

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 6 DECEMBER 2016 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:

Sally Marks (Chairman)
Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman)

	Mary Angell		David Hodge
	W D Barker OBE		Saj Hussain
	Mrs N Barton		David Ivison
	Ian Beardsmore		George Johnson
	John Beckett		Linda Kemeny
	Mike Bennison		Colin Kemp
	Liz Bowes		Eber Kington
	Natalie Bramhall		Rachael I Lake
*	Mark Brett-Warburton		Yvonna Lay
*	Ben Carasco		Ms D Le Gal
	Bill Chapman		Mary Lewis
	Helyn Clack		Ernest Mallett MBE
	Carol Coleman		Mr P J Martin
	Stephen Cooksey		Jan Mason
	Mr S Cosser	*	Marsha Moseley
	Clare Curran		Tina Mountain
	Graham Ellwood		Christopher Norman
	Jonathan Essex	*	John Orrick
	Robert Evans		Adrian Page
	Tim Evans		Karan Persand
	Mel Few		Chris Pitt
	Will Forster		Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
	Mrs P Frost	*	Denise Saliagopoulos
*	Denis Fuller		Tony Samuels
	John Furey		Pauline Searle
	Bob Gardner		Stuart Selleck
	Mike Goodman		Michael Sydney
	David Goodwin		Keith Taylor
	Michael Gosling		Barbara Thomson
	Zully Grant-Duff		Chris Townsend
	Ramon Gray		Denise Turner-Stewart
	Ken Gulati		Richard Walsh
	Tim Hall		Hazel Watson
	Kay Hammond		Fiona White
	Mr D Harmer		Richard Wilson
	Nick Harrison		Helena Windsor
	Marisa Heath		Keith Witham
	Peter Hickman		Mr A Young
	Margaret Hicks		Mrs V Young

*absent

70/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Mark Brett-Warburton, Mr Ben Carasco, Mr Denis Fuller, Ms Marsha Moseley, Mr John Orrick and Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos.

71/16 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 11 October 2016 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

72/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

She reminded Members to complete the Members' Allowances IRP questionnaire.

Recent events that were mentioned:

- She had attended the Buckingham Palace for the presentation of the Gold award in the Military Employer Recognition Scheme, in national recognition of Surrey County Council's commitment to the Armed Forces. It was available to view.
- An Orbis Award had been awarded to the Programme Team for Culture and was presented to the Deputy Chief Executive. The award was in recognition for outstanding organisation culture.
- A fascinating visit to Surrey Satellite Tech Ltd with Princess Anne & Lord-Lieutenant on 22 November. They make 40% of all satellites in the world.
- The official opening of Salfords Fire Station on 18 November.
- The official openings of two youth centres – Redhill Youth Centre on 14 November and Phoenix Youth Club at Tadworth on 24 November.
- She had attended a fundraising dinner at Loseley for hospices which had raised £23k to be divided between the five hospices in Surrey.
- Congratulations were given to the successful Cow Parade and thanks given to Mr Goodman for taking the idea forward.

73/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

Mr Mike Bennison declared a non-pecuniary interest in that his son worked at Heathrow.

Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin declared a non-prejudicial interest in that she received a pension from BAA Heathrow.

74/16 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

The Leader made a detailed statement. A copy of the statement is attached as Appendix A.

Members raised the following topics:

- There was much support for the sentiments and recognition that it was down to all Members to write MPs.
- The London Borough of Sutton was to become Oxfam's landlord following investment and the question was asked why Surrey could not invest outside of the County.

- A question was put as to how much development was unsustainable due to roads and traffic being beyond capacity.

75/16 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Declarations of interest:

None

Questions:

Notice of 22 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below:

(Q1) Mr Robert Evans stated that residents were horrified that the busiest fire station in Surrey was to be closed, that the number of incidents had risen and in the last consultation 92% of residents were opposed to the closure. Mr Ian Beardsmore asked what would happen if the bridge was gridlocked? The Cabinet Member stated that there were very difficult decisions to be made, that the fire service was changing year on year, and that only 20% of the total number of calls to the service related to fires. He also pointed out that North West Surrey had four stations in close proximity with another four nearby.

(Q3) Mrs Carol Coleman requested that the Cabinet Member look into staffing at the centre for dementia, stating that staff/client ratio was 2/10 and this was a safeguarding issue. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence replied that he would meet with Mrs Coleman to discuss her concerns.

(Q5) Mr Stephen Cooksey stated that the definition of DIY waste was not included in the response and that residents needed to know precisely what was meant by DIY waste. The Cabinet Member replied that extensive messages had been sent out regarding DIY waste. He also stated that the Council actions were within the law and other local authorities were following suit.

(Q6) Mrs Hazel Watson asked if actions could be taken sooner to which the Cabinet Member response was that it was not possible.

(Q8) Mr Ian Beardsmore stated that the response to his question gave no thought on forms of government and that the more liability the Council takes on, the less the budget the Council received. The Leader directed Mr Beardsmore to the section of his response which stated that decisions on governance could only be made when the details of any deal was known.

(Q10) Mrs Fiona White stated that pharmacies in less advantaged areas may be at risk of closure and residents needed good access. Mr Keith Witham requested to be kept informed of any updates and asked the Director for Public Health to report to the Social Care Services Board. The Cabinet Member stated that she would ensure information was circulated when she received it and that the issue would be raised at the Wellbeing Board.

(Q12) Mr Jonathan Evans stated that, whilst money for community support had increased, the money for individuals had reduced and he was of the belief that community support funding was to boost that for the individual. The Cabinet Member stated that the Council now had to rely more on voluntary organisations to perform some functions.

(Q14) Mr Stephen Cooksey asked if Skanska were interested in making replacements of the street lights. The Cabinet Member stated that safety was paramount for the Council, that consultation did take place and if something new came up he would respond. He also pointed out that to replace current lighting with LED lights would be very expensive and time consuming as each light column would need work.

(Q17) Mr Bill Barker asked about the Council approving planning applications and allowing HGV's to ruin the County's roads. The Cabinet Member had spoken with parish council about further work that they could take on and fund from their precept but they had been silent on this.

(Q18) Mr Will Forster asked for details on the number of refugee families being supported, to which the Cabinet Member responded that the Council were working with districts to support over 130 families.

(Q19) Mr Will Forster stated that he was very unhappy with the Cabinet Member's response to his question. The Cabinet Member stated that he thought the Liberal Democrats did not support censorship.

Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios are attached as Appendix C.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing: A statement was made that children and families services were dependent on early help and a request was made for an update on the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). The Cabinet Member reported that the MASH went live on 6 October 2016 and that delivery of the new operation had been challenging but much work had been done to bed in the new work and overcome teething problems. IT issues were overcome and the backlog and delay was now reduced. At present the daily work was being accomplished and the backlog being reduced.

Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning was asked if the work with buses was just a sticking plaster with further cuts coming in the next year, and that flytipping seemed to be increasing on the ground, which made a mockery of the statement that it was decreasing. The Cabinet Member reported that he was happy with the progress made with Abellio and explained that the county needed fair funding in the future. He also reported that flytipping tonnage was down, that the number of flytipping incidents would be available one month after tonnage figures, and that if they had indeed risen that he would work with enforcement on this.

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence was asked if he would consider funding from the Investment Strategy being used to pay for accommodation for extra care facilities. The Cabinet Member responded that site research was being undertaken and that funding would be provided if a site is found.

Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding: Concern was expressed about the policy on road safety in small communities. The Cabinet

Member explained that Drive Smart keep a close eye on the number of fatalities and where they occur. They would also look at the causation of fatalities. He would also request that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning look at this.

76/16 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There was one local Member statement, from Mr Michael Sydney, concerning future housing development on green belt land.

77/16 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

Item 8(i):

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Mike Goodman moved the motion, which was:

‘Given the decision by the Government to support a new runway at Heathrow, this Council reaffirms its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in July 2013.

The Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

This Council remains strongly of the view that expansion requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council wishes to work constructively with the Government, the airport, relevant national agencies, other local authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships on the expansion plans in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey residents and businesses.

However, this Council considers that the proposals and commitments, including on surface access, that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be prioritised nor that adequate funding will be committed.

This Council considers that any expansion will only be a success for Surrey residents and businesses and for the wider South East if there is a clear and agreed framework for the necessary infrastructure, including southern rail access, and other measures to be in place before any new runway comes into operation.

This Council calls on the Government to take the lead in developing such a framework.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Martin.

Mr Goodman said that:

- The future expansion of airports would benefit Surrey's economy.
- Service access to Heathrow was not good from Surrey. Only 4% travelled by rail and the majority by road, which was unsustainable.

- The Leader had written to and awaited a meeting with Chris Grayling MP.
- There was a need to ensure good connectivity with Surrey and reduce emissions around the airport site.
- He had spoken with Lord Ahmad about night flights and residents' need for respite.

Mr Essex moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

This was formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans.

The amendment was as follows **(with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)**:

~~'Given the decision by the Government to support a new runway at Heathrow, this Council reaffirms its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in July 2013.~~

The Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

This Council remains strongly of the view that expansion requires the climate change, noise, air pollution and environmental and surface access issues, as well as housing needs to all involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council wishes to work constructively with the Government, the airport, relevant national agencies, other local authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships ~~on the expansion plans~~ in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey residents and businesses.

~~However, this~~ This Council considers that the current proposals and commitments, including on climate change, noise, air pollution and surface access aspects that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be fully addressed ~~prioritised~~ nor that adequate funding will be committed.

This Council considers that ~~any expansion will only be a success for Surrey residents and businesses and for the wider South East if~~ the proposed southern rail access and other surface access schemes should be progressed now, there is a clear and agreed framework for the necessary infrastructure, including southern rail access, and other measures to be in place before any new runway comes into operation.

This Council calls on the Government to take the lead in progressing the improved Southern Access to the airport, and ensuring that the climate, environment, air pollution and surface access issues remain as preconditions which must be met before any expansion is considered. ~~developing such a framework.'~~

This amendment was not accepted by Mr Goodman and therefore Mr Essex spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- Whilst he sympathised with the original motion, the amendment aimed to match the aspiration of surface access issues.

- The amendment sets out what is meant by improvements.
- That the air pollution limits were already being breached and 40,000 people were being killed slowly each year by pollution. The only answer being to fly less.
- The issue of freight by road was not dealt with.

Mr Evans reserved his right to speak later.

Four Members spoke on the amendment and made the following comments:

- That the speech given by the mover of the motion reflected the amendment more than the original motion.
- It was reported that the Heathrow expansion would create another 20,000 jobs but there was no mention of where those additional workers were going to live. Therefore it was a threat to the Green Belt.
- The economic benefits were overstated.
- Nitrous oxide limits were already exceeded around the airport.
- Station improvements were needed at Woking before it could have access to Heathrow.
- That 10,000 Surrey residents were employed at Heathrow and Surrey was home to many international businesses. Therefore the economic benefits were real and the importance of expansion should not be diminished.

Mr Evans, as seconder, made the following points:

- The amendment strengthened the original motion.
- The 10,000 jobs already provided to Surrey residents would not be lost – they would continue to be there.
- Surrey's surface access was the worst in Europe.
- This was a missed opportunity to sort out the transport issues.
- That pollution at Stanwell could be tasted at times and the noise was terrible.
- Surrey had a housing problem which would be exacerbated by the expansion due to the properties that would be demolished to make way for it.
- The bus link 555 to the airport was to be reduced.

The amendment was put to the vote with 12 voting and 48 voting against. The amendment was lost and the original motion then discussed.

Eight Members spoke to the motion and made the following points:

- At the Heathrow seminar members had called upon airlines to adhere to regulations.
- The Surrey case for adequate funding had been well made.
- Expansion was needed at both airports.
- There maybe people working at airports wishing to live in Surrey and current residents may wish to move out due to the noise.
- Support was voiced for a rail link from Guildford.
- East Surrey were having a rail consultation. Connections were needed from east as well as west Surrey.
- It was important for Surrey to have input into the redesign of Heathrow.
- There was a disconnect between the motion and the speech given.
- Imbalance would increase if expansion went ahead. Additional housing was needed.

- Although Spelthorne and Guildford were geographically close to Heathrow, it could take a long time to travel from there to the airport due to the 8mph average road speed in those areas.

Mr Goodman stated that he was championing rail access and informed Council that there was to be a flight path consultation and members and residents would hear from the districts when the consultation started.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 55 voting for, 9 voting against and 3 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

Resolved:

Given the decision by the Government to support a new runway at Heathrow, this Council reaffirms its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in July 2013.

The Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

This Council remains strongly of the view that expansion requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council wishes to work constructively with the Government, the airport, relevant national agencies, other local authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships on the expansion plans in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey residents and businesses.

However, this Council considers that the proposals and commitments, including on surface access, that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be prioritised nor that adequate funding will be committed.

This Council considers that any expansion will only be a success for Surrey residents and businesses and for the wider South East if there is a clear and agreed framework for the necessary infrastructure, including southern rail access, and other measures to be in place before any new runway comes into operation.

This Council calls on the Government to take the lead in developing such a framework.

Item 8(ii)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Ian Beardsmore moved the motion, which was:

‘The Council notes the difficulties in recruiting and retaining skilled staff to work for the County Council, the high cost of agency staff and that the situation is becoming critical as the council’s financial position worsens.

This Council has previously agreed that more emphasis should be given to key worker housing as one approach to dealing with this problem.

The Council now agrees to support a new investment strategy that sees increased emphasis on acquiring key worker housing for Surrey, to help recruit and retain more skilled staff whilst reducing agency spend.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Hazel Watson.

Mr Beardsmore said that:

- Newly qualified staff would not move to Surrey due to the costs and wanted a change of emphasis on human infrastructure.

Ms Denise Le Gal moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

This was formally seconded by Mrs Mary Lewis.

The amendment was as follows **(with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)**:

'The Council notes the difficulties in recruiting and retaining skilled staff to work for the County Council, the high cost of agency staff and that the situation is becoming critical as the council's financial position worsens.

This Council has previously agreed that more emphasis should be given to key worker housing as one approach to dealing with this problem.

The Council now agrees to explore the options available to enhance the provision of key worker housing in Surrey in order to ~~to support a new investment strategy that sees increased emphasis on acquiring key worker housing for Surrey,~~ to help recruit and retain more skilled staff whilst reducing agency spend.'

Ms Le Gal stated that the amendment allowed the Council to explore the various options in dealing with this issue.

This amendment was accepted by Mr Beardsmore and thus became the substantive motion.

Mrs Lewis made the following points:

- Other government agencies appeared able to pay more for skilled staff than Surrey were.
- Young professionals wanted to be able to buy their home so there was a need for a range of schemes such as part ownership. There was also a need for a variety of housing.
- Social workers were asking for reduced caseloads and more reflective supervision. The Council was making progress in this regard with its Safer Surrey approach.

Three Members spoke on the motion and made the following comments:

- Welcomed Ms Le Gal's statement that the public estate would be used for key worker staff.
- Increased agency costs were being paid for social workers, planners and highway engineers.
- There was an increase in cost of living in Surrey.
- The Investment Strategy needs changing rather than paying for investment properties outside of Surrey.

The motion was put to the vote with the majority voting for.

Therefore, it was:

Resolved:

The Council notes the difficulties in recruiting and retaining skilled staff to work for the County Council, the high cost of agency staff and that the situation is becoming critical as the council's financial position worsens.

This Council has previously agreed that more emphasis should be given to key worker housing as one approach to dealing with this problem.

The Council now agrees to explore the options available to enhance the provision of key worker housing in Surrey in order to help recruit and retain more skilled staff whilst reducing agency spend.

The Council adjourned for lunch at 12.53~~pm~~ and reconvened at 14.00~~pm~~.

Item 8(iii)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Robert Evans moved the motion, which was:

'This Council congratulates the many teachers, support staff, parents, governors and children who have enabled the vast majority of Surrey's schools to be judged, by Ofsted, as 'good' or 'outstanding'. Council is very proud that Surrey has so many excellent schools at every phase of education.

Surrey County Council takes great pride that as an education authority, it has for many years, been at the forefront of innovative, progressive education and setting high standards in schools.

There have been many changes in the format of schools in recent years, with for example, academies and free schools being created. Council therefore believes that a period of stability would be beneficial and is concerned that the Government is considering yet further changes.

Council expresses confidence in its teachers and headteachers to continue to deliver a high quality education under the current system.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Essex who reserved his right to speak later.

Mr Evans said that:

- That there were good schools in Surrey with good results and good teaching.
- Pupils receiving free school meals were underrepresented at grammar schools.
- Surrey provided a good mix of specialist schools.
- He was opposed to the 11+ exam and any further major changes to schools.

Mrs White moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

This was formally seconded by Mr Forster.

The amendment was as follows **(with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)**:

'This Council congratulates the many teachers, support staff, parents, governors and children who have enabled the vast majority of Surrey's schools to be judged, by Ofsted, as 'good' or 'outstanding'. Council is very proud that Surrey has so many excellent schools at every phase of education.

Surrey County Council takes great pride that as an education authority, it has for many years, been at the forefront of innovative, progressive education and setting high standards in schools.

There have been many changes in the format of schools in recent years, with for example, academies and free schools being created. Council therefore believes that a period of stability would be beneficial and is concerned that the Government is considering yet further changes.

Council expresses confidence in its teachers and headteachers to continue to deliver a high quality education ~~under the current system~~ without introducing grammar schools or any further major reorganisations.'

This amendment was not accepted by Mr Evans and therefore Mrs White spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- That grammar schools were divisive.
- Another organisation was setting up grammars.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement made the following points:

- Selection was already taking place in secondary schools e.g. with post codes.
- Agreed there should be a period of stability
- Surrey received £450 less per pupil than London boroughs across the border.
- There was a need to work with schools without setting conditions.

At this point Mrs White withdrew her amendment.

Four Members spoke to the substantive motion and made the following points:

- Opposes the motion especially as it was shutting down the means to modernise. There was a need to modernise the selection process to allow a better mix of pupils.
- Congratulations to the schools in Surrey which were good schools providing good education.
- There was agreement with the Cabinet Member's speech regarding selection.
- It was down to schools to challenge.
- There was a need for technical colleges.
- There was a need for some stability for the next few years.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 48 voting for, 5 voting against and 6 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

Resolved:

This Council congratulates the many teachers, support staff, parents, governors and children who have enabled the vast majority of Surrey's schools to be judged, by Ofsted, as 'good' or 'outstanding'. Council is very proud that Surrey has so many excellent schools at every phase of education.

Surrey County Council takes great pride that as an education authority, it has for many years, been at the forefront of innovative, progressive education and setting high standards in schools.

There have been many changes in the format of schools in recent years, with for example, academies and free schools being created. Council therefore believes that a period of stability would be beneficial and is concerned that the Government is considering yet further changes.

Council expresses confidence in its teachers and headteachers to continue to deliver a high quality education under the current system.

78/16 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 18 October and 22 November 2016.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A School Organisation Plan

One Member stated that the 1% margin of error in Surrey goes against what was said at the previous meeting.

RESOLVED:

1. That the School Organisation Plan 2016/17 – 2025/26 be approved.
2. To note that at present the funding for the increased number of school places within this Plan has not been fully identified.

Reports for Information/ Discussion

One Member stated that the action plan should have measurable and bigger targets to which the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning responded that the plan sets out what the intentions are.

B Smarter Working for the Environment: Policy Statement and Action Plan

RESOLVED:

That the Smarter Working for the Environment: Policy Statement and Action Plan be noted.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 18 October and 22 November 2016 be adopted.

79/16 PAY POLICY STATEMENT [Item 10]

The Leader presented this report and stated that members, officers and trade unions had worked closely together to get this Statement more focussed on awarding high performance and gave more flexibility for staff and modernised work practices.

RESOLVED:

That the Pay Policy Statement for 2016 – 2017 be agreed.

80/16 RECRUITMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSON [Item 11]

The chairman of the selection panel presented this report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council agrees the recommendation of the selection panel and appoints Mr Bernard Quoroll as the Independent Person for Surrey for a four year term ending on 5 December 2020.
2. That the Council authorises the Monitoring Officer to identify an appropriate alternative Independent Person appointed by a Surrey District or Borough Council to fulfil the role should Mr Quoroll be unavailable or unable to act.

81/16 CONSTITUTION UPDATE REPORT [Item 12]

The Leader submitted this report and its appendices to the Council.

RESOLVED:

That the Council approves the following recommendations with immediate effect:

1. The non-executive changes to the Scheme of Delegation within the Constitution.
2. Notes the executive changes to the Scheme of Delegation that were approved by the Leader on 9 November.
3. Notes that Part 6 of the Constitution (Codes and Protocols) has been updated following administrative changes and will be published on the Council's website.

82/16 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 13]

Mr Alan Young referred to the Cabinet Member's response to a public question regarding roads in Tandridge. He asked to see mileage percentage figures for the road network in each area and the percentage of total road funding to each area.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding would ensure Mr Young received the figures but also pointed out that the important data would be the condition of the roads and not the mileage.

[Meeting ended at: 2.40 pm]

Chairman

County Council – 6 December 2016
Leader of the Council's Statement

Madam Chairman, I used to be one of the millions of workers making the daily commute by train to and from the capital. Every evening when I arrived back at Caterham station, as everybody got into cars, onto bicycles, or hit the pavements, the Sheriff would be there to meet me. No, Madam Chairman, he wasn't there to arrest me. This kind and gentle man would offer to join me on my walk home rain or shine, day or night.

We never knew that much about each other - I didn't even know his real name or much about where he came from - but on our way up the hill, towards my home, we would talk about anything and everything that had happened that day. When I reached my front door we would say our goodbyes and he would carry on his way – back to St Lawrence's Hospital in Caterham.

Madam Chairman, my friend didn't live in this institution because he had a long-term illness, nor did he need to be there to receive medical care. He lived there simply because he had a Learning Disability. It was a place where he should never have been. It wasn't right for him. And it wasn't right for our communities. Surrey had a great many of these institutions – they were full of people with Learning Disabilities like the Sheriff. But today, those place are gone - and rightly so.

St Lawrence's Hospital in Caterham has closed down, like many other institutions in Surrey, and people with Learning Disabilities are now supported by our social care services and living in our communities. It's a change that means instead of being treated as patients, they are seen as individuals; like all of us. Because we know that people with Learning Disabilities will always be better-off

- when they are supported in their own community,
- when they are kept close to loved ones,
- and when they are empowered with their families to make decisions about their own care.

Today, our council supports over 3,500 Surrey residents with a Learning Disability. Take James for example. James attended Young Epilepsy until 2014. When he left college, James's parents wanted him to be able to live independently. And at the same time as this young man was finishing college, Surrey was working to develop a new supported living service for younger people. James was able to join this service when he left Young Epilepsy and in those two years, he has developed his independent skills – like cooking and cleaning. He has forged links in his new community; joining a gym, attending a rambling club and enjoying going out with his friends. It is a huge success. For James and his family.

Then there is Tom. Tom lives at home with his mother and sister. Whilst attending college, Tom was on a work experience placement at Surrey University. They were so impressed with his work that they offered him a paid job. So Surrey worked with the college to develop a role that would fit around Tom's course. Now he's doing really well - both on the course and at work. Another great success.

That's why we do all we can to support residents with Learning Disabilities – helping them do the ordinary things which most us take for granted; helping them to be part of their local community and ensuring their voice is listened to. Surely, this is some of the most important work this council does.

However, the number of residents with Learning Disabilities we support is rising fast. In 2011, 860 adults with severe Learning Disabilities were transferred into our care from the National Health Service. Because of their complex needs they required personal support in the community. Yet this was by far the biggest transfer of Learning Disability cases in the entire country - 8 times larger than the average.

Madam Chairman, it was because of this large increase in numbers, that the government gave Surrey 64 million pounds to support these residents annually.

Now - here comes the sting in the tail.

Three years later this funding – worth sixty nine million pounds at this point - was simply rolled in with our overall government grant. The very same grant which has been slashed again and again by central government. It means the money we got to look after some of our most vulnerable residents with Learning Disabilities is - in effect - simply disappearing. That's tens of millions of pounds wiped clean off our books. Tens of millions of pounds we have no real way of replacing. And tens of millions of pounds we urgently need now to support some of the most vulnerable residents in our communities.

Madam Chairman, no other local authority faces a situation on this scale. No other area has such a large demand. Numbers at these levels exist only here, in Surrey. Our county is actually home to the largest population of people with Learning Disabilities not just in the UK, but across Europe. In fact, the number of people this council supports is expected to rise to over 3,750 by April 2017. That's an increase of 36% in just five years. It means we will need to provide more care packages than ever before...

- for increasingly complex cases...
- and for a rising number of young people leaving Children's services – who will need our social care services for many years to come.

We have reached the point where demand is so high that Learning Disabilities is actually the largest area of Adult Social Care spend for this council. Even higher than our spend on older residents. We have worked hard to keep costs down - as we have across all council services. Despite numbers increasing by 36% we have reduced the average cost of supporting residents with Learning Disabilities by 12% over the past five years. Yet unrelenting demand and sky-rocketing costs - over which we have no control - means that this financial year we expect to spend over 168 million pounds on our Learning Disability services.

Madam Chairman, that's more than ever before.

With rising demand set to continue, it is fast becoming more and more difficult to find the funding for these services as Government cuts bite. We are trapped in an unsustainable system. A system which makes no allowances for the demographic demand in Surrey. A system which is stretching our finances to breaking point. The government must recognise the situation in Surrey before it's too late. They must recognise the financial impact of such a high level of Learning Disability demand. After all, by their own admission, government said that Surrey County Council needed 75 million pounds to support the Learning Disabilities clients we took from NHS in 2011. But as I have said that funding is disappearing in smokescreens.

Government must make sure we receive correct funding to take care of residents with Learning Disabilities in Surrey.

Madam Chairman, looking after Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities is our responsibility – a responsibility we treasure and we work hard to make a difference to their

lives – but Government also has a responsibility to make sure that our most vulnerable residents are supported through fair funding.

Our Social Care Services have the power to change these residents' lives for the better.

There are hundreds more stories like those of James and Tom where our support has made a huge difference. Hundreds more stories which inspire us. Hundreds more stories which drive us to get it right for our residents.

Madam Chairman, at the moment I'm reading Joey Deacon's story. It reminds me just how important it is that we listen to residents with Learning Disabilities– because everyone has their own story to tell. I'm really proud of the hard-working staff in our social care services and I'm even more humbled by the fortitude and character demonstrated by residents with Learning Disabilities and their families. A fortitude and character that is evidenced by Joey Deacon's story.

Madam Chairman, they are a credit to our communities throughout Surrey.

As a Council:-

- We must never stop listening.
- We must never stop caring.
- And we must never stop fighting for funding to ensure people with Learning Disabilities live and grow as part of our communities in Surrey.

Madam Chairman, I have never been afraid to tell the truth to those in power. If government policies are letting Surrey residents down it is my job – if fact, the job of all of us – to speak up for Surrey. Our MPs and central government need to be told when the people of Surrey are being treated unfairly. I will fight tooth and nail to get the right deal – a fair deal - for Surrey.

So I call on Surrey's MPs and Government to understand the reality – that Surrey has the highest volume of residents with Learning Disabilities in the country. I call on them to listen to the facts – facts which make it clear that we can't cope with rising demand while our budgets are slashed year after year. I call on them to do what's right for Surrey and fund Learning Disabilities fairly. And I call on our 11 Surrey MPs to join me in this campaign to ensure that those with Learning Disabilities get the support they deserve.

+For every resident. For every Sheriff. For every James. For every Tom. For every Joey.

I call on the Government to act now before it is too late.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2016

**QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1**

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(1) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:

Can the Council update members on the state of progress regarding the proposed changes to fire cover in Spelthorne. Is the new fire station still going ahead? What are the problems that have been encountered and what is the up to date budget for the whole project?

Reply

Changes are being proposed to the current fire provision in the Spelthorne area that will impact residents in Surrey, particularly in the borough and in neighbouring Elmbridge and Runnymede. As a result a public consultation was launched on 29 November. The consultation will run until 20 February 2017.

We had planned to close Sunbury and Staines fire stations by the end of this financial year, after the new fire station at Fordbridge had opened. The development of the new fire station "Fordbridge" is still going ahead but has been delayed while we secure the best possible vehicle access to the site.

However, the need to make savings has not changed. We need to operate from one fire station from April 2017 until Fordbridge opens, in order to achieve the savings.

Having looked carefully at the potential options, we are proposing that Staines fire station should close and that Sunbury fire station remain to provide cover until Fordbridge is ready. In addition to the cover provided by Sunbury, crews from nearby stations, such as Chertsey and Egham, would also be called upon if needed. Subject to planning it is anticipated that Fordbridge fire station will be operational by summer 2018.

We have also reviewed the plans to have an on-call crew to work alongside the fulltime crew when Fordbridge is operational. The council faces huge financial pressures and needs to find tens of millions of pounds extra each year to meet rising demand for services such as adult social care. In light of these pressures we're facing, we have little choice but to propose to go ahead with Fordbridge without an on-call crew.

Residents and other stakeholders are encouraged to have their say on these proposals by completing the questionnaire online at www.surrey-fire.gov.uk/psp where further information is also available. Paper questionnaires will be available in libraries, council offices and fire stations in the Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Runnymede areas from December until February.

Cabinet approved (on 23 June 2015) £4.9m to build a new fire station in Spelthorne. The current Budget is £5.3M, an increase of £400k. This cost is provided for in the

MTFP as it is part of a larger fire reconfiguration budget supporting savings set out to 2020.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(2) MR ERNEST MALLETT (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:

Congratulations on getting County publicity in the 'CASH FOR TRASH' TV series. Well done also for realising that Peter Martin's division of Godalming South, Milford and Witley is the one where the residents throw away the most valuable stuff.

Would you agree to getting even more publicity for the County by appearing in the next series as Father Christmas or if it is in the New Year, as some other delightful character?

Reply

I have to congratulate the programme for recognising there is nothing rubbish about Surrey!

We all know there is value in everything Godalming, Milford and Witley has to offer – just look at the quality of their county councillor!

I'd be delighted to appear in the next series but unfortunately my talents in this portfolio have been spotted and have been snapped up for the remake of Steptoe and Son!

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE, WELLBEING AND INDEPENDENCE

(3) MRS CAROL COLEMAN (ASHFORD) TO ASK:

Early Years day care settings have strict regulations concerning numbers of staff ratio to children and are inspected and monitored by Ofsted regularly to safeguard our young children. There is also an inspection and monitoring regime of youth centres and schools where children are looked after during the daytime. CQC inspect and monitor homes for elderly and vulnerable people in the borough, but what about day centres for the elderly such as people with dementia? There should be a minimum ratio of staff to clients, and inspections to ensure that these people are getting a good standard of care and the correct stimulation and nutrition and fluids. Who is responsible and what are Surrey County Council and the borough and district councils doing to inspect and monitor day care for the elderly and for people with Dementia in Surrey to safeguard them?

Reply

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) only register and inspect services that fall within the legal scope of registration and provide 'regulated activities'. Traditional day care centres are not regulated by CQC. However, a number of day care facilities take place within services that are registered with CQC for example registered care homes and nursing homes. Our Adult Social Care Quality Monitoring team focus their monitoring and work with care homes, nursing homes, home based care agencies and supported living services to improve the quality and experiences of individuals using these

services. They would not generally undertake visits to day care services unless they were specifically asked to do so by a local ASC team.

Day care services that are commissioned by Surrey County Council are monitored through the contract that we have with them. The contract includes quality measures and outcomes that are expected to be delivered as part of the contract.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(4) MRS PAT FROST (FARNHAM CENTRAL) TO ASK:

At the last full Council I was intrigued by the question about the Young Musician Award. I looked into it further and came across a leaflet which said "The Alan Young Award for the best musician in Surrey". It seems unusual for an individual councillor to be named in this way. Can the Leader to confirm that no Surrey County Council money was used to support this endeavour.

Reply

In 2015, a grant of £2000 was made to Awards for Young Musicians to provide a Surrey Young Musician of the Year Award. This was financed by the Council, through the Members' Allocation Fund and was supported by Councillor Alan Young.

Earlier this year I became aware that this same award had been publicised as the "Alan Young Award" and was sufficiently concerned by this to refer the matter to the Monitoring Officer. She decided that this needed to be dealt with in accordance with this Council's Arrangements for investigating and determining whether a Member has breached the Council's Code of Conduct.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(5) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK:

Following the letter I have received from DCLG on 18th November confirming that the prohibition on charging should extend to household waste from DIY, will the Cabinet member now set out when he will stop charging Surrey residents to dispose of household DIY waste at CRCs?

Reply

The Council has followed legal definitions around the types of waste that can be charged for at the Council's community recycling centres and is confident that this legislation has been interpreted correctly in applying the charging scheme implemented on 1st September 2016. The same interpretations have been made by all the other authorities that charge for the materials in question, including our immediate neighbours Hampshire and West Sussex who have also introduced charging schemes recently. The letter from DCLG refers to non-statutory guidance from WRAP. This guidance confirms in table 5.1 that the council can make a charge for waste which comprises construction and demolition waste from the household such as the following items

- Doors and windows;
- Fitted kitchens;

- Fitted wardrobes;
- Inert material such as rubble and concrete,
- Bricks and roof tiles;
- Plasterboard;
- Soil from landscaping activities;
- Any other building materials;
- Commercial wastes; and
- Tyres.

MRS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

(6) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:

What steps is the county council taking to rationalize its office portfolio, where offices are under occupied or empty?

Reply

There are only four buildings in our Corporate Office Portfolio all of which are occupied. These include Consort House in Redhill, Fairmount House in Leatherhead, County Hall in Kingston and Quadrant Court in Woking.

In recent years the office portfolio has contracted with the Runnymede Centre in Runnymede being developed into a new secondary school serving that area.

We monitor office utilisation through regular surveys and this supports both operational change, the shifting and merging of teams to make best use of a site and strategic change, the consolidation of teams and functions into a building so that ultimately the building may be reallocated for either other use, letting, or sale, if that is appropriate.

Following the last utilisation survey, 2015/2016 we have committed to the following actions:

1. Reviewing the pool or team ownership of space throughout the sites, looking to create bigger management pools which in turn will increase the amount of available space or headroom at the site. Opening up more flexible spaces such as hotdesking, which is popular and well used.
2. Ensuring all space is booked through the new space management system which will be fully live in July 2017. Monitor meeting room use and in particular meeting "no-shows" through the new system.
3. Foster a culture of space sharing amongst staff such that we optimise our space through ensuring we cancel a meeting room if no longer needed and only reserving hotdesking for the time we know we will be there at site.

MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

(7) MR DAVID GOODWIN (GUILDFORD SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:

Surrey schools provide an excellent standard of education to young people across the county. However, our headteachers have written to the government outlining their opposition to plans for new grammar schools, stating that they are strongly opposed to

creating a "selective, segregated, two-tier state funded system of education". Does the Cabinet member agree with the headteachers and the points outlined in their letter?

Reply

Many schools and community groups feel selective education would not be consistent with their values and Surrey's inclusive approach; the council recognises the strength of feeling within Surrey's education community on this matter.

Surrey's schools have also reaffirmed their commitment to moving forward together and building on the effective partnership working already taking place across the county. Strong partnerships have helped to drive a significant increase in the number of good and outstanding schools in the county and the Council will continue to support the development of local partnerships wherever possible.

Despite Surrey's success, we know there are areas in which we still need to see outcomes improve. We must maintain our focus on providing the right support for vulnerable learners – including those with special educational needs and disabilities – while also ensuring the most able pupils can realise their potential.

Sharing expertise and resources through effective partnerships will help us to meet the needs of individuals. Surrey's children and young people already benefit from peer-to-peer and cross-sector collaboration - as demonstrated by the development of Surrey's first UTC - and it is vital that we continue to harness knowledge and expertise across all sectors of education.

Surrey County Council is committed to supporting schools to build on their strengths and in so doing make the transition to a sustainable schools-led system. The Council will also continue to protect and promote the principle of choice, helping schools to reach the right local decisions for their children and young people.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(8) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON AND ASHFORD COMMON) TO ASK:

The cross-party Communities and Local Government Select Committee, in its report on devolution to cities & regions stated that:

"We believe elected Mayors are likely to be better suited to urban areas. The scale, geography and economic diversity of non-metropolitan areas mean elected Mayors are unlikely to be an easy fit. Local areas should be allowed to decide whether or not they wish to have an elected Mayor. Those which do not want an elected Mayor, but nonetheless want substantial devolved powers, should be allowed to propose an equally strong alternative model of governance". Does the Leader agree with this?

Reply

Seeking devolution of powers from central government that deliver improvements for residents and our businesses is my priority, rather than focusing on forms of governance.

I recognise that for the ambitious devolution of responsibilities from government we are seeking, appropriate and proportionate governance arrangements will need to be agreed. I can confirm that all Councils will be involved in the decision about the form

this might take – but these decisions can only be made when the detail of any deal is known.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(9) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:

Surrey County Council currently offers borough and district councils Recycling Credits to encourage high recycling rates across Surrey. Please will the Cabinet Member confirm if the County Council will be reviewing its Recycling Credits system?

Reply

The need to make changes to the current financial arrangements for waste management has been discussed within the Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) and by Surrey Chief Executives since the beginning of 2015 as the current system is no longer working to improve recycling and has led to a net cost transfer to the county council. SCC and the SWP have identified that significant savings and improvements for residents can be made by changing the way in which waste is managed in the county.

A business case developed by the SWP proposes that waste services are delivered via a new partnership arrangement which is collectively owned by SCC and Surrey's district and borough councils. This would mean the benefits gained by working together would be shared across all authorities.

Whilst work on delivering this approach continues, SCC is committed to working with district and borough councils to collectively develop new financial arrangements from 2018/19 onwards, which would replace recycling credits and a number of other financial transfers. This new system would need to consider the true cost of waste management, share these costs equitably across all authorities and effectively incentivise performance improvement.

SCC Cabinet will discuss a paper on this subject on 13 December 2016.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

(10) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:

Pharmacies provide a vital service to people all over the county, alleviating pressure on the NHS and GPs, and giving face-to-face, professional healthcare advice without an appointment. The Department of Health (DH) has proposed budget cuts to the subsidy provided to pharmacies of £170m nationally to take effect from December 2016. How many pharmacies in Surrey does the Cabinet member estimate are at risk of closure as a result of these cuts?

Reply

Colleagues at NHS England in the South East Community Pharmacy team are responsible for overseeing and commissioning community pharmacy. They have advised that they are unable to give a definitive number of pharmacies at risk of closure, however they are continuing to work and support community pharmacies across Surrey and the rest of South East.

This is a link to a Government document that sets out the package of reforms that has been developed and approved by Department of Health Ministers, following consultation with the Pharmaceutical Services Negotiating Committee (PSNC) and other key stakeholders, including patient and public representatives. There is a list of pharmacies in the annexe that could be affected by the national changes as they are in rural areas. These pharmacies will get protected supplementary payment to mitigate against the threat of closure.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-pharmacy-reforms>

I am following this up with the Community Pharmacy Contracts Manager and as soon as I hear anything more concrete will let you know, by way of a written response.

MRS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

(11) MR JOHN ORRICK (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:

The Council's Constitution outlines a "Strategy Against Fraud & Corruption". Can the Cabinet Member outline the amount of money lost to fraud over the last 5 years and what monies, if any, were recovered? How many prosecutions have been secured over the last 5 years and what was the penalty in each case?

Reply

The council is committed to a zero tolerance policy in relation to fraud and corruption.

In the period from 1 April 2011 to 30 November 2016 (which covers five full financial years plus the current year to date) the total known amount of money lost to Surrey County Council through fraud loss (including theft) is £586,394.

In the same period, a total of £322,317 has been recovered from the perpetrators of these fraudulent acts. Additionally, there is one case still in court where the council anticipates a further recovery of £162,000 of public funds.

These totals necessarily reflect only the known cases of fraud, and cannot therefore be a summary of all fraud that may have occurred within the last five years.

A total of 12 cases have been referred to the police in this period, some of which are still on-going. In each case, the decision to prosecute rests with the Crown Prosecution Service and not with the council.

Known outcomes from police referrals include:

- 1 case of community service
- 1 court case dismissed due to police procedural issues
- 1 individual arrested but no charge brought
- 3 cases where no further action was brought
- 3 cautions given out
- 1 custodial sentence
- 2 cases are on-going

A refreshed Counter Fraud Strategy and Framework was reviewed by the Audit and Governance Committee on Monday and a report on completed fraud investigations is presented by Internal Audit to the Audit and Governance Committee twice yearly.

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE, WELLBEING AND INDEPENDENCE

(12) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:

Please can you provide details as to how much of the money saved through the Family, Friends and Community Support scheme to reduce care packages for Surrey residents has been used to provide improved services for residents in the community? In particular please can you confirm:

- a) How the amount of funding provided by Surrey County Council to the voluntary, community and faith sector through the Adult Social Care and Public Health budget has changed since the introduction of this scheme; and
- b) What level of financial reduction to the work packages for Surrey residents have been realised for each year to date and what is currently forecast for this financial year in the categories of: physical & sensory disabilities, learning disabilities, mental health and substance misuse and older people?

Reply

- a) The Family, Friends and Community (FFC) support programme commenced in 2014/15. The amount spent by Adult Social Care (ASC) on grants to voluntary, community, faith and other support organisations in 2014/15 was £8.3m. The amount forecast to be spent by ASC on grants in 2016/17 is £6.8m. The reduction in grant expenditure is due to two main factors. Firstly, one stream of the FFC programme has been the promotion of corporate social responsibility. This has focused on highlighting that the council is not the only funding source for the third sector and working with business to encourage them to invest in supporting local organisations in their areas. This will enable a shift in some investment from the council to local businesses. Secondly, ASC has conducted a review of all contracts and grants in 2016/17 to analyse current performance and assess the equalities impacts of any changes to funding levels. This review has resulted in reductions in some contracts and grants, many of which reflect more efficient practice or commissioning rather than a reduction in the overall service offer.
- b) A fundamental aspect of the FFC programme has been to adapt the social care assessment process to encourage residents to utilise support that is freely available through family, friends or community assets, and in doing so deliver better outcomes at less cost by developing a better support network for people’s care and placing less reliance on the local authority. Ensuring people’s eligible care need are being met remains at the heart of the social care assessment process.

The table below outlines the savings achieved through the FFC approach to assessments since the start of the programme split across the main care groups.

Care Group	2014/15 £m	2014/15 £m	2015/16 £m	2016/17* £m
Older people (all care 65+)	0.9	1.0	1.3	0.9
Physical & Sensory Disabilities (26-64)	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.1
Learning Disabilities (26-64)	0.4	0.4	1.7	0.4

Transition (18-25)	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.2
Mental Health & Substance Misuse (18-64)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total Adult Social Care	1.7	2.4	4.4	1.7

* Up to the end of October 2016

MRS LINDA KEMENY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

(13) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK (2ND):

How many children in Surrey are 'home-educated'? To what extent is the County responsible for their education and what checks and supervision procedures does the County have in place?"

Reply

As at 30 November 2016 there were 686 children registered for Elective Home Education (EHE). Children who are withdrawn from school need to be registered with the Local Authority (LA), a parent must write to the Headteacher requesting that their child is de-registered and confirming that it is their intention to home educate their child. If a child has never been registered for a school place then they are not lawfully required to be registered with the LA.

The Education Act 1996 Section 7 states that a parent must ensure that their child receives education that is full-time, efficient and suitable. There are no statutory definitions for these requirements. A parent can lawfully refuse to have any contact with the LA regarding the provision of home education. There is no statutory duty to monitor home education and the Surrey EHE Team cannot insist on seeing either a child or examples of a child's work or ask for evidence of a timetable of learning activities unless it is made known to the LA that "...it appears that the parents are not providing a suitable education..."

Surrey has an EHE Team comprising of one full time senior officer, one half time and term time only worker and one half time admin worker. The Team works collaboratively with colleagues in Early Help, Children Services, Education Welfare Service, Health and Police Services to address concerns where they are made known to the LA.

The Surrey EHE Team is working hard to encourage families who have chosen not to register to make themselves known to the LA wherever possible; for example there is a working practice in place with Surrey hospitals (A&E) who routinely alert the LA when an unregistered home educating family come to notice and we seek to establish contact with these families and encourage registration with the LA..

When it becomes clear that following support, advice and guidance that a family is not able to provide fulltime, efficient or suitable education for their children (either within the family or through provision of Tutors) the Surrey EHE Team will discuss this with the family and advise that the child must be removed from the Elective Home Education Register and needs to be returned to a school setting. The responsibility for a child is then passed to colleagues in the Education Welfare Service.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(14) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK (2ND):

Given that the current street lighting contract allows for technical innovation, will the Cabinet member explore how new technologies could help save Surrey money over the lifetime of the contract, and reduce the county council's carbon footprint?

Reply

Officers have been and will continue to review opportunities to save money and reduce our carbon footprint on street lighting. One of the biggest opportunities for Local Authorities to reduce energy consumption is through the installation of a Central Management System to dynamically control the street lights.

Being one of the first Councils to adopt this technology in 2010, we have been able to dim lights since they were replaced during the first 5 years of the PFI contract. It also enabled us to extend the dimming of lights by an hour to commence at ten o'clock each night in October 2015 saving £90,000 per year and Members will be aware we have recently begun switching off lights in Residential roads from midnight to 0500 each night which, when completed will save a further £220,000 each year.

The energy pressures facing Local Authorities means the industry is adapting and developing new technologies to combat these however, things like solar and wind power or sensor controlled lighting are not yet proven to be cost effective on a large scale.

LED replacements provide the greatest opportunity to reduce energy consumption however the Council would need to fund the Capital replacement costs of any conversion programme. Officers are currently revisiting opportunities to replace higher wattage lanterns on traffic routes to evaluate whether the savings generated will provide a quick enough payback to make this viable.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(15) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK (2ND):

I understand that Devon County Council have adopted a scheme of Road Wardens who are trained to repair small potholes before they grow big enough to be a danger to cyclists and damage cars. Has Surrey County Council considered adopting a similar scheme?

Reply

For a number of years the County Council has successfully operated a "Localism" initiative where Parish Councils, Town Councils or constituted Resident Associations can work with us to undertake a range of routine highway maintenance functions. The Road Warden scheme for Devon operates with their Parish Councils and, at the moment is a trial. It should be noted that in both Surrey and Devon neither of these initiatives replace the formal highway inspection and repair regime, but compliment it.

If there are specific requests forthcoming from Parish or Town Councils via our established localism arrangements, I have asked Officers to carefully consider them.

MRS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

(16) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK (2ND):

Please can the Cabinet Member confirm what is the Council's full bill for the failed legal challenge of Windsor and Maidenhead Council's decision to ban HGV movement on Windsor Road?

Reply

The outcome of any litigation is always uncertain. We challenged the introduction of the weight limit on this stretch of road on a number of grounds, but unfortunately were not successful. As a result we will pay our own costs and those of RBWM, a total of £21,700.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(17) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK (2ND):

In the past year the County Council has conducted a speed survey in Hollow Lane, Wotton, Dorking which concluded that it would be appropriate for the speed limit to be reduced on this rural lane from the national default speed limit to a 40mph speed limit. The County Council has thus placed this potential speed reduction on the list of proposed schemes which will be considered for implementation in the future but has decided not to fund the implementation of the lower speed limit in the next financial year.

Would the Cabinet member for Highways and Flooding agree with me that it is a waste of money for the County Council to fund and carry out such initial survey work only to put the proposed scheme resulting from the survey work onto an unfunded projects list and would he agree that the situation that we currently have where projects have to separately bid for survey funding and then for implementation funding is evidence that the Department he runs is inefficient, out of control, and wasteful in its spending in that some projects which have been developed up to implementation stage are never actually implemented?

To address this, will the Cabinet Member identify additional funding for proposed schemes where the initial survey work has been carried out and where schemes have been approved for future implementation by Local Committees so that these schemes are actually implemented in the next year?

Reply

Speed surveys are carried out by the Local Area Teams for two main reasons. The first main reason is where there has been a request for a speed limit reduction. The survey is carried out to establish if the measured mean speeds comply with the County Council's Speed Limit Policy for a reduction in speed limit. The second main reason is where there is a perceived traffic speeding problem on a stretch of road. A speed

survey is carried out to gather evidence to determine if a scheme for speed reducing measures would be appropriate, before prioritisation.

Surrey Police are consulted on the survey locations, when a survey is carried out as a result of a request to reduce a speed limit. This is because the Police would be responsible for enforcement of the reduced speed limit if the speed limit reduction proposal is progressed.

Traffic speed surveys are a revenue funded activity and each Local Committee allocates funding for approximately 13 speed surveys in each year. The cost of each survey is approximately £180. The locations of the surveys are prioritised and are at the discretion of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of each Local Committee. Traffic speed surveys are one element that can inform the feasibility process for a highway scheme. Funding of feasibility, design and implementation is prioritised by the Local Committee within the available capital schemes budget. This is on a two year rolling forward programme that allows for design and implementation, and is based on the proposed capital funding allocation from the approved Medium Term Financial Plan. Surrey County Council has an approved Speed Limit Policy which sets out the criteria under which a reduction in speed limit by signs alone would be considered. The policy requires that the length of road over which a speed limit change would be considered should be at least 600m in length. This is to ensure against too many speed limit changes that could be confusing to the motorist along a length of road.

Existing speeds are then required to be measured using over a 7 day continuous period using automatic survey equipment. A traffic speed survey was carried out on Hollow Lane on 23 June to 29 June 2016, and the data from this survey has already been shared with you, as the Divisional Member. The measured existing mean speed was compared to a threshold set out in the policy and was found to be below the threshold, which meant that the council could consider reducing the speed limit. However, this would still be subject to consideration of other factors such as the specific location constraints, and prioritisation within the Local Committee limited budget.

The speed limit reduction proposal would require the installation of terminal 40mph signs at the start and end of the road, and 40mph repeater signs at regular intervals to advise motorists of the speed limit and to enable the Police to enforce the order. The entire length of the road is in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Through the de-cluttering initiative, the number of signs installed in the AONB is to be reduced wherever possible. This proposal has not had feasibility design, as it has not been prioritised for inclusion on the Local Committee forward programme. Only schemes that have been included on the forward programme have funding allocated for design and implementation.

Although the proposed 40mph speed limit is appropriate for this road, this proposal has not been prioritised through the Local Committee above other proposals. However, the scheme has been placed on the ITS list for consideration for future funding. This request has been assessed alongside all the other demands and previous commitments for Local Committee funding. It is appropriate and proportionate to carry out traffic speed surveys to gather the evidence to assess whether a road would comply with Surrey's Policy and reduce the speed limit. It is also appropriate for this data to be used to determine if a proposal could proceed to feasibility design stage and inform local priorities for capital funding allocation within the Local Committee.

In terms of funding, the draft Highways Forward Programme 17/18 – 18/19 set out the detail for Mole Valley ITS prioritised schemes budget allocation at the Informal Local

Committee on 16 November 2016. This was based on the capital funding for Local Committees allocated through the Medium Term Financial Plan. It should be noted, however, that the Council's financial position is very serious, and Capital funding available for Local Committees will need to be determined as part of the current financial planning process.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(18) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK (2ND):

Please can the Leader provide an update as to the number of Syrian refugee households supported so far in Surrey as part of the government's Syrian vulnerable person's relocation scheme?

Reply

I thank Mr Essex for this question and providing me with the opportunity to update Members on the important work underway in Surrey to support the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme.

Surrey responded positively to the Government's invitation to participate in the Scheme, with work being led by our District and Borough colleagues and actively supported by County Council services. The majority of District and Boroughs have committed to taking a set number of families per year, reflecting the limited affordable accommodation available. Projections are for **up to 137 families** to be settled over the 5 years of the programme. This compares very favourably with other areas of the South East and other counties.

There is a strong and proactive multi-agency group co-ordinating the programme across Surrey, including participating District and Boroughs, County Council services, schools, health, mental health, the police and voluntary and faith sector. We carefully balance the commitment we have already made to the Syrian programme with our agreed priorities and commitments to the County and its residents.

I hope you will join with me to thank all our partner organisations for their continued commitment to this work.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(19) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK (3RD):

I am sure the Cabinet Member is aware of the Stop Funding Hate campaign. Please will the Cabinet Member ensure that the Council stops buying copies of the Daily Express, Daily Mail and The Sun for its libraries?

Reply

Libraries in Surrey take a range of daily newspapers (broadsheets and red-tops) covering all political views. In the larger libraries the selection of titles is understandably wider, and we try to offer a balanced range of reading material, but with reductions in funding this is not possible in our smaller libraries.

As with our book stock, the library service has to be careful not to censor material that has been legally published in the U.K.

If, in response to the Stop Funding Hate media campaign, libraries in Surrey were to stop taking these papers there may be a reaction from some residents against this censorship. Whatever one may feel individually about the content of some of these tabloids, they are legitimately published in this country.

The Council is working with its partners to prevent hate crime, encouraging reporting and providing support to victims.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(20) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK (3RD):

The County Council a number of years ago ran a major project to develop safe walking routes to schools.

In 2010 in Chalkpit Lane, Dorking (the A2003) the Crossing Patrol Officer retired and the post was withdrawn as, principally, it was deemed to have become unsafe to have a crossing patrol at this point on this road. There is, however, no alternative crossing point for children walking between the main population centre in the centre of the town and St Martins School.

The County Council this September considered a controlled crossing at this point on Chalkpit Lane and, following St Martins School presenting a significant petition to the Local Committee, has placed the scheme on the ITS list for potential future funding. However, the implementation of such a controlled crossing is unlikely to happen in the near future.

Would the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding agree with me that safe walking routes to schools is one of the highest priorities for this Council and will he look for additional funding to allow a controlled crossing to be installed on the A2003 in Dorking to link the main population area of the town and the school in the next financial year?

Reply

Chalkpit Lane in Dorking forms part of the A2003 which links the A25 with the A24. It is a single carriageway road through a residential area with a 30mph speed limit. The section of the A2003 Chalkpit Lane, in the vicinity of the Triangle Stores, has residential properties, shops and businesses on both sides. There is an existing informal pedestrian crossing point at this location. This is a pedestrian refuge island in the centre of the road, with dropped kerbs at the edge of the pavement on both sides.

A site meeting, to assess the safety of the existing crossing facility and investigate possible improvements on the A2003 Chalkpit Lane in the vicinity of the Triangle Stores, was held in February 2014. The site meeting was attended by the local Divisional Member, officers from the Council's Sustainable Travel Team and Local Highways Team, the Headteacher of St Martin's School and parents of pupils from St Martin's School. Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team were advised of the findings and outcome of this meeting.

Since the site meeting, held in February 2014, Surrey County Council has introduced a Road Safety Outside Schools policy. It was therefore agreed at the Local Committee

meeting on 2nd March 2016 to carry out a safety assessment as outlined in this policy. A second site meeting, as part of that assessment, was held on 14th September 2016 and was attended by the local Divisional Member, officers from the Council's School Sustainable Travel Team, Local Highways Team, Safety Engineering Team and Surrey Police.

A review of the reported personal injury collisions shows that there has been 1 reported personal injury collision in Chalkpit Lane, resulting in a slight injury, during the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 01/07/2013 to 30/04/2016). This collision involved a cyclist falling from their bike as a result of a car turning right across their path.

A petition was presented to the formal November meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee on the 16th November 2016. The Petitioners requested that priority be given to the scheme for a formalised pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane, and funding be allocated from the Local Committee budget, so that the scheme could be constructed in the 2017/18 financial year. The Local Committee, although sympathetic to the request, did not prioritise this crossing request above other schemes in Mole Valley.

This scheme, for a formalised crossing, is on the Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) list for consideration for possible future funding. However, it has not been prioritised over other schemes for inclusion on the draft Highways Forward Programme of schemes for feasibility & detailed design, and implementation, during 2017/18 and 2018/19 financial years. Feasibility design of a formal pedestrian crossing at this location would need to consider the impact of the crossing on traffic congestion in Dorking town centre.

The draft Highways Forward Programme 17/18 – 18/19 set out the detail for Mole Valley ITS prioritised schemes budget allocation at the Informal Local Committee on 16 November 2016. The capital funding for Local Committees has been allocated through the Medium Term Financial Plan that forms part of the County Council's corporate planning processes. The Council approved the County Council's budgets for 2016-21 on 22 March 2016.

The scheme could potentially be funded by a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) bid but this would have to be prioritised alongside other schemes. The scheme would be subject to further analysis to ensure suitability, and match funding would need to be identified and prioritised.

The school crossing patrol site as mentioned above was inherited by the service when the Sustainability Group took over responsibility 15 years ago. The site was patrolled until 2010 when the officer retired. There have been numerous attempts to recruit to this site both locally and countywide which have been unsuccessful which reflects the picture across the county. Despite this site being unmanned all site visit observations have shown that pedestrians are crossing safely while using the refuge.

Following initial site visits the Schools Sustainable Travel Team have delivered Pedestrian Awareness Training to the school. They have also participated in Bikeability Level 2 training for their year 6 pupils and have booked Level 1 and Pedals for year 2 in the New Year.

MRS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

(21) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK (3RD):

In May 2014 this Council supported a motion to 'facilitate fair trade wherever possible'. Please can you provide an update as to what Surrey County Council has done since this date, including the council stocking Fairtrade in addition to other brands internally?

Reply

The commitment to ethical sourcing now forms part of the Council's Social Value procurement strategy, and the purchasing of sustainable products, including those with Fairtrade accreditation, are incorporated into our tender documents in compliance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015.

The Council continues to procure Fairtrade bananas, coffee and sugar as part of the ongoing commitment to supporting the motion to facilitate Fairtrade wherever possible.

Officers are actively working with existing suppliers to promote sustainability and ethical sourcing throughout the supply chain. The Council has Soil Association Food for Life (FFL) Gold accreditation for its catering services (including all food supply).

We are proud that the Fairtrade towns in Surrey include Addlestone, Dorking, Godalming, Guildford, Haslemere, Leatherhead, Lingfield & Dormansland, Rushmoor, Tatsfield and Woking.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(22) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK (4TH):

Lyefield Lane was included as a road to be repaired in the latter years of the first phase of Project Horizon.

Two years ago I took the Chief Executive to see the condition of Lyefield Lane, Abinger, Dorking as an example of a road that was badly in need of repair within the County – a road that really could not wait any longer for reconstruction. Whilst we drove down the road, the Chief Executive expressed concern that my car would be damaged as the road was in such poor condition.

Lyefield Lane has continued to deteriorate and the "uneven road" signs at either end are becoming rather weather beaten. Just recently Lyefield Lane, rather than being resurfaced, has been moved into the "unfunded roads" list within Project Horizon.

Can the Cabinet Member for Highways and Flooding please consult with the Chief Executive and then explain why a road that the Chief Executive believes could easily damage vehicles driving slowly along it has not been repaired on a timely basis and will he give an assurance, as residents have waited patiently for a number of years for this road to be repaired (or, more appropriately, reconstructed) under Project Horizon, that Lyefield Lane will be repaired / reconstructed within the next twelve months? In the meantime, will the Cabinet Member confirm, as the County Council is clearly on notice of the extremely poor condition of this road, that the County Council will accept all claims for damage to cars caused by the failure of the road surface on Lyefield Lane?

Reply

All roads on the Horizon programme have been prioritised in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management and in accordance with the cabinet approved prioritisation process. The process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

Over the last 18 months the Asset Planning Team has been assessing all the remaining schemes on the Horizon programme. They have also assessed additional schemes generated from condition surveys. All the schemes (some 800+) have been prioritised against others countywide into a new 5 year list. Unfortunately the number of schemes involved means not all the schemes on prior Horizon lists will now appear on the new version.

Lyefield Lane did not score high enough to be included on the new 5 year list. Members do have the ability to nominate roads to be included in the remaining 20% of schemes however. It may be that Lyefield Lane is selected on this basis as it ranked 104 out of the 100 schemes selected for inclusion in the list on the basis of its condition. In the meantime it will continue to be inspected and any defects at intervention level will be repaired under routine maintenance processes.

This page is intentionally left blank

Peter Martin - Economy and Prosperous Places**Local Growth Fund 3**

Surrey County Council has supported Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to develop bids for round three of the Local Growth Fund. The Local Growth Fund is a capital fund that aims to unlock growth through supporting the delivery of local infrastructure projects and skills capital schemes. The bidding process is open to all 39 LEPs across England and is a competitive process.

Both LEPs submitted detailed bids to Government in in summer 2016. The Government announced in the Autumn Statement that a total of £1.8 billion will be available in the third round, with approximately £492 million allocated to London and the south east.

The final details of individual settlements have not been announced, but we understand that the settlements for Enterprise M3 and Coast to Capital are considerably lower than expected (in common with most county areas). County Council officers are supporting both LEPs in their ongoing negotiations with Government.

MIPIM UK 2016

MIPIM UK is the UK's largest exhibition and conference for property professionals. It provides a market place for UK and international investors to meet, discuss opportunities and do business. MIPIM is typically associated with the annual conference in Cannes, France (MIPIM stands for Le marche international des professionnels de l'immobilier). MIPIM UK is now in its third year.

Surrey, under the banner of Invest in Surrey, took a stand at the exhibition to showcase opportunities for investment in the county. Good feedback has been received on Surrey's participation. 15 private sector sponsors and all Surrey's boroughs and districts were involved and information on the following sites and premises was available on the stand and as part of the Invest in Surrey brochure:

- Guildford Town Centre
- Horley Business Park
- Transform Leatherhead
- Longcross Park, Chertsey
- Elmsleigh Centre Phase III, Staines-Upon-Thames
- Elmsleigh Centre Phase IV, Staines-Upon-Thames
- Hobbs Industrial Estate, Lingfield
- The Gateway Woking
- Camberley Town Centre
- Marketfield Way, Redhill
- Surrey County Council Property Development Programme
- Brightwells, Farnham (Case Study)

Clare Curran - Children and Families Wellbeing**Children Looked After**

“We are the corporate parents to our children and young people in care. We seek to ensure that the young people we look after grow up with the same opportunities as other young people and go on to live successful and fulfilling lives. As corporate parents we want every child to feel safe and confident about their future.”

These words are taken from our Corporate Parenting Strategy. A huge amount of work takes place day in day out to achieve this. There are some important facts about the changing scale and nature of this critical work.

- We are looking after 898 children, up from 779 in 2015 and 793 in 2014
- Of these 151 are UASC (Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children), up from 102 in 2015 and 72 in 2014
- 21.7% of children looked after also have a Special Educational Need or Disability

One of our key pledges to children in our care is that “we will do the best we can to make sure where you live is right for you”. Our focus has been to reduce the number of placement moves that children have to make, to support them to become securely attached to their carers and to achieve to the best of their ability. We have been successful in reducing the numbers of children with three or more placements in a year to 11% in 2016 and in increasing the number of children who remain with their carers long-term (70%). However, too many of our children (around 22%) are placed outside of the Surrey area, either because of specialist need or because we do not have enough foster carers locally. This is a priority for our strategy.

Nationally there is a concern around the number of teenagers coming into care and this is particularly pronounced in Surrey where children aged 12+ made up 49% of our entrants to care in 2015/16. We are working to develop our Early Help offer alongside targeted support for adolescents and families to address this. We know the importance of immediate response at times of crisis and Extended Hope (initially funded through national social innovation grant) is able to make a difference at times of emotional wellbeing / mental health crisis.

As corporate parents we know the importance of encouraging and supporting our children to achieve. This includes our members bursary fund (we have some budding sports, drama and music stars growing up in our care!), celebration parties, match-savings fund and events such as SkillsFest.

We are responsible for supporting children once they have left care up to age 25 and we currently support 486 care-leavers (including 158 UASC). There have been some positive improvements in the numbers of care-leavers who are living in suitable accommodation (up from 81.8% in 2015 to 93.1% in 2016) and those who are in Education, Employment and Training (up from 54.9% in 2015 to 60.1% in 2016). And 32 young people are currently at university.

Improving outcomes for children in our care and who have left our care will remain a key area of focus with partners and is part of our wider [Children's Improvement Plan](#) which was recently refreshed.

Ofsted will complete a further monitoring visit 11-12 January 2017 with a focus on CSE, missing, and care-leavers. The DfE will also complete another visit and review on 30 January 2017. Finally a reminder that we have an all Member Seminar on children's improvement on 12 December 2016.

Denise Le Gal - Business Services and Resident Experience

Over the last period Orbis has been shaping its Leadership community and I am pleased to confirm that a number of key roles within the organisation have been put in place to ensure Orbis can continue to support Surrey's services.

Sheila Little, previously Surrey County Council's Director of Finance, was appointed to the Orbis Director of Finance role.

In addition, I can confirm that we have also now completed the recruitment of the IT and Digital Leadership team. Mark Edridge has been successfully appointed to the role of Head of Strategy and Engagement for Surrey County Council. I wish them both every success in their roles.

Alongside the changes within the IT and Digital team, the work in Surrey to roll out the Office 365 system is progressing well. The organisation now has over 3,200 employees transferred over to the system with a clear programme over the coming months to complete the migration of all users. We are also reviewing the IT offer to members to improve accessibility to Word processing and document handling.

Business Operations has also been expanding the role that it plays within the market of providing services to other organisations. Orbis has been confirmed as a provider on the Norfolk County Council Framework for Pensions Administration. Orbis is already one of the largest Local Authority providers of LGPS administration.

Congratulations to our Payroll Team in Kingston who were Highly Commended under the 'Public Sector Team of the Year' category at this year's Payroll World Awards. We thank our technology providers, Winshuttle, for sponsoring a table at the awards evening enabling us to attend. Well done to everyone involved.

Finally I would like to take this opportunity to announce that Orbis won the award for Culture at the Organisational Excellence Awards held on 16th November. This award recognises the creation or advancement of an outstanding Organisational Culture.

The achievement is defined through the passion and commitment to create a unique workplace, highlighting an innovative and unique approach to addressing organisational culture and to facilitate effective working across boundaries and/or partnerships. The judges recognised Orbis' ability to deliver significant cultural change against a back drop of ongoing austerity and financial challenges in Local Government, while spanning a complex multi-organisational environment.

The finalists included large private sector companies; BNP Paribas and Hain Daniels Group together with large public sector organisations including Caring Homes Group and Health Education England.

Helyn Clack - Wellbeing and Health

Health and Wellbeing Board

To keep up to date with the Health and Wellbeing Board activity read the [Public Update](#).

National Energy Action – Get Warm Soon Report

Surrey's Health and Wellbeing Board has been identified by National Energy Action as one of the top performers nationally in tackling fuel poverty among its residents. The Board received the highest possible rating for addressing fuel poverty and excess winter deaths through its Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Joint Health & Wellbeing Strategy. This year's winter campaign, **Stay Well This Winter**, is about to enter its third phase with coordinated communications across the Board agencies and other partners.

Response to Communities and Local Government Select Community

In August, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence; my Co-Chair on the Health & Wellbeing Board and I co-signed a letter to the Chairman of the Communities and Local Government Select Committee in response to a call for evidence on the financial sustainability of Adult Social Care services. Our collective response reiterated the significant challenges faced by Surrey County Council in attempting to cope with a sharp rise in demand against the backdrop of an ever decreasing budget envelope. The Select Committee's inquiry is ongoing.

Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs)

They continue to progress and all three plans that cover Surrey are now published [online](#) and will be discussed at the Health and Wellbeing Board public meeting on 8 December 2016.

High Impact Complex Drinkers

Following a successful public health pilot which developed an integrated approach to supporting vulnerable adults who have complex needs and alcohol dependency, Surrey County Council and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner are co-commissioning for two years, a new service element which will work with High Impact Complex Drinkers (HICD). This will involve adapting the [Blue Light Manual](#) and the [Tackling Street Drinking](#) for Police and Crime Commissioners guidance, to Surrey's local geography and service landscape. The cost analysis on the pilot showed an expected 1:4 (£) return on investment for two case workers working with a rolling caseload of 36 clients across a 12 month period. For further information contact Laura Saunders l.saunders@surreycc.gov.uk.

Drug related deaths

There has been an increase in the number of recorded [drug-related deaths](#)¹ both nationally and locally. Work has been undertaken to identify reasons for this, and to ensure that our public health services are providing the best possible interventions to prevent further deaths. A local working group involving key partners share intelligence regarding the deaths to identify any trends. The roll-out of a take-home [Naloxone](#) programme is underway, targeting prioritised individuals, and providing a training programme for staff, service users and external agencies. Over coming months this will be developed further to reach all those identified as being at risk of opiate overdose.

John Furey - Highways, Transport and Flooding

Horizon Improves Road Safety

Each year the European Road Assessment Programme (EuroRAP) tracks accident statistics on Britain's roads. In its 2016 performance report, one of Surrey's roads, the A283 between Milford and Sandy Lane Guildford, has been highlighted as having the second largest reduction in the number of serious collisions. The road was resurfaced as part of Operation Horizon, and it is very pleasing to see that the number of people killed or seriously injured along this section has reduced from 10 in the two-year period prior to resurfacing, to 2 in the two-year period after, an 80% reduction. The EuroRAP report attributes this reduction to the resurfacing work and associated improvements undertaken as part of Operation Horizon, and is an exceptional example of how Horizon has improved our highway network and the wellbeing of our residents.

Investing in Skills in Surrey's Communities

An innovative partnership between Surrey County Council and Kier Highways is bringing vulnerable people furthest from employment into the workplace through a supported programme. This programme will engage candidates not engaged in education, employment or training (NEETs) or those with special educational needs, with an intention of carrying out highway works in the community.

The model supports 24 candidates per year, in three cohorts, engaged in meaningful work, giving the right balance of sustainability, throughput and benefit for the local authority. These candidates will be generally in the care of SCC Youth Support Service, Adult Social Care and Surrey Choices, so during their time working within Highways, Case workers and managers can prioritise and support their highest-need individuals. This is a high Social Value initiative, with a target of 50% of entry to mainstream employment. Social value is created within the individual, the local authority and the wider society.

A pilot induction week was hosted at Brooklands Motor Museum, providing a controlled environment, where students can learn real highway maintenance tasks without the risks of the live highway. The week was managed by both Kier and Surrey staff and included a full safety induction, small tools training, team-building activities and training on basic skills such as pothole repair, patching and grass cutting.

Strong candidates will be able to join Kier's apprenticeship scheme. This currently employs 10 apprentices either directly or through the supply chain, working in Surrey, and Kier have committed that this figure rises each year to 14 apprentices by 2021.

This is a very exciting initiative that will:

- * Address skills shortages within the Highways Service through the targeted selection and training of local people who would not normally be able to access this employment;
- * Provide vulnerable people with a supported route to employment that improves their economic wellbeing and reduces their reliance on statutory services;
- * Provide enhanced service and social value within existing highways contracts and in so doing support the local authority's overall performance under the Social Value Act.

New Head of Highways and Transport

Following the appointment of Jason Russell to the post of Deputy Director, Environment and Infrastructure, we have been running a recruitment process for a new post of Head of Highways and Transport. I am delighted to be able to tell you that Lucy Monie, formally the Network and Asset Management Group Manager and recently returned from a 6 month secondment in West Sussex as their Director of Highways and Transport, has been appointed to this position. Lucy has worked in Surrey Highways for many years in a number of roles, and is a very experienced highways manager. I'm sure that she will prove to be a very capable head of service, and I know that you will join with me in wishing her every success in this role.

Mel Few - Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence**First steps towards more integrated approach with CCG's initiated**

Adults service and Surrey Heath CCG have reached terms of agreement to shadow pool their respective budgets for the next year. Legal contacts under section 75 have been drafted and agreed.

The objective is to ensure a one stop approach for the residents where their initial needs will be triaged and then directed to the most appropriate service. Social care staff will be working alongside community matrons, community MH teams and GPs to ensure joined up care for our residents. The objective of this approach is to reduce unnecessary hospital admissions. The success of this programme will be measured in June 2017, and if successful full budget pooling will commence from the financial year 2017/18.

The MASH (Multi agency Safeguarding hub) is now operating

It is the largest and first integrated Adults and Children's MASH in the country. The objective is to have one location for reporting concerns regarding safeguarding issues which will then be transferred to the correct organisation to resolve.

Accommodation with Care and Support strategy moves ahead

Strategy to move ahead with Provision of Extra Care facilities is progressing:

- Successful provider network has indicated firm support to proceed with further detailed work in finding sites owned by Surrey County Council.
- Principle of retaining land and inviting through tender providers to develop and run extra care facilities for elderly people.
- Proof of the concept is reinforced by the successful direction of neighbouring authorities.

Richard Walsh - Localities and Community Wellbeing**Emergency Planning**

The Team are currently focused on ensuring that the Council and our partners have the plans and arrangements in place ahead of the Christmas holidays.

The Emergency Management Team are working with the Environment Agency to develop 10 local temporary flood defence deployment plans that are being produced.

The Vulnerable People Reporting System has been completed and allows us to identify vulnerable people in an emergency and provide support to them as required. We have been nominated for a number of awards for the new system and will be sharing this and our learning with other UK Emergency Planning Teams.

With the development sites for Oil Exploration and the Third Runway at Heathrow we are seeing an increase in the activities of Environmental Protestors. We are working with the Police to ensure that while respecting the protestors' right to protest, the needs of local residents are also protected.

Fire and Rescue

Surrey Fire and Rescue's new state of the art 999 centre went live on Wednesday 23 November 2016. The new centre has technological advances that improve how we mobilise and manage fire and rescue incidents. An event bringing together a variety of commercial and public sector partners was held last week to mark the opening of the 999 centre.

Safe Drive, Stay Alive

12,000 students and members of the public saw one of the 19 Safe Drive Stay Alive performances this year. Since its inception 11 years ago that's 126,000 educated on our award winning programme.

Feedback from young people has been hugely positive once again.

Discussions are underway with Highways England who we expect to provide an additional £35k pa to help finance future events.

Youth Engagement Scheme (YES)

The Youth Engagement Scheme (YES) delivers targeted intervention and support to young people who have been identified, for a number of risk factors, as being at risk of involvement in youth crime or anti-social behaviour.

The week long course and follow up day aim to engage these young people in a variety of physical and social challenges that help them to understand actions and consequence, boundaries, respect for self and others, build their self-esteem and confidence, take ownership of their actions and to develop skills such as communication and leadership.

61 courses have been run to date with the latest taking place at Gomshall fire station last week. 518 young people have 'graduated' from YES since it began in 2006 and our follow up evaluation shows the scheme has positive impacts on school attendance, attitudes and aspirations.

Mike Goodman - Environment and Planning

Surrey Wildlife Trust The draft business plan for SCC Countryside Estate for 2017/18 has been looked at by a new Board, comprising two Cabinet Members and two Trustees of Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT). Their role is to consider the viability of the business plan at the draft stage. We are working with SWT to finalise the plan for next financial year. A summary of the plan will be published when it goes to Cabinet in March next year. Surrey County Council has supported SWT in its work to replace the old education building at Nower Wood, near Headley. The new flagship building is due to open early in the New Year and will be used for education of all ages and for hire. Nower Wood will be a centre for learning about the natural world and our place in it.

Abellio Abellio Surrey formally announced changes to bus services in the county from 31 December 2016; a decision taken for commercial and operational reasons. We tried to find a solution with Abellio, however, once their intention became clear, our focus was on making alternative arrangements to cover the services affected by this decision. I was pleased to announce that, despite this challenging situation, we have managed to maintain bus services to most localities within the affected area. Details of replacement services are available on our web site. Changes come into effect from 31 December 2016. Our transport team will continue to monitor the services.

Access to Airports A review of the various proposals for a southern rail access to Heathrow Airport from Surrey was reported to a Members Seminar. This work is shaping our preferred option(s) so we can secure the best outcome for Surrey in terms of connectivity to Heathrow Airport now and in the future. The need for a southern rail access to Heathrow was raised with Government.

Waste contract and community recycling centres Work continues to identify and implement savings and efficiencies across the waste service. Changes to the operation of the community recycling centres, including reduced working hours and implementation of charges for some non-household waste have been successfully implemented and are starting to deliver the required savings. Work has commenced on increasing the number of reuse shops at our CRCs, with planning applications submitted for shops at the Woking and Witley sites. This will provide additional income to offset the costs of operating the community recycling centres.

Work with district and borough councils SCC has been working with the Surrey Waste Partnership to identify opportunities for savings and improvements for residents that can be made by changing the way waste is managed in Surrey. A business case developed by the Surrey Waste Partnership proposes that waste services are delivered by a new partnership arrangement, which is collectively owned by all of Surrey's authorities. Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and Woking have made a step towards this by jointly procuring a waste collection contract, which will be governed by a joint committee and an Inter Authority Agreement. Cabinet will be considering a recommendation at their next meeting to expand this arrangement to include some of SCC's functions to deliver further benefit, and the EPEH Board were supportive of the proposal. More work has begun to develop the optimum solution for other district and borough councils and SCC's remaining waste functions.

Fly Tipping prevention work Following the adoption of the Surrey fly-tipping prevention strategy in June 2016, work began on the 'Tip Off' fly tipping prevention communications campaign. This ran from July to November and included a communications campaign designed to raise awareness of the impacts of fly tipping and to provide advice to residents and businesses about how they can prevent their waste from being fly-tipped. The campaign was promoted online via the campaign website digital advertising, on the radio, in the press and with posters and leaflets being distributed to residents, businesses and landowners in Surrey. In November we appointed an officer to strengthen the effectiveness of the D&B enforcement teams.

Cabinet Member Update to Full Council

December 2016

For the period April to October 2016 the tonnage of fly-tipped waste collected by district and borough councils and delivered to the waste transfer stations has fallen by around 1000 tonnes compared to the same period in the previous year. This equates to a saving of around £100,000 in disposal costs.

New Head of Place Development Following the appointment of Jason Russell I am delighted to be able to tell you that Lesley Harding has been appointed to the role of Head of Place Development. We wish her well in this new role.

Linda Kemeny - Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement

Education in Partnership Update

Since the start of this term, Surrey's Education in Partnership programme has seen Council Members and Officers working with head teachers, governors and other education stakeholders to achieve a collective understanding of the changes taking place in education. The Government's ambition remains for all schools to convert to academy status. However, it has decided not to take the Education for All Bill forward and is now focusing on "building capacity in the system and encouraging schools to convert voluntarily", although there is no pressure to do so.

With no new legislation, the Council's responsibilities remain unchanged. However, other changes taking place mean Surrey's current education system is unsustainable and the Council therefore needs to rethink its offer and how it is best able to discharge its responsibilities going forward. Future funding arrangements have not yet been confirmed, but we expect the Government to proceed with its proposal to remove general Education Services Grant funding from April 2017, a total budget of £600m nationally that is received by both local authorities and academies. Due to this anticipated loss of funding – and viewed in the context of Surrey's wider financial challenge – the council will be unable to maintain its school improvement services.

The Education in Partnership conversations are providing a forum for colleagues to come together and discuss both system-wide and local issues, and are an important step towards co-designing a sustainable schools-led education system. Common concerns have been identified around funding, recruitment and retention of high quality staff, future school improvement arrangements and the persistent attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their non-disadvantaged peers. These conversations are also highlighting Surrey's many strengths – particularly more and better inclusion in mainstream settings and schools' continuing commitment to work together.

Strong partnerships sit at the heart of Surrey's inclusive approach to education and have led to great strides forward in recent years: the proportion of Surrey's pupils attending a school judged by Ofsted to be Good or Outstanding is now 94.3%, placing Surrey 1st out of 20 local authorities in the south-east and 25th out of 153 local authorities nationally. At Key Stage 4, 69% of Surrey pupils attained 5 A*-C GCSEs including English and Maths in 2016, ranking Surrey 4th in the south-east and 15th out of 153 local authorities nationally.

However, while it is right to celebrate these achievements, we still need to do more to support and raise the attainment of vulnerable learners in Surrey. We also need to ensure we are providing the right levels of challenge and stretch for our more able learners.

By building on our strengths and developing resilient partnerships, Surrey will be able to make the transition to a high quality, inclusive and sustainable schools-led system and the Council will continue to fully support this work.

Helyn Clack - Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health – Additional Statement**Health devolution proposals for Surrey Heartlands**

Thank you chairman – today I would like to make a statement that publicly confirms the commitment and ambition of a number of partners to develop health devolution proposals for Surrey Heartlands.

This is an important step that will bring substantial tangible benefits for residents and highlights the strength of partnership working across the area.

Guildford & Waverley CCG, Surrey Downs CCG, North West Surrey CCG, the Department of Health, NHS England and Surrey County Council are working together to develop a health devolution agreement for all the residents of Surrey Heartlands.

Devolution will enable Surrey Heartlands partners to go further and faster to deliver the benefits articulated in the Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP).

Through a place-based focus underpinned by a formal devolution agreement, better outcomes, stronger integration and public value can be achieved for the people of Surrey Heartlands.

For background, based on local communities and patient flows, the health geography within Surrey currently splits three ways and is articulated through three STPS – Surrey Heartlands, Sussex and East Surrey and Frimley.

To understand the scale and size of this agreement - Surrey Heartlands serves 850,000 people and accounts for 85% of the overall Surrey population.

Joining up and integrating health and care services is a crucial part of the Surrey Heartlands plan but its ambitions go much further.

This will enable us to firmly place health and wellbeing as part of the infrastructure of prosperity and aligning this with wider work around education, skills, employment and housing, will help to secure the best outcomes for the people of Surrey Heartlands, and unlock new opportunities to develop and strengthen partnership arrangements with academic and business partners.

We will set out our commitment in a joint 'statement of intent' which we will publish before Christmas - this will reflect the shared ambition of all the partners to move towards a health devolution agreement for Surrey Heartlands for the benefit of all Surrey Heartlands patients and citizens.

I bring this update today as the only opportunity to share this with all Members before we finalise and publish the 'statement'. I hope members will join me in recognising the significant efforts from all partners that have gone into bringing this work together and also recognising the opportunities this brings for residents.