

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 18 MARCH 2014

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

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(1) MR MIKE BENNISON (HINCHLEY WOOD, CLAYGATE & OXSHOTT)
TO ASK:**

Would the Leader of the Council join with me in thanking the employers for the part that they are playing in our successful apprenticeship scheme, totalling in excess of 500 new apprenticeships. Will he also commend the employers on their excellent record of creating a highly skilled workforce for Surrey. Could he reassure me that schools are being encouraged to sell apprenticeships to the students?

Lastly, would the Leader also join with me in thanking the staff and Cabinet Members for all the hard work that they have put in to making Surrey a strong and vibrant council, leading all other county councils in such difficult financial times.

Reply:

I would like to thank Mr Bennison for his question. Surrey continues to buck the national trend by increasing the numbers of teenagers starting apprenticeships year-on-year; last year the number of 16-18 year old apprentices in Surrey increased by 2.1% year-on-year, compared to a national decline of 11.6% over the same period.

I set a target of 500 apprenticeship starts for Surrey teenagers in 2013/14, and we were able to report that we had successfully achieved that figure in time for National Apprenticeship Week at the beginning of the month. I have committed to achieving this number again in 2014/15 and am confident that we will achieve it.

Mr Bennison is right in that none of this would have been possible without the support of Surrey businesses. In particular I wish to highlight the county's SMEs, which have contributed enormously to this success. Our work with the Federation of Small Businesses and Surrey Chamber of Commerce has been particularly valuable in promoting apprenticeships to their members.

Organisations with which the County Council does business are also embracing the opportunity to engage with the apprentice agenda. I would like to thank those of our suppliers who have taken a very positive and active approach to offering apprenticeship, traineeships and work placements for the young people of Surrey.

As the understanding of value of apprentices continues to grow amongst Surrey employers, these in turn will encourage schools, colleges and training providers to promote this option as a progression pathway for their students. The county council are also involved in the direct promotion of the apprenticeship option to young people. We have sponsored a vocational options stand at the UCAS Higher Education Fair held at the University of Surrey this week (18 & 19 March), and in October we organise and manage the annual Opportunities Fair for Year 11 students planning their next steps after GCSEs. If Member colleagues are interested in attending, it is an excellent way to gain an idea of the breadth of provision available in the county.

We are also continuing to sell the benefits of our successful internal Surrey County Council apprenticeship scheme via school and college career fairs. This ensures that schools and students are aware of our scheme and the opportunities available to their students. We are constantly reviewing how the SCC apprenticeship scheme can be accessible to all students, to ensure those with a disability or from vulnerable groups can gain equal access.

CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES

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

Surrey County Council deposited £20 million of tax payers money with Landbanski and Glinir- two Icelandic Banks. Following the well-publicised collapse of the Icelandic economy exactly how much of this investment has the Council lost and how much has it since managed to recover?

What lessons have been learnt from this venture?

Reply:

When the Icelandic economy collapsed in October 2008, SCC had £20m of outstanding investments with two Icelandic institutions: Landsbanki and Glitnir (£10m with each). This was out of a total investment portfolio of £350m. The investments were agreed when the banks in question had very good credit rating criteria (AAA), in line with the treasury management strategy.

Since the collapse the Council has recovered the following amounts in relation to these investments:

Glitnir:

A total of £8,385,477 has been received in sterling, with the remainder held in escrow in Icelandic Krona. This balance is expected to be received by the Council, although it is subject to capital controls and at present there is no indication when those controls will be lifted.

	£m
Total Investment	10.000
Received to date	8.385

Remaining Balance 1.615 (excluding interest)

In 2008/9 the Council set up a Financial Investment Reserve to make provision for any loss which may be realised from the collapse of the Icelandic Banks. In recent years, as the likelihood of recovering the Icelandic investments has become more certain, the balance on this provision has been reduced. There is a balance of £0.6m remaining as at the end of 2013/14 which is expected to more than cover any potential exchange rate risk in relation to the remaining Glitnir investment.

Landsbanki (LBI):

A total of £9,632,000 of the £10m has been repaid to the Council, some of this as a result of the Council selling the outstanding claim through competitive auction in January 2014, (as agreed by Cabinet in November 2013). The proceeds of the sale were paid in cash in Pounds Sterling and those funds have already been received by the Council. The sale of this claim represents a clean break and the Council is now no longer a creditor of LBI.

In November 2007, following the collapse of Northern Rock, officers implemented a more risk-averse approach to the Council's treasury strategy and tightened its lending criteria by reducing the maximum period of time that a loan could be placed with any bank to one month. In response to the Icelandic banking collapse, officers placed further restrictions on deposit activity, limiting new deposits to overnight only with UK banks and building societies or AAA rated money market funds.

In consultation with the Audit & Governance Committee, these restrictions have been reviewed and elements of them lifted over time. The Council's treasury management strategy has continued to follow a cautious approach, as a direct result of the Council's experience with Icelandic banks. The 2014/15 Treasury Management Strategy was approved by the County Council in February 2014 and did not propose any significant changes, reflecting the ongoing economic climate and the Council's risk appetite.

Importantly, at the point these investments were made, the institutions in question were highly rated. Such unexpected events cannot always be avoided but the risk is mitigated by numerous factors such as limiting the amount and length of investments in a wide range of institutions, and ensuring Treasury team members keep abreast of factors influencing the economic climate.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

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

Will the County Council promote as a high priority, and if necessary provide funding towards strategic modelling by the Environment Agency of the middle Mole to assess the viability of options to improve flood defences between Horley and Cobham?

Reply:

The County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, is in constant discussion with the Environment Agency (EA) about its own scheme proposals and bids as well as those proposed by other flood risk management authorities, including the EA itself.

The Council is aware that the EA has submitted its own bid for funding to undertake strategic modelling of the Middle Mole to assess options to improve flood defences between Horley and Cobham. The River Mole is designated a main river so the EA is responsible for flood risk management proposals but the county will provide whatever resources are available to support the bid should a request be made. There is, however, no existing budgetary provision available for the Council to part fund the modelling proposal.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

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

A report to the December 2013 Environment & Transport Select Committee stated "...a survey is currently underway to record all visible highway drainage assets. The survey will assist in filling in the gaps and provide a more comprehensive drainage inventory." Is the survey complete and if not, how can the County Council be confident that it has a complete and accurate calculation of the sum of money required to maintain and repair gullies if its records of gully assets is incomplete?

Reply:

The County Council has a comprehensive data set on gully assets. Based on existing survey data there are 160,000 gullies across the county, each with a unique identification number and position coordinates recorded. The data is validated during every cleaning cycle and amendments made as necessary. This level of survey data provides us with enough detail to be confident on funding requirements to maintain and repair gullies in Surrey.

The aim of the current survey, referred to in the select committee report, is to identify and record the location of all other drainage surface features such as catch pits and linear channels. This survey is still ongoing. Having collected

records on these other features, the intention is then to include them in future routine cleaning programmes to improve the effectiveness of the maintenance process.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

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

There is a school in my division, Guildford Grove, which has a carefully negotiated limited time parking area at the front. On the morning of 10 March, notices suddenly appeared saying that Highways were going to do some work to the footpath near the bus stop outside the school and that parking was suspended for a week. I have a number of questions arising from this:

1. Why was no-one consulted about the proposed widening of a footpath which would push the bus out further into the road at a very busy pinchpoint?
2. Why wasn't the school notified in advance of the work and the suspension of parking so that they could warn parents?
3. Why wasn't Guildford Borough Council notified in advance as the parking authority?
4. Why did no-one do me the courtesy of informing me as the local Member of the changes to the parking arrangements outside the school so that I could take appropriate steps to mitigate the chaos which the decision has caused?
5. In view of the number of times I, and other Members, have asked to be consulted about proposals for work in our divisions and been assured that this would be done, what steps will the Cabinet Member take this time to make sure that it does happen in future?

Reply:

1. This bus stop improvement is part of the package of 200+ bus stop upgrades across Guildford which is being funded through the agreed and approved LSTF programme. The purpose of this element of the programme is to improve passenger accessibility, the waiting environment and assist with bus service reliability.

Specifically at this busy location, the bus bay will be "filled in", allowing buses to pull up at the kerb in a parallel fashion, and then depart from the bus stop without delay. This will also make the stop compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act and is intended to improve the environment and accessibility for passengers, including those in wheelchairs or with prams or pushchairs. The recently installed parking bays at the head of

the stop had made the bus exit movement more difficult. These works will assist with improving this.

In this particular case location of the temporary bus stop was chosen in order to keep the stop as close to the shops as possible, thus minimising disruption for bus users. Our contractor, Kier, has also been asked to check what can be done to minimise any disruption whilst the works are on-going.

Guildford Local Committee and the Members Task Group have been consulted on all LSTF proposals. In addition, the Local Highway Team has been consulted. Local Members are also informed of these works.

2. That is one of the purposes of the notices that were put up. However the school should also have received a letter a few days in advance of the works informing them of the proposals. The gang on site had copies of this letter so if someone had approached them from the school they could have provided the information. Although there has been a change of gang on these works, we have requested that they are briefed to ensure the letter drop is completed before work starts. Due to the short time-scales for the response Kiers, our contractor, will be checking to ensure that this is done.
3. Due to the short duration of the works and the short notice given to the contractor to request the bays suspended, it was not deemed necessary to fully suspend the parking bay, and therefore of the need to inform Guildford Borough Council or fully suspend the parking bay. Our contractor has accepted that this was an oversight on their behalf. Their decision was based on the need to allow buses an appropriate stopping location and to not fully close the stop. For this reason parking cones were not placed on the site.
4. In this case Kier assumed that no formal suspension was required which was why the only notification was the sign at the site (and also why no parking cones were placed there). This was done so that works could progress without further delays to the programme which had already been delayed due to the bad weather. This is the normal process our contractor follows if they need to temporarily suspend parking for a short duration. For more permanent suspensions or for works where no parking is crucial, such as carriageway surfacing, a full suspension is sought.

Please accept my apologies for any inconvenience the works may have caused or are causing. However, be assured that the improvements will make a positive difference for all highway users. Kier have also apologised for any misunderstanding that may have occurred in this instance and have said that they will ensure that this will not happen again.

5. Surrey Highways are committed to ensuring all planned works are promoted in advance via the Surrey County Council website and the

Guildford Local Committee. Highways then work with Local Committee Members to determine an appropriate consultation programme for the wider community.

The bus stop improvement scheme referred to is being delivered as part of the wider Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) programme. This programme was discussed with the Guildford Member Task Group and approved by Guildford Local Committee on 13 April 2013. Further communication was provided to local Members on 23 January 2014.

In response to the County Councillor's concerns, Surrey Highways and Travel & Transport Group will work with the Local Committee Chairman and the Members Task Group to understand if improvements can be made to increase awareness of the LSTF capital infrastructure programme.

CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

(6) MRS STELLA LALLEMENT (EPSOM WEST) TO ASK:

95.4% (10,141) of Surrey applicants have been offered a place at one of their six preferred secondary schools this year. This is a deterioration compared to last year when 96.5% were offered a place at one of their six preferred schools. This also means that there are around 500 children who have not been offered one of their six preferred schools. Parents' choices are based on many factors: proximity to home, faith, quality of teaching, etc.

My questions are:

1. What actions are being taken to ensure that sufficient school places are being provided to ensure that secondary school children can attend a school within a reasonable distance of their home to enable them to walk or cycle to school?
2. What factors are used in determining which secondary schools are expanded to ensure that places are available where there is demand whether by proximity to home, faith or quality of teaching?
3. As faith schools may give priority to applicants who are of the faith of the school independent of how distant they live from the school, what actions are being taken to ensure that applicants who are not of the faith of the faith schools close to their home are given a school place within a reasonable distance of their home?

Reply:

Although the preference satisfaction rate has fallen slightly this year, such fluctuation is not unusual. Each year satisfaction rates will depend not just on the number of children applying and the number of places, but also on where

children live and the preference decisions that parents make. Surrey's preference satisfaction rates remain high when compared to some other areas of the country. Across London only 69.21% of children were offered one of their first preference schools whereas in Surrey we achieved a figure of 83%.

1. The Schools Commissioning team continually monitors the pupil forecast data to ensure that the Local Authority has sufficient school places. This data is monitored in planning areas which take into account typical patterns of transition from primary to secondary. There will be a range of travel requirements at the stage of transition from primary to secondary school as secondary schools admit pupils from a greater distance than primary schools typically do. However, all plans for school expansions have extensive discussions at a very early stage in the planning process with a range of officers from the planning & transport, property and education directorates within SCC and with parents and residents local to the school to ensure that there are robust travel arrangements, including walking and cycling options. Ultimately, it is the admission criteria for each school that determines how children will be admitted and most schools give some priority to children based on the distance they live from the school, thus ensuring that the majority of children can attend a school within a reasonable distance from their home.
2. Birth data, housing data (permissions and trajectories) and historical transfer trends are factored into the school planning forecasts to determine where there is demand. Trends in admissions reflecting parental preferences are closely monitored. In addition, school commissioning officers work with a range of stakeholders including Area Education Officers, Education Officers from all the Diocesan bodies linked to Surrey, Head teachers and Governors to ensure that any additional places are being created in the most appropriate schools.
3. In Surrey, the majority of community and voluntary controlled schools give priority to children according to whether or not the school is their nearest school. In considering which school is nearest, faith schools which do not provide places for local children are disregarded. In this way, children whose nearest school is a faith school which is oversubscribed by children of the faith are not disadvantaged in their application for their nearest non-faith school. This helps to ensure that as far as is reasonably practicable, children are given a place within a reasonable distance from their home.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

In a written answer to a public question at 25 February 2014, Cabinet meeting, the Cabinet Member said; "Our ambition for the future is to operate not from fixed fire stations but use fire engines for community work and dispatch them when they're out and about, so they can be mobilised from anywhere."

Every fire and rescue authority must produce and have a publicly available Integrated Risk Management Plan. In Surrey, this is called the Public Safety Plan.

- Where in this plan is the ambition outlined above referred to?
- Why is Surrey looking for fire stations when it plans not to have any in the future?
- What is planned for overnight operations, will fire appliances and crews be parked in lay-bys across the county?

Reply:

One of the prime means of delivering community work is through our flexible workforce using fire engines. Fire engines are not solely used for responding to incidents however we know that this is their core function. Whilst not attending incidents our firefighters will be undertaking a variety of work, much of which will be out in their communities. They will remain available to be dispatched to incidents at any time and from any location.

The ambition to operate from alternative locations whilst being involved in Community Work is not specifically mentioned within the current PSP 2011 - 2020. However, paragraph 7.49, page 28 talks about our response and how we manage our resource dynamically using automatic vehicle location and we will move our fire engines around the county to maintain emergency cover. This is an operating model we have employed for some considerable time and our position has not changed - the nearest and quickest appropriate resource to any incident will be dispatched.

In relation to fire stations, there will always be a need to house our fire engines within stations and currently Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has no intention of moving away from this. As stated within our current Public Safety Plan 2011 - 2020, (Paragraph 7.50, page 29) when referring to appropriate locations for our resources, primarily we mean fire stations, but we will also be considering locating fire engines at other identified locations when appropriate. This does not mean that we would expect to be parking fire engines at road junctions on a regular basis, but must be able to consider this at times of high demand.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

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

In the light of the failed process a year ago of the attempts to close provision for shorts breaks in East Surrey for children with complex needs and their families, how confident are you that the current consultation process, which makes a number of the same mistakes in respect of the data and analysis provided, and

which contains a fundamentally flawed Equality Impact Assessment, will produce a fair outcome for residents of East Surrey?

Are you concerned that the reputation of the Council will be further damaged by this process?

Reply:

Surrey County Council did not consider or attempt to close of any of its in house provision for short breaks last year.

I assume that the question refers to the Beeches which is owned, funded and managed by the NHS. Access to the Beeches requires an NHS health assessment.

Surrey County Council's Children's Services spends over £8m per year on short breaks for children and young people with disabilities and Surrey CCGs currently fund approximately £1.3m per year. Surrey County Council invests significantly more in short breaks than many other local authorities and it continues to be a priority for the Council.

Residential short breaks for children with disabilities are provided through a number of services, including White Lodge, Cherry Trees, Applewood and Beeches.

Beeches is a resource that is funded and commissioned through our health partners. As part of their plans for service provision, on 18th January 2013 Surrey Primary Care Trust with Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) decided not to close the Beeches short breaks unit managed by Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Trust. Our NHS partners committed to carrying out a Strategic Review of Short Breaks for children with disabilities in conjunction with Surrey County Council.

Families were actively involved in the process of designing the consultation and scrutinised and agreed the consultation document before it went live.

The Review has looked at a number of data sources including:

- Legislative Requirements
- Local Need
- Key messages from consultations
- Funding and provision of short breaks for children and young people with disabilities in Surrey
- Residential services at Beeches and Applewood
- Other residential services in Surrey and out of county
- Community based services
- Value for money from services commissioned in all settings.

The Review puts forward options for Beeches and Applewood for the future. Respondents to the consultation also have the opportunity to put forward alternative suggestions.

Following analysis of the public consultation, recommendations will be made to Surrey County Council Cabinet and Clinical Commissioning Group Collaborative Meeting. This will include a comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment on any recommendations.

As we are currently in the period of public consultation, any feedback should be given through the survey on the 'Surrey Says' Website. The consultation period will end on 24 April 2014.

A Parent/ Carer Panel (parent/carers who use Beeches and Applewood) has been set up to jointly oversee the consultation process and ensure that it is fair and transparent process.

This Review is not a process aimed at making cuts to short break services. As noted, Surrey County Council invests significantly more in short breaks than many other local authorities and it continues to be a priority for the Council. As part of this, we need to look at how we maximise our resources to deliver best quality services to children and young people with disabilities and their families to ensure they are effective, supportive and caring for children who need their support.

We are a listening authority and we recognise that this is an ongoing issue that is very difficult for all concerned. Families are rightly concerned about the issue and we have received correspondence expressing a range of views about services that people would like us to support. I would encourage all families who use the services to engage in the consultation process.

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

(9) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK: (2nd question)

Does the Council have full confidence in the ability of May Gurney as sole contractor, to be able to repair and maintain all the roads in the whole of Surrey?

What checks and quality control procedures are in place to ensure that all work carried out by May Gurney and all sub contractors is to the highest standard?

Reply:

The council has full confidence in the ability of May Gurney (now Kier) to deliver the contract requirements, this output is both in terms of resource management and quality of delivery.

In addition to its own internal resources, Kier has access to over thirty sub-contractors, with approximately £10m per annum provided directly to local Surrey companies who work with Kier as part of a strategic team. Kier therefore have access to a wealth of both local and national resources, and this availability was no more evident than during the recent flooding crisis. During the ten week period from Xmas, Kier increased its emergency response gangs from three per day to over ten gangs, while the number of Pothole Crews increased from 16 to over 30 full time (2 man crews), with all additional resource available within 24 hours notice. Kier also arranged purchase of all sandbags and sand used by the emergency services to defend local communities.

An independent SCC quality inspection team reviews all Kier activity. All schemes over £5,000 must be individually inspected by an SCC Engineer prior to any payment, while a 10% random audit is undertaken on all schemes under £5,000. If any failures are found the council can withhold payment; penalise profit; or demand additional remedial work. Since the start of the contract in 2010 there are no outstanding quality issues and all schemes (where quality failures had been identified by SCC engineer) have been fully rectified to the council standards.

In regards to pothole repair a specific SCC team review quality each month. Every pothole must have a before and after photograph and permanent repair (with 2 year guarantee) within 28 days. This is strictly enforced with Kier required to achieve 98% pass rate for all potholes before any profit is released. The outcome of the monthly quality audit is available to all Surrey residents via the Surrey Website under "Highway Maintenance Contract" homepage.

This confirms that until November 2013 Kier were achieving over 98% pass rate for pothole repairs, however, due to the ongoing flooding crisis since December the percentage of passes for permanent repairs has significantly dropped below target. However, the council accepts that this failure, since December, is not as a direct result of contractor performance but as a result of both pothole volume (with 100% increase in reported potholes since Xmas) and also the underlying road condition. With level of water saturation preventing any meaningful long term repair to roads, the council is therefore working with Kier to deliver a major long term repair programme once the water level recede in the spring.

Our internal quality management and benchmarking with peer authorities consequently confirms that Kier continue to deliver an overall high level of performance. Further information on quality output can also be found via the Kier Annual Review submitted each year to the Transport and Environment Select Committee.

CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES

(10) MR JOHN ORRICK (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK: (2nd question)

At the March 2010 and March 2012 Council meetings, the then Cabinet Members for Corporate Services and Change and Efficiency answered the following question from me, set out below, with the detailed replies:

“How much has the County Council paid in compensation for damage to vehicles caused by defects in roads in each of the last four years, including the current year to date? How many claims have been made in each of those years in each of Surrey’s Boroughs and Districts, and how many have been paid in full or part?”

Could the Cabinet Member please provide an update to the figures provided, with the same full breakdown from 2006/7 to 2013/14?

Reply:

I have been asked to produce details of carriageway claims received relating to accidents that occurred between 1 April 2006 and today’s date.

The Figtree system that the insurance section uses to record such claims has been used since 2008. Whilst upon its installation all claims that the insurance section had previously received and dealt with were transferred across, the East and West area offices were only able to put claims on from a date later than 1 April 2006 and therefore some caution is required in the figures before 2008.

Members will be aware of the severe weather the county has experienced in the last two or three years, which will have an effect on the number of claims and that the figures for 2013/14 are up until 13 March 2013

The analysis of claims and amounts by year is set out below

Reigate & Banstead

2006/7	62 claims	£44,958 paid	21	successful claims
2007/8	144 claims	£52,062 paid	14	successful claims
2008/9	177 claims	£37,716 paid	14	successful claims
2009/10	455 claims	£12,848 paid	22	successful claims
2010/11	416 claims	£51,439 paid	145	successful claims
2011/12	161 claims	£32,587 paid	46	successful claims
2012/13	424 claims	£24,886 paid	97	successful claims
2013/14	416 claims	£6,539 paid	27	successful claims

Elmbridge

2006/7	49 claims	£40,987 paid	14 successful claims
2007/8	93 claims	£62,027 paid	10 successful claims
2008/9	177 claims	£52,333 paid	25 successful claims
2009/10	260 claims	£11,482 paid	12 successful claims
2010/11	195 claims	£38,596 paid	63 successful claims
2011/12	114 claims	£20,117 paid	43 successful claims
2012/13	159 claims	£7,907 paid	22 successful claims
2013/14	201 claims	£7,148 paid	21 successful claims

Epsom & Ewell

2006/7	17 claims	£37,596 paid	6 successful claims
2007/8	33 claims	£20,082 paid	1 successful claim
2008/9	60 claims	£33,241 paid	14 successful claims
2009/10	120 claims	£1,251 paid	2 successful claims
2010/11	66 claims	£15,551 paid	9 successful claims
2011/12	16 claims	£2,681 paid	7 successful claims
2012/13	67 claims	£3,049 paid	19 successful claims
2013/14	59 claims	£651 paid	3 successful claims

Mole Valley

2006/7	47 claims	£30,155 paid	19 successful claims
2007/8	112 claims	£15,328 paid	16 successful claims
2008/9	89 claims	£ 7,807 paid	12 successful claims
2009/10	205 claims	£ 6,411 paid	8 successful claims
2010/11	239 claims	£39,652 paid	79 successful claims
2011/12	88 claims	£10,174 paid	34 successful claims
2012/13	214 claims	£11,603 paid	43 successful claims
2013/14	193 claims	£5,080 paid	19 successful claims

Tandridge

2006/7	50 claims	£ 9,243 paid	12 successful claims
	183 claims	£ 9,874 paid	9 successful claims
	221 claims	£44,021 paid	37 successful claims
	386 claims	£17,158 paid	17 successful claims
2010/11	576 claims	£98,083 paid	224 successful claims
2011/12	218 claims	£24,455 paid	66 successful claims
2012/13	375 claims	£13,890 paid	58 successful claims
2013/14	433 claims	£11,217 paid	43 successful claims

Runnymede

2006/7	15 claims	£0 paid	0 successful claims
2007/8	7 claims	£0 paid	0 successful claims
2008/9	15 claims	£923 paid	1 successful claim
2009/10	34 claims	£0 paid	0 successful claims
2010/11	25 claims	£214 paid	1 successful claims
2011/12	21 claims	£0 paid	0 successful claims
2012/13	48 claims	£6,581 paid	18 successful claims
2013/14	47 claims	£709 paid	2 successful claims

Spelthorne

2006/7	27 claims	£7,308 paid	2 successful claims
2007/8	19 claims	£36,466 paid	6 successful claims
2008/9	44 claims	£11,847 paid	9 successful claims
2009/10	42 claims	£6,319 paid	1 successful claim
2010/11	33 claims	£2,904 paid	6 successful claims
2011/12	12 claims	£8,500 paid	7 successful claims
2012/13	31 claims	£9,997 paid	14 successful claims
2013/14	45 claims	£3,341 paid	1 successful claim

Surrey Heath

2006/7	20 claims	£0 paid	0 successful claims
2007/8	15 claims	£1,488 paid	1 successful claim
2008/9	62 claims	£8,380 paid	8 successful claims
2009/10	50 claims	£1,582 paid	1 successful claim
2010/11	50 claims	£4,591 paid	5 successful claims
2011/12	27 claims	£3,860 paid	8 successful claims
2012/13	97 claims	£4,522 paid	15 successful claims
2013/14	80 claims	£555 paid	6 successful claims

Woking

2006/7	32 claims	£120 paid	1 successful claim
2007/8	28 claims	£44,546 paid	7 successful claims
2008/9	49 claims	£2,099 paid	4 successful claims
2009/10	70 claims	£419 paid	1 successful claim
2010/11	72 claims	£1,090 paid	4 successful claims
2011/12	29 claims	£3,022 paid	8 successful claims
2012/13	69 claims	£4,213 paid	14 successful claims
2013/14	85 claims	£797 paid	3 successful claims

Guildford

2006/7	221 claims	£18,461 paid	14 successful claims
2007/8	60 claims	£13,507 paid	12 successful claims
2008/9	175 claims	£55,483 paid	33 successful claims
2009/10	239 claims	£ 4,783 paid	6 successful claims
2010/11	229 claims	£10,149 paid	22 successful claims
2011/12	121 claims	£23,285 paid	46 successful claims
2012/13	274 claims	£35,625 paid	116 successful claims
2013/14	268 claims	£14,532 paid	43 successful claims

Waverley

2006/7	37 claims	£ 993 paid	2 successful claims
2007/8	54 claims	£ 5,981 paid	3 successful claims
2008/9	49 claims	£ 6,346 paid	9 successful claims
2009/10	466 claims	£ 2,280 paid	4 successful claims
2010/11	186 claims	£18,404 paid	17 successful claims
2011/12	115 claims	£8,226 paid	25 successful claims
2012/13	353 claims	£41,467 paid	90 successful claims
2013/14	293 claims	£10,561 paid	27 successful claims

If we add these figures together we reach a total of:

2006/7	577 claims	£189,821 paid
2007/8	748 claims	£261,361 paid
2008/9	1,118 claims	£260,196 paid
2009/10	2,327 claims	£64,533 paid
2010/11	2,087 claims	£281,713 paid
2011/12	922 claims	£135,907 paid
2012/13	2,111 claims	£163,739 paid
2013/14	2,120 claims	£61,131 paid

I hope that the information provided is of interest and benefit, bearing in mind historic difficulties with changes in the database system.