

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**TUESDAY 15 JULY 2014****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING****(1) MR KEITH WITHAM (WORPLESDON) TO ASK:**

Will the Cabinet Member, responsible for Surrey County Council's (SCC) formal response to Guildford Borough Council's (GBC) Draft Local Plan, please give assurances to residents and me:

- That SCC's response, particularly in respect of planning for housing in Guildford and on the future need for additional school places, highways and transport issues, and other County Council services, will be thorough and robust, and include the representations of County Councillors representing Guildford
- Advertise clearly on the SCC website the contact details of those responsible for the above, and, if different, how and to whom the public and Members should address questions and comments, and, also;
- Set out the process for finalising the SCC response to GBC and how Guildford SCC Members will be able to input to that before it is finalised?

Reply:

Officers from across County Council services will input into a corporate response focussed on the implications for those services of the policies and proposals in Guildford Borough Council's draft Local Plan. The response will consider the future need for additional school places, highways and transport and other County Council services. It will be based on the best evidence currently available and officers will use their professional and specialist knowledge to ensure that it is robust. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning will agree the response with the Planning and Development Group Manager before it is signed off. As is normally the case, Members are able to advise the Cabinet Member of their views and he may consult with them before the response is finalised. Members are also encouraged to make their own individual representations to the borough council.

It is Guildford Borough Council's responsibility as the local planning authority to ensure that its plan is 'sound' and deliverable and that adequate infrastructure can be delivered in a timely manner to support new development. The draft Local Plan is the borough council's document and the borough council is responsible for running a statutory public consultation process in line with the requirements and processes set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and subsequent regulations. The borough council will need to demonstrate to an independent inspector at examination an audit trail of

comments received on the draft Local Plan and how it has responded to these comments before producing the next pre-submission version of the document. It is important for any comments and questions from the public on infrastructure issues to be submitted to Guildford Borough Council and/or raised at the various consultation events to be held during the consultation period and for the borough council to respond and take these up with the county council if necessary. Comments on the draft Local Plan can be made to the borough council by:

- Making comments against the online version of the plan that can be viewed at <https://getinvolved.guildford.gov.uk/consult.ti/DLPSS14/consultationHome>
- Complete the online or paper version of the questionnaire
- Email comments to the borough council at localplan@guildford.gov.uk or write to the council at Planning Policy, Planning Services, Guildford Borough Council, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, GU2 4BB

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY

(2) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:

It is now over five months since the terrible flooding that affected so many residents in Spelthorne. Yet there still appears to be ambiguity and confusion as to where responsibility lies between the various agencies, notably Thames Water and the Environment Agency.

Worse - No works on flood defences or flood alleviation have begun.

No decisions have been reached by any of the agencies as to exactly what works should be undertaken. No definitive time frame exists by any of the agencies as to when decisions will be made or actual works begun.

Why has Surrey County Council allowed this situation to occur?

Why hasn't Surrey County Council, as the lead flood authority, demanded that Thames Water and the Environment Agency produce a detailed time plan for flood defence and alleviation works, with specific dates for decisions to be reached and works to commence?

Reply:

Lead Local Flood Authority Duties

With the introduction of the Flood and Water Management Act in 2010 the county council became the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) responsible for managing the flood risk associated with surface water runoff, ordinary water courses and groundwater. These responsibilities are in addition to the duties

also imposed on the council as Highway Authority. The LLFA has a duty under the Act to:

1. Produce a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy
2. Create an Asset Register
3. Carry out an investigation where significant flooding occurs
4. Create a Sustainable Drainage Approval Body (not yet enacted)

In these circumstances Surrey has responded proactively to flooding issues throughout the county, and will continue to do so, providing practical support and assistance with partner organisations where possible. The council is also ensuring that flood information is obtained, maintained, shared and communicated widely with other flood risk management authorities, and internal and external stakeholders, for future reference and to promote action where appropriate.

Following the flood events since Christmas the council has been collating and evaluating a wide range of data to confirm where official 'investigations' are now required and 54 sites across the county have been identified and prioritised. All individual investigations will require the involvement of the various flood risk management authorities concerned in order to provide appropriate conclusions. This process has commenced.

The Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy has been produced and is currently being revised, following a public engagement exercise, prior to approval by Cabinet in due course. The Asset Register has also been established and is being maintained.

River Thames Flood Events

The significant flood events that affected Spelthorne and other areas of northern Surrey, together with adjacent authorities, in February and March of this year were substantially due to fluvial flooding from the River Thames and its various tributaries. The Environment Agency (EA) is responsible for managing the flood risks on these main rivers. When reviewing these events over a two month period it is clear that both the duration and total volume of water discharged easily surpassed anything previously recorded. This includes the major events in March 1947 and November 1894.

Due to the scale and extent of the event the EA has investigated and reviewed the reactive and recovery phases of the response to learn from the experience and inform how any future incidents are dealt with. As LLFA the County assisted with this work, with other risk management authorities, and will use the outputs to inform ongoing investigations and works. Surrey, the EA and Thames Water were also represented at public and private meetings organised by Spelthorne Borough with the local MP and local residents on 5 June. In addition there is regular liaison enabling all risk management authorities to engage through the Surrey Flood Risk Partnership Board and supporting Working Group. The Board has established collaborative working

arrangements to promote and progress flood and water management objectives, priorities, programmes and funding bids across Surrey.

The River Thames Scheme

At the SFRPB meeting on 17 June the EA provided an update on the River Thames Scheme (Datchet to Teddington). The aim of the current scheme is to:

- Construct a flood channel (in three sections totalling approximately 17 km in length and 20-30 m wide to increase flow capacity of the River Thames
- Increase the capacity of three of the Thames weirs
- Develop a major incident plan
- Install property level protection for up to 1,200 properties

A multi agency team of senior officers and members from affected authorities is working closely with scheme owners and managers from DEFRA and the Environment Agency (EA), to promote the new scheme and develop joint funding initiatives to locally raise approximately £120m towards the scheme cost currently estimated to be approximately £256m. The provisional programme indicates that from the current consents stage completion of the scheme is programmed in Spring 2025.

I believe the above information clearly demonstrates the extent of the collaborative working arrangements between Surrey, as the LLFA, and all other flood risk management authorities and partner organisations in and adjacent to Surrey.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

I attended a recent Junior Citizens' Event held at Dapdune Wharf in Guildford. In a series of 10 minute sets, it delivered training in road safety, water safety, stranger danger, bullying, how to deal with dogs (including the dangers of dog mess), parks and countryside safety among other things. A lot of the people delivering the sets were volunteers but there is always a cost to arranging such events. In view of the costs of dealing with accidents to children, would the Leader of the Council agree with me that these events are good value for money. Further, would he agree that Surrey County Council should support these events by contributing to those costs?

Reply:

Junior Citizens Schemes have been coordinated, administered and managed by the district and borough community safety partnerships (CSPs). Prior to 2012 when the CSPs were in receipt of direct central government funding, Junior Citizens Schemes were run across the County. However, with the loss of the direct funding and the increasing difficulty of securing the support and

commitment of partners, including the County Council, a number of the CSPs decided, albeit reluctantly, to no longer run the Scheme in their area. Of the eleven CSPs in the County there are only five who currently deliver a Junior Citizens Scheme in their area.

The core cost to running a Junior Citizens event is not the day itself rather it is the administration and organisation in the weeks and months leading up to the event and many of the CSPs no longer have the resources or capacity available to deliver such a commitment.

The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner has taken a keen interest in Junior Citizens and has been working to find support and assistance so that Schemes could again cover the whole of the County. There is funding and other resources available to the CSPs to support both existing Junior Citizens Scheme and develop new ones from the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. Before the County Council contributes to the costs of Junior Citizens, a discussion with the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner would be in order.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY

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

At the May 2014 meeting of the County Council, the Leader of the Council announced additional £23m funding for repairing Surrey's roads, bridges and drains without specifying where the money was coming from. Government has allocated Surrey an additional £9.2m funding for highways maintenance in 2014. Where is the £14m shortfall in funding to be found to reach the £23m announced by the Leader of the Council in May?

Reply:

The cost of highway flood repairs this year has been estimated at £23m. This is partially funded by £9.2m received through severe weather and pot hole challenge funding. The remaining cost will be met from savings within the existing Highway budget, funding secured from developers, and funding identified following a review of the authority's capital programme, the outcome of which will be reported to the next Cabinet meeting on 22 July.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

What actions are being taken to ensure that the County Council fully complies with the Department for Communities and Local Government's Local Government Transparency Code 2014?

Reply:

The Council already provides a significant amount of information in accordance with the 2012 Transparency Code. The new code, which is more detailed and wider-ranging, is in the process of being implemented and is awaiting Government regulations. Officers in relevant Services across the Council are currently doing work to ensure that the additional requirements of the 2014 code are met.

Key points are as follows:

- Procurement- the Council already publishes details of contracts on its Contract Management System, and all items of expenditure over £500. Officers will add to this - details of grants, all purchase orders over £5k, Invitations to Tender and Requests for Quotation, and details of purchase card transactions. There is some development work needed to prepare and collate appropriate reports and ensure data is as complete as possible. The plan is to begin publication under the new standard from January 2015 for data relating to Quarter 3.
- Land and building assets- the information required exists on both the Property Asset Management System (PAMS) and the Property Asset Register and work is in hand to create the required schedule with any additional details that need to be included.
- HR- Information already published on our website includes the Pay Policy statement in accordance with the Localism Act. The Pay Multiple (defined as the ratio between the highest paid salary and the median salary) is also already shown in the Pay Policy statement. Details of the salaries of senior Council officers are also on the website. Further requirements include details of trade union facility time and these and other updated matters are being worked on.
- Parking- the Council currently publishes annual parking reports that provide an overview of on street parking management across the county. This includes financial information as well as data concerning the issue of penalty charge notices. For the 2013/14 financial year the report will include the financial outturn in each area more comprehensively including the data stipulated by the Code. Work is currently being done in relation to providing details of the total number of designated and free on street spaces in the county and this will be included in the 2014/15 annual report.
- Governance- the Council already publishes its Constitution on the website.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Which Boards has the County Council established, what are their terms of reference and membership? Do all of the Boards meet in private and if so are their minutes published on the external website?

Reply:

I believe that Mr Orrick is referring to the new networks that are in the process of being established by the County Council.

As I have said in this chamber before, if we are to meet the challenges that lie ahead we need to be able to direct our resources and skills nimbly onto the most important tasks. It is also important that we are able balance the day-to-day delivery of current services with work to design and implement new models of public services.

That is why we are moving away from a purely functional and directorate/service centred set of arrangements and supplementing these with networks focussed on cross-cutting goals.

The networks are still in the process of being set up and therefore Terms of Reference are yet to be finalised. However, I would be more than happy to update Mr Orrick (or indeed any other Member) on the set up of the networks after the summer recess.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Under the latest proposals by Heathrow to the Davies Commission the huge Colnbrook Incinerator will be relocated to Spelthorne. Does the Cabinet Member support this?

Reply:

The proposal for a third runway at Heathrow is one of a number of options being considered by the Airports Commission, which is due to report in summer 2015. If the proposal for a third runway at Heathrow is agreed then it would be at least 2025 before it could be delivered. If, as suggested, the construction of a third runway would involve demolition of the existing energy from waste plant at Colnbrook and its replacement at another location then this in itself is likely to take many years given the planning and other regulatory approvals that would be required, as well as the considerable build time.

Given the uncertainties surrounding this whole proposal and the fact that there is no clarity on the detail of what is being proposed, it is not possible to make any comment at this stage.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Over 2000 people have now signed an e-petition on the council's website, critical of the decision of Surrey's ruling group to award themselves huge increases in special responsibility allowances. The Leader of the Council was questioned about the matter when giving evidence recently, to a House of Commons Committee and at least one MP, Guildford Conservative Anne Milton, has asked the Council to reconsider the decision. In light of all this public opposition, does the Leadership intend to press on with these enormous rises regardless?

Reply:

The Government has given county councils 42 new responsibilities since 2010 and these have increased the workload for the Cabinet and other senior councillors. There had been no review of allowances for four years and it is important that they are adjusted to reflect increases in roles and responsibilities. Therefore I stand by this Council's decision, whilst I recognise that there has been public debate on the matter.

CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

(9) MR KEN GULATI (BANSTEAD, WOODMANSTERNE AND CHIPSTEAD) TO ASK:

The Cabinet Member will be aware of the recent closure of the facilities for parental parking in the sports club next door to Woodmansterne Primary School in my Division.

Would the Cabinet Member please inform me of the course of and the current state of the negotiations with the sports club over the resumption of those facilities and what the Council is able to do to ameliorate the resulting problems for the parents, children and residents.

Reply:

I am aware of the closure to parents of parking facilities next to Woodmansterne Primary School. The private car park is owned by the Old Walcouthian Sports Club. A formal arrangement had been in place that enabled the parents to use the car park at the start and end of the school day.

Unfortunately the car park is situated on an un-made surface that has significantly deteriorated due both to its use and extreme weather. The car park has now reached a state where the previous agreement has now been terminated.

Officers of the Council have met with representatives of the Sports Club and at this stage the estimated costs of making the existing car park available for long term vehicular use remain prohibitive for both sides. We will continue to work with the Sports Club and monitor this situation. In addition, officers have also approached other third party car parks in the area but have been unsuccessful in gaining agreement for their use by parents.

We recognise that as a result difficulty has been created in the area both for those wishing to access the school and drop off their children and local residents in what is a confined location. In response council officers including the Road Safety Audit Team, the Local Highways Team, the Surrey Police Casualty Reduction Officer and the Sustainability Team have been working with the school to look at potential mitigation measures.

As part of this process, officers are considering the provision of a School Crossing Patrol on the Carshalton Road. In addition, the Local Highways team are examining the feasibility of providing a drop kerb to assist parents and children crossing outside the school.

Officers have also been working with the school to update its travel plan to ensure that best practise is promoted, in relation to all policies relating to access to the school.

We are aware that this will be an ongoing issue and has caused concern both within the school and the local area. I will ask officers to keep you informed of any developments.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY

(10) MR JOHN BECKETT (EWELL) TO ASK:

I understand that our highways facility at Meroo has recently been subject to flooding. Can I ask the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery if there are any consequences for Surrey residents, especially to services and projects that have associated timescales?

Reply:

Serious flooding resulting from a mains water leak occurred in Rowan House at Meroo over the weekend of 21 and 22 June 2014. This relative new modular building housed two teams from the Local Highways Service, the Parking team, restaurant and welfare facilities and two meeting rooms.

Surrey Highways is a Category 1 responder and this event resulted in the Service Business Continuity Plan being immediately invoked on Monday 23 June 2014. Since then the Business Continuity Service Recovery Team have held regular meetings, chaired by the on call Highways Duty Officer. This team of officers has engaged with staff to ensure adequate alternative accommodation and IT has been available to maintain services throughout. Property Services have assisted with temporary office and welfare facilities in response to the initial event and also the ongoing recovery. IMT have delivered an enhanced service, including evening and weekend working, to repair damaged servers, recover data and reinstall printer services etc.

The ongoing event and recovery is now focused on completing the IT recovery and ensuring the longer term building repairs are completed with the minimum delay working with the insurance assessors and Procurement to achieve best value solutions.

As with all sudden, high impact events such as this there will be some learning opportunities for future operations in the various services concerned. These will be fully identified at a debrief to be arranged in the near future and lead by the Emergency Management Team.

It is noted, however, that our services to the public, Members, other colleagues and stakeholders was managed throughout and not severely impacted. This reflects the robust management and Business Continuity arrangements operating in the Highways Service and the successful cross cutting work undertaken with other support services in the council to maintain 'Business as Usual'.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MR NICK HARRISON (NORK AND TATTENHAMS) TO ASK:

The Section 25 report by the Chief Finance Officer which accompanied the Budget Report presented in February 2014 states: "The Council is planning to apply one-off general reserves and balances totalling £26 million to achieve a balanced budget in 2014/15. This will enable the Council to further pursue the medium term strategy focused on securing a fair share of Government funding for this Council for the services where demand is uncontrollable by the Council: adult social care and school places in particular."

Could the Leader advise the Council what progress has been made towards securing a fairer share of Government funding?

Reply:

Members will be aware through the regular budget planning briefings that the Cabinet have a strategy for lobbying MPs, especially Cabinet Ministers, as well as partners and stakeholders to secure a fair share of funding for the County Council. Members will also appreciate that large government departments

rarely change decisions quickly. A policy of lobbying such as this has to be a sustained long term campaign that is focused on the right people. We are fortunate at Surrey County Council that we have Cabinet Members with good connections in Government and the expertise of officers to provide the right lobbying information in the right way.

But for successful lobbying we cannot just say how bad our luck is and hold up a begging bowl. We present a positive message that shows the County Council is proactive in securing its financial sustainability and that it wants to be treated fairly.

Over the past year we have demonstrated that we are controlling costs, in spite of increased demand for services, through lower unit costs. You will all have a copy of the Unit Cost booklet we produced late last year for Surrey MPs. This is now being updated for the last financial year and continues to show Surrey County Council reducing its costs in the face of ever increasing demand.

Members will also be well aware of the publication "More than 50 Ways Surrey County Council Adds Value". This has been used successfully with MPs to demonstrate that the County Council strives to do the best for its residents and only asks to be treated fairly.

As I said, this is a long term campaign. But we have had plenty of success over the last twelve months. This is evidence we are being listened to

School places funding

- Additional £72m basic need capital grants awarded for 2014-17

Better care funding

- National allocation based on health demographics, not local authority demographics (*£65m was allocated to the Surrey area, including £25m to sustain Adult Social Care provisionally agreed with CCGs*)

New homes bonus

- Proposed transfer to Local Enterprise Partnerships withdrawn outside London – after personal representations by Leader in his dual role as Leader of SCC and Chairman of County Council Network which has led to SCC retaining over £30m expected cumulative funding over MTFP 2014-19

Council tax referendum threshold

- 2% limit maintained for 2014/15

Highways Maintenance

- £3.9m from the Pot hole fund
- £5.3m for flood damaged roads and bridges

I think Members will agree that we have achieved a great deal, but there is no time to sit back and rest on our laurels. The County Council still faces significant financial challenges and these successes provide a platform for continuing our campaign for Surrey to be treated fairly by government. We will continue to ask our Surrey MPs to work within the corridors of Westminster and Whitehall to fight for a fairer funding solution for their constituents.

CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

(12) MR EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL AND CUDDINGTON) TO ASK:

A planning application has been submitted to site a demountable classroom (modular building) on the site of **The Vale Primary School**, Beaconsfield Road, Langley Vale, Epsom to create an additional classroom for September. However, construction of the building has already started before the final date for objections and before planning permission has been granted.

1. Were you aware that the Property Team had authorised building work to begin before residents have had the opportunity to express their views and influence the planning decision?
2. Are you aware that there is no School Travel Plan or agreed highway traffic reduction measures yet published to reassure the residents that this proposal will not result in additional, and unresolved, traffic problems in the area around the school?
3. Do you support a process whereby SCC can submit and agree its own planning application and give the nod to building work starting before the local community has had an opportunity to review and comment upon the application?
4. Do you accept that there is a serious flaw in school place planning and data collection and analysis, which sees the decision on the need for additional school places being taken less than 12 months before they are needed, and planning applications for new build being determined just two months before those buildings are required?

Reply:

The delivery team take extremely seriously the need to meet the statutory duty placed upon the local authority to provide a school place for every pupil seeking one, as well as the need to meet the statutory planning obligations of the authority. At times these obligations may possibly come into conflict and the applicant in this instance has recognised the duty and obligations to Surrey parents and taken the difficult decision to submit their planning application, enabling local residents to register their views for consideration, whilst running in parallel the development of the scheme.

The team undertook comprehensive and robust pre-application advice covering local planning and highways matters and implemented a review of the school travel plan in order to identify and mitigate areas of concern that may arise during the planning process. Subsequently and given the seriously restricted timescales and need to supply places to meet the local demand for school places in September 2014, the team undertook a calculated risk assessment and concluded that, in this particular instance, the planning application was likely to receive support and they would proceed in the knowledge that should planning permission be refused, the site would be returned to its prior state.

The SCC Environmental Sustainability Community Engagement Team has recently been commissioned to take forward all new travel plans for schools projects. The team were commissioned to review and update the Vale Primary School's travel plan, to enable a new plan to be produced and implemented in the Autumn term. This scheme is delivering one additional class with a maximum of 30 pupils and it is considered that a new travel plan will mitigate any impact on local residents arising from this small pupil intake.

SCC is the appropriate statutory planning body for such applications and acts independently from the other parts of SCC. This is similar to the approach taken by other Local Authority bodies, who act as planning authority where they are the majority funding partner. In this instance, following extensive pre-application planning and highways advice, the applicant decided after undertaking a calculated risk assessment, that the likelihood that the planning application would not be successful was low and took the decision to run both the planning process and project scheme development in parallel in order to meet the urgent need to provide schools places in September 2014.

Predicting school demand is a complex process and involves a range of different factors, collecting data on birth rates, analysing fertility rates, parental preferences both between schools and between the state maintained and private sector, housing growth and inward/outward migration. As a result planning for school places is based on probabilities and not certainties and while projections are derived from sound calculations, they come without guarantees. Furthermore school organisation and the provision of sufficient places must take into account different, and at times conflicting factors. In the 3 year period to the academic year commencing September 2013 these figures were within 2% accuracy for each year.

Surrey County Council has a 5 year planned programme for school expansion which we are confident will meet the need arising from the projections as described above.

However, each year there are nationally set dates for parents to apply to admissions authorities with their preferences of school places, which is 15 January for primary admissions. As a result, there is always a very short window of opportunity for decisions to be made about where the Local Authority will require exceptional and temporary classrooms to meet demand for the start of the following academic year.

The delivery process involves undertaking discussions and reaching agreement with the individual schools, obtaining pre-planning and highways advice, surveys and development of schemes for planning application, procurement and delivery of the project.

A new and refined forecasting tool was acquired in June 2014 and it is considered that, together with a comprehensive review of the approach areas of pupil place demand, the County will be able to avoid similar situations occurring in all but rare occasions in future.

There is a statutory duty placed on the Local Authority to provide a school place for every pupil seeking one. We are in an era of unprecedented demand for school places which reflects a national trend and I am confident that officers are meeting this challenge, working to provide solutions that ensure all children will have access to education which is at the forefront of our school improvement agenda.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(13) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:
(2nd question)**

Why has Surrey County Council failed to respond to requests from Zane Gbangbola's parents to conduct the necessary tests and investigations into the presence of Hydrogen Cyanide gas at their former home where Zane became ill and subsequently died?

Can the council confirm that the tests and investigations requested by the parents will be conducted, and if not, why not?

Reply:

On behalf of the Council I wish to offer my sincere condolences to Zane Gbangbola's parents for the tragic loss of their son.

In response to your question, Mr Jenkins, I have checked with Council officers and they do not appear to have received any such requests. In the event that the Council were to receive such a request however, it would pass these onto the relevant authorities as the County Council do not carry out testing. That is because it is not something which is a function of county councils. I am sure you are aware that it will be for the Coroner to hold an inquest to determine the cause of Zane's death. Both the Council and Surrey Fire and Rescue will continue to do all they can to provide any information and assistance required by the Coroner and Surrey Police. It would therefore be premature for me to make any further comment at this time.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(14) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (2nd question)

The County Council's Cabinet used to include performance data on its agenda for debate which was published and available for everyone to read. However, this practice has discontinued and this information is now included on the agenda of the Finance and Performance Sub Group of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which meets in private. This means that the County Council's performance data is not in the public domain and is not scrutinised by the Cabinet. Can the Cabinet include the performance data of the County Council on its future agendas so that everyone can read it?

Reply:

There are many opportunities to scrutinise the Council's performance. The County Council continues to produce a performance report each quarter that reports progress towards Directorate Strategy Priorities, alongside key Residents' Survey feedback, staffing and finance information. The reports against Directorate Strategy Priorities are jointly owned and prepared by the Portfolio Holder and Strategic Director. These reports are collectively considered by the Cabinet and Corporate Leadership Team and are then published each quarter on the Council's website as part of the Key Strategy Bookcase:

<http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/your-council/how-the-council-works/our-performance/our-key-strategies-bookcase/our-business-reports>

The Performance and Finance Sub Group of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee also scrutinises this information with a view to referring issues to the relevant Council Committee for further investigation or scrutiny. For example, at the meeting held on 2 June 2014, the Performance and Finance Sub Group agreed an action "that the Adult Social Care and Environment and Transport Select Committees scrutinise performance against the three priorities in each of their Directorates for which performance was rated red at year end 2013/14".

At the same meeting, Performance and Finance Sub Group, also agreed "Each Select Committee to scrutinise year-end performance information for the priorities set within their remit annually at their May/June meeting, with services providing written explanation for any priority rated as red" and "That the outcomes of the scrutiny be reported to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee annually at its meeting in July".

Local Committees also continue to monitor the quality of services provided locally and recommend action as appropriate.

The Council welcomes external scrutiny. For example, in addition to statutory Government inspections, the Council has invited peers from other councils and organisations to visit and feed back on performance, including for example the

LGA (Local Government Association) corporate peer challenge in February 2013.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

(15) MR NICK HARRISON (NORK AND TATTENHAMS) TO ASK:

The budget for Adult Social Care for 2014/15 includes plans for savings of £10 million through the Friends, Family and Community programme. At 1 February 2014, the Council had 9,128 open cases within the "Older People" category. Given we are now 30% of the way through the budget year, how many of the open cases have been re-assessed and what savings are forecast from these individual case reviews?

Reply:

It is important to emphasise that the primary purpose of the Family, Friends and Community (FFC) programme is to improve care outcomes, and the emerging evidence is that it increases independence and reduces isolation and loneliness whilst contributing to the savings target of the service.

The plan for delivery of the (FFC) programme is not based on reviewing all open older people cases, but on establishing an FFC way of working as the means of dealing with all new community placements, and to reassess those existing support plans where there is the most potential to make savings. The following summarises how those approaches are intended to work, and the progress to date:

Making all new placements in the community across all care groups by utilising the FFC approach. During the year some 5,000 new placements are expected to be made, and the key target is to reduce the average cost of those placements by 20%.

The overall position to date reflects good progress with Direct Payments, less progress in home based care support packages, and an overall saving identified across placements during June of £48,000 this year with a £72,000 full year effect.

Action plans are in place to prioritise the reassessment of cases with the most potential. A Programme Director has been identified from within Adult Social Care to oversee all aspects of the FFC programme. By the end of June 43 cases have been re-assessed which potentially show a saving of £165,000. Work is ongoing, but 24 cases across all care groups have been fully validated, of which:

9 achieved 20% or more of savings
1 achieved 0-19% of savings
6 no change in costs

8 increased costs

The ASC budget position incorporating the FFC position will be reported to the Cabinet as usual at the end of July. That first quarter position will indicate the position now projected against the £10m target, bearing in mind both the early results and adjustments to plans in the light of experience to date enabling the number of reassessments to increase quarter on quarter.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

**(16) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:
(3rd question)**

The move from two fire stations to one in Spelthorne was intended as a cost-cutting exercise.

When will the actual figure of the purchase of land in Kingston Road, Ashford, on which to build this new station, be released?

How can Surrey County Council have publicly committed to the purchase of a block of land when it has yet to agree upon a price, yet still insist that this is an exercise in financial savings?

Doesn't the construction of a new fire station negate any real savings to the council from the closure of the existing two fire stations?

Reply:

The acquisition of land is a commercial transaction and details of the figures involved are sensitive and therefore confidential until such time that any deal is completed. SFRS have received approval to close two fire stations and open a new one, based on operational efficiencies and savings. Property Services is undertaking to achieve this in the most advantageous way for the County Council.

The new fire station will provide a modern and efficient building from which to operate. It will house not only fire engines but also a rescue boat which can not only be used within Surrey but regionally and nationally to support wide area flood events. This new building will provide an agile workspace for Fire and Rescue staff to continue to work collaboratively with partners to deliver a range of high quality, early intervention activities to reduce community risk and vulnerabilities whilst at the same time improving community resilience. The associated training facilities will further enhance and consolidate our capabilities to respond to our core duties and provide flexibility to develop new skills as our role changes.

The money that Fire and Rescue is required to save, following the decision to have one fire station in Spelthorne, is from revenue budget. For Fire and

Rescue, the biggest element of the revenue budget is staff wages and a saving has been generated - in this instance - by consolidating two fire stations into one, retaining two fire engines but changing crewing configurations to provide a suitable and sufficient response and prevention capability, at a reduced cost. The cost of the building is from the capital budget. It is important to recognise that both Sunbury and Staines are older buildings that would otherwise require modernisation to meet the needs of a modern Fire and Rescue service and to be efficient in terms of energy use. A new fire station would be built to the latest environmental efficiency standards. The provision of fewer crews and their allied equipment will generate a year on year saving.