

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**TUESDAY 9 DECEMBER 2014****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING****(1) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:**

Since the route of the 441 bus was changed earlier this year, such that it no longer goes through Stanwell Moor village, passengers have to cross a busy dual carriageway to reach the bus stop.

If or when someone is injured or possibly killed negotiating this traffic, whose responsibility will it be?

Reply:

The removal of bus service 441 from Stanwell Moor village was a commercial decision taken by the bus operator Abellio. As the service is not operated under contract to the County Council, this is their prerogative within national legislation, as well as the timing and nature of the advance notification they provide to their customers. It is estimated that the County Council would have to pay Abellio over £100,000 per year for an extra bus to be put back onto the 441 service, to allow a reliable schedule with a detour to the village, or to fund an additional bespoke replacement beyond what has already been introduced. In the current financial climate and with the on-going Local Transport Review underway, we sadly do not have this funding available.

It was recognised that the 557 service was not a like for like replacement for the 441 in terms of accessing Staines, but the changes to 557 were made in April without additional cost to the public purse, and this allowed the retention of a link from Stanwell Moor village itself to a Heathrow Airport access point - in this case Terminal 5.

An initial assessment has been undertaken of the best way to cater for pedestrians crossing the A3044 dual carriageway to access bus services on the east side of the A3044 Stanwell Moor Road. The preferred solution would involve providing a new bus stop on the eastbound side of the B378 Park Road. The new bus stop would be located a short distance from the traffic signal junction of the A3044 Stanwell Moor Road with the B378 Park Road. The traffic signal junction would be redesigned to incorporate "Toucan" pedestrian and cyclist signalised crossing facilities. Further work and cost estimates will be developed in due course for presentation to the Spelthorne Local Committee, though it is expected that this would cost well over £100,000. It will be then for the Spelthorne Local Committee to decide whether to invest part of their budget allocated to them for highway improvements on this scheme as opposed to

other potential highway improvement schemes across the Spelthorne area. This will include an assessment of passenger demand for the new bus stop and an assessment of the wider benefits to the community of improving crossing facilities at this junction.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

- (a) Does Surrey County Council now accept responsibility for the Thames Water Aqueduct in Staines as a flood risk feature under the Flood Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010?
- (b) Does this Council accept that the residents of Staines deserve to be protected from the risk of the Thames Water Aqueduct and that physical measures are needed to prevent water flooding out of it?
- (c) Will this Council now make plans under section 3 of the FWMA 2010 to require physical barriers to be built to protect the residents of Staines, such as raising the height of the aqueducts levy banks, permanently fixing the sluice gate and raising the height at which it can operate?
- (d) Can Surrey County Council explain why exactly ten months after the totally preventable extensive and destructive flooding of the River Ash into Staines, it has failed to meet its obligations under the FWMA 2010 despite being the lead flood agency?

Reply:

- (a) Under section 21 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 the County has a duty to set up and maintain an asset register for any feature that may have an impact on flooding.

All Risk Management Authorities have been invited to nominate any feature which in their view should be added to the list. We are reliant on Risk Management Authorities (RMAs), which include Thames Water, to bring such structures forward. The aqueduct will only be placed on the asset register if it is so nominated.

- (b) The Council supports any flood alleviation measures and looks to those with duties under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 to carry out those duties
- (c) The County has no power to require these actions and has no plans to do so. The Environment Agency is doing modelling work here and further discussions will take place once that is done with Thames Water to decide on options.

- (d) The County does not agree that it has failed to meet obligations under the Act. It has set up an Asset Register and is undertaking a Section 19 investigation which will be published on our website in due course.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(3) MR DENIS FULLER (CAMBERLEY WEST) TO ASK:

The recent Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) 'Local Environment Quality Survey of England' reported that poor levels of cleanliness are associated with increases in other low-level crime and social disorder. This comes as no surprise to me, as one who has for many years suggested that if a litterer is not taught to respect his fellow citizens and can carry on littering without fear of prosecution or punishment, he or she will show disrespect in other ways. Commenting on the survey, Keep Britain Tidy Chief Executive, Phil Barton said that this should act as a wake-up call.

Earlier this year David Hodge, Leader of the Council introduced Surrey County Council's (SCC) anti-litter campaign. I regularly read of litterers being penalised in Hampshire, Essex, Lancashire, etc.

Should SCC use its' influence to encourage all of our Districts and Boroughs to introduce a policy of catching and penalising people who drop litter, cigarette ends or chewing gum? Further should they enforce the policy so efficiently that litterers will expect to be caught sooner or later?

Reply:

The Leader, alongside the Leaders of the District and Boroughs committed to working together to focus upon the issue of littering within our communities.

A residents survey in early 2014 indicated specific concerns over the levels of litter, particularly around fast food outlets and along roadsides and footpaths. Discarded bottles and cans, takeaway packing, cigarette butts and dog fouling were identified as the main annoyances. Following on from this, a communications campaign was run through April and into early May focussing on raising the awareness of the consequences and possible fines for littering.

The issue of enforcement is the subject of ongoing discussions with District and Borough officers. Surrey County Council coordinated training for enforcement and street scene officers that has been well received.

The Police and Crime Commissioner is supporting two enforcement pilot projects running in Reigate and Banstead and Spelthorne and Mrs Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate Member for Fire and Police Services, chairs the Governance Board. The aim of these pilots is to strengthen enforcement capacity in localities, working in close conjunction with the Police.

Surrey County Council is also supporting a joint pilot initiative between Woking Borough Council and Public Health that targets cigarette butt littering. The initiative aims to reduce cigarette butt litter through targeted enforcement. During this enforcement period those who have been fined will be able to get a refund in Boots vouchers if they quit smoking, they are also offered support from the Public Health team to help them stop. If a success, this will be rolled out further.

Whilst enforcement is part of the solution to littering, education also plays a key role and Surrey County Council are supporting schools to achieve Eco-School status, which includes activities to reduce litter and raise understanding. Southern Railway have been supporting the campaign with an anti litter poster competition for young children. Judging will take place the week commencing 15 December 2014 and the winning designs will be displayed at Southern Railway stations in the New Year.

Surrey County Council have also worked with Districts and Boroughs to involve Parish Councils and Community groups in keeping Surrey Tidy by offering support and tools to allow local people to carry out litter picks in their own areas, which in turn spreads the message on littering. For example in Mole Valley, Parish Councils have been displaying anti litter campaign material and regularly use the District's depot to borrow litter picking equipment when organising local litter picks.

I hope this indicates the ways in which Surrey County Council are already working with our Districts and Boroughs to influence behaviour in our County to Keep Surrey Tidy.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

In December 2013, I asked the following of the Cabinet Member:

'Has the County Council carried out a condition survey of its pavements and footways, and if so what percentage of Surrey's pavements were assessed as being in a poor condition? What percentage of Surrey's pavements and footways assessed as poor were resurfaced or repaved since 31 March 2013 to date?'

The Cabinet Member provided the following response:

'The County Council is currently progressing the fourth and final year of its initial Footway Network Survey (FNS) with 78% of the network finished. The remainder should be substantially complete by June next year.

The FNS records each footway section in one of the following four categories; as new; aesthetically impaired; functionally impaired or structurally impaired. Functional and structural impairment are considered for maintenance and can

therefore be considered in poor condition. Current information indicates that approximately 23% of the footway network is in this category.

The countywide footway programme for 2013/14 includes 3.4 kms of reconstruction and 21.5 kms of slurry seal. Reconstruction treatment is generally used where the footway condition is very poor and slurry may be used elsewhere to enhance an otherwise sound construction and prevent further deterioration. Current analysis indicates approximately 44% of the reconstruction programme addressed footways in a poor condition.'

Please could the Cabinet Member provide an update, in particular:

- Has the Footway Network Survey been completed?
- What percentage of footways are in each of the four categories referred to above?
- What percentage of those falling into the categories functionally or structurally impaired are being reconstructed in the 2014/15 programme?

Reply:

The Footway Network Survey (FNS) was completed on schedule this summer and included in the survey were all town paths that are maintained by the County.

The survey identified that Surrey is responsible for 4933kms of footways. The percentage of footways falling into each of the 4FNS categories are:

Category	% of network in each category
As New	1%
Aesthetically Impaired	66%
Functionally Impaired	27%
Structural Impaired	6%

The countywide capital footway programme for 2014/15 includes for 10.4km of functionally or structurally impaired footways to be reconstructed. This equates to 0.6% of the all of the footways that fall into the functionally or structurally impaired categories.

The Highways and Transport Service is currently developing a 15 year Asset Management Strategy which will inform 5 year plans for programmes of work. As part of this project, detailed analysis of the FNS data has taken place which has enabled us to develop a number of different models showing different outcomes for the condition of the footway asset over a 15 year period dependant on differing budget allocations. We will be consulting on the models over the next couple of months and, following refinement of the models based on consultation feedback, we aim to make recommendations to Cabinet in the Spring regarding how maintenance of each of the 6 key highway assets (roads, footways, drainage, safety barriers, structures and traffic signals) should be managed for the next 15 years to provide the required outcomes.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

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

The report to the Cabinet which initiated the consultation on the future of Surrey's Care Homes contained inadequate data on the financial effects of the proposal. To assess the financial implications for Surrey County Council and others of the proposal will require that estimates are made of:

- the costs of providing for the existing elsewhere for the existing residents.
- the capital cost of improving or rebuilding each facility
- the potential receipts from the sale of the sites if the sites are sold.

Please could this information be provided and also placed immediately on Surrey County Council's website on the consultation page on the future of the six residential care homes owned and operated by the council so that Surrey residents may be better informed?

Reply:

The Council has per week fee guidance rates for general Older People residential care (£326.45) and residential dementia care (£374.31).

These costs are outlined below and were estimated by Holbrow Brookes construction consultants in January 2012, who have specialist expertise in residential health and social care. It must be recognised that these costs were estimated and do not take into account any increases in costs since that date. The table below therefore shows both the original costs estimated by Holbrow Brookes and an allowance to account for changes to costs since the analysis was completed.

PREMISES	Option 3A - Retain, refurbish, enhance, extend		Option 4 - New Build	
	As estimated by Holbrow Brookes in Jan 2012	Allowance for changes in costs	As estimated by Holbrow Brookes in Jan 2012	Allowance for changes in costs
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Brockhurst	5.2	6.2	8.6	10.3
Cobgates	6.2	7.4	8.3	10.0
Dormers	3.7	4.4	7.9	9.5
Longfield	5.7	6.8	6.8	8.2
Parkhall	4.4	5.3	8.3	10.0
Pinehurst	3.9	4.7	8.5	10.2
TOTAL	29.1	34.9	48.4	58.1

The refurbishment and extension costs illustrated above (option 3A) are the minimum required to bring the homes up to a suitable standard. Only full rebuilding of the homes (option 4) would enable the level of quality of service that the Council would want to provide.

Neither option represents value for money in the context of the borrowing costs the Council would have to incur and the fact that alternative provision can be commissioned at better value in the independent sector.

It should also be noted that option 3A above would involve moving current residents from the current homes whilst the refurbishment is undertaken, which will take over one year and then relocating them back to the current homes. In view of the age profile of the residents this option was deemed unsatisfactory

Once the results of the consultation process are considered and the alternatives for the sites are explored, a decision will be made on their future.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

There has been no report to Cabinet since before the last budget setting meeting in February 2014 of the levels of reserves and balances. What are the levels of all individual reserves (revenue and capital) and cash balances as shown on the most recent quarterly balance sheets?

Reply:

The budget monitoring reports to Cabinet for the three months to June 2014 and the six months to September 2014 included clear statements about reserves and balances. I have examples from the more recent report. However both reports covered the same ground.

- Under the heading:

Maintain a prudent level of general balances and apply reserves appropriately

Page 2 of Annex 1 states '...The council currently has £21m in general balances.'

(The report to June 2014 said the same)

- Under the heading: **Reserves**

Paragraph 60 of Annex 1 sets out the change in earmarked reserves in the quarter, drawn down as planned in the MTFP.

(paragraph 49 of report to June 2014 covered the same issue)

- Under the heading: **Earmarked reserves**

Table App 5 gives details of the council's earmarked revenue reserves as at 30 September 2014.

(Table App 5 also gave details of the same as at 30 June 2014).

Background information

Cabinet discussed the budget monitoring report for the six months to 30 September 2014 on 20 October 2014.

On page 2 of Annex 1, the last sentence in the paragraph under the heading:

Maintain a prudent level of general balances and apply reserves appropriately states

'...The council currently has £21m in general balances.'

Paragraph 60 of Annex 1 under the heading **Reserves** states:

'60. The council's earmarked reserves reduced by £26m in the quarter to 30 September 2014. This was mainly due to drawing down reserves as planned in the MTFP and outlined in paragraph 1. Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked reserves as at 30 September 2014.'

Paragraph 1 of Annex 1 (page outlines the planned draw down of reserves as follows.

'1. In line with the council's multi year approach to financial management, which aims to smooth resource fluctuations over five years, Cabinet approved the use of £20.1m from the Budget Equalisation Reserve (including £13m contribution from 2013/14's unused risk contingency) plus £5.8m from other reserves to support 2014/15, £14m to support the Adult Social Care budget in 2014/15 and £5.5m revenue carried forward from 2013/14 to fund committed expenditure.'

In the appendix to the annex, under the heading: **Earmarked Reserves**, Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked revenue reserves as at 30 September 2014 as follows.

Table App 5: Earmarked revenue reserves

	Opening balance 1 Apr 2014 £m	Balance at 30 Sep 2014 £m	Forecast 31 Mar 2015 £m
Investment Renewals Reserve	13.0	12.7	10.9
Equipment Replacement Reserve	3.4	1.4	1.7
Vehicle Replacement Reserve	5.4	6.0	2.9
Waste Site Contingency Reserve	0.3	0.0	0.0
Budget Equalisation Reserve	33.6	0.8	0.8
Financial Investment Reserve	1.6	0.6	0.6
Street lighting PFI Reserve	6.2	5.8	5.8
Insurance Reserve	8.8	9.6	9.6
Eco Park Sinking Fund	14.6	14.6	18.9
Revolving Infrastructure & Investment Fund	20.2	20.2	20.8
Child Protection Reserve	3.1	1.9	1.9
Interest Rate Reserve	4.7	1.0	1.0
Economic Downturn Reserve	6.0	4.2	4.2
General Capital Reserve	7.7	7.5	6.7
Pension Stabilisation Reserve	0.0	1.1	1.1
Business Rates Appeals Reserve	0.0	1.3	1.3
Total earmarked revenue reserves	128.6	88.7	85.8

Note: All numbers have been rounded - which might cause a casting error

Cabinet discussed the budget monitoring report for the three months to 30 June 2014 on 22 July 2014.

On page 2 of Annex 1, the last sentence in the paragraph under the heading:

Maintain a prudent level of general balances and apply reserves appropriately states

'...The council currently has £21m in general balances.'

Paragraph 49 of Annex 1 under the heading: **Reserves** states

'49. The council's earmarked reserves have reduced in the quarter to 30 June 2014. This was mainly due to drawing down reserves as planned in the MTFP. Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked reserves as at 30 June 2013.'

(the draw down was to provide £14m used to support ASC during 2014/15)

In the appendix to the annex, under the heading: **Earmarked Reserves**, Table App 5 shows details of the council's earmarked revenue reserves as at 30 June 2014 as follows.

	Opening balance 1 Apr 2014 £m	Balance at 30 Jun 2014 £m	Forecast 31 Mar 2015 £m
Investment Renewals Reserve	13.0	12.8	10.7
Equipment Replacement Reserve	3.4	3.8	3.6
Vehicle Replacement Reserve	5.4	6.1	3.0
Waste Site Contingency Reserve	0.3	0.3	0.0
Budget Equalisation Reserve	33.6	20.9	0.9
Financial Investment Reserve	1.6	0.6	0.6
Street lighting PFI Reserve	6.2	5.8	5.8
Insurance Reserve	8.8	8.8	8.8
Eco Park Sinking Fund	14.6	14.6	14.6
Revolving Infrastructure & Investment Fund	20.2	20.2	20.8
Child Protection Reserve	3.1	1.9	0.4
Interest Rate Reserve	4.7	4.7	1.0
Economic Downturn Reserve	6.0	4.2	1.7
General Capital Reserve	7.7	7.7	6.7
Pension Stabilisation Reserve	0.0	1.1	1.1
Rates Appeals Reserve	0.0	1.3	1.3
Total earmarked revenue reserves	128.6	114.8	81.0

The list of earmarked revenue reserves shown above are those the council has earmarked for specific purposes.

The council holds other usable revenue and capital reserves as follows:

- schools' balances (£26m brought forward at 1 April 2014);
- revenue grants unapplied reserve (£46m brought forward at 1 April 2014);
- general fund balance (discussed above) (£21m brought forward at 1 April 2014);
- capital receipts reserve (£20m brought forward at 1 April 2014); and
- capital grants and contributions unapplied (£37m brought forward at 1 April 2014).

The quarterly budget monitoring report does not cover these as they are either:

- outside our discretion to decide or vary spending (schools' balances and revenue grants);
- restricted to capital spending; or
- maintained as a safety net (general fund balances).

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

The Coalition Government has committed £100 million of funding during this 'Road Period' to an Air Quality Fund. The Government has stated it wants interactions with local authorities to help shape how this fund is used.

Please will the Cabinet Member agree to bid for funding from the Air Quality Fund in order to combat poor air quality in Surrey?

Reply:

As part of the Road investment strategy produced by the Department for Transport and Highways Agency, published 1 December 2014, £100 million of funding is committed specifically to target improvements in air quality. Interaction with local authorities will help shape how this fund is used and inform how this difficult but vitally important issue is addressed. It is expected that this fund could tackle a number of locations and the Government is already in the early stages of pioneering this approach in Manchester, working with the local transport authority.

Surrey County Council intend to contact the Department for Transport to learn what opportunities there are for Surrey to bid for funding within this new national allocation to improve the air quality within the County. It is worth noting however that in a two tier local authority areas such as Surrey, it is the borough and district councils who monitor air quality in their areas, declare Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and prepare the action plans.

It is likely that funding from this source will focus on primarily on motorways and trunk roads where air quality is an issue rather than on local roads.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Why has Surrey County Council not started a policy review on the cumulative impact of mineral extraction in Spelthorne?

When are they going to start such a review?

Reply:

A review of minerals policy relating to the cumulative impact of extraction is not required for the following reasons:

- The issue of cumulative impact needs to be seen in the context of the historic production of sand and gravel in North West Surrey. The trend over time has been declining production over many decades from a high of over 3 million tonnes per year in the late 1970s to only some 10% of this figure in recent years.
- Successive plans have taken into account the question of cumulative impact as well as the acceptability of working individual sites. The North West Surrey Minerals Local Plan 1985 looked at all potential working sites and catalogued them according to constraints with a designation in favour or

against working. Those designations have remained largely unchanged and we have seen the less constrained sites worked and progressively restored.

- We have a recently adopted Minerals Plan 2011. A thorough assessment of potential sites in the plan included looking at cumulative impact - an issue debated at the Public Examination in 2011. Hence one of the reasons why some allocated sites in the SMP are phased.
- Our adopted Minerals Plan policy requires that the cumulative impacts of minerals development are taken into account before planning permission is granted. This is often the best time to look at the cumulative impact of minerals extraction as only then can other development taking place in the vicinity be taken into account in the determination process.

To conclude – no policy review is considered necessary because cumulative impact is already appropriately addressed in the recently adopted Minerals Plan 2011. This is the County Council’s adopted policy position. Cumulative impact is also considered each time individual planning applications for mineral extraction are determined.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

(9) MRS HELENA WINDSOR (GODSTONE DIVISION) TO ASK:

The stated aim of both health and social care is to allow people to remain as independent as possible in their own homes with the support of family, friends and local community services. Adequate respite care is an essential requirement to enable family members, or friends to continue providing care, without adversely affecting their own health and wellbeing.

There is an urgent need to reduce the demand on acute care beds in our hospitals and prevent “bed blocking” where patients are unable to leave hospital as their recuperative needs cannot be met in their homes or the community.

The six residential care homes run by Surrey County Council (SCC) currently under review have provision for both respite care and re-enabling, services which are likely to be in increased demand in the foreseeable future.

Could the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care please advise us of the plans for the future provision of the following services:

- What provision for cost effective respite care, to compensate for the loss of these beds, will be made if a decision is made to close all, or any of the six homes?
- What provision for convalescent care, or re-enabling, will be made to compensate for the loss of the facilities currently available if all or any of the six homes are closed?

Reply:

Should a decision be taken to proceed with the closure of one or all the six SCC older peoples' homes:

- We will work with all residents individually to secure suitable alternative respite services that best meet their needs and choices. Active engagement with the wider market around alternative services would commence should such a decision to close a SCC home result. Implementation of closure would be phased to enable alternative arrangements to be put in place prior to closure. No resident will be moved until the spring of 2015.
- For bed based re-ablement alternatives, work continues with Clinical Commissioning Groups to develop integrated models of reablement and rehabilitation, reducing the need for bed based options. We will commission services, as required, that can deliver the appropriate access to suitable multiagency rehabilitation/ reablement. We have already been approached by providers who could offer this option across Surrey.

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

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

Kwasi Kwartang, MP called for an enquiry into the terrible flooding from the Thames Water Aqueduct that occurred in Staines on the 8, 9 and 10 February 2014 in an adjournment debate on 12 May 2014, but has since failed to effectively pursue the matter.

Surrey County Council, the supposed lead flood authority have the statutory authority to conduct an enquiry under section 19 of the Flood Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010.

What progress, if any has been made with that enquiry?

If no progress has in fact been made, then why has Surrey County Council failed to conduct an enquiry that could result in measures preventing similar, calamitous events, occurring in the future?

Reply:

The Section 19 duty is to investigate. Surrey County Council in collaboration with Spelthorne Borough Council is undertaking a Section 19 investigation in accordance with the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. A Section 19 investigation will look into who the Risk Management Authorities are in relation to the flooding, what duties they have under the FWMA and their actions or

proposed actions in relation to those duties. We will have an update at the next Working Group meeting on 8 December 2014. If it is ready, it will be circulated to the Partnership Board before being published on our website.

CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES

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

How many buildings, excluding schools, does Surrey County Council (SCC) currently occupy and, of those buildings how many have solar panels installed?

Reply:

There are currently around 160 sites across the County from which five or more SCC staff members are predominantly working. This includes hospital sites such as Epsom or St Peters Hospital, District & Borough buildings and other sites for which we are minor occupiers, tenants or have hot-desking arrangements.

Over 40% of SCC (non-school) staff work out of four corporate buildings: Consort House, Redhill, County Hall, Kingston Upon Thames, Quadrant Court, Woking and Fairmount House, Leatherhead.

There are two Surrey owned buildings and one Surrey owned site with solar panels installed. These include a Community Home, a Corporate office building in Redhill and a Waste Recycling Centre. All three installations are Photovoltaics (PVs) which generate electricity.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(12) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:
(2nd question)

My division is struggling with the effects of a 6 month closure of Vicarage Road, a key B-road in Kingfield. Officers of the County Council have said that this road closure has been difficult to manage as some motorists are regularly ignoring the road closure signs.

Would the Cabinet Member agree with me that motorists should always follow the road closure signs?

Reply:

We all recognise that temporary road works can be frustrating and impact journey times, however they are necessary to enable essential work to infrastructure.

In this particular case, Thames Water are installing a wider water main in Vicarage Road. As this involves excavation of nearly the width of the road it has had to be closed. This work is necessary to reduce pressure in the pipe, which is causing it to leak, and also to increase capacity (there is a new housing development nearby). The closure of Rosebery Crescent and Loop Road (at their respective junctions with Vicarage Road) has also been necessary in order to control the flow of traffic.

It can be challenging managing traffic when a key road is closed for this length of time. Thames Water have installed hard road closures, and also have security at the site 24 hours a day. We are not aware of any specific problems with drivers not complying with the signs at the site.

To assist residents, there are three signs indicating 'road closed, access only' at the junction of Westfield Road, as well as an informative sign to indicate that the local shops are open.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

In the light of his most recent conviction for a further two road traffic offences, does the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding still retain the full confidence of the Leader and the whole Cabinet ?

Reply:

Yes.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

On Monday morning 1 December, twenty fire crews and engines, 100 firefighters in total from across Surrey and London and as far away as West Sussex battled furiously to control a fire on the Renshaw industrial estate in Staines to save the lives and property of the local residents.

This incident clearly demonstrates the need to retain the current crew capacity in Spelthorne, in particular - a borough with specific and greater risks.

The Option 5 model adopted by this Council is deeply unpopular with local residents for obvious reasons and only slightly less unpopular than the Council's preferred option 4.

Option 5 is now proving near impossible to implement, as the Council was warned. The response time of the 'On Call' crew has had to be extended from the normal 4 minutes to 13 minutes in order to even find 18 applicants capable of fitting the totally unrealistic criteria; and the likelihood is that the response time will have to be extended again. The operational start date has already been moved back from April 2016 to September 2016.

This is a deeply flawed, shambolic policy and the people of Spelthorne need and deserve what they have always asked for: two fire engines with two whole time, fully trained permanent crews, before the unthinkable happens and in an incident like the one on Monday and someone dies, because when you cut vital emergency services to save a bit of cash, that is the reality you are talking about.

Will the Council finally concede that what Spelthorne needs is two fire engines with two fully trained permanent whole time crews?

Reply:

It is important to understand that the emergency response cover provided by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service is not based on borough or county boundaries.

This means that whilst there are proposed changes to how the fire cover is provided from the stations that are located in the Borough of Spelthorne, the cover for the area will continue to be provided from where ever is most appropriate, regardless of the borough boundary.

This was the case at the incident at Renshaw Industrial Estate, the initial attendance of two pumps were sent from Staines Fire Station and Egham Fire Station.

It should also be noted that the resources required to resolve an incident of this scale will always need to be drawn from a wide area. In the case of this incident, crews attended from across Surrey and surrounding services including London, Royal Berkshire and West Sussex.