

## ANNEX 1



## LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND  
RESPONSES**

12 DECEMBER 2014

**1. From Elstead Parish Council**

There are on-going problems in Elstead with regards to blocked drains in areas of the village resulting in flooding and hazardous driving conditions. The problem is likely to get worse during the winter months with increased concerns regarding the icy conditions that may result.

Please could the Committee advise the best course of action for the Parish Council to take in order to resolve the problem quickly and on a long term basis in order to ensure that the roads in the village are safe.

The areas of road the Parish Council are particularly concerned about are opposite the Woolpack, on the bend by the bus stop (believed to be a blocked and broken drain) and on the triangle at the junction of Milford Road with Shackleford Road (blocked culvert)- both of these have been reported to the County Council, in the first case over 2 years ago.

**Response**

In the last year the Area Highways Team has addressed highway flooding in Elstead at Fulbrook Lane and Springhill. The maintenance engineer for Waverley will be meeting Parish Council representatives later this month to tour known drainage hotspots.

**2. From Ms Liz Townsend on behalf of the Cranleigh Civic Society**

Is Surrey County Council still intending to establish a Sustainable Drainage Systems Approving Body (SuDS) to test, adopt and maintain sustainable drainage systems associated with all major new housing developments ?

## ITEM 2

If not, please advise what measures Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council are planning to take to ensure the risk of damage to property and risk to life is not created by new housing built on sites which contain flood zones 2 and 3.

We ask this with specific reference to the Berkeley Homes "The Maples" proposed development to build 425 dwellings on flood prone land in Cranleigh and the Knowle Park Initiative's intentions to build 265 dwellings on an adjacent and equally flood prone site.

### **Response**

The Local Committee does not comment on individual planning applications.

Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 has not been implemented yet. The government has further delayed its implementation and recently went out to consultation on an alternative to implement SuDS through the planning system. DCLG and Defra have received some 400 responses to their consultation and are still going through those prior to making a further announcement. Until such time that government commits to the implementation of Schedule 3, Surrey County Council cannot set up a Sustainable Drainage Approving Body (SAB).

The purpose of the SAB under Schedule 3 is not to assess flood risk from new development, but rather to ensure that the drainage strategy for new development adheres to a National Standards for SuDS. Under the National Planning Policy Framework, the planning authority is responsible to assess flood risk from all sources. How the individual planning authority delivers that function is down to them.

The Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, which was developed with the assistance of all 11 Surrey Boroughs and Districts, is to be published shortly. It highlights the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework with relation to flood risk. It also looks for development schemes to provide multiple benefits at a local and wider level. The strategy promotes reducing flood risk through attenuation and improving water quality, the environment and amenity, all of which are cornerstones of the Sustainable Drainage Systems.

In assessing planning applications Waverley Borough Council will follow advice in National Guidance on the matter (including the National Planning Policy Framework) and take into account the views of the Environment Agency.

### **3. From Mr Mark Richards**

I refer you to Professor David Jolley, a Consultant of Psychiatry of old age. He was appointed by a Court in the North of England (in the Midlands) for exactly the same reason that we are going through, with Cobgates in Farnham and the other care homes facing closure in Surrey. At a public meeting in Brambleton Hall on 4 December 2014, it was evident that families and relatives have the foresight to see how damaging it will be to our loved ones if they are to be moved involuntarily from one care home to another. The three citations below come from a medical Professor. This is his speciality and he says from his common experience and clinical experience in an informed review:

“It is an inescapable truism relocation is a stressful event and can precipitate problems with mental health, physical health, and even bring forth death.”

(See page 12 <http://www.ragenational.com/pdfs/jolley.pdf>)

“Taken as a group the deaths of seven residents are mostly in keeping with the demonstrated excess mortality that occurs when older frailer people, particularly those with advanced dementia are moved from one institution to another.” (See page 3

[http://www.ragenational.com/pdfs/closure\\_facts.pdf](http://www.ragenational.com/pdfs/closure_facts.pdf))

“The ill effects of involuntary transfer cannot be eradicated. For some, careful preparation under psychiatric oversight can ameliorate the risk. Such preparation cannot be achieved for those with moderate or severe dementia because the process has to build on retained knowledge, the first of which is that the home is closing.” (See page 3

[http://www.ragenational.com/pdfs/closure\\_facts.pdf](http://www.ragenational.com/pdfs/closure_facts.pdf))

My question to the Local Committee is: will you please share Professor Jolley’s findings with Surrey County Council’s Cabinet and ask for a full published risk assessment to be provided to all the families of Cobgates’ residents, as this is most distressing for all the residents and families concerned ?

### **Response**

The website links in the question have been passed to the project team, who are currently working on an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) which will form part of a report to the Council's Cabinet in February 2015 making recommendations about the future of the in-house homes. The EIA will assess any positive or negative impacts that have been identified as potentially resulting from all the recommendations in the report. This will include consideration of the impact on residents if any closure is recommended. A copy of the EIA will be made publicly available as soon as it is finalised, along with the wider Cabinet report.

We acknowledge that any proposed move may cause anxieties and be difficult for people, and this will be considered in the decision--making process. The EIA will identify actions required to minimise any negative impacts of proposals, which will include the use of national good practice guidance.

Should there be a decision to close the home, each individual would have an in-depth assessment of their current needs carried out by their care practitioner (social worker), and this process will include the advice and views of everyone who is involved in their care and support.

#### **4. From Mr Paul Couchman on behalf of Save our Services in Surrey**

Will this Waverley Local Committee agree to put it to the Surrey County Council Cabinet at the earliest opportunity that Surrey County Council should arrange a full public meeting as soon as possible regarding the closure of Surrey Care Homes, particularly as two of the care homes, Cobgates in Farnham and Longfield in Cranleigh, are in Waverley ?

### **Response**

## ITEM 2

As part of the consultation process a series of meetings have been offered and held for residents, family members, and other interested parties to meet with officers to discuss the consultation information and ask questions. In the case of Cobgates three meetings for groups of residents and relatives were held on 9 November. There was a day of 'drop in' sessions for anyone else with an interest in Cobgates on 20 November. In response to requests at the meetings on 9 November, an additional meeting was held on 6 December. Outside these meetings, we have made an ongoing offer of individual meetings and discussions --- with the aim of ensuring that all those directly affected have an opportunity to discuss their particular circumstances and views, and ensure all affected residents and their families have the information they need to make an informed response to the consultation.

### 5. From Mr Sean Ellis

Given the consultation on the closure of Cobgates and five other care homes, what are the projected costings for care of elderly people in the county going forward ?

Using Cobgates as an example, I would like to be able to compare the expected revenue from selling Cobgates, the cost of refurbishment, and the ongoing cost to the Council of outsourcing care to the private sector.

Another part of this calculation will be to identify what control the council has over the price of private sector care. With a new influx of residents from six care homes, this skews the supply/demand balance and would conceivably lead to price increases. As I understand it, the majority of the 15 care homes identified as suitable for outplacement are already more expensive than the current in-house provision. What is the Council's financial responsibility in this case? What guarantees do these homes provide for continuity of care and price control ?

I presume that these figures should be readily to hand, as they will have been prepared as part of the due diligence process.

### Response

- a) The Council anticipates growing pressures for older people care services in the forward budget in light of demographics and new duties associated with the implementation of the Care Act 2014 which come into force in April 2015. These pressures come at a time when government funding is decreasing, resulting in all councils having to focus on preventative services to help manage demand of increasing complex needs whilst maintaining people's wellbeing and independence in the community. Refurbishment or rebuilding to the quality that the Council would wish to offer going forward to the next generation of elderly would, in the opinion of professional experts, require large sums to be invested in the existing facilities. The Council is also able to source care at the right quality standards in the independent sector.
- b) Information about the investment options considered and the costs to the Council of sourcing care in the independent sector has been circulated to Cobgates relatives as part of a supplementary information pack which will be published on the Surrey County Council website within the next few days. As no decision has been made regarding the future of Cobgates or the other homes, no decision has or will be made regarding the future use of the site ---

this would be considered at a later date as part of the Council's response to the consultation.

- c) The supplementary information outlines the fee guidance rates the Council uses in its negotiations with providers. It is worth noting that the Council, out of some 18300 residents under its care, places approximately 1560 residents in residential care homes with 140 in the six Council homes under consultation. In-house homes only represent approximately 9% of care home placements the Council funds --- the vast majority are in the independent sector. Should the consultation result in option A (decision is made to close the in-house homes), this would be implemented through a phased and carefully managed process, as part of which officers will actively engage with the provider market to secure alternative provision at rates agreeable to the Council.

This page is intentionally left blank