

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 8 DECEMBER 2015

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

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

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

I led a team of about four Members about two years ago to look into the future and budget of the Department for "Births, Deaths and Marriages".

We came up with at least one full A4 sheet of ways to improve the Department but it was mainly full of revenue generating ideas.

How many of these ideas have been implemented?

How much third-party money or revenue has been generated by this department bearing in mind that virtually every man and his dog seems to make money out of the Marriage Ceremonies. According to one website I recently looked at, this can be upto £25,000.

Reply:

Income generated by the Registration Service has grown by 20% since 2011/12 and is due to reach £1,940,000 by the end of 2015/16.

Within this total, income for conducting ceremonies at outside venues is projected to reach £952,000 by March 2016 or almost 30% above income achieved in 2011/12.

Stronger links with Visit Surrey have led to some growth in the number of venues licensed to hold weddings and civil partnerships up from 104 to 110 and the service benefitted from marketing activities carried out by external venues to promote their premises as locations for weddings and civil partnership ceremonies. The Surrey Guide to weddings is paid for entirely by external advertising.

In recent years the service has centralised work on the production of copy certificates at the Guildford office. This has led to a more streamlined service and enabled the team to minimise costs. Income from certificates has risen from just over £500,000 in 2011/12 to £637,831 (projected for 2015/16).

The Registration Service cannot set prices for all costs as some are statutory fees set nationally by the General Register Office. Locally set prices are benchmarked against other registration services.

The service continues to actively explore other opportunities to provide additional services and opportunities to generate additional income, and is investigating charges for rehearsals for weddings and civil partnership ceremonies.

Regarding the suggestion that the service could offer weddings by telephone (as happens in the USA), or holding civil weddings in religious buildings, these would require a change in legislation.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

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

On 27 October 2015, Surrey County Council closed Camberley Library, the principal library serving around 80,000 people. The library is scheduled to be shut for over three months until at least mid February in order to repair the library's windows. What consultation, if any, did the Council undertake with the local Surrey County and Surrey Heath Borough Councillors?

Why was no notification of closure given in advance to Surrey Heath Borough Council itself? Is it acceptable that the first the manager of the local Citizens Advice Bureau knew of the closure was the notice appearing on the library door?

Is the Council aware that, for many people, the library is invaluable not just for borrowing books but also for access to computers for job searches and other important matters?

What priority does Surrey County Council put on the library service if the nearest alternative library, Frimley Green, involves a lengthy bus journey and no provision for a more local temporary or mobile library has been made?

Reply:

Firstly, may I thank Robert Evans the Member for Stanwell and Stanwell Moor for this question concerning the temporary closure of Camberley library in Surrey Heath.

Just a point of clarification, the library was closed for essential works - complete window replacement and asbestos removal - on 28 November, not 27 October as Mr Evans states. Careful consideration was given to whether or not there was an alternative to closure but the size of the windows and nature of the asbestos has meant it has been necessary for the safety of both users and staff to close during the works programme. Having had experience of providing temporary accommodation for much lengthier closures, the high costs, complexity and low level of service obtainable in such premises ruled that out for a closure of two months over the quietest part of the year.

I would like to assure Members that every effort has been made to advise Camberley library's 6,000 regular users and local residents of the forthcoming closure by every means available, giving six weeks notice and using posters, bookmarks, our website, social media, and an email sent to all library users of Camberley, Frimley Green, Lightwater and Bagshot - 12,000 emails in total. Additional IT facilities have been put into Frimley Green and its opening hours extended by 30%. I must also remind Members that many Surrey residents regularly use more than one library and also our excellent digital library services.

The library service was also in communication with Surrey County Councillors, the information was also shared on the Surrey Heath Local Committee twitter feed, and information on the closure emailed to all Surrey Heath Councillors.

The replacement glazing will vastly reduce heat loss in the winter months, saving on the Council's and therefore taxpayers' energy bills, along with reducing solar gain resulting in a much more comfortable environment in the summer months.

While any disruption in service is a concern, the long term investment in this library will be of benefit to local residents.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

The Prudential Ride London cycle event causes immense disruption each year for residents and businesses living or working on or near the route as a consequence of lengthy road closures on the day of the event itself and considerable numbers of cyclists practising on the route for several months in advance. In view of these problems and many requests by residents from the Dorking Hills Division, can the Leader of the Council state whether or not a decision has been taken to extend the event beyond 2017, and by whom, and can he ensure that the route for the Prudential Ride London event is varied each year to ensure that the same residents and businesses are not disrupted by road closures and practising by cyclists relating to the event each year?

Reply:

No decision has been taken to extend the Prudential Ride London event in 2018-2019. This item is scheduled to come to Cabinet in February 2016 for further discussion.

We are encouraged by the large numbers of Surrey residents who choose to take part in the event. The event has generated £1.2m for local sporting and recreational charities. This is new money and, in a time of austerity, more than welcomed in protecting the financial position of institutions and clubs that are valued by our communities.

It is always difficult to balance the needs of residents and visitors who wish to take part in the event and those who live in the area. The event organiser has been working with local communities to ensure as much access as far as possible is provided for residents whilst maintaining the safety of those taking part in the event.

Surrey County Council and its partners are continuing to work together through the Cycling Strategy Group and our Drive SMART partnership to manage the increase in cyclists on the road and the need to promote the need for all road users to share the highway as they go about their business and leisure activities.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

At its September meeting, the Cabinet agreed to introduce charges to park at its Newlands Corner car park to access the countryside. Since then, a petition opposing the introduction of car parking charges at Newlands Corner has been signed by over 6000 people. Is the Cabinet Member aware of this petition and will he commit to giving it due consideration when it is presented?

Reply:

I am fully aware of the petition and have already spoken to the person who set it up. Unfortunately the petition is based on some inaccurate information and we are keen to ensure that the public have the full story and can then judge for themselves. To this end I have arranged to meet the petitioner before Christmas and have asked our Media Team to produce articles for the press.

The Newlands Corner project is split into two phases to deliver improved visitor facilities and encourage visitors to stay longer and to enjoy the site. Currently visitors to the site generally only stay for less than an hour and the majority of those for less than half an hour. Newlands Corner offers huge potential to encourage people of all ages to explore the countryside and learn about the natural world.

Phase 1 of the project will provide a family play trail to encourage that exploration along with improvements to the toilets and cafe to improve the residents' experience. We will be working with the cafe owner, who is a tenant of the Albury Estate, to develop his business as the improvements are implemented.

The designers of the play trail are now working with members of the public to develop appropriate play pieces for the trail. Site users will have an opportunity to look at and comment on the play trail designs when outline designs go up on site soon. There will also be a website where people can comment.

Only once these improvements are in place will charges be made for parking at Newlands Corner. These charges are in line with those made at similar countryside sites across the County and neighbouring Counties.

Phase 2 work

Part of the Master Plan for Newlands Corner was to look at the opportunity for a new visitor centre, which will include a new undercover cafe area, new toilets, a visitor area and space to allow retail of local produce. This is still in a very early stage. Architects have been commissioned to sketch out three proposals on two locations within the site. We have only recently commissioned architects to look at potential concepts for a new facility. The designers will produce sketches that will be displayed on site and on our website early in the New Year. We will then invite comments from the public.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Is the Council aware that according to Heathrow's Director of External Affairs, Mr Nigel Milton, 70% of the flights leaving Heathrow are not following the legally agreed Compton NPR (Noise Preferential Route) flight paths, as defined in the Noise Abatement Legislation for U.K. Designated Airports? This is causing wide-spread noise problems for many people, including those I represent.

When challenged, Heathrow claim it is done to avoid safety problems and that Tactical Vectoring is used on a plane by plane basis to avoid the so called Safety Problems. The issue is not just noise but the fact planes are flying as low as 500m (1500ft) above communities where there should be no flights at all. This seriously increases the risk of pollution in what is already the most polluted part of the county.

It beggars belief that safety concerns are so common place that the rules have to be flouted many times a day, day in day out, each time at the risk of local residents. Given the direct risk to its residents, will the Council find out as a matter of urgency what is going on here and take whatever steps it can to stop it?

Reply:

The County Council has no remit for aviation operations or the consequent noise or air quality impacts from aircraft. However, as these overflights are clearly having an impact on the lives of Surrey residents, this matter is a cause for concern.

I am concerned about the issue raised by Ian Beardsmore and so I have written in the first instance to John Holland-Kaye, Chief Executive of Heathrow Airport Limited, and I have copied this letter to Nigel Milton and Cheryl Monk of the Public Affairs and Community Relations Team.

Depending on the response to my letter, I may further correspond with the National Air Traffic Services (NATS) or the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) to seek any necessary detailed information and to explore the possibility of a resolution. I am aware that Heathrow Airport have publicly acknowledged that there is a problem with the Compton Route relating to easterly departures as the route involves an 180 degree turn, which is apparently difficult for modern aircraft to navigate. This means that aircraft consistently fail to stay on this particular track.

I would also suggest that Ian Beardsmore consider approaching the Spelthorne Borough Council representative on the Heathrow Community Noise Forum, Councillor Colin Davis, regarding this matter if he has not done so already.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

In view of the large public opposition to car parking charges at Newlands Corner would the Cabinet Member say what weight is being given to these in any final decision on this matter?

Is the Cabinet Member aware that it is common practice among the Borough/Districts to maintain parkland and commons car parks free, as it also for the Royal Parks such as Richmond and Bushy Parks and for National Trust general woodland and parkland areas?

Reply:

As the Cabinet Report set out, we are funding these improvements at Newlands Corner in order to enhance the facilities at the site, create a destination that is more appropriate for this key site in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and to encourage a wider range of people to visit throughout the week. The car parking charges are necessary to create an income stream that will help to fund management of the countryside. We understand that they are unpopular but with evidence from other countryside sites we are sure that they will achieve our aim of generating an income and that people will get used to them. A decision has been made to recommend the car parking charges. However, we will continue to listen to the public's views on the proposed improvements to the site. The play trial designer is working with members of

the public to develop the trial play pieces and the outline drawings of the new building will be available for public comment in the New Year.

Cabinet have agreed that the charges will not be made until the improvements to the cafe, and toilets and the family play trail have been installed.

Although some countryside car parks are free, The National Trust and the Forestry Commission both charge for parking on sites such as Hindhead, Boxhill, Ranmore Common and Alice Holt and several local authorities also charge for parking where they provide extra facilities such as a cafe and toilets. The charges we are proposing are set at a level that compares favourably with those of the National Trust and Forestry commission.

Length of stay	Newlands Corner	Alice Holt	National Trust – Box Hill and Hindhead
20 minute short stay	Free	£1.80	£4.00
Up to 1 hr	£1.00	£1.80	£4.00
Up to 2 hrs	£2.00	£3.00	£4.00
Up to 3 hrs	£3.00	£4.50	£4.00
Up to 4 hrs	£4.00 (maximum charge)	£6.00	£4.00
Over 4 hrs		£8.00	£4.00

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

After a consultation exercise which started in July, why does the Cabinet Member not yet have detailed costed proposals for the public to understand the new restrictions on days and hours of operation of the Community Recycling Centres, and the level of charges for specialist materials? Without this, how can he be confident that he can achieve his savings target?

Reply:

The proposals to reduce opening times, to fit with demand and levels of charges for non-household materials, have been costed. Implementation of the proposals has also been costed. The proposals and associated costs then formed the basis of the savings target of £1.8m. This information was then used to inform the public consultation and resulting reports and recommendations to Cabinet.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(8) MR BILL BARKER OBE (HORSLEYS) TO ASK:

Who is responsible for monitoring air quality in Surrey? Where are the areas of highest pollution and are the results publicly available? Can residents be assured that no new school would be built in an area of high pollution?

Reply:

Who is responsible for monitoring air quality In Surrey?

Borough and Districts are responsible for monitoring local air quality.

Areas of poor air quality are declared Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA), and once declared the local authority is required to publish further assessments of existing and likely future air quality within 12 months. Authorities are then required to publish Updating and Screening Assessment reports every 3 years. All districts and boroughs in Surrey have published air quality management reports and assessments which are available on their websites, regardless of whether they have declared AQMAs. A list of all local authorities with declared AQMAs are published on the DEFRA [website](#).

In addition to AQMAs, local authorities select other sites within their areas to monitor air quality that are likely to be representative of residential exposure and areas where road traffic would expect to have higher levels of pollutants, with the requirement to declare AQMAs.

Where are the areas of highest pollution and are the results publicly available?

To create a ranked list, 12 month mean levels of NO₂ have been used for the 12 months of most recent data respective to each district and borough. The ranking therefore focuses on elevated NO₂ levels (i.e. average over 12 months of above 40_{µg/m³}) which is the EU maximum limit. Note that these sites are where static diffusion tubes are located and therefore are not necessarily declared AQMAs.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Borough/District</u>	<u>Most recent NO₂ 12 month average</u>	<u>Year of data</u>
1	<u>Brighton Road, Hooley</u>	<u>Reigate and Banstead</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>2014</u>
2	<u>The Parade, Sunbury Cross</u>	<u>Spelthorne</u>	<u>58.7</u>	<u>2014</u>
3	<u>London Road, Staines</u>	<u>Spelthorne</u>	<u>58.4</u>	<u>2014</u>
4	<u>Opposite Cafe Rouge, Farnham</u>	<u>Waverley</u>	<u>56.9</u>	<u>2014</u>
5	<u>Railway Crossing, Vicarage Road, Egham</u>	<u>Runnymede</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>2012</u>
6	<u>Outside Prezzo, Weybridge</u>	<u>Elmbridge</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>2014</u>
7	<u>Horley / Gatwick Airport, roads related to A23</u>	<u>Reigate and Banstead</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>2014</u>
8	<u>M25 Junction 11</u>	<u>Woking</u>	<u>54.7</u>	<u>2014</u>
9	<u>14</u>	<u>Roundabout Copsem Lane/A3</u>	<u>Elmbridge</u>	<u>51.8</u>
10	<u>15</u>	<u>Bottom of Wrecclesham Road – A325 Farnham</u>	<u>Waverley</u>	<u>50.4</u>

NOTE: List derived from latest available data from each Borough and District using NO₂ diffusion tube data, including the authority applied adjustment factor.

NOTE: Figures in italics are awaiting update from relevant borough

Can residents be assured that no new school would be built in an area of high pollution?

Borough and district councils are responsible for designating Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) which indicate existing air quality problems. The County Council has adopted a Local List for the Validation of Planning Applications which sets out the

information required to accompany any planning application. It specifies that an air quality assessment be provided for any substantial school development in an AQMA, and the need to take full account of air quality issues would be reflected in advice at pre-application stage.

Air quality is a factor which would be given weight in planning decisions. It is, however, only one of many considerations which may be relevant in any given case. The weight given to air quality should be considered against the weight to be given to other environmental policies and designations. For example, a new school located to avoid higher air pollution levels arising from traffic generation in urban areas may be more likely to involve a Green Belt location and itself give rise to more and longer car journeys unless located close to the population it is intended to serve. National planning policy requires that great weight be given to the need to create, expand or alter schools in response to the growing demand for places. While most AQMAs are very localised, the whole of the borough of Spelthorne is a designated area. Nevertheless, provision for additional school places must be made for Spelthorne residents.

For these reasons, air quality, while an important consideration, may not be considered an absolute constraint on new school development.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

Following through on the proposed in-year ring-fenced budget reductions from Central Government to the Public Health service, could you please confirm what the anticipated service implications will be for the Council.

Reply:

The Surrey Public Health team is funded directly by the public health grant received from the Department of Health. In 2015/16 the total public health grant was £35.5 million (£22 per head of population).

The grant allocation for Local Authorities is calculated according to a formula that aims to represent variations in need. However, due to historical patterns of funding allocation, Local Authorities do not currently receive their target grant allocation according to this formula. Surrey is one of four local authorities whose current grant allocation is more than 40% below the target level of funding.

In the Summer of 2015 the Government announced a national public health budget reduction of 6.2%. For Surrey this equated to £2.2 million.

The November 2015 Comprehensive Spending Review announced average annual real-terms savings of 3.9% over the next five years in the Public Health budget. In real cash terms this translates into a further reduction of 9.6% in addition to the above savings made in 2015/16. Nationally the savings will be phased in at 2.2% in 16/17, 2.5% in 17/18, 2.6% in each of the two following years, and flat cash in 20/21.

Public Health also has funding pressures which come from increases in Surrey County Council MTFP savings, to be delivered through 'shadow funding' existing spend in other departments. As the public health grant is 'ring fenced' this means that Surrey County Council has to demonstrate that the whole allocation is spent on services and

functions that contribute towards public health outcomes. Public Health are therefore are not able to contribute to MTFP savings via the usual way as we need to account for the whole allocation. The identified 'savings' for Public Health in the MTFP is £1m, £2m and £3m respectively for the three years beginning 2015/16.

In order to achieve these identified savings services are currently being reviewed and prioritised to inform reductions in provision which will be implemented through contract variation and re-commissioning of services.

However we do not yet know the implications for individual local authorities of the recent announcements as this will depend on political decisions about the funding formula and pace of change (how fast we move from historic spend to the formula based target shares).

The spending review did clarify that the ring fence on Public Health spending in local government will be maintained for the next two years until 2017/18.

The Government has announced it will consult councils in relation to the future funding of Public Health spending from additional funding which arises as a result of the proposed reform of business rates.

MRS HEILYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

In 1297 King Edward I sent a copy of Magna Carta to Robert de Glamorgan, then High Sheriff of Surrey. By the 1930s it was in the possession of the King's School in Bruton, Somerset who sold it to Australia in 1952.

What communication has Surrey County Council had with the Government of Australia regarding the return Surrey's own copy of the Magna Carta?

Reply:

In August 2014, as part of planning arrangements for the 800th anniversary, I wrote to the Australian Government's High Commissioner in London regarding the 1297 Inspeximus Magna Carta that is now owned by the Australian Government.

Although it refers to Surrey, it is held in the Parliament House Art Collection in Canberra where it is prominently displayed and interpreted as the centre piece of their permanent exhibition in Parliament House on democracy and the development of the Rule of Law. It is an extremely valuable document and, given both its rarity and that it is part of their art collection, we were realistic about any opportunity to seek its return to Surrey - but we did enquire about a getting a full facsimile copy.

Because of the budget available for the Magna Carta programme in 2015 officers were subsequently asked not to conclude negotiations on this until some of the costs of Surrey's other major commitments were known.

In the debrief report to Residents Experience Board on 19 November 2015, you will note that there is an action under Next Steps, to continue to pursue the possibility of obtaining a facsimile copy of the 1297 Surrey County Inspeximus issue of Magna

Carta, held by the Australian Parliament. A sum (estimated) has been reserved in the remaining balance for this purpose.

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

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

Essex County Council was recently successful in achieving an improvement in its Ofsted rating for Children's Services from inadequate to good whilst significantly reducing its reliance on agency social workers. What action is Surrey County Council taking to emulate Essex County Council to improve its Children's Services to a good rating by Ofsted and at the same time reduce its numbers of agency social workers?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been actively working to strengthen its approach to recruitment and retention of social workers. This is multi-faceted and includes learning from other authorities.

Peer learning

Learning from others has to date included a range of visits to local authorities, most recently to the London Boroughs of Greenwich, Kingston and Richmond. A visit is arranged to Oxfordshire County Council during the week this week and a visit is being arranged to Essex County Council in the New Year. The Director of Children's Services has already been in contact with her counterpart in Essex to share thinking prior to this visit.

Staffing:

It is highly likely that most local authorities will always require good quality locum staff to supplement their permanent workforce; this is becoming a market workforce reality. Surrey has been working to ensure that it continues to encourage and increase its permanent workforce and is also able to support good quality locums so there is adequate capacity to meet demand and keep children safe. Thus attention is being given to the recruitment and retention of both permanent and locum staff. Key activities include:

- Running a national recruitment campaign
- Developing a recruitment and retention strategy
- Expanding Surrey's Academy for first year Social Workers
- Further development of Surrey job pages
- Improving and streamlining our application processes
- Reviewing our 'Surrey Offer'
- Undertaking exit interviews and analysis

- Further developing our pay and reward offer
- Developing career pathways for non-social work qualified children's workforce
- Strengthening our learning opportunities and expectations

Partnership working

Partnership working is a growing strength in the County, strategically and operationally. This is manifest in a range of settings including partnership engagement through the Improvement Board. Board membership includes police, health, schools and the Chair of the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board. This provides the opportunity for support and challenge as well as partnership sharing of learning. Partnership learning and support adds value to a range of activities from workforce development to the identification and support of those at risk of child sexual exploitation.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(12) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK: 2nd question

I have sent you a document listing a number of aspects of the County's handling of the plan to convert the Lingfield Library to the so called Community Partnership model, with accompanying documentary evidence.

I do not want to go over the content of the report which I am sure you have now read and absorbed.

In the report I have asked you for three undertakings. These are:

1. That you ask the Audit Department to make a study of this project and report back to you on their findings.
2. That you ensure that there are no further changes in the management of and future planning of the Lingfield Library until the Audit Department's study is received.
3. That you raise with the Leader an invitation to the Chairman of Lingfield Parish Council for a public meeting to be held in Lingfield, as was promised by the then Assistant Chief Executive, Susie Kemp, and confirmed by the Leader of the Council, at the Public Meeting held in Lingfield in June 2014.

Reply:

I am of course well aware that Lingfield Library is a subject close to Mr Sydney's heart and he has made his views about its future known to me over the last few months.

The community partnership model for libraries is exactly that – local people working in partnership with the council to secure the future of a local service. CIPFA report that 272 public libraries have closed since 2010. Our successful partnerships with local communities means that, in Surrey, not a single library has closed and our 9 established CPLs are performing well.

Given previous Cabinet decisions, the success of the CPL model and the ongoing work in connection with Lingfield library, I do not consider it would be appropriate for me to give any of the undertakings Mr Sydney requests.

The Council's Internal Audit team has very recently completed an audit of the CPL initiative. Members of the Audit and Governance Committee will recall that the findings were reported to them at yesterday's meeting and I have asked that a copy of the report be forwarded to Mr Sydney.

Later this month the Leader and I are meeting representatives of the prospective board of trustees for the Guest House Trust and will be discussing with them how we can work with them and with the wider community to progress proposals for a community partnered library in Lingfield.

As Mr Sydney is aware SCC has instructed a firm of solicitors, specialising in charity work, to establish whether part of that trust's funds could contribute towards paying a staff member for the library. The trust fund does not currently allow for this and the recommended way forward was an application to the Charity Commission to vary the terms of the trust. That application was made back in September and has not proved plain sailing, with the most recent email from the Charity Commissioners flagging a delay whilst they consider the relevance of recent case law. Without knowing the outcome of the application to the Charity Commission, I cannot see what a public meeting would achieve at this time.

When we have a clearer indication of the likelihood of the application succeeding we can engage with the local community to brief them on this and how we then take forward future arrangements for Lingfield library.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(13) MR ERNEST MALLETT (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK: 2nd question

Would the Cabinet Member say what weight is being given to the public protest about the proposed charges and shortening of hours at Community Recycling Centres?

What calculations have been done of the possible added cost of fly tipping and the environmental inconvenience that this brings?

If residents decide to drip-feed rubble and other DIY material into wheelie bins, will this not deprive the Council of the opportunity to recycle various quantities of this material and therefore increase landfill or other disposal costs?

Reply:

Surrey County Council consulted on proposed changes to the service for 11 weeks over the summer. As a result of views received from the public, site closures are now not being considered, charging for non-household waste has been adapted to allow small amounts to still be deposited free of charge, and reducing opening hours to fit with demand has been accepted as the public indicated that this was a more acceptable change to the service. We are aware that any change is difficult and not everyone will be happy, but we believe that we have responded appropriately and have adapted proposals in a sensitive manner to fit with the feedback we have received from the residents.

Surrey County Council has analysed fly tipping tonnages and costs over the past five years and is already working in partnership with all 11 Districts and Boroughs, Surrey Police, the Environment Agency and Trading Standards to develop a fly tipping strategy which will reduce current levels of fly tipping across the county.

Most residents are aware that rubble is not accepted in their wheelie bins. All 11 Districts and Boroughs in Surrey already prohibit this material from being deposited in wheelie bins. Rubble found in wheelie bins is not collected, as it is not household waste and can damage the collection vehicles.

In addition, Surrey County Council will allow for small amounts of rubble to be deposited for free in order to avoid the potential for some residents to drip feed rubble into their wheelie bins. Surrey County Council has also decided to allow small gas bottles and asbestos to continue to be accepted for free.

Any resident carrying out substantial DIY works will require a skip or will be able to take the material to a site that can weigh their material and charge for it. Using the wheelie bin to dispose of rubble from large scale DIY works would not be practical and would very likely result in collection crews refusing to collect the bin.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

(14) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK: 2nd question

Please can you confirm what investment Surrey intends to make to achieve our 70% recycling target across Surrey and confirm that there are no plans to reduce funding for Surrey's districts and boroughs in the form of the level of recycling credit received for each tonne of waste collected by them for recycling.

Reply:

The Surrey Waste Partnership, which is made up of all 12 local authorities in the county, has recently updated its strategy and adopted a 70% recycling and recovery target to be achieved by 2019/20. The target includes the recovery of certain materials where this is the preferable option for dealing with that material, for example recovering energy from wood that isn't clean enough to recycle. 2014/15 saw a slight increase on 2013/14, taking Surrey's recycling and recovery rate to 60%, meaning that more work is required from all of Surrey's authorities if we are to meet this challenging target.

Recycling rates across the county have remained fairly static for the past three years and the Surrey Waste Partnership is working hard to turn this around. All 12 partner authorities have developed action plans aimed at delivering the aims of the joint strategy and progress is regularly monitored by the partnership. From a resourcing perspective, SCC has committed to match funding for a dedicated Surrey Waste Partnership communications team for the next three years in order to engage with the public in new and innovative ways and has a small team of officers who work with district and borough colleagues to deliver countywide kerbside improvement projects.

It is estimated that delivering the actions set out in the new joint waste strategy could save the Surrey taxpayer up to £8m per year. However, it has been acknowledged by Surrey Chief Executives that the current way in which the partner authorities work together is unlikely to deliver this saving. The Surrey Waste Partnership is therefore

looking at new models of how we can work together most effectively and progress will be reported to Cabinet early next year.