

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 11 OCTOBER 2016

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

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

A recent survey by Prudential rated Surrey only 10th in the *Quality of Retirement Index*. What ideas or plans are being considered by the Council to improve things for pensioners and to move Surrey up this scale?

Reply:

Thank you for your question in relation to the recent Prudential survey on the Quality of Retirement Index and the plans in place in Surrey to improve things for pensioners. It is great you have such an interest as it highlights the important issue of the health and wellbeing of retired older people in Surrey.

Whilst the Prudential Survey has helped to raise awareness of the quality of life experienced by retired people, as a comparable index we prefer to use the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). This provides a more robust theoretical methodology to measure relative deprivation, which is a key indicator for determining the quality of life of Surrey residents. The IMD ranks Surrey 150 out of 152 councils, London Boroughs, unitary authorities and metropolitan districts, where 152 is considered the least deprived. Therefore, Surrey is considered in the top three of the least deprived areas to live in the country which is a good overarching indicator that the quality of life in Surrey is high.

Older adults in Surrey are living longer and healthier lives in 2012 - 14 compared to 2009 – 11 and Surrey has one of the highest life expectancies in the country¹. By 2020 there will be 20,000 more older people and they will make up 1 in 5 of the population.

In order to meet the changing needs of our residents as they age, it is vital that there is a good supply of activities, services and support available in our towns and villages to help people stay active and healthy throughout their whole life.

In Surrey, we have a wide programme of work supporting improvements in older adults' health and wellbeing. Below you will find an overview, signposting to more detailed reports where available.

The [Surrey Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy](#)² prioritises "improving older adults' health and wellbeing" setting out the outcomes we hope to see through the work we do:

1. Older adults will stay healthier and independent for longer
2. Older adults will have a good experience of care and support
3. More older adults with dementia will have access to care and support

¹ <http://www.phoutcomes.info>

² <http://www.healthysurrey.org.uk/about-us/health-and-wellbeing-strategy/>

4. Older adults will experience hospital admission only when needed and will be supported to return home as soon as possible
5. Older carers will be supported to live a fulfilling life outside caring.

In support of this the Surrey Better Care Fund and the broader work to integrate health and social care services have agreed three strategic aims:

- Enabling people to stay well - maximising independence and wellbeing through prevention and early intervention for people at risk of being unable to manage their physical health, mental health and social care needs
- Enabling people to stay at home - integrated care delivered seven days a week through enhanced primary and community services which are safe and effective and increase public confidence to remain out of hospital or residential/nursing care
- Enabling people to return home sooner from hospital - excellent hospital care and post-hospital support for people with acute, specialist or complex needs supported by a proactive discharge system which enables a prompt return home

The Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board receives regular updates on progress towards achieving the outcomes of this priority, with the latest update being presented to the [Board in September 2016](#)³. This update sets out what we are trying to achieve in Surrey to improve the health and wellbeing of older adults; an update on the actions that we are taking jointly and the next steps; and how we are [tracking the progress/ impact](#)².

In Surrey we wish to recognise the many ways older people contribute to society and their local communities, and to build on the opportunities for improving the wellbeing of local people as they age. That's why we have a programme of work called [Living and Ageing Well in Surrey](#)⁴, working closely with partners in health, borough and district councils, voluntary, community and faith organisations, and local people with shared guiding principles and values: to make Surrey the best possible place to live and age well.

[Surrey's Commitment to Ageing Well](#)⁵ is a public statement of intentions setting out what organisations, groups of people and individuals aim to do to support people in Surrey to age well. By pledging support we can make positive changes for people in their local area and create healthy and vibrant communities fit for a population with older people than ever before.

Examples of some of the community projects and opportunities for older adults to engage in their communities include: Walking/ other sports or exercise groups; volunteer centres; intergenerational opportunities (e.g. working in schools); dementia awareness training and dementia champions; Wellbeing Cafes; and social prescribing projects.

Borough and District Councils also have an important role in older adults' health and wellbeing and the quality of life of retired people in Surrey. They offer a range of services such as housing support and adaptations, social isolation, community

³ <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=328&MIId=5053&Ver=4>

⁴ <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/social-care-and-health/care-and-support-for-adults/support-to-stay-home/living-and-ageing-well-in-surrey>

⁵ http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/19807/CS2444-Ageing-Well-Commitment_WEB.pdf

transport, shopping services, handyman services and meals on wheels. These all contribute to the quality of life of older adults and improve the quality of retirement.

As you can see there is a wide range of activity happening in Surrey to improve the quality of life of older adults, supporting them to enjoy a happy and healthy retirement.

For further information please contact: Victoria Heald, Health and Wellbeing Programme Manager, Adult Social Care and Public Health
Email: victoria.heald@surreycc.gov.uk

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(2) MRS HELENA WINDSOR (GODSTONE) TO ASK:

The 2015/16 Annual Report was presented to Members in the form of a high quality printed book. A second booklet in the same style, titled 50 things we achieved in 2015/16 was delivered with the agenda for the 11 October 2016 County Council meeting. What were the costs of publishing and distributing these two items?

Reply:

The 2015-16 corporate Annual Report of the council was produced in line with good practice, endorsed by the council's auditors Grant Thornton, and based on a model used by many corporate organisations following professional accountancy conventions and the guidance of the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC). The Annual Report provides performance highlights across the council's range of services over the last year and describes the context in which the council operates, its responsibilities and the major challenges it faces. Also in the report are audited financial statements, which the council is statutorily required to publish and are included as part of the main report for reasons of greater transparency and accessibility.

In addition, at the request of Members, the council also produced a summary version of the Annual Report, entitled More Than 50 Things We Achieved Last Year, which can be used as a reference for Members when engaging with their residents about the services provided by the council. The total cost of publishing and distributing the two publications to Members, MPs, partner organisations, businesses, libraries and other interested parties was £4,067.80.

MR JOHN FUREY, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

(3) MRS JAN MASON (WEST EWELL) TO ASK:

In response to my question at a previous Council Meeting on the future Project Horizon Programme, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding stated that a provisional date for the new five year programme will be available in October. Can he now give me a date for the provision of this information.

Reply:

This information will be available and emailed to all Members on 1 November 2016.

MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

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

The County Council is currently investing in commercial buildings - warehouses and offices outside Surrey for investment purposes – as set out in the Member Questions to the Cabinet on 20 September 2016.

The County Council is exposed to the counter-party risk of the tenant continuing to pay the rent on the warehouses and offices during the terms of the various leases, to interest rate risk if the funding has not been obtained on a fixed rate basis, to the risk that the dilapidation clauses will not ensure that the offices and warehouses are reinstated into current condition at the end of the leases, to the risk that the insurance purchased may not cover a potential loss, and to the property values at the maturity of the loan in order to be able to refinance or repay the sum borrowed to purchase the property at loan maturity.

Can the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience, in light of the County Council's previous problematic investments in Icelandic banks in recent years, confirm that the credit rating of the tenant counter-parties for each of the buildings purchased are "investment grade" and if not confirm how the credit risk will be managed by the County Council, confirm that the current lease terms match the debt repayment terms, i.e. that the tenants' rent fund the interest on the County Council's loans to the loan maturities without any contributions required from the County Council, confirm whether the loans obtained to acquire the properties have been obtained on a fixed rate basis or whether floating rate loans have been swapped onto a fixed rate basis and if not how the interest rate risk will be managed, confirm whether there is any residual exposures to the landlord (the County Council) which are not covered by the dilapidations clauses, confirm that the insurances obtained will cover every potential loss including terrorism cover, confirm the basis for the residual value calculations which will underpin the County Council's ability to repay the amounts borrowed at the maturity of the loans and confirm that such calculations take into account that property prices are currently at or close to all time highs and that property values of such offices and warehouses, which are based on the discounted cash flows of the tenant's rent, are likely to be lower in the future as interest rates rise from their current all-time lows?

Can the Cabinet Member also disclose the current and projected internal costs for managing this portfolio over the life of the leases and what effect these costs will have on the anticipated investment return?

Reply:

The Investment Strategy was agreed by Cabinet in July 2013 as one of a series of responses to improve the financial resilience of the Council in the longer term. The portfolio consists of property investments which have been made by the Council in order to deliver economic regeneration or to provide for long-term future service use, whilst delivering an investment return. These assets provide flexibility in the estate whilst producing a net revenue. The Council has also provided its subsidiary company, Halsey Garton Property Ltd, with equity and debt financing to facilitate the purchase of assets for their investment return. The portfolio of property investments therefore consists of assets held by the Council together with those owned by the Property Company. The Council is developing a mixed and diversified portfolio in order to manage the inherent economic and market risks.

The performance of the portfolio across the Council and the Property Company is managed and monitored to avoid an over-reliance upon single tenants or types of tenants in terms of their impact as a percentage of the total portfolio. Investment property assets are let to a variety of tenants in a number of different industry sectors, these range in size from local businesses to large PLCs. The covenant of each tenant is evaluated at the time of purchase and the asset is priced in accordance with this covenant together with a number of other factors, for example the length of the lease and the location, such that the returns available are commensurate with risk.

The Council funds its capital & investment expenditure through the use of reserves, capital receipts and prudential borrowing. The Council undertakes required borrowing in accordance with the conditions of the Prudential Code, which requires the borrowing to be affordable, sustainable and provide value for money. As the Council does not hypothecate borrowing, the use of receipts or the utilisation of cash resources against individual projects or acquisitions, we assume that all the Council's activities in progressing the Investment Strategy will increase the Council's requirement to borrow. All investments are therefore required to demonstrate a return in excess of the opportunity cost of capital which is calculated with reference to the Council's interest payable on equivalent borrowing and the statutory minimum revenue provision (MRP) that sets aside funds for the repayment of the borrowing. The Council only undertakes fixed rate borrowing and is therefore not exposed to interest rate risk in the way expressed in the question. The Treasury Management Strategy agreed by full Council each year provides further information about the way in which borrowing is undertaken.

All properties owned by the Council and the Property Company are insured on normal commercial terms and tenant leases are provided on a fully repairing basis except where tenants are taking a short-term lease pending redevelopment, thus all insurance costs are the responsibility of the tenants. All investment opportunities are progressed based upon a robust business case which takes into account due and proper consideration of the balance between risk and reward. A number of scenarios are evaluated for each asset purchase to understand the impact of any potential tenant void and to consider the likelihood of other occupiers taking up the vacant space. There will be occasions when a tenant triggers their break clause or vacates at the end of their lease resulting in a potential letting void. In these circumstances there will be a revenue loss position on these particular assets. However, this will be offset by the net revenue income produced by other assets in the property portfolio. As a backstop position the Council's Revolving Investment and Infrastructure fund is available to meet revenue costs should there be the unlikely situation of an overall net loss on the portfolio and therefore the Council and its services are protected.

The key purpose of the Investment Strategy is to deliver an ongoing net income stream to the Council to provide a source of funding to support services and in doing so, we are taking a long-term view of capital values. We ensure that the forecast income received from the investment is sufficient to pay any interest costs and deliver a net return. As we are not reliant upon capital appreciation we can therefore decide to retain or sell assets at the right time for the Council.

The Investment Portfolio is managed by a small team of staff who are supplemented by external specialist advisors when required. The Council makes an appropriate charge to the property company for the professional services provided, to ensure that the full cost of the activity is recovered and that there is no subsidy. The overall investment returns are reported each month as part of the Finance & Budget Monitoring report provided to Cabinet and future anticipated net returns are considered as part of the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES WELLBEING

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

Following on from the recent audit report into Surrey Youth Centres, could the Cabinet Member confirm:

- (i) what was the purchase cost of the 55 BB Playbook devices that were not returned to SCC?
- (ii) that an up to date inventory of assets has now been completed?
- (iii) how much was spent on purchase cards that contravened SCC rules and guidance on appropriate spending?
- (iv) what, if any, disciplinary action has been taken as a result of this audit?

Reply:

1. What was the purchase cost of the 55 BB Playbook devices that were not returned to SCC?

As this is an IMT question I have sought a response from them.

The Youth Attendance Application was developed to work using BlackBerry WiFi only PlayBooks which connected to the SCC PSN network using the BlackBerry Bridge software on a separate BlackBerry handheld device. At the time of development BlackBerry was the only Mobile Device/Infrastructure that was approved by CESG to be used to connect to PSN networks. The service purchased 50 WiFi Only PlayBooks and 50 BlackBerry Handheld devices to enable each Youth Centre to have the application connected. The cost of these 50 devices was £9,100.

Prior to this, Surrey were working with Northgate and BlackBerry on a mobile project for the Adults service and 50 of the 16GB WiFi only BlackBerry PlayBooks were provided by BlackBerry to enable this project to proceed. The development of this mobile application was not completed by Northgate and the BlackBerry PlayBooks were re-assigned to be additional spares and hot swaps for the Youth Attendance Application that had already been rolled out and was being used by staff in the youth centres.

Due to the issues with the connectivity where two devices had to be used together to allow the staff to use the application, and the limited development and support of the BlackBerry PlayBook devices (the devices were pulled from sale and no further support and development was completed) it was decided to replace them with Apple iPads which had by then been approved by CESG to connect to PSN network using Good initially and MobileIron currently to provide the connectivity.

The BlackBerry PlayBook devices were reviewed to see if they could be reused for any other services in the authority and there was no uses found for the devices due to:-

- WiFi only connectivity using the BlackBerry Bridge software.
- Requirement for additional devices to provide connectivity.
- Poor performance due to the way that web traffic is serviced through the BlackBerry infrastructure.
- Limited and very poor application store.
- Lack of development of applications for BlackBerry (Suppliers only developing for iOS/Android and Windows).
- Device support including hardware and software no longer available.

An investigation was done into looking to get the devices sold to recoup cost and it was found that there was no market for BlackBerry PlayBooks (due to the above reasons) and that the money that could be recouped would be far less than the cost of returning/wiping and selling the devices so the service was not asked to return the Playbooks.

2. That an up to date inventory of assets has now been completed?

The service can confirm that we undertake a rolling programme of asset checks on a six monthly basis. We currently have two centres that have fallen outside of this parameter - The Street Youth Centre in Caterham and Ashford Youth Centre. These were last checked in January and February 2016 respectively. These two asset checks are due for completion by the end of October.

3. How much was spent on purchase cards that contravened SCC rules and guidance on appropriate spending?

£31.03 on refreshment costs and toll charges as part of a work visit to youth centres in the North West that had been set up as an employee run mutual. These were legitimate costs but should have been reimbursed through a travel expenses claim.

4. What, if any, disciplinary action has been taken as a result of this audit?

No disciplinary action has been taken as a result of the audit. The audit was undertaken within the context of considerable change. The youth service was brought back in house leading to a change in management and restructure of the service that was completed in November 2015. We have acknowledged that the criticism from audit is primarily of management and we have implemented a plan to rectify the areas of weakness with new policies and procedures to ensure that our financial and resource management is in line with SCC best policy and practice. This is being undertaken with the support of internal audit and has been scrutinised by the Council Overview Board (COB). The service will be subject to a further inspection by audit to ensure that the Management Action Plan is implemented and will then be subject to a further review by COB later in 2017.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Will the Cabinet Member give an update on what measures are being taken to cover Abellio's withdrawal of bus routes in North West Surrey?

Reply:

On 2 September 2016, Surrey County Council and Abellio jointly issued a statement concerning changes to some services currently operated by Abellio in north Surrey, as part of the company's decision to downsize their activities in the county. This was sent to the media and affected Divisional Members, amongst others. It included details of nine services which Abellio currently run under contract with substantial financial support from the Council, from which the company has sought resignation for commercial and operational reasons from 31 December 2016. This is their prerogative. The nine services are: 81 Woking-Barnsbury (Sundays only), 436 Woking-Brooklands (Sundays only), 458 Kingston-Staines, 514 Kingston-Addlestone, 515 Kingston-Guildford, 555 Heathrow Airport-Hersham, 556 Woking-Chertsey, 557 Woking-Sunbury Tesco and 663 Walton-Esher High School.

Beforehand, there were extensive discussions between the Council and the company as to the least-disruptive way to manage the situation, as well as independent scrutiny for the Council of Abellio's costs, revenues and subsidy levels required. This decision was solely Abellio's and the statement made it clear that the Council's focus would be on engaging alternative bus companies to provide replacements. Although the above bus services would no longer feature Abellio's involvement, it has never been suggested that these services would be disappearing completely. Were they to do so, the potential impact on many bus users is of course recognised, along with hardship that could result if key strategic bus services were to be just abandoned.

For this reason, the Council is leading a process to obtain new operators for the services. Plans for this have been formulated and engagement has been launched with all companies currently approved by the Council for running supported bus services in Surrey, in advance of discussions. Expressions of interest are now being received. This cannot result in immediate clear outcomes, but it is expected that by mid-autumn, it will be possible to advise the public and Members of what the new arrangements will be. Until that time, it is unfortunately not possible to give further information on future timetables and frequency of specific services, but the Council will use all endeavours to secure the best possible outcome within the funding budget available.

The timescale involved does not allow a full public consultation, but officers are sharing information with, and receiving feedback from, the North West Surrey Bus Users Group. This organisation is considered to be a local voice for all bus users in the area where Abellio services operate and represents its members and others when considering potential bus service changes, as it did in 2015 as part of the ongoing Local Transport Review.

Updates regarding the future service pattern will be advised to local Members and published in due course on www.surreycc.gov.uk/buses whilst final service details are also expected to appear in printed form and be distributed from around early December.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

The change in state pension arrangements for women will have a serious and harmful effect on many older women working in the county. The claimed £418 extra income they get when they retire will not offset the losses accrued from retiring six years later. Although the legislation for this has been around for some while, most women have only been made aware of the changes very recently and it has caused some serious problems for the way some of them have planned for their future over many years. Will the Leader of the Council take this issue to Government and strongly urge a more balanced transition from the previous system to the new one?

Reply:

I appreciate these concerns. However, in light of the fact that state pensions are a national issue, I recommend the best course of action is for the Member to raise these concerns directly with his Member of Parliament, Kwasi Kwarteng.

MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

(8) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK

Agricultural Tenants

Our tenants at Bysse Court Farm, where they are successful dairy farmers, have spent much of the last seven years grappling with the shortcomings of our property management service.

On 19 January this year they were visited by five officers, who were tasked with assessing some farm buildings. The consensus of the team was that one of the barns was in a dangerous condition as was a workshop area. They said that, based on their survey, the property management department would prepare specifications upon which contractors would be invited to tender for the needed repairs to make the building safe. The tenants made it clear that they would need to have the building work completed by September this year as it was needed for wintering cattle and storing winter feed. This was accepted.

By July there had been no perceptible activity, apart from one or two visits by officers the purpose of which was unclear.

The tenant asked me for my help and I drew your attention to this problem. Your intervention resulted in some action, but it was not until late August that we learned that tender documents were sent out to contractors. In September I asked for information as to when the work began on the tender documents. To date I have not received a reply. You kindly informed me in early September that all was in hand and that it was planned to undertake the work in October.

There was a visit yesterday by a group including officers from the County and the selected contractor. The tenant was told that work could commence in three weeks; effectively the end of October. They said that there had been a delay in locating a source for tiles. The tenant pointed out that it had been agreed in January that the roof repair would be in metal sheeting so that tiles were not required. They asked the visitors to look at their own report from that meeting which would record this decision. There was some hesitation from which it became clear that the report of the meeting had not been found.

This is but one example of the problems which the County is creating for its tenants.

Are you still of the belief that our property services management is capable of providing a serious and professional service to our countryside tenants and if so how do you justify this view and may you let me have the answer to the question which I have asked about the progress of tender documents.

Reply:

Bysse Court Farm is owned by SCC and is currently tenanted. In the 2016/17 property planned maintenance programme there are works relating to building roof replacement. The two projects in particular are for replacement of Barn Roof and Workshop (machinery store) roof. These are fairly major, high cost projects and do require liaising with tenant and specialist site visits.

The contractor tender for the works to the barn roof was returned and contract awarded in September 2016. We are currently discussing a mutually convenient project start date with the tenant for this work.

The workshop roof is more complex and is in design. We still anticipate that both projects will be delivered as part of the 2016/17 planned maintenance programme

budget.

Management of the Rural Portfolio of properties is not dissimilar to management of other portfolios, for example, Operational Buildings. Specialist skills are retained in-house in the form of a qualified Rural Surveyor but where other specialist skills are required they are procured through the marketplace as necessary.

I am confident that the Property Team are doing everything they can to expedite these works as soon as possible.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

(9) MR SAJ HUSSAIN (KNAPHILL AND GOLDSWORTH WEST) TO ASK:

On the 20 September 2016, South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAMB) announced their intention to close the ambulance station in Knaphill in six weeks time, with the staff and vehicles transferring to Ottershaw. There has not been any consultation with local residents or ward Councillors on the reasoning behind this decision and the implications for patient safety.

I call upon the Council to make representations for the closure of the Knaphill Ambulance station to be suspended until there has been a full independent risk assessment on the implications for patients' safety.

Reply:

In my capacity as Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health, I will ask Northwest Surrey CCG, who are the lead Commissioner for SECAMB, to confirm that an independent risk assessment of patient safety has been undertaken and that they are satisfied with the outcome and decision. I will make sure the response I receive is made available to Members.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

I understand that the 2016/17 settlement from the Government announced a Better Care Fund totalling £3.3bn by 2019/20, of which £800m is coming from removal of New Homes Bonus funding to councils and £1.8 billion from increasing council tax by a further 2%: the so called adult social care levy.

I understand that the Government calculates that Surrey's additional adult social care need (according to the Relative Needs Formula for adult social care) is for an additional £55m up until 2019/20, of which £53.5m is due to come from Surrey council tax payers and £1.5m from the Government.

In light of this, please can you confirm:

- Firstly, how much New Homes Bonus: (a) Surrey County Council and (b) the Borough and District Councils in Surrey are expected to lose as a result of this change.
- Secondly, how Surrey County Council's estimates of additional need for care funding over this period compares with that from the Government.

Reply:

The growth in demand for our adult social care services is the largest factor in the financial challenge facing this Council. This growth in demand alone increases the cost to the council by around £24m per year – totalling nearly £100m per year by 2019/20. That is why it was welcome news last year when the Chancellor announced an improved Better Care Fund to be phased in from 2017/18, with a value rising to £1.5bn nationally by 2019/20. Based on the government's Relative Needs Formula for adult social care, Surrey's share would be £25m in 2019/20. Whilst this would not plug this funding gap, it would – along with the flexibility to raise £12m per year from the adult social care precept – go some way helping the hard pressed finances of the Council.

However, there are stings in the tail. First, over half of the improved Better Care Fund - £800m – will be funded from the New Homes Bonus, which is a grant currently paid to local authorities. It is estimated that the County Council will lose £2.5 m in New Homes Bonus by 2019/20. For the county of Surrey as a whole, the district and borough councils could lose nearly £10m.

The second sting is one you know about. Due to the redistributive methodology used for the improved Better Care Fund, the County Council will only receive £1.5 m. This falls way short of what is really needed and this administration will continue to work with our MPs to reach a fairer distribution.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MR ALAN YOUNG (CRANLEIGH AND EWHURST) TO ASK:

Does the Leader believe that the Council's new Customer Promise should apply to all Members of this Council, including the Leader, in their interactions with residents, officers and one another?

Reply:

Our Customer Promise, which was adopted by Cabinet in March 2015 has been created to provide the Council with a focus on improving resident experience in Surrey. Building on the Customer Promise, managers across the Council have been engaged in promoting a customer focused culture with residents and service users at its heart. I believe that all of us should have the interests of Surrey residents in mind in all our interactions, after all that is why we, as councillors, are here to serve.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Does Surrey have up-to-date statistics for the numbers of pedestrians and cyclists injured on the county's roads?

How many of these can be attributed to the rather confusing and disjointed cycle lane structure?

Reply:

The table in Appendix A shows the number of pedestrian and cyclist casualties recorded by the police in Surrey over recent years, by severity.

It is not possible to say whether an individual pedestrian or cyclist casualty could be attributed directly to “confusing or disjointed cycle lane structure”, as this would be hard to define, and it would be impossible to say whether the incident might have happened irrespective of the presence of different types of dedicated cycle infrastructure.

Detailed analysis of the 627 cycling casualties taking place in 2013 showed that the single most common type of collision is when a vehicle exits a side road or other ‘give way’ junction into the path of the casualty (30%). The next most common is when the casualty crashes but there is no other road user involved (22%), resulting from a variety of reasons including a slippery surface, colliding with kerb or parked car, or road surface irregularity to name a few.

Implementation of improved cycling infrastructure is a vital part of achieving the aim of the Surrey Cycling Strategy to get “more people cycling, more safely”. A key part of this is to provide cycling infrastructure that is of high quality, safe and secure, comfortable and well maintained, continuous and is available where people want to go to.

There continues to be a large amount of investment in highway, public transport, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure in Surrey as a result of the funding from Local Enterprise Partnerships for major schemes. In all, eight schemes have been awarded £34m of funding and these contain significant cycling and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, which are due to be delivered in the coming years. Further business cases are being developed for submission to the Local Enterprise Partnerships for a further five major schemes that are also likely to contain significant cycling and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, with a value approaching £22m.

The Drive SMART Partnership has also provided funding towards cycle safety campaigning that includes messages to cyclists about sharing paths considerately with pedestrians, positioning carefully when sharing roads with vehicles, and messages to motorists about sharing roads carefully with cyclists and looking out for them at junctions.

It is expected that with continued investment in improved infrastructure, road safety campaigning and enforcement in partnership with Surrey Police, the risk of cycling casualties will reduce while the amount of cycling increases.

New standards for cycle infrastructure

Officers are currently working on developing new standards for developing cycling infrastructure, supporting the Surrey Cycle Strategy’s objective to ‘**improve infrastructure for cycling** by securing funding to develop high quality, joined up cycle routes, taking account of international best practice, utilising off road and quiet streets, and separating cyclists from motorised traffic on busy roads where feasible’. We have started a dialogue with designers from Transport for London and the City of Cardiff to learn from their designers about the current best practice in cycling infrastructure and what is suitable for Surrey. This will allow us to build infrastructure that is fit for purpose, will keep cyclists safe and encourage more people to cycle for local trips. As part of the development of local cycling plans in each district and borough we are reviewing existing infrastructure, and where substandard, un-clear or disjointed, highlighting this for future improvement when funds are available.

Appendix A

Year	Pedestrian casualties					Cycling casualties				
	Killed	Serious	Killed or Serious	Slight	Total	Killed	Serious	Killed or Serious	Slight	Total
2007	10	73	83	297	380	2	60	62	319	381
2008	10	82	82	294	376	1	49	50	371	421
2009	10	75	85	317	402	2	78	80	392	472
2010	9	78	87	306	393	4	94	98	355	453
2011	10	85	95	295	390	1	106	107	422	529
2012	2	82	84	261	345	2	121	123	438	561
2013	5	93	98	264	362	1	144	145	482	627
2014	10	88	98	327	425	4	162	166	482	648
2015	9	117	126	317	443	3	136	139	447	586
2016	5*	43**	48**	184**	232**	1*	79**	80**	252**	332**

* To the end of August

** To the end of July

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES WELLBEING

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

On 14 September 2016, the Children's Society published a report stating that young people leaving care in England are facing financial hardship because of a lack of help from local authorities. The Children's Society said that almost half of councils were failing to offer financial education, which left many care leavers struggling to adapt and ending up homeless. It has called on local authorities to offer more specialised help for care leavers' transition into adult life. Please will the Cabinet Member confirm what steps Surrey County Council is taking to improve support for care leavers?

Reply:

Surrey Care Leavers' Service have 485 young people over 18 within the service. Through our Corporate Parenting Strategy we have recognised the importance of ensuring our Care Leavers have the right support in place as they move to being independent adults, with the skills and support to be successful in whatever they choose to do.

In recognition of the needs of these young adults we provide a range of services to help and support them, including a team of Personal Advisors who are their allocated caseworkers, supported accommodation ranging from continued placement with their foster carer post-18 to support with independent tenancies at a time that is right for them, financial support as they continue with education or training, and access to health care, including a newly commissioned mental health service specifically for careleavers, hosted through Surrey and Borders Partnership as part of our CAMHS pooled budget contract.

We offer a bespoke service as we recognise an individual approach is required for each Care Leaver.

Outcomes for our Care Leavers are monitored nationally through a range of performance indicators, with an annual performance table of local authorities being

provided to check on progress. For our Care Leavers we have shown improvements across all the indicators, although final figures are not released nationally until October 2016. Provisionally, our records show that the numbers of our Care Leavers who are engaged in education, employment and training now stands at 60% (55% in 2015) and the numbers living in suitable accommodation has improved from 82% in 2015 to 93% in 2016. The 2016 data includes all those who are aged 17-21 who are Care Leavers.

We are pleased with this progress and are working hard to sustain and improve our support through our collective responsibility as corporate parents.

MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

**(14) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON AND ASHFORD COMMON)
TO ASK:
2nd question**

Of the investment properties currently owned by Surrey, how many are:

- (i) fully let and what is the duration of those rental streams
- (ii) partially let, what is the duration of those income streams and what is the proportion of the property currently unlet
- (iii) completely unlet.

Reply:

All investment property assets are currently fully let with the exception of the upper floors of two properties which are subject to conversion proposals from office space to residential use. Tenants are in occupancy on leases due to expire between 3 years and 25 years.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

The new Surrey Fly-tipping Strategy produced in June 2016 reported an increase of 91 incidents of fly-tipping (up to 6,851) in 2014/15 compared to a year earlier, and notes that this cost Surrey County Council and Surrey's Boroughs and Districts £0.9m that year, but did not estimate the additional cost to private landowners. It also predicted a 60% increase in the tonnes fly-tipped in 2015/16. Its main aim is stated as to 'stimulate a change in behaviour amongst residents, businesses and landowners that helps reduce the amount of fly-tipping in Surrey' with one additional post budgeted for one year only.

In light of this can you please provide:

- Figures on the incidence of fly-tipping over each of the past 12 months, and how this compares to the equivalent months a year earlier.
- What percentage of the reported fly-tipping incidents were on public as opposed to private land; and
- The costs, for the last reported year, to deal with fly-tipping that fell to Surrey County Council and the costs that fell to Surrey's District and Borough Councils.

Reply:

Q1. Figures on the incidence of fly-tipping over each of the past 12 months, and how this compares to the equivalent months a year earlier.

The latest dataset that we can extract from the waste dataflow system is from the period April 2015 - March 2016. We are unable to provide the data on fly-tipping incidents from April 2016 - September 2016 at this stage, as the fly-tipping data is submitted following the end of each quarter and is then validated thereafter by the WDF validation team. We are unable to provide a breakdown by month from the system and can only do this by quarter. Please see **Table 1** below for a quarterly breakdown of fly-tipping incidents from April 2015 – March 2016, and for the same period a year earlier.

Table 1 total number of fly-tipping incidents reported by District and Borough Councils via the Waste Data Flow reporting system

Period	Apr - Jun	Jul - Sep	Oct - Dec	Jan - Mar	Total
Apr 15 - Mar 16	1620	1868	1779	2183	7450
Apr 14 - Mar 15	1769	1709	1628	1745	6851

The County Council, as the Waste Disposal Authority, does have more timely access to the fly-tipping tonnage data that comes into our Waste Transfer Stations from District and Borough Councils for disposal. Please see **Table 2** below for a monthly breakdown of fly-tipping tonnages received at our Waste Transfer Stations for the past 12 months compared to a year earlier.

Table 2 Total fly-tipping tonnages received at Waste Transfer Stations for disposal

Month	Reporting period	
	October 15 - September 16	October 14 - September 15
Oct	468.50	262.00
Nov	326.70	246.08
Dec	279.58	185.42
Jan	334.72	224.80
Feb	276.64	272.44
Mar	263.90	340.28
Apr	279.06	414.22
May	291.56	327.20
Jun	278.44	438.54
Jul	353.90	413.40
Aug	260.96	398.44
Sep	282.74	499.76
Total	3,696.70	4,022.58

Q2 What percentage of the reported fly-tipping incidents were on public as opposed to private land?

The only breakdown we can give for fly-tipping by location is based on what District and Borough Councils report to WDF. Please see **Table 3** for a breakdown by location type for the latest available period April 2015 – March 2016 compared to a year earlier. We are aware that not all fly-tipping incidents that occur on private land are reported to District and Borough Councils, as the responsibility and cost for clearance and disposal sits with the private landowner, manager or occupier.

Table 3 number of fly-tipping incidents reported by location type by District and Borough Councils via the Waste Data Flow reporting system

Incident by location type	Apr 15 - Mar 16		Apr 14 - Mar 15	
	Number of incidents	Percentage of Incidents	Number of incidents	Percentage of Incidents
Agricultural Incidents	25	0.34%	32	0.47%
Back Alleyway Incidents	218	2.93%	223	3.25%
Commercial / Industrial Incidents	19	0.26%	28	0.41%
Council Land Incidents	2121	28.47%	1942	28.35%
Footpath / Bridleway Incidents	1132	15.19%	728	10.63%
Highway Incidents	3377	45.33%	3497	51.04%
Other (unidentified) Incidents	370	4.97%	216	3.15%
Private / Residential Incidents	167	2.24%	141	2.06%
Railway Incidents	2	0.03%	2	0.03%
Watercourse / Bank Incidents	19	0.26%	42	0.61%

Q3 The costs, for the last reported year, to deal with fly-tipping that fell to Surrey County Council and the costs that fell to Surrey’s District and Borough Councils.

Please see **Table 4** for a summary of the estimated costs to deal with fly-tipping for the last reported year, April 2015 – March 2016.

Table 4 Estimated fly-tipping collection, enforcement action and disposal costs for April 2015 – March 2016

Type of cost	Estimated cost	Information source
Total D&B Incident clearance cost	£483,000	Waste Data Flow
D&B Enforcement cost (for carrying out investigations and further actions)	£138,000	Waste Data Flow
SCC Highways clearance cost	£100,000	SCC Highways via Kier
SCC disposal cost	£444,000	Disposal contractor Suez
Total cost	£1,165,000	

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**(16) MR ALAN YOUNG (CRANLEIGH AND EWHURST) TO ASK:
2nd question**

Does the Leader believe that it is important that he and all Members of this Council adhere to the Seven Principles of Public Life?

Reply:

Not only do I believe that they should, I know that it is a requirement placed on us all in the Surrey County Council Member Code of Conduct.

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE, WELLBEING AND INDEPENDENCE

**(17) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:
3rd question**

The recent King's Fund report, "Social Care for Older People: Home Truths" found that over the last five years, the number of older people receiving social care help by local authorities fell by over 25% as the spending by councils on adult social care fell by 11% in real terms over this period. In addition it found that 37% of care staff were found to have no recognised qualification. What are the equivalent figures for adult social care commissioned by Surrey County Council?

Reply:

Number of Older People receiving social care support:

The 26% decrease in the number of Older People supported by local authorities stated in the report was based on information from a statutory return gathered nationally, until 2013/14. This return measured the total number of contacts each local authority received relating to social care, including referrals for assessment that did not result in a funded package of care. The equivalent figure for Surrey was a decrease of 12%. A more reliable measure of the number of people supported though, certainly in terms of the impact on the budget, is the change in the actual number of funded packages of care. This presents a very different picture. Overall there was a 15% increase in the total number of Older People council funded care services for the period in question.

Older People social care expenditure:

The 9% national reduction in Older People social care expenditure in real terms stated in the Kings Fund report does not match the trend in Surrey. Adult Social Care (ASC) remains one of the Council's biggest budget pressures. The equivalent trend in Surrey was an increase in real terms of 12% on the Council's expenditure on Older People social care between 2009/10 and 2014/15. This demonstrates the significant pressure the Council faces in terms of ASC provision.

Social Care Workforce:

The Council does not hold comparable data on the Adult Social Care Workforce in Surrey. Nationally, and in Surrey, the workforce is diverse including qualified professional staff and unqualified staff, working within councils and the independent care sector e.g. registered Home Care Agencies and Care Homes. Home Care

services and Residential/Nursing homes are regulated by the Care Quality Commission and this includes oversight of appropriate staff qualification and training.

There is a comprehensive learning and development programme for Surrey County Council Adult Social Care staff to ensure they have the necessary competencies. The council's Adult Social Care contracts require providers to deliver services via appropriately qualified and trained staff.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(18) MR ALAN YOUNG (CRANLEIGH AND EWHURST) TO ASK:

3rd question

Will the Leader join me in congratulating Callum Mitchell on winning the Surrey Young Musician of the Year Award, supported through the Surrey Members' Allocation Fund, and express his support and encouragement for all young musicians in the county.

Reply:

I am delighted to express my support and encouragement for all Surrey's young musicians and to offer them my and the Council's congratulations. I am particularly proud of the work in this county to provide opportunities for children and young people living in challenging circumstances. Surrey Arts are acquiring an international reputation for leading the way in musical inclusion. This summer our UP! Orchestra opened the National Paralympic Day and Liberty Festival at the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, just a few days before the start of the Rio 2016 Paralympic Games. The Surrey Youth Choir has a fantastic reputation and was resident at York Minster for three days in August. We also have some fantastic music charities, the Orpheus Trust and Rythmix to name just two. Surrey recognises and nurtures musical talent in its young people and I am sure that all Members will join me in applauding their achievements.