

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2016

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

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

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

Can the Council update members on the state of progress regarding the proposed changes to fire cover in Spelthorne. Is the new fire station still going ahead? What are the problems that have been encountered and what is the up to date budget for the whole project?

Reply

Changes are being proposed to the current fire provision in the Spelthorne area that will impact residents in Surrey, particularly in the borough and in neighbouring Elmbridge and Runnymede. As a result a public consultation was launched on 29 November. The consultation will run until 20 February 2017.

We had planned to close Sunbury and Staines fire stations by the end of this financial year, after the new fire station at Fordbridge had opened. The development of the new fire station "Fordbridge" is still going ahead but has been delayed while we secure the best possible vehicle access to the site.

However, the need to make savings has not changed. We need to operate from one fire station from April 2017 until Fordbridge opens, in order to achieve the savings.

Having looked carefully at the potential options, we are proposing that Staines fire station should close and that Sunbury fire station remain to provide cover until Fordbridge is ready. In addition to the cover provided by Sunbury, crews from nearby stations, such as Chertsey and Egham, would also be called upon if needed. Subject to planning it is anticipated that Fordbridge fire station will be operational by summer 2018.

We have also reviewed the plans to have an on-call crew to work alongside the fulltime crew when Fordbridge is operational. The council faces huge financial pressures and needs to find tens of millions of pounds extra each year to meet rising demand for services such as adult social care. In light of these pressures we're facing, we have little choice but to propose to go ahead with Fordbridge without an on-call crew.

Residents and other stakeholders are encouraged to have their say on these proposals by completing the questionnaire online at www.surrey-fire.gov.uk/psp where further information is also available. Paper questionnaires will be available in libraries, council offices and fire stations in the Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Runnymede areas from December until February.

Cabinet approved (on 23 June 2015) £4.9m to build a new fire station in Spelthorne. The current Budget is £5.3M, an increase of £400k. This cost is provided for in the

MTFP as it is part of a larger fire reconfiguration budget supporting savings set out to 2020.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Congratulations on getting County publicity in the 'CASH FOR TRASH' TV series. Well done also for realising that Peter Martin's division of Godalming South, Milford and Witley is the one where the residents throw away the most valuable stuff.

Would you agree to getting even more publicity for the County by appearing in the next series as Father Christmas or if it is in the New Year, as some other delightful character?

Reply

I have to congratulate the programme for recognising there is nothing rubbish about Surrey!

We all know there is value in everything Godalming, Milford and Witley has to offer – just look at the quality of their county councillor!

I'd be delighted to appear in the next series but unfortunately my talents in this portfolio have been spotted and have been snapped up for the remake of Steptoe and Son!

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

(3) MRS CAROL COLEMAN (ASHFORD) TO ASK:

Early Years day care settings have strict regulations concerning numbers of staff ratio to children and are inspected and monitored by Ofsted regularly to safeguard our young children. There is also an inspection and monitoring regime of youth centres and schools where children are looked after during the daytime. CQC inspect and monitor homes for elderly and vulnerable people in the borough, but what about day centres for the elderly such as people with dementia? There should be a minimum ratio of staff to clients, and inspections to ensure that these people are getting a good standard of care and the correct stimulation and nutrition and fluids. Who is responsible and what are Surrey County Council and the borough and district councils doing to inspect and monitor day care for the elderly and for people with Dementia in Surrey to safeguard them?

Reply

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) only register and inspect services that fall within the legal scope of registration and provide 'regulated activities'. Traditional day care centres are not regulated by CQC. However, a number of day care facilities take place within services that are registered with CQC for example registered care homes and nursing homes. Our Adult Social Care Quality Monitoring team focus their monitoring and work with care homes, nursing homes, home based care agencies and supported living services to improve the quality and experiences of individuals using these

services. They would not generally undertake visits to day care services unless they were specifically asked to do so by a local ASC team.

Day care services that are commissioned by Surrey County Council are monitored through the contract that we have with them. The contract includes quality measures and outcomes that are expected to be delivered as part of the contract.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(4) MRS PAT FROST (FARNHAM CENTRAL) TO ASK:

At the last full Council I was intrigued by the question about the Young Musician Award. I looked into it further and came across a leaflet which said "The Alan Young Award for the best musician in Surrey". It seems unusual for an individual councillor to be named in this way. Can the Leader to confirm that no Surrey County Council money was used to support this endeavour.

Reply

In 2015, a grant of £2000 was made to Awards for Young Musicians to provide a Surrey Young Musician of the Year Award. This was financed by the Council, through the Members' Allocation Fund and was supported by Councillor Alan Young.

Earlier this year I became aware that this same award had been publicised as the "Alan Young Award" and was sufficiently concerned by this to refer the matter to the Monitoring Officer. She decided that this needed to be dealt with in accordance with this Council's Arrangements for investigating and determining whether a Member has breached the Council's Code of Conduct.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Following the letter I have received from DCLG on 18th November confirming that the prohibition on charging should extend to household waste from DIY, will the Cabinet member now set out when he will stop charging Surrey residents to dispose of household DIY waste at CRCs?

Reply

The Council has followed legal definitions around the types of waste that can be charged for at the Council's community recycling centres and is confident that this legislation has been interpreted correctly in applying the charging scheme implemented on 1st September 2016. The same interpretations have been made by all the other authorities that charge for the materials in question, including our immediate neighbours Hampshire and West Sussex who have also introduced charging schemes recently. The letter from DCLG refers to non-statutory guidance from WRAP. This guidance confirms in table 5.1 that the council can make a charge for waste which comprises construction and demolition waste from the household such as the following items

- Doors and windows;
- Fitted kitchens;

- Fitted wardrobes;
- Inert material such as rubble and concrete,
- Bricks and roof tiles;
- Plasterboard;
- Soil from landscaping activities;
- Any other building materials;
- Commercial wastes; and
- Tyres.

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

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

What steps is the county council taking to rationalize its office portfolio, where offices are under occupied or empty?

Reply

There are only four buildings in our Corporate Office Portfolio all of which are occupied. These include Consort House in Redhill, Fairmount House in Leatherhead, County Hall in Kingston and Quadrant Court in Woking.

In recent years the office portfolio has contracted with the Runnymede Centre in Runnymede being developed into a new secondary school serving that area.

We monitor office utilisation through regular surveys and this supports both operational change, the shifting and merging of teams to make best use of a site and strategic change, the consolidation of teams and functions into a building so that ultimately the building may be reallocated for either other use, letting, or sale, if that is appropriate.

Following the last utilisation survey, 2015/2016 we have committed to the following actions:

1. Reviewing the pool or team ownership of space throughout the sites, looking to create bigger management pools which in turn will increase the amount of available space or headroom at the site. Opening up more flexible spaces such as hotdesking, which is popular and well used.
2. Ensuring all space is booked through the new space management system which will be fully live in July 2017. Monitor meeting room use and in particular meeting "no-shows" through the new system.
3. Foster a culture of space sharing amongst staff such that we optimise our space through ensuring we cancel a meeting room if no longer needed and only reserving hotdesking for the time we know we will be there at site.

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

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

Surrey schools provide an excellent standard of education to young people across the county. However, our headteachers have written to the government outlining their opposition to plans for new grammar schools, stating that they are strongly opposed to

creating a "selective, segregated, two-tier state funded system of education". Does the Cabinet member agree with the headteachers and the points outlined in their letter?

Reply

Many schools and community groups feel selective education would not be consistent with their values and Surrey's inclusive approach; the council recognises the strength of feeling within Surrey's education community on this matter.

Surrey's schools have also reaffirmed their commitment to moving forward together and building on the effective partnership working already taking place across the county. Strong partnerships have helped to drive a significant increase in the number of good and outstanding schools in the county and the Council will continue to support the development of local partnerships wherever possible.

Despite Surrey's success, we know there are areas in which we still need to see outcomes improve. We must maintain our focus on providing the right support for vulnerable learners – including those with special educational needs and disabilities – while also ensuring the most able pupils can realise their potential.

Sharing expertise and resources through effective partnerships will help us to meet the needs of individuals. Surrey's children and young people already benefit from peer-to-peer and cross-sector collaboration - as demonstrated by the development of Surrey's first UTC - and it is vital that we continue to harness knowledge and expertise across all sectors of education.

Surrey County Council is committed to supporting schools to build on their strengths and in so doing make the transition to a sustainable schools-led system. The Council will also continue to protect and promote the principle of choice, helping schools to reach the right local decisions for their children and young people.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

The cross-party Communities and Local Government Select Committee, in its report on devolution to cities & regions stated that:

"We believe elected Mayors are likely to be better suited to urban areas. The scale, geography and economic diversity of non-metropolitan areas mean elected Mayors are unlikely to be an easy fit. Local areas should be allowed to decide whether or not they wish to have an elected Mayor. Those which do not want an elected Mayor, but nonetheless want substantial devolved powers, should be allowed to propose an equally strong alternative model of governance". Does the Leader agree with this?

Reply

Seeking devolution of powers from central government that deliver improvements for residents and our businesses is my priority, rather than focusing on forms of governance.

I recognise that for the ambitious devolution of responsibilities from government we are seeking, appropriate and proportionate governance arrangements will need to be agreed. I can confirm that all Councils will be involved in the decision about the form

this might take – but these decisions can only be made when the detail of any deal is known.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

Surrey County Council currently offers borough and district councils Recycling Credits to encourage high recycling rates across Surrey. Please will the Cabinet Member confirm if the County Council will be reviewing its Recycling Credits system?

Reply

The need to make changes to the current financial arrangements for waste management has been discussed within the Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) and by Surrey Chief Executives since the beginning of 2015 as the current system is no longer working to improve recycling and has led to a net cost transfer to the county council. SCC and the SWP have identified that significant savings and improvements for residents can be made by changing the way in which waste is managed in the county.

A business case developed by the SWP proposes that waste services are delivered via a new partnership arrangement which is collectively owned by SCC and Surrey's district and borough councils. This would mean the benefits gained by working together would be shared across all authorities.

Whilst work on delivering this approach continues, SCC is committed to working with district and borough councils to collectively develop new financial arrangements from 2018/19 onwards, which would replace recycling credits and a number of other financial transfers. This new system would need to consider the true cost of waste management, share these costs equitably across all authorities and effectively incentivise performance improvement.

SCC Cabinet will discuss a paper on this subject on 13 December 2016.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

Pharmacies provide a vital service to people all over the county, alleviating pressure on the NHS and GPs, and giving face-to-face, professional healthcare advice without an appointment. The Department of Health (DH) has proposed budget cuts to the subsidy provided to pharmacies of £170m nationally to take effect from December 2016. How many pharmacies in Surrey does the Cabinet member estimate are at risk of closure as a result of these cuts?

Reply

Colleagues at NHS England in the South East Community Pharmacy team are responsible for overseeing and commissioning community pharmacy. They have advised that they are unable to give a definitive number of pharmacies at risk of closure, however they are continuing to work and support community pharmacies across Surrey and the rest of South East.

This is a link to a Government document that sets out the package of reforms that has been developed and approved by Department of Health Ministers, following consultation with the Pharmaceutical Services Negotiating Committee (PSNC) and other key stakeholders, including patient and public representatives. There is a list of pharmacies in the annexe that could be affected by the national changes as they are in rural areas. These pharmacies will get protected supplementary payment to mitigate against the threat of closure.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-pharmacy-reforms>

I am following this up with the Community Pharmacy Contracts Manager and as soon as I hear anything more concrete will let you know, by way of a written response.

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

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

The Council's Constitution outlines a "Strategy Against Fraud & Corruption". Can the Cabinet Member outline the amount of money lost to fraud over the last 5 years and what monies, if any, were recovered? How many prosecutions have been secured over the last 5 years and what was the penalty in each case?

Reply

The council is committed to a zero tolerance policy in relation to fraud and corruption.

In the period from 1 April 2011 to 30 November 2016 (which covers five full financial years plus the current year to date) the total known amount of money lost to Surrey County Council through fraud loss (including theft) is £586,394.

In the same period, a total of £322,317 has been recovered from the perpetrators of these fraudulent acts. Additionally, there is one case still in court where the council anticipates a further recovery of £162,000 of public funds.

These totals necessarily reflect only the known cases of fraud, and cannot therefore be a summary of all fraud that may have occurred within the last five years.

A total of 12 cases have been referred to the police in this period, some of which are still on-going. In each case, the decision to prosecute rests with the Crown Prosecution Service and not with the council.

Known outcomes from police referrals include:

- 1 case of community service
- 1 court case dismissed due to police procedural issues
- 1 individual arrested but no charge brought
- 3 cases where no further action was brought
- 3 cautions given out
- 1 custodial sentence
- 2 cases are on-going

A refreshed Counter Fraud Strategy and Framework was reviewed by the Audit and Governance Committee on Monday and a report on completed fraud investigations is presented by Internal Audit to the Audit and Governance Committee twice yearly.

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

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

Please can you provide details as to how much of the money saved through the Family, Friends and Community Support scheme to reduce care packages for Surrey residents has been used to provide improved services for residents in the community? In particular please can you confirm:

- a) How the amount of funding provided by Surrey County Council to the voluntary, community and faith sector through the Adult Social Care and Public Health budget has changed since the introduction of this scheme; and
- b) What level of financial reduction to the work packages for Surrey residents have been realised for each year to date and what is currently forecast for this financial year in the categories of: physical & sensory disabilities, learning disabilities, mental health and substance misuse and older people?

Reply

- a) The Family, Friends and Community (FFC) support programme commenced in 2014/15. The amount spent by Adult Social Care (ASC) on grants to voluntary, community, faith and other support organisations in 2014/15 was £8.3m. The amount forecast to be spent by ASC on grants in 2016/17 is £6.8m. The reduction in grant expenditure is due to two main factors. Firstly, one stream of the FFC programme has been the promotion of corporate social responsibility. This has focused on highlighting that the council is not the only funding source for the third sector and working with business to encourage them to invest in supporting local organisations in their areas. This will enable a shift in some investment from the council to local businesses. Secondly, ASC has conducted a review of all contracts and grants in 2016/17 to analyse current performance and assess the equalities impacts of any changes to funding levels. This review has resulted in reductions in some contracts and grants, many of which reflect more efficient practice or commissioning rather than a reduction in the overall service offer.
- b) A fundamental aspect of the FFC programme has been to adapt the social care assessment process to encourage residents to utilise support that is freely available through family, friends or community assets, and in doing so deliver better outcomes at less cost by developing a better support network for people’s care and placing less reliance on the local authority. Ensuring people’s eligible care need are being met remains at the heart of the social care assessment process.

The table below outlines the savings achieved through the FFC approach to assessments since the start of the programme split across the main care groups.

Care Group	2014/15 £m	2014/15 £m	2015/16 £m	2016/17* £m
Older people (all care 65+)	0.9	1.0	1.3	0.9
Physical & Sensory Disabilities (26-64)	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.1
Learning Disabilities (26-64)	0.4	0.4	1.7	0.4

Transition (18-25)	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.2
Mental Health & Substance Misuse (18-64)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total Adult Social Care	1.7	2.4	4.4	1.7

** Up to the end of October 2016*

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

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

How many children in Surrey are 'home-educated'? To what extent is the County responsible for their education and what checks and supervision procedures does the County have in place?"

Reply

As at 30 November 2016 there were 686 children registered for Elective Home Education (EHE). Children who are withdrawn from school need to be registered with the Local Authority (LA), a parent must write to the Headteacher requesting that their child is de-registered and confirming that it is their intention to home educate their child. If a child has never been registered for a school place then they are not lawfully required to be registered with the LA.

The Education Act 1996 Section 7 states that a parent must ensure that their child receives education that is full-time, efficient and suitable. There are no statutory definitions for these requirements. A parent can lawfully refuse to have any contact with the LA regarding the provision of home education. There is no statutory duty to monitor home education and the Surrey EHE Team cannot insist on seeing either a child or examples of a child's work or ask for evidence of a timetable of learning activities unless it is made known to the LA that "...it appears that the parents are not providing a suitable education..."

Surrey has an EHE Team comprising of one full time senior officer, one half time and term time only worker and one half time admin worker. The Team works collaboratively with colleagues in Early Help, Children Services, Education Welfare Service, Health and Police Services to address concerns where they are made known to the LA.

The Surrey EHE Team is working hard to encourage families who have chosen not to register to make themselves known to the LA wherever possible; for example there is a working practice in place with Surrey hospitals (A&E) who routinely alert the LA when an unregistered home educating family come to notice and we seek to establish contact with these families and encourage registration with the LA..

When it becomes clear that following support, advice and guidance that a family is not able to provide fulltime, efficient or suitable education for their children (either within the family or through provision of Tutors) the Surrey EHE Team will discuss this with the family and advise that the child must be removed from the Elective Home Education Register and needs to be returned to a school setting. The responsibility for a child is then passed to colleagues in the Education Welfare Service.

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

(14) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK (2ND):

Given that the current street lighting contract allows for technical innovation, will the Cabinet member explore how new technologies could help save Surrey money over the lifetime of the contract, and reduce the county council's carbon footprint?

Reply

Officers have been and will continue to review opportunities to save money and reduce our carbon footprint on street lighting. One of the biggest opportunities for Local Authorities to reduce energy consumption is through the installation of a Central Management System to dynamically control the street lights.

Being one of the first Councils to adopt this technology in 2010, we have been able to dim lights since they were replaced during the first 5 years of the PFI contract. It also enabled us to extend the dimming of lights by an hour to commence at ten o'clock each night in October 2015 saving £90,000 per year and Members will be aware we have recently begun switching off lights in Residential roads from midnight to 0500 each night which, when completed will save a further £220,000 each year.

The energy pressures facing Local Authorities means the industry is adapting and developing new technologies to combat these however, things like solar and wind power or sensor controlled lighting are not yet proven to be cost effective on a large scale.

LED replacements provide the greatest opportunity to reduce energy consumption however the Council would need to fund the Capital replacement costs of any conversion programme. Officers are currently revisiting opportunities to replace higher wattage lanterns on traffic routes to evaluate whether the savings generated will provide a quick enough payback to make this viable.

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

(15) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK (2ND):

I understand that Devon County Council have adopted a scheme of Road Wardens who are trained to repair small potholes before they grow big enough to be a danger to cyclists and damage cars. Has Surrey County Council considered adopting a similar scheme?

Reply

For a number of years the County Council has successfully operated a "Localism" initiative where Parish Councils, Town Councils or constituted Resident Associations can work with us to undertake a range of routine highway maintenance functions. The Road Warden scheme for Devon operates with their Parish Councils and, at the moment is a trial. It should be noted that in both Surrey and Devon neither of these initiatives replace the formal highway inspection and repair regime, but compliment it.

If there are specific requests forthcoming from Parish or Town Councils via our established localism arrangements, I have asked Officers to carefully consider them.

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

(16) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK (2ND):

Please can the Cabinet Member confirm what is the Council's full bill for the failed legal challenge of Windsor and Maidenhead Council's decision to ban HGV movement on Windsor Road?

Reply

The outcome of any litigation is always uncertain. We challenged the introduction of the weight limit on this stretch of road on a number of grounds, but unfortunately were not successful. As a result we will pay our own costs and those of RBWM, a total of £21,700.

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

(17) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK (2ND):

In the past year the County Council has conducted a speed survey in Hollow Lane, Wotton, Dorking which concluded that it would be appropriate for the speed limit to be reduced on this rural lane from the national default speed limit to a 40mph speed limit. The County Council has thus placed this potential speed reduction on the list of proposed schemes which will be considered for implementation in the future but has decided not to fund the implementation of the lower speed limit in the next financial year.

Would the Cabinet member for Highways and Flooding agree with me that it is a waste of money for the County Council to fund and carry out such initial survey work only to put the proposed scheme resulting from the survey work onto an unfunded projects list and would he agree that the situation that we currently have where projects have to separately bid for survey funding and then for implementation funding is evidence that the Department he runs is inefficient, out of control, and wasteful in its spending in that some projects which have been developed up to implementation stage are never actually implemented?

To address this, will the Cabinet Member identify additional funding for proposed schemes where the initial survey work has been carried out and where schemes have been approved for future implementation by Local Committees so that these schemes are actually implemented in the next year?

Reply

Speed surveys are carried out by the Local Area Teams for two main reasons. The first main reason is where there has been a request for a speed limit reduction. The survey is carried out to establish if the measured mean speeds comply with the County Council's Speed Limit Policy for a reduction in speed limit. The second main reason is where there is a perceived traffic speeding problem on a stretch of road. A speed

survey is carried out to gather evidence to determine if a scheme for speed reducing measures would be appropriate, before prioritisation.

Surrey Police are consulted on the survey locations, when a survey is carried out as a result of a request to reduce a speed limit. This is because the Police would be responsible for enforcement of the reduced speed limit if the speed limit reduction proposal is progressed.

Traffic speed surveys are a revenue funded activity and each Local Committee allocates funding for approximately 13 speed surveys in each year. The cost of each survey is approximately £180. The locations of the surveys are prioritised and are at the discretion of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of each Local Committee. Traffic speed surveys are one element that can inform the feasibility process for a highway scheme. Funding of feasibility, design and implementation is prioritised by the Local Committee within the available capital schemes budget. This is on a two year rolling forward programme that allows for design and implementation, and is based on the proposed capital funding allocation from the approved Medium Term Financial Plan. Surrey County Council has an approved Speed Limit Policy which sets out the criteria under which a reduction in speed limit by signs alone would be considered. The policy requires that the length of road over which a speed limit change would be considered should be at least 600m in length. This is to ensure against too many speed limit changes that could be confusing to the motorist along a length of road.

Existing speeds are then required to be measured using over a 7 day continuous period using automatic survey equipment. A traffic speed survey was carried out on Hollow Lane on 23 June to 29 June 2016, and the data from this survey has already been shared with you, as the Divisional Member. The measured existing mean speed was compared to a threshold set out in the policy and was found to be below the threshold, which meant that the council could consider reducing the speed limit. However, this would still be subject to consideration of other factors such as the specific location constraints, and prioritisation within the Local Committee limited budget.

The speed limit reduction proposal would require the installation of terminal 40mph signs at the start and end of the road, and 40mph repeater signs at regular intervals to advise motorists of the speed limit and to enable the Police to enforce the order. The entire length of the road is in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Through the de-cluttering initiative, the number of signs installed in the AONB is to be reduced wherever possible. This proposal has not had feasibility design, as it has not been prioritised for inclusion on the Local Committee forward programme. Only schemes that have been included on the forward programme have funding allocated for design and implementation.

Although the proposed 40mph speed limit is appropriate for this road, this proposal has not been prioritised through the Local Committee above other proposals. However, the scheme has been placed on the ITS list for consideration for future funding. This request has been assessed alongside all the other demands and previous commitments for Local Committee funding. It is appropriate and proportionate to carry out traffic speed surveys to gather the evidence to assess whether a road would comply with Surrey's Policy and reduce the speed limit. It is also appropriate for this data to be used to determine if a proposal could proceed to feasibility design stage and inform local priorities for capital funding allocation within the Local Committee.

In terms of funding, the draft Highways Forward Programme 17/18 – 18/19 set out the detail for Mole Valley ITS prioritised schemes budget allocation at the Informal Local

Committee on 16 November 2016. This was based on the capital funding for Local Committees allocated through the Medium Term Financial Plan. It should be noted, however, that the Council's financial position is very serious, and Capital funding available for Local Committees will need to be determined as part of the current financial planning process.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(18) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK (2ND):

Please can the Leader provide an update as to the number of Syrian refugee households supported so far in Surrey as part of the government's Syrian vulnerable person's relocation scheme?

Reply

I thank Mr Essex for this question and providing me with the opportunity to update Members on the important work underway in Surrey to support the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme.

Surrey responded positively to the Government's invitation to participate in the Scheme, with work being led by our District and Borough colleagues and actively supported by County Council services. The majority of District and Boroughs have committed to taking a set number of families per year, reflecting the limited affordable accommodation available. Projections are for **up to 137 families** to be settled over the 5 years of the programme. This compares very favourably with other areas of the South East and other counties.

There is a strong and proactive multi-agency group co-ordinating the programme across Surrey, including participating District and Boroughs, County Council services, schools, health, mental health, the police and voluntary and faith sector. We carefully balance the commitment we have already made to the Syrian programme with our agreed priorities and commitments to the County and its residents.

I hope you will join with me to thank all our partner organisations for their continued commitment to this work.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(19) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK (3RD):

I am sure the Cabinet Member is aware of the Stop Funding Hate campaign. Please will the Cabinet Member ensure that the Council stops buying copies of the Daily Express, Daily Mail and The Sun for its libraries?

Reply

Libraries in Surrey take a range of daily newspapers (broadsheets and red-tops) covering all political views. In the larger libraries the selection of titles is understandably wider, and we try to offer a balanced range of reading material, but with reductions in funding this is not possible in our smaller libraries.

As with our book stock, the library service has to be careful not to censor material that has been legally published in the U.K.

If, in response to the Stop Funding Hate media campaign, libraries in Surrey were to stop taking these papers there may be a reaction from some residents against this censorship. Whatever one may feel individually about the content of some of these tabloids, they are legitimately published in this country.

The Council is working with its partners to prevent hate crime, encouraging reporting and providing support to victims.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

The County Council a number of years ago ran a major project to develop safe walking routes to schools.

In 2010 in Chalkpit Lane, Dorking (the A2003) the Crossing Patrol Officer retired and the post was withdrawn as, principally, it was deemed to have become unsafe to have a crossing patrol at this point on this road. There is, however, no alternative crossing point for children walking between the main population centre in the centre of the town and St Martins School.

The County Council this September considered a controlled crossing at this point on Chalkpit Lane and, following St Martins School presenting a significant petition to the Local Committee, has placed the scheme on the ITS list for potential future funding. However, the implementation of such a controlled crossing is unlikely to happen in the near future.

Would the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding agree with me that safe walking routes to schools is one of the highest priorities for this Council and will he look for additional funding to allow a controlled crossing to be installed on the A2003 in Dorking to link the main population area of the town and the school in the next financial year?

Reply

Chalkpit Lane in Dorking forms part of the A2003 which links the A25 with the A24. It is a single carriageway road through a residential area with a 30mph speed limit. The section of the A2003 Chalkpit Lane, in the vicinity of the Triangle Stores, has residential properties, shops and businesses on both sides. There is an existing informal pedestrian crossing point at this location. This is a pedestrian refuge island in the centre of the road, with dropped kerbs at the edge of the pavement on both sides.

A site meeting, to assess the safety of the existing crossing facility and investigate possible improvements on the A2003 Chalkpit Lane in the vicinity of the Triangle Stores, was held in February 2014. The site meeting was attended by the local Divisional Member, officers from the Council's Sustainable Travel Team and Local Highways Team, the Headteacher of St Martin's School and parents of pupils from St Martin's School. Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team were advised of the findings and outcome of this meeting.

Since the site meeting, held in February 2014, Surrey County Council has introduced a Road Safety Outside Schools policy. It was therefore agreed at the Local Committee

meeting on 2nd March 2016 to carry out a safety assessment as outlined in this policy. A second site meeting, as part of that assessment, was held on 14th September 2016 and was attended by the local Divisional Member, officers from the Council's School Sustainable Travel Team, Local Highways Team, Safety Engineering Team and Surrey Police.

A review of the reported personal injury collisions shows that there has been 1 reported personal injury collision in Chalkpit Lane, resulting in a slight injury, during the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 01/07/2013 to 30/04/2016). This collision involved a cyclist falling from their bike as a result of a car turning right across their path.

A petition was presented to the formal November meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee on the 16th November 2016. The Petitioners requested that priority be given to the scheme for a formalised pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane, and funding be allocated from the Local Committee budget, so that the scheme could be constructed in the 2017/18 financial year. The Local Committee, although sympathetic to the request, did not prioritise this crossing request above other schemes in Mole Valley.

This scheme, for a formalised crossing, is on the Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) list for consideration for possible future funding. However, it has not been prioritised over other schemes for inclusion on the draft Highways Forward Programme of schemes for feasibility & detailed design, and implementation, during 2017/18 and 2018/19 financial years. Feasibility design of a formal pedestrian crossing at this location would need to consider the impact of the crossing on traffic congestion in Dorking town centre.

The draft Highways Forward Programme 17/18 – 18/19 set out the detail for Mole Valley ITS prioritised schemes budget allocation at the Informal Local Committee on 16 November 2016. The capital funding for Local Committees has been allocated through the Medium Term Financial Plan that forms part of the County Council's corporate planning processes. The Council approved the County Council's budgets for 2016-21 on 22 March 2016.

The scheme could potentially be funded by a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) bid but this would have to be prioritised alongside other schemes. The scheme would be subject to further analysis to ensure suitability, and match funding would need to be identified and prioritised.

The school crossing patrol site as mentioned above was inherited by the service when the Sustainability Group took over responsibility 15 years ago. The site was patrolled until 2010 when the officer retired. There have been numerous attempts to recruit to this site both locally and countywide which have been unsuccessful which reflects the picture across the county. Despite this site being unmanned all site visit observations have shown that pedestrians are crossing safely while using the refuge.

Following initial site visits the Schools Sustainable Travel Team have delivered Pedestrian Awareness Training to the school. They have also participated in Bikeability Level 2 training for their year 6 pupils and have booked Level 1 and Pedals for year 2 in the New Year.

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

(21) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK (3RD):

In May 2014 this Council supported a motion to 'facilitate fair trade wherever possible'. Please can you provide an update as to what Surrey County Council has done since this date, including the council stocking Fairtrade in addition to other brands internally?

Reply

The commitment to ethical sourcing now forms part of the Councils Social Value procurement strategy, and the purchasing of sustainable products, including those with Fairtrade accreditation, are incorporated into our tender documents in compliance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015.

The Council continues to procure Fairtrade bananas, coffee and sugar as part of the ongoing commitment to supporting the motion to facilitate Fairtrade wherever possible.

Officers are actively working with existing suppliers to promote sustainability and ethical sourcing throughout the supply chain. The Council has Soil Association Food for Life (FFL) Gold accreditation for its catering services (including all food supply).

We are proud that the Fairtrade towns in Surrey include Addlestone, Dorking, Godalming, Guildford, Haslemere, Leatherhead, Lingfield & Dormansland, Rushmoor, Tatsfield and Woking.

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

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

Lyefield Lane was included as a road to be repaired in the latter years of the first phase of Project Horizon.

Two years ago I took the Chief Executive to see the condition of Lyefield Lane, Abinger, Dorking as an example of a road that was badly in need of repair within the County – a road that really could not wait any longer for reconstruction. Whilst we drove down the road, the Chief Executive expressed concern that my car would be damaged as the road was in such poor condition.

Lyefield Lane has continued to deteriorate and the "uneven road" signs at either end are becoming rather weather beaten. Just recently Lyefield Lane, rather than being resurfaced, has been moved into the "unfunded roads" list within Project Horizon.

Can the Cabinet Member for Highways and Flooding please consult with the Chief Executive and then explain why a road that the Chief Executive believes could easily damage vehicles driving slowly along it has not been repaired on a timely basis and will he give an assurance, as residents have waited patiently for a number of years for this road to be repaired (or, more appropriately, reconstructed) under Project Horizon, that Lyefield Lane will be repaired / reconstructed within the next twelve months? In the meantime, will the Cabinet Member confirm, as the County Council is clearly on notice of the extremely poor condition of this road, that the County Council will accept all claims for damage to cars caused by the failure of the road surface on Lyefield Lane?

Reply

All roads on the Horizon programme have been prioritised in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management and in accordance with the cabinet approved prioritisation process. The process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

Over the last 18 months the Asset Planning Team has been assessing all the remaining schemes on the Horizon programme. They have also assessed additional schemes generated from condition surveys. All the schemes (some 800+) have been prioritised against others countywide into a new 5 year list. Unfortunately the number of schemes involved means not all the schemes on prior Horizon lists will now appear on the new version.

Lyefield Lane did not score high enough to be included on the new 5 year list. Members do have the ability to nominate roads to be included in the remaining 20% of schemes however. It may be that Lyefield Lane is selected on this basis as it ranked 104 out of the 100 schemes selected for inclusion in the list on the basis of its condition. In the meantime it will continue to be inspected and any defects at intervention level will be repaired under routine maintenance processes.

This page is intentionally left blank