

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**TUESDAY 21 MARCH 2017****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL****(1) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:**

At the last Council meeting the Leader declined to release details of all his budget communications with MPs and the government.

In view of all that has happened since, does he now feel it would have been better to have been more honest and open in the first place?

Response:

I did not decline to release this information and all such requests have been handled via the Council's Freedom of Information process. The Council has published the FOI requests about council tax for 2017-18 and our responses are on the county council's website. This information is available to all members as well as the public.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**(2) MS NIKKI BARTON (HASLEMERE) TO ASK:**

Why is this Council investing £30 million of council taxpayers' money in the Brightwells Development, a scheme that for over fifteen years nobody in the private sector would invest in? What financial benefit has the Cabinet discovered which has not been evident thus far to the private sector?

Please provide a full written answer without referring me to Cabinet Papers.

Response:

The council's participation in the proposed regeneration is in line with its corporate priority of economic prosperity and is an opportunity to work with partners. The market based approach to the purchase is designed to ensure that the council is paying an appropriate price for the assets, with the level of return being commensurate with the risk.

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

(3) MR JOHN BECKETT (EWELL) TO ASK:

Epsom and Ewell Councillors have received many enquiries about the new part-night street lighting regime and one consistent point is raised time and time again. Trains through, and to, Epsom arrive at the Borough's 4 stations after 12 midnight and commuters and late night travellers are walking home in dark unlit streets. I do recognise that certain streets attached to stations remain lit but these are proving inadequate.

Concerned at these comments and the number raised by residents, Epsom and Ewell Local Committee asked officers to investigate. It has been advised that a change to a switch-off time of one hour later, to 1.00am, would cost just £5578 per year. Will the Cabinet member agree to authorise this change so that rail travellers returning to Epsom and Ewell between midnight and 1.00am continue to have the benefit of well-lit streets.

Response:

As a result of the need to make significant savings in the Council's budget, the Cabinet has taken the decision to implement part night lighting in residential areas to contribute to this. The timings (from midnight to 0500) not only reflect the reduced vehicle and pedestrian traffic on the Council's roads during this time but also policies in place or being introduced elsewhere in the UK.

As noted by Mr Beckett where trains or buses arrive close to or later than midnight or before 0500, lights that would otherwise be switched off in the near vicinity will be left on later or turned off earlier to accommodate this. Generally speaking, in the case of trains, this will provide a route from the station to a primary traffic route which will remain lit all night. However beyond that, it is impossible to accommodate all roads to allow for possible journeys that might be made on foot or by car from the station to the ultimate destination without amending the overall policy and impacting on the planned savings as described above.

As the media has recently publicised, through discussion with Surrey Police and Road Safety teams, in excess of 4,000 lights have been excluded from the programme. Residents who have concerns about specific roads can request that the decision be reviewed and the process is detailed on the Council's website. However generally speaking decisions are only likely to be overturned if new information is presented or something was missed during the site surveys.

Mr Beckett highlights that the cost of keeping the lights on for Epsom and Ewell alone would be in excess of £5500 per annum at today's prices. However such a change as suggested would not only be applicable to Epsom and Ewell but to the whole County. Any decision to change this either to exclude a specific group of lights or to start later will inevitably reduce the amount of savings and require even greater savings to be made elsewhere in the Council's budget. For example, amending the policy to commence switch off at 0100 across

Surrey would reduce the expected savings by around £40000-50000 per year – a figure that would need to be found elsewhere

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

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

You will be aware of the letter from representatives of the Simon Trust who have offered up to £800,000 of funds to help establish a high quality community social unit for autistic children/adults at the Lindon Farm site. The letter gives a disturbing account of non-co-operation from Surrey County Council and of broken promises and a disregard for the interests of those concerned with the Simon Trust by SCC.

What is now being done to address and put matters on a proper considerate base, in relation to the 9 points in the Simon Trust letter addressed to the Chairman of the Council, the Chief Executive and the local M.P?

Response:

The Simon Trust - Mr and Mrs Lawrence are the parents of Simon Lawrence, a young adult with autism and high support needs. Simon is resident at Prior's Court and is due to leave in Summer 2018. Mr and Mrs Lawrence were instrumental in finding Lindon Farm and in developing a business case which resulted in the Council acquiring the property. The Simon Trust is a registered charity which was set up in 2015 with the aim of raising over £500,000 towards creating a home for adults with severe autism and complex needs in Surrey. Mr & Mrs Lawrence are members of the Stakeholder Group which acts as a sounding board and critical friend for the development at Lindon Farm.

Vision - The Simon Trust has a vision for Lindon Farm as a centre of excellence for adults with autism, with an activity centre, a mini-farm, woodland and with activities being made available to other disabled people in the local community. The Council has a slightly different vision. It sees Lindon Farm as people's homes, so not be open to the local community, and with residents wherever possible going out to use local community facilities which reflect their individual needs and interests. It is about creating a balance of activities for individuals at home and in their local community.

Design team - The Council has employed a design team of specialist consultants and advisors to work alongside our in-house staff. The Council awarded the contract for the design of the development to Haverstock Associates LLP. Haverstock are widely regarded as one of the leading architects in the design of buildings for people with special education needs and have delivered a number of autism specialist projects. Prior's Court, a specialist school with supported living and a learning environment for young adults, is providing advice to the Council on a consultancy basis. Six of the young people who have been offered tenancies at Lindon Farm currently live at Prior's Court, including Simon Lawrence, so this has enabled us to ensure the design, space and facilities will meet their needs.

Stakeholder Group – The Council holds regular joint meetings with the Stakeholder Group and they have been engaged on all the key decisions. The Council has for example taken on-board their suggestion to include individual lounges in the shared flats, replaced the pond with an underground water storage facility and included a

horticultural area. Members of the Stakeholder Group participated in our engagement with the local community, have attended planning application meetings and are invited to the turf cutting event.

Investment and pace – The Council has made significant progress since the decision to acquire the site in August 2015. Detailed feasibility and costing work has been completed, which showed that an all-new build facility was the best option with existing buildings to be demolished. Detailed work on the financial case enabled officers to demonstrate that a high quality scheme costing c £5.5m to construct was both feasible and deliverable resulting in full business case approval by Cabinet on 21 June 2016. Further detailed design and evaluation work paved the way for a successful planning application with consent being obtained on 11 January 2017 'subject to conditions' to build long term supported living accommodation for ten young adults with autism and high support needs at Lindon Farm in Alfold.

Space – The provision of large spaces at Lindon Farm has been a key objective for Mr and Mrs Lawrence. In response, the Council's design team has tried to maximise the size of the rooms. For example, in the shared flat for three young people, the bedrooms are 13m² and 17m², the en-suites 6m², the individual lounges 10m²; the shared kitchen/diner 25m², and the shared lounge 18m². Adult Social Care believes the accommodation and space is appropriate for the young people who have been offered tenancies. During the last couple of months as the designs have been finalised, any adjustments to the internal areas have been kept to a minimum but the build-up of internal wall thicknesses and brick/stone setting out have resulted in slight changes. There has been no change to the overall gross internal floor area and room sizes are significantly larger than the equivalent spaces at Priors Court.

Commuted sum – The Council will fund the baseline scheme which will meet the needs of the tenants at Lindon Farm. The Council has invited The Simon Trust to fund items to personalise and enhance Lindon Farm. Items suggested include a sensory garden, greenhouse, basketball area, chicken coop, water features, benches, fruit cages, trampoline, swing etc. All these items will become the responsibility of the Council and will have a financial implication in terms of future revenue funding for inspection, maintenance, insurance costs etc. Cumulatively this could add up to a significant sum. The Council has not made provision for these additional costs in its financial plan and is unable to commit tax payer's money to fund these additional on-going costs, particularly at a time when we face unprecedented financial pressures. We have therefore asked The Simon Trust for a commuted sum to cover these additional costs for a reasonable period.

MR RICHARD WALSH, CABINET MEMBER FOR LOCALITIES AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING

(5) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK:

In your reply to my first question (No.11) at Full Council on February 7th you seem to have misread my words. I wanted to know how far we are from returning the CPL borrowing figures to the level they were before they were converted into Community Partnered Libraries. This you did not achieve. The figures I give below on chart A together with the figures at the top of chart B. would indicate that only Warlingham (which is a special case with paid professional staff) has managed to come anywhere near meeting the level of borrowing achieved before they became a CPL. The remainder have fallen back by as much as 30-40% with little sign that they are now increasing.

You claimed that the 10 CPL libraries were chosen as they were "experiencing low and declining use". The figures at the top of Chart A would confirm this except for Lingfield which shows growth of just over 16% over a four year period. The figures at the bottom of Chart A are from a random 14 of the staffed Libraries which show declines generally as bad as the CPL's for the period 2005-09 yet they were not regarded as CPL material. Why?

In your reply to my second question you again seem to have failed to understand what I was seeking. In February 2011 at the Communities and Safety Select Committee the Head of Cultural Services stated that "the savings of removing staff from the 11 Libraries would be around £400,000." However according to figures provided by SCC under Freedom of Information requests, the annual total costs of the CPL cost centre - now the Customer Network Lead - which supports the CPL initiative exceeded £400,000 in the three 2012/13 to 2014/15 and £356,00 in 2015/16. Could you please explain how any savings have been achieved?

Chart A

Surrey CPL Issues 2004/5 and 2008/9

	2004/5	2008/9
Bagshot	13793	16705*
Bramley	35392	29928
Byfleet	35294	35886*
Ewell Court	43097	34589
New Haw	45993	41843
Stoneleigh	43036	38237
Tattenhams	57135	48415
Virginia Water	18980	22891*
Warlingham	34370	25690
Lingfield	14174	16685*
*increase over 5 years prior to PVR		

	2004/5	2008/9
Banstead	198733	143060
Camberley	332565	218566
Cranleigh	130368	95991
Dorking	225304	180061
Epsom	311984	226454
Farnham	241223	188122
Guildford	386419	294642
Haslemere	124837	86383
Horley	185292	145566
Redhill	288220	225957
Staines	192184	139583
Stanwell	14451	12450
Weybridge	158209	102215
Woking	562125	376880

Chart B
Borrowing from Surrey CPL's

	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Bagshot	16002	15436	14827	12150	10860	11058	12577
Bramley	27839	25155	21755	19665	18696	17218	20581
Byfleet	31417	38359	35514	26072	23555	24197	24412
Ewell Court	31458	31634	28623	26263	22958	16433	20420
New Haw	41440	39562	36800	30250	27434	30856	33189
Stoneleigh	38118	38584	33727	28644	27419	27831	27465
Tattenhams	45863	39526	42501	33737	31497	34720	30747
Virginia Water	19237	17941	14293	12603	12077	14336	14126
Warlingham	25499	25916	24184	21567	21561	23550	23896
Lingfield	17338	17428	16310	16745	18531	19749	17779

Response:

The methodology of the library review in 2010/11 which established which libraries would become CPLs was fully audited and subsequently the council policy on implementation in July 2012 was fully debated at the time.

Although a range of measures were used to decide which libraries were proposed for community partnered arrangements they all had low levels of use and many had declining use, which was not by itself a defining criterion.

The objective of the CPL initiative was not explicitly to address levels of use but to keep these libraries open. There are currently in the SCC managed network a number of libraries where use has declined but these libraries account for a larger proportion of the total network volumes and serve larger communities.

Regarding the staff savings achieved by the CPL initiative these have been fully audited. The savings target was permanently taken off the baseline of the annual revenue budget of the library service. As has been highlighted in earlier correspondence any management support costs attributed to these libraries via a cost centre would be in place regardless of their operational model, and the support given to the CPLs has been an important factor in their successful continuance.

The volunteers at a number of CPLs have, with the hard work and commitment they are able to devote to their local library, been able to achieve some success in reversing trends in downward use. The situation at Lingfield is noted and the partnership between the library service and the local library steering group, now established and working well, aspires to remedy the situation.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Will the Leader of the Council confirm the date he will release the full written CIPFA report on financial resilience, which cost tax-payers £25K, to all county councillors?

Response:

We aim to make the report available by the end of the day Tuesday 21 March 2017.

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

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

Will the Cabinet Member outline the extra funds for social care for Surrey announced in the Spring Budget over the next 3 years? How does this funding compare to the amounts received by

Hertfordshire
West Sussex
East Sussex
Essex
Kent

in each of the 3 years?

Response:

The Chancellor announced additional funding for social care in his Spring Budget Statement. Nationally an additional £1 billion pounds is being provided to local authorities with social care responsibilities in 2017/18. The additional funding reduces nationally to £674 million in 2018/19 and then to £337 million in 2019/20.

This funding is on top of the improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) monies previously announced. It has been allocated to authorities taking into account the funding they are already receiving from the iBCF and the Adult Social Care precept (assuming that all authorities choose to levy the maximum precepts of 3% in 2017/18 and 2018/19). Due to this allocation methodology Surrey County Council's allocations of iBCF and the additional social care funding are considerably lower than would be the case if these funding streams were allocated purely based on the relative needs of the local population. This is because Surrey receives relatively more income through the ASC precept than most authorities.

The table below sets out the additional funding Surrey County Council is due to receive along with the other authorities that were requested. On a relative needs basis Surrey would have received £16.6 million in 2017/18, whereas the actual amount allocated to Surrey in 2017/18 is £7.5 million. The table also shows the total funding over the three years per head of 65+ population. Surrey is receiving significantly less per head than the other authorities outlined in the table and substantially less per head than the vast majority of other authorities across the country.

Local Authority	2017/18 £m	2018/19 £m	2019/20 £m	Total 2017-20	Total funding per head of 65+ population
Surrey	7.5	7.9	5.6	21.0	£97
Hertfordshire	13.0	11.6	5.8	30.5	£157
West Sussex	11.4	9.3	4.6	25.3	£136
East Sussex	11.0	7.3	3.6	22.0	£162
Essex	24.7	16.8	8.3	49.9	£171
Kent	26.1	17.5	8.7	52.3	£174

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

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

What representations, whether by email, phone call, letter or in person, has the Cabinet Member made to Government regarding the 75% cut in the Education Services Grant?

Response:

Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills, and Educational Achievement, raised the council's concerns regarding the ceasing of the Education Services Grant and the potential impact of the national funding formula directly with Sam Gyimah (then Parliamentary Under Secretary at the DfE) last year. She also raised these issues with the Regional Schools Commissioner.

Additionally, David Hodge, Leader of the council sent a letter to Sam Gyimah on 5 April 2016 reiterating Surrey's concerns about the reductions in Education Services Grant and other proposed changes to schools funding. Sam Gyimah responded on 10 May 2016.

On 9 May 2016 the Leader met with Nicky Morgan, then Secretary of State for Education, to discuss these issues further. Notes indicate that he gained assurances that a process had been put in place to find a positive way forward on education reforms and other key issues.

MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR WELLBEING AND HEALTH

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

In September 2017, the Cabinet agreed to a new contract for the "Provision of an Integrated Sexual Health Service" for Surrey. Can the Cabinet Member explain where in the papers that were agreed by her and her colleagues does it mention that contraception clinics at [Caterham](#) Dene Hospital, Cobham Hospital, [Dorking](#) Hospital, Epsom Clinic, [Horley](#) Young People's Centre and [Oxted](#) Therapies Unit will close?

Can she confirm whether there are proposals to close clinics in Leatherhead, Chertsey and Frimley Green? Does it also mean the closure of the southern clinics at Camberley Health Centre, Guildford's Jarvis centre and seven sites in North West Surrey including Molesey Clinic, Staines Health centre, Stanwell Health and Community Centre, Sunbury Health Centre, Walton Health Centre, Weybridge Health Centre and Woking Hospital?

Response:

The Cabinet decision in September 2016 was to award the contract for an integrated sexual health service for Surrey consisting of hub, spoke and outreach services following a competitive tendering process. The service specification reflected local engagement work with clinicians, staff and patients undertaken throughout the early part of 2016 to tailor this to meet local needs. This included a well-attended Concept Day, a 'Surrey Says' survey and a Market Engagement Event.

The successful provider is required to ensure areas with the greatest need are where

services will be provided, based on the evidence from the sexual health needs assessment. The new service will have an emphasis on supporting young people with greater access to services and extended opening hours with online support. The new service will deliver an extended Outreach Programme with increased access to LARC (Long Acting Reversible Contraception), EHC (Emergency Hormonal Contraception) and STI (Sexually transmitted infections) testing and treatment. The provider will also be targeting support for the following high need groups: men who have sex with men (MSM), the Black African population and sex workers. The successful provider will be working with the Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups to identify where clinics will be run from as some of the existing premises are owned by the previous service providers and therefore not available for the successful provider.

The HIV element of the service (commissioned by NHS England) required further work during mobilisation. Due to the interdependencies between the HIV service and mainstream sexual health services, this has impacted on the speed of mobilisation of the service commissioned by Surrey County Council and the resulting communications which will be sent to all partners imminently and will be available on www.healthysurrey.org.uk.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

How many EU nationals currently work for Surrey County Council?

Response:

As of March 2017, the number of non-school EU national employees working for Surrey is 415 and the number of school EU national employees is 5. The total number of EU nationals currently working for Surrey is 420.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MR GEORGE JOHNSON (SHALFORD) TO ASK:

The average pay gap between the highest and lowest paid employees in the United Kingdom is reputed to be among the widest in Europe. In the interests of transparency and in order to demonstrate that Surrey County Council is not complicit in this unwelcome situation, will the Leader set out the average remuneration package of the ten highest paid full-time, permanent employees of the Council (excluding the Chief Executive), and, similarly, the average remuneration package of the ten lowest paid, full-time, permanent employees.

Response:

This information is already publically available to Mr Johnson. Figures relating to the remuneration of senior officers are published every July in the Annual Statement of Accounts and if Mr Johnson would like to refer to the Pay Policy Statement, which was in his December Council papers, and which is now available on our website, he will find the additional information he is requesting.

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

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

Please provide a full breakdown of highway spending, split by borough and district council area provided, in each of the last four years (including a budget or estimated figure for this year) under the following categories: a) resurfacing of roads, b) local structural repair and c) pothole filling d) pavement works and e) structures and for the budgeted amounts for the next year, broken down into the same categories.

Response:

a) Resurfacing of roads

Borough/District	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Elmbridge	3,967	4,598	4,187	1,093	159
Epsom & Ewell	434	1,653	2,792	1,896	2,235
Guildford	5,171	6,472	3,711	1,503	2,460
Mole Valley	5,445	4,692	5,862	4,945	127
Reigate & Banstead	2,438	5,622	5,243	2,466	3,212
Runnymede	282	3,587	475	273	177
Spelthorne	763	2,970	1,030	683	175
Surrey Heath	1,689	1,911	1,772	799	425
Tandridge	10,265	4,969	9,287	1,411	1,401
Waverley	4,137	4,907	2,984	1,391	1,913
Woking	2,349	3,205	1,521	253	648
	36,940	44,586	38,863	16,713	12,930

Figures above include, Major Maintenance (Horizon) and Surface Treatment Schemes Costs are included in above figures for LEP Resilience schemes in Tandridge (2015/16, & 17/18), Epsom & Ewell (2017/18) Mole Valley(2015/16 & 2016/17) & Reigate and Banstead (2017/18).

b) Local Structural Repair

Borough/District	£000 2013/14	£000 2014/15	£000 2015/16	£000 2016/17	£000 2017/18
Elmbridge	474	286	377	282	To be determined by local committees
Epsom & Ewell	237	146	44	128	
Guildford	334	121	0	25	
Mole Valley	162	164	188	134	
Reigate & Banstead	195	321	187	114	
Runnymede	128	0	151	185	
Spelthorne	309	81	172	177	
Surrey Heath	2	0	164	125	
Tandridge	141	168	142	162	
Waverley	98	52	0	5	
Woking	144	30	86	184	
	2,224	1,369	1,511	1,521	

c) Pothole Filling

Borough/District	£000 2013/14	£000 2014/15	£000 2015/16	£000 2016/17	£000 2017/18
Elmbridge	257	308	347	335	Not possible to forecast
Epsom & Ewell	85	210	210	193	
Guildford	188	331	360	322	
Mole Valley	352	333	457	449	
Reigate & Banstead	326	411	483	582	
Runnymede	54	67	83	93	
Spelthorne	115	167	178	163	
Surrey Heath	121	170	191	260	
Tandridge	242	273	306	394	
Waverley	368	400	500	435	
Woking	86	138	112	147	
	2,195	2,807	3,227	3,373	

Figures above include potholes in both roads and pavements.

As potholes are paid for via lump sum the figures above are reflective of the volumes of defects in each borough/district and costs have been apportioned as a percentage of each years lump sum.

d) Pavement Works

Borough/District	£000 2013/14	£000 2014/15	£000 2015/16	£000 2016/17	£000 2017/18
Elmbridge	186	143	207	398	30
Epsom & Ewell	81	500	360	687	420
Guildford	511	109	212	223	187
Mole Valley	29	0	46	469	107
Reigate & Banstead	152	73	186	1,758	884
Runnymede	100	29	43	133	145
Spelthorne	166	242	63	1,387	80
Surrey Heath	85	125	55	328	66
Tandridge	16	22	37	130	54
Waverley	82	16	16	79	230
Woking	12	72	23	58	170
	1,420	1,332	1,248	5,650	2,373

Figures above include Pavement Reconstruction and Pavement Slurry Schemes

e) Structures

Borough/District	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Elmbridge	1,048	399	13	22	400
Epsom & Ewell	0	13	0	0	120
Guildford	1,727	602	407	10	490
Mole Valley	2	629	673	1,280	200
Reigate & Banstead	16	35	72	14	100
Runnymede	344	141	0	0	0
Spelthorne	5,113	1,516	0	0	0
Surrey Heath	3	258	7	0	0
Tandridge	1,142	420	152	17	90
Waverley	1	252	331	35	300
Woking	0	186	1	0	0
Countywide*	200	106	201	2	400
	9596	4558	1857	1380	2100

Costs are included in above figures for LEP Resilience Structures work in Mole Valley (15/16).

Costs for Walton Bridge are included under Spelthorne although part of the structure is in Elmbridge.

*These costs cannot be apportioned to individual Boroughs/Districts

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

How much did the CIPFA study cost? Can all members have sight of it now?

Response:

As has previously been confirmed, this work cost £24,500 and we aim to make the report available by the end of the day, Tuesday 21st March 2017.

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

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

In your reply to my question at the meeting on February 7th you said "Property Services has the right mix of skills, qualifications, and experience to deliver the services it is responsible for". If this is the case then how is it that our tenant farmers are visited by Officers, representing themselves as County staff, but clearly not skilled in the way you suggest?

Response:

Property Services have a strong mix of qualified and professional staff. Contractors, where used, have also been through a corporate procurement selection process to ensure that they provide the right fit to meet the needs of the property delivery.

The service have no outstanding or current complaints raised by tenant farmers relating to not being able to represent their needs due to a lack of appropriate skill set. So therefore I'm unable to comment further upon specifics to which your question may relate.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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

The 465 bus is an essential service for residents in Mole Valley and there has been much speculation about the possibility of the Leatherhead to Dorking section of the service being abandoned as a consequence of the withdrawal of the Surrey CC subsidy for cross-boundary routes.

Would the responsible Cabinet member:

1. Confirm that more than half of the journeys on this route are made solely within the Surrey County Council area;
2. Agree that this provides a sound basis for the provision of a subsidy for this service;
3. Acknowledge that the withdrawal of the Leatherhead to Dorking part of the route would isolate communities between the two towns with no other bus service, create significant problems for pupils attending secondary schools in

- Leatherhead and Dorking and add to the already very heavy traffic congestion in Dorking town centre;
4. Report on the latest discussions regarding the future of this service between SCC and TfL

Response:

This council is managing a range of cost pressures in local bus provision alongside the delivery of the 3-year Local Transport Review. In managing this we have clearly demonstrated that we have maintained the services our residents rely on the most and that we have worked hard to minimise any adverse impact.

Work is now focusing on the long term future of our bus network, including the cross boundary Transport for London services, within the envelope of a balanced budget. I can confirm that no decision on the future of the 465 has been taken. This is subject to on-going discussions with Transport for London.

Regarding the level of patronage with fifty percent being made solely within the Surrey County Council area on route 465, the figures supplied by TfL does not show this.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

How much has the County Council spent on Special Responsibility Allowances for Cabinet Associate posts since they were created?

Response:

£192,820

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Please confirm the level of job and budget reductions that are planned as part of the proposed changes to all of the different parts of Surrey County Council services, as part of the budget for 2017-18 passed at the February 2017 Council meeting. In particular please confirm details of proposed staffing and budget reductions for the 2017-18 year in adult social care, children's care and in the children and families directorates.

Response:

A summary of Surrey County Council's gross expenditure budgets for 2016/17 and 2017/18 shows expenditure on social care for adults and for children is rising. Other council services' expenditure reduces over this period.

Gross expenditure budget	2016/17	2017/18	Change
	£m	£m	£m
Schools & SEND	229.9	234.3	4.4
Children's services	104.7	112.8	8.0
Commissioning & Prevention	98.1	107.7	9.6
Children, Schools & Families (CSF) excluding delegated schools	432.7	454.7	22.0
Adult Social Care	437.4	460.8	23.3
Services other than ASC and CSF	426.8	416.0	-10.9
Surrey County Council excluding delegated schools	1297.0	1331.5	34.5

The level of budget reductions and full time equivalent employees for each service will form a part of the cabinet papers for the meeting on 28 March 2017.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(18) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK: (3rd question)

Will the Council list its current membership by age brackets i.e. how many councillors are aged 21-30, 31-40 etc. What is the mean age for members of Surrey County Council?

Response:

As of today, the composition of the Council's membership by age bracket is as follows:

Age:	Number:
21-30	1
31-40	1
41-50	6
51-60	21
61-70	29
71-80	20
81-90	3

The mean age is 64.5 years old.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(19) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK: (3rd question)

In your response to my question at the Meeting on February 7th you say, apropos the Basingstoke Canal, "I understand that activity is already underway to look at the options to deliver further income from the Basingstoke Canal". This would have been

the answer to this question at each of the Council meetings over the last six years. When do you expect a result?

Response:

The Canal is owned and managed by Surrey County Council in Surrey and Hampshire County Council in Hampshire. Any future plans for the canal as a whole need to be agreed by both parties. The nature of the canal means that it needs ongoing investment in management and maintenance in order to ensure it remains safe and navigable.

Our aim is to identify a financially sustainable solution for the canal. To this end, we are in dialogue with the Canals and Rivers Trust (CaRT) about the future management of the Canal and are jointly reviewing the asset management plan and revising the business plan to reflect a number of scenarios. This is being undertaken with advice from property consultants.

In the interim, work has been continuing to increase income generation on the Canal, for example new moorings have been constructed at the Canal Centre in Mytchett and are now let, and further moorings are due to be installed at Woking. Plans are underway to improve the facilities at the Canal Centre as part of a phased development and other property along the canal is being assessed for its potential to generate an increased income.

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

**(20) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:
(4th question)**

Before buying the Vue Cinema, Nando's and Subway in Worcester, what investment opportunities in Surrey did the Council consider?

Response:

Prior to acquiring the Vue Cinema, the Council, through its Investment Advisory Board (IAB) considered a number of opportunities both in and out of county. The adopted Investment Strategy is to build a resilient revenue stream from a diverse portfolio of assets, across both different asset classes (e.g. offices, retail and warehouses) and across geographies.

Prior to any purchase, an opportunity is assessed by the IAB across a number of criteria, including the level of return relative to the risk, the length of lease(s) and the strength of the tenant(s) as well as the locational attributes (both at a macro and micro level).

The Investment Strategy approved by Cabinet in 2013 provides for where there is a choice of investment opportunities with a comparable financial return, the Investment Advisory Board will give priority to securing such additional benefits for Surrey.

The Council continues to consider investment and regeneration opportunities in Surrey and this includes the council's involvement in the Brightwell's development in Farnham, following the dismissal of the Judicial Review claim.

MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(21) MR MICHAEL SYDNEY (LINGFIELD) TO ASK: (4th question)

In response to my second question at the Meeting on February 7th about Surrey's failure to develop the use of wood fuel both as a product to sell and as a heat source for its buildings have you asked why it is so difficult to do this in Surrey while other counties seem to have found it very useful? And the fact that natural gas is widely available does not sit comfortably with our efforts to combat climate change.

Response:

There has been good progress in re-introducing active management of Surrey's woodlands for wood production even though the character of woodlands in Surrey represents some significant challenges. There is a higher proportion of broadleaved trees rather than fast growing species, a fragmented distribution, a large proportion of them subject to nature conservation protection and a general public concern with tree felling activities.

However, significant progress has been made in overcoming these challenges and many sites have recently been brought back into active management for wood products including timber for construction and wood fuel for biomass energy. Examples include new management plans for productivity on the estate of the Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT), which are approved by the Forestry Commission and Natural England. As a County we are also running the Wood Processing Grant (Local Growth Fund money from the LEPS) and have worked with the Forestry Commission to make the applications to both C2C and EM3 and are now delivering the programme of grants. This is funding sawmills and wood hubs as an example, to support the development of the sector. The most recent hub in Surrey is at the Albury Estate.

The high land values in Surrey can also affect the commercial viability of the wood fuel industry infrastructure. Consequently, there are no wood pellet producers within the county. In addition, the relative cost of wood fuel compared to fossil fuels is a significant factor in assessing a business case for wood hubs. Although the price of gas and heating oil can be subject to significant fluctuations both are currently cheaper than wood pellets, gas considerably so.

This page is intentionally left blank