

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**TUESDAY 11 JULY 2017****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND
TRANSPORT****(1) MR GRAHAM ELLWOOD (GUILDFORD EAST) TO ASK:**

We have discussed the continuing and mounting opposition to the above proposals by the Cabinet to introduce parking charges, build play trails and alter the visitor centre and café at this outstandingly beautiful and natural site. Of course, Newlands Corner actually falls within Mr Keith Taylor's division but my division adjoins within easy walking distance and a very large number of my Guildford East residents have raised objections to the Cabinet's proposals

Turning first to the parking charges I have explained to my residents that Surrey County Council (SCC) cannot afford to continue the £540k subsidy to the Surrey Wildlife Trust and that the parking charges are essential to ensure this beautiful site is maintained.

However, what no one can understand and what, for example, Merrow Residents Association have passed a formal resolution objecting to, is the unnecessary expense on the play trails that nobody wants. Residents are forcefully complaining that SCC is, on the one hand, saying there is no money to maintain the site and, on the other, proposing spending money they don't have on the proposed play trails.

Also, residents do not want the existing visitor centre changed or enlarged as we all enjoy it the way it is and do not want any intrusive and unnecessary development in its place.

I strongly request therefore that you please reconsider both the play trail proposals and any visitor centre and café proposals (notwithstanding the latter falls under the auspices of Planning at Guildford Borough Council) as neither are wanted by local residents. Many still object to the parking charges but I have tried to explain the very real financial reasons for these.

I look forward to your response.

Reply:

Thank you for your question and giving me the opportunity to update you on proposed improvements at Newlands Corner.

The changes are part of the programme to make the countryside self-sufficient by 2020/21. The current situation is that we are reviewing the proposal and are in discussions with the Albury Estate. These are sensitive negotiations and these will be concluded very soon.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

What communication has the Council had with the new Government, since the general election, regarding additional funding for Surrey?

Reply:

This administration is committed to securing funding for services that address Surrey residents' needs. As we know, there was no specific commitment to extending the Business Rates Retention scheme in last month's Queen's Speech. However, I am still convinced of the need for a Fair Funding Review of local government funding. This will be our opportunity to make sure those factors that directly affect Surrey are properly reflected in any future funding formula. These include learning difficulties, public health, road use and the cost of providing services in a place so close to London.

To this end I have recently written to the Chancellor to make clear Surrey County Council's willingness to assist with any review of local government funding, so that it enables all Councils to provide vital services on a sustainable basis. And of course, I will continue to work with our other local MPs to make the case for Surrey's residents.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

(3) DR ANDREW POVEY (CRANLEIGH AND EWHURST) TO ASK:

The Community Recycling Centre (CRC) in Cranleigh currently receives about 3000 tonnes of material a year. If the CRC is closed, this material will go into the waste stream in different ways. Assuming one third is fed into wheelie bins, one third is taken to an alternative CRC and one third is fly tipped, what is the new cost of disposal of this 3000 tonnes?

Reply:

It is with regret that we have announced a consultation that includes the possible closure of four sites including Elmbridge Road, Cranleigh. The Council is facing significant financial pressures and need to save over £100m this year. The proposals in the consultation, if fully implemented, will save up to £2m in a full year. The community recycling centre (CRC) at Cranleigh handles about 2.5% of the total amount of waste brought to our community recycling centres. If the CRC at Cranleigh were to be closed, then we believe that the most likely alternative would be for residents to take their waste to the CRC at Witley, which is approximately nine miles from the existing site, although in some cases this will be less.

I was disappointed to read that it is believed the good people of Cranleigh will be breaking the law and fly tip. Based on the experience of other local authorities that have closed sites and on our own information from changes that we introduced in the last year, such as reduced opening days and hours, there is no evidence to suggest that material would be either placed in the residual bin or fly-tipped. We will continue to work with MPs, Borough and District Councils and parishes to minimise any potential impact on residents.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(4) MR EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL AND CUDDINGTON) TO ASK:

The Changes to the County Council's Overview and Scrutiny function as outlined in Agenda item 11 of the agenda of the Council Meeting of 23 May 2017 states that the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee's role includes "formally agreeing the work programmes of the Select Committees to ensure a more cohesive approach and a strong focus on the Council's key priorities".

- (i) Would he agree with me that the role of Select Committees should also have a focus on residents' priorities which may or may not be aligned to the Council's priorities as determined by the Conservative majority on the Council?

The same document also states that "The [Overview and Budget Scrutiny] Committee will also have responsibility for budget scrutiny across all services". This caused some confusion at the first meeting of the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee where requests to examine some of the spending cuts made by the Cabinet in March 2017 were blocked on the basis that finance was the responsibility of the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee.

- (ii) Does Mr Hodge agree with me that spending cuts have a service implication and scrutinising those service implications is very clearly within the remit of all service based Select Committees?

Reply:

Select Committee forward plans are informed by a range of issues, including the Council's corporate priorities, required budget savings and Members' knowledge of issues relevant to residents and partners. Resident Experience is one of the key strands of the Council's Corporate Strategy, and residents' priorities inform the Council's own priority-setting process. As elected Members, it is our responsibility to make judgements about what is best for Surrey as a whole, balancing the competing demands of residents, businesses and partners within the resources available.

The Overview & Budget Scrutiny Committee has established a cross-party Budget Sub-Group, chaired by the Leader of the Residents' Association and Independent Group, to undertake monitoring of the existing budgets of all services and to identify further budget savings. As part of its work the Budget Sub-Group will be linking closely with the individual select committees as appropriate to understand detailed service implications, as well as using the resources of those committees to undertake service-level reviews (as required) to inform the Sub-Group's overall recommendations.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

How does the loss of the pilot business rates retention scheme affect Surrey's financial resilience for the next financial year?

Reply:

The council's MTFP (2017-20) makes no assumption about additional funding from any business rate pilot.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Does the Leader agree with Mr Hall that Surrey County Council "*appears remote and irrelevant, inward looking, financially unviable and unable to tackle problems?*"

Reply:

As I am sure Mr Goodwin understands, this council faces significant challenges with rising need for vital services such as Adult and Children's social care, the largest cohort of adults with Learning Disabilities, the need to fund over 25,000 school places and of course the ever-increasing usage of the roads we maintain across the county. These services are essential to our residents and this Conservative administration does not shy away from the challenge of continuing to provide them. We are determined to do our best for this county and we are realistic enough to know there is always more we can do to improve things for local people.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

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

Given that it did not appear in the Conservative Party manifesto or the recent Queen's Speech, could the Cabinet Member report back as to what representations he and the County Council have recently made to Government on their commitment to Crossrail 2?

Reply:

I would like to thank Mr Forster for raising this very important issue, which is a defined priority in our Rail Strategy.

I can confirm that we continue to press the case with Government for greater rail investment in Surrey. This is a key element of 'Transport for the South East' as announced by the Leader on 28 June 2017. As part of this we have been lobbying Government to commit to capacity and performance enhancements on the Brighton Main Line, along with a funding commitment to take Crossrail 2 to the next stage of development.

Members will no doubt recall that Epsom, Hampton Court and Shepperton are the proposed origin stations for Crossrail 2 in Surrey. Our own scheme assessment has identified the optimum configuration of services. This has helped us understand the best use of released capacity and provided us with an evidence base for ongoing design development and scheme consultation. All of this has been shared with relevant

borough councils and the scheme promoters. It is also publically available on our web site.

Crossrail 2 should be subject to a further round of public consultation in early 2018. In recent weeks we have been working with the scheme promoter to maximise the effectiveness of this consultation for our residents as we continue to make the case for the scheme and for Government investment.

MRS MARY LEWIS, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION / MRS CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN

(8) MR CHRIS BOTTEN (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:

Is the Cabinet Member aware that the closure of The Beeches will substantially disadvantage a number of families in East Surrey and represents a failure of commissioners to properly plan social care and health packages for children with complex needs?

Does the Cabinet Member not recognise that this bodes ill for a future in which the commissioning of health and social care jointly will be essential for the Wellbeing of Surrey?

Reply:

I am confident that the impact of closure of the Beeches and wider short breaks changes have been fully assessed in the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) that accompanies the Cabinet report.

Surrey County Council (SCC) has undertaken a robust and comprehensive re-commissioning process, which has involved strong joint working between health and social care in planning and evaluation of proposals. It has also been underpinned by extensive engagement with children, young people and families during the process, delivered in partnership with Family Voice Surrey. This began with an analysis of need and review of existing services from January 2016, and we published a joint short breaks needs assessment in April 2016, exploring and designing new options for short breaks services, and evaluating bids received by providers looking to deliver short breaks.

As mentioned, we have engaged extensively with families throughout the process to co-design the future offer of services. Our work has involved the following stages:

1) Understanding need and reviewing the current offer (January to May 2016)

- An online survey, which was completed by over 200 families.
- Drop-in events around the county, which were attended by over 90 families and professionals.
- Meetings with the Community Nursing teams in Surrey and Children with Disabilities Social Care teams and a range of other key stakeholders.
- Reviewing previous surveys and consultations relating to short breaks in Surrey.

2) Service design (June – mid November 2016)

- 8 x drop-in sessions for families and professionals at a number of special schools across Surrey including Clifton Hill, The Ridgeway, Pond Meadow and Brooklands

- sharing the results of the review and focusing on the outcomes that families and children and young people want from short breaks.
- 2 x workshops with providers, practitioners and parent carers across Surrey - co-designing the outcomes that short breaks should enable families to achieve and exploring where we should focus the design of our new commissions.
- 7 x drop-in sessions for families and professionals at Play and Leisure provision across the summer holidays in August 2016 – reviewing and validating the co-designed outcomes, further information about where our design focus should be (using a mini questionnaire format).
- 3 x coffee mornings/focus groups with parent carers at White Lodge, The Beeches and Cherry Trees.
- 5 x design workshops during September 2016 with parents, carers, providers and practitioners to review what people had told us our areas of focus and outcomes should be and co-designing the response.
- Sense checking and validating the outcomes and options (6 Oct, 20 Oct, 25 Oct - with the service and Family Voice Surrey).
- Feedback from families of children and young people with complex health needs was sought by an additional survey, working with Family Voice Surrey that included specific health related questions. This was run with the Physical and Sensory Support Service.
- Checking with children and young people what they would like to see from the Short Break's offer, including:
 - Gypsy Roma Traveller community engagement - site visit to meet with 2 families with disabled children and young people (19 September 2016)
 - Feedback from specialist residential settings – creative sessions at Beeches (30 October 2016) and Cherry Trees (3 November 2016)
 - Sibling focus group in specialist residential setting (10 November 2016)
 - Questionnaire sent to Young Carers for inclusion in their autumn newsletter. Questionnaire also sent to Woking High School Young Carers Group and through visits to Egham Youth Club & Woking Young Carers Groups (July and October 2016).

Since July 2016:

- 95 parent carers and 40 providers and professionals shared their views at the drop-in sessions.
- 28 providers and 16 parent carers attended the September design workshops.
- 196 families completed an on-line survey
- 62 children & young people have told us their views about short breaks.

3) Tender for the service and evaluation of bids – January – March 2017 Involving children and young people

- A number of different creative approaches were used including 24 children and young people with different needs engaged to give feedback on some elements of the bids from providers. This contributed to bid scoring. Sessions held included:
 - 2 x sessions in a community venue with children and young people from a youth group for feedback on overnight and play and leisure bids

- 2 x sessions in a specialist residential setting for feedback on overnight submissions
- 1 x session in a voluntary youth club (shorter session so only video clips were shown)

Involving parent carers

- Parent carers who currently use short breaks were invited to participate in the evaluation via specialist residential setting routes and the Family Voice Surrey (FVS) network. Family Voice convened a panel of family evaluators to contribute to bid scoring and families had a specific question as part of the process that they were exclusively responsible for scoring.

As well as meetings that happened as part of this overall engagement process, specific meetings have been held with families who currently access Beeches, following Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABP) confirming they were not going to bid to continue to provide overnight residential short breaks, including:

- 14 March 2017 – Joint meeting SABP, SCC and Family Voice Surrey with Beeches parents;
- 2 May 2017 – Meeting of senior SCC Officers and Family Voice Surrey with Beeches parents; and
- 23 May 2017 – Mrs Mary Lewis and Chris Tisdall met with Beeches families, to hear their concerns and views first hand.

Whilst I appreciate that any changes to services can be unsettling for families, I am confident that as a result of the comprehensive and robust process that has been undertaken there is sufficient provision to meet the assessed needs of children and young people who are identified as needing overnight residential short breaks in Surrey - through block contracts for services, in-house SCC provision and spot purchasing of provision where this is required to meet need. We do acknowledge in the report that these changes will have an impact on families. In particular, the report highlights that there will be increased travel for some of families to access services and that choice will be reduced in overnight residential provision, particularly for those living in some parts of Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead and Tandridge. The report also highlights the importance of ensuring the capacity of services is kept under review during the next contract cycle, to ensure families continue to have access to the provision that they need.

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS

(9) MRS ANGELA GOODWIN (GUILDFORD NORTH) TO ASK:

According to the County Council, Housing Related Support currently helps:

- people who have experienced domestic abuse
- people with mental health support needs
- frail, older people with support needs
- people with drug and alcohol problems
- people leaving care
- people with physical, sensory and learning disabilities
- parents
- people or people at risk of homelessness

Could the Cabinet Member explain whether he thinks a 70% cut in this budget will make people who fall into these categories but do not fall under the Care Act, more or less vulnerable?

Reply:

The County Council currently provides Housing Related Support services to all the client groups above. The proposal that is currently being consulted on relates only to housing related support funding for services for older people and services for people with learning, physical and sensory disabilities will be decommissioned.

If people feel they have an on-going need for support they will be able to request Adult Social Care for an assessment of their needs. If they qualify for support under the Care Act eligibility criteria they will receive funding through a personal budget from Surrey County Council.

Adult Social Care's planning assumption is that the proposed changes would save the County Council £2,858,000, which represents 70% of the Housing Related Support budget for older people and people with disabilities.

For those people who do not qualify for support under the Care Act eligibility criteria during their assessment process they will be directed to other existing support services within their communities.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(10) MR DAVID LEE (CATERHAM VALLEY) TO ASK:

Could the Leader update the County Council with the latest information as to what, if any, devolved powers will be granted to Surrey and/or the Three Counties by the Government or is Lord Porter correct when he says that devolution is dead and the boat has sailed out of the harbour?

Reply:

Negotiations on the 3SC deal are paused, while the Government considers the future of devolution in England.

In the meantime, we continue to work collaboratively with 3SC partners and others on issues where we have shared interests and where we can collectively make a difference for residents, for example, the recently launched Transport for the South East to provide a single voice on the area's transport priorities.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(11) MRS PENNY RIVERS (GODALMING NORTH) TO ASK:

What assistance did the Local Government Association give the County Council in recovering the £20m that was invested in Icelandic banks?

Reply:

The Local Government Association (LGA) negotiated two separate offers on behalf of a substantial number of local authorities, leading to the sale of their priority claims regarding frozen Icelandic bank deposits. Surrey County Council had deposits in Landsbanki Bank and in Glitnir Bank. In this process, the Council, as part of the LGA group of local authority creditors, received expert advice from the LGA and Bevan Brittan, the legal firm appointed by the LGA who, in turn, engaged Icelandic lawyers to advise on Icelandic law and to conduct the litigation and the subsequent auction processes.

On 22 October 2013, Cabinet delegated authority to the Leader and Cabinet Member for Business Services, in conjunction with the Director of Finance, to negotiate a final settlement, and authorised the LGA and its representatives to arrange an auction of the Council's claim for its deposit with Landsbanki. The delegation was properly exercised and the sale was completed on 30 January 2014, achieving the levels required in accordance with the Cabinet's authority. On 3 February 2015, Cabinet approved a similar process to arrange an auction for the Council's claim for its deposit with Glitnir, again with the delegation properly exercised leading to a successful sale on 10 February 2015 that achieved the levels required in accordance with the Cabinet's authority. The sale of the claims brought closure to a situation that had lasted over six years, with the final outcome representing the best security and lowest risk to the Council.

MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS**(12) MR ERNEST MALLETT (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:**

Members will be aware that the company 'Surrey Choices' was set up with a block of Adult Services funds to carry out Adult Social Services work at a cost less than that that incurred by the County doing the work directly.

- What was the estimated cost of the work which County was doing directly and which was transferred to Surrey Choices?
- What was the initial funding of Surrey Choices?
- What is the additional increase in funding which the County has had to provide so that Surrey Choices could carry out the work which was transferred to them?
- Is the present conclusion that Surrey Choices are able to carry out work transferred to them at less cost than doing this work by in house arrangements?

Reply:**Response to questions 1 and 2:**

The initial annual contract value for the services provided by Surrey Choices, based on the level of services provided at that point, was £12.1m. This represented the equivalent cost of services previously provided in-house by the council less a savings target of £0.85m built into the contract. The contract was set up on a block basis (i.e. set payments for agreed levels of service delivery), with the aim of moving to spot arrangements (paying for services delivered at an individual level) in the medium term.

Response to question 3:

A review of the services provided by Surrey Choices after the first year and a half of operation determined that the permanent contract value needed to be increased by £1.3m to £12.6m in order to take into account the growth in the number of requiring the services.

The Shareholder Board is satisfied the proposed increase to the contract was appropriate and it was formally agreed in October 2016 following contract negotiations with Adult Social Care commissioners. The contract value remains at this level in 2017/18.

Response to question 4:

The Council continues to work with Surrey Choices to understand the costs of service delivery at an individual service user level across the range of different services provided by the company. This will enable the transition to spot contractual arrangements which should set a base for the future of the business.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**(13) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

Could you please confirm that, if the proposed changes to the Constitution are passed today:

- Members of all select committees will still retain the right to table items to the committee (in line with Section 9FC of the Localism Act 2011);
- Select committees will still have the role of scrutinising the service impacts of budget changes already agreed, such as by the Council in the Medium Term Financial Plan; and
- That, in addition to items requested by the Overview & Budget scrutiny committee, individual committees will retain the right to add items to their work programme, establish member reference groups/ task and finish groups.

Reply:

As stated in the report to Council, the amendment to Article 7 is to bring the process for Members' requests for items in line with the arrangements for overview and scrutiny agreed by the Council at its last meeting, and the changes do not impact on Members' statutory right to request items for an agenda. The only difference is that the Overview & Budget Scrutiny Committee, rather than the individual select committee, will receive the request and schedule the item.

Select Committees will still have a role in scrutinising the service impacts of budget changes already agreed, as the likelihood of those savings being achieved and the consequent implications for the delivery of services is one of the criteria which will inform the identification of potential items for select committees forward plans.

Under the new arrangements agreed by the Council at its last meeting, select committee work programmes and the establishment of any sub-groups will be determined by the Overview & Budget Scrutiny Committee. This is to ensure that the

focus of the overview and scrutiny function as a whole is on the areas where the greatest impact can be achieved, and that the resources available are used most effectively

MR COLIN KEMP, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS

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

The road repairs budget in Surrey is apparently being cut by up to 80%.

Has the County done any studies to discover the possible long term damage that might occur with such a high degree of neglect?

Reply:

While reductions to local committee discretionary budgets have been cut by up to 80%, this is only a proportion of the overall Highways and Transport budget. Overall the Highways and Transport revenue budget has reduced by approximately 5% and the capital budget by approximately 12.5%. The paragraphs below detail the reasons behind the reductions and the factors taken into account to ensure our statutory duties are met and highway assets are maintained to a reasonable standard in the long term.

In response to the documented funding pressures being faced by the County Council, mostly created by an increasing demand for social care against reducing funding, all council services were asked to produce savings scenarios to mitigate the forecast budget pressures.

Accordingly, Highways and Transport proposed potential savings options which were subsequently included in the budget setting and MTFP report both of which were approved at Full Council and Cabinet during the last quarter of 2016.

In identifying savings options Highways and Transport Service took in to account the following;

- 1.1 Our legal responsibilities as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority
- 1.2 Our existing levels of service and what would be considered as minimum legally defensible levels of service
- 1.3 Our existing commitments, to savings and expenditure, and therefore what feasible opportunities remained across activities for further savings

By applying these principles, we arrived at the following savings:

Savings	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<u>Efficiency/Service Transformation</u>			
Highways Information Team Income	£40,000	£40,000	
Integrated Team Structure	£200,000		
E&I Support Functions	£141,000		
<u>Service Reduction</u>			
Local Committee Funding	£1,700,000		
Reactive Maintenance		£1,200,000	

<u>Savings to be identified</u>	£178,000	£178,000	£178,000
Total Savings	£2,259,000	£1,418,000	£178,000

Revenue

The Highways and Transport revenue budget for 2017/18 comprise as follows;

	2017/18
Streetlighting PFI and illuminated street furniture	£15,810,000
Routine/reactive works (Safety defects, winter service, drainage, grass)	£19,719,000
Local Committees	£450,000
Staffing, insurance and other costs	£8,672,000
Total	£44,651,000

For 2017/18 onwards saving options were considered across all these areas of expenditure, however the constraints listed in points 1.1 to 1.3 above limited the areas where savings could be realised.

As can be seen in the table above, a large proportion of the budget is committed to the street lighting PFI contract. Savings associated with Part Night Lighting had already been agreed to reduce energy costs and given the PFI commitment further savings in this large spend area were considered unachievable.

The Routine/reactive works included safety defects, environmental maintenance, drainage, winter service, traffic systems, signs and lines and structures. It was considered that these activities were generally at the minimum level required to meet statutory duties. In some cases additional budget was required to address known pressures, including addressing backlogs of safety related work such as tree defects and bridge maintenance programmes. Environmental maintenance and signs and lines were the only areas where some reductions were considered feasible. Most of the highways discretionary allocation was included in the Local Committee budget and is managed by the Local Committees to promote local decision making. It was acknowledged that some Local Committees used this budget to supplement a variety of highway maintenance activities. This budget had already been reduced from £3.15m to £2.15m, however given the discretionary nature of the budget it was considered that further reductions were possible in this area.

Capital

The capital budgets were also considered as part of the savings options in accordance with the decision to significantly reduce borrowing. For Highways and Transport the majority of the programme is funded by grants (Maintenance Block Grant, Integrated Transport Grant and Local Growth Fund) however the decision resulted in a reduction from approximately £124m to £108m over the period of the 2017/18 MTFP. This represents a budget reduction of approximately 12.5% and is comprised as follows:

	2017-20 budgets in 2016/17 MTFP (£m)	2017-20 budgets in 2017/18 MTFP (£)
Capital Maintenance	£69,200,000	£60,000,000
Local Growth Deal schemes	£40,000,000	£40,000,000
Local Committees	£7,500,000	£1,200,000

Flood Resilience, incl River Thames Scheme	£3,000,000	£3,000,000
Developer Funded Schemes	£3,600,000	£3,600,000
Vehicle Replacement	£400,000	£320,000
Total	123.7	108.12

Following the reduction in capital investment and ongoing revenue pressures, Highways and Transport reviewed the allocations across the programme in order to minimise future liabilities. For example targeting investment to minimise the deterioration of highway assets. This resulted in a focus on maintenance rather than improvement programmes and the delivery of the Highways & Transport Asset Strategy approved in 2016. All of the capital programmes, including maintenance and the Local Committee budget, were reduced in line with the available budget.

Impact of Reductions

The reduction in revenue and capital budgets will clearly reduce the ability of the local committees to invest in locally important highway work. How this money is spent varies between the different committees, reflecting their priorities, and in some cases has been used for repairs or improvements that might otherwise have become necessary to fund from the wider highways budget.

However, when judged against the criteria detailed in points 1.1 to 1.3 on page 1, this reduction will not impact as significantly as other reductions would have done, and does not compromise the Council's ability to deliver its statutory duties.

Future Alternative Funding Options

In recent years the total amount spent by each Local Committee has consisted of a capital and revenue allocation, which has been topped up by use of any developer contributions (CIL / PIC / S106), on-street parking surplus and private / parish / district contributions. These totals vary from Committee to Committee

Previous funding arrangements that enabled Local Committees to have an allocated Highways budget at levels experienced in recent years are unfortunately no longer sustainable. In order to continue to enable delivery of services based on local priorities we are currently working with colleagues, both internally and externally from Districts and Boroughs, to maximise alternative funding options.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(15) MR EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL AND CUDDINGTON) TO

ASK:

(2ND question)

The changes to the County Council's Overview and Scrutiny Function as outlined in Agenda item 11 of the agenda of the Council Meeting of 23 May 2017 refers to the creation of an informal Select Committee Chairmen's Group. Whilst the rationale and remit of that Group is reasonable, does he agree with me that it lacks credibility whilst the membership comprises only of members of the Conservative Party.

Will he agree to widening that membership to include member(s) of other political group(s).

Reply:

The Select Committee Chairmen's Group is not part of the formal committee structure, and its purpose is 'to support the Council's overview and scrutiny work by sharing good practice, identifying training and development needs and liaising with the Cabinet and strategic managers.' It follows a model which has been in place since 2006 to allow chairmen to share issues relevant to their roles and the work of select committees on an informal basis. The current terms of reference, agreed at its first meeting last month, allow other Members to attend as appropriate, at the invitation of the Chairman. Nick Harrison, Leader of the Residents' Association and Independent Group, attended for the whole of the first meeting.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Could the Leader of the Council confirm whether he intends to raise council tax by more than 5% in the next financial year, beginning 1 April 2018?

Reply:

As I am sure Mrs Watson is aware it is the Council rather than the Leader that sets the council tax. The council's current MTFP (2017-20) includes a proposal to increase council tax within the Government's referendum threshold by 5% in 2018/19 and 2% in 2019/20. However, it will be for the Full Council in February 2018 to confirm the level of council tax for 2018/19 based on the budget proposals made by the Cabinet at that point.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

Could the Leader update the County Council regarding a response from Government to the letter sent by him, on behalf of all of us, following the motion passed in March regarding school budget cuts?

Reply:

Following the March County Council meeting the Leader wrote to all Surrey MPs urging them to raise with the Secretary of State, the council's concerns regarding cost pressures facing schools and the need to increase the schools budget in order to prevent a serious detrimental impact.

In his response, Nick Gibb, Minister for School Standards says that core funding is almost £41 billion in 2017/18 and will increase to £42 billion by 2019/20 as pupil numbers rise. The Department has recently consulted on a new national funding formula for schools which would use an up-to-date assessment of need and was currently analysing over 25,000 responses received.

Following the general election council officers have been advised that a government announcement on schools funding is expected during July, with the details of the new

national funding formula - and therefore the potential impact on Surrey schools - to be issued after the summer recess.

MRS MARY LEWIS, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

(18) MR CHRIS BOTTEN (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:
(2ND question)

Why does the Cabinet Member think Head Teachers in Surrey are considering moving to a 4-day teaching week?

Does she agree that the lifting of the public sector pay cap would help tackle teacher retention and recruitment in Surrey?

Reply:

I would like to thank Mr Botten for his question, which recognises the challenges Surrey's schools – and indeed the council – are facing. Surrey has a growing school-age population with increasingly diverse needs. Education funding has not been cut in monetary terms, but increased costs and higher pupil numbers are making budgeting difficult. SCC will continue to work with schools to ensure all learners have access to a good education and are able to achieve their potential.

With regard to a 4-day teaching week, I do not think it would be right for me to speak on behalf of Surrey's head teachers. However, I can confirm that I am not aware of any schools in Surrey that are implementing such a policy.

Mr Botten has rightly identified a key issue. With 93% of Surrey's schools currently good or outstanding, schools must be able to recruit and retain high quality staff if they are to maintain and improve current standards.

We know that funding contributes to this issue. Pupils in Surrey living as little as 5 miles from a London borough each received £446 less funding this year than their London peers, despite living in similar communities with similar challenges. Surrey would receive an additional £30million each year if the county was funded at the same rate as the average of those boroughs. Teachers enjoy working – and can be properly rewarded – in well-resourced schools.

However, this is not just about funding. A number of factors, including the cost of living and recruitment practices, must be recognised and addressed if we are to attract the quality of staff we need in Surrey schools. Officers are already speaking to colleagues in schools about how to develop together a more effective approach to recruitment and retention in Surrey.

MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

(19) MR DAVID LEE (CATERHAM VALLEY) TO ASK:
(2ND question)

When was Warlingham Community Recycling Centre refurbished and at what cost?

Reply:

Essential maintenance work for the purposes of site safety was undertaken in June and July 2016 at a Capital cost of £103,000.

MR COLIN KEMP, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS

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

The local structural repair budget has been reduced for each local committee, in some cases to zero. This could mean that apart from individual pothole repairs no surface repairs are carried for roads until the whole road is resurfaced. How does the Council plan to fund proactive routine repair of roads so that localised repairs can be carried out on all types of roads?

Reply:

In recent years the total amount spent by each Local Committee has consisted of a capital and revenue allocation, topped up by use of any developer contributions (CIL / PIC / S106), on-street parking surplus and private / parish / district contributions. These vary from Committee to Committee. The County Council allocations have been reduced as part of the need to ensure the entire County has a balanced budget. This is in alignment with the budget approved by full council. The use of developer contributions, on street parking surplus and private/parish/district contributions will continue. The sum of these allocations will vary between areas and as a result of local committee decision making arrangements. The table below gives a comparison between 2016/17 and this financial year.

District	2016/17			2017/18*		
	Revenue	Capital	Total	Revenue	Capital	Total
Elmbridge	£203,541	£345,136	£548,676	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Epsom & Ewell	£158,946	£196,487	£355,434	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Guildford	£238,312	£461,040	£699,352	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Mole Valley	£196,601	£322,002	£518,603	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Reigate & Banstead	£217,778	£392,593	£610,371	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Runnymede	£168,688	£228,961	£397,649	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Spelthorne	£174,714	£249,046	£423,760	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Surrey Heath	£180,529	£268,430	£448,959	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Tandridge	£195,303	£317,676	£512,979	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Waverley	£237,173	£457,242	£694,414	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
Woking	£178,416	£261,387	£439,803	£40,909	£36,363	£77,272
TOTAL	£2,150,000	£3,500,000	£5,650,000	£450,000	£400,000	£850,000

**Prior to 2017/18, the budget was split on the basis of a minimum amount for each Local Committee, with the remainder allocated according to road length / population. This year there is no available excess budget over the minimum sums, hence each committee has an equal share.*

Local Committees determine how they will best use the budgets available to them on an annual basis. The desired priorities for most areas have always exceeded the

available budget, this is not new. It is therefore not possible to accurately state what local structural repair works will be funded by local committees going forwards, however as the table above and first paragraph demonstrate, there will be funding available to local committees which they can choose to spend on LSR.

In addition to local committee funding there are three other centrally funded programmes through which road repairs are carried out;

1. The Horizon major maintenance programme which will see nearly 14 km of roads reconstructed in 2017/18
2. The Horizon surface treatment programme which will see nearly 30km of preventative maintenance on roads in 2017/18
3. The Capital Safety defect programme, an innovative £3,000,000 programme which will use treatments such as LSR and other types of patching work on category 4a and 4b roads – which make up 75% of the Surrey road network

The capital programmes above are in addition to the revenue funded safety defect service whereby each road is inspected and defects meeting intervention level are repaired which ensures we comply with our statutory duties. Throughout the County, the Council is spending approximately £70m maintaining and improving the highway network.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL / MR TIM OLIVER, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES

**(21) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:
(3rd question)**

What would be the increased costs to the council, in terms of fees to managing agents, professional advisors, insurance and contingency planning, if the value of its investment strategy portfolio increases to £1bn, as set out in the Cabinet report of 28 March 2017?

Reply:

The annual net income return takes into account all costs associated with the strategy – in particular funding costs, administration, professional advisors and the cost of voids. The cost of managing agents and insurance is generally recoverable from the tenants of each property and is therefore not a cost to the council except where there is a void. Progressing the strategy will not therefore result in increased costs for the council since costs incurred are fully offset by the income received.

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. We ensure that the forecast income received from the investment is sufficient to pay any interest and administration costs and deliver a net return before each potential acquisition is progressed.

MR DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

At the Council meeting on 21 March 2017, the requirement for items for public consultation requiring to first come before the Council's Cabinet was removed. Since then, the Council has chosen to consult the public on changes to the Community Recycling Centres without first bringing this for Cabinet approval. In the past Equality Impact Assessments were published alongside such public consultation. Can the Council confirm that it will continue to publish full EIAs alongside public consultation documents, and provide links to these EIAs on its Surrey Says consultation website?

Reply:

The Cabinet approved the Community Recycling Centre (CRC) proposals as part of the Medium-Term Financial Plan savings at its meeting on 28 March 2017. It was important that consultations could start as soon as possible to deliver this year's target of more than £100 million, which is why it was right that we agreed to delegate those decisions to senior officers, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Portfolio Holder, on 21 March.

As you will be aware from our previous exchanges, the views of residents and service users make an important contribution to the Council's decision making; particularly now as we take difficult decisions around service provision in the face of reduced central funding and increased demand.

We have a duty to consider the impact of each of our policy decisions on groups with different protected characteristics. Consulting our residents is often an important contributor to the development of the high quality, robust equality impact assessments (EIA) which help us to do this. For example, the CRC consultation asks equalities monitoring questions to help the Council assess whether there will be a disproportionate impact on certain groups – in most cases publishing an EIA before we had this information would be premature.

I can confirm that a detailed EIA will be published alongside a Cabinet paper this autumn on proposed changes to the CRCs to enable a final decision to be taken, in line with our usual practice.