

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****TUESDAY 5 DECEMBER 2017****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS  
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****TIM OLIVER, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES****1. MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:**

How many children in Surrey schools are currently being taught in temporary classrooms and what plans does the County have to address the situation?

**Reply:**

There were 1,375 places created in the period 2012-2017 for temporary bulge places at 29 schools in modular accommodation.

Where a school has insufficient capacity to accept a bulge class, then a modern modular solution is provided. These buildings come with equivalent facilities and services and fire, eco and energy ratings to a modern permanent building solution.

At the end of the bulge class requirement, the modular unit is reused at other schools requiring similar bulge classroom accommodation. This temporary modular approach has been used in primaries where numbers are already falling in many parts of the county, as the bulge moves to the secondary.

This approach provides the Local Authority with a value for money solution for addressing short term pressures, which arise at very short notice in the community, requiring a fast response to meet our statutory requirement to provide every child with a place.

**DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL****2. DR ANDREW POVEY (CRANLEIGH & EWHURST) TO ASK:**

The current investment strategy includes investment in commercial and retail premises, but no investment in residential property. Does the Leader consider this is the best investment strategy and if so, why?

**Reply:**

The council is currently considering the appointment of a joint venture partner who will assist in identifying and delivering residential investment opportunities subject to approved business cases by Cabinet on 14 December. The Investment strategy has been developed around achieving a balanced portfolio across all property sectors and therefore it is clear that this council is considering the full range of opportunities to generate income from investments to support the delivery of front line services.

May I remind Members that this strategy has been clearly laid out on the Cabinet Forward Plan/Note of Decisions since September 2017. -  
<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/mgListPlanItems.aspx?PlanId=185&RP=120>

**MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**3. MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

The Government is currently consulting on a revised national policy statement for aviation, which proposes that expansion of Heathrow will mean that international aviation is no longer accounted for within the UK's carbon budget. Please confirm that Surrey County Council does not support expansion of Heathrow or Gatwick if this increases aviation emissions beyond that recommended by the Committee on Climate Change and accounted for in the Government's Carbon Plan.

**Reply:**

Council has agreed resolutions in 2013 and 2016 that make clear that whilst we recognise the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting major businesses to locate in the county; any expansion requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

The council is aware that the Committee on Climate Change, the Government's independent advisors on climate change, have expressed concern about the assumptions that have been made relating to growth in aviation emissions in the context of national carbon budgets. In our response to the draft Airports National Policy Statement we have been clear that Government should be more specific and more transparent about carbon emissions and carbon budgets as a result of airport expansion. It is for Government to respond to the concerns that have been expressed. We would expect them to be much clearer about the impact of expansion in the final National Policy Statement.

**HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH**

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

According to the Independent on Wednesday 29 November: "*Virgin Care sued the NHS last year after it lost out on an £82m contract to provide children's health services across Surrey, citing concerns over "serious flaws" in the way the contract was awarded. The company filed proceedings at the UK High Court naming the six local NHS clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) in Surrey, as well as Surrey County Council and NHS England.*" What were the grounds of the legal dispute between Virgin Care and Surrey County Council regarding the contract for children's health services and how much has been or will be paid by the County Council to resolve this matter?

**Reply:**

Virgin Care began legal proceedings against a number of parties including Surrey County Council alleging irregularities in the procurement of the contract to provide children's and young people community health care services throughout Surrey. The proceedings have now been settled on terms that are confidential to the parties. Disclosure of those terms by any of the parties could lead to enforcement action against that party. I am therefore not able to provide the information that the Councillor has asked for.

**COLIN KEMP, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS**

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

Can the Cabinet Member please set out his plans to use LED lights in Surrey and what the potential costs and savings will be?

**Reply:**

When the Private finance initiative (PFI) contract was let and awarded in 2009, LED technology in street lighting was in its infancy and not suitable for Surrey County Council (SCC) although the Council was able to take advantage of a Central Management System (the largest installation by far at the outset in 2010) to enable dynamic control including the ability to dim lights and change profiles with minimal costs.

LED lighting has made significant advances across all sectors including domestic, office, automotive lighting and of course Street Lighting in the intervening years. With a need to reduce our energy consumption and CO2 emissions we are investigating options to upgrade the street lighting to this technology.

These investigations are at an early stage and will require more detailed analysis on the type of lighting and options for funding the replacement. An outline report was recently submitted to the county council Investment Panel for consideration. Subject to Panel and Cabinet approval, a detailed programme will be developed and shared with Members in due course.

**COLIN KEMP, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS**

**6. MR CHRIS BOTTEN (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:**

Will the Cabinet Member explain why he will not countenance the idea of parish councils in Surrey paying for streetlights to stay on at night?

**Reply:**

Cabinet agreed in May to implement an 'Alternative Funding Model' allowing districts and boroughs to request an enhanced level of service by excluding all lights in their area from Part Night lighting subject to agreement to reimburse the County Council in full for any costs associated with delivering the enhanced level of service.

It was recognised in the report that some parish councils had expressed an interest in being able to fund the cost of keeping the street lights in their respective areas on and so exclude them from Part Night lighting. However retaining the decision at the borough level ensures a greater level of consistency across an area. The complexity of managing change requests and restructuring the street light central management system was also taken into account. For these reasons it was agreed any externally funded changes need to be on a district wide level.

The agreement with Spelthorne is an example of how this can work well in practice.

**DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES**

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

Could the Cabinet Member confirm whether she plans to convert any Surrey Library into a community or volunteer-led library? If so, which ones?

**Reply:**

I hope Mr Goodwin agrees that the Community Partnered Library initiative is something we should celebrate. Thanks to the volunteers that came forward from ten Surrey communities, we have not closed a single library in Surrey, at a time when, across the country so many places have lost their local branch library.

The increased demand for our services to vulnerable people and reduced Government funding, means we must continue to review the Council's spend on all the services it provides for the county's residents. We are exploring a range of ideas about how we build on our previous successful work and ensure that the library service remains sustainable in these increasingly challenging times. These ideas are not at a stage at which I would describe them as "plans". We will invite the Communities Select Committee to help us develop policy options, some of which may become plans, once this initial exploratory work is completed.

**DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**8. MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:**

Brexit will mean that £8.4 billion of Structural Investment Funding will no longer be available to the UK. What is the estimated impact on Surrey?

**Reply:**

EU Structural Investment Funding for the 2014-20 programme is allocated by the Government to Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas rather than to local government areas such as counties. Surrey is split between the Coast to Capital (C2C) LEP and the Enterprise M3 (EM3) LEPs. C2C has an allocation of €72m and EM3 an allocation of €50m over the 7 year programme period. There is no ring-fencing to Surrey and all calls for proposals are open and competitive. Some of the programme has yet to be awarded. The Government has indicated that on departure from the European Union, it will put in place a replacement for the Structural Funds on which a consultation exercise is currently due to be launched in early 2018.

**DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**9. MR DAVID LEE (CATERHAM VALLEY) TO ASK:**

Following the Budget, what devolution arrangements are being taken forward in Surrey and when will they take effect?

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council is a key partner in the Surrey Heartlands Partnership which has agreed and begun to implement new 'devolution' arrangements for the health and care system.

Surrey Heartlands serves 850,000 people within the areas of Guildford and Waverley, North West Surrey and Surrey Downs and accounts for around three quarters of the overall Surrey population. The development of the Surrey Heartlands Health and Care Devolution agreement (the 'Trilateral Agreement') emerged from discussions with national partners (primarily NHS England and NHS Improvement) in relation to the Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Plan. The devolution and delegation of additional responsibilities and freedoms to the local area is seen as crucial to enabling the delivery of the aims of the Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP) and wider plans to transform and integrate the health and care system to secure the best outcomes for local residents.

The Memorandum of Understanding (the 'Trilateral Agreement' – <http://www.surreyheartlands.uk/devolution/>) between local partners, NHS England and NHS Improvement was finalised and signed on 15 June 2017.

This Agreement confirmed the commitment of partners to work towards the 'progressive implementation' of a devolved health and care system for Surrey Heartlands. It also set out a shared vision and objectives for the work, the proposed governance arrangements, and the scope of functions being explored as part of the devolution / delegation of responsibilities to Surrey Heartlands.

Implementation of the Agreement has begun with 2017/18 being used as a 'shadow year' with new governance mechanisms already in place through joint leadership arrangements between the County Council, the NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups and NHS England. Dialogue is underway between local and national partners to agree the functions that local partners will take greater control of from April 2018.

## **MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

### **10. MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:**

The County Council have proposed a new system of financial transfers to district and borough councils for recycled waste. Please could the Cabinet Member explain how he will ensure that no Waste Collection Authority will cut their recycling services to residents as a result?

#### **Reply:**

The new financial mechanisms have been developed in close consultation with district and borough partners. A number of elements have been built in to incentivise future performance improvements and to ensure that waste collection authorities do not reduce their level of service.

The fixed payment will be conditional on the district or borough council agreeing to maintain a certain level of service for all households where practicable. This includes collecting the core dry recyclables (paper, card, metals, plastics and glass), and providing weekly food waste collections. A reduction in service that may stop the fixed payment from being made would include stopping collecting a key recyclable material, or reducing the frequency of recycling collections.

Memoranda of Understanding between SCC and individual authorities are currently being drafted. The Surrey Waste Partnership will be consulted on these and it is proposed that the Partnership would be the body that decides if an authority is not acting in the spirit of the agreement.

The variable payment mechanism provides a formula for sharing savings that arise from future improvements, and is designed to reward increases in recycling and reductions in residual waste. This means that authorities should continue to work towards improving the performance of their services.

The Surrey Waste Partnership will also continue to be funded at current levels which means that its comprehensive and well established improvement programme will remain in place.

SCC will closely monitor the introduction of the new mechanisms and will review arrangements if they do not deliver the expected outcomes.

## **MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS**

### **11. MRS ANGELA GOODWIN (GUILDFORD NORTH) TO ASK:**

Please set out for the financial years 14/15, 15/16 & 16/17 the percentage of the County Council's total budget that was spent on Adult Social Care

#### **Reply:**

Over the last three financial years the council has spent 42% of its budget on Adult Social Care.

## **TIM OLIVER, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES**

### **12. MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:**

In May 2014 Surrey County Council agreed to become a Fair Trade Council and was granted the status in 2015. Will the Council please provide an update on actions taken and progress made since then?

#### **Reply:**

The Council continues to support the delivery of fair trade through a number of initiatives. Specifically, these include:

- The commitment to ethical sourcing which forms part of the Social Value Procurement Strategy developed in response to the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012. For tenders over £100k in value, Procurement in agreement with budget holders, incorporate fair trade criteria into the procurement process whilst ensuring compliance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015.
- The Council's continued procurement of Fairtrade bananas, coffee and sugar as part of the ongoing commitment to supporting the motion to facilitate Fairtrade wherever possible.
- Recently, the Procurement Department has also developed an Ethical Procurement Statement and Supplier Code of Conduct which is in the process of being published.
- The inclusion of a commitment to purchase sustainable products and the promotion of sustainable development within the Council's tender documents. Where relevant appropriate weighting is given to sustainable products in the purchasing process.

- Active work 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). The FFL programme is about making good food the easy choice for everyone by making healthy, tasty and sustainable meals the norm for all to enjoy, as well as reconnecting people with where their food comes from, teaching them how its grown, and championing the importance of well-sourced ingredients.

**TIM OLIVER, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES**

**13. MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

Please provide a full list of all properties currently purchased as part of the County Council's investment portfolio (both directly by Surrey County Council and via the Halsey Garton trading company), together with the Energy Performance Certificate for all buildings when acquired by SCC.

**Reply:**

Below is a table of all properties currently within the County Council's Investment Portfolio owned by either Surrey County Council (SCC) or the Halsey Garton Property (HGP) trading company as part of its adopted Investment Strategy. Officers will provide a separate spreadsheet of Energy Performance Certificate's for all SCC buildings once the information has been collated.

<b>Address</b>	<b>SCC or HGP Owned</b>	<b>Property Type</b>
Ranger House, Guildford	SCC	Office Building
High St, Egham	SCC	Retail with Offices above
Watermans House, Woking	SCC	Office Building
High St, Staines	SCC	Retail with Offices above
Pixham End, Dorking	SCC	Office campus
Abbeymoor Golf Club/Course	SCC	Golf Course
Bridgehead House, Ashtead	SCC	Office Building
Nexus, 4 Gatwick Rd, Crawley	SCC	Office Building
Hempston Way, Melksham	HGP	Industrial Building
Bristol Distribution Centre	HGP	Industrial Buildings
Aztec West, Bristol	HGP	Office Building
Washford Mills Retail Pk, Redditch	HGP	Retail Park
Birmingham Road, Stratford	HGP	Retail with Hotel above
Willowbrook Retail Pk, Loughborough	HGP	Retail Park
Statham Street, Macclesfield	HGP	Retail Store
Manton Business Park, Worksop	HGP	Warehouse Building
Agecroft Commerce Pk, Salfords, Manchester	HGP	Warehouse Building
Oakgrove Retail Park, Milton Keynes	HGP	Retail Park
12-15 High Street, Winchester	HGP	Retail Store

Malvern Shopping Park, Malvern	HGP	Retail Park
55/57 & 59 Friar St, Worcester	HGP	Retail with Cinema above

**DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**14. MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:**

Could the Leader of the Council set out what extra funding SCC will receive as a result of measures announced in the Budget on 22 November?

**Reply:**

The Chancellor's budget statement sets out the government's high level plans for spending and how it is going to fund that spending. As ever, although there are number of announcements that will impact on Local Government, many members will already know that the detail of its impact and specifically how it effects Surrey County Council will not be known until the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement, and possibly sometime after that. As in previous years we expect this in the weeks before the Christmas break.

**MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**15. MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:**

In its Medium Term Finance Strategy Update and Transformation to 2019 proposals, Hampshire County Council has called on the Government to allow local authorities to levy modest charges on older persons' bus passes. Will the Cabinet Member reassure elderly residents that they will not implement such a fee in Surrey?

**Reply:**

Thank you for your question. The Leader of Surrey County Council has been in discussions with his counterpart in Hampshire about this matter.

**MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**16. MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

The County Council is currently consulting on its new Local Waste Plan. Table 5 of the Draft Local Waste Plan proposes three additional Energy-from-Waste plants (incinerators) are required up until 2033. Please confirm how many of these are proposed to be for waste from households and which of the waste sites being consulted on under the Plan will be considered for energy-from-waste development.

**Reply:**

At this stage, there are no plans to provide additional treatment capacity for residual municipal waste (i.e. largely waste from households that cannot be recycled) beyond that provided by the Eco-Park. However further infrastructure in Surrey may be required in the future depending on the continued availability of facilities outside

Surrey, the costs associated with shipping waste to these facilities and the success of measures to increase recycling and minimise the total volume of waste generated.

In addition, at this stage our Draft Waste Plan does not specify which of the nine shortlisted sites will be suitable for which treatment types. We will need to review potential sites in the light of the consultation response and a detailed environmental assessment. The next stage of the plan making process will contain more information to help determine the types of waste facility that may be acceptable on identified sites.

Table 7 of the new Draft Waste Local Plan identifies a waste capacity gap up until 2033 – that is the gap between the amount of waste that will need to be managed in different ways and the ability of existing facilities to do this. We need to provide additional land to accommodate facilities that can treat our residual waste (i.e. waste that cannot be recycled) by providing energy recovery (Energy-from-Waste). Table 7 sets out the amount of Energy Recovery we need to plan for, which is between 174,000 and 278,000 tonnes per annum in 2033. This may require somewhere between three and six sites for energy recovery.

In order to calculate this waste capacity gap, the future waste management capacity for Surrey (i.e. the amount of capacity existing facilities currently provide and will continue to provide in future) was calculated. This information is shown in Table 5<sup>1</sup>. The total waste management requirement was also calculated.

We need to plan for the highest potential amount of waste, using the calculated figures. The ultimate number of facilities could be less depending on how much waste we can reuse or recycle, on the scale of the facilities proposed and indeed on the willingness of the commercial sector to build them.

Our Waste Plan needs to make provision for all types of waste – that is waste from construction and demolition activities, from industry and commerce as well as households. Accordingly additional energy recovery facilities may be proposed in Surrey by the private sector to deal with commercial waste streams. If so, it may be these also have capacity to deal with municipal waste.

## **MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

### **17. MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:**

In what way has the County Council changed the criteria which impact on the granting of bus passes for older people and people with learning disabilities renewing or applying for bus passes?

#### **Reply:**

In 2013 the Department for Transport (DfT) published a revised version of its guidance document to Local Authorities on assessing the eligibility of disabled applications for the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS). This revised version was updated to reflect changes in state benefits for disabled people, namely the phasing out of DLA and the introduction of Personal Independence Payment (PIP). Under the terms of the Transport Act 2000 it is for local authorities to determine whether someone is a “disabled person” for the purposes of concessionary travel, however, the guidance provides advice on the basis of automatic entitlement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Table 5 shows the future waste management capacity, rather than the “Future waste capacity requirements...” as indicated in the Table caption.

SCC understood the need to respond to the various implications that have arisen as a result of this phased transfer to Personal Independence Payment (PIP) and has therefore been reviewing and updating information regularly. This change has impacted some residents who had previously qualified for a disabled free bus pass as they were awarded a middle/higher rate care component with Disability Living Allowance (DLA). In the current guidance, the Department for Transformation (DfT) detail two PIP descriptors that should be used for automatic eligibility for a disabled bus pass:

- Moving around (8 or more points needed) – relates to residents with mobility issues
- Communicating verbally (8 or more points needed) – relates to residents who are i) profoundly or severely deaf ii) without speech

Members will also be aware that Surrey offers two additional concessions over and above the statutory minimum scheme that is required by the DfT; these are

- a) Free travel for Disabled Persons pass holders at all times, and
- b) Companion passes for pass holders who cannot travel on their own which provide free travel for the companion.

A full list of the acceptable documents to prove eligibility for a disabled free bus pass can be found on the Surrey web pages.

We recognised that many residents who have a learning disability and were being phased onto PIP from DLA would not qualify under the above PIP descriptors. This would create an obvious gap which could impact on their ability to access services. The DfT guidance does not provide Local Authorities with any clear pathway to assess a resident's eligibility for a pass under the learning disability criteria. The team has therefore been working with Adult Social Care (ASC) and disability groups such as the Surrey Coalition to find a suitable pathway to assess a resident under this category. In September 2017 the PIP descriptor 'Planning and Following a Journey' for those residents who score 12 points was adopted as suitable eligibility. This was a positive move for many residents with a learning disability however further pathways continue to be explored. Joint working with Adult Social Care continued to find a robust and inclusive approach to assessing a resident with learning disabilities.

Concurrently, residents registered on the Surrey Disability Register (SDR) as proof of eligibility for a disabled free bus pass was reviewed. This proof had been included originally in the Surrey list of acceptable documentation as an additional pathway which was not included in DfT guidance. However, as SDR members are not asked to provide proof of disability to join the register, there is no adequate audit trail in terms of the allocation of this public funding stream. The issuing of a disabled free bus pass is dependent on the severity of an applicant's disability set out by the DfT guidance and not the case that a resident identifies themselves as having a disability. SDR registration is not now accepted.

Following discussions with ASC, it is proposed that an additional pathway for an applicant to apply for a disabled free bus pass, under the learning disability criteria, is included. ASC has advised that residents in receipt of a funded SCC care package would meet with the DfT learning disability criteria, therefore an additional pathway would be to evidence that an applicant is supported by a funded SCC care package. This suggested way forward is currently being assessed by ASC and is the first phase of work that the team is undertaking relating to the disabled free bus pass scheme.

With regard to the older person's free bus pass there has been no change to the eligibility. Residents may apply for a free bus pass when they reach the female State Pension age.

This page is intentionally left blank