

## SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 22 MAY 2018 2018

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

**MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT****1. MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:**

Has the Council had any further discussions with DEFRA now that the government has stated clearly, in their litter strategy that 'disposing of household waste, including waste from DIY home improvement projects, should be free of charge'.

**Reply:**

I would thank Cllr Evans for his continuing interest in this subject. My officers and I met with Robert Vaughan, Head of Recycling at Defra, on 17 April 2018 and discussed the subject of charging for construction waste at household waste recycling centres.

I circulated a note of my meeting with Robert Vaughan to all Members on 10 May 2018 and I would refer Cllr Evans to the contents of this note, which I have reproduced below.

'Dear Members,

I wanted to update you following a meeting that I and officers had with Robert Vaughan, Head of Recycling at Defra on 17<sup>th</sup> April. The discussion was wide-ranging and we covered a number of areas as set out below.

**Fly-tipping**

We raised concerns in particular about the quality of the data that was being collected by local authorities in respect of fly tipping incident numbers. We expressed our view that a more consistent definition of what constitutes fly tipping would certainly help to address this and that it would be helpful if this could be fed back to Robert's colleagues in Defra.

We made Robert aware of the Surrey fly tipping prevention strategy, which was developed by all local authorities in Surrey and informed him of the two publicity campaigns that had been undertaken to encourage residents and businesses to dispose of their waste lawfully and cut off the supply of waste to illegal fly-tippers. We pointed out that one of the problems with such localised campaigns is that they do not necessarily reach beyond the boundaries of Surrey. Fly tippers do not respect such boundaries and we believe that much of the fly tipping that we see in Surrey originates from London. We told Robert that we believed that a government led national publicity campaign on fly tipping prevention would be much more effective and asked Robert to find out whether there were any plans for a national communications campaign.

### **Improving joint working in two-tier areas**

We told Robert that, In Surrey, we believe that the most effective way to work together on waste issues is to develop arrangements between Surrey County Council and the eleven district and borough councils which, as far as possible, resemble those of a unitary authority. We said that we felt that the government could further encourage joint working by considering incentives that would drive best practice in this area. For example through national performance indicators, financial incentives and sharing of best practice.

We said that we considered that the current recycling credit system has been a barrier to better joint working arrangements and that a change in the law to encourage a mechanism that shares the savings gained through increased recycling, such as the one we have developed in Surrey, would be beneficial. In this respect our Partnership Manage is going to investigate whether a task group to investigate this can be set up with the National Association of Waste Disposal Officers (NAWDO).

### **Producer responsibility**

We said that we were encouraged by the work being done at a national level to develop an improved producer responsibility system. We believe that good progress is being made in this area and we are looking forward to some exciting developments coming forward.

### **Charging for construction waste at community recycling centres**

We spoke at great length with Robert about the government's stated view that local authorities should accept reasonable amounts of 'DIY' waste generated by householders, free of charge at community recycling centres.

I told Robert that this is a significant matter for Surrey County Council and that if the council were no longer able to recover the cost of disposing of construction waste from our residents then the additional cost of disposing of this waste would be between £0.5 million and £1 million per year. I said that, in view of the council's difficult financial position, compensating savings would need to be found to balance our budget, this would mean very difficult decisions for the service to make.

I reiterated the council's view that there was no legal definition of 'DIY' waste but that the law did define 'construction and demolition' waste and allowed local authorities to make a charge for this type of waste even if it originated from a household.

Robert acknowledged that this was not a straightforward issue and agreed that defining what constituted a 'reasonable amount' and identifying whether the waste had in fact arisen from a work undertaken by a householder, would be challenging.

He said that the government had so far sought to deal with the matter through updated guidance from the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) however he did acknowledge that if the government needed to change the law then they would have to consult all local authorities on the proposed change and consider the cost implications.

Given that there are over 100 authorities operating community recycling centres in England, the cost impact for all English disposal authorities is likely to run into tens of millions of pounds.

### **Absorbent Hygiene Products**

I mentioned that we are currently working with Proctor and Gamble to establish the viability of a process to recycle absorbent hygiene products, including nappies. Robert said that Therese Coffey, Parliamentary under Secretary of State for the Environment, is aware of and interested in this development. We said that we would be interested to hear of any future opportunity for infrastructure/innovation funding that would improve the viability of the process and reduce the risk to pathfinder authorities such as Surrey County Council.'

### **HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SUPPORT**

#### **2. WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:**

Please could the Cabinet Member provide an update on the County Council's insurance claim following the fire at Lakers Youth Centre?

#### **Reply:**

I can advise the Member that two of my Cabinet Colleagues, Clare Curran and Tim Oliver, recently met with representatives from user groups based at Lakers and that the local County Councillor, Cabinet Member Colin Kemp, is aware of ongoing discussions that are happening with regards to future provision of Services. Whilst the Council understands the difficulties the local community are having whilst we go through these options following the damaging fire the building suffered in January, I can confirm that this Council fully recognises the importance these community buildings play in providing and generating positive social engagement opportunities to communities.

At this time there is an ongoing review and establishment of the business case to identify the options for Lakers and that working in conjunction with key providers and partners, such as the local borough and other active community providers including local schools, health providers and the voluntary and third sector, the Council will move forward with a decision around future options and this will factor in the ongoing conversations with the Councils Insurers.

### **CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN**

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

Recent statistics obtained by the NSPCC show a sharp rise in the number of children under 11 referred for mental health treatment by schools, with one third of those referred to CAMHS services refused help. Given the recent concerns expressed by councillors, residents and service users over CAMHS services in Surrey, can the Cabinet Member confirm that the current provider will not be offered a contract extension, that there will be a proper procurement process in which she will be fully involved and can she indicate what is being done to remedy the current failures in the service?

**Reply:**

As Cabinet Member I recognise the concerns raised by the Member and would like to reassure the Council of the high priority being placed on addressing the unacceptable waits and high demand for Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS).

The County Council and Surrey CCGs jointly commissioned the current CAMHS contract for a term of three years from April 2016 until March 2019 with the option to extend for another two years. The contract is now in its third year and the commissioners are working through the options for the future of CAMHS services to extend or re-procure. The decision on the contract will be made by a Committee in Common and based on key information which will include performance data, risk analysis and future operating models. I will be a member of the Committee in Common alongside the Assistant Director for Commissioning and Prevention, Head of Strategic Finance and representatives from our six partner CCGs. I am pressing for an early decision and seeking for this to be made next month subject to the necessary information being available.

To address the current failures and risks within the system, an urgent CAMHS summit was held on 13 April 2018. This was attended by Surrey County Council (SCC), Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Surrey and Borders Partnership (SABP) colleagues. The purpose of the summit was to agree an interim plan to address the immediate concerns around backlog and risks and to agree the specification for an independent review of the service approach.

The interim plan has a renewed focus on using early intervention services and supporting children, families, schools and GPs to use the range of services that are already provided through subcontracted partners. In order to deliver the interim plan and address the waiting list, additional resources are being secured through the Sustainable Transformation Partnership and the CCGs. This work will be supported by a review of case management criteria to reduce caseloads for clinicians to safe and manageable levels. I would like to stress the urgent and crisis referral pathway for children will still be in place during this period.

I reassure Members that whilst there will be concerns and risks during this period, access to CAMHS is being prioritised for those children most at risk and a thorough approach is being taken to decision making on the options of contract extension or procurement.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN**

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

What plans does the Cabinet Member have to increase the number of Foster Carers across Surrey and how will the resources for this be identified?

**Reply:**

It has been a significant challenge for some time to recruit sufficient high quality foster carers for our children in Surrey. In Surrey we are proud of our carers and know they do a fabulous job to support our most vulnerable children and to provide them with a

safe and stable home. But we do need more of them – and we are committed to working collectively to address this and I hope that our approach will have the support of all Members.

Within the Fostering service we have had a dedicated fostering recruitment team in place since January 2017 and we have been able to see the impact and effectiveness of this. The number of carers recruited in 2017-18 more than doubled with 27 households approved in contrast to only 13 the previous year. This team is shortly to be strengthened by an additional worker focusing on the assessment of carers for our unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Funding for this post is directly from the Department for Education (DfE) Migration Fund.

As you are aware, Dave Hill has recently joined us as our Executive Director for Children, Families and Schools and has already recognised that recruiting more foster carers in the County is a priority. Building on what has been successful elsewhere, we will be developing a more community based approach for recruitment, with our carers at the very heart of this. They are best placed to know what motivated them to become foster carers, and to use their passion and insight and experience to speak with family, friends, colleagues and others within their communities to identify other potential carers. Alongside this we fully recognise the level of support they need to be able to provide the best care possible to our children so we will be ensuring all our carers have strong support available from our Child & Adolescent Mental Health services.

It is currently Foster Carers Fortnight. I know many members are already supporting Surrey Fostering Service through talking with residents and sharing our fostering publicity material including car stickers and through invitations for our recruitment team to attend community events in their divisions. I hope you will all be willing to continue this support.

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

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

At the recent meeting of the E&I Select Committee, it was confirmed that there are at least 10 footbridges, and other rights-of-way bridges in Surrey, that are currently closed, which means that some of our rights-of-way network is also currently closed. Please could you provide details of where they are, how long they have been closed, and the cost of replacement of each of these bridges? Which bridges have a budget and plan in place for repairs/replacement and when will they re-open?

**Reply:**

Out of approximately 1,500 bridge/structures carrying public rights of way in the county, there are currently nine closed awaiting repairs. Seven of these are the responsibility of the County Council and two are private bridges.

We have an estimate of the cost to repair most of the bridges but do not have set dates for their repair because the budget available is very small. The total budget to cover bridges, surface repairs and other capital items is £175,000 over a network of 3,400 kilometres of publically maintainable rights of way. £71,000 of this is allocated in 2018/19 towards bridges.

Right of way	Closed since	Estimated cost	Budget in place	Opening	Comment
--------------	--------------	----------------	-----------------	---------	---------

FP 228a Chiddingfold	May 2018	£8,000	No. 2018/19 Budget already allocated	No date set. Possibly 2019/20	Standard footbridge with rotten timbers, needs replacement
FP6 Staines	May 2018	£6,000	No. 2018/19 budget already allocated	No date set. Possibly 2019/20	Standard footbridge with rotten timbers, replacement
FP 61 Send	Sept 2017	£25,000	No	No date set	Repairs to riverbank to protect bridge abutments. Negotiations with landowner have been protracted and yet to be finalised as a Public Path Diversion Order is also needed
FP 5 Ockham/FP82 Woking	Feb 2014	£350,000	No, due to scale of likely cost. Additional capital funding will need to be secured.	No date set. Feasibility work is being undertaken	This was a large footbridge (25m spanning River Wey) with no vehicular access. The old bridge has been removed for safety reasons. Discussions have taken place with adjoining landowners about possibility of moving the location/access, but no agreement has been reached.
FP 32 Egham	May 2018	£10,000	No. 2018/19 budget already allocated	No date set	Standard footbridge and boardwalk with rotten timbers
BW 163 Busbridge	June 2015	£5,000	Working with volunteers	Dec 2018	Complex legal situation. Protracted negotiations with adjoining landowners

					recently completed. Volunteer input is being used to progress 'simple' repairs one stage at a time, with contributions from interested parties/landowners
FP81 Farnham	Mar 2017	£15,000	Yes	Dec 2018	Standard footbridge with rotten timbers. Tendering process commencing June 2018
FP 34 Ripley & FP 123 Woking	Apr 2018	£0	Yes	Oct 2018	Privately owned bridge/structure
FP 19 Chertsey & FP 19 Walton and Weybridge	Mar 2018	£0	Yes	Aug 2018	Privately owned bridge/structure

**MARY LEWIS, CABINET MEMBER FOR ALL-AGE LEARNING**

**6. MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

Does the Council have any plans to close libraries in the north of the County (Elmbridge, Runnymede and Spelthorne)?

**Reply:**

There are no plans to close any libraries in Surrey but I cannot rule out that some libraries might at some stage be considered for relocation to alternative local premises where, as part of a review of our property holdings, this might be cost-effective. Like all local authorities, SCC are looking for creative solutions to deliver the breadth and quality of services that residents expect.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN**

**7. MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

The decision to set up a Charter for care leavers was passed unanimously at Council in March 2018. Please could the Cabinet Member set out what progress has been made in setting up the Charter since then and what the timescale is for its full implementation?

**Reply:**

We are all committed to develop a charter of entitlements with Care Leavers. We have recognised this as part of a range of Corporate Parenting improvements. Over the last month our energy has been focused on reviewing our corporate parenting in order to have more impact and to be more responsive to our Looked After Children and Care Leavers. This was agreed at the Corporate Parenting Board meeting this week. The next stage of this work is to update our Looked After Children and Care Leavers Strategy and Pledge and to see how well we are delivering against a charter. In order to ensure this work is meaningful we will include young people, practitioners, carers and partners in carrying out this work over the summer with a view to finalising it in September 2018.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN**

**8. MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

The Surrey Placement Strategy for Looked After Children (2016 – 2019) commits that by 2018 Surrey will “*reduce the reliance on out of county placements, particularly for those children and young people placed more than 20-miles from their originating home*”. In light of this please can Surrey confirm how the number of looked after children placed out of county has changed since 2016, where geographically they are placed, how far from their originating home they are placed and what affect this has on the quality of care and outcomes of these Looked After Children?

**Reply:**

Since 2016 the overall number of looked after children has increased from 876 to 930 as of 31 March 2018. A number of factors has led to the increase and this includes a greater number of younger children coming into care within Court proceedings due to concerns regarding the harm, or risk to harm, they have experienced. In addition more teenagers have become looked after because of concerns about them being exploited and going missing, as well as due to challenging behaviour. In line with this increase in overall numbers there has also been an increase in the number of children who are placed more than twenty miles from their home.

	<b>As at 31 March 2016</b>	<b>As at 31 March 2017</b>	<b>As at 31 March 2018</b>
Children Placed out of County (% of Looked After Children)	438 (50%)	422 (48%)	466 (50%)
Of which also > 20 miles from home (% of Looked After Children)	200 (23%)	219 (25%)	267 (28%)

Placements for children placed out of county will cover a wide range of needs – from those with severe disabilities or high educational needs who are placed in specialist residential schools, secure units, specialist intervention placements and parent and child residential assessments to those who are placed with foster carers as local foster carers could not be found. In the last three years children have been placed in 119 different local authority areas around the United Kingdom as well as abroad. The top 10 local authorities where children are placed outside of Surrey as at 31 March 2018 are:

<b>Children</b>	<b>% of all children</b>
-----------------	--------------------------



		<b>placed outside Surrey</b>
Kent County	56	21%
West Sussex County	52	19%
Croydon London Borough	49	18%
Hampshire County	49	18%
East Sussex County	24	9%
Medway (B)	14	5%
Sutton London Borough	12	4%
Bromley London Borough	12	4%
Hounslow London Borough	11	4%
Merton London Borough	10	4%

In terms of quality and impact on outcomes for their care, all children are supported and monitored through the same regulatory frameworks as those placed within Surrey and we have the same responsibilities. Their placements are subject to inspections, their care plans and care is scrutinised by Independent Reviewing Officers and they have allocated social workers who visit in line with our procedures. However we know that we are best able to care for our children when they are placed in Surrey, and that most children are best placed within their community. Where children are placed further away purely because of placement availability we recognise the impact this can have in terms of being able to keep contact with their family and friends, needing to change schools and also being able to access services such as CAMHS.

We take steps to mitigate these factors but we know that we need to work creatively to identify more placements within Surrey, as well as developing our services to support more adolescents to remain in the care of their family as this is where most children achieve the best outcome.

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

**9. MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:  
(3<sup>rd</sup> question)**

Surrey County Council has recently installed some more electronic real time information signs at bus stops. How much do these each cost to install and maintain? How many have been installed and how many more are planned? Does the County consider it a sensible use of limited resources when, for example, one bus stop in Stanwell has just six buses a day on weekdays, 10 on Saturdays and no service on Sundays or Bank Holidays?

**Reply:**

The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership provided funding for the County Council to deliver the Wider Staines Sustainable Transport Package (STP). This programme includes improvements to passenger transport, cycling and walking with the aim of encouraging more people to use sustainable travel modes. The overall package value is £4.95M, with scheme delivery between April 2017 to March 2020.

The passenger transport elements of the package have been designed to encourage increased passenger use. These measures include accessibility improvements to bus stops, new bus shelters and Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) displays. Overall up to 30 bus stops will be enhanced and this will include new bus shelters and real time displays at twenty bus stops. To date six real time displays have been installed. A

RTPI display costs approximately £6,000 for the supply, installation and maintenance. It is expected these RTPI displays will have a life span in excess of 15 years. This is based upon our experiences elsewhere in the county.

We have undertaken extensive consultation across the county as part of the Local Transport Review, and through our work with the Knowledge Transfer Partnership. This has identified that existing passengers place a high importance on the availability of up to date real time passenger information, providing them with confidence of their bus arrival times. This is as equally important for high frequency routes as it is for bus services that may operate less often. Our residents who do not currently use Surrey bus services have also told us that bus punctuality and the availability of this up to date real time bus arrival information are the most important factors that will encourage them to use our bus services. The Wider Staines STP programme is consistent with this and with our ambition to increase passenger numbers across the bus network.