

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**TUESDAY 11 DECEMBER 2018****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT****1. MRS HELYN CLACK (DORKING RURAL) TO ASK:**

The Cabinet Member is aware that Gatwick Airport is consulting on a masterplan and growth scenarios for the next fifteen years, and in spite of the Davies Commission settling the question of airport expansion in the South East, GAL has come up with a proposal for a three runways airport at Gatwick, using the emergency runway to the north of the existing runway for take-offs to the west and safeguarding land to the south for a third runway. The Consultation makes no mention of mitigation measures to reduce and compensate for the increase in noise and air pollution, a 25% increase in passenger traffic, nor details of the infrastructure requirements to support these expansion plans.

How will the Cabinet Member respond to the consultation and what measures will he take to make sure that local people to the north of the airport are consulted and protected from this?

Reply:

This Council's position with regard to airport expansion at Gatwick is set out in the Council resolution agreed at the meeting of the County Council on 16 July 2013. The resolution recognises the vital importance of Heathrow and Gatwick Airports to the success of Surrey's economy and would not wish to see their capacity reduced, but is clear that expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues to be satisfactorily addressed.

The Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018 is a non-statutory document which will replace the current 2012 Airport Master Plan. It sets out how the airport could develop and grow. Any proposals to bring the existing emergency runway into regular use and build an additional runway to the south were to be taken forward would require the submission of a Development Consent Order (DCO). This is the process for obtaining permission for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). If a DCO application is made, the County Council will be a statutory consultee and environmental information has to be provided as part of this process.

It should be noted that the only fully worked-up element of the draft Master Plan is for the first five years, 2018 to 2022. The only firm proposal for this period involves Gatwick Airport Limited doing more with the existing main runway and taking their current capital investment programme forward. This is consistent with current national aviation policy and it is important that the necessary supporting transport infrastructure is delivered and any appropriate mitigation provided. The other growth scenarios, involving the use of the emergency runway and the construction of a third runway on the safeguarded land, are conceptual at this stage and therefore little detail is provided on how they might be taken forward. Air quality and noise are identified in the draft Master Plan as two of the key environmental issues to be addressed. However, whilst

assumptions are made about the potential environmental impacts of the longer term expansion scenarios, these are not supported by any detailed evidence

I intend to respond to Gatwick Airport's Draft Masterplan in line with the County Council's resolution and to emphasise that the environmental impacts, particularly noise and air quality, must be satisfactorily addressed alongside any proposal for increased operations at the airport. Night flights are a significant noise nuisance and must be strictly controlled. I will also make it clear that investment in transport infrastructure to mitigate the additional local impact of any expansion proposals must be a central part of the Airport's future plans, especially where it encourages more travel by public transport and investment in new technologies to reduce air pollution.

As the resolution is opposed to any proposals that would serve to reduce airport capacity or the role of Heathrow as a hub airport, I will seek assurance from Gatwick Airport Limited that any expansion proposals do not threaten the viability of Heathrow as a hub airport and that they are in line with national aviation policy.

On the subject of consultation, I have already written to the Chief Executive Officer of Gatwick Airport Limited, Stuart Wingate, to express my serious concern that residents have not been given a proper opportunity to have their views on the Draft Master Plan to be heard and understood. Apart from a belatedly organised exhibition at Horley, Gatwick Airport Limited decided not to hold public exhibitions in other areas of Surrey likely to be significantly impacted by the plan proposals. Residents in Mole Valley, Tandridge and Waverley already suffer or could suffer from aircraft noise and airport related transport impacts and they should have been consulted directly. I have sought assurance that, when Gatwick formally develop any expansion proposals, every endeavour will be made to ensure that all Surrey communities likely to be impacted are informed of the consultation and that residents are given the opportunity to get to a public event that is convenient for them to attend so they are able to participate appropriately in the consultation.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

Why was Surrey County Council the only council not represented at the recent Police and Crime Panel national conference?

Reply:

The Police and Crime Panel is a countywide panel, administered by the County Council. I cannot comment on the question as it was the decision of the Panel. There is, however, facility on the Panel agenda for you to direct your question directly to the Police and Crime Panel.

CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN

3. MR GRAHAM ELLWOOD (GUILDFORD EAST) TO ASK:

Whilst I understand the financial constraints imposed upon Surrey County Council by Central Government, I want to draw your attention to my residents' concerns as follows:

If the Boxgrove Centre were to close, Merrow and Burpham residents are concerned that in this area of Guildford there would be no similar facilities within easy reach by young families. I would add that my own grandson and his family, in common with many local families, has benefitted enormously from the wonderful facilities available. In addition, those families living in the less well-off areas within Merrow and Burpham would find it difficult to travel across Guildford.

My concerns are:

- Where would the proposed replacement be sited?
- How far away from the existing site would it be?
- What thought has been given to ease of access, i.e. what is the availability of public transport to the proposed new site (to and from Merrow and Burpham)?

Reply:

The Children's Centre proposal will increase the level of targeted support for vulnerable children and offer services to the whole family, particularly where families have children between 0 – 11 years. There is a consultation in progress about the future of Children's Centres and no decisions will be taken until the consultation has closed and the results have been analysed.

MARY LEWIS, CABINET MEMBER FOR ALL-AGE LEARNING

4. MR CHRIS BOTTEN (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:

Could the Cabinet Member advise on the progress in relation to the replacement of the services until now provided by Babcock 4S, especially in relation to school support and governance?

Reply:

There is a programme in place that is managing the end of the County Council's contract with Babcock Education (who trade in Surrey as B4S). The priority of this programme is to ensure the smooth transfer of the Local Authority's statutory and strategic roles by 1 April 2019. School Support covers a range of services such as teacher training, raising the quality of performance and pupil progress, curriculum development, IT advice, support with financial matters and guidance around staffing and contractual matters. In most cases these services are purchased directly by schools. The local authority still maintains an important role in school effectiveness, particularly in identifying schools causing concern, monitoring and brokering support.

Work is on-going to develop a team within the education service which will be responsible for the Council's statutory duties and this will be in place by 31 March 2019. In Surrey we have a large number of Teaching Schools, some strong multi academy trusts, many high performing schools of all categories and both National and Local Leaders of Education and Governance. We are developing a school to school support system through an education partnership and a universal offer of support for all schools by schools was recently launched.

The statutory functions in relation to governance will be delivered by a new provider (this work is currently out to tender). The provider will offer some services, which have been commissioned by the County Council, free of charge to governors. These functions include the appointment of Additional Skills Governors and Interim Executive Board (IEB) members where required; maintenance of the countywide governor

database and supporting the appointments of Local Authority governors. There will also be a free helpline offering advice, guidance and support. Governor training and clerking services, plus optional external governor support or governing body audits will be traded, as indeed they are now, and schools will be free to purchase these from their existing supplier or find a new one.

MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS

5. MRS ANGELA GOODWIN (GUILDFORD NORTH) TO ASK:

A report has recently been published which reveals that complaints regarding social care in England have nearly trebled in the last few years. In light of this, can the lead Member please clarify the numerical and percentage increase in the number of complaints in relation to social care provided by this authority year on year since 2015? And can the Member also provide a breakdown of the type of complaints received? What action is Surrey County Council taking to reduce these, especially in light of the proposed cuts to social care?

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/nov/28/complaints-over-social-care-in-england-nearly-trebled-since-2010>

Reply:

A. Please clarify the numerical and percentage increase in the number of complaints in relation to social care provided by this authority year on year since 2015?

Overall there has been an increase in the number of complaints received by Adult Social Care since 2014/15. In 2014/15 the Directorate received 196, compared with 221 in 2017/18 (13% increase).

The Directorate received 128 complaints in Q1 and Q2 of 2018/19. Projecting this rate forward, we could expect a total of 256 complaints in 2018/19. This would represent an overall increase of 31% between 2014/15 and 2018/19.

Reporting Year	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	*2018/19	Total
Total Received	196	201	255	221	128	1001
% Variance	9.5%	2.6%	26.9%	-13.3%	15.8%	
Upheld	47	42	44	32	22	187
Partially Upheld	65	86	89	84	38	362
Not Upheld	75	64	106	90	47	382
Withdrawn	9	9	16	15	8	57
In Progress	-	-	-	-	13	13

* 15.8% variance is based on the predicted total of 256
 * Total Received of 128 for 2018/19 is for Q1 and Q2 only

B. Can the Member also provide a breakdown of the type of complaints received?

The nature of complaints has remained broadly consistent year on year. The top ten type of complaints account for just under 90% of all complaints received by Adult Social Care. Being dissatisfied with service quality and issues with the finance and funding of care consistently appear as the most frequent types of complaint.

Nature of Complaint	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	Total No.	Total %
Dissatisfied with Service Quality	42	49	53	51	27	222	22.2%
Financial/Funding	30	28	42	33	17	150	15.0%
Dissatisfied with assessment process	19	13	32	26	13	103	10.3%
Poor Communication	20	15	22	24	9	90	9.0%
Decision Making	12	19	16	20	6	73	7.3%
Staff Attitude/Behaviour	11	14	18	13	13	69	6.9%
Dissatisfied with appropriateness of service	14	9	18	11	11	63	6.3%
Dissatisfied with speed of service provision	10	12	12	11	5	50	5.0%
Inadequate information and advice	5	7	10	13	4	39	3.9%
Staff Competency	7	10	10	3	4	34	3.4%
Dissatisfied with appropriateness of placement	7	4	6	2	5	24	2.4%
Unsatisfactory response	7	6	3	3	4	23	2.3%
Policy/Procedures	2	6	2	3	2	15	1.5%
Dissatisfied with speed of placement	3	4	7			14	1.4%
Fair treatment/(discrimination)	1	1	1	5	2	10	1.0%
Dissatisfied with volumes of service offered	3	1		1	3	8	0.8%
IG or Data protection breach	3	2	2			7	0.7%
Legal/POA			1	2	1	4	0.4%
Not following the Care Plan		1			1	2	0.2%
Dissatisfied with speed of placement					1	1	0.1%
Grand Total	196	201	255	221	128	1001	

C. What action is SCC taking to reduce these, especially in light of the proposed cuts to social care?

Adult Social Care has a vision for 'a modern service' which will promote independence. Delivering this vision will require transformational change across all aspects of service delivery. This level of change will inevitably impact upon people who use services and their carers but we will do everything we can to ensure people remain at the heart of any changes.

Adult Social Care will not be taking specific actions to reduce the number of complaints, as these create learning opportunities to improve service quality and are a means by which residents can hold the Council to account.

The Ombudsman has acknowledged that Councils are operating in a difficult financial landscape, but that this should not influence their decision making processes. The Ombudsman is currently consulting with Councils on the principles of good administrative practice and has suggested six principles which offer the Council an opportunity to improve the complaints process and ultimately the quality of service that the Council provides.

1. Getting it right.
2. Being service-user focussed.
3. Being open and accountable.
4. Acting fairly and proportionately.
5. Putting things right.
6. Seeking continuous improvement.

MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

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

At 10.09 on 17 August 2018 a resident purchased a ticket to park in the Countryside Estate Car Park at Newlands Corner and claims to have placed the ticket on the dashboard of their open top car. At 10.27 the car was issued with a parking ticket on the basis that no ticket was displayed. On returning to the car, the resident claims that the purchased ticket was on the floor of the car having been blown off the dashboard by the wind.

The purchased ticket has been provided to District Enforcement and thus the timings of the ticket purchase and the time of the penalty charge are agreed facts. It would also appear, on the balance of probabilities, that the resident's statement that the ticket blew off the dashboard onto the floor of the car in the intervening period is credible and that the ticket had been properly displayed in accordance with the stated terms and conditions for parking in the car park when the resident left the car.

The resident appealed, the appeal was turned down, and then the resident paid the fine under duress, District Enforcement stating that the discounted rate for payment would only apply for 14 days from the date of the appeal determination and that the fine would double if not paid at that time.

When the Cabinet Member responsible for the Countryside Car Park was invited to refund the fine as the case has clearly been made on the balance of probabilities that the resident had paid to park their car at the car park before the penalty charge was levied and that the resident had not overstayed the purchased parking time, he declined to do so.

I believe that in these circumstances, where on the balance of probabilities the resident paid the appropriate parking charge at the correct time, this decision not to refund the parking fine is wrong and that not to refund the fine adversely affects the reputation of this Council. I also note of at least one instance, in very similar circumstances, that Mole Valley District Council waived a parking fine levied on a resident in relation to one of its car parks.

As the Cabinet Member and I clearly disagree over this, I ask the Cabinet Member to explain to all County Councillors why he believes that a resident who, on the balance of probabilities following the presentation of evidence to District Enforcement, has correctly paid to park in one of the Council's Countryside Car Parks should not have their fine refunded and why he believes his decision does not adversely affect the reputation of this Council?

Reply:

As previously stated to Hazel Watson, the contravention of this parking fine was failure to display a valid ticket in the car at the time of parking. The ticket and other signs in the car park clearly state that it is a pay and display car park. There is an additional note on all parking tickets dispensed that the ticket must be displayed on the dashboard of the car. The resident who incurred the fine parked a soft top convertible car in the car park on the 17 August 2018. It would be common sense for the resident to secure the parking ticket to their car as per the instructions and policy of the car park, however the resident failed to do so. Obviously the district enforcement team denied the request for appeal from the resident.

When working with the district enforcement team to see if this could be refunded, I asked if this was common problem that they experience with soft top convertible cars. The team told me that this is the first time they have heard this excuse and their policy states that it is the motorist's responsibility to display a valid ticket at the time of parking. In the letter of the parking charge that was issued to the resident there are also several photos of the car with the roof down and no ticket on the dashboard. The local Councillor states that this ticket was on the floor of the car, however no ticket can be seen in the photographs.

The resident was actually given further options for appeal once the first appeal was declined by the district enforcement officers. They were informed that they could take their case to an independent adjudicator at the IAS service and that their case would be reviewed by a barrister. It would then be the barrister's decision whether to waive the parking fine. They would have had 21 days to seek this service from the date that their parking fine appeals process was declined. Unfortunately this was not done by the resident, in fact their parking fine was paid just a few days before law enforcement would have been involved.

To conclude, the parking charge has been incurred because of failure to display the ticket in the car. We are not denying the probability of the driver having bought the ticket, but we are clear on the fact that they have failed to display their ticket.

CHARLOTTE MORLEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SUPPORT

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

Would the appropriate Cabinet Member inform Council who was responsible for the final decision to close the catering outlets in Kingston and Woking; and what was the level of support for this decision as expressed in response to the consultation that preceded it both from staff and members?

Reply:

As you know, the Council is under significant pressure to find savings in order to ensure that it does not overspend in 2018/19 and that budgets for 2019/20 can be balanced. As part of the £40m in year savings agreed by the Cabinet as a whole in the summer the decision was taken to close the canteens at two of the County Council sites. As the communications stated, the canteens were making a loss and the number of people using each of the canteens had much reduced. In the light of the financial situation and the fact that the canteens were not commercially viable, the canteens were closed.

The consultation responses from staff were minimal on this matter.

DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

8. MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:

The Council is currently consulting on five aspects of its Transformation Programme after receiving over 3,000 responses to its Draft Vision for Surrey 2030. The Council recently engaged IESE to run a training session for councillors to 'take a lead role in transformation', which spent an afternoon distinguishing between incremental change

(improving service delivery), innovative change (described as customer centred) and transformative change (described as community enabling). I understand this training cost us £7,380.

To what extent are the following changes, currently being consulted on, considered to be 'community-enabling' and 'transformative', and to what extent do they constitute a reduction in locally provided services:

- a. proposed closure of 37 children centres (reducing number from 58 to 21);
- b. proposed £4 million savings through transformation of libraries and cultural services;
- c. closing between 4 and 6 of our smaller community recycling centres, after strong rejection of these proposals in two previous consultations (reducing number of community recycling centres from 15 to 9 or 11 across Surrey);
- d. reducing bus concessionary funding; and
- e. proposed changes to SEND?

For each of these five service changes, please provide an estimate of the level of front-line staffing reductions (direct and contracted) which would result, evidence of where best practice exists for these changes being 'transformative' and how these changes align to the 2030 vision.

Reply:

Upon conclusion of the consultations Cabinet and the Corporate Leadership Team will review and bring forward recommendations. It would be inappropriate for me as Leader to comment prior to the closure of the consultations.

DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

**9. MR CHRIS BOTTEN (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:
(2ND QUESTION)**

Will the Leader of the Council now commission and publish a proper risk assessment for the County Council in respect of the current Brexit scenarios, especially in relation to the potential impacts on the recruitment and retention of staff in the care, health and construction sectors, and will he be writing to the Prime Minister and the Surrey MPs calling for a People's Vote?

Reply:

Work is underway to ensure plans are in place to mitigate against potential disruption for the Council and for residents. Officers are progressing our preparations and contingency plans for all eventualities in four priority areas: emergency planning; the Surrey County Council workforce, including the wider care sector; non-UK EU national Surrey residents; and returning UK nationals. Preparations comprise establishing comprehensive awareness of implications for those priority areas, plans to mitigate against any negative implications and how we deliver support to those affected people.

I will not be writing to the Prime Minister and the Surrey MPs calling for a People's Vote. Such representations are more likely to come from individual Members or others, rather than the County Council, where the focus is upon managing any impacts or implications on behalf of Surrey's residents.

MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS

10. MRS ANGELA GOODWIN (GUILDFORD NORTH) TO ASK: (2ND QUESTION)

Can the lead Member detail the current 'adult care debt'? How does it compare to the figure from the 2016/2017 financial year? What additional steps are Surrey County Council taking to reduce this latest figure?

Reply:

Please find below the current debt position as at end of October 2018, with comparable figures for March 2017 and March 2018.

	Total debt	Secured and not due	Pending a deferred payment	Net overdue charges
March 2017	16.54m	6.06m	0.27m	10.21m
March 2018	20.67m	8.37m	0.43m	11.87m
October 2018	21.88m	8.77m	0.94m	12.17m

The charges raised in the same period were £48.6m in 2016/17, £54.5m in 2017/18 and the forecast for 18/19 is £57.3m.

In January 2018 the Credit Control team responsible for recovery of charges transferred from Orbis Business Operations to Adult Social Care. The Credit Control team and the Financial Assessment and Benefit Teams are currently subject to a restructure with the aim of integrating debt recovery as part of the overall financial assessment process. A new Debt Prevention Officer role will co-ordinate and provide specialist advice to support individuals to make early payment. Additionally, a new Debt Recovery Officer role will lead on the management of online county court claims and instructions to Legal Services.

COLIN KEMP, CABINET LEAD MEMBER FOR PLACE

11. MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (2ND QUESTION)

During the daytime of 2 May 2018, Ashcombe Road A2003 was closed for patching work by contractors on behalf of the County Council with no road closure order in place, no advance warning to the County Council or local residents or businesses and with no diversion route in place, which brought the town to a standstill with complete gridlock on the roads.

Again, during the evening of 22 November, the A25 in Westcott was closed by contractors on behalf of the County Council for putting down an anti-skid surface at the pedestrian crossing with no road closure order in place, no advance warning to the County Council or local residents and with no diversion route in place, which meant that Westcott residents had difficulty getting home that evening, HGVs trying to turn around with difficulty on the A25 and Logmore Lane, which is a single track road, was jammed with vehicles.

In view of these problems, what action is the Cabinet Member taking to ensure that contractors working for the County Council do not close roads in Surrey without having the necessary road closure order in place so that the County Council, local residents

and businesses have the necessary advance warning of the road closure with a diversion route in place?

Reply:

There was an official road closure in place for this section of Ashcombe Road for the duration of the patching works in question. The closure commenced on 1 March 2018 and is valid for 18 months. This has been verified by our Temporary Traffic Regulation Order Team. Advanced warning signs were erected detailing information of the closure and three Variable Message Signs were used to inform drivers of the closure.

Cllr Watson was emailed regarding the commencement of the patching works and informed that most of the patching would be undertaken using temporary traffic signals. Unfortunately, due to a mistake during the permit application process, the Works Communication Team (WCT) were not aware that a road closure was required to complete the few patches that were in the centre of the road and thus did not follow the proper Customer & Stakeholder Engagement Plan (CSEP) process that would have informed all stakeholders via letter drops.

There was an official diversion in place. Our work partner's surface treatments supervisor attended the site on several occasions and we can confirm that he drove the diversion route to check that the signs were all in place as per the Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO).

There was an official road closure in place for this section of the A25 Guildford Road for the duration of the works in question. The closure commenced on 1 August 2018, valid for 18 months. This has been verified by our Temporary Traffic Regulation Order Team.

There was an official diversion in place, with the signage set out as per the Temporary Traffic Regulation Order. This included advanced warning signs on every approach to the site. Due to a technical issue in the permitting of the works, the Works Communication Team (WCT) were not aware of the closure in time to follow the Customer & Stakeholder Engagement Plan (CSEP) and were therefore unable to communicate the closure through the normal channels.

Due to these departures from the SCC policy, a case study was carried out by the Communications Manager with the permitting team, contractor and SCC. An improvement plan and revised processes have now been put in place to prevent future similar issues.

MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

**12. MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:
(2ND QUESTION)**

Gatwick Airport Ltd is currently consulting on a master plan, which includes proposals for use of its emergency runway in the short-term and a second runway in the longer-term. The Airports Commission's final report concluded that with a third runway at Heathrow Airport it would only be possible to stay in the UK's current carbon budget for aviation and shipping if flights from all other airports were to reduce. The International Panel on Climate Change's 1.5°C report (October 2018) notes that we must dramatically reduce emissions globally in the next 12 years. This would require far stronger carbon reduction targets in the UK. Please confirm that Surrey County Council

objects to Gatwick Airport Ltd's proposals for expansion and will respond accordingly to the airport's master plan consultation.

Reply:

This council agreed a resolution in 2013 that makes it clear that any expansion at Gatwick Airport would require the environmental and surface access issues to be satisfactorily addressed. As indicated in my response to Cllr Clack at Question 1, little detail is provided in the Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018 on how any proposals to use the emergency runway on a routine basis and the construction of a third runway might be taken forward, although these are expected to require Development Consent Order (DCO) applications to be made. Carbon emissions are identified in the Draft Master Plan as a key environmental issue to be addressed in an environmental impact assessment, which is required to be provided with any DCO submission. Any expansion proposals will need to be in line with national aviation policy.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

**13. MR CHRIS BOTTEN (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:
(3RD QUESTION)**

Is there a savings target for the fire service for the coming year (2019/2020), and what will be the impact on service delivery?

Reply:

There is no savings target for Surrey Fire & Rescue Service for the coming year (2019/2020). The Service will instead be focusing on developing its plans for transformation. Residents will have the opportunity to contribute views on any transformation proposals as part of a consultation exercise.

DAVID HODGE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

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

The Cabinet meeting on 25 September 2018 included an agenda item titled 'Finance Improvement Plan', which reported on a review by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) commissioned by Surrey County Council in May 2018 to "undertake a deep dive review on issues of concern and the appointment of a panel of experts to quality assure progress assessments." The paper notes that CIPFA did conduct deep-dive examinations into the areas of a) contract inflation of £30.9m and b) changes in demand [for council services] of £60.9m. CIPFA noted that they found "difficulties in obtaining and scrutinising performance to estimate the financial consequences" and that "there is a lack of reliable and granular performance data to underpin such estimates." However, no details of this work were included in the Cabinet agenda item, and a senior council officer confirmed that this was only the Executive Summary of the review. Please can the full report (with confidential aspects redacted as appropriate) be placed in the public domain.

Reply:

The report published in September was the full and final end report of this process.

This page is intentionally left blank