

CABINET – 29 January 2019**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Will Forster (Woking South):**

The Government has previously announced that European Union (EU) citizens, post Brexit, will need to apply and pay for 'settled status'. Adult EU nationals were originally required to pay £65, or £32.50 if they are under 16 years old, though the fee has now been waived.

Please will Surrey County Council agree to automatically apply for settled status for any children in its care? Please will the Council also agree to help staff and their families that are EU citizens with the application process to ensure it does not lose valuable staff?

Reply:

With regard to children in care, the County Council has an existing track record, which it will continue, of assisting children in our care to achieve settled status in the UK when it is in their interests to do so.

With regard to staff, the joint management/Trade Union note on S-net confirms the Council's commitment to supporting staff who are EU nationals; this extends to support with the application process itself if required. A copy of the note (including reference to the Council's commitment to reimbursing staff the cost of applications for settled/pre-settled status ahead of the Government announcing the waiving of this fee), as available via the link below.

https://snet.surreycc.gov.uk/_media/files/hr/Support-for-Surrey-CC-staff-who-are-EU-nationals-an-update.pdf

Mr Colin Kemp
Deputy Leader
29 January 2019

Question (2) Will Forster (Woking South):

One year ago, Lakers Youth Centre in Goldsworth Park, Woking, was badly damaged by a fire and has not been used for youth work since.

Please can the County Council confirm if or when it will repair and reopen Lakers Youth Centre?

Reply:

We are reviewing the existing 'Youth Offer' in Surrey which will involve engaging with young people and key stakeholders to co-design the future service. This will take place in the coming months. The resulting offer will then be implemented in partnership with the District and Borough Councils and partner agencies including the voluntary, community and faith sector. There are no immediate plans to rebuild the Lakers Youth Centre but we will be considering the future need for buildings as part of the review.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families
29 January 2019

Question (3) Angela Goodwin (Guildford North):

If they have not done so already, would SCC investigate the use of technology, such as Centrica's Hive, as an alternative to care homes and live-in carers, in the effort to combat problems such as loneliness, and foster safety, amongst the elderly?

Reply:

The District and Borough Councils provide a community alarm and telecare service to support people and enable them to live safely and securely at home for longer. For those people with eligible social care needs who would benefit from a community alarm or telecare, the Adult Social Care service make a referral to the relevant local council to provide the service. The District and Borough Councils recommend equipment that meets the needs and reduces the risks for the individual. The benefits of telecare and alarm systems are well established in helping to avoid the need for residential care, live-in carers and unnecessary hospital admissions.

We are aware that Carers UK has been working with Centrica to introduce the Hive system, although we have not investigated this to date. Technology Enabled Care [TEC] is a rapidly expanding market. There are a wide range of devices and apps now available that can help someone to live independently for longer. The devices can support people with dementia to manage aspects of daily living as well as supporting younger adults to be more independent. TEC can also provide immense support and peace of mind to the 3 million carers in the UK.

Here at SCC, we are exploring the greater use of TEC and are currently in conversation with two of our District and Boroughs to look at potential pilot sites to test and learn about the best device and app solutions to help us assist residents in different ways. This could include the use of sensors to reduce the need for sleep-ins and on site waking night staff in supported living as well as exploring the options for wearable devices to support more independent living. We are also looking at devices that control lighting and heating systems etc. to help keep people safe in their own homes.

In exploring the options around an expanded TEC offer we are also in discussions with Health colleagues about the opportunities for Telehealth devices to help monitor hydration levels and other indicators of health and wellbeing. These explorations will lead to an expanded TEC offer in the future.

Mrs Sinead Mooney
Cabinet Member for Adults
29 January 2019

Question (4) Dr Andrew Povey (Cranleigh & Ewhurst):

The residents of my division, Cranleigh and Ewhurst, and of surrounding divisions are environmentally conscious and wish to recycle materials to the maximum extent. How can this environmental responsibility be encouraged in the future if Cranleigh community recycling centre is closed?

Reply:

Residents will be able to use alternative CRCs at Witley, Farnham and Guildford which have a full range of recycling facilities.

The council does however accept that the users of the sites recommended for closure will now have a longer journey time to an alternative CRC. We'll try to limit this by improving communications on what alternatives are available to a CRC such as kerbside collections through the district and borough council or commercial waste companies.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste
29 January 2019

Question (5) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):
--

Please confirm the total number of posts filled with agency staff on a rate that is equivalent to an annual salary of a) over £50,000 a year or more, b) over £100,000 a year or more and c) over £200,000 a year or more - and how these figures compare to 1 year ago. Please confirm the current monthly cost of agency staff positions and how this compares to 1 year ago.

Reply:

The Council uses agency workers and interim contractors on a temporary basis for a number of reasons:

- To fill critical roles pending permanent recruitment, for example statutory/leadership roles.
- To fill other critical roles where market conditions make permanent recruitment challenging, for example children's social workers.*
- To fill roles pending a reorganisation/restructure, where it is envisaged redundancies may occur.
- To provide specialist expertise not available within the permanent workforce to enable delivery of critical programmes of work.

* The Council, along with many other Local Authorities, faces significant difficulties recruiting and retaining children's social workers. The Family Resilience Programme underway to improve Children's Services includes plans to address this, however in the short-term it is necessary for us to bring in suitably qualified temporary workers in order to meet our statutory duties to children and their families.

The majority of interim expenditure over the past twelve months has been in support of organisational transformation; given the scale and pace of this there is a need to engage people with the necessary expertise, capacity and competence on an interim basis to support our effort to make the improvements necessary across the Council, as set out in the Transformation Programme.

Whilst there will inevitably be a need for short-term temporary resource on an ongoing basis, for example to cover unexpected vacancies, the requirement for specialist interim resource will diminish and a number of roles currently filled on a temporary basis will, as soon as is practicable, be filled by permanent employees.

Statistics in relation to agency workers/interim contractors are given below:

	December 2018	December 2017
Rate equivalent to a salary of £50,000 - £99,000 p.a.	41	21
Rate equivalent to a salary of £100,000 - £199,000 p.a.	46	2
Rate equivalent to a salary of £200,000 p.a. and above	1	0

2018/19 monthly expenditure on agency/interim workers averaged £2.2m against an average monthly spend of £1m during 2017/18.

Ms Charlotte Morley
Cabinet Member for Corporate Support
29 January 2019

Question (6) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)(JE2):

1. Equality Impact Assessments

- A. The Equality Act 2010 requires consideration of equality of opportunity (as stated on p47 of council papers) for those who share a 'relevant protected characteristic'. Please confirm if this includes living in one specific area (e.g. avoiding a postcode lottery of service provision across Surrey) and also whether this includes equality of income related impacts.
- B. The EIA (equality impact assessment) for children centres considers:
- i. Who is affected by the proposals, does not identify those most affected by the reduction of coverage of the new, reduced number of centres (those near centres to be closed or re-purposed). Why?
 - ii. The assessment of protected characteristics states that because funding and provision is allocated based on the index of deprivation affecting children (IDACI index), which assesses deprivation at a super-output area level, this means that children and families living in areas of lower income will benefit from services being located within their community. Please confirm, firstly that children in poverty in smaller areas of deprivation (for example, Whitebushes estate which has around 700 households, but is smaller than a super-output area scale) will therefore be negatively benefited as this is not picked up in this statistical measure, and secondly, whether any new centres are to be opened leading the positive location-based impacts set out here.
 - iii. Why is the impact of closure of children centres specialising in supporting SEND needs (e.g. Stepping Stones in Earlswood) not identified as an impact to those with disabilities (only impacts on staff with disabilities appear to be considered)?
 - iv. How will the amendments to the proposals to provide mobile provision through use of a bus (how many buses?) provide coverage not just those in remote rural areas but those living in peri-urban areas and smaller towns where children centres are to be closed?
 - v. To what extent is the EIA action plan considered to address the primarily negative issues raised throughout the equality impact assessment? What residual impacts, after the mitigating actions set out are taken, are envisaged?

- C. The EIA for the SEND is mainly positive and notes that Surrey County Council are proposing to follow this strategy with an action plan setting out how SEND transformation is achieved. Please confirm when and where this will be published.
- D. Please confirm when the second public consultation setting out detailed proposals for the Libraries and Cultural Services Transformation will take place and what budget savings this is required to deliver.
- E.
- i. Please confirm (through providing a map and numbers) how many households fail to meet the criteria for CRCs to be reasonably accessible (considering the 3 and 7 mile limits stated) as defined by WRAP, and where these people live. Please confirm which parts of Surrey are defined as 'very rural' by Surrey in ensuring compliance. In February 2017 Surrey announced it had invested so that 7,000 additional homes received Superfast Broadband - achieving a 99% coverage across Surrey. Please confirm the coverage of 'reasonably accessible' CRCs this budget change will result in, and how many households will no longer have reasonably accessible access, as defined by the government's Waste and Resources Action Plan to a CRC.
 - ii. ii) Please provide data on how customer satisfaction, recycling rates and residual waste volumes both at CRCs and households (see paragraphs 12 - 14 and Table 6 of Annex 4) have changed alongside the changes made to the CRCs since 2015/2016 (table 1) and changing levels of usage (table 2).
 - iii. iii) It appears that each year the Surrey waste contractor who runs the CRCs for Surrey Council has been targeted to recommend and deliver at least £1m savings (see Annex 4, Table 5). Please confirm if this is indeed the case, and why the council does not target better separation and collection of high quality recycling in both CRCs and from households instead.
 - iv. iv) Please confirm how the proposed changes to CRCs are predicted to impact on recycling rates at each of the CRCs and overall Surrey County Council recycling rates.
 - v. v) In the EIA for CRCs no consideration for increased distance to travel to a CRC for those with protected characteristics has been considered. Please confirm why not.

Reply:

- A. Area of residence and income are not protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, and therefore the duties in section 149 of the Act do not apply directly to those features. Accordingly there is no duty to have regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity as between persons who live in different areas or as between persons who have different levels of income.
- B. (i) The proposal is relevant to all children and families, as set out in the first bullet point of those affected by the proposal.
- (ii) The new model locates centres where there is evidence of higher numbers of families affected by deprivation (IDACI index), but the funding formula used for each district and borough also takes in to account the total population of 0-4 year olds therefore the Whitebushes estate is included in the calculations. We have not proposed any new locations for main Family Centres but will use community venues to deliver outreach where there is a need to do so. This is in accordance with statutory guidance which states "It follows from the statutory definition of a children's centre that children's centres are as much about making appropriate and integrated services available, as it is about providing premises in particular geographical areas."

(iii) The new delivery model will provide outreach support for families if they do not live near a centre, we do not expect families to travel to centres. We have however identified the potential impact if they do not live near a centre on page 8 of the EIA *“the proposed restructure may reduce the quantity of frontline universal service. This change may affect children with disabilities and their families”*. All of the Children’s Centres support children with SEND needs and therefore the EIA has not specified individual centres.

(iv) We are proposing to retain one mobile children’s centre which will be deployed in areas where there is a lack of suitable community venues. This could either be within urban or rural areas.

(v) The EIA and resulting action plan is a dynamic document and addresses the assessed impact at this point. The EIA will be continue to be reviewed as part of the implementation process and any residual impacts that require further action will be identified, documented and acted on accordingly.

- C. This will be published by 30 April 2019 on the [Surrey Local Offer website](#) and promoted through various channels including social media, accessible formats and partners.
- D. We envisage that there will be further consultation on the Libraries and Cultural Services transformation, with the next round being launched in mid-May. With regard to budget savings, we stated in our first stage consultation document that we are aiming to bring library spending per head in line with the national average per head.
- E. (i)The Waste Resources and Action Programme (WRAP) has suggested that a good minimum level of CRC provision with some exceptions for very rural/urban areas would be. The four areas suggested by WRAP are represented by the bullet points below:
- Maximum catchment radius for a large proportion of the population: **three to five miles (very rural areas: seven miles)**.

We have cross-referenced the proportion of Surrey within a five mile radius of the CRCs being closed with the population of different wards in Surrey, and believe that **90% of Surrey residents** still will be within a five mile radius of an existing CRC in the network. The areas that fall outside are mainly in rural locations in the south of Mole Valley, East of Waverley and South and East of Tandridge.

- Maximum driving times for the great majority of residents in good traffic conditions: **20 minutes (very rural areas: 30 minutes)**

Map 2 in Annex 4b shows that the great majority of residents (95.5% of households) will still be within 20 minutes drive of a CRC.

- Maximum number of inhabitants per Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) (in all but the most urbanised areas): **120,000**

The estimated population in Surrey is 1,194,500 (based on projections by the Office for National Statistics) which is an average of 108,591 residents per CRC site.

- Maximum number of households per HWRC (in all but the most urbanised areas): **50,000**

The estimated number of households in Surrey is 486,939 which is an average of 44,267 households per CRC site.

(ii) table:

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Percentage of residents very satisfied or fairly satisfied with CRC sites (based on a survey of 1,600 residents)	86%	77%	73%
Overall district and borough kerbside collection recycling rate	53%	55%	54%
CRC recycling rate	64%	62%	59%
District and borough kerbside collected (residual tonnage)	193,576 T	190,763 T	191,672 T
CRC residual Tonnage (includes wood)	50,678 T	42,869 T	38,303 T

(iii) The measures set out in Annex 4, Table 2 have delivered £2.5 million of savings since 2015/16 however a further £1 million of savings is required to meet the council's budget envelope and measures to achieve this are set out in Annex 4, Table 5.

Around 80% of waste delivered to the CRCs is collected as separated material, for example wood, green waste and metal and this is sent either for recycling or recovery depending on the nature of the material. The remaining waste comprises black bag waste as well as bulky waste such as mattresses, rigid plastics, carpets and unusable furniture. The bulky waste is sent for secondary sorting where some recovery take place but options for recycling or recovery of this material are limited by economics and markets. Suez already undertake some manual sorting of black-bag waste to recover recyclables and as set out in Paragraph 17 of Annex 4, it is proposed to undertake a mechanical sorting trial to see whether it is economic to extract more recyclable material from black-bag waste.

The Surrey Waste Partnership also have a programme of work aimed at increasing recycling of kerbside collected material. This work includes targeted publicity campaigns, for example to encourage greater levels of food waste recycling as well as employment of a team of officers dedicated to increasing recycling at flatted properties.

(iv) We do not expect the proposed changes to impact recycling rates as a comprehensive range of recycling services will be provided at alternative CRCs to complement the existing kerbside recycling collections provided by the districts and boroughs.

(v) In some cases, service users or staff may have to drive further to an alternative site as a result of permanently closing a CRC site. However having to drive further has no differential impact on those with protected characteristics, as to be able to drive you need to demonstrate that you are in good health, and that any condition does not affect your ability to drive irrespective of the distance driven. Service users may have to spend more money on petrol because of driving further to an alternative CRC. However, low income itself is not a protected characteristic.

Pedestrians (service users) are currently allowed to walk into Warlingham CRC to access this site. If this site were to close it would impact pedestrians who use this site and have no means of other transport to drive to an alternative CRC. This would in theory have a greater impact on pedestrians with limited physical mobility, who are unable to drive. This has been captured in Annex 4a. However staff and contractors indicate that most pedestrians who use the Warlingham CRC actually park their car outside the site and then walk in, so the impact that these pedestrians will have is having to drive further to reach an alternative site, which has no differential impact on protected characteristics. However we acknowledge that some pedestrians who live locally will walk into the site, and while we're not aware that there are many of these pedestrians with limited physical mobility, we recognise the greater impact that it could have on them especially if they are unable to drive to an alternative CRC because of their condition. We anticipate those affected will be able to use alternative methods of disposal available at the kerbside or commercially.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
29 January 2019

Question (7) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)(JE3):

The 2019/2020 Budget together with the proposed 5 year Financial Strategy 2019/2024 (item 7, main report) considers significant changes to Surrey services, including to our Community Recycling Centres, which will have not just impacts on Surrey residents, but on our local environment and climate change. No assessment of climate and environment impacts has been considered in this overall report and only limited impacts on the environment (but not climate change) in the supporting annexes (only for CRCs). Please confirm when this assessment will be made, and how negative impacts made will be mitigated.

Reply:

Where environmental impacts have been identified, services have assessed the implications and detailed them in the annex reports for this item.

On CRCs, additional emissions of carbon dioxide through increased car journeys have been taken into account as part of the analysis related to the proposed changes to them. It is unlikely there will be any other significant climate change implications from the changes to the service. The environmental considerations summary (Annex 4c) provides more detail.

Retaining a mobile Family Centre will enable outreach services to be provided to hard to reach groups.

On concessionary travel, there are around 5 million journeys made under the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme made on weekdays. Less than 1% of these have been made before 09:30 and after 23:00. This means only a small number of people

potentially making the same journey by car, or other transport that would result in increased peak time congestion, and so no assessment was necessary.

This view was also taken in line with the planned negotiation with the bus operators on a reduced or flat fare scheme for disabled and companion pass holders before 09.30. Which, if implemented, will further reduce any potential shift to car or other vehicle use.

The majority of consultation responses indicated people would continue to travel by bus, either by paying or changing travel plans. This, along with the numbers of respondents saying that would drive, get a lift or use a different form of free transport, led to reinforcing the original view.

The consultations on Libraries and Culture and SEND were on the future strategic direction for these services, so it would not be possible at this stage to be able to predict the environmental implications until the future models for these services become clearer. We will review the environmental impacts as new services are developed and implemented.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste
29 January 2019

Question (8) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)(JE4):

Capital and Investment Strategy:

- i. Please confirm if the Capital and Investment Strategy is considering wider strategic and commercial investments beyond property, which has been the focus in recent years.
- ii. Which sites fall under the joint venture arrangement with Places for People (page 308).

Reply:

The Council's investment strategy is delivering a net return which contributes to the council's financial resilience and goes some way towards mitigating the impact of the loss of other more traditional sources of funding, such as government grants. The Council continues to assess other ways in which to deliver an income to enhance its financial resilience and, where appropriate and within its powers, the Cabinet will consider other forms of investments. In order to mitigate risk the Council will however focus on those areas in which it has some experience and expertise.

Four site briefs have been formally submitted to the Joint Venture Partner to undertake options analysis for consideration by the council. These are-

- The former Adult Learning Centre, Dene Street, Dorking
- First & second floors, 61-63 High Street, Staines upon Thames
- First & second floors, Kingfisher House, 160-162 High Street, Egham
- 33 Rookery Road, Staines upon Thames

Further sites will be approved to be passed to the Joint Venture as part of the Council's current wider review of its assets.

Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
29 January 2019

This page is intentionally left blank