

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****TUESDAY 13 JULY 2021****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS  
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE****1. JONATHAN HULLEY (FOXHILLS, THORPE & VIRGINIA WATER) TO ASK:**

I warmly welcome the decision of the Surrey County Council Cabinet to adopt an HGV Weight Restriction Policy in the form of "Surrey HGV Watch".

Would the Cabinet member for Transport and Infrastructure update the Council on steps taken to communicate this policy to residents and HGV operators, and also what steps he intends to take to equip residents to help identify lorries on roads that they are not legally permitted to drive on?

**RESPONSE:**

The HGV watch policy should help to improve the compliance of weight restrictions by HGV drivers and it will also help Surrey Police focus their limited enforcement resources for this problem where they are most likely to be effective.

Following Cabinet approval for the scheme in March we have been making arrangements to get the scheme up and running. A co-ordinator post is being created in Highways to run the scheme and we anticipate recruitment could be completed around September.

The co-ordinator will be able to liaise with volunteer groups to induct and train them as well as providing equipment to undertake HGV monitoring. This is likely to consist of high visibility jackets/vests and a digital camera capable of downloading images to a database. Web pages will also be set up explaining the scheme and how to get involved. The co-ordinator will arrange for letters to be sent to vehicles identified in contravention of a weight restrictions and also potential enforcement options.

We intend to initially test the scheme at a couple of locations before rolling out more widely with increasing publicity later this year.

## **MARISA HEATH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT**

### **2. JEREMY WEBSTER (CATERHAM HILL) TO ASK:**

Caterham Hill has a small recycling Centre on Chaldon Road. This centre is in close proximity to:

1. A Day Care Centre for older people.
2. Doctor's Surgery.
3. Primary School- Hillcroft.
4. Retirement Flats.
5. Key bus routes in and out of Caterham Hill.

During the pandemic there have been restrictions on traffic flows into the recycling centre. In addition, pedestrian access was banned.

I have been approached by residents, upset that they cannot enter the site as pedestrians to dispose of their waste - I have observed the upset this causes and also been turned away in the past myself. Residents have turned up with one-off items (e.g. old TVs) or with bags and wheelbarrows of waste. Residents point out that it is not particularly environmentally friendly to require them to use their cars to enter the Centre and that were pedestrian access to be allowed it would do something to reduce the number of cars queuing outside the Centre.

There have been issues with the location of this Centre for many years. More recently, at times when it is necessary to temporarily close the Centre during working hours for waste compaction and removal, the traffic build up in Chaldon Road is immediate and you have "idling" vehicles stretching back several hundred yards, causing access issues to the premises listed above and down into Caterham High Street itself. At one point recently, the Police became involved.

This matter has been brought to the attention of officers and I know some solutions are being considered.

Can we have an update please as I am aware similar situations exist elsewhere?

Even when pandemic restrictions are relaxed, there should still be active encouragement for pedestrians to use this facility.

### **RESPONSE:**

Pedestrian access to the Caterham community recycling centre was suspended at the outset of the Coronavirus pandemic to facilitate a safe operation and ensure adequate social distancing. Arrangements have now been put in place to allow

pedestrian-only access from 4pm until 5pm on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday. The arrangements have been put in place for a period of 3 months to allow the investigation of a dedicated pedestrian access to the site which should allow safe access to pedestrians at all times the site is open.

**TIM OLIVER, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**3. EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL & CUDDINGTON) TO ASK:**

In 2017/2018 Surrey County Council employed nine Officers with a salary evaluated within a pay range that included £100k p.a. and above. By March 2021 that had increased to twenty-nine. Additional appointments have been made, or planned, since March.

Will the Leader publish:

- I. the number of current employees with a salary evaluated within a pay range that includes £100k p.a. and above, and
- II. the number of future planned appointments of such Officers, along with their titles so that the final number of such posts planned to be employed by SCC is clear to Members of the Council and members of the public.

**RESPONSE:**

As the Member has been told on many previous occasions, information on senior salaries is published on the external website. This is due to be updated imminently.

The County Council employed 26 officers at 1 April 2021 with a salary evaluated in a pay range that includes £100k, a reduction in 3 since this information was previously provided at the beginning of the year.

The PS18 role being considered at PPDC on 19 July is for the permanent appointment to the Executive Director Customers and Communities, as part of the CLT restructure process.

Our focus is on attracting the people that can help us deliver the best possible services to the 1.2 million residents of Surrey. We need to offer competitive salaries if we are to attract applications from both the public and private sector in a very competitive market. The extent to which the county council has improved its financial position, is delivering a hugely effective transformation programme across many areas of the council which is being recognised nationally and by the agencies that are responsible for overseeing our service delivery, is a reflection of our investment in our top roles.

## **MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **4. NICK DARBY (THE DITTONS) TO ASK:**

In relation to the proposed Highways restructuring, can you assure Members that any changes will:

1. retain staff with local knowledge in roles which allow them to use that knowledge fully;
2. enable Members to obtain information/action easily and more quickly;
3. ensure greater engagement with Members; and
4. provide better value for money.

### **RESPONSE:**

An update was sent to all Members on 25 June explaining the rational and reasoning for the Creating ETI (Environment, Transport & Infrastructure) programme. The review of Highways & Transport falls within this programme. In answer to the specific points highlighted above:

- 1) Local knowledge varies across the county and across teams. The restructure will mean that officers will not be as rigorously geographically based. This does not mean that local knowledge will be lost as most officers will continue working in similar roles but within different operating structures.
- 2) The intention is to improve the information we provide to Members. The weekly Highways Bulletins will continue, and as of now all our works are available via the one.network website. We are developing an interactive dashboard – where you will easily be able to see what is happening in your Division. Enquires can be logged via our website, and the [councillors@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:councillors@surreycc.gov.uk) email continues. Using these dedicated channels ensures that any enquiry you submit will be recorded and replied to in a timely manner.
- 3) Like all services that form the County Council, the purpose is to provide a service to our residents. At the moment, a range of officers engage with members, and this will continue. However, the restructure includes a proposed Engagement & Commissioning Team which will be the main link for Committee business.
- 4) The County Council always seeks to ensure good value for money. However, there is no savings target associated with the proposed restructures. The changes are about enabling the teams to deliver against the Council's ambitions around improving the quality of service, increasing capacity for delivery and customer engagement.

## **MARK NUTI, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES**

### **5. CATHERINE POWELL (FARNHAM NORTH) TO ASK:**

1. Has the map of the most deprived Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) been overlaid on the locations of Your Fund Surrey applications to ensure that those in most need are being prioritised?
2. Have Your Fund Surrey applications been received from the 10 most deprived LSOAs?

### **RESPONSE:**

1. Your Fund Surrey (YFS) has been developed to bring community-led improvement projects to life at a scale to make a truly significant difference to communities. It will fundamentally support the aims of the Community Vision for 2030, in which Surrey is a county in which communities feel supported and people can support each other, where people feel able to contribute to their community and no one is left behind.

The allocation of funding is not predetermined by geography. Instead, the Fund is designed to provide investment in schemes that encourage community participation, reduce isolation, and develop the potential for social wellbeing and economic prosperity. In addition, the application process is designed with input of the community to be accessible to all with lower barriers of entry than comparable funds. As such it is anticipated that it will have a positive impact on a number of those who may rely on or gain support from within the local community and those within protected characteristics that maybe more likely to experience social and economic exclusion.

2. We monitor access of the fund proactively via Commonplace and have used insight into both the people and communities already engaged and the project ideas put forward to further tailor our communications. This will enable us to identify any areas that are currently underrepresented in terms of community projects proposed, geographical areas, and represented groups, and also identify ideas that do not meet current criteria so that we can support residents and groups by giving them further direction as required.

To date, no projects have been awarded funding. Regular evaluation is planned to consider the reach of the fund and flow through, from pinning an idea to receiving funding. As part of this evaluation, equity of access will be evaluated enabling the approach to be adjusted throughout the five-year course of the fund.

## CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

### 6. FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:

In 2019 the county council made the controversial decision to close 37 out of 58 children's centres as a £1m cost cutting measure.

- a) Please confirm the final amount of savings achieved by the closure of the children's centres.
- b) The county council's objective was to target services to those most in need. How has the council measured its performance in achieving that aim?
- c) What steps have the county council taken to assess the impact of the withdrawal of support through the children's centres on those families who do not meet the criteria for assistance under the new delivery model?

### RESPONSE:

- a) £1m in 2019/20 and £2.4m in 2020/21. The overall efficiency for this programme was £3.4m spread over two financial years.
- b) The Children, Families and Lifelong Learning Directorate measures whether the retained centres, now referred to as Family Centres, have targeted families most in need through quarterly performance data produced by each Family Centre and through comprehensive monthly performance monitoring of children, entering or stepping out of early help and of statutory children's social care services.

Families needing targeted help are allocated to Family Centres via the Children's Single Point of Access (C-SPA) using the Effective Family Resilience guidance published by the Surrey Safeguarding Children Partnership. [Effective-family-resilience-SSCB-Final-March-2019-1.pdf \(surreyscp.org.uk\)](https://www.surreyscp.org.uk)

- c) The Children, Families and Lifelong Learning Directorate closely monitor the number of contacts and referrals made to the Children's Single Point of Access and the levels of need these identify for children and families in Surrey. Families not meeting the criteria for assistance are signposted to universal services and may refer to the Family Information Service. The Family Resilience Commissioning team is conducting a review of all Helping Families Early interventions with children and families.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**7. LANCE SPENCER (GOLDSWORTH EAST AND HORSELL VILLAGE) TO ASK:**

In the recent county election campaign dissatisfaction with the state of Surrey's road network was probably the number one issue on the doorstep. This chimes with the latest National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey (NHT) which ranked Surrey 20th out of 27 County Councils for overall satisfaction and the news that SCC paid out over £400,000 last year compensation for damage and injury claims due to potholes in 2019-20.

When will Surrey residents start to see recognisable improvements in the delivery of road repair and maintenance services, not just in terms of quantity but also in the quality of the work being carried out?

**RESPONSE:**

The budget for Highway Maintenance, which covers maintenance of roads and pavements, in the period of the current Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) is £200m over five years. The MTFS three years ago had a 5-year investment programme of £79m for highway maintenance so there has been significant additional investment in this area agreed over the past few years. This demonstrates that we have recognised the need for investment in this area and is enabling us to resurface over 150 miles of roads and pavements in the current financial year as well as repairing potholes as they occur. However due to the recognised historic underfunding of highway maintenance at a national level, it will take time for our increased investment to deliver recognisable improvements.

In terms of the quality of the work being carried out we are fortunate to be one of the few authorities in the Country to retain an in-house Highways Laboratory which enables us to audit and test the quality of the materials and workmanship of our schemes. Where quality issues are identified we work with our contractors to rectify them. In addition to the Highways Laboratory we also have a Compliance Team dedicated to the audit and compliance of our Safety Defect Service which covers the repair of potholes. The Compliance Team work with the contractor to ensure that the required levels of quality are achieved and both the Laboratory and Compliance Teams work with our contractors to identify new and innovative materials and ways of working, such as the "cold lay" pothole materials which are currently being trialled.

We are in the process of tendering for a new Highways Term Maintenance Contract. We have made it clear to those bidding for the contract that areas such as Innovation, Quality and Value for Money are some of the key areas that we need our

Contractor partner to excel in and we are confident that this new contract will help our Highways Teams to deliver further improvements in the coming years.

## **MARK NUTI, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES**

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

Since 2011 the number of firefighters in Surrey (full time equivalent) has been cut every year from 641 in 2011 to 448 (or fewer) today.

When does the Council envisage restoring the number of firefighters to what it was and should be?

### **RESPONSE:**

As explained in the previous responses to similar questions asked by Cllr Evans, the number of firefighters needed in Surrey is based now on how many fire appliances the service needs to meet the level of risk and to keep Surrey safe - this in turn determines how many crew are required.

Before implementation of the Making Surrey Safer Plan (MSSP) there was no methodology employed by the service to determine the resources required against the level of risk. The MSSP is based on five years' worth of historical data coupled with a thorough analysis of both national and local risks and professional judgment. The plan has also been scrutinised and assured by the National Fire Chiefs Council Advisory Group, reviewed by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Service, externally verified, and independently given full assurance by Brunel University London. The service is confident that they have designed the optimum plan for Surrey.

The Making Surrey Safer plan shows that the service needs as a minimum, 16 fire appliances at night and 20 in the day. The service is at full establishment to crew these. However, to build in additional resilience to allow for training and other activities, during the day the service aims to have a maximum of 25 fire appliances available and at night a maximum of 23.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**9. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:**

Please can you provide a list of the ten most recent 20mph speed zones (not just 20mph roads) implemented across Surrey, including details of the location, the date the zone was originally proposed and the date the 20mph signage was in place.

**RESPONSE:**

Please see the table below showing the most recent 20mph speed limit schemes introduced in the county. The zones tend to have more than one road listed in the location. The speed limit operational date is usually made to coincide with the signs being put in place.

Speed limit schemes are often considered and instigated by local committees but implementation depends on their overall priorities and the outcomes of a feasibility study or speed limit assessment in accordance with our policy. Once the formal decision is made to progress and fund 20mph speed limit changes, implementation, including the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation, can take up to 12 months. The dates listed in the table are when each speed limit order came into effect so each proposal would have been proposed at least 12 months previously.

<b>USRN, Road Name, Village, Town - 20mph speed limits</b>	<b>Length (km)</b>
13700062, ASHLEY ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.255
13700092, BARRINGTON LODGE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.065
13700093, BASING CLOSE, , THAMES DITTON	0.078
13700094, BASING WAY, , THAMES DITTON	0.263
13700095, BASINGFIELD ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.257
13700097, BEALES LANE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.138
13700229, CAMM GARDENS, , THAMES DITTON	0.117
13700286, CHURCH LANE, , THAMES DITTON	0.071
13700403, DANESWOOD CLOSE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.274
13700404, DARNLEY PARK, , WEYBRIDGE	0.113
13700420, DEVONSHIRE ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.176
13700429, DORCHESTER ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.229
13700436, DOWNSIDE COMMON ROAD, DOWNSIDE, COBHAM	0.384
13700442, DRESDEN WAY, , WEYBRIDGE	0.088
13700475, ELMGROVE ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.313
13700488, EMBERCOURT ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.180

13700554, FIR GRANGE AVENUE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.055
13700594, GASCOIGNE ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.076
13700598, GIGGS HILL ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.272
13700605, GLENCOE ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.184
13700639, GROVE PLACE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.104
13700699, HIGH STREET, , THAMES DITTON	0.447
13700725, HOLSTEIN AVENUE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.085
13700729, HOME FARM CLOSE, , THAMES DITTON	0.181
13700765, JASON CLOSE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.063
13700767, JESSAMY ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.132
13700792, KINGS CLOSE, , THAMES DITTON	0.083
13700794, KINGS DRIVE, , THAMES DITTON	0.197
13700828, LEAVESDEN ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.076
13700839, LINDEN CLOSE, , THAMES DITTON	0.123
13700971, MONTROSE WALK, , WEYBRIDGE	0.087
13700978, MOUNT PLEASANT, , WEYBRIDGE	0.158
13700992, NEW ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.147
13701015, OAKDALE ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.221
13701110, PINE GROVE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.571
13701123, PORTMORE PARK ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.960
13701125, PORTMORE WAY, , WEYBRIDGE	0.118
13701127, PORTSMOUTH AVENUE, , THAMES DITTON	0.434
13701137, PRINCES ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.741
13701150, QUEENS DRIVE, , THAMES DITTON	0.330
13701163, RADNOR ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.191
13701185, RIVER AVENUE, , THAMES DITTON	0.179
13701212, ROUND OAK ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.206
13701302, SPEER ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.135
13701316, ST ALBANS AVENUE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.205
13701330, ST LEONARDS ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.512
13701351, STATION ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.399
13701376, SUMMER ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.119
13701399, THAMES STREET, , WEYBRIDGE	0.774
13701413, THE CRESCENT, , WEYBRIDGE	0.113
13701459, THE WILLOWS, , WEYBRIDGE	0.158
13701526, WALTON LANE, , WALTON-ON-THAMES	0.160
13701527, WALTON LANE, , WEYBRIDGE	0.079
13701544, WATTS ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.309
13701571, WESTON GREEN ROAD, , THAMES DITTON	0.490
13701578, WEY ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.771
13701596, WINDSOR WALK, , WEYBRIDGE	0.154
13701638, YORK ROAD, , WEYBRIDGE	0.301

13900669, VALE ROAD, , WORCESTER PARK	0.185
16000044, ANNANDALE ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.133
16000056, ARTILLERY ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.185
16000057, ARTILLERY TERRACE, , GUILDFORD	0.198
16000145, BERBERIS CLOSE, , GUILDFORD	0.104
16000294, CEDAR WAY, , GUILDFORD	0.802
16000306, CHANTRY LANE, , SHERE	0.377
16000343, CHURCH HILL, , SHERE	0.113
16000351, CHURCH ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.190
16000435, CYPRESS ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.629
16000443, DAPDUNE ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.217
16000495, DRUMMOND ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.014
16000620, FIR TREE ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.504
16000682, GARDNER ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.166
16000685, GEORGE ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.189
16000702, GOMSHALL LANE, , SHERE	0.274
16000905, HORNBEAM ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.358
16000998, LABURNUM CLOSE, , GUILDFORD	0.226
16001103, LOWER STREET, , SHERE	0.215
16001144, MARESCHAL ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.132
16001150, MARKENFIELD ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.341
16001178, MEDLAR CLOSE, , GUILDFORD	0.091
16001193, MIDDLE STREET, , SHERE	0.154
16001226, MOUNTSIDE, , GUILDFORD	0.390
16001237, NETHER MOUNT, , GUILDFORD	0.139
16001238, NETTLES TERRACE, , GUILDFORD	0.061
16001388, PARK ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.173
16001520, RECTORY LANE, , SHERE	0.209
16001616, SANDY LANE, , SHERE	0.013
16001623, SCHOOL LANE, , NORMANDY	0.393
16001624, SCHOOL LANE, , PIRBRIGHT	0.321
16001666, SHERE LANE, , SHERE	0.202
16001699, THE SPINNING WALK, , SHERE	0.203
16001752, STOKE FIELDS, , GUILDFORD	0.294
16001753, STOKE GROVE, , GUILDFORD	0.069
16001811, TESTARD ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.111
16001861, THE SQUARE, , SHERE	0.117
16001939, UPPER STREET, , SHERE	0.561
16002027, WHERWELL ROAD, , GUILDFORD	0.062
16002075, WODELAND AVENUE, , GUILDFORD	0.847
16002223, CHURCH LANE, , SHERE	0.074
25900003, ABINGER LANE, ABINGER, DORKING	1.285

25900229, CHURCH ROAD, , LEATHERHEAD	0.166
25900250, CLEEVE ROAD, , LEATHERHEAD	0.470
25900331, DENE ROAD, , ASHTEAD	0.262
25900392, EVELYN COTTAGES, ABINGER, DORKING	0.165
25900446, GAVESTON ROAD, , LEATHERHEAD	0.239
25900561, HIGHLANDS ROAD, , LEATHERHEAD	0.558
25900707, LONG SHAW, , LEATHERHEAD	0.122
25900976, RANDALLS CRESCENT, , LEATHERHEAD	0.224
25900977, RANDALLS PARK AVENUE, , LEATHERHEAD	0.252
25901123, ST NICHOLAS HILL, , LEATHERHEAD	0.074
25901159, SUTTON LANE, ABINGER, DORKING	0.237
31200028, ALTHORNE ROAD, , REDHILL	0.287
31200076, BANCROFT ROAD, , REIGATE	0.296
31200116, BELL STREET, , REIGATE	0.436
31200146, BOLTERS LANE, , BANSTEAD	0.116
31200162, BRAMBLETYE PARK ROAD, , REDHILL	0.943
31200205, BUCKLAND ROAD, , LOWER KINGSWOOD	0.244
31200265, CHART LANE, , REIGATE	0.395
31200295, CHIPSTEAD CLOSE, , REDHILL	0.091
31200315, CHURCH STREET, , REIGATE	0.211
31200355, COMMON ROAD, , REDHILL	0.411
31200385, COURT ROAD, , BANSTEAD	0.134
31200470, EARLSBROOK ROAD, , REDHILL	0.527
31200471, EARLSWOOD ROAD, , REDHILL	0.618
31200491, EMLYN ROAD, , REDHILL	0.340
31200569, GARRATTS LANE, , BANSTEAD	0.129
31200606, GREENFIELDS CLOSE, , HORLEY	0.110
31200607, GREENFIELDS ROAD, , HORLEY	0.250
31200699, HIGH STREET, , REIGATE	0.311
31200729, HOLLY LANE, , BANSTEAD	0.176
31200744, HOOLEY LANE, , REDHILL	0.260
31200767, IFOLD ROAD, , REDHILL	0.216
31200810, KNIGHTON ROAD, , REDHILL	0.343
31200826, LANGSHOTT, , HORLEY	1.219
31200937, MEATH GREEN LANE, , HORLEY	0.293
31201105, PHILANTHROPIC ROAD, , REDHILL	0.082
31201165, REDSTONE ROAD, , REDHILL	0.175
31201201, ROOKERY WAY, , LOWER KINGSWOOD	0.049
31201330, ST JOHNS ROAD, , REDHILL	0.747
31201331, ST JOHNS TERRACE ROAD, , REDHILL	0.145
31201350, STATION APPROACH EAST, , REDHILL	0.053
31201352, STATION APPROACH WEST, , REDHILL	0.043

31201483, TRENTHAM ROAD, , REDHILL	0.161
31201514, VICTORIA ROAD, , REDHILL	0.236
31201623, WOODLANDS AVENUE, , REDHILL	0.234
31201624, WOODLANDS ROAD, , REDHILL	0.542
31202413, BROOKFIELD DRIVE, , HORLEY	0.344
31202583, ACCESS FROM BELL STREET TO SUPERSTORE, , REIGATE	0.067
32900457, GUILDFORD STREET, , CHERTSEY	0.231
32900506, HIGH STREET, , EGHAM	0.314
32900985, STATION ROAD NORTH, , EGHAM	0.128
32901159, WETTON PLACE, , EGHAM	0.074
32901224, BOSHERS GARDENS, , EGHAM	0.010
37200013, ALLEN CLOSE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.042
37200014, ALLEN ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.196
37200026, ANVIL ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.271
37200185, CHERTSEY ROAD, , ASHFORD	0.203
37200187, CHERTSEY ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.321
37200206, CHURCH STREET, , STAINES-UPON-THAMES	0.570
37200207, CHURCH STREET, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.184
37200211, CLAREMONT AVENUE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.257
37200344, FALCON WAY, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.137
37200349, FARRIER CLOSE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.055
37200373, FORGE LANE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.167
37200377, FRENCH STREET, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.733
37200420, GREEN STREET, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.276
37200503, ISLAND CLOSE, , STAINES-UPON-THAMES	0.139
37200504, IVY CLOSE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.082
37200556, LAYTONS LANE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.250
37200586, LOWER HAMPTON ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.027
37200600, MANOR LANE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.396
37200717, PEREGRINE ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.648
37200772, ROOKSMEAD ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.284
37200883, STILE PATH, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.117
37200884, STRATTON ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.353
37200894, SUNMEAD ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.329
37200895, SUNNA GARDENS, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.388
37200914, THAMES STREET, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.940
37200918, THE AVENUE, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.023
37200937, THE PENNARDS, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.077
37200973, VICARAGE ROAD, , STAINES-UPON-THAMES	0.121
37200987, WALTON LANE, , SHEPPERTON	0.580

37201138, ACCESS ROAD TO REAR OF 127 TO 139A GREEN STREET FROM SUNMEAD ROAD, , SUNBURY ON THAMES	0.047
38800625, HIGH STREET, , BAGSHOT	0.328
38800923, PARK STREET, , BAGSHOT	0.098
38801112, ST CATHERINES ROAD, FRIMLEY, CAMBERLEY	0.378
38801195, THE SQUARE, , BAGSHOT	0.119
38801784, MINDENHURST ROAD, DEEPCUT, CAMBERLEY	0.027
39500520, HIGH STREET, , LIMPSFIELD	0.484
39500807, PAYNESFIELD ROAD, , TATSFIELD	0.118
39500828, PLOUGH ROAD, , SMALLFIELD	0.039
39500863, REDEHALL ROAD, , SMALLFIELD	0.216
39500926, SHIP HILL, , TATSFIELD	0.306
39500979, ST PIERS LANE, , LINGFIELD	0.654
39501172, WESTMORE GREEN, , TATSFIELD	0.114
39501173, WESTMORE ROAD, , TATSFIELD	0.014
39501178, WHEELERS LANE, , SMALLFIELD	0.181
42600185, BOUNDSTONE ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.156
42600262, BURNT HILL ROAD, LOWER BOURNE, FARNHAM	0.063
42600299, CHAPEL ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.423
42600314, CHERRY TREE ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.269
42600493, DYE HOUSE ROAD, THURSLEY, GODALMING	0.141
42600613, FRENHAM ROAD, LOWER BOURNE, FARNHAM	0.166
42600618, FULLERS ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.092
42600816, HIGH STREET, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.388
42600973, LICKFOLDS ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.596
42601015, LODGE HILL ROAD, LOWER BOURNE, FARNHAM	0.055
42601072, MANLEY BRIDGE ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.074
42601073, MANLEY BRIDGE ROAD, WRECCLESHAM, FARNHAM	0.091
42601247, OLD FRENHAM ROAD, LOWER BOURNE, FARNHAM	0.022
42601393, RAKE LANE, MILFORD, GODALMING	0.886
42601399, RECREATION ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.225
42601497, SCHOOL LANE, LOWER BOURNE, FARNHAM	0.015
42601693, THE AVENUE, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.097
42601735, THE LANE, THURSLEY, GODALMING	0.182
42601740, THE LONG ROAD, ROWLEDGE, FARNHAM	0.518
42601767, THE STREET, THURSLEY, GODALMING	0.206
42601963, WEYDON LANE, , FARNHAM	0.653
42605422, CROSSWAYS ROAD, GRAYSHOTT, HINDHEAD	0.016
44600238, CHAPEL STREET, , WOKING	0.132
44600246, CHERTSEY ROAD, , WOKING	0.331
44600255, CHOBHAM ROAD, , WOKING	0.139
44600257, CHRISTCHURCH WAY, , WOKING	0.095

44600260, CHURCH HILL, HORSELL, WOKING	0.116
44600267, CHURCH STREET EAST, , WOKING	0.302
44600300, COMMERCIAL WAY, , WOKING	0.082
44600371, DUKE STREET, , WOKING	0.131
44600582, HIGH STREET, HORSELL, WOKING	0.360
44600731, LOCKE WAY, , WOKING	0.113
44600748, Lych Way, HORSELL, WOKING	0.260
44600778, MAYBURY ROAD, , WOKING	0.071
44600788, MEADWAY DRIVE, HORSELL, WOKING	0.119
44600897, PARES CLOSE, HORSELL, WOKING	0.124
44601083, SOUTH CLOSE, HORSELL, WOKING	0.115
44601150, THE BROADWAY, , WOKING	0.230
44601263, WEST STREET, , WOKING	0.044
44601300, WILSON WAY, HORSELL, WOKING	0.186
44601363, CHURCH PATH, , WOKING	0.087
44602129, HIGH STREET, , WOKING	0.273

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

### **10. JOHN ROBINI (HASLEMERE) TO ASK:**

In 2020 SCC made the decision to stop providing universal youth services directly and instead to enable the community, voluntary and faith sector (CVFS) to use the youth centres to deliver these services to young people at little or no cost.

- a) One of the reasons for the change in approach was that the youth centres were under-used. Please confirm the number of hours of universal youth work now being delivered under the new arrangements in comparison with the previous in-house service.
- b) In September 2020 the county council stated that 60 organisations had expressed an interest and subsequently that 8 groups had taken over the services across 22 centres. Please confirm the number of organisations the county council is still in discussions with and how many centres these arrangements would cover?
- c) With the Lakers Youth Centre in Woking unlikely to attract expressions of interest given its current physical state, please advise which other areas are not currently served by these new arrangements and which youth centres risk remaining without a service in the longer term and why? What steps is the county council taking to plug any gaps in the services being provided?
- d) In Haslemere the local youth club is being charged exorbitant fees by trustees to use a building that the county council handed back to Waverley BC under a previous administration. This situation is not sustainable and will mean that

in the future only fee-paying groups of private clubs will be able to afford to use the site. What help can the county council offer in this and in other areas where there are similar inequalities in youth service provision?

**RESPONSE:**

- a) The Service Level Agreement (SLA) in place for each of the organisations delivering in the youth centres stipulates a minimum number of sessions of open access youth work delivery per week. Typically, the requirement is two per week, but in one youth centre the SLA requires one session due to the volume of existing usage of that building by other community groups which limits the time available for youth work delivery. The organisations started delivery between April and June 2021 and the Children, Families and Lifelong Learning Directorate is about to undertake the first quarterly performance monitoring activity. The performance reporting process requires organisations to report on the number of sessions delivered, number of young people who have attended and the outcomes they have achieved.

I am not able to provide a comparison with the volume of delivery previously as this baseline data is not available, however, the impact of the new arrangements will be visible by 2022.

An initial review of the data and feedback shared by providers to date shows that good progress is being made by providers. In most locations, the providers have had to start from scratch as there has not been open access delivery from the youth centres for a long period of time, certainly during the pandemic. Two providers are already delivering two sessions of open access provision per week, two providers are delivering far in excess of this minimum, and the final provider has opened one session at each of the nine centres they have taken on which will be increasing to two sessions in the coming months.

It is important to note that in addition to the universal youth work sessions, the organisations are extending the usage of the buildings for young people through a breadth of provision including targeted youth work, the Duke of Edinburgh Award, therapeutic provision, music, and sports.

- b) The Safeguarding and Family Resilience Service are working with 10 organisations. 5 have already taken on the running of youth centres and delivery of provision and two more are about to complete the legal process to do so in the next two weeks. Two other organisations will be delivering open

access youth work in youth centres that are being retained by Surrey County Council.

The Service are also working alongside another organisation to consider the development of a new space for youth work delivery. This is outside of the scope of the public consultation.

- c) Fourteen youth centres are already being operated by community, voluntary and faith sector (CVFS) organisations with three more centres due to start operating in the next few weeks. These youth centres are Claygate, Molesey, Walton, The Edge, Ash, Ashted, The Bridge, Banstead, Horley, Phoenix, Egham, Ashford, Leacroft, Stanwell, Sunbury, and Sheerwater.

They are located across Elmbridge, Epsom & Ewell, Guildford; Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead; Runnymede; Spelthorne; and Woking Districts and Boroughs.

2 more centres will be leased to CVFS organisations in autumn 2021 once renovation work at those sites is completed.

There are nine youth centres which will be remaining with Surrey County Council which are in Epsom & Ewell; Mole Valley; Reigate and Banstead; Runnymede; Spelthorne; Surrey Heath; and Woking Districts and Boroughs. They are remaining with the local authority for reasons including:

- suitability for the delivery of universal youth work
- the volume of other existing SCC provision on the site which limits income generation opportunities for CVFS organisations
- a lack of expressions of interest
- complexities relating to leasehold arrangements where buildings are not owned by the Council
- sites which have shared usage with Family Centres (Addlestone and The Old Dean) and Frimley Green youth centre hosts Life (a post-16 education programme)

The Service is continuing to explore alternative models, including working with community-based groups who are interested in delivering open access youth work without taking responsibility for the buildings. In these circumstances, the Council will continue to manage the sites.

- d) Although Surrey County Council does not have a statutory responsibility, Officers in Land and Property Services are happy to liaise with Waverley Borough Council on this matter.

From autumn 2021, the Council will be undertaking a review of the SCC youth estate in order to devise a long-term strategy to ensure property is fit for

purpose and in the right places for young people. Officers will be engaging with stakeholders as part of this process and welcome the knowledge and insight Elected Members have of their local communities.

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

### **11. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

The recent Surrey County Council's consultation on Universal Youth Work across Surrey ([Universal Youth Work Proposal - Surrey County Council - Citizen Space \(surreysays.co.uk\)](https://www.surreysays.co.uk)) confirmed that Surrey County Council will enable the community, voluntary and faith sector (CVFS) to use the youth centres for the benefit of young people at little or no cost. However, in Reigate and Banstead it is not clear how that offer has been applied to the use of the Annexe behind the family centre on Station Road, Redhill which was the location where Surrey County Council has previously provided open-access youth provision in Redhill. In light of this, and considering the recommendations following the consultation, please can you provide:

- i) A breakdown as to which youth centres have been enabled for CVFS use at little or no cost, and which have not, and in such cases why not.
- ii) Confirm how Surrey County Council ensures that there remains complete coverage of open access universal youth work across Surrey now that it is not providing the service directly.
- iii) How Surrey County Council is using/intending to use learning from Covid-19 to inform the service design of its universal youth work offer.

### **RESPONSE:**

- i) The following youth centres have been transferred to the community, voluntary and faith sector (CVFS) on a Lease/ Tenancy at Will, or are due to be transferred: Claygate; Molesey; Walton; The Edge; Ash; Ashtead; The Bridge; Banstead; Horley; Phoenix; Egham; Ashford; Leacroft; Stanwell; Sunbury; Harrys; The Street; Sheerwater

The following youth centres are remaining with SCC: Focus; Discovery; Merstham; Malthouse; Addlestone; Shepperton; Old Dean; Frimley Green; Redhill Annexe; WYAC.

These centres are remaining with the local authority for reasons including:

- suitability for the delivery of universal youth work
- the volume of other existing SCC provision on the site which limits income generation opportunities for CVFS organisations

- a lack of expressions of interest
- complexities relating to leasehold arrangements where buildings are not owned by the Council
- sites which have shared usage with Family Centres (Addlestone and The Old Dean) and Frimley Green youth centre hosts Life (a post-16 education programme)

The Redhill Annexe has been retained by SCC due the existing provision delivery there for priority groups of young people including CYP Haven delivered in partnership with SABP, targeted youth work delivery by the Youth Offending and Targeted Youth Support Service. A2E also deliver their day-time education programmes for vulnerable young people from this site.

However, CVFS organisations that deliver provision for young people can use these youth centres at little or no cost unless they are in receipt of funding that includes premises costs.

- ii) Open access and universal youth work is delivered by a range of organisations across Surrey, including, but not exclusively, those CVFS organisations that are now operating from SCC youth centres.

The universal youth work being delivered through the Service Level Agreement is being monitored on a quarterly basis. The first meetings are taking place in July 2021.

From autumn 2021, officers will be undertaking a review of the SCC youth estate in order to devise a long-term strategy to ensure property is fit for purpose and in the right places for young people. Officers will be engaging with stakeholders as part of this process and welcome the knowledge and insight Elected Members have of their local communities.

- iii) Following the decision made in August 2020, Surrey County Council will be an enabler and facilitator of open access universal youth work rather than providing the service directly. The re-design phase of the youth work offer has been completed and is now in the mobilisation phase.

Learning from the Covid-19 pandemic will be used to inform the mobilisation phase and future developments of any new alternative delivery models at sites still being directly managed by the Council. There is also an opportunity to include the learning from the Covid-19 pandemic in the forthcoming review of the youth estate.

## **MARISA HEATH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT**

### **12. TREFOR HOGG (CAMBERLEY EAST) TO ASK:**

I note Surrey County Council's important declaration of a climate emergency and recent publication of the Greener Futures Climate Change Strategy. I am also encouraged by this Conservative Council's ambitious goal of achieving net zero for the county by 2050, to ensure residents live in cleaner and greener areas, and in turn improve the lives of many residents.

Could the Cabinet Member for Environment confirm what work is currently being done to ensure communities and partners also play a crucial role in helping us to deliver our Greener Futures ambition?

### **RESPONSE:**

Councillor Hogg is right to point out the crucial role that communities and partners play in helping us to achieve our climate change targets, it will ultimately come down to the decisions that we all make with regards to the ways we travel, heat our homes and consume more generally which will have the biggest carbon reduction impacts. The Council is committed to empowering our communities and partners to inform and influence our Climate Change Delivery Plan (2021-2025) as we continue to develop it over the summer but also to ensure that this engagement and participation doesn't end there and that we truly enable residents and other stakeholder to own and lead on carbon reduction activity within their communities.

Over the coming months we are planning a number of engagement activities, including the following;

- A public sector decarbonisation workshop with climate change leads in the Boroughs and Districts
- A workshop for local climate/low carbon groups
- Presentations at relevant networks and forums
- Attendance at local community events
- Launching the Community Energy Pathways Programme (to encourage community owned energy projects)

In addition to these activities we will be providing information to residents and community groups through our Greener Futures Engagement [Site](#) and our Greener Futures [newsletter](#).

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

### **13. BUDDHI WEERASINGHE (LOWER SUNBURY AND HALLIFORD) TO ASK:**

I am delighted with the latest Ofsted focussed visit report showing 'significant improvement' in Children's services and that "senior leaders have responded swiftly to the challenges of COVID-19". The encouraging progress that Surrey children's services have continued to make during the pandemic is testament to the hard work of this Council.

Could the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, therefore provide an update on this administration's plans to capitalise on this progress, so that no-one is left behind?

**RESPONSE:**

I too am encouraged by the outcome and feedback from Ofsted's recent focussed visit to Surrey Children's Services. It is clear that the hard work and commitment of the children's workforce, leaders and partners is now being realised.

The Children, Families and Lifelong Learning Directorate is committed to helping children and families in need early, so that no-one is left behind and children are safe, focussing on 3 overarching priorities during 2021-22:

- Safeguarding and Children's Social Care
- Services for Children with Additional Needs
- Children's Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health

The Getting to Good plan, which underpinned and drove the significant improvements Ofsted identified in children's social care, continues to guide and focus the improvement programme across the Directorate and wider children's partnership network. Feedback from the recent Ofsted focussed visit has been incorporated into this plan.

In June 2020 the Helping Families Early Strategy was launched and the Surrey children's partnership continue to develop and strengthen the early help offer for Surrey children and families so that they get the help they need as soon as difficulties emerge.

To support children with additional needs, in the past year, Cabinet agreed £79million of capital investment in 1,600 new specialist places so that Surrey children with special education needs and disabilities (SEND) could be educated closer to home, 290 of these places will come on line for the 2021/22 academic year. The new places that have been created mean that children with SEND will benefit from places closer to home this September as they transition to new school placements, enabling them to group up within their communities and with friends.

School leaders, supported by the Council, are driving forward a new approach to inclusion in mainstream schools for children with additional needs. There is a clear vision and purpose to this work that recognises that 'Inclusion is at the heart of a school's work'. We are also working in collaboration with health partners to improve

support to children with emotional wellbeing and mental health needs. Additional resources provided through the new I-Thrive model will mean children and young people are able to access support more easily and that they will be able to do so in their local community.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**14. JORDAN BEECH (HORLEY EAST) TO ASK:**

Surrey County Council's 2030 Community Vision and impressive Organisational Strategy set out the positive vision of achieving "A future-ready transport system that allows Surrey to lead the UK in achieving a low carbon, economically prosperous, healthy and inclusive county".

Could the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure explain how Surrey's Transport Plan will engage and get the buy-in from residents, so that communities are brought along on our vital journey of tackling climate change?

**RESPONSE:**

The statutory public consultation of our new draft Surrey Transport Plan was launched on 5 July. It seeks views on our plans and ideas to reduce the 46% of carbon emissions currently generated by transport.

Cabinet has also approved our Greener Future Climate Change Delivery Plan Approach, of which the Surrey Transport Plan is a core component. Recognised within this approach is that, whilst the Council and our partners clearly have a major role to play in supporting the delivery of the county's net zero target, it will be the choices that each and every individual living and working in the county are able and willing to make that will ultimately determine whether the county is able to meet our emissions reduction targets.

This Council is committed to continuing to build upon the power of communities to take a leading role in shaping and delivering the way we decarbonise the county, including transport. Over the summer, Members and Officers will work together to drive engagement activity on the emerging Greener Futures Climate Change Delivery Plan, including the Surrey Transport Plan, making connections with communities. This will be achieved through a range of approaches, including focus groups, citizens assemblies, digital engagement platforms and informal dialogue. This will enable the Delivery Plan to encompass local opportunities and priorities.

## **TIM OLIVER, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

### **15. REBECCA JENNINGS-EVANS (LIGHTWATER, WEST END AND BISLEY) TO ASK:**

Surrey County Council has recognised the increased strain Covid-19 has placed on both the physical and mental wellbeing of residents. Therefore, it is encouraging that SCC has rightly declared its commitment to tackling health inequality and ensuring residents receive the support they need.

Could the Leader set out what steps Surrey County Council is taking to improve mental health services and outcomes across Surrey, particularly for young people in this difficult time?

### **RESPONSE:**

I would like to thank the Councillor for Lightwater, West End and Bisley for the important points made in this question about the steps taken by Surrey County Council to improve mental health outcomes for residents, particularly young people at this difficult time.

### **Review and Refresh of the Mental Health System**

More Surrey residents, of all ages, are experiencing more pronounced mental health problems as a result of being affected by Covid-19, national or tiered lockdowns, social distancing and the general disruption to the patterns and rhythm of normal life.

In November 2020 a Summit on Mental Health was held to facilitate a joint understanding across Surrey of the current situation with regard to the mental health of residents, the experiences of users and challenges facing services and build a consensus around and set in motion activity to improve mental health services, user experiences and outcomes. The Summit highlighted key issues and poor service user experiences, as well as best practice and alternative models from elsewhere. It also confirmed a renewed commitment and energy to work together as system partners to design and invest in transformative solutions that will improve emotional wellbeing and mental health outcomes for the residents of Surrey.

Arising from the Summit, in December 2020, the Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care System (ICS) Board established an independently chaired Mental Health Partnership Board, comprising representatives of service users, the voluntary sector, District and Borough Councils, health bodies, business and County Council.

In January 2021 the inaugural Mental Health Partnership Board met with the purpose 'To bring together a range of partner organisations to oversee, govern and drive whole system transformation. This, with the overall aim of improvement in services and subsequent mental health outcomes, and experiences for children and adults

living with mental ill-health in Surrey.’ The Partnership Board identified their ‘key lines of enquiry’ and commissioned a Peer Led Review. This was to enable effective engagement and understanding from all partner agencies, carers, those with lived experience and residents with no experience of mental health problems.

The peer team’s approach involved focus groups and written feedback from service users, carers and Surrey residents, focus groups from all of Surrey’s agencies and organisations, interviews & workshops with 19 senior leaders from the MHPB, data and insight gathering exercises, a relational value audit, a study of the Care Quality Commission outstanding examples, a review of best practice and existing evidence across Surrey and England and a cross-cutting ‘findings and recommendations’ workshop. Key recommendations of the review:

- A “prevention and early help first” approach across all organisations
- Analysis to be commissioned from specialist health economists into levels of funding for mental health in Surrey. The county receives the lowest allocation of funding for mental health nationally and the analysis will look at how we might secure more funding and/or change the way resources are distributed around the system
- Closer working between services at local community level, such as GPs and housing
- A “no bouncing” approach to avoid people being passed around the system – organisations wouldn’t be able to close cases simply by referring people to another service
- More use of digital technology, such as online consultations and wellbeing apps
- More work to understand needs of specific groups – starting with people who have multiple conditions, those from the BAME (black, Asian and minority ethnic) community, those with eating disorders and those aged 16 to 25

Having regard to the peer-led review’s findings and recommendations the Board prepared a report setting out their conclusions and recommendations and endorsed an initial high-level Improvement Programme, drawn from the diagnostic review and built around the recommendations.

The MHPB also recommended that a follow-up peer review in one year’s time be undertaken, to assess the progress made against the Improvement Programme and suggest any further activity required to secure the vision for emotional wellbeing and mental health in Surrey.

### **Approach to improve Mental Health outcomes for Young People**

Children and Young People’s Emotional Mental Health and Wellbeing Services responded during the pandemic despite significant pressures. National benchmarking data shows that CAMHS has experienced a 22% increase in demand above the same time last year. This increased demand is evident in Surrey.

Services and system face the challenge of meeting increased need whilst still managing the pandemic alongside mobilising the new Emotional Mental Health and Wellbeing contract which started on 1st April 2021. The new contract includes circa £6m of additional investment (equally split between the CCGs and the County Council) over 7 years, with an option to extend for a further 3 years and has a new focus on early intervention and prevention. The contract was awarded to an Alliance of Partners. In the past 4 months since the new Alliance began its work, the following has happened:-

### **Improved all organisations response to CYP Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health.**

We are doing this by carrying out system wide training on the implementation of the THRIVE Framework. The Thrive Framework will remove the 'tiers' and eligibility/levels of severity and focuses on goals of families and the types of support they would like rather than what an 'expert' tells them. This is being implemented across health, education, social care and third sector and will strengthen everyone's contribution to keeping CYP resilient and improve emotional, mental health and wellbeing. So far 4 workshops in April, a System leaders training has been launched and 1 mapping exercise x 50 attendances.

### **Focus on 'Waits.'**

There is a Single Point of Access (SPA) for services. A plan and additional investment has been made in to the SPA. This investment will produce a plan for how the SPA can be improved. In the meantime new agency staff have been recruited to cope with the additional demand and a further investment of £500k into Third Sector to provide extra interventions for CYP has been confirmed and recruitment processes to bring in the staff to deliver have been implemented. A targeted approach to reducing the time CYP awaiting neuro- developmental assessments has been mobilised. The number of children waiting for neuro- developmental assessments had dramatically decreased. To date 1,152 children from the backlog of 1,512 are engaged with a provider. 414 of the 1,152 children have completed ASD assessments.

### **Increased access to services and Early Intervention:**

The increased investment into Third Sector will enable CYP access to services within local communities such as counselling, mentoring or wellbeing projects. The Surrey Wellbeing Partnership is recruiting this new early intervention at the moment. The new model of support for schools which includes a team around the school approach and strengthening of Surrey Healthy Schools is being developed. In addition, Surrey has been awarded 10 new Mental Health Support Teams in Schools over the next 3 years. There are currently three existing schemes in Surrey.

A new crisis line has been launched in Surrey and is already being used by CYP and their families.

Further detail on the offer of support for Children and young people's mental health and wellbeing can be found on Healthy Surrey [Children and young people's mental health and wellbeing - Healthy Surrey](#)

## **SINEAD MOONEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS**

### **16. DAVID LEWIS (COBHAM) TO ASK:**

Supported independent living schemes enable people to exercise more choice and control over their daily lives and become more involved in their local communities - all of which Surrey County Council is working hard to deliver.

Could the Cabinet Member for Adults outline what work this Council is doing to reduce the reliance on traditional residential care, and help people with learning disabilities or autism to live more independently?

### **RESPONSE:**

We welcome Councillor Lewis' recognition that Supported Independent Living schemes enable people to exercise more choice and control over their daily lives and become more involved in their local communities. We are delivering an ambitious transformation programme that will increase the availability of Supported Independent Living for Surrey's working age residents with learning disabilities and/or autism. Supported Independent Living accommodation offers our residents their 'own front door' where residents are helped to self-care and promote independent living skills, with the right level of care and support from staff. The accommodation is domestic in nature and does not resemble institutional environments like residential homes. Our other programme focuses on Extra Care Housing which also offers residents their 'own front door' where residents are helped to self-care and promote independent living skills, with the right level of care and support from staff. The key difference between the two types of accommodation is that Extra Care Housing is primarily for older residents and the developments are larger with greater communal facilities for residents.

In November 2020 Surrey County Council's Cabinet endorsed our delivery approaches to increase the availability of Supported Independent Living and approved in-principle the use of four Surrey owned sites for new developments. These are the key areas of work that we are delivering to reduce our reliance on residential care:

1. **Redevelopment of Surrey County Council owned sites:** so far we have identified four sites and these have been allocated in principle for Supported Independent Living. We are currently in the process of preparing the business

cases for these developments that will be presented to Cabinet for approval to commence the planning and development process. Consideration is being given to an additional two sites for Supported Independent Living.

2. **Deregistration:** providers have confirmed their interest in exploring the viability of re-purposing current stock – registered care homes - to create instead Supported Independent Living accommodation. In most cases the buildings will need to be re-modelled to enable the different model of care required. So far, working in partnership with our providers, we have deregistered seven care homes and provided Supported Independent Living accommodation to 34 residents. Work continues with providers on our current cohort of deregistrations and we anticipate helping a further 28 individuals move into Supported Independent Living by the end of March 2022. The planned deregistrations are subject to a range of factors, including Care Quality Commission agreement to deregister.
3. **Market Development:** A commissioning framework is being developed that will encourage providers already operating in Surrey their capacity and will encourage providers not currently active in Surrey to enter the market.
4. **Partnership working with District and Borough Councils:** we will work in partnership with our District and Borough Council partners to identify housing opportunities for our residents. These include opportunities around stock that requires refurbishment and previous sheltered housing accommodation.
5. **Community Inclusion:** We are supporting communities across Surrey to welcome our residents of Supported Independent Living accommodation, and working with our providers to ensure people are supported to be empowered and active members of their local communities.

All of these measures will ensure we support our residents with learning disabilities and/or autism to live active and fulfilling lives and help us achieve our Community Vision for Surrey in 2030.

## **MARK NUTI, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES**

### **17. NICK DARBY (THE DITTONS) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

In respect of Your Fund Surrey:

1. How were the Experts (i.e. those being used to assist with applications), selected and by whom?
2. Where is a complete set of rules which cover governance of this Fund and how it operates published in readily accessible form, and when was this first available to Members?

**RESPONSE:**

1. Professional Officers who form the YFS Expert Hub have been identified from within SCC, Borough and District Councils and the voluntary sector to provide specialist insight for the eligibility of funding, which will assist the YFS team in rigorously assessing applications against the fund requirements and scoring criteria.

Services have been identified by the YFS team based on the expectation of projects coming through and are supplemented in response to the applications received and types of expertise required, or a requirement to involve, such as Land and Assets for a SCC owned asset. Experts have been nominated by senior officers across services at SCC and by District and Boroughs. Several services were initially identified as key according to their specialist field, for example, both Finance and Audit. We have worked collaboratively with the Borough's and Districts and will be flexible in growing this hub of experts depending on applications being made to ensure we have the relevant technical input in place.

2. We take the governance of this substantial fund very seriously and a lot of work has been done over the past 18 months with the oversight of Cabinet, to ensure a robust and transparent process. The governance for the fund is fully compliant with the Council's decision-making processes with full checks and balances and scrutiny where appropriate. A full, readily accessible, governance document will be published by 19 July and will be circulated to the Advisory panel, in good time prior to its meeting on 26 July.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**18. ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

What procedures, formal and informal are in place for discussion and cooperation (e.g. regarding transport routes and other issues of mutual interest) between Surrey and our geographical neighbours, in particular the Mayor of London, the GLA and the seven London boroughs with whom we share borders?

**RESPONSE:**

The Council has well established cross-boundary strategic and operational contacts with all our neighbouring highway authorities, including Transport for London, Highways England and the Department for Transport.

At a sub-regional level, we work through regular meetings with Transport for the South East. These bring together all the constituent local authorities, transport operators and national government organisations.

At a local level we have a number of bilateral meetings on key areas of mutual interest covering infrastructure investment, data collection, transport planning and transport modelling. With our Surrey districts and our neighbouring local authorities, we also work closely on Local Plans, including via formal requests under the 'duty to cooperate'.

At an operational level there is regular liaison and coordination of works on one another's highway networks using the Department for Transport's 'StreetManager' IT system to manage roadworks with information on the one.network website. Both of these are useful tools, giving us the ability to be aware of works in other authorities' areas. We also liaise closely with airports, and bus and rail providers operating services that benefit residents across Surrey and beyond. As an example, the Council is an active member of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group, covering local transport authorities to the west of the airport, various London councils, Transport for London and other stakeholders. The group considers many cross boundary issues such as active travel and public transport as well as proposed expansion plans.

## **MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **19. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

Surrey County Council agreed to implement a new wildlife friendly mowing regime across the county.

Please confirm how this change in policy has been implemented by the County Council in those areas where it contracts mowing directly, and what the cost impact has been; and what actions the County Council has taken to ensure the new policy is reflected in contracting arrangements where mowing is delegated to districts and boroughs, so there is a common wildlife friendly practice across the county?

### **RESPONSE:**

The County Council is committed to making verges more attractive to wildflowers and wildlife where it is safe and desirable to do so. With the exception of Mole Valley and Tandridge, all highway grass is cut by the relevant District or Borough Council through an agency agreement.

Both the County Council and our agent partners have undertaken a number of measures to manage grass cutting in a manner which is safe, acceptable to residents and supports wildlife. A few years ago we reduced the minimum number of urban cuts from seven to four and rural cuts from three to two. Discussions have been held with Agents to promote not cutting verges where it is appropriate.

Local initiatives have been trialled such as leaving swathes of the verges on the A24 south of Dorking uncut and introducing wildflowers on the A217. The County Council supports the “Blue Heart” scheme, where residents can nominate verges not to be cut and these are then marked with a “Blue Heart” to advise other residents. Views amongst residents differ and the scheme is not universally popular, hence not all of our agents currently support it.

This year in parts of the County we adopted “No mow May”. This gave the grass an opportunity to grow but has brought its own challenges which we need to look at how to address.

There have been no quantifiable cost savings by introducing these measures as yet. If the grass is left to grow, when it is cut it can take more time and resource due to its length. For our high-speed network (such as the A24) the bulk of the cost is the required traffic management measures. Reducing the grass cutting area is not a large enough variation to make a meaningful difference to payments.

The agency agreements with our District & Borough partners are due for renewal in April 2022. This will provide an important opportunity to review the policy with partners and residents to ensure we maximise positive environmental benefits as much as possible to deliver our Greener Future agenda while still being safe.

## **MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **20. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

Please confirm the extent of measures identified in road safety outside school surveys across Surrey by borough and district council area, and the amount of funding required to deliver those that do not yet have funding allocated through local committees.

### **RESPONSE:**

In 2014 this council introduced a new Road Safety Outside Schools policy. This was in response to concerns raised by residents and school communities over road safety, anti-social driving, parking and congestion around schools. It sets out a

procedure to investigate these concerns. The aim is to diagnose problems and where necessary, make recommendations for highway improvements to make walking, push scooting and cycling easier and safer, as well as to consider what actions the school could take to promote road safety and encourage sustainable travel.

Since the policy was introduced, a total of 132 Road Safety Outside Schools assessments have been carried out. At five locations, highway improvements have been implemented, funded either by the local committee, Community Infrastructure Levy or other developer funding. Each scheme is making a positive difference to the daily journeys of thousands of children.

In addition, this Council has agreed to increase the funding allocated to local committees for highway improvements over the next three years. Consequently, local committees have allocated funding, Community Infrastructure Levy funding or developer funding to design and implement schemes at a further 24 sites over the next three years.

It is our intention to clear the remaining 49 schemes with a one-off injection of funding similar to the recent increase awarded to Local and Joint Committees over a three-year programme. An additional 21 assessments are scheduled.

Overall, the schemes themselves range from minor improvements, such as dropped kerbs, improved parking controls and bollards, to more substantial schemes, such as traffic calming and pedestrian crossings. In total all the schemes, yet to be delivered, have an estimated cost of approximately £3 million.

The following table gives a breakdown by district and borough:

<b>Road Safety Outside School Assessments</b>	Number of Assessments	Number of Schemes implemented	Number of schemes allocated funding for design and implementation	Number of schemes where funding has not yet been secured	Further Assessments Scheduled
Elmbridge	15	1	3	6	2
Epsom & Ewell	6	0	2	3	1
Guildford	11	1	2	8	3
Mole Valley	7	0	2	3	2
Reigate & Banstead	12	0	4	6	4
Runnymede	11	0	0	3	0
Spelthorne	20	1	2	4	2

Surrey Heath	10	1	2	5	2
Tandridge	15	0	2	3	4
Waverley	18	0	3	7	1
Woking	7	1	2	1	0
	132	5	24	49	21

**NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND PROPERTY**

**21. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:  
(3<sup>rd</sup> Question)**

Please can you provide an update on the travel plan for staff, members and visitors travelling to Woodhatch Place from local stations, including when the electric bus will begin operation. Will members of the public, including school children, be allowed on the bus too?

**RESPONSE:**

The Woodhatch Place travel plan has been produced. It includes a number of suggested sustainable transport and travel measures that aim to deliver a 'green head quarters' for the council. They include improvements to help those walking, cycling and taking public transport to Woodhatch Place, along with those using electric vehicles, as well as ensuring the ability to meet virtually.

Our next step is to create a delivery plan to implement the measures to be taken forward. This will include understanding demand and then consideration of appropriate and flexible public transport options to support access to Woodhatch Place and potentially the local community.

I hope to be able to share that delivery plan shortly.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

**22. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:  
(3<sup>rd</sup> Question)**

In 2019 Surrey County Council closed many of its 58 Children Centres and moved to what it termed the Family Centre model.

Please provide details of how these 21 Family Centres are now contracted by the Council and the reported outcomes delivered by this network of Family Centres in terms of support provided in the last financial year.

**RESPONSE:**

Surrey County Council's Children's Commissioning Service lead on an outcomes-based approach to performance management of Family Centres. Commissioners focuses on the long-term positive changes that Family Centres have helped children and young people and their families to achieve, rather than on the activities that have been delivered.

Family Centres deliver Early Help (Level 2) and Targeted Early Help (Level 3) and support the delivery of the Helping Families Early strategy (2020-2023) [Helping Families Early Strategy 2020 to 2023 \(final version 5 June 2020\) \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](#).

Quarterly performance meetings are held with each Family Centre which focus on key performance indicators and the outcomes framework detailed in the service specification. Each Family Centre also works with families to complete a distance travelled tool (outcome star) which demonstrates tangible progress the family have made in their individual outcomes.

This page is intentionally left blank