



Tasteless Tweeting Councillor loses Tory whip

A Horley councillor has lost the Tory whip after posting what his party called “wholly unacceptable and grossly offensive” posts from a now-deleted Twitter account. **Surrey County Councillor Andy Lynch** was investigated by the Conservatives for posts made last month from an account with the handle @TheLandlorduk.

Surrey County Councillor Andy Lynch now sits as an Independent.

On Tuesday (November 1), the chairman of the Surrey County Council Conservative group, **Cllr John O'Reilly**, said the investigation on behalf of the party into the account had concluded. He said: “Having spoken to senior members of the Conservative group, we have unanimously agreed that Mr Lynch’s various comments under ‘The Landlord’ twitter handle are wholly unacceptable and grossly offensive, and, accordingly, the Conservative whip has been withdrawn from him.”

Screenshots taken before the Twitter account was deleted show one post sent in response to a tweet about asylum seekers which said: “When are [politicians] going to recognise the human rights of the indigenous people to have a quiet and peaceful life?” Separately, a county council spokesperson confirmed two complaints have been received about the @TheLandlorduk account, and were being considered in line with the authority’s process for complaints against councillors.

In May this year Cllr Lynch was found to be in breach of the county council’s code of conduct for separate posts sent in February from a different Twitter account, now also deleted, with the handle @cllrAndyLynch. Tweets posted from the @TheLandlorduk account included calling the “police force an absolute disgrace these days”, and responding to a picture of a Muslim woman and child standing at a halal fridge saying: “Throw a packet of bacon in there”.

Posts also called London Mayor Sadiq Khan an “absolute knob” and London a “third world s and the murder capital of Western Europe”. A county council spokesperson said the authority’s code of conduct had no specific guidelines regarding previous conduct of the same nature but the council’s member conduct panel may take it into account when considering a complaint made against a councillor.

Llr Lynch had not responded to LDRS requests for comment at the time of publication. In May, the Horley West, Salfords & Sidlow councillor was found to have breached Surrey County Council’s code of conduct for posts from the @cllrAndyLynch account.

He sent a written apology to the county council’s chief executive, its chairman and its leader. At the time, Cllr Lynch was removed from a select committee by the Conservative group, and received a statement of censure from the county council. Minutes from the conduct panel said: “The panel noted that Andy Lynch had fully co-operated with the investigation and had voluntarily admitted and apologised for his conduct.”

At the time of the first account being deleted, from which Cllr Lynch called journalist Yasmin Alibhai-Brown “a racist b***”, he was also a Reigate and Banstead borough councillor but did not stand again in May’s local elections. A borough council spokesperson said he was suspended by his council political group as part of its disciplinary process, and remained suspended until the end of his electoral term in May.

The investigation by the borough council’s monitoring officer did not conclude because the complaints were withdrawn. Cllr Lynch was elected to the county council in May 2021.

“The Landlord” account repeated comments about Ms Alibhai-Brown including calling her an “evil, racist loon”.

Surrey Ambulance employee woes far from over

An NHS chief executive has never in her career seen employee relations cases of the “volume and a complexity” as at her current troubled ambulance trust. **South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECamb)**, the NHS trust which covers Surrey, is on an improvement journey, after an “inadequate” rating for how the service was led in June and a report this week which downgraded its overall rating.

The trust’s interim chief executive, **Siobhan Melia**, said though she was not happy with the pace of the progress on improving the culture at the trust, she understood why it was not moving quickly. She told a board meeting on Thursday (October 27): “I have never in my career seen a volume and a complexity of [employee relations] cases that we are dealing with.” She said she understood why limited staff resources and an “incredibly high case load” were contributing to this.

The meeting heard what progress was being made against two warnings given in the June report, which found a culture of



“bullying, harassment and sexualised behaviour” at the trust.

A report published this week by the **Care Quality Commission** downgraded the trust’s overall rating, finding that staff were “burnt out”, working beyond their hours and not always getting breaks. But the area of “caring” was given a “good” rating in the latest report, with patients found to be treated with kindness and compassion.

Thursday’s meeting focused on the two warning areas of four highlighted in the June report, namely risk, clinical governance and quality improvement, and of a culture of bullying. The latest report will be addressed at future board meetings of the ambulance trust, which covers Surrey, Kent, Sussex and parts of Hampshire.

According to meeting documents, the trust’s planned outcome for concerns around culture centred on a “significant reduction in bullying and harassment”, and staff feeling empowered and supported to raise concerns.

The interim chief executive said there needed to be “absolute clarity” on there being zero tolerance on behaviours that did not align with trust values, and a “decisive position” taken that sexually inappropriate behaviour would not be tolerated.

She said the backlog of cases meant people were getting “frustrated” at the length of processes because the trust was “running to catch up”. Ms Melia said she had found herself “challenged” as a woman chief executive in 2022 to have taken a sexual safety workshop in the last week. She added: “I’m listening to the lived experiences of female members of staff at SECamb, who are talking quite openly in that workshop about some of the things that are happening. So we simply have to get more decisive, more strong in the actions that we take and continually say: ‘We will protect you as we should when you’re an employee of SECamb’.”

Saying decisions on sanctions in proven cases needed to be “much faster”, she added that the trust needed to “deliver the actions in a much more overt way” to match words and communications that were being put out.

The trust’s executive director of human resources and organisational development, **Ali Mohammed**, said that 25 per cent of employee relations cases involved bullying, harassment or sexual safety.

He said once the initial work had been done on meeting targets set out after the CQC report and clearing the backlog of cases, more of a “learning culture” needed to be brought in at the trust. But he said ultimately it would be the staff that would be able to tell leaders if things had changed for the better. He said: “Are we winning in terms of people feeling that there’s a different culture within the organisation? That’s the key thing in the end, asking the individuals themselves because they are the best judge of it.” He said there was an “individual and collective responsibility” on all board members, managers and “every single individual within the organisation” to push the same message and the same culture. He added: “This isn’t something one person could do in isolation. I think it’s a test we should hold ourselves to as a board, and as a senior management community, that it is something that we personally will be pushing forward.”

The board’s chairman **David Astley** said the trust needed to “root out” inappropriate behaviour. He said all staff needed to feel confident and safe at work, whether on the front line or in other areas. Mr Astley added: “They’ve got to feel safe, so they can do the best job they can for their colleagues, and more importantly, the patients.”

Surrey to SEND £40m for special schools

A £40 million project to improve education facilities for some of Surrey’s most vulnerable children has moved to its next stage. **Surrey County Council** is currently not providing enough spaces in its “alternative provision” schools, which cater for children who have been excluded from mainstream schools or have additional educational needs. [Ed. SEND = special educational needs and disability.]

The current facilities are also described by the council as in “extremely poor” and “dilapidated condition”.

It is hoped that being able to provide places in council-run facilities will unlock more than £1m a year because the cost of a place with private providers is around £30,000 more per year than in an authority setting.

A meeting of Surrey County Council’s cabinet on Tuesday (October 25) heard from the authority’s cabinet member for education and learning that the new and redeveloped sites would be “first class”.

Councillor **Clare Curran** (Conservative, Bookham and Fetcham West) outlined plans for sites across Surrey which would be redeveloped, demolished or built from scratch to aim to increase the authority’s capacity.

Currently, according to council documents, the authority can only provide 196 spaces, out of a total of 240 that are required by law.

Legally, the county council must secure suitable, full-time alternative education for children who, because of reasons including illness or exclusion, would not be in education unless it was arranged for them.



It must also make sure there is provision for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) who have Education, Health, and Care Plans in place.

Alternative provision is often a short-term solution until a child can return to mainstream education or move to a dedicated school, but in some cases is a longer-term solution.

Cllr Curran said the new sites would provide an environment where children would feel valued, could access high quality curriculum and get the emotional, health and well-being support they needed.

She said: "These short-stay schools can include some of the most vulnerable and marginalised children and young people that are in the county. We really want to ensure that we're providing them not only with first-class accommodation, but a first-class learning experience."

The plans, which would add 44 alternative provision places, include new sites in Elmbridge, on a council-owned site at Thamesfield Farm North, in either Surrey Heath or Runnymede and a new school on a new site for Reigate Valley College.

There are also plans to demolish the current Fordway School in Spelthorne, with the school relocating temporarily to Wey Valley College in Guildford while a new school is built, and plans to remodel and expand the Wey Valley College site.

The targets for the school sites are autumn and winter 2024.

An officers' report said: "The current assets are in extremely poor condition and lack capacity to provide adequate places in appropriate locations across the county. Existing accommodation across the current nine buildings is significantly undersized and the buildings are in a dilapidated condition which is likely to render them unusable within the next two years. As such, the existing accommodation does not enable the provision of a full statutory educational offer that meets the educational needs of Surrey's most vulnerable learners."

Cabinet members approved the £43.2m budget for the project, which should also generate £5.77m in capital receipts when current council land is sold off.

The officers' report showed that the average cost of a child going to an independent facility was around £52,000 per year, compared to £22,000 per year for a place at a maintained specialist school.

The additional places in council-run schools would mean a difference of £1.32m a year to the council's budget.

Indecent images end policeman's career

A former Surrey Police special constable will never be in the profession again after failing to report unwanted illegal indecent images. According to an accelerated misconduct hearing outcome posted on the force's website, Special Constable **Alan Harvey** breached the "standards of professional behaviour" and was so serious "it warranted dismissal".

Surrey Police handed Mr Harvey's name to the LDRS on request as the hearing notice and outcome refers to him as "Special Constable Harvey". However, limited details have been released since the hearing took place on October 3.

Here's what happened:

A notice of the hearing was on the Surrey Police website on September 27, and was seen by the LDRS.

On approaching the force to gain the full name of the officer involved, which was not initially included, the notice was taken down and replaced with one with less detail on the allegations. The original notice of the hearing stated that former SC Harvey had stated, during police interview, that sometimes he would be sent indecent images of children. It said: "SC Harvey failed to report these illegal images to police so that the offenders could be prosecuted, and children safeguarded. Former SC Harvey continued to use the same online services despite having been sent [indecent images of children]."

According to the original hearing notice, the former SC had also accepted in police interview that he may have sent one of the indecent images of children by accident when trying to send legal adult pornography through the online service.

Chief Constable **Gavin Stephens** chaired the hearing on October 3, finding that the breach of the standards of professional behaviour was so serious that former SC Harvey should be dismissed, had he still been serving

The college of policing states that special constables are voluntary officers with the same powers as regular officers, and they take part in frontline police work.

This can mean a varied role including spending "much of their time on the streets", patrolling in crime hotspots or taking part in crime-prevention initiatives.

A Surrey Police spokeswoman said: "The rules breached were that it breached our professional standards, the finding made was that he would have been dismissed had he still been serving and same goes for the sanctions imposed."



*LDRS = Local Democracy Reporting Service of the BBC with which Epsom and Ewell Times is partnered.

Woking up to a very big debt problem

The senior councillor responsible for **Surrey County Council**'s money will step down from its cabinet amid a "potential conflict" as the Government calls for a review of finances at the borough council she used to lead.

Woking Borough Council's forecasted **£2.4bn debt** has been called an "outlier" by government ministers.

The now leader at Woking was sent a letter by local government minister MP **Paul Scully** on Tuesday (October 18) which said the authority had the highest level of commercial debt relative to its size for a council.

Images: Woking Borough Council. Credit Rebecca Curley.

It follows a letter that was sent to the borough council in May which said there was a need to tackle risk at local government level and protect taxpayers' interest. Mr Scully's letter said: "As you will be aware, the Government has in recent years expressed concerns that some authorities are putting taxpayers' money at risk through disproportionate levels of debt, over-reliance on commercial income, or pursuing novel and risky investments." He described Woking's debt, forecast to rise to almost £2.4bn by 2024/25, as "an outlier" even among the other local authorities government was working with.

He also said he had concerns about the authority's lending arrangements for major developments, the risks council and taxpayers were exposed to due to the long-term high levels of debt and the "sensitivity of these investments to commercial performance".



Ayesha Azad, leader of Woking Borough Council from Oct 2020, submitted by her. Credit to Ayesha Azad.

Surrey County Council announced Councillor **Ayesha Azad** (Conservative, Woking South West), who led Woking Borough Council from October 2020 to May 2022, had decided to step down from the authority's cabinet, where she was appointed in September. The county council's leader, **Tim Oliver** (Conservative, Weybridge), said: "I have discussed this matter with Cllr Azad and in light of her recent role in Woking and a potential conflict in the light of the support being provided by SCC, she has decided to step aside from her cabinet position while this review takes place."

On Wednesday (October 19) the borough council had announced a "partnership approach" to fixing the authority's finances, working with the county council and continuing to work alongside the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC).

Councillor **Ann-Marie Barker** (Liberal Democrat, Goldsworth Park), the borough council's leader, said she was pleased the letter had recognised the "constructive and cooperative approach" taken by the authority in working with DLUHC and the county council. She added: "I welcome the support and additional advice from an independent review into the council's finances, investments and related governance that has been offered on a non-statutory basis."

She said since the Liberal Democrat group had taken control of the council in May, the administration had been assessing the debt, looking among other things at the rising cost of the Victoria Arch project, projecting a further £53 million in costs, and the funding of the Victoria Square development. Cllr Barker said: "It is however clear that difficult decisions will have to be made



and significant financial challenges lay ahead. "My administration has taken decisive early action and is committed to ensuring that our financial position is resilient, affordable, responsible, and sustainable and I will ensure that that residents, businesses, and community partners are kept fully informed throughout the duration of this process."

The authority's portfolio holder for finance and economic development, Cllr **Dale Roberts** (Liberal Democrat, St Johns), said the first priority was taking "urgent preventative steps to stop the situation worsening" and said reviews would be carried out of the Thamesway and Victoria Square Woking companies.

In May's local elections the Liberal Democrats won a majority on the council, after the Conservative group had led the council for 14 years.

The May letter, from then minister for equalities and levelling up communities, **Kemi Badenoch**, was received a week after the local elections, while Cllr Azad was still technically in position as leader. At the time Cllr Azad said that though the size of Woking's debt was not disputed, the council was acting on a financial model accepted and encouraged by central government. Cllr Azad said at the time that of the money, £700m had gone into Victoria Place and £450m into Sheerwater which had provided between them new homes, retail and entertainment spaces, public spaces and space for NHS provision.

Cllr Oliver said in a statement: "Surrey County Council has agreed to work closely with Woking Borough Council on this review and to support them in the coming months to develop a sustainable and deliverable improvement plan. The residents of Surrey are our primary focus and, as we have demonstrated before, we will always do everything we can to help our fellow Surrey local authorities to protect the services our residents rely on."

Chelsea supports footie expansion next-door

Cobham Football Club will get major upgrades to attract more women into football after councillors gave the green light following support from Premier League giant **Chelsea**. Several other organisations showed support for plans, which include a new spectator stand and new floodlights, saying the club helps support those with disabilities and could help in bringing more women and girls to the game.

Councillors said the football club was an asset to the community in an area where a lot of facilities were privately owned, voting for the changes with only the meeting chair abstaining. A meeting of **Elmbridge Borough Council's** planning committee approved the application from the club, which was brought to the meeting on Tuesday (October 18) for a decision because the land is owned by the authority.

Support for the new 3G artificial pitch came from **Chelsea FC**, in a letter which highlighted the Premier League club having worked in the area for many years and said it would like "first refusal" on possible future community projects. These were listed as possibly including supporting the growth of women's football and running a development centre for 7- to 15-year-old girls as well as supporting grass roots clubs looking to get girls into competitive football.

Chelsea's Cobham Training Centre is in nearby Stoke d'Abernon and many former players including Frank Lampard, John Terry, Petr Cech, and Eden Hazard have lived in the area.

As well as this there was support for the application from **Surrey FA, Surrey Soccer Schools, Cobham Link**, a day service for adults with learning disabilities and autism, and **Leatherhead Primary Care Network**, representing a group of GP practices in the area.

Councillor **Alistair Mann** (Conservative, Cobham and Downside) said he hoped the committee would get behind the application because the club was there to promote "sport for all, football for all". He said: "The outstanding feature of Cobham Football Club is its community basis. It's there for the community."

Concerns raised around the application included the loss of Cypress trees at the club's eastern edge, to be replaced with holly hedges, as well as the noise impact on neighbours of the facility. Councillor **Laurence Wells** (Liberal Democrat, Cobham and Downside) said the installation of an artificial pitch would mean more playing time available, important in making sure sport was accessible to all and particularly in an area with a lot of private facilities. He said he thought conditions on the application regarding light and noise would deal with issues as best as they could but added: "Whether a noise management plan can effectively deal with swearing at 10 o'clock at night, we will wait and see but I think it's covered off as best as possible." He called for the pitch to be recycled at the end of its ten-year lifespan, saying it was equivalent to 1.5million plastic bags.

ENDS



Will Council strikes spread to Epsom and Ewell?

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council staff are using food banks and claiming Universal Credit, according to union officials, as workers go out on strike. Council employees have been offered a 1.3 per cent pay rise, labelled “insulting” by the Unison union. The strike will take place over Tuesday and Wednesday (18 and 19 October) with organisers calling for a greater increase in the face of rising inflation and the cost of living crisis.

Reigate and Banstead council staff on strike. Image credit: Darren Pepe/Surrey Live

Maggie Judd, principal local land charges officer at the council, is the union’s branch manager and said it’s the first industrial action in her 20 years at the authority. She said the council should be using some of its reserves to help staff with a better pay offer and the number of staff out on strike today showed the “strength of feeling” on the issue.

Claiming some staff were having to use food banks and topping up their wages with Universal Credit, she said: “It’s just so upsetting in this day and age, in full time employment, having to use food banks. People are having to make difficult choices.”

Unison said planning officers, parking attendants, administrators, refuse workers, cleaners, and security officers were on strike, and staff on the lower pay grades at the council would receive an additional £200. Unison south east regional organiser **Jenny Mason** said: “This pay offer is nowhere near enough. Staff feel insulted. Many employees are using food banks and their wages have to be topped up with benefits. They’ve been forced to stretch their pay to make ends meet even at the best of times.”

She called on the council to make a better offer, and on the government to provide money to protect local services, saying residents would also suffer because staff would “vote with their feet and join other local councils offering better pay”.

A council spokesperson said around seven per cent of its workforce, 40 employees, were believed to be on strike, and all services continued to operate. They said the 2022/23 pay rise was in addition to cumulative increases in the previous five years from 2017/18 to 2020/21 totalling 10.13 per cent, and additional one-off payments, such as £250 paid to all staff during the covid pandemic in August 2020 and £200 paid in April during National Insurance increases and rising living costs.

Council leader Councillor **Mark Brunt** (Conservative, Hooley, Merstham and Netherne) said the council had been making plans to minimise disruption to services since strike plans were announced. He said: “I am pleased to report that services, including our bin collections, are running as normal. We are disappointed that Unison has chosen to take this course of action. We are grateful to our dedicated staff for their ongoing hard work in challenging circumstances, and at the same time very conscious of the increased cost of living that they and their families are experiencing. However, the reality is that the council only has a finite budget from which we can offer a pay award. This is a national cost of living crisis, and increased costs and inflation are impacting the council’s budgets as well as those of households.”

Emily Coady-Stemp LDRS

Epsom and Ewell Times adds:

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council does not have a formal recognition agreement with a trade union due to the small number of union members in relation to the whole organisation. UNISON has a seat on the staff consultative group (made up of locally elected staff representatives) which is the recognised body for consultation purposes for the Council. As there is no formal recognition agreement with any union there is no formally recognised “facility time” [paid time to undertake union duties] within the Council. EEBC website statement on transparency.

A pay award for 2022/2023 of a 3% increase for staff was approved by the Council on 15th February 2022.

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council has 8 union representatives on its payroll and therefore do have “facility” time provided.

It seems unlikely that Epsom and Ewell Borough Council will be affected by strike action despite current inflation outstripping the pay award.



Epsom Hospital's multi storey carpark wrong on many levels?

A council decision to refuse a new multi-storey car park at Epsom hospital is being appealed. **Epsom and Ewell Borough Council** refused an application for 600 parking spaces and changes to the Dorking Road access because of its impact on the area. An appeal by the **Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust** will be heard at the authority's town hall from November 2, and government inspectors will make a decision on the application.

Plans for the five storey car park, along with changes to surface parking and access to the site, received 125 objections and one letter in support before being refused by the borough council in May 2021.

Image: Stripe Consulting: West elevation multi-storey car park.

The multi-storey would have 527 parking spaces, with a further 104 spaces outside. Planning documents said that currently cars were backed up out of the existing car park, blocking the ambulance route in and out of the hospital but that the plans should help with this congestion. The hospital trust appealed the decision, which was made by councillors because the proposed development would adversely impact the area and affect the adjacent **Woodcote Conservation Area**.

Objections to the plans called for the car park to have some underground levels, which one nearby resident said would "minimise the horrific visual impact on the area". A resident of Dorking Road, **Mr S Curd**, called the plans "totally out of proportion for a residential area". He added: "We are so dismayed by the proposition that the house owners along our stretch of road were willing to sell our houses to the Trust so they can build a single storey car park that would actually add more spaces than this five storey monstrosity without desecrating the entire area."

The appeal will take place on November 2 from 10am.

Epsom Councillor challenges County "community" funding

Questions have been raised about a community cash project and whether it is reaching those in Surrey who are most in need. **Surrey County Council** plans to allocate £100million over five years, with residents and community groups pitching for money for their areas. At its last cabinet meeting on September 22, £586,000 was allocated from the council's Your Fund Surrey community fund for the rebuilding of **Ripley Village Hall** and £982,000 was given to the **Old Woking and District Community Centre**.

Image: More than £500K was awarded for a community shop and cafe in Normandy from Your Fund Surrey. Credit Surrey County Council.

But a motion put forward at the authority's full council meeting on Tuesday (October 11) called for the fund to be paused in next year's budget, in a financial climate that is "very different" from when it was established. **Epsom** Councillor **Jan Mason** (Residents Association, West Ewell) said in her area she had two of the county's most deprived estates, and among the lowest car ownership, meaning people couldn't necessarily travel to community facilities elsewhere. She claimed the money had been "wasted", saying she was sure some councillors had "lovely clubs" for people in middle-income areas.

Cllr Mason added: "You've taken the money from the people in my area that are on low income, and they are paying their rates, they're not getting out of that. But they're actually paying for things that no one asked them do they want to have?" Cllr Mason took issue with councillors being told to work with their communities on getting the funding and has spoken out before on the lengthy application process to get the money. She added: "I know what it's like, so don't say to people like me: 'What you've got to do Jan, is work with your communities.' Yes I do, and I've always done for 20 years."

Cllr Denise Turner-Stewart (Conservative, Staines South and Ashford West), cabinet member for communities and community safety, said the fund had so far given 14 projects £4.5million, with another seven applications worth more than £3.75m which could be decided by the end of the year. She added: "Many of the projects funded have focused on early intervention and prevention by promoting the health and well being of residents. "Funded projects have provided residents with a safe space to exercise, socialise and learn new skills. Bringing communities together on projects has helped reduce social isolation and there



are numerous examples where projects have led to new connections being build out in our communities.”

She also announced that £50,000 would be allocated to each member for their area, aiming to simplify the fund from early 2023. Cllr **George Potter** (Liberal Democrat, Guildford East) called the announcement a “rabbit pulled out of the hat” and questioned if it should come in the middle of a debate and not via a leader’s statement or at a select committee. He said he welcomed the simplification of the process, hoping it might help some of areas of high deprivation in his division, though he raised concerns about rising costs of borrowing on the fund.

Cllr **Nick Darby** (Dittons and Weston Green Residents, The Dittons), putting forward the failed motion to pause the funding, said it was a question of “affordability, pure and simple” and not a question of not wanting to support communities. He said: “We are borrowing £100m or would be if it goes all the way through, and we cannot afford at the moment to do this.”

Council leader Cllr **Tim Oliver** (Conservative, Weybridge) called the “knee-jerk” move “premature at the very least”, saying the next year’s budget would be looked at over the coming weeks and a decision could be made. He said the council would continue to be prudent in budgeting, prioritising services to the most vulnerable children and families, but that the administration would not “abandon our residents and communities”.

Cllr Oliver added: “We should be optimistic in our ability to overcome these challenges. We have a track record of facing up to issues and finding solutions.”

Warnings of County bankruptcy?

Surrey County Council is calling on the government to delay **social care reforms** which it is claimed could “bankrupt” the authority. Plans for more generous means testing and an £86,000 cap on care costs are due to come in from October 2023, but councillors have raised serious concerns on the impact it could have on finances. Surrey County Council, which was last week called on to use its status as a “top Tory authority” in lobbying government for more funding ahead of winter pressures on the NHS, has voted to call for a delay to the social care changes.

A meeting of full council on Tuesday (October 11) approved a motion to ask for more time to prepare for the roll out of the plans, which could cost the council up to an additional £40million a year.



Cllr Bernie Muir - SCC

Calling adult social care “the key issue of our time” **Councillor Bernie Muir** (Conservative, Epsom West), putting forward the motion, said Surrey was an “outlier”, with nearly two thirds of residents funding their own care. Cllr Muir said many of those would qualify for funding under the new plans, therefore needing a detailed means test and said without government funding the plans “simply would not be financially viable”.

She called the numbers “staggering” and said the timescale was “not practical” because of needing to means test an additional



9,500 to 12,000 people, on top of already “extremely challenging” staffing problems. Cllr Muir said: “With the rapidly ageing population and increase in those who have complex needs, it is clear that we have to find a way to pay for social care needs and these need to change in order to help meet the challenge. Surrey County Council supports the government’s desire to tackle this long term issue. But for Surrey the current proposals would appear to be untenable.”

Seconding the motion, **Riasat Khan** (Conservative, Woking North) said it was estimated that the county council could face a funding gap of between £8-20m in 2023/24, rising to £25-40m in 2024/25. He also said somewhere between 85 to 300 extra trained social workers would be needed “within a very tight timescale”.

Cllr Khan said: “Given that we already have resourcing issues, this will be extremely challenging.” Cllr **Will Forster** (Liberal Democrat, Woking South) said the cumulative cost to the council by 2033 could be as high as £3.2billion, which he said “terrified” him. He said: “That is unsustainable. That would bankrupt this council, resulting in us abolishing all services to keep that bill going.”

The **County Councils Network**, which represents 36 English councils, also called for delays to the reforms, which it otherwise supports. The organisation said they could lead to longer waits for care packages, and would add to “a workforce crisis” being faced by authorities at the moment, with inflation also set to add £3.7bn in additional costs to existing services by 2023.

The motion, carried by members, said the council would continue to work with central government to get money to “fully fund reforms across the decade” and push for a delayed and phased introduction of the reforms. As well as this, the council will continue to develop the new Integrated Care Systems for a more joined up approach to health and social care and continue its commitment of tackling health inequalities across the county.