



‘Crisis point’ in local government funding

Parties from across the spectrum called on the next government to change its funding model for local councils, claiming it is “not fit for purpose”.

Councillor **Robert Evans** (Labour, Spelthorne) told Surrey County Council (SCC) it should call on the next government to bring in a “fairer and robust system to replace council tax”. He put forward the motion at Surrey’s full council meeting on Tuesday, March 19.

Introduced in 1993, council tax is based on 30-year-old property valuations (from 1991). This is not affected by changes in house prices or how much the property is worth today.

Average house prices in Surrey have risen over 400 per cent, from £103,569 in January 1995 to £525,897 in December 2023.

Leader of the County Council **Tim Oliver** (Conservative, Weybridge) said the issues are not party-political, but “local government vs central government”. He added: “Everything should be put on the table. We are now at a crisis point within the local government and we need to do something different.”

Wage inflation, general inflation and soaring demands in adult social care and child services have squeezed council budgets, exceeding the income received from central government. The Local Government Association (LGA) found councils have suffered a 27 per cent real-terms cut in core spending power since 2010.

Council tax for Surrey residents will increase a further 4.99 per cent from April, as the county leader claims £1.2bn net is needed for the council. Around 70 per cent of SCC’s budget is spent on social care. With Surrey’s older demographic and ageing population, the demands on care are likely to increase.

Deputy leader for bankrupt Woking Borough Council, Cllr **Will Forster** (Liberal Democrats) said: “When there is so much cross-party consensus, in and out of the political spectrum, I think something is up.”

Cllr Forster said as a “ridiculous comparison”, Buckingham Palace, valued at £1bn, sits in Band H and pays just over £1,800 council tax, which is equivalent to a Band B property in Surrey.

In the short-term, Cllr Evans suggested the government could introduce new council tax bands “so the wealthy in larger homes could contribute a fairer percentage of their income to Surrey”.

He also suggested as a long-term proposal, to replace council tax, stamp duty and the bedroom tax with a “proportional property tax based on property values updated annually”. Another “more radical” option would be a land tax as land or a site itself- not the buildings or anything on it would be valued.

Discussions on local government funding were extended to include reforming business rates and highways funding. Speculative options also mentioned a local levy on fuel duty and petrol stations, airport tax, tourists charges, increased fines in breaches of highway rules.

The motion was resolved that SCC would lobby the next government, following the General Election, to overhaul local council funding.

Related reports:

Local Government monopoly board at play?

How far will £500m go for Surrey Councils?

Tory leader pleads with Tory Government

Better private - public health communications could prevent deaths

A young woman tragically took her own life in Surrey prompting a warning from a coroner over communication barriers between hospitals. Meghan Christmas, who suffered from anxiety disorder, depression, complex PTSD and ADHD, died by suicide on October 20, 2021 at a Premier Inn in Guildford.



Less than three weeks prior, Meghan had impulsively attempted suicide by overdose and was admitted to Royal Surrey Hospital on the following day. She was offered further psychiatric treatment through the NHS at this time, which she declined in favour of continuing with her private treatments at The Priory Hospital. Information about Meghan Christmas' attempted overdose was only sent to her GP and not her private psychiatrist.

Meghan took her own life the same day as her private psychiatrist said she was "progressing well". Following Meghan's inquest Coroner Darren Stewart OBE wrote in a Prevention of Future Deaths report to NHS England over the 'concerning' communication barriers between private and public healthcare services.

He wrote: "At a time where pressures on the NHS exist, particularly for mental health services, it is of concern that measures which could alleviate this pressure (where someone sources private care) do not exist. There is little or no policy, guidance or other effective arrangements to share important clinical information about patients between private and public healthcare sectors."

"The passage of information between NHS and private healthcare providers is hindered due to the absence of an adequate structure to share important clinical information about patients in a timely and effective manner. Action should be taken to prevent future deaths."

Meghan was prescribed antidepressants after a face-to-face appointment with her GP in February 2021. She started seeing a private psychiatrist around July, and received prescriptions both privately and from her GP.

The coroner also raised this as a key concern. They wrote: "This means Mrs. Christmas had access to double prescriptions. Healthcare professionals treating Mrs. Christmas placed significant reliance on the perception that she would be open and honest in her communication with them."

The coroner also raised concerns around police forces communication between each other. It was at, 4.54pm that Meghan contacted Surrey Police to explain that she was fine. At 5.18pm, the call handler in the Hampshire Police control room communicated with Surrey Police only via email.

After receiving no response from Surrey Police, the handler in the Hampshire Police control room communicated with them via telephone Surrey Police then attended the location in Guildford and found Meghan's room barricaded. Upon gaining access to the room, officers found that Meghan had sadly died.

Officers attempted to resuscitate Meghan and her heartbeat restarted. After resuscitation, Meghan was transported to Royal Surrey County Hospital where she died two days later on October 20, 2021 from a Hypoxic Brain Injury.

The coroner wrote: "The handling of the incident involving Mrs. Christmas in Hampshire Constabulary's Force Control Room which resulted in a hour delay in determining that an important communication (being a request for assistance) had not been received by a neighbouring force." It was not concluded however that this shortcoming contributed to her death.

Hampshire Constabulary have since said they have made significant improvements to their process. These measures included: Revision of training provided and the introduction of additional training for supervisors and control room staff. Implementation of National Policy concerning Missing Persons, including documentation to assist in control room responses to similar circumstances. Revision of the recording of risk assessment measurements on the computer aided dispatch record (CAD) system.

It was further explained to the court that the measures should be seen in the context of wider cultural change management in the supervision and leadership being undertaken by Hampshire Constabulary in the operation of the Control Room.

A spokesperson for Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust said: "Following Meghan's death an amendment was made to our Psychiatric Liaison Service policy stating discharge letters will be sent not just to the GP, but also to any other relevant external professional - provided we have the explicit consent of the individual to do this. The measure was welcomed by the Coroner."

SABP added it has developed new guidelines for both community and in-patient clinicians to ensure it routinely and actively seeks a person's consent to contact and share information with or from their private practitioner.

The Priory Hospital did not make an additional comment. NHS England has been approached for comment.



Varying opinions on local maternity services

Epsom and St Helier Hospital NHS Trust claims it has a 'strong' maternity service despite failings in a recent CQC report. Safety in the maternity service was rated 'inadequate' in a report published by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in February. The service overall was downgraded from 'good' to 'requires improvement'.

Managing Director of the Trust **James Blythe** said, at an Epsom and Ewell Health Liaison Panel on March 3, he was "disappointed" with the CQC report. He added: "The hospital has a really strong service and what the CQC identified are processes we need to get stronger at."

However, the CQC's report highlights practical issues including qualifications and competence of staff, and an environment 'not fit for purpose'.

An update report by the Trust given to the Epsom and Ewell Health Liaison Panel said: "All of our maternity services meet 10 out of the 10 safety actions required nationally." The 10 safety actions are specific to maternity services and range from submitting maternity data, workforce planning, training and action plans, to delivering best practice.

However, the CQC report found the leadership team 'did not take timely action' to make change where non-compliance with four safety actions was identified in the 2022/23 inspection.

A report in July 2022 identified a shortfall of midwives, yet this had still not been addressed in January 2023. The service was therefore unable to declare compliance with safety action 5 on midwifery workforce planning.

The CQC report said: "On inspection, there was a lack of clarity from managers and leaders about whether the service was on track to make improvements and declare compliance for 2023/24."

Epsom and St Helier hospital Trust were asked about the discrepancy between the agenda stating they met all 10 safety actions and the CQC inspection report outlying non-compliance of safety actions. The Trust did not comment on the difference.

The Trust is planning to invest more than £2m over two years to increase midwifery staffing in the unit by 8% so the Trust can declare full compliance with safety action 5.

Visiting the hospital in August 2023, the CQC found the service "did not have enough midwifery and nursing staff in the right areas with the right qualifications, skills and training to care for women, birthing [partners] and babies".

Staff working in transitional care for babies who require extra support "did not have the qualifications and competence for the role they were undertaking."

A spokesperson from Epsom and St Helier said: "Our priority is to ensure women and birthing people receive the best possible care, and we have already taken steps to improve and strengthen our maternity services - rated by mums in the CQC's own survey as the best in London."

Days before the inspection report was published, the Trust secured a strong result in a CQC patient experience survey of women and birthing partner's experiences of maternity care in England.

Maternity services at Epsom and St Helier received the best scores in London, with maternity care at St George's joint second place.

The environment in some areas was 'not fit for purpose', and on the maternity ward this posed an 'infection prevention and control risk'. Bereavement and recovery facilities did not meet national standards for privacy.

The Trust is said it is 'fast-tracking' estates work with new doors and blinds fitted to improve privacy and dignity.

The hospital's environment was "not fit for purpose in all areas" and the facilities and equipment were found to "not always keep people safe".

An Epsom and St Helier spokesperson implied that patients deserve better than the current crumbling estate - but the hospital can still deliver and receive safe care.

Founded in 1938, approximately 90% of St Helier Hospital pre-dates the NHS itself. A further 98% of the St Helier estate is said to be either in very poor or bad condition and requires capital investment or replacement.

Millions are said to be invested every year to address the most urgent estate challenges, while also improving the buildings, facilities, equipment and environment for patients and staff.

A spokesperson for Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust said: "This new rating is partly a reflection of our ageing



estate, and – while the care they receive is safe – mums, babies and other patients deserve better, which is why we're pleased the Government has promised us a new hospital and upgrades to our existing facilities by 2030."

Surrey Police roots out non-PC conduct

There is a culture of "sexualised conversations" within a Surrey Police training group, an officer's gross misconduct hearing panel heard.

PC Adam Watkins was found culpable of making sexually inappropriate comments and gestures to a female colleague and then also during the 'end of training' celebration evening on 7 October 2022.

Inappropriate comments included PC Watkins asking his colleague, anonymised as 'Officer A', if she had 'christened' her new house with her boyfriend (i.e whether they had had sex in it yet).

Watkins also asked Officer A how big her boyfriend's penis is, gesturing with his hands and asking her to stop when he gestured the correct size, then commenting that Officer A would need crutches because of the size.

CCTV footage from a pub also showed Watkins approaching Officer A holding his drink to her face and that she had backed away. He then approached her from behind and pressed his groin against her buttock.

Watkins accepted that he had been drinking throughout the evening and noted that he was unsteady on his feet.

Officer A said, in a written statement on 9 October 2022, that "she turned around and saw [the former officer] right behind [her] swaying his pelvis from side to side. [Her] heart started racing when [she] noticed it was him and [she] felt a bit afraid."

Officer A's statement after the event said: "It was an extremely creepy and uncomfortable experience and it shocked me that he would behave in this way. Most times I talk about this experience, I start crying."

Separate observations from some of the witness statements led the panel to note there "appeared to be a culture of 'sexualised conversations' within the training group" at large. Surrey Police have since said that the "overwhelming majority" of their officers and staff are professional.

A police misconduct hearing into Watkins' conduct was held at Surrey Police Headquarters on 29th and 30th January and was heard by an independent panel.

Watkins had resigned during the investigation and prior to the hearing on 12 May 2023. The panel found that the officer's actions amounted to gross misconduct and he would have been dismissed if he had not ceased to be a member of the police force.

Watkins argued his comments were made within the context of the culture of the team. Both Watkins and Officer A had instigated conversations of a sexual nature on occasions, the report read.

The misconduct report advised that Surrey Police Force may wish to review the training provided to new officers with the standards of professional conduct, as well as respect to equality and diversity to ensure the content is adequate.

It added training provided to the Police and Crime training team leaders should be revised to ensure unacceptable standards of conduct are quickly identified and resolved.

Head of Surrey Police's Professional Standards Department, Superintendent Andy Rundle, said: "We have invested in a comprehensive programme of cultural change towards challenging, reporting and tackling unethical or unprofessional behaviour. This included every officer and staff member under-taking mandatory training and plenary sessions in abuse of position for a sexual purpose, gender, and racial bias."

Noting Officer A's presentation at the hearing, the panel felt she remained "significantly affected" by the former officer's actions.

The panel found Watkins "displayed a lack of awareness about his actions". The former officer claimed "he was just being a bit silly".

Watkins relied on Officer A to point out that his conduct was unacceptable instead of taking responsibility for his own conduct, the panel observed.

According to the misconduct panel, Watkins "attempted to minimise his involvement by maintaining that he was only joking" when he made the comments to Officer A.



The report said: "We found the former officer's view – that it was Officer A's responsibility to tell him that his conduct was unacceptable – to be concerning."

It added: "The public rightly expects a police officer to maintain the highest standards of behaviour."

Watkins disputed the allegation that, whilst [Officer A] was discussing what she was going to wear on the 'end of training' celebration with her colleague, he said "are you going to get your tits out?".

Instead, he believed that he said "Are you going to get the girls out" and clarified that by "girls" he meant breasts. Accordingly, the panel considered that whether the words "girls" or "tits" were said by Watkins, the difference was not significantly material.

Accepting his behaviour amounted to misconduct, Watkins denied that it reached the Gross Misconduct threshold as he had not intended to cause harm or distress to Officer A.

The panel concluded it had "no doubt" that the former officer's actions is likely to cause "reputational harm" to the police service and undermine public confidence in policing. This is particularly the case given the increasing societal concerns regarding acts of violence against women and girls, the hearing heard.

Superintendent Rundle added: "This is a very concerning case where PC Watkins displayed completely inappropriate behaviour towards a fellow colleague and displayed a total lack of respect for her.

"This is simply not acceptable, and we are very sorry that she was subjected to this in the workplace; a place where she should feel safe and respected by all colleagues.

"We recognise the impact this case will have both on the Surrey public and our own officers and staff, particularly with the current focus on standards. Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of our officers and staff are professional and a credit to the force, however, it is essential that we continue to root out those colleagues who do not meet our demanding standards and ethics."

Image is illustration only and is not nor intended to represent any individual referred to in this report.

New housing around Surrey's cathedral in contention

A developer is arguing the benefits of 124 new homes next to **Guildford Cathedral** outweigh the potential harms to the heritage and green space.

Vivid Homes is appealing for a public inquiry to consider its planning application which was unanimously rejected by the council in March 2023.

The Cathedral, along with developer Vivid Homes, proposed to demolish the existing staff housing and create 124 homes in a mix of flats and housing – 54 of which would be affordable properties – on undeveloped woodland.

Officers at the Council in March 2023 recommended refusing the plans for a host of reasons including its harm to the heritage setting including the "visual prominence of the apartment blocks", the impact on the "green collar" and the effect on the "silhouette" of the landmark.

Councillors decided it was ultimately not the right location for the development, even if the scheme offered affordable homes. Vivid Homes' appeal contends that any harm identified has been minimised and should be balanced against the benefits.

The main appeals argue the visual prominence of the development will blend with the heritage asset. Apartment blocks and roofscapes will "sit within the landscape". Reducing building heights, landscaping and tree planting were also cited as ways to keep the green collar and "longer-distant views" towards and around the Cathedral.

A council report noted that the submitted design proposals would "harm the landscape character and the visual experience of the site to the east", but would "benefit" the approach to the cathedral from the west.

The council concluded that the proposals would "still result in moderate adverse landscape and visual effects" concerning Surrey Hills as an area of natural beauty.

The proposed development as submitted would "continue to harm 'important views'" in relation to the character and heritage assets of Guildford Town Centre, the council added.

The Guildford Society, a civic group promoting high standards in planning and architecture, said it was "disappointed" at hearing



the news that the developers had appeal the decision, in late October 2023.

The urban planning organisation said it had two major concerns: the visual impact of the development on Guildford's iconic skyline and the infrastructure supporting the development.

A spokesperson said: "The classic view of Guildford Cathedral from the south with its grass area is not really replicated in any of the planning documents." - There is "very little information" on how the development will look when viewed from afar.

Starting 5 March, the public inquiry will be conducted by a planning inspectorate and last ten days.

Vivid homes is footing the bill for the appeal, despite the application also made on behalf of Guildford Cathedral.

The acting dean, **Stuart Beake**, said when the appeal was announced: "[The] decision is crucial for us financially - if planning permission is granted it will mean that our reserves will receive some much needed funds as we can recoup all the money we have spent on fees. An endowment will be established which will provide funds for the routine maintenance and upkeep of the cathedral and that in turn means that our annual budget will start to break even or be in surplus."

Guildford Cathedral has been operating with a financial deficit for several years which has exacerbated with the coronavirus pandemic and the refusal of planning developments. The cathedral said it was selling land surrounding its Grade II listed site to create an endowment fund to pay for maintenance costs.

A spokesperson from The Guildford Society said: "Planning applications should be viewed without prejudice of its financial background. Whether the cathedral is making money out of it or making a thundering loss is not a matter for the review."

The application would have raised a £10m endowment for the cathedral, which it said would help fund the future of the cathedral.

However, it was highlighted during a public presentation that cash from this sale would only last five years. When combined with a separate sale, planners said, this would only raise 23 per cent of the budgeted maintenance costs.

According to Vivid Homes documents, the cathedral's deficit at the end of 2022 was £116,000. It was predicted to reduce the deficit slightly to £100,000 in 2023 by looking at ways to increase income and reduce expenditure. Details of repairing costs provided by a Quinquennial Inspection have identified repairs costing a total of £3,585,000.

Guildford Cathedral and Vivid homes were invited to comment.

Related report:

Surrey County's Cathedral citadel conserved...

Image: Grahame Larter

Coroner catalogues care failures in diabetic death

Surrey County Council (SCC) has been accused of not taking its responsibilities seriously after an eighteen-year-old tragically died from diabetes.

Jake Baker, an 18-year-old with a learning disability and type 1 diabetes, died at home following Diabetic Ketoacidosis. He required residential care since the age of eight, under the guardianship of the council. An inquest concluded a catalogue of failures by Surrey County Council and other bodies contributed to Jake's death.

The coroner found Surrey Care Leavers team and Children Services had failed to obtain information about Jake's cognitive ability and his capability of managing his diabetes independently, a Prevention of Future Deaths report published this month reads.

Coroner **Caroline Topping** said: "I am not satisfied that Surrey County Council have undertaken a rigorous review of the circumstances of the death, nor that the risk of future deaths has been averted. The issues surrounding the inadequacy of Jake's pathway plan have not been addressed comprehensively in the last 4 years. Training for personal advisers is not mandatory and is only now being rolled out."

The court was not provided with copies of the training or any protocol to be assured of the adequacy of the training and its implementation.

The coroner said that Jake's death was "avoidable" and was "contributed to by neglect". In September 2018 Jake (then 17) was placed in a full-time residential placement at **Ruskin Mill College**.

At the time of his death, Jake was staying with family for a few days when he became seriously ill from uncontrolled diabetes.



Jake's mother and stepfather found him unresponsive. His family previously said "there is nothing that can take away the pain" of losing their son.

The days before his death were the first time he had stayed away from his care facilities for more than two nights in a row, since being placed in the care of Surrey County Council when eight years old, his family's lawyers said.

He was entitled to a personal adviser who had a statutory duty to write a pathway plan for Jake, including consideration of how his health needs were to be met. However, when away from home, no advice was sought from specialist diabetes services to inform the pathway plan and no risk assessment was made for Jake having unsupported contact with his family and managing his diabetes, the coroner's report concludes.

Meetings discussing Jake staying over at his family's house without support were unminuted. The emails which refer to meeting decisions made no reference to any of the dangers inherent in Jake's diabetic condition nor his ability to manage it unsupported. The family were also not given any advice or training on how to keep Jake safe if he became unwell nor any emergency contact numbers.

The coroner added: "The local authority employees held the mistaken belief that if Jake wanted to go home unsupervised once he turned 18 there was nothing they could do to stop him. No capacity assessment was undertaken in relation to Jake's ability to make a decision to go home unsupported. In my opinion there is a risk that future deaths could occur unless action is taken"

Four years on from Jake's death, the coroner found the process of obtaining learning disabilities diagnoses remains opaque and difficult as there is no protocol in relation to this. Vulnerable care leavers are at risk of being denied necessary support due to the confusion and delay teams accessing adult social care assessments.

Jake was assessed not to meet the threshold for SCC Transitions Team because a report containing his original disability diagnosis was lost. Children's Services were unable to obtain an up to date diagnosis. He did not have the support of an adult social work team and this outcome was being challenged when he died.

Overnight from the 28 to the 29 December 2019, Jake developed diabetic ketoacidosis as a result of being hyperglycaemic in the preceding days. He began to vomit and required immediate hospitalisation. On 30 December 2019 the college was notified by his family that he was too ill to travel. The staff who were travelling to collect him were told to return to the college. His family was not told to take him to hospital.

He was last seen alive at 11pm and found dead at 3am on 31 December 2019. If Jake had been admitted to hospital at any time prior to 5pm on the 30 December 2019 he would have been successfully treated."

The family claim that Jake's death was avoidable if he had been admitted to hospital any time before 5pm on December 29. In a statement, the family said: "Losing Jake has been incredibly difficult for our family, especially as he died in our home at what should have been a happy time. We trusted Ruskin Mill Trust with Jake's care, and we have been let down by them in the worst possible way.

"Jake was an enthusiastic and determined young man who always put his mind to things. As a family we did all we could to make sure that Jake was looking after himself and was well taken care of, but those that were put in charge of his care didn't give us the information necessary to ensure Jake's safety"

Clare Curran, SCC Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning, said: "Our deepest sympathies remain with Jake's family and friends. The services provided to Jake fell short of what he and his family needed to keep him safe, and we are very sorry for our part in that. We have taken a number of actions over the past four years to improve our support for young adults leaving care and we will be responding to the Coroner outlining our action plan to prevent future deaths. While we have already made changes, we know there is still further to go and we will carefully consider the Coroner's concerns as we take our next steps."

Published on 14 February 2024, SCC have up to 56 days to formally respond to the coroner's report and outline the service's action plan.

A boozy blow to Epsom's "gentrification"?

Epsom's new B&M bargains store, formerly Wilko, can sell booze from 7am-11pm despite a resident's concerns it could "attract the wrong crowd". After entering administration last summer, the former Wilko branch was purchased by B&M in September 2023 in a re-brand.



Epsom and Ewell's licensing committee unanimously granted an alcohol licence for the new B&M store, due to open 1 March, at a meeting held 12 February.

One resident, Neil Gandhi had objected stating: "[It] goes against the local plan to gentrify Epsom. A B&M bargain will attract more crime, shoplifting, litter and the wrong crowds to our beautiful town Epsom."

Another resident from Hudson House, a nearby apartment building, said they already experience problems from people who buy alcohol late at night from Tesco and Co-op. They added people proceed to drink under their car park and walkway.

A statement from Keystone Law on behalf of B&M said: "The concept of gentrification and what is 'the wrong crowd' is somewhat subjective and, in any event, is not strictly relevant to the Licensing Objectives."

The national discount retailer sells a range of products including food, electricals, homeware, furniture, DIY and a limited range of alcohol.

The committee heard the main risk of crime out of B&M is shoplifting, according to the B&M representative. This danger is mitigated by a one-way system and the alcohol aisle placed at the centre of the premises, preventing potential shoplifters from rushing in and out of the store.

The application was granted despite Cllr **Phil Neale** (RA Cuddington) raising concerns on the effect of the "early" licensing hours on "teenagers and the school run at that time in the morning".

Although the licensing hours expand between 7am-11pm seven days a week, the applicant stated the store would "generally" operate from 8am-7pm Monday to Saturday and 10:30am to 4:30pm on Sundays.

During peak trading periods, such as Christmas celebrations in December, the applicant's trading hours are extended to 11pm closing time subject to customer demand.

While he was content with the 11pm cut-off, Cllr Neale said: "I would rather see the early hour one made a little bit tighter than 7am."

The B&M representative explained the 7am start catered towards customers who shop earlier due to shift work patterns. He added that the sale of alcohol is an important part of the store's offer because it "wants to ensure B&M is a one-stop shop."

Related report:

Another news in store for Epsom!

Image: Credit: Google street view. Former Wilko store to open as B&M bargains applies for alcohol licence.