THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF TANDRIDGE

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes and Report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 28th September 2010.

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs. Whittle (Chairman) Councillor Compton (Vice-Chairman) and Councillors Elias, Gosling, Jones and Pannett.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Ainsworth, Mrs. Black, Mrs. Connolly and Keymer.

TANDRIDGE LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SCC: Councillors Mrs. Marks, Orrick, Skellet and Sydney.
TDC: Councillors Cooper and Harwood.


Andy Sayers, Partner, External Auditors - KPMG.
Anna Simmonds, Client Manager, Internal Auditors – RSM Tenon.
Adrian Rutter – Director, Internal Auditors – RSM Tenon.

106. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings held on the 6th July 2010 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

COUNCIL DECISIONS
(Subject to ratification by Council)

107. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITY OF TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL’S OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE TO SCRUTINISE THE TANDRIDGE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (CSP)

Tandridge District Council’s Overview & Scrutiny Committee had now taken on a new statutory responsibility to scrutinise the Tandridge Community Safety Partnership (CSP). The Committee had to fulfil this responsibility once in every 12 month period. Surrey County Council’s Local Committee in Tandridge had also previously undertaken work in reviewing the performance of the Community Safety Partnership annually. This had provided an opportunity for residents and County Council and District Council Members to raise issues.
The Community Safety Partnership in Tandridge was well established and had been in existence for over 10 years with the core partners being the District Council, County Council, the Police Authority, Primary Care Trust, Probation Service and Fire & Rescue Service. The CSP member representatives were Councillor Whittle (District Council) and Councillor Skellett (County Council).

In recognition of this background and after discussion with Members and CSP partners it was decided that this Item of the Overview & Committee would be considered in a partnership form with Members of both the Committees and the Community Safety Partnership being present.

The principal objective was to jointly review the work of the Community Partnership against the key priorities for action against crime and disorder issues, within the framework of the agreed Strategic Assessment. A copy of the Assessment is attached at Appendix ‘A’ together with the other supporting papers from partners.

Following an introductory address from both the Chairman of the Committee and County Councillor Skellett, presentations from all the Partnership representatives were given highlighting their partnership work to all the Members present.

Discussion ensued and questions answered on all the issues concerned.

Members thanked all the Partners involved for their valuable work and contributions in terms of scrutiny and information provided.

**RECOMMENDED** – that the role, work and priorities of the Tandridge Community Safety Partnership be noted.

108. KPMG – EXTERNAL AUDIT – REPORT TO THOSE CHARGED WITH GOVERNANCE (ISA 260) 2009/10

Andy Sayers presented the above report which contained the key issues identified during the audit of the Council’s financial statements for the year ended 31st March 2010, and the assessment of the Authority’s arrangements to secure value for money in its use of resources.

He confirmed that all work had been completed and signed off with an unqualified audit opinion. The quality of the accounts and supporting working papers were good with the majority of audit queries being resolved in a reasonable time.

The audit had identified two audit adjustments. The first adjustment related to the provision within creditors for £404,000 in connection with the Housing Benefit Subsidy claims, which was more properly described as a reserve. The amount had therefore been re-allocated from creditors to earmarked reserves by reducing current liabilities in the balance sheet and increasing earmarked reserves by £404,000.

The second adjustment related to a re-classification of £290,000 of short term investments to long term investments as their maturity date was after 31st March 2011.

Members discussed and asked questions regarding the above.

The Authority had made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

**RECOMMENDED** – that the report as attached at Appendix ‘B’, be noted.
109. INTERNAL AUDIT (RSM TENON) OPERATION/MONITORING REPORT

Adrian Rutter and Anna Simmonds presented the latest progress report summarising the outcome of work completed to date against the internal audit plan for 2010/11. Four reports been finalised since the last Committee meeting in the areas of: Health and Safety; Departmental Income & Expenditure – Commercial Services; Efficiency Review – Support Services Recharges; and Sustainability (Carbon Reduction).

Anna Simmonds updated the Committee regarding the follow up work on the implementation of recommendations made in 2008/09 and prior years as presented to the July meeting, when at that time only nine of 21 recommendations had been satisfactorily implemented or addressed. Three of the five recommendations classified as significant when they were made had not been implemented and were no longer being taken forward by officers.

Since the last meeting more than 50% of the recommendations had been implemented.

Officers had reviewed all the outstanding recommendations and provided detailed comments on their status or revised responses taking into account the Council’s current circumstances and priorities.

Officers addressed Member questions regarding the three significant and one meriting attention recommendations no longer being taken forward, as shown in the report.

Following the revised responses received and by revisiting original reports and discussing them with the Council’s Section 151 officer, it was reported that the decisions not to take forward the recommendations previously agreed would not adversely affect the Council’s internal controls and management processes.

It was suggested that in future a more detailed report of historic and non-implemented recommendations should be reported to Committee.

No significant issues had been identified since the last meeting that would adversely affect the annual opinion given to the Council.

***

RECOMMENDED – that the progress report attached at Appendix ‘C’, be noted.

110. MONITORING OF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR 2010/11

The Committee considered current performance data for 2010/11.

***

RECOMMENDED – that the performance in respect of KPI’s, attached at Appendix ‘D’, be noted.

111. STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN – (SIP)

The Committee considered the progress to date against the Strategic Improvement Plan.

***

RECOMMENDED - that the progress summary, attached at Appendix ‘E’, be noted.

Rising: 9.16 p.m.
Tandridge Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Strategic Assessment

October 2009 – September 2010

For further information contact:

Hilary New
Community Safety Manager
Tandridge District Council

Tel: 01883 732703
E-mail: hnew@tandridge.gov.uk

Completed January 2010
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Executive Summary

Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP’s) are required to produce an annual strategic assessment based on the National Intelligence Model, in order to identify priorities for the Community Safety Plan 2008-2011.

This assessment is a ‘refresh’, two years into the Plan to highlight new emerging issues of concern and assess progress against previously identified priorities.

The assessment has made use of a wide range of data and evidence from CDRP partners as well as feedback from residents. Analysis of this data has led to the identification of the following priorities for the next strategic period.

### STRATEGIC PRIORITIES 2010 -2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISIONAL BASIS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing priorities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Responsible working group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance misuse</td>
<td>East Surrey  Substance Misuse Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Violent Crime</td>
<td>East Surrey Domestic Abuse Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Domestic Abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT BASIS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious Acquisitive Crime</strong></td>
<td>Tandridge Community Incident Action Group/Joint Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distraction burglary/bogus callers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Reassurance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Crime</strong></td>
<td>Tandridge Community Incident Action Group/Joint Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Damage to pens outbuildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theft of equipment and fuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Burglary non dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antisocial behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focusing on young people and prevent and deter work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic related issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Anti social driving</td>
<td>Casualty Reduction Working Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING PRIORITIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of vehicles</td>
<td>Tandridge Community Incident Action Group/Joint Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Car key thefts from properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thefts of number plates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make off without payment (MOWP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONAL PRIORITY

Counter Terrorism

- PREVENT

Divisional Security & Resilience Group

Action plans will be drawn up by the relevant Working Groups to address these priorities. The progress of each plan will be monitored by the CDRP Working Group with regular reports to the CDRP Steering Group. A further assessment process will be undertaken in 12 months time and a new three year Community Safety Plan produced.
Tandridge Strategic Assessment 2009

Introduction

This Strategic Assessment is the second ‘refresh’ of the Tandridge Community Safety Plan 2008-2011. Its purpose is to identify any emerging issues of concern, review progress against the existing priorities and outline the ‘next steps’ and future action. The Assessment has made use of a wide range of data and evidence from CDRP partners as well as resident feedback. A comprehensive list of all sources utilised is detailed in Appendix 1. The methodology used and the process taken is the same as in previous years and as such is not reiterated in this Assessment.

For detailed background information to this process, please refer to the Tandridge Strategic Assessment 2008.

Review of 2009/10 priorities
(Reviewing data sets/activity from 1st October 2008 – 30th September 2009)

1. Serious Violent Crime

1.1 Domestic Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current &amp; change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic abuse offences</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>+ 29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic abuse offences have increased by 29.9% to 217 offences. 98 of these offences were repeat victims, a third of which (33) were linked to alcohol. An increase in reporting does not necessarily mean an increase in offending rates but may indicate a willingness by victims to report incidents. It should also be noted that an increase in domestic abuse incidents was expected as a result of the ‘credit crunch’, with the increased stress of financial difficulties resulting in additional violent attacks.

Referrals to East Surrey Domestic Abuse Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current &amp; change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alcohol remains the highest reported additional need amongst perpetrators accounting for 14% of those presenting. Victims report mental health issues as being the highest reported need, with alcohol coming second. The number of victims with substance misuse issues remains low at 0.7%. The trend since Summer 2009 has been an increase in the level of referrals to ESDAS.
Sanctuary Scheme

The Sanctuary Scheme continues to enable victims of domestic abuse to remain in their own homes by providing security improvements, ensuring their safety. Enabling victims to remain in their own homes minimises the disruption caused, particularly to children and significantly reduces the costs associated with providing alternative accommodation. **Domestic abuse accounts for approximately a quarter of all violent crime and will remain a priority.**

2. Serious Acquisitive Crime

2.1 Burglary Dwelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td>-13.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last strategic period, burglary dwelling **decreased** by 13.65% to 234 offences. There was a noticeable trend emerging with an increase in ‘car-key burglaries’ of 25 offences. The majority of these offences have taken place in the north of the District, (Caterham-on-the-Hill and Warlingham) close to the Metropolitan Police border.

2.2 Distraction Burglary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis carried out in 2009, has highlighted a discrepancy in how distraction burglaries are recorded, making a year on year comparison impossible. Intelligence suggests that distraction burglaries are still prevalent across the District. In addition to distraction burglaries, rogue traders are also a significant issue impacting particularly on vulnerable and elderly residents.

There has also been a large increase in suspicious caller ICADS in the last year. However, while these are a possible indicator for distraction type offences or potential locations for burglaries, they cover a wide range of activity, not just those with possible links to burglary.

Overall the number of complaints regarding rogue traders reported to Trading Standards has increased in this reporting period, but this may be partly due to better reporting and increased awareness of how to contact Trading Standards.

The liaison between Police and Trading Standards remains a vital link that can lead to both prevention of offences and identification of more criminals. **Distraction burglary and bogus callers will remain a priority.**
2.3 Theft of Fuel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between October 08 and September 09, the theft of fuel (domestic and red diesel) decreased by 23.73%, with a significant reduction in red diesel offences. This reduction was assisted by a drop in fuel prices in October 2008. Making Off Without Payment (MOWP) offences using stolen number plates is the emerging trend for fuel theft and will be a future priority.

3. Community Reassurance

3.1 Rural Crime

Burglary non-dwelling (sheds, barns, garages etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>+32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between October 08 and September 09 burglary non-dwelling offences have significantly risen by 32.39 % to 466 offences. Tandridge District suffered from shed, garage, barn, outbuildings and stable breaks with tools, garden equipment, ride on mowers, quad bikes, motorcycles and horse tack being targeted. The majority of offences occurred in the north of the District at rural premises which backed onto woodland or fields and offences increased during the summer months. It is believed that the offences were committed by cross border offenders, as Sussex and Kent were also suffering the same type of offences. There has also been an increase in the reports of suspicious incidents, such as poaching and theft of game birds. The increase in reported incidents could be attributed to the successful introduction of Countrywatch which has encouraged increased reporting by members. Burglary non-dwelling will continue to be a priority.

Countrywatch,
This scheme was launched in November 2008, to combat the increasing problem of rural crime and to improve community reassurance. It is a message alert scheme enabling the Police and the rural communities to work together to combat crime. There are currently 142 members and confidence amongst the rural community has increased significantly.

3.2 Anti-social Behaviour

Successful partnership working has helped bring about a reduction in the level of anti-social behaviour across the District, particularly in relation to incidents by young people.

The very low level of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC’s) and Anti-social Behaviour Orders (ASBO’s) and Injunctions (ASBI’s) issued is seen as an indication of the successful early intervention work that is
Currently taking place via the Community Incident Action Group (CIAG) and Joint Action Group (JAG). Emphasis will continue to be placed on ASB to try to avoid an increase from the existing low level.

**Summary of Interventions 1 Oct 08- 30 Sept 09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young People</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC’s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASBO’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASBI’s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two early intervention programmes are funded by the CDRP and available for young people in Tandridge:

**IMPACT** - is a 12 week programme run by the Youth Development Service, for young people who ‘come to notice’ or are at risk of offending. Three courses were held between October 2008 and September 2009 which were attended by 25 young people. Ongoing monitoring of attendees is in place following their completion of the course.

**YES Scheme (Youth Engagement Scheme)** - is a week long programme organised by Surrey Fire & Rescue Service for those deemed ‘at risk’.

Two programmes were run between October 2008 and September 2009 and 12 young people attended. An evaluation showing whether the attendees have offended or reoffended takes place six months following completion of the course.

**Criminal Damage (under 18’s)**

There has been a significant reduction in the recorded level of criminal damage offences by under 18’s as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-52.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3 Environmental Crime**

**3.3.1 Fly Tipping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded Incidents</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sept 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sept 09</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fly-tipping</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>+ 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Transit’ sized tips</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incidence of fly-tipping has increased over the last 12 months. With the housing market stagnant, home improvements are being carried out on the cheap using cut price methods and cut price waste disposal. However, the amount of larger incidents continues to drop. Enforcement actions are continuing at a greater rate than the previous year, but as we are more successful the offenders become more vigilant. Nevertheless an assessment of our enforcement activity by the Environment Agency showed that we remain “Effective”.
3.3.2 Abandoned Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sept 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sept 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sept 09</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Vehicles</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt out vehicles</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle amnesty</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reduction in the number of abandoned and burnt out vehicles has continued during this period. Although metal prices dipped during the recession, prices recovered quickly and demand for second hand cars has strengthened, suggesting that more vehicles were legitimately resold or scrapped rather than abandoned. The ‘Vehicle Amnesty’ continued and also showed a slight reduction.

3.3.3 Graffiti

Significant progress has continued to be made in tackling and reducing incidents of graffiti due to effective partnership working and initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graffiti incidents</th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-65.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been a significant improvement in the rate of graffiti cleaning across the District measured by NI 195. (NI195 measures the %age of graffiti visible from the highway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graffiti removal</th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Service Level Agreement is in place with Surrey Probation Service to use personnel from the Community Payback Scheme on a weekly basis to remove graffiti from identified sites around the District.

3.4 Community Confidence

3.4.1 Joint Neighbourhood Policing Survey

This survey was introduced in April 2008 and measures confidence in Neighbourhood Policing as well as asking residents to state their local concerns and issues. Residents were asked ‘How much of a problem, if any’ various community safety issues were for them. The results reveal that vehicle crime and burglary were of most concern.
Although confidence levels in police were slightly lower than the previous assessment, down from 79.6% to 77.8%, the confidence level is again rising.

3.4.2 Place Survey

The Place Survey provides information on peoples’ perceptions of their local area and the local services they receive.

Detailed information was collected on peoples’ perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour. The results for Tandridge compare favourably with the results for the rest of Surrey and the wider area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% agreed that abs was a very big or fairly big problem</th>
<th>% think drunk or rowdy behaviour is a very big or fairly big problem</th>
<th>% think drug use or drug dealing is a very big or fairly big problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANDRIDGE</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURREY CC</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH EAST</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also sought residents’ views on the extent to which they felt that the police and other services were dealing with these problems. The results for these questions were less favourable, suggesting more work needs to be done around publicising and informing residents of our individual and collective activities in dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% strongly or tend to agree police &amp; others sought views about crime &amp; asb</th>
<th>% feeling that police and others were dealing with crime and asb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANDRIDGE</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURREY CC</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH EAST</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Community Engagement Activities

There are a range of community engagement and awareness raising activities taking place to ensure residents are kept up to date and have access to relevant information and advice.

- Neighbourhood Panels are routinely held across the District, with issues raised being taken to CIAG/JAG for partner discussion and resolution.
- The Safer Neighbourhood Newsletter is distributed across the District twice annually providing updates, advice and information from the local neighbourhood Specialist Officers.
• Information and advice is made widely available through the Community Safety Leaflet included in the three Tandridge Magazines. Additionally, regular community safety articles are included in the Tenants Magazine.

• Partners’ websites also carry topical community safety advice and information.

• A number of Community Safety Days were also organised to promote partnership working and provide members of the public with the opportunity to talk to officers from partner agencies.

3.4.4
Watch schemes are also having a positive effect on the community’s feelings of security.

Country Watch has been extremely successful both in terms of encouraging reporting of rural crime as well as reassuring members and the wider rural community.

Shop Watch This scheme was introduced by Caterham Valley Business Partnership and is fully supported by Police. Nineteen retailers are members with 2 pending. The scheme has led to several arrests of shoplifters, some of which were from outside the District.

Pubwatch now covers the whole of the District and is proving effective in quickly dealing with reports of ASB and other public disorder offences associated with particular public houses.

Neighbourhood Watch is currently being reviewed to ensure that it continues to operate effectively and encourage new schemes,

Dog Walker Watch is a new watch scheme which aims to encourage local dog owners to report any suspicious or anti-social behaviour.

4. Traffic Related Issues

Anti-social driving, speeding and parking issues continue to be a concern regularly raised by residents at Neighbourhood Panels.

4.1 Anti-social Driving
An Anti-social Driving Profile was compiled in December 2009 to identify hotspot areas and an Action Plan listing actions covering, enforcement, education, prevention and communication has been developed by the Tandridge Casualty Reduction Officer from Surrey Police.

DRIVESMART
The past year has seen an increase in the profile of road safety as a public concern. The DRIVESMART campaign was launched in September 2009 to focus resources on the problems identified by the community. This includes; speeding, poor parking, use of mobile phones and seat belts as well as other issues such as the state of the roads and road signs.
As part of DRIVESMART, larger scale Roadside Education and Enforcement Days (REEDS) will be taking place in each District & Borough, which aim to bring about long term changes in motorists behaviour. An evaluation of all activities will be conducted at the end of the campaign.

4.2 Speeding

**Community Speedwatch Schemes**
Local Parish Councils and volunteer residents from 13 villages in Tandridge currently work together with Surrey Police running Community Speed Watch Schemes, as below:

1. DORMANSLAND – 10 sites
2. LINGFIELD – 6 sites
3. CROWHURST – 4 sites
4. WOLDINGHAM – 4 sites
5. SOUTH GODSTONE – 4 sites
6. OUTWOOD – 6 sites
7. FELBRIDGE – 5 sites
8. BLETCHINGLEY – 4 sites
9. CHALDON – 4 sites
10. NUTFIELD – 2 sites
11. SOUTH NUTFIELD – 3 sites
12. HORNE – 5 sites
13. GODSTONE – 3 sites

It has been shown that these community based projects do reduce vehicle speeds at specific locations and increase reassurance due to the presence of highly visible Community Speed Watch monitors at the roadside together with legislative influences and site support being applied by the Police.

**New Schemes 2010** - Four villages have expressed an interest in setting up new CSW schemes in the New Year and are in the process of organising volunteers for training. They are Smallfield, Tandridge Village, St Piers (NCYPE) and Caterham-on-Hill.

**School Speed Watch** – As part of Drive Smart, an assessment is taking place of all the school sites in the Tandridge area with a view to setting up a number of School speed watch schemes for Spring 2010.

4.3 Parking

Inconsiderate parking causes inconvenience, increases congestion and can be dangerous and is one of the on-going concerns raised by residents. Recent new powers under the Traffic Management Act will be available for use by TDC Parking Enforcement Officers to issue penalty charge notices to motorists who double park, obstruct dropped kerbs and cause congestion through poor parking to help improve parking across the District.
5. Substance Misuse

At the time of writing, very limited data was available from DAAT (Drug and Alcohol Action Team). In addition, more detailed information has been requested to inform the Divisional Drug Profile in relation to Tandridge. Whilst it is acknowledged that substance misuse has an impact on the level of crime and disorder, there is little evidence to support that it should remain a specific local priority for Tandridge. Therefore, substance misuse issues will continue to be addressed at a Divisional level through participation in the East Surrey Substance Misuse Working Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 06 – Sep 07</th>
<th>Oct 07 – Sep 08</th>
<th>Oct 08 – Sep 09</th>
<th>Current % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related Crime</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>-9.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related Violent Crime</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>+6.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Related Crime</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Related Violent Crime</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-27.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Underage Sales
Trading Standards conducted 34 test purchases in Tandridge for under age sales of alcohol, of which 4 were positive.

5.2 Pubwatch
Two Pub watch schemes are running in Tandridge, one in the South of the District and one in the North. The South Tandridge Pub Watch has been running successfully for some time and now has 24 members.

The North Tandridge Pub Watch started in September 2009 and currently has 20 members signed up with more public houses interested in joining.

The Pub Watch website [www.pubwatchsurrey.com](http://www.pubwatchsurrey.com) was launched to support the scheme, allowing members to log in and be kept up to date with relevant and helpful information.
Identification of Priorities 2010 – 2011

The 2009 Strategic Assessment process used statistics and supporting documents from partner agencies, which included their own particular priorities, to confirm ongoing and identify emerging priorities for 2010-2011. The process followed was the same as in previous years and as such is not detailed in this document. More information on the process can be found in the Tandridge Strategic Assessment 2008.

Continuing Priorities:

1. Divisional/cluster basis
   - Substance Misuse - focusing on alcohol related crime.
   - Domestic Abuse

2. District Basis
   - Serious Acquisitive Crime – focusing on Distraction Burglary/Bogus Callers
   - Rural crime - including damage to pens outbuildings, theft of equipment and fuel
   - Burglary non dwelling - focusing on theft from outbuildings, sheds and garages.
   - Anti-social behaviour - focusing on young people and prevent and deter work
   - Traffic related issues focusing on anti-social driving.

3. Emerging Priorities:

Theft of vehicles - Burglary-car key thefts leading to theft of vehicles (including motorbikes/scooters) from properties

Vehicle burglaries have shown a significant increase of 55.6%, (56) offences in the last strategic period. In most cases, entry has been gained to the premises and the vehicle keys stolen. The majority of offences have taken place in the north of the District, close to the Metpol border. Intelligence suggests that the offenders are out from Metpol areas. Operation Shield together with close cross border cooperation between police forces will continue to tackle this type of offending.

Theft from Vehicles - focusing on theft of number plates and Make Off Without Payment (MOWP)

During the last strategic period, theft of number plate offences rose by 35.09% (20 offences). Of the total 77 offences, 29 were linked directly to MOWP offences within Surrey. However, it is not known how many MOWPs being committed in other force areas are using plates stolen in Surrey or how many MOWPs are being committed in Surrey with plates stolen from other force areas. These offences are increasing across the County.

A Police Surgery held at the BP Petrol Station, Whyteleafe has assisted in preventing the level of offences increasing significantly.
In January 2010, a three month pilot for ‘Forecourt Watch’ will be launched at 13 petrol retailers across the District. This scheme places a stronger emphasis on reporting, recording and detecting this type of crime.

4. Additional priority
Counter Terrorism – PREVENT

In addition to focusing on the priorities detailed above, Tandridge CDRP will take an active role in the development of the ‘Prevent Strategy’. This is part of CONTEST, the Government’s counter terrorism strategy responding to terrorist threats. CONTEST has four main components, each with a clear objective:

- Pursue – to stop terrorist attacks
- Prepare – to mitigate the impact of any attack
- Protect – to strengthen our overall protection against terrorist attacks.
- Prevent – to stop people from becoming terrorists or support violent extremism.

Work towards the County LAA target of Protection against terrorism will take place both at a Divisional level through the East Surrey Resilience Group and at a local level through the CDRP via the appropriate Working Groups and the individual activities of partners.

Next Steps

Tandridge CDRP funding decisions for 2010/11 will be aligned against the identified priority areas.

Action Plans for tackling each of the priority issues will continue to be developed by the associated Working Groups and progress monitored by the CDRP Working Group.

This document will feed into the Divisional Partnership Strategic Assessment which will be produced for implementation by April 2010. This in turn will inform the Surrey Police Force Strategic Assessment.
Appendix 1: Strategic Assessment Data List

Data relates to the period 1st October 2008 to 30th September 2009 unless otherwise stated.

Crime Statistics
Surrey Police East Division Strategic Intelligence report

Young Offenders
Report compiled for Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) 2009, including.
• Borough and district breakdown of first time entrants to Youth Justice System aged 10 –17 (2008 – 2009, quarter 1 2009/10)
• Number of young offenders receiving court disposals by borough and district, by age, by gender and by ethnic composition (2006/7 to 2008/9)
• Reoffending rate for young people for first quarter of this year (though not broken down by borough/district) Quarter 1 2009/10
• Percentage of closed cases in satisfactory accommodation (though not broken down by borough/district). 2008 – 2009, quarter 1 2009/10

Road Casualty Data
• Child Killed and Seriously Injured casualty figures (KSIs) from 1994 - 2008 with borough and all Surrey comparison
• Adult KSIs from 1994 - 2008 with borough and all Surrey comparison
• User group breakdown for same dates with borough and Surrey comparison
• Pie-chart showing casualties by road class - Surrey County Council and Highways agency
• Comparator pie-chart showing casualties by road class in particular borough/district
• The 2008 road casualty report (which is the most up-to-date one available). The 2009 version will be available in February/March of 2010.
• 'Hotspots' information for motorcycle accidents in Surrey.
• BVPI monitoring data = total numbers for child KSIs, KSIs and slights for each borough monthly up to and including September 2009
• Monthly monitoring for Highways Agency Roads (Motorways - mostly M25/A3) = total numbers child KSIs, KSIs and slights plus all casualties up to and including July 2009
• Detailed monthly monitoring =breakdown of casualties into fatal, serious, child fatal, child serious and total slights up to and including July 2009
• Dashboard charts = charts showing annual progress in reducing KSI, Child KSI and slights plus charts showing monthly progress in reducing KSI, child KSI and slights. (progress is measured against national 2010 targets, and against the more challenging 'stretched' targets set in Surrey's last Local Transport Plan (LTP).
Domestic Abuse Data
Domestic Abuse report compiled for 2009 Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) The data in the subsection only covers the first quarter of 2009 as it is a yearly report starting in April 2008 and finishing at the end of March 2009. The breakdowns include:

- Surrey Police recorded incidents of domestic abuse from April 2008 to March 2009 as per borough/district
- Domestic abuse incidents and arrests from April 2008-March 2009 as per borough/district
- Domestic abuse incidents and repeats from April 2008 to March 2009 as per borough/district
- Number of new contacts by outreach provider showing changes back from 2006/7
- Number of new contacts by district and borough between April 2008 and March 2009
- Domestic abuse incidents – alcohol related for May 2009
- Issues impacting on children’s lives: Primary individual issues for children subject of a child protection plan as of November 2008 (including parent/carer mental health issues, domestic abuse, parent/carer drug misuse, parent/carer alcohol misuse)
- Domestic abuse issues affecting children subject of a child protection plan at November 2008
- Two further updates of this data distributed – Quarter1 (April 09 until June 09) and Q2 (July 09 until Sept. 09).

Bogus Callers Data
Trading Standards Report for CDRPs including:

- Doorstep complaints hotspots by district for same period
- Doorstep complaints hotspots by ward for same period
- Same data broken down into borough/district but with different trade type
- Amount of money that is paid out by Surrey residents to so called “Rogue Traders” measured against the amount of money that has been saved by intervention from Trading Standards officers

Anti social behaviour data
- Joint Action Group agendas/minutes
- Community Incident Action Group agendas/minutes
- Number of School exclusions
- Numbers truanting
- Abandoned cars
- Fly tipping
- Graffiti reported/removed
NEETS Data (Not in Education, Employment or Training)
Monthly statistics for July and August 2009 including:
- % 16 – 18 Year Olds Adjusted NEET from March 08 – Aug 09
- % 16 – 18 Year Olds Adjusted NEET Yearly Comparison
- Borough Breakdown – Number of Actual NEET comparator chart
- Monthly 16 – 18 Year Old Unknown Cohort
- Monthly 16 – 18 Year Old Unknown Cohort Yearly Comparison
- Surrey’s Vulnerable Groups - Post Compulsory Education 2009/10 includes:
  - Actual % 16 – 19 year old Teenage Mothers
  - Actual % 16 – 19 year old with LDD EET - July and August 2009
  - Adjusted % NEET 16-19 (up to age 25 with LDD) Ethnic Groups – July and August 2009

Surrey Fire and Rescue Data
Performance Report from 1 Dec 2008 - 30 Sept 2009 spreadsheet with 3 workbooks on following indicators broken down by borough/district:
- BVPI 146 – number of calls to hoax false alarms attended / not attended
- BVPI 206 - number of deliberate fires, primary and secondary in vehicles, number of fires primary and secondary excluding vehicles, plus number of accidental fires for the same categories.
- BVPI 209 including % of fires attended where smoke alarm had been activated, % of fires attended where smoke alarm fitted but not activated, % of fires attended in dwelling where no smoke alarm fitted.
- Borough action plans for Surrey’s 11 boroughs and districts (Dec 2008- 31 March 2009 end of year review)
- Performance précis for indicators BVPI 206 and 209

Substance misuse data
Alcohol related harm data
Alcohol Report compiled for JSNA 2009. Subsection includes data on:
- Synthetic estimate of the percentage of the population aged 16 years and over who report engaging in hazardous drinking, by borough in Surrey compared to England, 2007
- Synthetic estimate of the percentage of the population aged 16 years and over who report engaging in harmful drinking by borough in Surrey compared to England, 2007.
- Synthetic estimate of the percentage of the population aged 16 years and over who report engaging in binge drinking by borough in Surrey compared to England, 2007
- Synthetic estimate of the percentage of the population aged 16 years and over who report engaging in binge drinking by borough in Surrey 2003-2005
- Directly age-standardised mortality from alcohol attributable conditions for men and women by borough in Surrey, rate per 100,000 people (2005/6)
- Directly age-standardised hospital admission rates for alcohol-related harm for all persons by borough in Surrey (2006-2007)
- Percentage change in Alcohol related admissions for Surrey and Local Authority 2002 – 2008
Underage Sales (Trading Standards)
Trading Standards Report for CDRPs includes:
- Breakdown by borough or district, of the total test purchases carried out, and how many of those were positive sales
- The types of premises – eg 8 til late stores, newsagents, petrol stations, (to see if any particular areas stand out).
- Age of assistant making the positive sales

Surrey Alcohol and Drug Service (SADAS)
Information on clients with substance misuse issues

Licensed premises information
Incidents in licensed premises (Traffic Light scheme)
Licensed premises noise complaints

DAAT (Drug and Alcohol Action Team)
Data sets containing sets on Drug User Profile from National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse have been supplied.

Perception data
- Neighbourhood Panel priorities
- Place survey 2009
- Joint Satisfaction Survey 2008
Appendix 2: Missing data sets

Ambulance Data
Information requested regarding calls attended where violence, drugs misuse or alcohol mis-use is involved, broken down by:
- Location
- Day
- Time (e.g. 4 hour time bands)
- Nature of incident
- Gender of victim
- Age of victim

Substance Misuse Data
Data requested on a borough/district basis to include:
- Number of people in treatment
- Number of new presentations
- Number/proportion defined as problematic drug users
- Number of individuals accessing Community Pharmacy Needle Exchange Scheme (CPNES)
- Number of visits to CPNES sites around the Borough
- Number of packs issued per visit

Accident and Emergency Data
A&E data being collected by the Frimley pilot was considered one of the most important data sets to have, including:
- Individuals presenting at A&E where cause of attendance is through being involved in crime, especially violence, domestic violence or hate crime, by:
  - Location
  - Day
  - Time (e.g. 4 hour time bands)
  - Nature of incident
  - Gender of victim
  - Age of victim
  - Ethnicity (in order to help identify possible hate crime)
- Individuals presenting at A&E where cause of attendance is through drugs or alcohol misuse, by:
  - Location
  - Day
  - Time (e.g. 4 hour time bands)
  - Nature of incident
  - Gender of victim
  - Age of victim
  - Ethnicity
## How does your organisation contribute to the Tandridge Community Safety Plan 2008-2011?

**The role of the Community Safety Manager includes the following ongoing responsibilities and activities:**

- Supporting the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) helping ensure it complies with all current and emerging legislation.
- Co-ordinating the annual Strategic Assessment process and production of Community Safety Plan.
- Development of local and divisional Action Plans in support of the Strategic Aims.
- Co-ordination and implementation of targeted campaigns and initiatives.
- Managing the Area Based Grant and partner funding contributions allocated to the CSP.
- Developing cross borough/divisional working through chairing East Surrey working groups dealing with Domestic Abuse and Substance Misuse.

**Improving community safety is embedded in the delivery of the Council’s services and includes:**

- **Amenity Services**: Graffiti removal, dealing with abandoned vehicles, fly-tipping and litter.
- **Housing**: Ensuring compliance with tenancy conditions and use of legal remedies in dealing with anti-social and nuisance behaviour of our tenants. The provision of Care and Repair Agency.
- **Planning**: Routine consultation with Surrey Police to ensure crime prevention advice is incorporated into new developments.
- **Environmental Health**: Licensing and monitoring of premises selling alcohol and dealing with noise complaints.
- **Revenue and Benefits**: Investigation of fraudulent benefit claims.

## What progress has your organisation made towards the achievement of the aims and objectives of the Community Safety Plan?

**Substance misuse – alcohol**

We support national campaigns to raise awareness around drug and alcohol misuse by co-ordinating local activities. Key messages are promoted on an on-going basis via our website and magazine. The CSM co-ordinates and Chairs the ES Substance Misuse Working Group.

**Violent crime - Domestic Abuse**

We work closely with East Surrey Domestic Abuse Services (ESDAS) developing campaigns and activities to raise awareness of domestic abuse. A campaign to highlight the link between alcohol and domestic abuse was developed and promoted via Pubwatch.

A further campaign to counter the increase in domestic abuse associated with England’s International football games was developed to coincide with the World Cup. This local campaign was subsequently rolled out across the county The CSM co-ordinates and chairs the ES Domestic Abuse Working Group to encourage inter-agency collaboration and partnership working.
Acquisitive crime

**Distraction burglary/bogus callers**
A range of activities take place on a regular basis, including talks at our sheltered schemes and day centres to raise awareness among the vulnerable and elderly. Advice and information is regularly circulated and support is given to any county or national campaigns addressing this issue.

**Burglary**
We have recently established a joint initiative with estate and travel agents in the district to distribute ‘Home Security/Crime Prevention’ packs to their clients.

Community reassurance

**Graffiti**: Co-ordinated and sustained activity has resulted in a significant reduction in the level of graffiti across the district. Activities include: ongoing use of ‘Community Service’ personnel to remove graffiti and litter pick on a weekly basis and training of the Council’s Street Cleaning Teams to routinely remove graffiti.

**Abandoned vehicles**: The ‘Vehicle Amnesty’ project continues to have a positive impact in maintaining a low level of vehicles being abandoned. The high price of metal has also helped.

**Anti-social behaviour**: We participate in the monthly multi agency Community Incident Action Group meetings (CIAGs) to address and resolve incidents of anti-social behaviour (asb). Successful partnership working with an emphasis on early intervention and prevention work has helped achieve a reduction in the level of asb, particularly in relation to young people. The attendance on projects such as the IMPACT and YES Schemes by young people identified ‘at risk’ is proving to be an effective and successful way to prevent the escalation of their anti-social behaviour.

**Personal safety for children and young people**
Following reports of attempted child abductions, a campaign giving personal safety advice to children, young people and their parents/carers was quickly pulled together and delivered through the local schools.

**Vehicle crime**
We assisted in the launch of Forecourt Watch’ designed to reduce the level of ‘make off without payment’ offences from local petrol stations.

**Counter terrorism**
We organised training for council staff to raise awareness of potential terrorist activity. Further specific training will be delivered as appropriate.

We also co-ordinated the production of the divisional ‘Counter Terrorism’ Action Plan.

**General**
We organise two Junior Citizen events annually covering both Tandridge and Reigate & Banstead primary schools. The scheme covers personal safety topics including internet safety, as well as the consequences of anti-social behaviour. 1300 students aged 10/11 years old attend each of the events.

We routinely produce three Community Safety Supplements within the Tandridge Magazine, which offer topical and seasonal crime prevention advice and information.

Community safety advice and information is also included in each of our Tenants Newsletters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What obstacles or barriers, if any, have you encountered in improving community safety in Tandridge?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid year funding cuts and uncertainty regarding on-going funding, impacts on the ability to plan future activity and undermines the sustainability of successful partnership projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganisation within partner agencies impacts upon available local resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What are your Organisation’s future plans for community safety particularly with regard to the Government’s NIs?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recognising the funding constraints we will continue to take a flexible approach through partnership working to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.  
Respond to local concerns to increase public confidence. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Youth Development Service SCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Representative |

**How does your Organisation contribute to the Tandridge Community Safety Plan 2008-2011?**

- Work in Partnership with the Police and Community Safety to identify areas to deploy Youth Service provision if there are increased incidents involving YP
- Targeted Intervention with Young people at Risk of School exclusion.
- Targeted Intervention with Young people at risk of engaging in Anti Social Behaviour
- Provision of Youth centres with skilled workers to inform YP and reduce risk of Becoming involved in negative behaviour.
- Supporting Voluntary and local Youth initiatives in the more isolated areas of the District to help reduce the risk of YP getting involved in negative behaviour.
- Working with the Police to provide information to young people in connection with the consequences of getting involved in crime.
- Deploying the mobile provision to communities with little or no youth provision
- Providing opportunities for Young people to get involved in their community as a way of reducing incidents of Anti Social behaviour

**What progress has your Organisation made towards the achievement of the Aims and Objectives of the Community Safety Plan?**

- Increased preventative work with young people.
- Increased the delivery of youth work across the District
- Contributed to marinating the low incidents of YP reported for Anti Social Behaviour
- Contributed to preventing Young people entering the Youth Justice System

**What obstacles or barriers, if any, have you encountered in improving community safety in Tandridge?**

- There are very limited services for Young people where there are known Alcohol or drug related problems that are affecting behaviour.
- Young people who are Not in Employment are known to cause a concern in their communities and there are no local services to access.
- Poor Transport links and costs are a barrier to Young people wanting to make any lifestyle choices.
- Because Tandridge does not have huge numbers of Young people with perceived needs, services are not readily available to provide extra support

**What are your Organisation's future plans for community safety?**

- To continue to work alongside partners to keep improving community Safety.
- Work with Partners to improve areas where community safety is a concern
### Organisation
Surrey Police

### Representative
Inspector Elaine Burtenshaw

### How does your Organisation contribute to the Tandridge Community Safety Plan 2008-2011?

The Tandridge Safer Neighbourhood Team provides a visible presence in the District and works closely with our partners and the public to tackle the aims and objectives within the plan. They also deal with the priority issues and concerns of the people in their area – and keep the community updated on progress made on previous priorities.

The Tandridge Safer Neighbourhood team has increased its staff within this last year with the return of the Crime Reduction and Youth Intervention Officer solely for Tandridge and our own Neighbourhood Support Team consisting of 4 Police officers at present with 2 more Officers are due to join the team over the coming months. Together with the Neighbourhood Specialist Officers, Police Community Support Officers, Roads Policing, Operational Support, Response officers, detectives and other Surrey Police Specialists, they ensure that Tandridge Neighbourhood is policed in order to meet the priorities, reduce crime and importantly build reassurance, confidence and partnership work with the community. Statutory and Voluntary Partners have an important role to play working alongside us.

### What progress has your Organisation made towards the achievement of the Aims and Objectives of the Community Safety Plan?

Before going into specifics it is important to note that Tandridge District had an overall 4.9% reduction in total notifiable offences for the financial year 2009/2010. The figures for this current financial year up to 31st August show a 5.7% reduction in total notifiable offences.

With regards to specifics Surry Police have done the following:-

**Serious Violent Crime**
Domestic Abuse - Positive action is taken at all DA incidence attended. Each is risk assessed those that are high risk are discussed at a monthly MARAC meeting (multi-agency). DASH (Domestic Abuse Stalking Harassment and Honour based violence) risk assessment tool will be launched in October this is completed at every domestic incident – staff has been trained to use this.

**Serious Acquisitive Crime/Community Reassurance/Rural Crime**

OP SWELLANDS
This is a joint operation with the Roads Policing Unit that had just commenced when I made last years report, involving a vehicle staffed by a Roads Policing Officer and Neighbourhood Support Officer patrolling rural areas. The patrols aim to target those crimes affecting the rural areas, such as poaching. As a result there has been a decrease in rural crime. The operation ran for six months averaging 3-4 patrols a month the result was not only a reduction in crime but the following number of positive interventions:-

- Number of Vehicles Stopped 269
- Process for various offences 51
- Intelligence Submitted 57 5x5x5’s
- Total Number of Stop Searches 143
- Number of Arrests 38
- Driver Alert Scheme 8
• Section 165 Seized vehicles

OP KAVOS
This was a cross border Operation run with both Kent and Metropolitan Police forces during March on three dates whereby staff from the forces patrolled together targeting cross border criminality. Vehicles with Surrey officers alone on each of the days stopped an average of 20 vehicles and persons were arrested for offences including procession of drugs and thefts. Good intelligence also gained.

OP YULETIDE (December 2009)
Tandridge Neighbourhood Team had their own Advent calendar where each day had a different focus ranging from Vehicle crime, dwelling burglaries, criminal damage, vandalism and OP SMART

OP MAGANESE (17th – 23rd April 2010)
Intensive week long campaign to target vehicle crime. This included – OP Swellands on three days (details below) crime prevention advice and launch of Forecourt Watch

COUNTRYWATCH
This continues to go from strength to strength with over 200 members in Tandridge. The members are extremely pro-active and have rung in many reported sightings, enabling us to monitor movements of vehicles and occupants. My officers have patrolled land with Farmers and gamekeepers forging good community links. Country watch is being launched Force wide on 18th October 2010 and a talk will be given by Insp Burtenshaw and a Tandridge watch member at this launch. Meetings have been held in December 2009 and September 2010 to forge closer links with members and continue to encourage active participation. These meetings are facilitated jointly with TDC.

PUBWATCH /LICENSING
Tandridge continues to have a low level of licensed premises disorder. Pub watch continues to grow with the North Tandridge Pub watch formally launched in 2010. Members include not only Public Houses but retail outlets as well. We have been pro-active in enforcing licensing legislation which has included a Publican losing their Designated Premises Supervisor Licence.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH
This number of schemes has continued to grow in the last year at least 2769 homes are members of schemes throughout Tandridge. We send out a weekly newsletter to all co-ordinators with details of emerging issues. Undoubtedly this has led to an increase in the number of calls relating to people vehicles acting suspiciously

ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR
We deal robustly with asb and we have seen a reduction in incidents across the District. A notable success has been the CR3 Soldiers, a youth club that came about as a result of the excellent work facilitated by Jane Wilson (YDS) at Caterham on the Hill. The young people involved having carried out research, have now secured premises and are running their own youth club on the Hill supported by a management committee. They attended a Force wide Neighbourhood Day and were judged as a partnership success in targeting a neighbourhood problem - they came first across the county. ACC Kirkby attended the centre presenting them with a cheque for £500.

TRAFFIC RELATED ISSUES
Please see separate report by Neighbourhood ROADS Officer PC Cocks which details work across the District including Community Speed watch and activities under Drive Smart (OP SMART)
OP DEFLECTION
These are days of action held across the District organised by NSO PC Bassom working with colleagues from Roads Policing, VOSA and Customs. Often they target Panel Priorities in August alone with three days of activities the following results:-
185 vehicles stopped
68 tickets process for no seatbelt, mobile phones etc
26 vehicles PG9 by VOSA and taken of the road
3 S165 no insurance with vehicles seized
5 arrests for various offences
21 stop and search of vehicles.

OPERATIONS/CAMPAIGNS
All the above are supported by awareness raising campaigns and activities that are co-ordinated and developed by TDC and partners. Further information on the campaigns will be detailed by Hilary New (TDC Community Safety Manager).

What obstacles or barriers, if any, have you encountered in improving community safety in Tandridge?
Red tape around things such as signage i.e. the erecting of Neighbourhood Watch Signs
Difficulties in liaising with contractors to arrange, erecting and sighting of cameras on lamp-posts – costs are now also prohibitive.

What are your Organisation’s future plans for community safety?
To continue to build on the solid foundation established with both the community and partners to combat crime in the community and increase public confidence and satisfaction.
To continue to reduce crime to improve reassurance and confidence
To encourage customers to become partners in combating crime and disorder
To continue to increase the membership of all Watch Schemes
TANDRIDGE ROAD SAFETY ACTIVITIES to August 2010

This year has seen the continuation of the DRIVE SMART Campaign which targets the public’s main concern, anti-social driving.

The launch of the DRIVE SMART Campaign in September 2009 has focused new resources into the problems that the communities have with the hazards created by road users.

These hazards include speeding, poor parking, use of mobile phones, not wearing a seat belt and other road traffic offences. Other issues raised are the condition of the roads and road signs, the need for police activity or engineering remedies to reduce the fears and concerns of the general public and increase the safety for all road users.

Together the Casualty Reduction Officer the Roads Policing Units the locally assigned RPCSO’s and local Neighbourhood Officers have been involved in over 100 roadside checks in a number of locations and at various times resulting in hundreds of fixed penalty notices being issued for a variety of offences. In addition, 40 vehicles were seized for driving licence and insurance offences as well as arrests for a range of offences such as possession of drugs and stolen goods. Many drivers were given advice and leaflets in an effort to educate them and prevent future offending.

In February the Special Constabulary had a weekend of activities under the Drive Smart banner throughout the county and they were joined by the local teams on their vehicle checks.

More of the local TPT and Neighbourhood officers have been trained in the use of the speed monitoring devices with a view to checks being carried out in the problem profile areas and making the roads safer through enforcement and education at specified sites.

As part of the DRIVE SMART campaign a larger scale Roadside Education and Enforcement Days (REED) is taking place in each Borough, with Police and Council Road Safety Officers as well as Fire Brigade, VOSA and other agencies all aiming to change motorist’s behaviour for the long term. Tandridge has its first REED day booked in for 30 November 2010; this is likely to be located in the Warlingham area. A second day is planned for Tandridge in October 2011 which will be held in another part of the Borough.

There have also been targeted campaigns over the year such as Park SMART which encouraged drivers by informing them of current regulations and to encourage sensible parking. Leaflets were distributed across the area by the local officers at panel meetings and in places they felt had such problems.

Talk SMART targeted the use of mobile phones whilst driving and again leaflets were distributed as well as the undertaking of targeted roadside checks to stop and prosecute drivers who committed this offence.

Junior Citizen – This took place over 2 weeks in March and a further 2 weeks will take place in October 2010. This year we included an interactive Drive Smart station educating the year 6 children in issues such as wearing seat belts and how long it takes a car to stop.

Over 1250 children were spoken to during the 2 weeks in March and the numbers for October will be similar.
As many Drive Smart activities as possible, that have taken place, are being monitored on the ASDAM monitoring system. Some of the main results for Tandridge can be seen in the table below. (An intervention is when someone has been stopped and spoken to or prosecuted in relation to any kind of anti-social driving)

**TANDRIDGE – ASDAM totals SEPT 09 to JULY 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>INTERVentions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bletchingley/Nutfield</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>A25 Bletchingley main site for larger checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Valley/Whyteleafe</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>A22 northern section is 1st Casualty Reduction routes for Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Hill</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>New CSW started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone/South</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>A22 south section is 2nd main Cas. Red Route for Tandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallfield/Burstow</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield, Dormansland, Crowhurst</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>NI re dangers in Woodcock Hill &amp; A264 Copthorne Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted/Limpsfield/Hurst Green</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham East/Chelsham</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>B269 Warlingham main check site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham West/Woldingham</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>B269 main check area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8664</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VEHICLE ACTIVATED SIGNS**

The Tandridge Community Safety Team currently has four semi-mobile, interactive speed signs. One of these was funded by Drive Smart. They are currently sited in Crowhurst Road, Crowhurst, Red Lane at Hurst Green and Woodcock Hill, Felbridge. One other will go out in the Caterham area once it has been repaired.

All have been placed in sites of concern to the local residents or through the study of collision records. Over the long term the speed-reducing effect seems to be very positive and reassuring to the local residents and a number of the Parishes have or are considering purchasing their own permanent signs.

**COMMUNITY SPEED WATCH**

Community Speed Watch has continued to go from strength to strength in the Tandridge area this year. At the start of the year 13 villages had schemes carrying out speed checks.

A number of the areas involved had not carried out checks for a while and those have, in the main, been rejuvenated with new members and renewed enthusiasm.

All of the CSW teams receive support in the form of police checks carried out at the sites at times identified by them whereby persistent offenders are prosecuted.
The Drive Smart funding has meant that the £1000 required for the cost of the kit to start a new scheme was readily available and this has encouraged 5 new schemes to start in Smallfield, Tatsfield, Tandridge Village, Caterham on the Hill and Tandridge Lane.

Since then two more areas have expressed an interest and a team from the Warlingham area will be trained in September 2010 and another team from NCYPE at Lingfield are in the process of organising staff to be trained. This will give a total of 20 areas in the Tandridge area covered by Community Speed Watch.

Bearing in mind the poor weather we had over the winter months, between September 2009 and August 2010, **340 hours** of Community Speed Watch checks have been carried out by the volunteers around Tandridge.

**SCHOOL SPEED WATCH**

In July this year the Tandridge area held their first School Speed watch days with the help of three local schools in July this year. Schools were encouraged to get involved with the community Speedwatch initiative aimed at educating both the drivers and the pupils of the dangers on the roads around the school.

Pupils from St Stephen’s Primary School went out along the A22 at South Godstone to monitor the speed of passing motorists and encourage them to slow down. They carried out two checks over two mornings and recorded a total of 22 vehicles stopped and the drivers spoken to by the children.

Hamsey Green Junior School spent four hours checking the speed of motorists in Tithepitshaw Lane, Warlingham. They stopped 47 vehicles with four drivers being issued with fixed penalty notices for speeding.

Children from Dormansland Primary School stopped a total of 35 drivers, over a two day period; two drivers were issued with fixed penalty notices for speeding.

School Speedwatch proved popular with the children. Motorists were pulled over by police and then spoken to by the pupils and asked why they are speeding near their schools. It really helped to get the message through to drivers to slow down and allowed the children to experience how fast vehicles can travel.

**Future activities**

It is hoped that the Drive Smart initiative will continue once the year of funding has ended and certainly the activities by Police and the Community will continue throughout the Tandridge area.
How does your Organisation contribute to the Tandridge Community Safety Plan 2008–2011?

NHS Surrey is a commissioning body for many important services that contribute to Community Safety.

Key services commissioned include:-

- **Alcohol**

  The NHS commissions Alcohol treatment services via the Drug and alcohol Team.

  Its lead role is to pilot collection of assault related A&E data. This is due to start in Surrey and Sussex Hospital next year.

- **Health Visitors and School Nurses** for those aged between 0-19.

The NHS commissions Surrey Community Health:-

- To work closely with the Children’s safeguarding team and other agencies to assess need and identify children at risk of harm or neglect and to target needs with appropriate services. This includes work regarding domestic abuse, alcohol and drug misuse in families.
- To work in partnership via Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences on serious domestic abuse cases.
- To follow up A&E attendances that they are made aware of, e.g., A&E information regarding injuries from a particular school is followed up
- To work with families to offer advice and support regarding behaviour management
- To participate in the Junior Citizens programme, in particular by helping youngsters learn how to respond to medical emergencies.
- To provide a specialist health visitor for homeless families, including asylum seekers, mothers and children living in a safe hostel for victims of domestic abuse and travelling families.

**Other services commissioned include:-**

- Child & Adolescent Mental Health Service. Community nurses work alongside school nurses to assess children with mental health problems and their families.
- Domestic abuse
- A Surrey Sexual Assault Referral Centre. This is jointly commissioned with Surrey Police. It will open later this year at Cobham Community Hospital to offer a specialist, dedicated, forensic level facility to anyone who has been the subject of a rape or serious sexual assault. Accessible to adults and children, the facility can be used by victims already supported by the police as well as those who wish to self-refer. It has been estimated that in the first year alone it will offer services to 200 adults and 50 children.
What progress has your Organisation made towards the achievement of the Aims and Objectives of the Community Safety Plan?

- Continued partnership working in serious domestic abuse cases through MARAC (Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences) and CIAG (Community Incident Action group) processes
- Role out of Common Assessment Framework across therapy services and 0-19 teams. There is still some work to be done to ensure that CAFs are completed where appropriate.
- Work with schools confederation to provide local services in consultation with local people
- 0-19 Team working closely, with midwives and Early Years within Children’s Centres to improve breast feeding within local area therefore improving physical & emotional health of both mother & child. Two Baby cafes now open in Hurst Green and Caterham.

What obstacles or barriers, if any, have you encountered in improving community safety in Tandridge?

Staffing levels for the 0-19 teams are low and there is an increase in safeguarding and vulnerable family work which is of a complex nature.

What are your Organisation’s future plans for community safety?

- Increase in workforce so that the Strategy for Children and young people’s health- “Healthy lives, Brighter Futures” through the Healthy Child Programme can be implemented.
- Progress in multi-agency working with agreed shared processes to give more streamlined services.
- Working with other agencies to engage the hard to reach groups of children and families.
**Organisation**

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service

**Representative**

Dave Steggles (Area Manager), Martin Garrod (Borough Manager)

**How does your Organisation contribute to the Tandridge Community Safety Plan 2008-2011?**

Reducing the numbers of Fires, Deaths and Injuries
Reducing the number of Arson Attacks

The provision of free fire safety advice on request to occupiers of both commercial and residential property.

The provision of free advice about means of escape, access for fire fighting and fire safety legislation to the Building Approvals Bodies, for example Tandridge Local Authority Building Control.

Working with young children, for example, Youth Engagement Scheme, Fire Fighter For a Day, Duke of Edinburgh, Firewise, Safe Drive Stay Alive
Working with vulnerable groups

Support the work of the Local Strategic Partnership, the Crime Disorder Reduction Partnership, the CIAG/JAG and Road Safety Forums

School liaison officers attend Tandridge Schools to educate different year groups about the importance of smoke detectors, escape plans and what to do in the event of a fire.

SF&RS supports, and attends the Community Safety days organised through Tandridge partnerships with the aim of targeting identified risk areas.

SF&RS is keen to contribute to the reduction in numbers and severity of road traffic collisions in Tandridge.

SF&RS is committed to making Tandridge a safer place to live, work, travel and to do business.

**What progress has your Organisation made towards the achievement of the Aims and Objectives of the Community Safety Plan?**

For Tandridge, during 2009/10, 10 out of 10 Fire and Rescue Service BVPI’s were on target or better than target.

The following is information is specific to Tandridge, G = Green, A = Amber, R = Red

- No Fire Fatalities (NI49ii) (G)
- Number of primary fires attended, actual,130, target 173 (G), only Epsom and Mole Valley had less fires.
- Number of accidental dwelling fires, actual 33, target 37 (G), only Epsom had less dwelling fires.
- Injuries from accidental dwelling fires actual 1, target 5 (G)
- Percentage of accidental fires in dwellings confined to room of origin, actual 91% target 90% (G), only Waverley and Elmbridge achieved a higher percentage.
- Number of deliberate fires (excluding vehicles), actual 61, target 81 (G), 20% reduction from last year, only Mole Valley, Epsom and Waverley had less incidents.
- Number of deliberate fires in vehicles, actual 26, target 52 (G), 54% reduction from last year, was the highest in Surrey, now joint 4th.
- Number of fires in non domestic premises, actual 12, target 17 (G), the lowest number in
Surrey.

- Malicious False Alarms, actual 10, target 9 (G), only Elmbridge, Mole Valley and Spelthorne had less incidents.
- False Alarms – automatic fire detection, actual 100, target 136 (G), down 60% from 168 last year, now the lowest in Surrey.

Targets are based on the previous three years activity and quarterly targets take into consideration seasonal variations.

Initiatives to continually improve performance are detailed in the Fire Rescue Services Plan for Tandridge, examples include:

- Hot strikes and cold strikes
- “Safe Drive Stay Alive”
- Involvement in Partnership Safety Events

Firewise: This scheme is aimed at young people who have displayed an unhealthy interest in fire, which has led, or could lead, to deliberate fire setting. This scheme has been running for many years with great success.

Schools Firewatch Scheme

Youth Engagement Scheme (YES)

Schools Education Programme: This is an ongoing programme of fire safety education for schoolchildren with classroom-based input in years 2, 5, and 8, supported by Schools liaison officers. In year 6 additional input comes in the form of the Junior Citizens scheme which is a two-week, multi-agency event.

Nursery Boxes

The Service operates the ’Home Fire Risk Check’ (HFRC) initiative which involves operational crews visiting domestic premises and discussing home fire safety with the occupier, offering advice on prevention, detection and escape plans, for free, and where necessary will supply and fit free of charge, smoke alarms.

SF&RS launched a new updated version of its award-winning Safe Drive Stay Alive event. Aimed at young drivers and those who are about to begin learning to drive, the event is a staged production held at Dorking Halls and has so far reached many thousands of school pupils, college students and young drivers in the county.

Using real-life victims of RTCs, the production carried a high satisfaction level - almost 100% of all attendees say they will be a safer driver as the result of attending the event.

What obstacles or barriers, if any, have you encountered in improving community safety in Tandridge?

The fire crews from Godstone, Oxted and Lingfield are busy, attending incidents and covering other crews that are at incidents or training, this restricts the time they have available for Community Safety. SF&RS are therefore keen to work with and involve all partners to promote the Community Safety agenda.

In the short term, Elected Members continued support for Safe Drive Stay Alive, Youth Engagement Schemes, Fire Fighter For A Day, Home Fire Risk Checks and other initiative detailed in the Borough Plan would be valued by SF&RS.
In the longer term, Elected Members support for road safety initiatives as well as the installation of residential sprinklers (fire sprinklers in new houses) would leave a legacy that improved community safety for generations to come.

**What are your Organisation’s future plans for community safety?**

- Reducing fire related injuries
- Reducing the number of fires
- Increasing the success of the Arson Task force team
- Reducing arson
- Reducing unwanted calls
- Reducing road traffic collisions
- Greater involvement with partners, vulnerable groups, youths, children
- Greater involvement at the different partnership meetings

As a Service, Fire and Rescue would like to see an increase with the installation of residential sprinklers (fire sprinklers in private dwellings), especially in new developments. The Service has strived to increase the use domestic sprinklers for some time, they are proven to reduce damage due to the effects from fire, and will improve community safety. The Service would like to see all affordable housing provided with domestic sprinkler systems. These new homes in Tandridge would then be the safest housing in the United Kingdom, with the additional benefits of limited damage thus offering very early re-occupation and reduced housing costs. This would also reduce the inevitable strain on the limited resources of the fire service due to the increase in numbers of dwellings.

The Service is committed to reducing the numbers of accidental domestic dwelling fires through the HFRC initiative. This involves operational crews visiting domestic properties, discussing the importance of home fire safety with the occupiers, and offering advice on prevention, detection and escape plans. Where necessary the crews will supply and fit, free of charge, normal domestic smoke alarms.

The Service will continue to work with our partner agencies, the police and SCC Traffic and Road Safety teams, participating in various campaigns, with the aim of reducing the numbers of road traffic collisions. Sadly, more than fifty lives were lost on Surrey’s roads last year, while 2 lives were lost in fire.
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Section one

Executive summary

Scope of this report

This report summarises:

- the key issues identified during our audit of Tandridge District Council’s (‘the Authority’s) financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2010; and
- our assessment of the Authority’s arrangements to secure value for money in its use of resources.

Financial Statements

The table below summarises the key findings from our work to date in relation to the financial statements audit. Section two of this document provides further details.

Proposed opinion

We anticipate issuing an unqualified audit opinion by 30 September 2010.

We will also report that the wording of your Annual Governance Statement complies with Delivery Good Governance in Local Government: Framework published by CIPFA/SOLACE in June 2007 and it is not misleading or inconsistent with other information we are aware of from our audit of the financial statements.

Accounts production and audit process

The quality of the accounts and the supporting working papers was generally good. The majority of audit queries were resolved in a reasonable time. In some cases, however, we experienced delays, specifically where staff who prepared the working papers were not available during the audit.

The Authority has implemented or partially implemented all of the recommendations in our ISA 260 Report in 2008/2009.

Critical accounting matters

We have worked with officers throughout the year to discuss specific risk areas. The Authority addressed the issues appropriately.

Audit differences

Our audit has identified two audit adjustments. Neither adjustment impacted the income and expenditure account.

The first adjustment relates to a provision within creditors for £404,000 in connection with the Housing Benefit Subsidy claims which is more properly described as a reserve. The amount has therefore been re-allocated from creditors to earmarked reserves by reducing current liabilities in the balance sheet and increasing earmarked reserves by £404,000.

The second adjustment relates to a re-classification of £290,000 of short term investments to long term investments as their maturity date is after 31 March 2011.

In addition we identified a number of non-significant presentational adjustments. All adjustments were processed by the Authority.

Completion

At the date of this report our audit of the financial statements is complete.

Before we can issue our opinion we require a signed management representation letter.

We confirm that we have complied with requirements on objectivity and independence in relation to this year’s audit of the Authority’s financial statements.

We have raised sixteen recommendations following our audit work, of which one is classified as high priority. The recommendations are summarised in Appendix C. The high priority item relates to the arrangements in place with ISEE whereby the Authority administers their funds. We have recommended these arrangements should be formalised.
Section one

Executive summary

Use of Resources

The table below summarises the key findings from our assessment of the Authority’s arrangements to secure value for money in its use of resources. Our findings are detailed in section three of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have concluded that the Authority has made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of resources assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following the change in government, the use of resources assessment at local authorities ceased with immediate effect in May 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Authority will therefore not receive scores in respect of the 2010 assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the fieldwork that we had carried out prior to the cessation of the assessment indicated to us that overall the Authority had maintain the level of performance we had seen in the prior year when it was judged to be performing well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exercise of other powers

We have a duty under section 8 of the Audit Commission Act 1998 to consider whether, in the public interest, to report on any matter that comes to our attention in order for it to be brought to the attention of the public. In addition we have a range of other powers under the 1988 Act. We did not exercise these powers or issue a report in the public interest in 2009/10.

Certificate

We are required to certify that we have completed the audit in accordance with the requirements of the Audit Commission Act 1998 and the Code of Audit Practice. If there are any circumstances under which we cannot issue a certificate, then we are required to report them to you and to issue a draft opinion on the financial statements.

At present there are no issues that would cause us to delay the issue of our certificate of completion of the audit.

Acknowledgements

We would like to take this opportunity to thank officers and Members for their continuing help and co-operation throughout our audit work.
Introduction

The Authority’s and our responsibilities

Tandridge District Council is responsible for having effective systems of internal control to ensure the regularity and lawfulness of transactions, to maintain proper accounting records and to prepare financial statements that give a true and fair view of its financial position and its expenditure and income. It is also responsible for preparing and publishing an Annual Statement of Governance with its financial statements.

Our responsibility is to audit the financial statements in accordance with relevant legal and regulatory requirements and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland).

The Audit Commission’s Code of Audit Practice requires us to summarise the work we have carried out to discharge our statutory audit responsibilities together with any governance issues identified and we report to those charged with governance (in this case the Resources Committee) at the time they are considering the financial statements.

We are also required to comply with International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 260 which sets out our responsibilities for communicating with those charged with governance.

This report meets both these requirements.

Introduction

Our audit of the financial statements can be split into four phases:

Planning	Control	Substantive	Completion
Evaluation	Procedures

This report focuses on the final two stages: substantive procedures and completion. It also includes any additional findings in respect of our control evaluation that have been identified in the year.

Substantive Procedures

Our final accounts visit on site took place between 26 July and 13 August 2010. During these 3 weeks, we carried out the following work:

- Planning and performing substantive audit procedures
- Concluding on critical accounting matters
- Identifying audit adjustments
- Reviewing the Annual Governance Statement

We have completed our audit of the Authority’s 2009/10 financial statements.

Completion

We are now in the final phase of the audit. Some aspects are discharged through this report:

- Declaring our independence and objectivity
- Obtaining management representations
- Reporting matters of governance interest
- Forming our audit opinion

We anticipate issuing an unqualified audit opinion by 30 September 2010.
Accounts production and audit process

ISA 260 requires us to communicate to you our views about the qualitative aspects of the Authority’s accounting practices and financial reporting.

We also assessed the Authority’s process for preparing the accounts and its support for an efficient audit.

We considered the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting practices and financial reporting</td>
<td>We consider that accounting practices are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness of draft accounts</td>
<td>We received a complete set of draft accounts on 1 July 2010. The Authority made a small number of amendments of a presentational nature following the Resource Committee meeting when the draft financial statements were discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of supporting working papers</td>
<td>Our Prepared by Client (PBC) list, which we issued during the March interim and discussed with the Group Accountant, set out our working paper requirements for the audit. The quality of working papers provided was variable but met the standards specified in our Accounts Audit Protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to audit queries</td>
<td>The majority of additional audit queries were resolved in a reasonable time. In some cases, however, we experienced delays, specifically where staff who prepared the working papers were not available during the audit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior year recommendations

In our Interim Audit Report 2009/10 we commented on the Authority’s progress in addressing the recommendations in our ISA 260 Report 2008/09.

The Authority has implemented, or partially implemented all of the recommendations in our ISA 260 Report 2008/09 relating to the financial statements.

Appendix D provides further details.

Annual Governance Statement

We have reviewed the Annual Governance Statement and confirmed that

- it complies with Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: A Framework published by CIPFA/SOLACE in June 2007; and
- it is not misleading or inconsistent with other information we are aware of from our audit of the financial statements.

We have made comments in respect of its format and content which the Authority has agreed to amend where significant.
We have worked with officers throughout the year to discuss specific risk areas. The Authority addressed the issues appropriately.

We have carried out detailed testing in each area and have not identified any significant issues from this.

Work completed
● In our Financial Statements Audit Plan 2009/10, presented to you in February 2010, we identified the key risks affecting the Authority’s 2009/10 financial statements.
● We have now completed our testing of these areas and set out our final evaluation following our substantive work.

Key findings
● The table below sets out our detailed findings for each risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key audit risk</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Council Assets</td>
<td>Due to the uncertain economic environment in place over the past two years, asset values (in particular property and land) have fluctuated significantly.</td>
<td>We have reviewed the third party confirmations over the value from Wilks, Head and Eve your Chartered Surveyors. We considered the assumptions used in valuing the properties, and we have not identified any issues in relations to this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes / rent arrears</td>
<td>As above, the uncertain economic environment has meant an increased pressure on public finances and in particular the collection of local taxes and rent arrears.</td>
<td>During our interim audit (in March 2010) we reviewed the controls in place for collecting debt relating to local taxes and rent arrears. We did not find any significant weaknesses in these controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of IFRS</td>
<td>There is to be changes to the reporting standards which local authorities have to work to with the introduction of IFRS. Comparative balances are required to be produced for 2009-10 although they will not be subject to audit until the end of 2010. We are therefore required to check readiness for this.</td>
<td>We met with the Group Accountant to discuss the status the IFRS implementation. At this time the Authority appears to be in-line with established timetable. The Authority is planning on making adjustments to opening balances by 31 December 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our audit has identified a total of two audit adjustments neither of which impact the income and expenditure account.

**Work completed**

In accordance with ISA 260 we are required to report uncorrected audit differences to you. We also report any material misstatements which have been corrected and which we believe should be communicated to you to help you meet your governance responsibilities.

**Key findings**

Our audit identified a total of two audit adjustments neither of which impact the income and expenditure account.

The net impact on Earmarked Reserves as a result of audit adjustments is to increase the balance as at 31 March 2010 by £404k. This is mainly the result of the following amendments:

- The first adjustment relates to a provision in creditors in relation to Housing Subsidy Benefit claims. This amount is better described as a reserve and the full amount of £404,000 has been reclassified by reducing the DWP Benefits, Payments and Subsidy Creditor and creating an earmarked reserve.

- The second adjustment relates to a re-classification of £290,000 of short term investments to long term investments as their maturity date is after 31 March 2011.

We have provided a summary of the audit differences in Appendix E. It is our understanding that these will be adjusted in the final version of the financial statements.

In addition, we identified a small number of presentational adjustments required to ensure that the accounts are compliant with the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting the United Kingdom 2009: A Statement of Recommended Practice (‘SORP’). We understand that the Authority will be addressing these where significant.

The tables below illustrate the total impact of audit differences on the Authority’s balance sheet as at 31 March 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance Sheet as at 31 March 2010</th>
<th>Pre-audit £m</th>
<th>Post-audit £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
<td>272.634</td>
<td>272.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long term assets</td>
<td>3.052</td>
<td>3.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>13.920</td>
<td>13.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>(6.058)</td>
<td>(5.664)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term liabilities</td>
<td>(35.571)</td>
<td>(35.571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net worth</strong></td>
<td><strong>247.977</strong></td>
<td><strong>248.381</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>(2.156)</td>
<td>(2.156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>(5.555)</td>
<td>(5.959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reserves</td>
<td>(240.266)</td>
<td>(240.266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total reserves</strong></td>
<td><strong>(247.977)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(248.381)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section two – financial statements

Completion

Declaration of independence and objectivity
As part of the finalisation process we are required to provide you with representations concerning our independence.

In relation to the audit of the financial statements of Tandridge District Council for the year ending 31 March 2010, we confirm that there were no relationships between KPMG LLP and Tandridge District Council, its directors and senior management and its affiliates that we consider may reasonably be thought to bear on the objectivity and independence of the audit engagement lead and audit staff. We also confirm that we have complied with Ethical Standards and the Audit Commission’s requirements in relation to independence and objectivity.

We have provided a detailed declaration in Appendix F in accordance with ISA 260.

Management representations
You are required to provide us with representations on specific matters such as your financial standing and whether the transactions within the accounts are legal and unaffected by fraud. We have included a copy of a representation letter as Appendix G. We will provide a draft to the Chief Financial Officer. We require a signed copy of your management representations before we issue our audit opinion.

We are seeking specific assurance that sufficient and appropriate consideration has been given to the potential impairments of the assets included in the accounts in light of the current economic climate and that, where any such impairment has been identified, it is reflected accordingly in the accounts. This includes compliance with the accounting policy for periodic revaluation of assets (under FRS 15), as well as the need for management to undertake a review of assets to determine whether there is any impairment to their value in accordance with FRS 11.

We are also seeking specific assurance that valuation of land disclosed within the balance sheet and fixed assets is materially accurate.

Other matters
ISA 260 requires us to communicate “audit matters of governance interest that arise from the audit of the financial statements” to you which includes:

- material weaknesses in internal control identified during the audit;
- matters specifically required by other auditing standards to be communicated to those charged with governance (e.g. issues relating to fraud, compliance with laws and regulations, subsequent events etc); and
- other audit matters of governance interest.

There are no other matters which we wish to draw to your attention.

Opinion
We anticipate issuing an unqualified audit opinion by 30 September 2010.

Our proposed opinion on the financial statements is presented in Appendix A.
Section three – use of resources

Introduction

The Authority’s and our responsibilities

The Authority is responsible for putting in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources and regularly reviewing their adequacy and effectiveness.

We are required to conclude whether the Authority has adequate arrangements in place to ensure effective use of its resources. We refer to this as the ‘value for money (VFM) conclusion’.

Introduction

Our assessment previously drew mainly on the findings from the use of resources assessment (UoR) framework, as the specified criteria for the VFM conclusion were the same as the UoR Key Lines of Enquiry (KLoE).

In May 2010 the new government announced that the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) would be abolished. The Audit Commission subsequently confirmed that work related to CAA should cease with immediate effect. This includes work for UoR assessments at local authorities.

However, there is no change to the requirement in the statutory Code of Audit Practice for auditors to issue a VFM conclusion.

At the time of the announcement, the majority of UoR work for 2010 had already been completed and this therefore informed our 2009/10 VFM conclusion.

Conclusion

We have concluded that the Authority has made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.

Our proposed conclusion is set out in Appendix B.

VFM criterion | Met
---|---
Managing finances
Financial planning | ✓
Understanding costs and achieving efficiencies | ✓
Financial reporting | ✓
Governing the business
Commissioning and procurement | ✓
Data quality and use of information | ✓
Governance | ✓
Risk management and internal control | ✓
Managing resources
Use of natural resources | ✓
Strategic asset management | *
Workforce planning | **

* This KLoE was not assessed in 2008-08 or 2009-10.
** This KLoE was not assessed in 2009-10, but considered in 2008-09.

The following pages include further details on the use of resources assessment and specific risk-based work.
Work completed
- We completed work on the 2010 use of resources assessment between April 2009 and May 2010.
- Our work involved review of the Authority’s self-assessment, discussions with key officers for all areas, review of relevant internal and external documentation and a challenge workshop with the management team.

Key findings
- Even though the 2010 UoR assessment was substantially completed, we have been advised by the Audit Commission not to share indicative scores with audited bodies.
- We have therefore only included general messages in this report about the Authority’s performance in each area. In particular, we have highlighted the key issues which we consider should be brought to the attention of those charged with governance.
- Below we set out our findings in respect of each area.

### Manage finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headlines</th>
<th>Issues arising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historically the Authority has met or been very close to its budgets at the year end. The Authority has received a repayment of £467K relating to Fleming VAT which has helped to achieve financial break even at year end.</td>
<td>In the current economic climate and as per best practice, variances should be analysed at senior management level on a monthly basis to ensure costs are monitored and controlled and action plans put in place where variances are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Authority has updated its Treasury Management Strategy in line with CIPFA guidance in light of authorities losing investments in Icelandic Banks.</td>
<td>We have identified no systematic reviews of costs and their drivers. With improved cost analysis, the Authority may be able to identify where cost savings can more easily be generated. Consideration can also be given to benchmarking of costs against other authorities in the Surrey area, as this information could provide some relevant comparisons with identification of best practice to be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership efficiencies have been identified such as the Framework for procurement of external legal services and the Internal Audit contract with Mole Valley and Reigate and Banstead.</td>
<td>Scenario analysis on the medium term financial plan has not been routinely carried out. This would help to provide best and worst case scenarios for comparison and identification of problem areas where more focus will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiencies continue to be achieved through the recruitment and pay freezes that have been in place over the past two years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget monitoring is carried out on a monthly basis with statements sent to budget holders. However these are only reviewed by the CMT every two months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of working papers and accounts provided to us this year have been strong and the prior year recommendation relating to this has been implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Audit Commission announced that its use of resources assessment at local authorities ceased with immediate effect in May 2010.

The Authority will therefore not receive scores in respect of the 2010 assessment.

The Authority’s performance has remained consistent with prior year in “managing finances”. There have been some updates in the year including the treasury management strategy which has been addressed and partnership working appears to be more embedded than before.

The Audit Commission announced that its use of resources assessment at local authorities ceased with immediate effect in May 2010.

The Authority will therefore not receive scores in respect of the 2010 assessment.

The Authority’s performance has remained consistent with prior year in “managing finances”. There have been some updates in the year including the treasury management strategy which has been addressed and partnership working appears to be more embedded than before.
### Issues arising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headlines</th>
<th>Issues arising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Authority has considered the wider social, economic and environmental issues in its Procurement and Sustainable Procurement Strategy and focuses on outcomes for communities by linking procurement to the Community Strategy.</td>
<td>The Authority is working with a range of partners to help secure efficiencies, however the Authority should continue to develop partnership working to deliver greater efficiencies and economies of scale. There is not routine sharing of data with other authorities in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact assessments are performed and residents’ views used to inform strategy such as the Joint East Surrey Housing Strategy. The Authority can demonstrate improvement through service redesign in its ICT strategy which aims for an improvement in capabilities and infrastructure for better customer service.</td>
<td>There are not clear and routine processes for the testing of the integrity of the data that is being reported across the Authority and externally. The PMG do review the data, but do not test its integrity unless they believe it is out of line with what they would have expected. Data quality is a key aspect across the public sector, and data should be tested and verified to ensure it is reported accurately and in line with national guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is limited evidence of data sharing between partners to improve the service provision.</td>
<td>Governance arrangements in partnerships need to be formalised to ensure each partner is aware of their responsibilities. This should include areas such as data quality and information governance, as noted above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are not clear and routine process for testing the integrity of data although indicators are regularly reviewed by the Performance Management Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal audit have provided substantial assurance reports over key financial systems and other governance reviews such as risk management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Use of resources assessment (continued)

#### G o v e r n i n g  t h e  b u s i n e s s

The assessment for “Governing the business” has remained broadly consistent with the prior year. Further work is needed in assessing the quality of data that is being reported. In addition greater benchmarking and sharing of data could be carried out with other authorities to identify areas of best practice and improvements that can be made.

The Authority has considered the wider social, economic and environmental issues in its Procurement and Sustainable Procurement Strategy and focuses on outcomes for communities by linking procurement to the Community Strategy.

Impact assessments are performed and residents’ views used to inform strategy such as the Joint East Surrey Housing Strategy. The Authority can demonstrate improvement through service redesign in its ICT strategy which aims for an improvement in capabilities and infrastructure for better customer service.

There is limited evidence of data sharing between partners to improve the service provision.

There are not clear and routine process for testing the integrity of data although indicators are regularly reviewed by the Performance Management Group.

Internal audit have provided substantial assurance reports over key financial systems and other governance reviews such as risk management.

---

#### M a n a g i n g  r e s o u r c e s

The Authority has made good initial steps in thinking about its impact on the environment. These processes and strategies need to become embedded over the coming years to see the impact of the work done to date.

The Authority has developed an over-arching Climate Change Action Plan which is due to be in place by December 2010.

Linked to this is the Energy and Management Strategy which is in draft format and expected to be finalised in March 2011. This has identified areas for efficiency such as heating control which could achieve savings of 10% over three years. Also Power Perfector have been engaged to consider improvements in voltage stabilisation, which could achieve savings of 8-10%.

Data collection is being improved under the above strategy to ensure accurate and relevant information is collected, such as centralised collection of utility invoices and establishing an Energy Management System to maintain key data on buildings.

The Authority has for its energy procurement utilised the services of Setsquare Energy Solutions, who collect meter readings and analyse the data.

The Authority does not qualify for the Carbon Reduction Commitment as its consumption is significantly below the threshold.

---

With the resources available the Authority has made some positive progress in area of sustainability. The Authority is still in the process of finalising the strategy and action plan relating to sustainability. Therefore sustainability is not fully embedded in the processes of the Authority.

The Authority does not currently have a full time member of staff dedicated to sustainability. We do not propose to recommend this due to the size of the Authority, but the needs and resources should be continually assessed to ensure they remain adequate. Also consideration could be given to greater joint working on sustainability with Mole Valley and Reigate and Banstead who do have dedicated resources.
Appendices

Appendix A: Proposed Opinion on the Financial Statements

Independent auditors’ report to the Members of Tandridge District Council

Opinion on the accounting statements

We have audited the accounting statements and related notes of Tandridge District Council for the year ended 31 March 2010 under the Audit Commission Act 1998. The accounting statements comprise the Income and Expenditure Account, the Statement of Movement on the General Fund Balance, the Balance Sheet, the Statement of Total Recognised Gains and Losses, the Cash Flow Statement, the Housing Revenue Account Income and Expenditure Account, the Statement of Movement on the Housing Revenue Account, and the Collection Fund. The accounting statements have been prepared under the accounting policies set out in the Statement of Accounting Policies.

This report is made solely to Tandridge District Council, as a body, in accordance with Part II of the Audit Commission Act 1998. Our audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to Tandridge District Council, as a body, those matters we are required to state to them in an auditors’ report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than Tandridge District Council, as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

Respective responsibilities of the Chief Finance Officer and auditors

The Chief Financial Officer’s responsibilities for preparing the financial statements, in accordance with relevant legal and regulatory requirements and the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2009 are set out in the Statement of Responsibilities for the Statement of Accounts.

Our responsibility is to audit the accounting statements and related notes in accordance with relevant legal and regulatory requirements and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland).

We report to you our opinion as to whether the accounting statements and related notes give a true and fair view, in accordance with relevant legal and regulatory requirements and the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2009, of:

- the financial position of the Authority and its income and expenditure for the year;

We review whether the governance statement reflects compliance with ‘Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: A Framework’ published by CIPFA/SOLACE in June 2007. We report if it does not comply with proper practices specified by CIPFA/SOLACE or if the statement is misleading or inconsistent with other information we are aware of from our audit of the financial statements. We are not required to consider, nor have we considered, whether the governance statement covers all risks and controls. Neither are we required to form an opinion on the effectiveness of the Authority’s corporate governance procedures or its risk and control procedures.

We read other information published with the accounting statements and related notes and consider whether it is consistent with the audited accounting statements and related notes. This other information comprises the Explanatory Foreword. We consider the implications for our report if we become aware of any apparent misstatements or material inconsistencies with the accounting statements and related notes. Our responsibilities do not extend to any other information.
Appendix A: Proposed Opinion on the Financial Statements (continued)

Basis of audit opinion
We conducted our audit in accordance with the Audit Commission Act 1998, the Code of Audit Practice issued by the Audit Commission and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland) issued by the Auditing Practices Board. An audit includes examination, on a test basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in the accounting statements and related notes. It also includes an assessment of the significant estimates and judgments made by the Authority in the preparation of the accounting statements and related notes, and of whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the Authority’s circumstances, consistently applied and adequately disclosed.

We planned and performed our audit so as to obtain all the information and explanations which we considered necessary in order to provide us with sufficient evidence to give reasonable assurance that the accounting statements and related notes are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or other irregularity or error. In forming our opinion we also evaluated the overall adequacy of the presentation of information in the accounting statements and related notes.

Opinion
In our opinion:

- The accounting statements and related notes give a true and fair view, in accordance with relevant legal and regulatory requirements and the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2009, of the financial position of the Authority as at 31 March 2010 and its income and expenditure for the year then ended.

Andy Sayers (Senior Statutory Auditor)
for and on behalf of KPMG LLP, Statutory Auditor

Chartered Accountants
15 Canada Square
London E14 5AG
September 2010

Our proposed opinion is unqualified.
There are no expected modifications to the auditors’ report.
Appendix B: Proposed use of resources conclusion

Conclusion on arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources

Authority’s Responsibilities

The Authority is responsible for putting in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources, to ensure proper stewardship and governance and regularly to review the adequacy and effectiveness of these arrangements.

Auditors’ Responsibilities

We are required by the Audit Commission Act 1998 to be satisfied that proper arrangements have been made by the Authority for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. The Code of Audit Practice issued by the Audit Commission requires us to report to you our conclusion in relation to proper arrangements, having regard to relevant criteria specified by the Audit Commission for principal local authorities. We report if significant matters have come to our attention which prevent us from concluding that the Authority has made such proper arrangements. We are not required to consider, nor have we considered, whether all aspects of the Authority’s arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources are operating effectively.

Conclusion

We have undertaken our audit in accordance with the Code of Audit Practice. Having regard to the criteria for principal local authorities specified by the Audit Commission and published in May 2008 and updated in February 2009, we are satisfied that, in all significant respects, Tandridge District Council made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources for the year ending 31 March 2010.

Andy Sayers (Senior Statutory Auditor)
for and on behalf of KPMG LLP, Statutory Auditor

Chartered Accountants
15 Canada Square
London E14 5GL
September 2010
We have identified that the financial management arrangements with IESE could be improved, in particular around the informal lending arrangements.

We have given each recommendation a risk rating (as explained below) and agreed what action management will need to take. We will follow up these recommendations next year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response / Responsible Officer / Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | 1        | IESE Finance Arrangements  
We have noted that the Authority holds IESE money in TDC bank accounts and investments under an agreement as part of the use of space at the council offices. Loans and borrowings between the Authority and IESE occur on an informal basis depending on the funds in the accounts. The values of amounts being held and expenditure incurred has increased significantly in the past year, and there is no formal arrangement in place to govern the use of funds and the levels that must be maintained on behalf of IESE.  
We recommend that the Authority formalises the agreement in place for administering of IESE funds to ensure that funds are separated from those of the Authority. This should be actioned through setting up a new bank account for IESE where funds must be maintained at appropriate levels. This will reduce any risks to the Authority around borrowing of funds and will make the process of identifying the funds of IESE easier. | Agreed  
Laurence Woolven, Group Accountant  
September/October 2010 |
We have identified that budget monitoring arrangements could be strengthened. In particular the reporting that occurs to the CMT and the interaction of finance with budget holders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response / Responsible Officer / Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monitoring of performance at CMT level</td>
<td>Major variance monitoring for CMT will now be produced on a quarterly basis, with four reports a year going to CMT, with a further higher level report submitted to the Chair of Resources Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At the time of our interim audit the last report of performance against budget was for information up to 30 November 2009, presented to BSMT in January 2010 and no further reports are planned to be presented in 2009/10. In light of the current economic climate and also best practice we would expect senior management to be reviewing and challenging financial information more regularly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition we have identified from the report that it does not include any information on other finance elements such as the cash position and forecast, KPIs or ratios, and the commentary on variances is very limited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In order to improve the level of information reported to senior management for more effective overview of the financial position of the authority, BSMT should review a finance report on a monthly basis. The report should be re-designed to incorporate performance and forecast at segment level, performance against financial KPIs, cash position and forecasts and performance against the capital programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior management do not rely solely on finance for all monitoring information and produce many of the key reports required from their own systems. Specific items such as the recruitment freeze or land charge income are monitored separately and reported to CMT and discussed as required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The production of a ‘dash board’ style monitoring report with many different forecasts and KPI’s would look good but likely provide little added value to CMT members. Investigation into what data CMT members would like added to this type of report produced scant replies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Jones, Accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the current economic climate, effective budget monitoring arrangements are essential, and they need to be applied consistently throughout the Authority.

### Appendix C: Recommendations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response / Responsible Officer / Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monthly management accounts&lt;br&gt;From discussions with budget holders we ascertained that whilst budgets are monitored regularly, this is not always the direct result of receiving the monthly report from finance. This is partly due to some of the profile budgets in the report being incorrect which will only be picked up if the budget holder contacts the relevant accountant. It does not appear that there is regular communication between all budget holders and accountants. &lt;br&gt;Next year it has been agreed by BSMT that budget holders should be responsible for checking their own budgets as they have access to these in Agresso, this way they can format the information to be effective for their needs. &lt;br&gt;Whilst the authority is confident that budget holders will check performance against budget on a regular basis on Agresso, we would recommend that a monthly or fortnightly meeting or conversation is put into the diaries of each budget holder and their accountant to ensure that variances can be explained and action plans to address issues are in place. There should be consultation in the form of a workshop or interviews between finance and budget holders to ensure that financial information provided to them for budget monitoring is fit for purpose.</td>
<td>The process of producing a monthly budget monitoring report that is dispatched to budget managers on a monthly basis has been replaced in favour of a more responsive service. Budget managers have been given access to Agresso and setup with templates allowing them to view their specific cost centres. Accountants have spoken to budget managers and provided the necessary training required. &lt;br&gt;This change gives budget holders the ability to check their budgets at any time they choose and see the most up-to-date information possible. It also frees up time of accountants allowing them to be more efficient with their time. &lt;br&gt;Budget managers know that when they require detailed advice from finance that accountants are ready and willing to lend a hand. Accountants regularly respond to requests from budget managers for more detailed monitoring information providing the added value that budget managers themselves would struggle to retrieve from Agresso and the previous monthly monitoring did not include. &lt;br&gt;Budget profiles on the whole are as accurately profiled as possible. The process of re-profiling budgets is quite time consuming and would represent poor use of time if done on a monthly basis. It is however undertaken as and when identified. &lt;br&gt;A regular timetabled monthly or fortnightly meeting with budget managers to discuss variances does not currently happen. Meetings between budget managers and accountants become more regular towards the year end. Much of the time a face to face meeting is not required as the budget manager will email the accountant with their queries about items posted to their accounts and any corrections necessary. This has the added benefit of acting as the back up evidence for any journals that are required. &lt;br&gt;When CMT level monitoring is produced accountants will contact budget managers to gain explanations and an understanding of any major variance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exception reporting for NNDR, Council Tax and Benefits is not routinely carried out where changes are made to accounts. Checks of the changes will strengthen the control environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response / Responsible Officer / Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4   | 2        | **Revenues exception reporting**  
Prior to October 2009, exception reports were run daily on Academy to identify any amendments to NNDR or Council Tax accounts, including any new accounts being set up. The reports were reviewed daily by the Revenues Manager, who would select a sample of transactions to check.  
However, since October these checks have not been completed and no compensating control has been implemented. There is a risk that errors in setting up or making changes to accounts could go undetected.  
The authority should verify a sample of changes on a regular basis to ensure that they have been entered correctly and are bona fide amendments. |
|     |          |                        | Resources no longer permit the frequency of checking. Agree to implement a light touch check.  
David Bunn, Revenues Manager  
April 2011 |
| 5   | 2        | **Review of exception reports**  
Currently exception reports are run for changes made to the housing benefits information on Academy. These reports are exported into excel, and a sample of 10% of the changes should be reviewed by the Benefits Team Leader. However, currently these samples are not consistently reviewed.  
There is a risk that changes to standing data could be made incorrectly or fraudulently resulting in incorrect benefits payments being made.  
The exception reports should be run on a regular basis, with a sample of changes reviewed to ensure that the information being changed on Academy is correct. A record of these reviews should be signed, dated and retained to ensure that an audit trail exists. |
|     |          |                        | Resources no longer permit the frequency of checking. Agree to implement a light touch check for assurance.  
Tim Brierley, Benefits Manager  
April 2011 |
### Key points to note

Include ensuring the updated IT Security policy is available with a direct link on the intranet and distributed to staff.

Access rights to Saffron, Academy and Trent are not reviewed on a regular basis to ensure they are up to date and in line with job requirements.

### Appendix C: Recommendations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response / Responsible Officer / Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Journal authorisation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Our testing over the authorisation of journals prior to input identified the following:&lt;br&gt;• 4 out of 25 of the journals tested were from the depot where journal documentation is prepared by one officer and entered by another however there is no countersignature to show that journal entry has been authorised.&lt;br&gt;• 1 out of 25 journals tested had been entered by the Finance Assistant in August 2009 however had not been authorised by the Group Accountant. This journal was for payroll allocation and was supported by backing documentation.&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that errors in journal entry may go undetected leading to misstatements in the financial statements. We understand that the Authority is moving to an electronic system which will ensure that journals must have appropriate approval before entry. Until this is implemented the Authority should ensure that all journals are reviewed prior to entry and evidence is retain of this in the form of an authorised journal sheet.</td>
<td>The depot procedures have been amended and now comply with this.&lt;br&gt;Payroll upload journals are monitored monthly and there is no proposal to change these arrangements prior to the introduction of electronic authorisation.&lt;br&gt;Chris Rolfe, Group Accountant&lt;br&gt;Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>IT security and user policy</strong>&lt;br&gt;IT security policy was updated but old version on intranet and there is no link to the policy – rather, it has to be searched for. Also minutes of board meeting at which it was agreed do not explicitly refer to the policy.&lt;br&gt;There is a risk that updated guidance is not available to staff and is not approved according to the Council’s policies.&lt;br&gt;Guidance should be made available on the intranet as it is approved and minutes should refer explicitly to policies.</td>
<td>Agreed IT Security Policy should be replaced on the Intranet with the new one.&lt;br&gt;Minutes of meeting should mention specific policy.&lt;br&gt;Matt Mitchell, IT Manager&lt;br&gt;October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Agresso and Saffron access</strong>&lt;br&gt;Our testing found that one account on each of these systems had not been deactivated for several months following the departure of the member of staff concerned. There is a risk of unauthorised access to key financial systems.&lt;br&gt;The starters and leavers spreadsheets circulated by payroll should be reviewed by system administrators every month to ensure that leavers’ accounts are disabled promptly.</td>
<td>Agreed&lt;br&gt;Seanne Giddy, HR Manager&lt;br&gt;September 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Access to the server room

Our testing found that one swipe card with access to the Tandridge server room belonging to a former member of staff had not been deactivated meaning that they could still gain unauthorised access to it.

The swipe card in question should be deactivated and periodic reviews of users with swipe cards which allow access to the server room should be undertaken.

**Management Response / Responsible Officer**

Agreed and swipe card has now been deactivated.

**Due Date**

October 2010

**Responsible Officer**

Matt Mitchell, IT Manager

---

### Backup notifications from SLAs

No backup notifications are received for SLAs (Mole Valley, Sevenoaks). There is a risk that backups are not performed correctly.

The IT department should liaise with Mole Valley and Sevenoaks to have them provide backup notifications and ensure these are reviewed by IT staff.

**Management Response / Responsible Officer**

Will request periodic backup notifications from Mole & Sevenoaks

**Due Date**

February 2011

**Responsible Officer**

Matt Mitchell, IT Manager

---

### User access review

We found that there are no regular periodic user access reviews for Saffron, Academy and Trent. There is a risk that ghost users are not deactivated and user rights are not in line with job descriptions.

Periodic (e.g. annual) user access reviews should be undertaken and evidenced.

**Management Response / Responsible Officer**

Agreed

**Due Date**

February 2011

**Responsible Officer**

Matt Mitchell, IT Manager

---

### Starters, leavers and amendments – Trent

Our testing found that there are no formal procedures for starters, leavers and amendments. There is a risk that access is not granted, modified and revoked in an appropriate manner and no evidence is retained.

The authority should implement formal procedures for each type of action and retain evidence.

**Management Response / Responsible Officer**

Accept and agree

**Due Date**

February 2011

**Responsible Officer**

Matt Mitchell, IT Manager

---

### Periodic test restores

We found that no periodic test restores are completed to ensure that the backup systems are fully functional. There is a risk that backup systems may not be fully functional.

The IT department should conduct annual test restores and document results.

**Management Response / Responsible Officer**

Accept and agree

**Due Date**

February 2011

**Responsible Officer**

Matt Mitchell, IT Manager
Appendices

Appendix C: Recommendations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response / Responsible Officer / Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Revenues procedures</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per discussion with the Revenues Manager, a number of procedure documents for the duties carried out by the Revenues Assistant, who retired in December 2009, were stored in her personal file and lost when she retired. Procedure notes for the reconciliation between JB Cash (cash receipting system) and Academy (NNDR/CTax system) are not available. In order to ensure that staff are fully aware of the procedures over revenues, these documents should be re-written and saved on a shared drive or posted on the Hub to ensure all staff have access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Bunn, Revenues Manager April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staff listings and budgets</td>
<td>Budget Managers can and do request staffing information from Accountancy, who then prepare reports for them. The information is held on Agresso, however for Data Protection purposes access to Salaries is restricted. For this reason we do not propose to change the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently budgets are circulated to budget holders on a monthly basis. However staff listing are not sent alongside these reports. In the budget reports the salaries and wages are not split out into individuals. HR send out staff listings to some staff within finance and HR but not all budget holders. Budget reporting should be refined to ensure staff listings are sent out by finance alongside the budget reports. These can then be linked up and staff costs analysed to ensure they are accurate. In addition positive confirmation should be sought from the officers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Rolfe, Group Accountant No action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Server security arrangements not detailed within SLAs</td>
<td>Site visits have been carried out at Remote server rooms and security has been deemed as adequate. Also sites are required to have same audit procedure as ourselves. Will amend SLA to cover server room security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a risk that server security on the other sites is inadequate as it is not detailed within the SLA. The IT department should liaise with Mole Valley and Sevenoaks to have them provide details regarding server security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Mitchell, IT Manager February 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The points on this page relate to best practice points.

Council tax and NNDR procedure notes are required to be produced to ensure staff have access to the procedures they must follow.

We have noted that staff listings are not sent to budget holders alongside finance reports in order to check leavers have been removed from payroll and staff numbers are up to date.

The SLA server security arrangements should be clearly defined.
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Appendix D: Follow-up of prior year recommendations

This appendix summarises the progress made to implement the recommendations identified in our ISA 260 Report 2008/09 and re-iterates any recommendations that are still outstanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of recommendations that were:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included in original report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Officer Responsible and Due Date</th>
<th>Status as at 16th August 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Completeness of fixed assets</td>
<td>Laurence Woolven, Group Accountant January 2010</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our audit identified that the Capital Accountant believes that there are a number of small parcels of land which are not recorded within the FAR, and subsequently, the accounts. We understand that these parcels of land are generally ‘scrub’ areas which are inaccessible or not suitable for building development, and subsequently likely to have negligible value.

We recommend that all land is included within the FAR and disclosed within the financial statements.

Where possible, the capital accountant has reviewed the land registry held by the council, and has ensured that land not previously included in the FAR is input. However further work is needed to clarify the completeness over the FAR regarding these pieces of land.

Based on our audit work, knowledge of TDC, and nature of the land, we do not consider these to be material.
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Appendix E: Audit differences

We are required by ISA 260 to report all uncorrected misstatements, other than those that we believe are clearly trivial, to those charged with governance (which in the Authority’s case is the Overview and Scrutiny Committee). We are also required to report all material misstatements that have been corrected but that we believe should be communicated to you to assist you in fulfilling your governance responsibilities.

Corrected audit differences

The following table sets out the significant audit differences identified by our audit of Tandridge District Council’s financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2010. It is our understanding that these will be adjusted. However, we have not yet received a revised set of financial statements to confirm this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Basis of audit difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement of Movement on GF Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement of Movement on GF Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement of Movement on GF Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement of Movement on GF Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement of Movement on GF Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Basis of audit difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>£0k</strong></td>
<td><strong>£0k</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are five other adjustments relating to presentation of supporting notes. These are not significant and do not impact the prime financial statements.
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Appendix F: Declaration of independence and objectivity

**Requirements**

Auditors appointed by the Audit Commission must comply with the Code of Audit Practice (the Code) which states that:

“Auditors and their staff should exercise their professional judgement and act independently of both the Commission and the audited body. Auditors, or any firm with which an auditor is associated, should not carry out work for an audited body that does not relate directly to the discharge of auditors’ functions, if it would impair the auditors’ independence or might give rise to a reasonable perception that their independence could be impaired.”

In considering issues of independence and objectivity we consider relevant professional, regulatory and legal requirements and guidance, including the provisions of the Code, the detailed provisions of the Statement of Independence included within the Audit Commission’s Standing guidance for local government auditors (‘Audit Commission Guidance’) and the requirements of APB Ethical Standard 1 Integrity, Objectivity and Independence (‘Ethical Standards’).

The Code states that, in carrying out their audit of the financial statements, auditors should comply with auditing standards currently in force, and as may be amended from time to time. Audit Commission Guidance requires appointed auditors to follow the provisions of ISA (UK & I) 260 Communication of Audit Matters with Those Charged with Governance that are applicable to the audit of listed companies. This means that the appointed auditor must disclose in writing:

- Details of all relationships between the auditor and the client, its directors and senior management and its affiliates, including all services provided by the audit firm and its network to the client, its directors and senior management and its affiliates, that the auditor considers may reasonably be thought to bear on the auditor’s objectivity and independence.

- The related safeguards that are in place.

- The total amount of fees that the auditor and the auditor’s network firms have charged to the client and its affiliates for the provision of services during the reporting period, analysed into appropriate categories, for example, statutory audit services, further audit services, tax advisory services and other non-audit services. For each category, the amounts of any future services which have been contracted or where a written proposal has been submitted are separately disclosed.

Appointed auditors are also required to confirm in writing that they have complied with Ethical Standards and that, in the auditor’s professional judgement, the auditor is independent and the auditor’s objectivity is not compromised, or otherwise declare that the auditor has concerns that the auditor’s objectivity and independence may be compromised and explaining the actions which necessarily follow from this. These matters should be discussed with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Ethical Standards require us to communicate to those charged with governance in writing at least annually all significant facts and matters, including those related to the provision of non-audit services and the safeguards put in place that, in our professional judgement, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence and the objectivity of the Audit Partner and the audit team.
Appendix F: Declaration of independence and objectivity (continued)

We confirm that we have complied with requirements on objectivity and independence in relation to this year’s audit of the Authority’s financial statements.

General procedures to safeguard independence and objectivity

KPMG’s reputation is built, in great part, upon the conduct of our professionals and their ability to deliver objective and independent advice and opinions. That integrity and objectivity underpins the work that KPMG performs and is important to the regulatory environments in which we operate. All partners and staff have an obligation to maintain the relevant level of required independence and to identify and evaluate circumstances and relationships that may impair that independence.

Acting as an auditor places specific obligations on the firm, partners and staff in order to demonstrate the firm’s required independence. KPMG’s policies and procedures regarding independence matters are detailed in the Ethics and Independence Manual (‘the Manual’). The Manual sets out the overriding principles and summarises the policies and regulations which all partners and staff must adhere to in the area of professional conduct and in dealings with clients and others.

KPMG is committed to ensuring that all partners and staff are aware of these principles. To facilitate this, a hard copy of the Manual is provided to everyone annually. The Manual is divided into two parts. Part 1 sets out KPMG’s ethics and independence policies which partners and staff must observe both in relation to their personal dealings and in relation to the professional services they provide. Part 2 of the Manual summarises the key risk management policies which partners and staff are required to follow when providing such services.

All partners and staff must understand the personal responsibilities they have towards complying with the policies outlined in the Manual and follow them at all times. To acknowledge understanding of and adherence to the policies set out in the Manual, all partners and staff are required to submit an annual Ethics and Independence Confirmation. Failure to follow these policies can result in disciplinary action.

Auditor Declaration

In relation to the audit of the financial statements of Tandridge District Council for the financial year ending 31 March 2010, we confirm that there were no relationships between KPMG LLP and Tandridge District Council, its directors and senior management and its affiliates that we consider may reasonably be thought to bear on the objectivity and independence of the audit engagement lead and audit staff. We also confirm that we have complied with Ethical Standards and the Audit Commission’s requirements in relation to independence and objectivity.
Dear KPMG LLP,

We understand that auditing standards require you to obtain representations from management on certain matters material to your opinion. Accordingly we confirm to the best of our knowledge and belief, having made appropriate enquiries of other members of the Authority, the following representations given to you in connection with your audit of the financial statements for Tandridge District Council for the year ended 31 March 2010.

All the accounting records have been made available to you for the purpose of your audit and the full effect of all the transactions undertaken by Tandridge District Council has been properly reflected and recorded in the accounting records in accordance with agreements, including side agreements, amendments and oral agreements. All other records and related information, including minutes of all management and Committee meetings, have been made available to you.

We confirm that we have disclosed all material related party transactions relevant to the Authority and that we are not aware of any other such matters required to be disclosed in the financial statements, whether under FRS 8 or other requirements.

We confirm that we are not aware of any actual or potential non-compliance with laws and regulations that would have had a material effect on the ability of the Authority to conduct its business and therefore on the results and financial position to be disclosed in the financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2010.

We acknowledge that we are responsible for the fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with the Local Government Statement of Recommended Practice (“SORP”) and wider UK accounting standards. We have considered and approved the financial statements.

We confirm that we:

- understand that the term “fraud” includes misstatements resulting from fraudulent financial reporting and misstatements resulting from misappropriation of assets. Misstatements resulting from fraudulent financial reporting involve intentional misstatements or omissions of amount or disclosures in financial statements to deceive financial statement users. Misstatements resulting from misappropriation of assets involve the theft of an entity’s assets, often accompanied by false or misleading records or documents in order to conceal the fact that the assets are missing or have been pledged without proper authorisation;

- are responsible for the design and implementation of internal control to prevent and detect fraud and error;

- have disclosed to you our knowledge of fraud or suspected fraud affecting the Authority involving:
  - management;
  - employees who have significant roles in internal control; or
  - others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.

- have disclosed to you our knowledge of any allegations of fraud, or suspected fraud, affecting the Authority’s financial statements communicated by employees, former employees, analysts, regulators or others; and

- have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.
We confirm that the presentation and disclosure of the fair value measurements of material assets, liabilities and components of equity are in accordance with applicable reporting standards. The amounts disclosed represent our best estimate of fair value of assets and liabilities required to be disclosed by these standards. The measurement methods and significant assumptions used in determining fair value have been applied on a consistent basis, are reasonable and they appropriately reflect our intent and ability to carry out specific courses of action on behalf of the Authority where relevant to the fair value measurements or disclosures.

We confirm that there are no other contingent liabilities, other than those that have been properly recorded and disclosed in the financial statements. In particular:

- there is no significant pending or threatened litigation, other than that already disclosed in the financial statements; and
- there are no material commitments or contractual issues, other than those already disclosed in the financial statements.

With reference to the specific issues on which you have requested assurances from Members, we confirm that:

- For 2009/10 we consider there to be an agreed arrangement in place between IESE and Tandridge District Council, which allows Tandridge District Council to borrow from IESE without a prior loan agreement.

Finally, no additional significant post balance sheet events have occurred that would require additional adjustment or disclosure in the financial statements, over and above those events already disclosed.

This letter was tabled at the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 28 September 2010.

Yours faithfully

Alistair Montgomery – Chief Finance Officer
On behalf of Tandridge District Council
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Internal Audit Progress Report

28 September 2010
The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during our internal audit work and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist, or of all the improvements that may be required. Whilst every care has been taken to ensure that the information provided in this report is as accurate as possible, based on the information provided and documentation reviewed, no complete guarantee or warranty can be given with regard to the advice and information contained herein. Our work does not provide absolute assurance that material errors, loss or fraud do not exist.

This report is prepared solely for the use of the Committee and senior management of Tandridge District Council. Details may be made available to specified external agencies, including external auditors, but otherwise the report should not be quoted or referred to in whole or in part without prior consent. No responsibility to any third party is accepted as the report has not been prepared, and is not intended for any other purpose.

© 2010 RSM Tenon Limited

RSM Tenon Limited is a member of RSM Tenon Group

RSM Tenon Limited is an independent member firm of RSM International an affiliation of independent accounting and consulting firms. RSM International is the name given to a network of independent accounting and consulting firms each of which practices in its own right. RSM International does not exist in any jurisdiction as a separate legal entity.

RSM Tenon Limited (No 4066924) is registered in England and Wales. Registered Office 66 Chiltern Street, London W1U 4GB. England
1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The periodic internal audit plan for 2010/11 was approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 13 April 2010. This report summarises the outcome of work completed to date against that plan, and Appendix A provides cumulative data in support of internal audit performance.

2. **FINAL REPORTS ISSUED**

2.1 We have finalised 4 reports on reviews in the 2010/11 programme since the last Committee meeting; these are in the areas of:

- Health and Safety
- Departmental Income & Expenditure – Commercial Services
- Efficiency Review – Support Services Recharges, and
- Sustainability (Carbon Reduction)

2.2 Action plans are included at Appendix B for the reports on departmental income and expenditure and sustainability where recommendations categorised ‘high’ and ‘medium’ have been raised. Management have accepted all the recommendations graded as low priority that were made in the other reports.

2.3 We have also finalised our 2009/10 report on the results of our follow up audit on the implementation of audit recommendations made in 2008/09 and prior years.

3. **KEY FINDINGS FROM INTERNAL AUDIT WORK IN 2010/11**

3.1 We have not to date identified any major issues that could impact on our annual opinion.

4. **RESULTS OF 2009/10 FOLLOW UP AUDIT**

4.1 We referred to our initial findings from our follow up work on the implementation of recommendations made in 2008/09 and prior years when we presented our annual internal audit report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in July 2010. At that time we had found that: only nine of the 21 recommendations we followed up had been satisfactorily implemented or otherwise addressed: and that three of the five recommendations that were classified as significant when they were made, had not been implemented.

4.2 Since the last meeting we have received responses to our recommendations and held discussions with officers. We have also extended our follow up analysis to include the results of recommendations made in 2008/09 in areas that we had also reviewed in 2009/10. A summary of the status of the recommendations that we have followed up is shown in Appendix C and on the basis that more than 50% of the recommendations have been implemented, we have now concluded that the Council has made *reasonable progress* in implementing audit recommendations.

4.3 Officers have reviewed all of the outstanding recommendations and provided detailed comments on their status and in some cases revised responses taking account the Council’s current circumstances and priorities. The effect of these revised responses are summarised below:
4.4 The three ‘significant’ and one ‘merits attention’ recommendations that are no longer being taken forward by officers concerned:

- The use of local performance indicators - officers consider that reports to CMT and Policy Committees should continue to be the prime source for monitoring strategic performance;
- Establishment of a records management system - officers have concluded that there is no positive financial business case for introducing a records management system;
- Introduction of version controls over internal guidance documentation – officers have concluded that whilst desirable this not a priority given current and likely resourcing levels;
- The production of policies and procedures governing the use of the Active Directory (part of the Council’s IT operating system) – officers have concluded that whilst desirable this not a priority (as above).

4.5 We have considered Officers’ revised responses by revisiting our original reports and discussing them with the Council’s Section 151 Officer. We are satisfied on this basis that the decisions not to take forward the recommendations previously agreed will not adversely affect the Council’s internal controls and management processes.

4.6 Officers have also put in place enhanced arrangement to track in year the progress of the remaining recommendations using the TEN system and we have suggested they undertake a similar review of the Council’s plans to implement internal audit recommendations made in 2009/10.

5. WORK IN PROGRESS OR PLANNED

5.1 We have recently issued 2 draft reports, which are awaiting comments from management to allow us to finalise them. These are the Emergency Planning review and Capital Accounting and Fixed Asset review.

5.2 A review of VAT was scheduled to start at the end of August, to be performed by one of our Tax Specialists; however, due to a family bereavement within the finance team, this has been rescheduled to take place in October.
6. LIAISON WITH MANAGEMENT AND EXTERNAL AUDIT

6.1 We last met formally with management in July 2010 and have been in communication with KPMG. Adrian Rutter has also met with the Council’s Chief Executive and S151 Officer.

7. CHANGES TO OUR PLAN

7.1 A risk management workshop has been provided by our Risk Management Advisory Team to the Community Services (Environment) Team, which has been resourced from the internal audit plan contingency budget.

7.2 We also undertook a piece of work to verify expenditure on decriminalised parking activities to allow the Council to recoup these monies from the County Council.

7.3 The VAT review has been rescheduled to take place in October.

8. SECTOR GUIDANCE

8.1 We have issued one further relevant client briefing since the last committee on the Bribery Act. This is included at Appendix D.
APPENDIX A: OPERATIONAL PLAN PERFORMANCE 2010/11

Detailed below is a summary of the work undertaken in 2010/11 to date, showing the levels of assurance given and the number of recommendations arising. Reports being considered at this Committee are shown in italics. Definitions with regard to the levels of assurance and the classification of recommendations are provided overleaf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditable Area</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Debrief date</th>
<th>Draft report issued</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Final report issued</th>
<th>Audit Committee</th>
<th>Audit approach</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Assurance level given</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td>23/06/10</td>
<td>20/07/10</td>
<td>29/07/10</td>
<td>02/08/10</td>
<td>Sept 2010 (Sept 2010)</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Income and Expenditure</td>
<td>19/07/10</td>
<td>22/07/10</td>
<td>26/07/10</td>
<td>06/08/10</td>
<td>10/08/10</td>
<td>Sept 2010 (Sept 2010)</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AMBER / GREEN</td>
<td>0 3 2 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Review – Support Services Recharges</td>
<td>Feb 2010</td>
<td>28/02/10</td>
<td>18/03/10</td>
<td>06/04/10</td>
<td>06/04/10</td>
<td>April 2010 (Sept 2010)</td>
<td>Advisory VFM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a 1 n/a n/a 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td>08/07/10</td>
<td>03/08/10</td>
<td>17/08/10</td>
<td>18/08/10</td>
<td>Sept 2010 (Sept 2010)</td>
<td>Thematic review</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1 1 2 4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals to date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>In Total</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 No categorisation level was assigned to these recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditable Area</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Debrief date</th>
<th>Draft report issued</th>
<th>Responses received</th>
<th>Final report issued</th>
<th>Audit Committee</th>
<th>Audit approach</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Assurance level given</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Follow Up 2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Emergency Planning</td>
<td>05/07/10</td>
<td>08/07/10</td>
<td>26/07/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 IT – Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Revenues</td>
<td>13/10/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Benefits</td>
<td>13/10/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Treasury Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Capital Accounting and Fixed Assets</td>
<td>12/07/10</td>
<td>06/08/10</td>
<td>27/08/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Main Accounting, General Ledger and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Bank Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Debtors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Creditors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Housing Rents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Risk Management and Compliance</td>
<td>13/09/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Corporate Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 IT Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 Assurance IT Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditable Area</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Debrief date</td>
<td>Draft report issued</td>
<td>Responses received</td>
<td>Final report issued</td>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>Audit approach</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Assurance level given</td>
<td>Number of Recommendations Made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud Thematic Review</td>
<td>28/06/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSM Tenon
### APPENDIX B:

**ACTION PLANS (WHERE HIGH OR MEDIUM RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE BEEN RAISED OR WHERE RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE NOT BEEN AGREED BY MANAGEMENT)**

#### DEPARTMENTAL INCOME & EXPENDITURE – TANDRIDGE COMMERCIAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Accepted (Y/N)</th>
<th>Management Comment</th>
<th>Implementation Date</th>
<th>Manager Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Tandridge Commercial Services should produce and implement formal procedures for all processes undertaken within the depot. This would help ensure that all processes and work flows are dealt with efficiently, in a consistent manner and within established time frames.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>These procedures will be produced individually under a structure framework, and will be in place prior to the Administration Manager retiring in 2011.</td>
<td>October 2010 to March 2011</td>
<td>Administration Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>In order to adhere to the current ordering system the possibility of reassigning the procurement card to the Administration Assistant should be discussed with the finance team. If this is not possible, to ensure compliance with corporate policy the Direct Works Manager should be the only officer to incur expenditure on the PC. These should be authorised by the Exchequer Services Manager.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Steps have already been taken to secure a Procurement Card for the Administration Assistant from the Finance Department.</td>
<td>Upon receipt of the Procurement Card.</td>
<td>Commercial Services Manager.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 The processes followed at TCS were documented in order to assist us over the course of the audit. This document provided a high level overview of a majority of processes undertaken within TCS, lacking the detail to be classified as procedures. These are a good starting point from which to produce formal procedures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Accepted (Y/N)</th>
<th>Management Comment</th>
<th>Implementation Date</th>
<th>Manager Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>All officers should use their specific ROCC user ID to raise Purchase Orders (POs). The generic log on profiles 'op' and 'OP' should be removed, or their access levels restricted. Management should review orders raised on a frequent basis to ensure that only recognised, authorised individuals have raised orders.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Because of the associated records it was not possible to remove 'op' and 'OP'. However the password has been changed to prevent further use. This will be monitored on a regular basis to ensure compliance.</td>
<td>Thursday 22 July 2010</td>
<td>Administration Manager.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUSTAINABILITY (CARBON REDUCTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Categorisation (H, M, L, S)</th>
<th>Accepted (Y/N)</th>
<th>Management Comment</th>
<th>Implementation Date</th>
<th>Manager Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4 Response to sustainability issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong> Senior management should review the sufficiency of resources for developing and taking forward the Council’s climate change strategy and related matters.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Over the last year the Council’s Sustainability Working Group has contributed to the production of the Surrey Climate Change Strategy which aligns shared goals and sets overarching objectives to better enable climate change to be advance in a co-ordinated manner. This approach has been agreed by Members and the Council is now in a position to draft a local action plan. It is the objective of the Planning Policy Committee Service Plan 2010-2011 draft a strategy for consultation by March 2011. The future work of the Sustainability Working Group is due to be reviewed by October 2010.</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Planning Policy Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | **4.2** The draft energy and water management policy should be further developed to include:  
  • more detailed and specific plans for reducing energy and water usage and carbon emissions  
  • details of the oversight and care required to measure compliance | Medium                      | Y              | The Council has set up an Energy Working Group that is currently working with Setsquare Energy Solutions Ltd to develop a priority list of actions that will make the most significant carbon savings across the estate.  
The Council carried out an initial electricity assessment – Apr 2011  
Detailed water assessment – Apr 2011 | Policy – Dec 2010  
Detailed electricity assessment – Apr 2011  
Detailed water | Head of IT |

---

3 We have been in contact with management to gain assurances that the policy will be updated to reflect appropriate oversight and governance arrangements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Categorisation (H, M, L, S)</th>
<th>Accepted (Y/N)</th>
<th>Management Comment</th>
<th>Implementation Date</th>
<th>Manager Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>governance arrangements that will be needed to monitor effective implementation of the policy and reduction plans.</td>
<td>(H, M, L, S)</td>
<td>(Y/N)</td>
<td>analysis of energy usage and water consumption which showed that gas consumption was okay but the focus needed to be on electricity, followed by water.</td>
<td>assessment – Oct 2011&lt;br&gt;Detailed gas assessment – Dec 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
FOR 2010/11 AUDITS
The priority of the recommendations made is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Recommendations are prioritised to reflect our assessment of risk associated with the control weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>These are not formal recommendations that impact our overall opinion, but used to highlight a suggestion or idea that management may want to consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall conclusions for every assignment will be depicted on a speedometer.
We have provided guidelines for each segment of the speedometer to provide the Audit Committee (or equivalent) with some context behind each of the ratings.

**RED**
Taking account of the issues identified, the Authority cannot take assurance that the controls upon which the organisation relies to manage this risk are suitably designed, consistently applied or effective.

**AMBER-RED**
Action needs to be taken to ensure this risk is managed. Taking account of the issues identified, whilst the Authority can take some assurance that the controls upon which the organisation relies to manage this risk are suitably designed, consistently applied and effective, action needs to be taken to ensure this risk is managed.

**AMBER-GREEN**
Taking account of the issues identified, the Authority can take reasonable assurance that the controls upon which the organisation relies to manage this risk are suitably designed, consistently applied and effective. However we have identified issues that, if not addressed, increase the likelihood of the risk materialising.

**GREEN**
Taking account of the issues identified, the Authority can take reasonable assurance that the controls upon which the organisation relies to manage this risk are suitably designed, consistently applied and effective.
APPENDIX C: STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 2008/09 AND PRIOR YEARS

Breakdown of implementation status by review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Assurance provided in original report</th>
<th>Total number of recs agreed.</th>
<th>Status of Recommendation</th>
<th>Audit work confirmed as completed or no longer necessary (1)+(4)</th>
<th>No of recs carried forward for follow up at next review (2)+(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008/09 Audits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented (1)</td>
<td>Implementatio n Ongoing (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Resource Management</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Enforcement</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendering and Procurement</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007/08 Audits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106 Agreements</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006/07 Audits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Registration</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Management Review</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating System and Active Directory</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationship Management &amp; Data Quality Review</td>
<td>n/a-advisory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other recommendations followed up as part of 2009/10 reviews</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total followed up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Management no longer considers that implementation of these recommendations warranted- see management comments in section 2
Status of Recommendations by Categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation of Recommendation</th>
<th>Total number of recs agreed.</th>
<th>Recs. not due for implementation (5)</th>
<th>Implemented (1)</th>
<th>Being Implemented (2)</th>
<th>Not Implemented (3)</th>
<th>Superseded (4)</th>
<th>Audit work confirmed as complete d (1)+(4)</th>
<th>No of recs carried forward to next review (2)+(3)+(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merits Attention</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One significant recommendation has now been reclassified as merits attention – so numbers do not agree with those shown on page 2
THE BRIBERY ACT

The Bribery Act: Can You Afford to Gamble?

28 June 2010
Client Briefing - Gen 05.10

THE BRIBERY ACT

The tough new Bribery Act heralds the end of an era of practice and law described by the Law Commission as “riddled with uncertainty and in need of rationalisation”. Having received Royal Assent in April this year, organisations need to understand the legislative requirements and act now to ensure compliance, or risk exposing themselves to an unlimited fine, up to ten years imprisonment for Directors and critical damage to the reputation of the organisation. With the stakes this high, you cannot afford to gamble and risk the consequences. Organisations must ensure that they have incorporated adequate procedures into their standard operational practice and control framework that are designed to prevent bribery in order to mitigate their liability.

The new Bribery Act has created four principal offences:

- Offering, promising or giving of an advantage;
- Requesting, agreeing to receive or accepting of an advantage;
- Bribery of a foreign public official; and
- Failing to prevent bribery (‘failing to prevent bribery’ is the new corporate offence which commercial organisations must act to set in place appropriate procedures to stamp out unethical business practices).

ADEQUATE PROCEDURES

The adequate procedures that the Act requires commercial organisations to adopt also represents good governance and best practice for the public sector. This preventive approach to anti-bribery is not prescriptive however it will include anti-bribery policies, training of staff, clear guidance and limits on corporate entertainment and gifts, plus better due diligence on agents and business partners. You should be preparing now and not wait until the Government issues guidance on what constitutes ‘adequate procedures’ to ensure you do not fall foul of the legislation.
HOW WE CAN HELP YOU
RSM Tenon can assist by working with you to design, deliver and embed a comprehensive and bespoke Anti-Bribery Programme including:

- A bespoke anti-bribery policy;
- Updating internal codes of conduct and policies such as gifts and hospitality, declarations of interests, Standing Financial Instructions, and whistleblowing;
- Deliver a communication strategy to both internal staff and external contractors;
- Training to all staff as well as targeting high risk areas such as procurement and finance; and
- A comprehensive bribery risk assessment to identify areas of the highest risk of exposure.

With unlimited fines, potential jail sentences and reputational devastation, ask the question: can your organisation afford to gamble?

IF YOU REQUIRE FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT

John Baker                                      John Slater
Director of Fraud Solutions                    National Investigations Manager
Tel: 07753 584 973                             Tel: 07753 584 990
Email: john.baker@rsmtenon.com                 Email: john.slater@rsmtenon.com
## National Indicators for 2010/11

### Resources Related National Indicators 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N179</td>
<td>Value for money - total net value of ongoing cash-releasing value for money gains that have impacted since the start of the financial year.</td>
<td>On target in 2009/10 return made at end of July. 10/11 estimate to be provided to CLG in October.</td>
<td>£1,081,000</td>
<td>£1,059,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N181</td>
<td>Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events</td>
<td>Currently exceeding Target, this achievement must be recognised in the context of continued increases in caseload (month on month)</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Related National Indicators 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N156</td>
<td>Number of households living in temporary accommodation</td>
<td>Above target. No identifiable cause but number fluctuates throughout the year.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N158</td>
<td>The proportion of LA homes which were non-decent at the start of the financial year.</td>
<td>Current figure given compares with April 2010 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Related National Indicators 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N157a</td>
<td>Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for ‘major’ application types</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N157b</td>
<td>Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for ‘minor’ application types</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>77.48%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N157c</td>
<td>Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for ‘other’ application types</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>88.29%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Services Related National Indicators 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N191</td>
<td>Residual household waste per household - (total collected per head)</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>710 (430)kg</td>
<td>610 (365)kg</td>
<td>710 (430)kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N192</td>
<td>Household waste recycled and composted</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>N195</td>
<td>Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti, litter, detritus and fly posting) - failure rate</td>
<td>Based on 3 inspections a year at specified times. The first measurement window shows 3%, 2%, 6% and 0% respectively.</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resources Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>End of Aug</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Estimated out-turn</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RL1</td>
<td>The percentage of invoices for commercial goods and services that were paid by the Council within 30 days of such invoices being received by the Council.</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL2</td>
<td>Percentage of Council Tax collected.</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>49.18%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>98.20%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL3</td>
<td>The percentage of non-domestic rates due for the financial year which were received by the Council.</td>
<td>Below target profile of 51% which is thought to be due to unallocated funds currently in suspense - anticipate these will be cleared by October.</td>
<td>49.32%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL4</td>
<td>The number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness absence.</td>
<td>On target (July)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>End of Aug</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Estimated out-turn</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL1</td>
<td>Local Council rent collection and arrears: proportion of rent collected.</td>
<td>On par with previous years</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>99.30%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL2</td>
<td>Local authority rent collection and arrears: rent arrears of current tenants as a proportion of the authority’s rent roll.</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL3</td>
<td>Average time taken to re-let local authority housing (days).</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL4</td>
<td>The percentage of urgent repairs completed within Government time limits</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL5</td>
<td>The number of households who considered themselves homeless, who approached the Council and for whom housing advice casework intervention resolved their situation</td>
<td>On par with previous years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Services Local Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>End of Aug</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Estimated out-turn</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSL1</td>
<td>Average percentage of missed waste collections per week</td>
<td>Below target. Reflects increase use of temporary staff</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSL2</td>
<td>Average time to remove fly-tips - working days</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSL3</td>
<td>The overall performance against a basket of local targets regarding Environmental complaints/services</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSL4</td>
<td>Performance against local targets to deal with food poisoning/notification of infectious disease</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Desired Outcomes</td>
<td>Progress – September 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 LSP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Support and advance agreed objectives</td>
<td>• Co-ordinated approach to collaboration with partners.</td>
<td>• The 2006 - 2011 Community Strategy themes and targets are being progressed through four projects. Monitoring of progress against the Community Strategy action plan takes place at LSP meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved quality of life for residents.</td>
<td>• The A Better Caterham (ABC) Healthcheck process is progressing. The ABC group has reconstituted as a company (Caterham Community Partnership).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 ESIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Support and advance agreed objectives</td>
<td>• An exemplar vehicle for the delivery of efficient and effective services in collaboration with others.</td>
<td>• ESIP board decided in January 2008 that time was not right to take a major shared services initiative forward. Achievements so far include joint officer and member training; sharing of some key officers; joint ICT infrastructure; shared HR and Revenues systems; a voice and profile for East Surrey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ESIP will continue to focus on joint collaboration projects particularly ICT, and Epsom and Ewell has joined the Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint ISP contract now negotiated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MVDC, EEBCC &amp; TDC joint ICT resilience proposal agreed and being implemented. Guildford has now joined the network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrey First project now underway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrey First infrastructure being built on ESIP model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Waverley joining ICT resilience framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MOU for mutual ICT reliance ready for completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint working to provide managed parking services on behalf of SCC by ESIP authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.3 Medium Term Financial Plan | Maintain links with Corporate Objectives | • Consideration by Resources Committee at least annually. Currently October meeting.  
• Sustainable service development.  
• An effective use of resources promoting a positive ‘direction of travel’.  
• Report presented to Resources Committee annually in October  
• Resources allocated to key service priorities during budget round eg recycling and garden waste collection with consequential service improvements.  
• Overall score of Level 3 achieved in 2006, 2007 and 2008 assessment representing ‘consistently above minimum requirements – performing well’. |
| 1.4 Caterham Town Centre and Oxted Gasholder site | Facilitate revitalisation at Caterham Town Centre and urge redevelopment at Oxted gasholder site | • Enhanced public engagement.  
• More public/private sector collaboration.  
• Improved sustainability and vitality.  
• Additional “pump priming” funds.  
• Support continuing for the Caterham Community Partnership (1.1 above refers) initiative. £210,000 has been secured from SEEDA (£95K), TDC (£45K), SCC (£45K) and Parishes (25K) for street scene improvements and economic development activities.  
• Meeting held with local representatives from the CCP encouraging private sector interest in developing the former Rose & Young site, Caterham. Meetings held with prospective private developers March and July 2010. Renewed contact made with owner of site July 2010.  
• Proposals agreed with Network Rail and Southern trains operating company for improved access to down-side at Oxted Station and lift now installed.  
• Agents acting for the owners of the gasholder site have advised that although feasibility studies have been undertaken and proposals drawn up to replace gasholder, a potential planning application is on hold due to economic downturn. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress – September 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Delivering service improvements and Value for Money | 2.1 Recycling | Extend range of materials collected. | • Wider take up of service and therefore increased proportion of materials diverted from landfill.  
• Reduction in collection and disposal costs | • New planning policy statement regarding recycling and refuse facilities in new developments adopted in January 2007 and now operating with planned facilities being installed as part of development.  
• Pilot weekly plastics scheme introduced July 2006 which has generated increased participation. Extended in 2007/8 to other areas of the District and includes plastics.  
• Service extended successfully to Hurst Green and Oxted autumn 2007. Further scheme extension rolled out to parts of Caterham in February 2008. Further expansion to rest of District areas now undertaken from February 2009.  
• Banks improvement initiative undertaken in 2007/08 to modernise and refresh principal recycling banks/bring sites in Tandridge using partnership monies provided from the Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.  
• Garden waste collection scheme introduced in May 2009 to enable residents to send waste for composting rather than landfill. 3,900 subscribers signed up.  
• Trade waste recycling being investigated.  
• Environmental Initiative Grant paid to Tatsfield Parish Council for Garden Composting Project (September 2010). |
| | 2.2 Equality & Diversity | Progress the Council’s Equality and Diversity Strategy up to Level 3 in 2007/08 | • Embedded ethos ensuring equitable service delivery.  
• Meet statutory requirements.  
• Enhanced public engagement. | • Level 3 of the Local Government Equality Standard.  
• Disability Equality Scheme action plan being regularly monitored in consultation with local Access Group. Ongoing liaison with the Access Group and the East Surrey Physical and Sensory Partnership Board is being maintained including Officer Presentations at meetings as and when required.  
• Survey undertaken to identify staff with disabilities.  
• DisabledGo commissioned to provide an online access guide to 500 Tandridge venues (contract period 2009 to 2014) - launched in October 2009.  
• Corporate commitment to enhance the accessibility of the TDC website.  
• Contribution to regional review of Gypsy and Traveler Accommodation needs.  
• Further discussions with SCC to take place over future management arrangements for 3 gypsy sites in Tandridge.  
• A review of requirements for Disability Symbol (two ticks) in December 2009 confirms TDC met requirements.  
• Evidence given at the public Examination into the Regional Gypsy and Traveler Accommodation Plan in 2010, prior to the Inspector’s report and Government decision. |
| 2.3 Performance improvement | Target key service areas to drive up performance | • Quality services which meet targets and compare favourably nationally, respecting local priorities.  
• Focus on key issues  
• Generate savings | • A revised suite of Key PIs reflecting both local and CPA priorities has been recommended to Overview and Scrutiny Committee.  
• Quarterly reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committee.  
• Increase in number of KPIs meeting local targets.  
• Internal audit has assessed “data quality” at substantial assurance level.  
• New National indicators being evaluated.  
• Targets set for new NIs and Local Indicators selected (March 2010).  
• AAIL for 2007/08 commends above average improvement in performance.  
• Increased amounts of legal work undertaken for other Surrey authorities bringing in additional income. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.4 Customer Services and other Service Initiatives | Review customer access channels | • More efficient and effective service delivery in line with customer preferences.  
• Effective delivery of planning services.  
• Increased capacity | • In 2008 Place Survey, 54% satisfied with the way TDC runs things (national average is 45%) and 86% satisfied with Tandridge as a place to live.  
• Core Strategy declared sound September 2008.  
• Officer group has reviewed provision consulting with staff and ESIP partners to address changes in customer behaviour and usage of telephone and internet. Has analysed data and noted that telephone and email usage is continuing to grow significantly. Preparing proposals to better manage telephones, reception and mail services as analysis of survey results confirms increasing demand for internet and phone based systems. Resources Committee approved revised Customer Services Strategy in October 2007. Customer Services Team Leader appointed to implement strategy and Team beginning to take more calls from public.  
• New Team now in place and front reception area revised.  
• Building Control Service & Local Land Charges represented at Local Business Event 2008 and 2009.  
• Commencement of process to produce Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to include land consultation on methodology; and Parish Council, developer and local resident involvement in stakeholder panel (March 2009). Stakeholder group met in June 2009.  
• Restructuring of some tasks enabling their more efficient delivery by Customer Services Team; plans to absorb post and scanning operations in 2010.  
• Core Strategy Policy 3 (CPS3) relating to housing land supply re-instated December 2009.  
• Status of Green Belt Settlements clarified in November 2009. |
| 2.4 Customer Services and other Service Initiatives Con’d.... | • A strategic review of the sheltered housing service completed in June 2010. The service will now be remodelled.  
|                                                                 | • All tenants are being consulted about housing service standards in relation to the Tenant Services Authority national standards for housing.  
|                                                                 | • Following extensive public consultation including close working with local residents and site owner, a supplementary planning document has been produced and adopted for the former Marie Curie Hospice Site, Harestone, Caterham – March 2010.  
|                                                                 | • Following feedback at Agents’ Forums, a simplified validation list for the registration of planning applications was adopted March 2010.  
|                                                                 | • Agents appointed to undertake Character Appraisal work as supplementary planning guidance. Initial survey work completed for pilot study areas in Harestone and Woldingham.  
|                                                                 | • Statement issued regarding the Tandridge approach to Government initiatives on planning.  
|                                                                 | • Documents approved for consultation on Harestone and Woldingham Design documents; Green Belt Villages; and the Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) – all September 2010.  
|                                                                 | • Programme of attendance agreed for six Parish Council meetings to advise on changes to planning law. Also agreed to attend meeting of East Surrey Parish Councils’ Association (Sept. 2010).  
<p>|                                                                 | • Hosted in Tandridge the SE Local Authority Building Control (LABC) Awards Event (July 2010). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress – September 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Partnerships and capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1 Member/ staff development | Review training, development and support | • Improved business planning and use of resources.  
• Enhanced community engagement and service delivery | • Member training programme in place in respect of planning and standards – subsequently extended to include planning enforcement.  
• All staff have individual training plans as part of the appraisal process.  
• Joint training planned as part of ESIP collaboration.  
• Planning Enforcement training provided for Members Dec 2008.  
• Staff training arranged & delivered for Legal & Planning staff on S106 on a county wide basis.  
• East Surrey Group of Planning Authorities continues jointly to procure services for Local Development Framework (e.g. software, sustainability appraisals and programme officer).  
• Member training on planning arranged September 2009.  
• Member tour of recent developments held in October 2009 with formal de-brief.  
• Joint Member training organized through Surrey Improvement Partnership.  
• Safeguarding training for the protection of children and vulnerable adults and staff, volunteers and contractors undertaken. Now included in the Council’s induction programme.  
• SIP Member Development project delivering a programme of training for all Members across Surrey on a cluster basis.  
• Member Training held on specific Planning Policy Matter (Policy CSP3) February 2010.  
• Member training on Planning held in May 2010 and New Member Induction in June 2010.  
• Meeting held with new MP in June 2010.  
• Officer attendance at Warlingham Parish Council Annual Assembly (guest speaker) May 2010; and at Burstow Parish Council (Member Training on Planning) June 2010.  
• Comments provided to Warlingham Parish Council on its draft Village Design Statement (September 2010).  
• TDC officer representing all Districts on Surrey wide multi agency Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Board.  
• TDC officer chairs Vulnerable Adult Services Case Review Group. |
3.3 Joint working with non ESIP organisations

Maximise joint working opportunities

- Expand existing partnerships.
- Increased resilience/capacity.
- Raise Council's profile.

- Dialogue with other Councils such as Sevenoaks on co-operation and joint working opportunities
- Joint working at a sub-regional level between the four East Surrey housing authorities (Tandridge, Epsom & Ewell, Mole Valley and Reigate & Banstead) has
  - seen the introduction of a sub-regional Choice Based Lettings Scheme (East Surrey Home Choice) in June 2008;
  - produced a joint East Surrey Housing Strategy for the period 2009-2013;
  - enabled participation in the Government’s Housing Options Trailblazers initiative by the development of a scheme that links housing advice with employment and training advice – aimed at breaking the link between homelessness, unemployment and social exclusion;
  - led to plans to develop a Housing Options for Older People Service (HOOPS) to assist them to move to a smaller or adapted home; and
  - attracted additional government grants totaling over £700,000 across the 4 authorities to provide mainly heating and insulation for older people and those on benefit.
- Sevenoaks and Tandridge seeking to identify areas of common interest.
- Out of hours stray dog service achieved in partnership with Mid Sussex DC and Crawley BC.
- Became the first Borough/District Council to formally sign up to the Multi-Agency Surrey Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Partnership Agreement.
- Surrey-wide Legal Framework Contract implemented estimated to save £1M across the county over the next 4 years.
- Hosted Annual Conference for Sussex Community Rail Partnership, June 2010
- Surrey First partnering progressing for Waste, HR, Procurement, ICT and Asset Management.
- Agreement reached with Sevenoaks to undertake technical capital programme work on leisure facilities with £4k saving to TDC.
| 3.4 ICT | Maximise benefits from ICT | • Rationalisation of systems across ESIP partnerships.  
• Increased resilience. | • Success of self help systems such as planning interactive to be developed.  
• Advertising now accepted on Website.  
• Desktop virtualisation to roll out by March 2011.  
• Electronic Document Management is being implemented in all major operational areas.  
• Remote and flexible working technology now available in line with staff development.  
• Virtualisation has reduced energy and operating costs in server areas, now looking to reduce office desktop costs during 2010/11.  
• Resilience arrangements improved internally and externally with ESIP partners.  
• Partnership with Mole Valley’s Legal Department has resulted in TDC benefiting from a superior case management system at a minimal cost and achieving long term savings.  
• Rationalisation of legal library and IT database has produced savings.  
• Surrey purchasing framework for IT procurement agreed by officer group.  
• Virtualisation of servers reduced energy consumption by 7.5%.  
• Replacement of multiple consultation letters on planning applications with web-based and telephone self-help alternative (July 2010). |
| 3.5 External Consultants | Procure external expertise where required | • Reduces overheads and risk.  
• Buy-in expertise on a needs basis. | • Market leader expertise sought to advise on ‘soundness’ of LDF Core Strategy.  
• Procurement of design advice for planning service changed to expert panel approach.  
• Use of interim staff and consultancy to cover staff vacancies in Planning Dept.  
• Continued use of consultants on planning enforcement issue.  
• County-wide legal procurement exercise undertaken.  
• IESE agree to undertake work with the Council on Asset Management and County-wide Infrastructure Study.  
• Engaged IESE to consider efficiency and effectiveness of current arrangements around the provision of Environmental Health Services.  
• Submissions by over 40 consultancies regarding character studies for Woldingham and Harestone Valley.  
• Further partnerships set up in Building Control – now seven consultancies partner with Tandridge Building Control by submitting nationwide proposals for Building Control approval.  
• IESE provided consultancy support for TDC during development of efficiency challenge tool for use by Districts/Boroughs.  
• Consultants appointed to undertake Woldingham and Harestone character studies. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress – September 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Modernisation and learning | 4.1 Customer focus | Progress Customer Services Strategy | • Organisational flexibility and responsiveness.  
• Customer choice | • Target areas for improvement have been identified through analysis of customer behaviour.  
• Officer proposals have been worked into a revised plan for customer services which would enable a more responsive service based on first point of call access for the public whilst reducing the load on professional services.  
• Strategy to address coping with 750,000 telephone calls per year (3,500 per day) and rapidly increasing internet use worked up. (See 2.4)  
• Communications survey of 2,000 households and 1,000 businesses completed in 2007.  
• Planning Forums held for developers and Parishes to give updates on service improvements  
• Improved pre-application advice service launched for prospective planning applicants.  
• Sub-regional Choice Based Lettings Scheme, offering housing applicants greater choice and transparency, has been agreed following consultation  
• Use of automated telephony services in Lettings, Amenities, Council Tax and Revenues is delivering an out of hour’s service to in excess of 1500 enquiries a month.  
• New Customer Services Team has been established and telephone system updated with more flexible features.  
• Meetings with local residents groups on unauthorized travelers’ sites; and on potential future housing development sites (Dec 08 and Feb 09).  
• Seminar held June 2009 for Parish Councils, updating them on planning matters.  
• 2 projects in Tandridge won awards in Local Authority Building Control (LABC) Awards Scheme.  
• Support for local residents and businesses by resolving early to grant planning permission for 5 years (instead of 3 years) June 2009.  
• Support from District Council to first Caterham Festival June 2009.  
• Two Tandridge projects won awards in Local Authority Building Control Awards Scheme 2010. |
| 4.2 Structure of local government | Maintain, review and respond to government proposals | • Identify and maximise any benefits arising.  
• Align any opportunities to local priorities. | • No authority in Surrey took up the government invitation to submit proposals for unitary councils. Work continues to maximise the benefits of two tier government locally with Surrey County Council, through Surrey Local Government Association. |
| 4.3 Shared learning | Identify and promote good practice | • Increased capacity through staff development  
  • Innovative business solutions |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                     | • Staff training needs identified and post-entry training in place.  
  • Staff attending courses delivered through Surrey Shared Training Programme. £100K funding secured until 2011.  
  • Training classes held for senior managers from all Surrey authorities.  
  • Coaching Classes held for senior managers – 3 attended from TDC.  
  • Leadership development for 22 Senior Manager in progress.  
  • Trained TDC staff provides training on Safeguarding Adults and Children to local housing associations, voluntary organizations/volunteers.  
  • Training on planning and highway issues provided by District and SCC officers.  
  • Training on preventing terrorism provided by Special Branch officers as part of Prevent Strategy.  
  • Leadership Development course completed by Senior Managers.  
  • A wide-ranging strategic review of the sheltered housing service is underway, in consultation with tenants and partner agencies, which is examining the needs and aspirations of older people; how they can be given greater choice; aimed at modernizing the service.  
  • Increased choice and flexibility in the models of service available to residents – e.g. resident staff v peripatetic, floating support, use of telecare, service standards.  
  • Review of Surrey Shared Training Programme being carried out by Training Officer to ensure it meets the needs of Surrey Authorities. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress – September 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Risk Management | 5.1 Risks arising from actions above | To effectively manage all action plans from a risk perspective | • To reduce, control or eliminate the risks associated with this Improvement Plan and demonstrate that risk management is embedded in all aspects of the Council’s work.  
• To formally update the registers half yearly at 30th March and 30th September. | • Corporate and departmental registers regularly updated. Web based IT system installation completed and fully in use.  
• Risk registers being regularly monitored and major update and monitoring exercise undertaken for most service areas.  
• Work on business continuity contingency planning continuing.  
• Internal Audit Assessment of substantial assurance for this area. |