

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 20 DECEMBER 2011 AT 2.00PM  
AT COUNTY HALL**

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Cabinet at its next meeting.

Members:

\*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)  
\*Mrs Mary Angell  
\*Mrs Helen Clack  
\*Mr Michael Gosling  
\*Mr Tim Hall

\*Mrs Kay Hammond  
\*Mr Ian Lake  
\*Mr Peter Martin  
\*Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos  
\*Mr Tony Samuels

\* = Present

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**172/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

There were no apologies.

**173/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 29 November 2011 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2011 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**174/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Mr Tim Hall declared a personal interest in minute item 183/11 and left the room during the consideration of this item. Reason: He is a director of the Leatherhead Youth Project.

**175/11 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

**(a) Public Questions.**

Two questions had been received from members of the public. The questions and agreed responses are attached as **Appendix 1 to these minutes.**

In addition to the questions of which written notice had been given, Mr Lee Godfrey asked a supplementary question to the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games. The question related to the response which Mr Godfrey had received to a Freedom of Information request submitted on 18 November 2011 in relation to the proposals for Community Libraries. Mr Godfrey questioned the information about costs and savings which had been provided and asked whether the information had been fabricated or if the Council had failed to comply with its legal obligation to provide the full breakdown of figures he had asked for.

Though the initial response was that it was not thought that either of these suggestions had been the case, it was agreed that the matter would be looked into and a written response provided to Mr Godfrey.

**(b) Members' Questions.**

Four questions were received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills). The questions and agreed responses are attached as **Appendix 1 to these minutes**.

In addition to the questions of which written notice had been given, Mrs Watson asked three supplementary questions. A summary of the questions and responses is set out below.

**Supplementary to Question 1** – The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment was asked to clarify the status of the woodfuel policy. A response had been given at Council which indicated that the council had a woodfuel policy in place, however the response to the Cabinet question indicated that it was a guidance note.

**Response:** The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment advised that the response given was correct in that it represented guidance and that he would follow the matter up.

**Supplementary to Questions 2 and 3** – Mrs Watson asked when the position of the Investment Panel would be regularised so that policy was not made by officers.

**Response:** The Chairman advised that the Investment Panel was not a policy making body.

**Supplementary to Question 4** – Mrs Watson asked whether an assurance could be given that, in relation to the Mobile Library Service, all residents who wanted it were still receiving a service.

**Response:** The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games confirmed that this was the case.

**176/11 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

**(a) Legacy 2012**

The recommendations of the Communities Select Committee on the Legacy 2012 report (discussed under minute item 185/11 in Part 2 of the meeting) were noted. The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games noted that the Select Committee had recognised the importance of legacy and endorsed the projects included in the report. All steps had been and would be taken to ensure that the road maintenance and improvement programme continues as planned and is not distorted by the Olympic 2012 Legacy projects.

The Cabinet's response is attached as **Appendix 2 to these minutes**.

**(b) Call-in of On-Street Parking Decision**

The recommendations arising from the Environment and Transport Select Committee's call-in of the decision arising from the recommendations of the On Street Parking Task Group were discussed. Steve Renshaw, Chairman of the Environment and Transport Select Committee, addressed the meeting to express his thanks to those involved in the call-in meeting and endorse the comments which had been made. He noted that the meeting had enabled a good exchange of views and was pleased that recognition

had been given to the issues surrounding the involvement of the local committees in parking management.

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment noted that the meeting had represented a good piece of scrutiny. The Chairman thanked Mr Renshaw for the work which his Committee had done and would continue to do.

The Cabinet's response is attached as **Appendix 3 to these minutes**.

#### **177/11 ARRANGEMENTS TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY PARTNERED LIBRARIES (Item 6)**

The delivery of library services via community partnership was agreed in ten locations in by Cabinet in September 2011. Since that time a number of community groups have come forward and have been working with the Library Service for some months on forming community partnerships to manage the libraries in their localities. The County Council was now close to a formal agreement with many of these groups and others are actively in hand. The Council was very appreciative of the energy and determination with which these communities have risen to the challenge. The County Council is therefore determined to ensure that it provides support to community partners that is as good as limited resources allow at this time of financial restraint.

The County Council was therefore creating a Community Partnered Libraries Sector Team which would provide a guaranteed level of on-site support to the Community Partnered Libraries. This support would be based on 20% of the current open hours of each Library.

The nine libraries (Ash, Caterham Hill, Frimley Green, Hersham, Horsley, Knaphill, Lightwater, Shepperton and West Byfleet) which had also been identified by the Public Value Review of Libraries as part of the Community Libraries structure would continue to form part of the Surrey County Council-managed Libraries Network irrespective of the outcome of the evaluation of the success of Community Partnered Libraries. The Medium-Term Financial Plan for the Library Service allows for these libraries to continue to operate at their current level of service and opening hours. However, in times of such severe financial stringency for public services, there can be no absolute guarantee that no further reductions in the costs of the Library Service would need to be made.

Though it was recognised that this had been a hard decision for the Council to make and for the communities involved to accept, the keen interest in the development of these partnerships and the way in which communities had risen to the challenge was appreciated. The example of Warlingham Library was given as a location where it was felt that tremendous local involvement could lead to a renaissance in the service. The long term objective would retain the support of library services through the measures announced and it was noted that the steps taken in Surrey had avoided the closures made by other local authorities. However the Cabinet noted that further worsening of the financial situation for the County Council would mean that reconsideration of the issues involved could not be ruled out in the future.

## **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the creation and operation of the Community Partnered Libraries Sector Team, as outlined in paragraphs 2-9 of the report submitted, be agreed.
- (2) That the guarantee that Community Partnered Libraries will receive on-site support from this team based on 20% of the current open hours (2011) of each Library be agreed.
- (3) That it be agreed that the nine identified Community Libraries (Ash, Caterham Hill, Frimley Green, Hersham, Horsley, Knaphill, Lightwater, Shepperton and West Byfleet) continue to form part of the SCC-managed Libraries Network irrespective of the outcome of the evaluation of the success of Community Partnered Libraries.

### **Reasons for decisions:**

The creation of the Community Partnered Libraries Sector Team and the guarantee of on-site and ongoing support from experienced SCC Library Service staff, will provide stability and confidence to our community partners and contribute to the success of the libraries under their management.

The retention of the nine identified libraries as part of the SCC-managed Library Network provides certainty for the future of the Library Network within the context of the current Medium Term Financial Plan for the County Council.

## **178/11 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR NOVEMBER 2011 (PERIOD 8) (Item 7)**

The November 2011 projection for the 2011/12 service revenue budget outturn showed a net underspending of £5.4 million. The Medium Term Financial Plan target of £59.3m of savings in 2011/12 was forecast to be exceeded by £2.6m. These savings were in addition to the £67m saved the previous year. The council's available balances were projected to be £34m at the year end.

The in-year capital budget had risen to £175m and was forecast to underspend by -£30m by the year end, mainly due to the re-profiling of projects but also some schemes forecast to be completed under budget. A significant proportion of this in-year re-profiling, £9.6m, related to the schools' basic needs projects, on which the capital expenditure will begin in 2012/13. There was also an expected £2.5m underspending on these schemes as a result of a reduced scope of work and savings arising from collaboration with Hampshire County Council. A further £5m in year saving had been forecast on the superfast broadband project as this was now due to start in the next financial year. A Fire Capital grant of £1.5m had been received and would be allocated to the Fire Vehicle Replacement Programme.

Cabinet Members noted the robust position that the County's finances were in despite challenging circumstances and with substantial changes arising from central government funding arrangements. All of the council's directorates had reported being on or under the budget targets, though it was acknowledged that there could be no room for complacency. Cabinet Members thanked staff for their efforts and in particular, those staff who would be working over the holiday period such as those involved with children's services.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the budget monitoring position and projected year end variances be noted.
- (2) That the Fire Capital grant (£1.5m) to be contributed to the Fire Vehicle Replacement Programme be approved.
- (3) That government grant changes be reflected in directorate budgets.

**Reason for decisions:**

To comply with the agreed strategy of reporting budget monitoring figures monthly to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

**179/11 2010/11 ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER (Item 8)**

The Annual Audit Letter is the principal means by which the External Auditor reports to the County Council on the outcome of the annual audit of the authority. The most significant areas noted by the auditor were:

- The opinion on the Surrey County Council financial statements and the Value for Money conclusion are unqualified (the auditor has no reservations)
- Considerable progress has been made in streamlining the process for the preparation of the accounts.
- The 'Fit for the Future' programme continues to improve arrangements for securing financial resilience.
- Achievement of the £67million savings for 2010/11 set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan and the current forecast of exceeding the £59.2m savings and efficiencies required for 2011/12 by £1.5 million.

The Cabinet heard from the District Auditor, Mr Paul Grady, and Mr Nick Harrison, Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee on the recommendations and key messages arising from the Letter. Mr Grady advised that the financial management of the organisation was much improved from that of several years ago. He noted that the council had consolidated these gains over the past year with further improvements in its financial management and was largely on track to achieve the savings for the current year. The Public Value Review process was commended as an innovative way to both identify more efficient ways of working and put them into practice. It was noted that Surrey would be receiving a rebate from the Audit Commission and that the fee charged for the audit would be reduced in future.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the contents of the 2010/11 Annual Audit Letter be acknowledged.
- (2) That the Audit & Governance Committee monitor progress on the implementation of the actions required.

**Reason for decisions:**

To ensure that the Cabinet is satisfied that all material issues have been raised and represented correctly in the 2010/11 Annual Audit Letter and that progress on recommendations is monitored.

**180/11 CHANGE & EFFICIENCY PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW: PROPERTY OPERATIONS (EPM) (Item 9)**

The Cabinet considered the report following the Public Value Review of the Council's property operational service in Estate Planning and Management and the related recommendations and action plan. Estate Planning and Management is directly responsible for the management of a portfolio of over 1,500 assets, valued at approximately £1bn. These range from traveller sites to corporate office buildings. The capital budget for 2011/12 is £68m, (including schools and libraries), and the revenue budget for 2011/12 is £33.6m including utility costs, rents, staffing and maintenance.

Savings delivered by the recommendations of the Public Value Review totalled £4.64m (£0.69m from re-structure and £3.95m from improved procurement, process and systems improvements). The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes noted that the adoption of the recommendations was an important step towards the council 'sweating its assets', maximising income and working in a more commercial way.

**RESOLVED:**

That the five recommendations as set out in the report and listed in the action plan attached as **Appendix 4 to these minutes** be approved.

**Reason for decisions:**

To move the Public Value Review of EPM into the implementation phase and drive improved outcomes and value for money for the residents of Surrey.

**181/11 CHANGE & EFFICIENCY PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT AND COMMISSIONING (Item 10)**

The Cabinet considered the report following the Public Value Review of the Procurement and Commissioning Service, its related recommendations and action plan. The Procurement and Commissioning Service provides professional expertise to all Services across the council to ensure that the contracts for the £660m of goods and services which are bought represent the best value for money and quality possible.

The Procurement and Commissioning Service has used the PVR process to revise its overall strategy and vision which will take it on the journey to be best in class by 2017 and get from "Good to Great". The new service vision is to be: "A Centre of Excellence in Commercial Procurement". The new vision describes where we want the Procurement and Commissioning service to be in 2013 and beyond where it will be providing a much broader commercial service across the Council by: providing professional sourcing to deliver the best commercial solutions; offering powerful insight into markets and suppliers throughout the life of our contracts; and to be a leading procurement team in the public sector.

The Chairman noted that the work of the Procurement and Commissioning Service had been instrumental in Surrey County Council receiving international recognition with an award in the USA for its joint work with Skandia on street lighting. He congratulated Members and officers for the achievement and noted that it showed that public authorities were just as capable as commercial companies of coming up with innovative solutions which make Surrey a nice place to live.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the recommendations set out in the report submitted and the action plan attached as **Appendix 5 to these minutes** be agreed.
- (2) That the implementation of the action plan start immediately, led by the Head of Procurement and Commissioning.
- (3) That progress be reported quarterly to the PVR Steering Board and the Member Reference Group

**Reason for decisions:**

To move the Public Value Review of Procurement and Commissioning into the implementation phase so that improved outcomes and value for money are delivered for the residents of Surrey. This supports the Council's ambition to be a best in class authority.

**182/11 SAVINGS ACCOUNTS FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN (Item 11)**

One in 300 children in Surrey are under the council's care in some form. These Looked After Children are amongst the most disadvantaged children and young people in the County. The Council is the parent to those children in its care and has a corporate responsibility towards them. The introduction of a new matched savings scheme will help to encourage the council's Looked After Children to develop personal financial skills and savings for when they become adults.

The scheme will support each Looked After Child to open a current account or other appropriate savings product and a Government Junior LAC ISA where savings can be securely placed up until the child's eighteenth birthday. An incentive for building up savings will be provided by the Council match-funding the savings accrued each tax year to a capped level of £260 pro rata, not including any Government contribution. Accompanying this initiative will be an education programme that will support Looked After Children in developing personal financial skills through objectives set in Personal Education Plans.

Cabinet Members expressed strong support for the scheme which was noted to show that the council could still do things to make a difference even during difficult times.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Council establish and fund a scheme to support and encourage the saving of money by Surrey's Looked After Children with effect from 1 April 2012.
- (2) That, where eligible, the Council will match fund savings in the Junior LAC ISA or child trust fund up to a cap of £260 (pro rata) per annum.
- (3) That the Council also match fund savings accrued by Looked After Children with a child trust fund.
- (4) That the Cabinet Member for Children & Families and the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families be delegated authority to agree the details and administration of the scheme.

- (5) That the scheme be reviewed after 18 months to ensure that it supports its original intentions.

**Reason for decisions:**

The Council's Looked After Children are amongst the most disadvantaged children and young people in the County. This scheme encourages responsible savings and the development of personal financial skills by 4 Looked After Children and uses an incentive to encourage financial skills used by many parents. The Council is the parent to those children in its care.

**183/11 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE:  
CONTRACT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS (Item 12)**

The Cabinet considered an update on the progress of the transformation of Services for Young People and the award of contracts for youth services. The award of contracts for the provision of Centre Based Youth Work and Youth Engagement services, enables the council to meet its duties and ensures improved outcomes for young people in Surrey. In addition, the establishment of a Local Prevention Framework (Approved Provider List) for young people in Surrey, will enable localised preventative services to be delivered to young people throughout the region.

The Cabinet heard representations from Ms Zoe Giles, speaking on behalf of PHAB (Physically Handicapped and Able-Bodied group). Ms Giles informed the Cabinet of the work done by PHAB, which was based at Linton's Lane (a decision relating to the leasehold of this facility was considered under minute item 188/11 at the meeting). Linton's Lane was used by an entirely voluntary group of 100 youngsters which put on a wide range of events and activities for young people including music, drama, dancing, socialising and shows. The young people involved were able to gain confidence and skills that could be used in later life. Groups such as PHAB needed a building and Linton's Lane represented a good location in Epsom and if it was to no longer be available they would have concerns around and another location being found that was fully accessible and with the facilities needed to provide the current range of activities. Ms Giles advised that she understood that the leaseholder of Linton's Lane would need to provide another building.

The Chairman responded to the concerns raised about the Linton's Lane facility with the following statement:

*"The County Council recognises that the existing facility at Linton's Lane is of immense value to the local community and user groups such as PHAB and Disability Challengers, who have used the centre and facilities for many years.*

*The proposals being brought to Cabinet specifically include a requirement to facilitate suitable alternative accommodation for the Youth Service and other third party users, including PHAB.*

*The County Council will not be obliged to give vacant possession to the purchaser until December 2012 at the earliest, which provides ample time for full consultation with all interested groups."*

Mrs Angela Fraser (Banstead East) and Mr Nick Harrison (Banstead West) addressed the Cabinet on the contract awards and any implications relating to Banstead Youth Centre. It was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Community Safety would look into the issues raised and a response would

be sent to both Members and Mr Michael Gosling (Banstead South). This would clarify the position of existing services such as the pre-school and YMCA at Banstead Youth Centre after the contract was transferred to Raven Housing Trust.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the award of contracts to the organisations set out in the Appendix to the report submitted be approved to commence on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012, expiring on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015, with an option to extend for up to 2 further years, to any/all successful providers delivering the following services:
  - Youth Engagement Contract  
Total value of up to £1,200,000 (£1,800,000 including extension period).
  - Centre-based Youth Work Contract(s)  
Total value of up to £987,132.60 (£1,645,221 including extension period).
- (2) That the maximum spend for the Year 11-12 Transition Contracts (Total value of up to £1,500,000 (£2,500,000 including extension period)) be approved and the final award of contract(s) be delegated to the Deputy Leader, Member for Community Safety, Member for Children and Learning and the Assistant Director for Young People.
- (3) That the total spend (Total value of up to £3,750,000 (£6,250,000 including extension period)) with the pre-qualified providers under the Local Prevention Framework (Approved Provider List) between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015, with an option to extend for up to 2 further years be approved.

**Reason for decisions:**

All the existing Connexions contracts will expire by 31 March 2012. A full tender process, in compliance with the relevant Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders was completed and the resolutions provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process. The decisions will aid in making Surrey Services for Young People fit for the future and also support the Council's ambition to be a world-class authority.

*[Note: Mr Tim Hall declared a personal interest and left the room during the consideration of this item.]*

**184/11 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 13)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the decisions taken by the Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as attached as **Appendix 6**, be noted.

**Reason for decision:**

To note the decisions taken by Members under delegated authority.

**185/11 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 9)**

**RESOLVED:** That, under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**P A R T T W O - I N P R I V A T E**

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BUSINESS WERE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE BY THE CABINET. HOWEVER THE INFORMATION SET OUT BELOW IS NOT CONFIDENTIAL.

**186/11 2012 LEGACY (Item 15)**

The Cabinet considered actions pertaining to 2012 legacy.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the hosting of the legacy event set out in paragraph 7 of the report submitted be agreed in principle on the basis set out in the report.
- (2) That a contractual agreement be entered into to host the legacy event set out in paragraph 3 of the report submitted in 2012 and 2013; subject to an annual economic impact assessment in future years.

**Reasons for decisions:**

Hosting the events will build on the Olympic legacy of encouraging healthy lifestyles, the green agenda, sustainable transport development and aligns with the council's community strategy priorities. It will increase the profile and reputation of Surrey as a tourist destination and bring both event specific and year-round economic benefits.

**187/11 APPROVAL OF ALTERATION TO BABCOCK4S JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENT (Item 16)**

The Cabinet considered amendments to Surrey County Council's joint venture contract with Babcock4S.

**RESOLVED:**

That the decision as to whether to agree the alteration of the joint venture agreement proposed in the report submitted be delegated to the Chief Executive subject to the agreement of the Leader of the Council and Deputy Leader to the final details of the financial proposal.

**Reason for decision:**

To enable further negotiations to take place with Babcock with a view to agreeing a financial proposal that represents best value for the county.

**188/11 LINTONS LANE YOUTH CENTRE, EPSOM – REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY (Item 17)**

The Cabinet considered whether to authorise the completion of legal documentation and exchange of contracts for the sale of the County Council's long leasehold interest. The Cabinet Member advised that, since the publication of the report, the prospective purchaser had informed the council of the name of the company in which it was proposed that the transaction would proceed with the prospective purchaser acting as guarantor.

The Cabinet heard representations on this item from Mr Colin Taylor (Epsom and Ewell South West).

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That Option (b) be approved for completion of the legal documentation and exchange of contracts for the sale of the County Council's long leasehold interest on the terms reported on the basis of no re-provision as part of the development of the site.
- (2) That officers be authorised to identify and provide suitable alternative accommodation for the youth service and other users, including PHAB, in full consultation with the service and relevant Cabinet Portfolio Holders, that ensures service continuity.

**Reason for decisions:**

The proposed Agreement and transactions with the freeholder and purchaser offer the County Council the option of realising a significant capital receipt that can be used to support wider service and corporate 6 objectives, including alternative accommodation and service re-provision elsewhere in the local community.

**189/11 APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR HOSPITAL ROUNDABOUT HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS (Additional Item 19)**

The Cabinet considered the award of a joint contract with the University of Surrey for highways infrastructure improvements to Hospital Roundabout, Guildford. During the discussion of this item it was agreed that officers would be asked to ensure that measures were in place to mitigate the potential impact of the works, for examples by adopting a methodology for the works which phases the working hours to ensure they take place quickly, efficiently and any ease additional congestion as much as possible.

**RESOLVED:**

That a contract with the University of Surrey to commence on the 21<sup>st</sup> December 2011 be awarded to the company set out in the report submitted for the amount stated in the report, with Surrey's contribution capped at £2 million.

**Reason for decision:**

The scheme aims to reduce significant peak time congestion at the Surrey Research Park and the Royal Surrey Hospital and is designed to sustain and grow jobs in Guildford. In the immediate vicinity, traffic delay will be reduced at a well-known local bottleneck, which will improve emergency response times to the Hospital.

*[Note: This item was considered under special urgency procedures.]*

*Reason for urgency: The decision related to the award of a contract taking place via a joint procurement and could not be delayed until the next meeting.]*

**190/11 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 18)**

**RESOLVED:**

That a press release be issued in relation to the improvements to Hospital Roundabout (excluding any confidential details of the contract) at the appropriate time.

**[The meeting closed at 4.38pm]**

---

**Chairman**

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

**4(a) Public Questions****Question (1) from Ms Margaret Williams:**

“Paragraph 8 in the report to cabinet on the Library Service contains an incorrect statement – that the 10 libraries earmarked to take the entire brunt of service cuts are suffering from “declining use”. I am not in possession of figures from all of these but in the case of Bagshot Library, local to me, County statistics show:

- A. an *increase* in use, a 28% rise in active borrowers over the past 5 years
- B. that the usage per head of catchment population is proportionate to that of most other libraries in Surrey and
- C. that the cost of an issue at Bagshot is *lower* than average for Surrey, and considerably lower than that at the nearest Class A library, making it in fact more cost effective to deliver the service at Bagshot.

Given these facts, why has the mis-statement been made in the report, and how is it justified on the basis of usage or cost to withdraw the tiny staffing budget from Bagshot Library?”

**Reply**

The report to Cabinet dated 20th December 2011 states that the changes to the SCC core managed network do not change the Public Value Review findings that identified 10 libraries which are at the limits of sustainability. It goes on to say that many of these ten libraries have been considered for closure in the past, in some cases more than once, largely due to two criteria, low level and declining use.

While Bagshot library's increase in use is admirable in 2010 it had 642 active users and 12,025 visits per annum. It is an increase on a very small base. To give a sense of scale, in comparison Camberley library has 9,424 active users and visits of 156,165 per annum. Bagshot is in the group of ten libraries largely due to low level of use and has been considered for closure in the past, always on the basis of its continuing low levels of use which as the review states puts it at the limit of sustainability and will continue to do so.

The proposal to offer it for community partnership is a pragmatic way forward to remove uncertainty and give the community the opportunity to increase its use.

**Denise Saliagopoulos**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**Question (2) from Mr Lee Godfrey:**

“In the Council Leader's statement to Cabinet on the 29th November 2011, David Hodge stated that he'd included the "second tranche" of CPL libraries in the core managed service because he had "listened and learned."

Could Mr Hodge tell us who he listened to and what persuaded him that turning these libraries into Community Partnered Libraries was a bad idea worthy of abandoning?”

**Reply**

Contrary to the question, I **do not** feel that Community Partnered Libraries are a bad idea; in fact, I think they are an **innovative alternative** to closure.

It is best if one looks at this recent change in the context of the financial constraints that the County Council is under, where we are required to save £207m over the next four years, and the grant we receive from central government has been reduced by 10.4% for next year alone.

One of the recommendations of the Library Service PVR was to create a strategic core library network of 33 libraries, as a **future planning tool** for the delivery of the service. We are now proposing to add to that the 9 libraries referred to in the question, as the Medium-Term Financial Plan for the Library Service **allows** for these libraries to continue to operate at their current level of service, and operating hours. Therefore, I feel it is best, under these circumstances, to move these libraries into the core network.

**Denise Saliagopoulos**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

#### **4(b) Members' Questions**

<b>Question (1) from Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):</b>
--

"What is the County Council's Woodfuel Policy, and where is it publicly available?"

#### **Reply**

The County Council's Energy Team within Estates Planning and Management is currently working within operational guidelines for wood fuel. This supports of the Council's commitment to meet a greater proportion of its energy demand through renewable fuels including biomass boilers, in the most cost effective manner, which is contained in the member approved 'Energy and Carbon Policy', which was approved by Cabinet on 27 April 2010.

Within this context, the switch to local and renewable wood fuel heating has been championed by the Council since May 2010 and so far has been referred to as the 'Wood fuel policy'. However, as an essentially operational guidance note, the Wood fuel document has not so far been made publicly available.

For Mrs Watson's information, the current wood fuel guidance states that wood fuel boilers are the default heating preference, subject to a life cycle business case and approval by investment panel.

The Council's Sustainability team is defining the potential for greater economic benefit to be derived from more active management of Surrey woodlands. This would deliver multiple benefits of income generation and wider rural economic development, biodiversity and climate change mitigation.

Given the Government's recent final confirmation of the 'Renewable Heat Incentive' and the evaluation of performance and lessons learnt from direct experience at sites such as High Ashurst Outdoor Learning Centre, it is timely to further clarify the Council's position, regarding wood fuel.

Therefore, as Cabinet members for Environment and Transport and Change and Efficiency, Helyn Clack and I have requested that current guidance is further developed to propose a clear policy and action plan and we expect to consider it for Cabinet approval early in the new year.

**Ian Lake**

## **Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**

### **Question (2) from Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

“What are the terms of reference and membership of the Investment Panel, and does it meet in public?”

#### **Reply**

Information about Council Investment Panel, including the terms of reference and membership, are available on the S:net, through the link below. The Investment Panel was established to ensure that robust business cases have been developed and can provide assurance to Cabinet Members in advance of Cabinet approval. As such, Council Investment Panel meetings aren't held in public.

[http://snet.surreycc.gov.uk/snet/core/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE\\_RTF/Investment+panel?opendocument](http://snet.surreycc.gov.uk/snet/core/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Investment+panel?opendocument)

**Tony Samuels**

**Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes**

### **Question (3) from Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

“Is it appropriate for the Investment Panel to be making policy decisions, when surely policy decisions should be made by the Cabinet or Full Council so they may be publicly scrutinised?”

#### **Reply**

Council Investment Panel does not make policy decisions but exists to provide assurance to Members that robust business cases support any member decisions around investment. The Investment Panel process is in advance of Cabinet or Cabinet Member policy decisions and scrutinises and reviews proposals to ensure any Member policy decision is based on robust information.

**Tony Samuels**

**Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes**

### **Question (4) from Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

“What alternative arrangements have been put in place for former users of the Mobile Library Service? Are there any gaps in service either on a geographic basis or for particular groups of service users?”

#### **Reply**

##### **Alternatives to the mobile library service**

All the registered members of the mobile library service were sent a questionnaire asking them to give a preference for an alternative service and 920 responses were received. In the run up to the closure of the service, the mobile library staff gave advice and help to all mobile library users who felt they could use a static library as an alternative.

Of those who responded, 237 wanted a housebound or home delivery service, 66 wanted an e-book service and 235 opted for community transport. During this period of contact 382 people notified the service that an alternative was no longer required, either because they used the service as a convenience and could use a static library, or because they had found their own alternative.

**Housebound/Home delivery.** Currently the numbers for each Borough requiring this service is

Elmbridge 13, Epsom and Ewell 3, Guildford 54, Mole Valley 26, Reigate and Banstead 20, Runnymede 16, Spelthorne 7, Surrey Heath 18, Tandridge 27, Waverley 42 and Woking 11.

To respond to this the library services agreement with the WRVS to provide volunteers to deliver this service has been expanded, extra volunteers have been recruited, and matching of volunteers and readers is progressing as quickly as possible. The service has prioritised efforts on this group of service users.

### **Community Transport**

Telephone contact with users who made this choice resulted in some users notifying the service they had found alternatives. Out of 235 who initially chose this option, after further contact 122 remained seeking the transport option. In Boroughs the results were Elmbridge 13, Epsom and Ewell 1, Guildford 25, Mole Valley 13, Reigate and Banstead 5, Runnymede 5, Spelthorne 0, Surrey Heath 20, Tandridge 8, Waverley 24, Woking 9.

The service has explored current community transport arrangements or sought to set up new agreements with the exception of Spelthorne who had no requests.

In Epsom and Ewell, Reigate and Banstead and Runnymede the service is working on a volunteer driver solution; in Elmbridge, Surrey Heath, Tandridge, Mole Valley Waverley and Guildford, working with local dial-a-ride, and Woking, working with local community transport.

### **Ebook option**

Ebook readers have been tested for suitability and ease of use, including ability to handle e-audio books. Some ebook users will be able to download themselves and some will be offered technical support in setting up, or the delivery of pre-loaded ebook readers and help with use by volunteers. Final letters to individual users are going out after Christmas to confirm arrangements.

### **Library Direct**

The service is now working on a range of services under this umbrella name, which will be widely publicised, including through organisations we work with eg NHS and third sector. It is aimed at providing library services to people who cannot access the static service in the future.

### **Denise Saliagopoulos**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**RESPONSE TO THE COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: 2012 Legacy Report**

**Date Considered: 1 December 2011**

The Communities Select Committee at its meeting of the 1 December 2011 considered the 2012 Legacy Report. The Chairman had agreed to accept the late report on the grounds that it should be taken as urgent business so that the Select Committee's view can be reported to the Cabinet when it considers the report at its meeting on 20 December 2011.

There was a wide-ranging discussion, which included:

- The potential to promote Surrey although members suggested that the report lacked detail on the potential for Tourism within Surrey.
- The Committee noted the cost of the projects against the potential income to the County.
- There was discussion that the two events were largely self-standing rather than legacy items.
- Members acknowledged the importance of retaining and using the knowledge base of officers following the Olympics.
- Members were concerned that funding for these events should not distort the County's overall priorities for Highways maintenance and improvements.
- There was a suggestion that new improved cycle tracks should be provided to form part of the legacy.

The Committee went on to consider its views on the report and its recommendations. A legacy was felt to be important and therefore, the projects identified in the report were positively received. However, there was concern amongst members that the financial investment in the two events should not be to the detriment of the funding and plans for road improvements or distort in any way the planned road maintenance and improvement programme for Surrey.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee therefore decided to submit the following recommendations to Cabinet made in the report:

- To recognise the importance of legacy and endorse the projects included in the report.
- To ensure that the road maintenance and improvement programme continues as planned and is not distorted by the Olympic 2012 Legacy projects.

**Reply**

The Select Committee met on the 1<sup>st</sup> December and considered the Cabinet Report on the 2012 Legacy. The Committee recognised the importance of legacy and endorsed the projects included in the report. All steps have and will be taken to ensure that the road maintenance and improvement programme continues as planned and is not distorted by these Olympic 2012 Legacy projects.

**Denise Saliagopoulos**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**RESPONSE TO CALL IN BY THE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Call in by the Environment and Transport Select Committee of Cabinet's response (of the 29 November 2011) to the report from Environment and Transport Select Committee's Parking Task Group (of the 10 November 2011).**

**Background**

1. On 10 November 2011 the Environment and Transport Select Committee considered a report from the reconvened Environment and Transport Select Committee Parking Task Group. This reviewed on street parking charges and enforcement. The Select Committee endorsed the report and it was presented to Cabinet on the 29 November 2011. Due to ongoing negotiations Cabinet felt unable to endorse all of the recommendations at that time.
2. The Chairman of the Environment and Transport Select Committee, Mr Steve Renshaw called in Cabinet's decision for this item.
3. On the 19 December 2011 the Environment and Transport Select Committee met to scrutinise Cabinet's decision. The Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member and Strategic Director attended the meeting and were able to listen and contribute to the debate.

**Cabinet Member response**

4. As expressed to Cabinet on the 29 November 2011, the detailed work undertaken by the Environment and Select Committee Parking Task Group is appreciated and will contribute to ensuring that on-street parking operations are properly managed within Surrey.
5. After carefully considering the report the original approved recommendation by Cabinet was in no way meant to detract from the work of the Parking Task group. As explained in the reply discussions were ongoing with our enforcement agents and due to a number of variables it was not deemed appropriate to formally endorse all of the 14 original recommendations at that time.
6. The subsequent debate at the Select Committee gave a very useful insight into the wishes of Select Committee Members in the roles of Local Committees for parking management. It helped to remove misunderstanding and ambiguity.

**Summary and proposed way forward**

7. The Cabinet Member and Officers will develop and refine options while giving full consideration to the comments raised by the Select Committee and the Parking Task Group's original report.
8. A further update will be provided in early 2012.

**Ian Lake  
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment  
20 December 2011**

# Public Value Review - Action Plan

<b>TITLE: EPM PVR</b>	<b>Overall accountable individual: Keith Brown</b>
-----------------------	--

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
1	<b>Implement effective systems and processes to develop robust KPIs and meet customer expectations</b>	2,5	Implement a new Property Asset Management System (PAMS)	Keith Brown	Nov 2011	Apr 2012	Savings of £93,000 (captured within total PVR savings) in 2012/13	EPM / Specific data cleansing and entering team	
		1,2,5	Carry out RIEs across suitable processes (including Helpdesk)	Keith Brown	Nov 2011	Ongoing	Savings to be quantified	EPM / PJ Wilkinson in Schools service / Lean support from SSC	

<sup>1</sup> This column is for future use to report on progress in delivering the recommendations

<sup>2</sup> The themes from the Corporate Strategy 2010-14 that each recommendation contributes to are listed using the following key: Our Core Responsibility (1); Personal Responsibility (2); Deciding and Delivering Locally (3); Prevention (4); and Working Together (5).

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
		1,2,5	Review of capital approvals process	Keith Brown	Nov 2011	Mar 2012	Efficiency in staff usage which contributes to organisational redesign and process efficiencies of £685,000	EPM / Procurement / Finance / Members	
2	<b>Develop and implement an improved customer service model</b>	1-5	Develop draft Property customer service model in conjunction with Asset Strategy Team.	Vicki Sitch	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Expected benefits around improved customer satisfaction and stronger strategy to planning link	EPM / Asset Strategy Team	
		1-5	Test the draft model with CLT, Members and Services, and formally sign off the model with CLT	Keith Brown / Pelham Walker	Nov 2011	Mar 2012	Expected benefits around improved customer satisfaction and stronger strategy to planning link	EPM / Asset Strategy Team / Agenda time at CLT and CPT	

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
		1-5	Develop a communications plan	Maria Higgs	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Expected benefits around improved customer satisfaction and stronger strategy to planning link	EPM	
		1-5	Actively implement, through communications, and direct engagement with services	Keith Brown / Pelham Walker	Mar 2012	Ongoing	Expected benefits around improved customer satisfaction and stronger strategy to planning link	EPM / Asset Strategy Team	
		1-5	Develop a Property draft customer service improvement plan, addressing customer feedback from surveys.  Actively implement the plan through communications, marketing, and direct engagement with services	Maria Higgs	Nov 2011	Mar 2012	Expected benefits around improved customer satisfaction and stronger strategy to planning link	EPM / Asset Strategy Team	

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
		1-5	Support through customer service training for all EPM staff, tailored to the model	Maria Higgs	Jan 2012	Mar 2012	Expected benefits around improved customer satisfaction and stronger strategy to planning link	EPM	
		1-5	Monitor through customer feedback	Keith Brown	Jan 2012	Ongoing	Increased customer satisfaction	EPM	
		1-5	Review of relationship model with CLT / CPT	Keith Brown / Pelham Walker	Jan 2013	Jan 2013	Expected benefits around improved customer satisfaction and stronger strategy to planning link	EPM / Asset Strategy Team / Agenda time at CLT and CPT	
3	<b>Restructure EPM to improve efficiency and customer focus</b>	1,2,5	Develop detailed structure and job descriptions in preparation for consultation with staff beginning in 2012	Vicki Sitch	Oct 2011	Feb 2012	Savings shown below against implementation of structure	EPM / HR Support	
		1,2,5	Carry out a skills audit, review job profiles with HR, develop career structure and succession planning for EPM staff (linking to C&E wide roles)	Vicki Sitch	Oct 2011	Feb 2012	Savings shown below against implementation of structure	EPM / HR Support	

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
		1,2,5	Run HR consultation process with staff	Keith Brown	Feb 2012	April 2012	Savings shown below against implementation of structure	EPM / HR Support	
		1,2,5	Implement new structure, recruiting where required (assuming no phased approach)	Keith Brown	April 2012	Sep 2012	£685,000 in 2012/13	EPM / HR Support	
		1,2,5	Implement performance management throughout the department to bed in new behaviours, roles and responsibilities	Keith Brown	Oct 2011	Sep 2012	Assures benefits of restructure are delivered	EPM	
		1,2,5	Use the training plan to support upskilling. Encourage staff to take full advantage of training, coaching, mentoring and knowledge share	Keith Brown	Mar 2012	Ongoing	Assures benefits of restructure are delivered	EPM	
4	<b>Drive a more responsive and proactive team culture.</b>	1-5	Define a blueprint of future culture and how this can be achieved	Vicki Sitch	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Benefits to staff and customers	EPM / HR OD Team to support	
		1-5	Test culture blueprint with EPM	Vicki Sitch	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Benefits to staff and customers	EPM / HR OD Team to support	
		1-5	Develop & deliver a culture change programme	Keith Brown	Jan 2012	Ongoing	Benefits to staff and customers	EPM / HR OD Team to support	

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
		1-5	Test progress and robustness of the culture change programme openly with staff and customers against original blueprint	Keith Brown	Jun 2012	Jun 2012	Benefits to staff and customers	EPM / HR OD Team to support	
5	<b>Develop greater market, financial and commercial skills across the service.</b>	1,2	Assign specific resource and responsibility in the new EPM structure for financial & commercial competitiveness in the function as a whole	Vicki Sitch	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Improved financial decisions	EPM	
		1,2	Review approach to pricing services within each part of EPM and improve knowledge and financial awareness of market pricing and competitiveness	Keith Brown	Apr 2012	Ongoing	Improved financial decisions	EPM	
		1,2	Develop improved commercial, contract management and financial skills and market awareness, including running training and providing ad hoc support	Keith Brown	Apr 2012	Ongoing	Improved financial decisions	EPM	
		1,2	Establish joint programme office for projects to drive a more commercial approach	Keith Brown	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Cost savings driven out as part of a more commercial approach – not quantified at this stage	EPM / HCC joint programme office	

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
		1,2	Review and refresh all contract management arrangements to embed continuous improvement, benchmarking and commercial scrutiny	Keith Brown	Oct 2011	Mar 2012	Contract savings – not quantified at this stage	EPM / HCC joint programme office	
	<b>The PVR will support the delivery of the Medium Term Financial Plan savings.</b>		Energy Use Reduction	Keith Atkins	2012	2014	Savings of £0.9m by the end of 2013/14		
			Reduction in Responsive Maintenance	Keith Brown	2012	2016	Savings of £1.5m by the end of 2015/16		
			HCC Collaboration / Procurement	Keith Brown	2012	2016	Savings of £1.05m by the end of 2015/16		
			Review of Business Rates	Keith Brown	2012	2013	Savings of £0.1m by the end of 2012/13		
			Lettings / rural estate income	Keith Brown	2012	2015	Savings of £0.25m by the end of 2014/15		
			Income / other	Keith Brown	2012	2015	Savings of £0.15m by the end of 2014/15		

Recommendation		Strategic themes <sup>2</sup>	Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date	Due Date	Expected savings	Resources required (in addition to staff time)	Progress <sup>1</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description								
	<b>Performance Management and Quality</b>	1,2	Improve approach to performance management at SMT level	Vicki Sitch	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Benefits in the management of work	EPM	
		1,2	Further develop quality assurance scorecard / dashboards at strategic and operational levels	Maria Higgs	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	Benefits in the management of work	EPM	
		1,2	Review with key stakeholders	Keith Brown	Jan 2012	Mar 2012	Benefits in the management of work	EPM	
		1,2	Implement scorecard / dashboards	Keith Brown	Mar 2012	Ongoing	Benefits in the management of work	EPM	

#### **Monitoring & reporting arrangements**

*The action plan will be delivered and managed by the EPM Implementation Team with oversight by Senior management team (Keith Brown and senior managers). Progress will be reported quarterly to the PVR Steering Board and to a timetable agreed with the Change and Efficiency Select Committee.*

#### **Communications arrangements**

*The results of the PVR and subsequent implementation will be communicated to all EPM staff and other stakeholders by the EPM Senior management team.*

# Public Value Review - Action Plan

<b>TITLE: Procurement and Commissioning PVR</b>	<b>Overall accountable individual: Andrew Forzani</b>
---	---

Recommendation			Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date (mm/yy)	Due Date (mm/yy)	Resources required	Expected savings & benefits	Progress <sup>3</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description	Strategic themes <sup>4</sup>							
1	Further develop category management capability and capacity to support the delivery of procurement savings in the MTFP.	1	1.1 Update and issue category staff job descriptions to include the skills and competencies required to further develop commercial approach.	LL	09/01/12	31/03/12	SMT HR (OD)	Ensures necessary resource to deliver procurement and contract savings identified in directorates MTFP for 2012/13 onwards.	

<sup>3</sup> This column is for future use to report on progress in delivering the recommendations

<sup>4</sup> The themes from the Corporate Strategy 2010-14 that each recommendation contributes to are listed using the following key: Our Core Responsibility (1); Personal Responsibility (2); Deciding and Delivering Locally (3); Prevention (4); and Working Together (5).

Recommendation			Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date (mm/yy)	Due Date (mm/yy)	Resources required	Expected savings & benefits	Progress <sup>3</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description	Strategic themes <sup>4</sup>							
		2	1.2 Ensure P&C attract and retain the best people; (a) Design and launch programme of training and personal development to support changes in job descriptions.	LL	09/01/12	31/03/12	SMT HR (L&D)	Ensures necessary capability to deliver procurement and contract savings identified in directorates MTFP for 2012/13 onwards.	
			(b) Create a clear career path through the Service with a lower grade of entry to grow our own procurement talent, including continued trainee programme.	LL	09/01/12	31/03/12	Recruitment	Increased retention and reduced recruitment costs for vacancies.	
2	Deliver a more effective and efficient tendering service for our customers.	1	2.1 Create a sourcing team to focus on improving and speeding up the tender process for customers and suppliers.	RD	09/01/12	31/03/12	P&D SSC	Delivers tender processes more efficiently resulting in higher customer satisfaction. Measured in CAE satisfaction survey 2012.	

Recommendation			Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date (mm/yy)	Due Date (mm/yy)	Resources required	Expected savings & benefits	Progress <sup>3</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description	Strategic themes <sup>4</sup>							
		1	2.2 Implement a programme of lean reviews including mini RIE to improve the tendering and procurement gateway process.	DL	09/01/12	30/09/12	Project Team Leader and Project Officer  LEAN resource	-	
3	Manage our major contracts more actively to drive continuous improvement in performance and efficiency and take the lead in developing contract management across the Council.	1	3.1 Launch contract management offer across Council to include; - clear roles & responsibilities for P&C and services - agreed action plans for individual strategic suppliers - training and development plan for Procurement & Commissioning staff - training plan for wider Services to raise overall skills	LL/PS	09/01/12	30/06/12	Supplier Relationship Specialist  HR (L&D)	Drive continuous improvement in performance and efficiency of our major contracts. Contributes to contract and supplier management savings identified in directorates MTFP for 2012/13 onwards.	
4	Build our capability and capacity for working with partners across the public sector to develop a regional procurement centre of excellence.	5	4.1 Identify and implement partnership opportunities: - Agree partnership model with other SE7 County Council - Support development of joint commissioning with Health	AF / LL	09/01/12	31/12/12	SMT	Leverage common areas of spend to deliver savings.	

Recommendation			Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date (mm/yy)	Due Date (mm/yy)	Resources required	Expected savings & benefits	Progress <sup>3</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description	Strategic themes <sup>4</sup>							
		5	4.2 Identify and implement potential income streams as a result of partnership.	LL			Finance	Delivery of identified income stream.	
		1	4.3 Create a flexible resource model by creating an interim and fixed term talent pool that allows the service to take on work from partners to grow income stream.	DL	09/01/12	31/03/12	SMT Recruitment	Cost-efficiently meets partnership resource demands.	
5	Invest in the latest purchasing and sourcing technology that ensures we have effective and efficient systems to help deliver savings, to support opportunities for local businesses to bid for work, and to provide a better buying experience for customers	3,5	5.4 Identify, purchase and implement local supplier portal to encourage wider participation by local suppliers in bidding for contracts.	AS	09/01/12	30/03/12	SSC IMT	Supports achievement of target of 60% spend with local suppliers in Surrey.	
		1	5.1 Identify, purchase and implement Contract Management system across the council	DL	09/01/12	31/06/12	SSC IMT	-	
		1	5.2 Develop e-procurement capability to improve tendering process	DL	09/01/12	31/03/12	SSC IMT	-	

Recommendation			Actions and key milestones	Accountable owner	Start Date (mm/yy)	Due Date (mm/yy)	Resources required	Expected savings & benefits	Progress <sup>3</sup> (RAG & comments)
Ref	Description	Strategic themes <sup>4</sup>							
		1	5.3 Improve supplier adoption and master data process to enable it to be managed across systems and automated where possible to drive consistency and efficiency	AS	09/01/12	31/06/12	SSC IMT	-	

#### Monitoring & reporting arrangements

The action plan will be delivered and managed by Derek Lancaster, Performance and Development Manager. Andrew Forzani, the Head of Procurement & Commissioning, will monitor delivery of the attached action plan.

There will be quarterly progress reports to the Public Value Steering Board. The Member Reference Group will also scrutinise delivery.

#### Communications arrangements

The outcome of the PVR and subsequent implementation will be communicated to all relevant staff and relevant stakeholder groups.

Progress against delivery will be communicated to all relevant staff by Andrew Forzani, the Head of Procurement & Commissioning.

**CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS**

**14 DECEMBER 2011**

**(i) SHORT BREAKS FOR DISABLED CHILDREN CAPITAL GRANT FUNDING 2011/12**

- (1) That the release of £739,037 Short Breaks for Disabled Children Capital Funding grant, being the total 2011/12 allocation, be approved
- (2) That the approach that has been taken to targeting and allocating funds be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

To ensure that the capital grants are utilised fully and within the grant criteria.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Families - 14 December 2011)

**(ii) AGGREGATES RECYCLING JOINT DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT: SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED MINOR AMENDMENTS**

That the schedule of proposed minor amendments be submitted to the Government with the Joint Aggregates Recycling DPD for independent examination.

**Reasons for decision**

The schedule of proposed minor amendments are mainly for clarification or factual update and would improve the content of the Joint Aggregates Recycling DPD.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment - 14 December 2011)

**(iii) VIREMENT OF BUDGET BETWEEN CHILDREN SCHOOLS & FAMILIES AND ADULT SOCIAL CARE TO REFLECT NEW TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS**

That the revenue budget virement of £707,000 for 2011/12 from Children, Schools & Families to Adult Social Care be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

To align budget responsibility and delivery in line with the improved Transition arrangements.

(Decision of the Leader - 14 December 2011)

**(iv) VIREMENT OF FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT AND BENEFITS TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

That the virement be approved to transfer responsibility for the Financial Assessment and Benefits service from the Director of Change and Efficiency to the Director of Adult Social Care

**Reasons for decision**

To align the Financial Assessment and Benefits function more closely with Adult Social Care in light of the increasing role of personalisation, the development of reablement and the introduction of a more unified Adult Information System, all of which increase the need to involve Adult Social Care fully in issues associated with charging.

(Decision of the Leader - 14 December 2011)