

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 29 MAY 2012 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 Kay Hammond
*Mrs Helyn Clack (arrived 2.45pm)	*Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr John Furey	*Mr Peter Martin
*Mr Michael Gosling	*Mr Tony Samuels

\* = Present

**PART ONE**  
**IN PUBLIC**

**70/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

There were none.

**71/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 24 April 2012 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**72/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

There were none.

**73/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

**Members' Questions.**

One question had been received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills). The question and agreed response is attached as **Appendix 1**.

Mrs Watson asked a supplementary question: Why was the Authority pursuing and not abandoning the proposals for Community Partnered Libraries.

The Leader responded by stating that he believed it was an excellent policy which would give local people the opportunity to run the service and he hoped that the localism agenda would be supported by the Liberal Democrats.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games stressed the importance of ensuring that as many people as possible could

access the library services and cited the success of the new Dorking Library and the current refurbishment of Woking Library.

**74/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

**None**

**75/12 YEAR END FINANCIAL POSITION 2011 - 2012 (Item 6)**

The Leader introduced the report and highlighted the following points:

- The second year of a tough financial settlement for Local Government had been completed.
- The target of £59.3m of on-going annual savings in 2011/12 financial year had been achieved, through Members, officers and Surrey County Council's partners working as One Team.
- Funding to provide on-going services and projects in 2012/13 financial year had been secured.
- Overall the budget had underspent by £4.5m (0.3% of the total revenue budget) – achieved by consistent financial management by both Cabinet Members and Strategic Directors.
- Through an innovative partnership with Hampshire County Council, the specification and scope of the schools' building programme had been reviewed and procurement processes improved, resulting in real savings of £3.7m.
- To ensure the Council's investment in its services continued, £27.8m of the 2011/12 budget was being made available in 2012/13.
- The Council's general balances currently stood at £28.8m and the level of reserves had improved.
- During the last 12 months, gross debt had been reduced by £3.6m and overdue debt by £1.6m.
- Public Value Reviews were at the centre of the Council's delivery of high quality services.
- Finally, there was a typo to correct in recommendation (4) – capital budgets should read £18.8m not £18.7m.

Other Cabinet Members were invited to comment on their portfolio's budgets, starting with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families who referred to her tabled response to the Children and Families Select Committee's recommendations (Appendix 2). She also referred to the huge pressures on the Children, Schools and Families Budget, due in part to the increased numbers of Looked After Children.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health thanked the Adult Social Care team for their achievements. He said that £28m savings had been made this year (and £34m in the previous year). With a further £100m to be saved over the next 5 years, it would be necessary to reconfigure the services to ensure that the service could manage the increased numbers of elderly residents requiring help.

The Deputy Leader considered that the County Council was 'on track' and in a good position for the next financial year. He commended all Directorates for meeting or bettering their targets.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games welcomed the additional Registration income and hoped that its current Public Value Review would produce further income generation. She also urged all Members to spend their allocations prudently for the benefit of their local communities.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety was pleased with the carry forward of funding for road safety schemes.

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency highlighted the £3.2m underspend in her portfolio's budget and said that planned efficiencies had been achieved and exceeded. Savings had been made in procurement, IMT, HR, Finance and Shared Services.

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment said that the new Highways contract had been a turning point for the service. It was working well and a 5 year rolling programme was being introduced. He also said that large part of the underspend in the budget was due to restructuring and staff vacancies.

Finally, the Leader said that he was pleased with the substantial progress made over the last year but said that the council must not be complacent. He drew attention to Annex D, Transparent Information on Members Allowances and Travel Expenses (2011/12 and 2010/11), a Summary of Members' 2011/12 committee attendance and complaints, and the Council's overall travel expenses (2011/12 and 2010/11). He said that this was not the final version of this information. All Members would have the opportunity to clarify their details and a report would be submitted to the Audit and Governance Committee in June, which if approved, would form part of the Council's Annual Report, due to be published in July.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the revenue and capital outturn, revenue efficiencies, reserves and balances positions and treasury information; as set out in Annex A of the submitted report be noted.
- (2) That the write off of care and non-care related debt as set out in paragraph 80 of the submitted report be noted.
- (3) That government grant changes are reflected in directorate budgets; as set out in Annex B of the submitted report be confirmed.
- (4) That the further support to the 2012/13 revenue (£0.3m) and capital (£18.8m) budgets from lower spending in 2011/12, as set out in Annex C of the submitted report, be approved.
- (5) That the publication of additional information on Members, in line with the Council's wish to increase transparency, as set out in Annex D of the submitted report, be approved.

**Reason for decisions:**

The recommendations assure adherence to the authority's financial governance requirements. The County Council's financial regulation require the aggregate outturn for the County Council's services to be reported to Cabinet, with proposals made for the carry forwards of service underspending and overspendings.

**76/12 ONE COUNTY ONE TEAM: PEOPLE STRATEGY 2011 – 2017 (Item 7)**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency presented the report and said that the formulation of the People Strategy had been driven by the desire of residents to create the best workforce for the Surrey people. The Strategy set out both the County Council and the Employee Promise.

**RESOLVED:**

That the One Council, One Team, People Strategy 2012-17, attached as Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

Approving the *One Council One Team, People Strategy* 2012 – 17 will ensure all employees have the skills, competence, and capacity to deliver professional services to Surrey residents and service users.

The *People Strategy* will support and enable a culture we can be proud of and on which residents can rely for best possible service.

**77/12 SURREY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2011 - 2012 (Item 8)**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health said that he was pleased to present the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Annual Report 2011 – 12. He said that it was a factual document on a serious matter and that whilst the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board was currently non-statutory, it was likely to become statutory in the coming months and if so, the responsibilities would mirror those of the Safeguarding Children's Boards that were already statutory.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families made three points: (i) concern about the large number of agencies and organisations represented on the Board, (ii) the prevention strategy and the thresholds around the 10 priorities, and (iii) a request for more information on the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards and the Mental Health Act.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health addressed the points in order: (i) he noted her point but said that Surrey was a large county and it was important that the Board was representative of the whole county, (ii) he believed that the thresholds were correct but would be agreeable to further discussion outside the meeting, and (iii) he would respond in writing.

Points made by other Cabinet Members included:

- That the membership of the Board could be reviewed after one year.
- That the Board was multi-agency and the County Council could not dictate its membership.
- If the Board became statutory, there should be more elected Members on it.

Finally, the Leader considered that it was an excellent and helpful report, which would be available in every Surrey library and on the council's website.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Annual Report from the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board and the actions in the Strategic Plan 2012-2015 that are within the Plan be noted.

That each Surrey library have paper copies of the Annual Report available for members of the public.

**Reasons for decisions:**

It is recommended that the Annual Report is noted. This will provide evidence the council has fulfilled its obligations to co-ordinate the activities of the Safeguarding Adults Board.

It is recommended that paper copies are available in each of Surrey's libraries to ensure that members of the public who do not have internet access, are able to read and have a copy of the report.

**78/12 PROPOSED CHANGES TO SERVICES IN BUS REVIEW PHASE 3 AREAS (Item 9)**

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment explained the background to the Bus Review and the savings achieved to date, which stemmed from the Cabinet decision of 2 March 2010 where it was agreed that the public bus network was progressively reviewed to meet the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate's savings targets. He confirmed that a full e-tender process, compliant with the European Public Procurement Regulations had been completed.

He referred to the Annexes, in particular Annex C which set out the guide to revised bus services from September 2012 in Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley District, Waverley Borough and part of Guildford Borough. He also highlighted the areas that had generated the most responses in the consultation process – these were set out in paragraph 27 of the report.

Cabinet Members had also received a letter from the Leader of Chichester District Council expressing her concern about the proposed discontinuation of the number 70 bus service from Guildford to Midhurst. Also, Stagecoach had come back to the County Council after the close of the consultation process and therefore, he was proposing that further consultation would take place and this was reflected in the revised recommendations tabled at the

meeting, which also included the extension of the service 53 through to Ewhurst on Sundays with the proviso that it was reviewed after 12 months.

Mr Young, local Member for Cranleigh and Ewhurst addressed the meeting and expressed his support and thanks for the Sunday service to Ewhurst.

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment said that the use of concessionary bus passes was not addressed as part of this review but confirmed that the council would work with NHS partners re. the timing of hospital appointments.

Key points raised by other Cabinet Members included:

- Concern about the services Nos.70,71 and 92.
- Review the service between Witley and Haslemere.
- There should be further consultation in certain areas with the final decisions being made by the Cabinet Member and the Leader.
- The Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) was detailed and several issues to be addressed were highlighted, including the Transport Coordination Centre. It also stated that the County Council subsidised socially necessary routes and it was important to emphasise this point.
- The huge amount of stakeholder engagement and the importance of continually reviewing and addressing the provision. The EIA also noted that Black and Minority Ethnic communities were not well represented in the consultation feedback but that members of the Forum were asked to contribute to this phase of the review as well as the other phases and there was no evidence that members of these communities would be more affected than others by the proposals.
- A welcome return of the Sunday bus service for Beare Green and the dependence on bus services in rural areas in Mole Valley to enable residents to get to work at Gatwick Airport.
- Support for the retention of Sunday bus services.
- A reference to the £12m bus subsidy in 2007 which was unsustainable.
- Savings achieved to date and recognition of the huge amount of work undertaken by the Travel and Transport team.

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

- (1) That the changes to supported public bus services and subsidy levels in Phase 3 areas on the basis described in the report be approved.
- (2) That the changes to bus services and service levels shown in Annex B and C on the basis of new subsidy levels in Annex D of the submitted report be confirmed but with further negotiations to be held with

Stagecoach in order to address concerns over services 70 (Guildford-Midhurst), 71 (Guildford – Haslemere) and 92 (Guildford-Eashing Lane/Aarons Hill Estates). The decision on these routes be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment in consultation with the Strategic Director of Environment and Infrastructure. Consultation with the public and Members within these areas will be undertaken. Also, a financial impact assessment will also be conducted and if there are any financial implications, the final decision will be made by the Leader.

- (3) That the optional additional services outlined in paragraph 27 - (a) to (d), together with the Sunday service through to Ewhurst be approved, with these services being reviewed after 12 months.
- (4) That the contracts as detailed in item 13, the confidential annex to this report, be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To develop an overall network of public bus provision which is fit for purpose, more commercially viable and financially sustainable.

**79/12 CONTRACT AWARD FOR A LOCAL CONSTRUCTION FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SURREY SMALL WORKS CONTRACTOR PANEL (Item 10)**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency introduced the report and informed Members that this Local Area Construction Framework Agreement for recommended tenderers was a strategy to improve the County Council's existing building maintenance provision which in the past had not always delivered Value for Money. She also drew attention to the proposal for a Surrey Small Works Panel which would allow access to a wide range of Surrey based suppliers who would have the option to quote on at least six projects per annum.

Cabinet Members agreed that these proposals were an excellent example of joint working that would deliver better Value for Money for Surrey residents and at the same time putting more money into the local economy by supporting local suppliers.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That selected contractors be appointed onto a Local Area Construction Framework Lot 3, jointly procured with Hampshire County Council as detailed in the confidential annex (item 14). Further, that the authority to award individual contracts above £500k, in value, under this framework be delegated to the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency.
- (2) That the strategy for the development of a Surrey Small Works Panel for all low value projects across construction, mechanical, electrical

and roofing works, which will be launched in August 2012, be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The Surrey and Hampshire Local Construction Framework was jointly established by Surrey County Council and Hampshire County Council, on behalf of themselves and other public sector and similar bodies in Surrey, Hampshire, Berkshire and adjoining areas.

The overarching aim of the framework is the efficient delivery of small building projects and programmes of work up to £1.5m.

It is a multi-authority collaborative framework which is jointly managed on a not-for-profit basis by Surrey and Hampshire County Councils. The Framework will operate from 2012 to 2016.

The Surrey Small Works Panel is a list of Surrey based suppliers who will contract directly with SCC in the delivery of some 260 projects annually (between £7.5k and £75k), as well as being exposed to opportunities to participate in higher value projects at a subcontractor level. Contracting directly will avoid the overhead costs of a managing contractor.

**80/12 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 11)**

The Leader drew attention to the revised Annex 1, tabled at the meeting, which included details of the Community Improvement Fund projects, approved at his individual decision making meeting on 24 May 2012. He also acknowledged the work undertaken both by officers and the Member panel to compile and consider the bids and said that a further round of bids would be considered later in the year.

That the decisions taken by the Cabinet Members since the last meeting be noted.

**Reason for decision:**

To note the decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

**81/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 12)**

**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.

**82/12 PROPOSED CHANGES TO SERVICES IN BUS REVIEW PHASE 3 AREAS  
(Item 13)**

Confidential annex for item 9.

**83/12 CONTRACT AWARD FOR A LOCAL CONSTRUCTION FRAMEWORK  
AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SURREY SMALL WORKS CONTRACTOR  
PANEL (Item 14)**

Confidential annex for item 10.

**84/12 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS – UNITS 1 AND 7 AC COURT, THAMES  
DITTON – PART SURRENDER OF LEASE (Item 15)**

The Cabinet Member for Assets and the Regeneration Programmes urged the Cabinet to support the surrender of this unprofitable lease.

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposed surrender of the County Council's lease on the terms reported be approved and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to complete the necessary Deed of Surrender and Variation to reflect the reduced demise.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To ensure that the County Council minimises its costs in relation to historic leasing arrangements where property is surplus to requirement and enable the legal documentation to be completed.

**85/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 16)**

**RESOLVED:**

That information relating to the items considered in Part 2 of the agenda could be made available to the press and public at the appropriate time.

**[The meeting closed at 3.20pm]**

---

**Chairman**

**RESPONSE TO QUESTION**

**Member Question**

**Question from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)**

What are the expected financial savings in 2012/13 in the Library Service as a result of the Community Partnered Libraries proposals?

What are the expected annual savings as a result of the Community Partnered Libraries proposals?

What are the budgeted training costs per volunteer in the Community Partnered Libraries proposals at start up?

Given that New Haw Library Community Partnership have sent an open letter to the Chief Executive stating that they have 150 volunteers, what is the projected total training cost at start up for the whole programme of 10 Community Partnered Libraries?

What are the proposals for ensuring that all new volunteers in the future receive training before they start volunteering?

What are the budgeted costs of administering the register of volunteers to ensure they all receive training in line with the recent High Court judgment and what are the expected ongoing annual costs of training volunteers?

**Reply:**

There are no expected financial savings in 2012 – 2013 in the Library Service as a result of Community Partnered Libraries proposals and there are no expected annual savings as a result of the Community Partnered Libraries proposals.

No additional costs are being incurred by the service in the roll out and ongoing support for Community Partnered Libraries. The provision of the team to support Community Partnered Libraries (including the time to be spent at the CP Libraries, and providing training and on-going support etc) is being met from existing capacity and arrangements that already provides the managerial and administrative support to these libraries.

Support to the Community Partnered libraries in terms of training key volunteers has been carefully planned and is part of the Council's ongoing commitment of support from the library service. All training will be carried out by experienced staff and will be based on training that is already delivered to library staff, but adapted for the Community Partnered Libraries and volunteers. The costs of the Community Partnered Libraries support team per annum is £106,083 but, as stated above, this has been achieved by realignment of staff roles and is not an additional cost.

The support team will be present for 20% of opening hours per week. The role of the support team is to work with the community partnership in training and supporting their volunteers. Needs may change over time, from getting up and running, to

moving on to more ambitious activities like running events and learning programmes, and what the team provide will also change to meet the needs of each library at that time.

The agreement signed for each partnership between the community partner and Surrey County Council - and its associated performance monitoring and performance procedures - will ensure that all volunteers receive key training before they start volunteering and ongoing monitored and evaluated training and development. The community partner is responsible for its volunteers and will be keeping registers of volunteers and their training which will be regularly mutually checked and reviewed by the community partner in conjunction with the Community Partnered Libraries Support Team.

The Community Partnered Libraries support team will be meeting very regularly with the steering group for that library, to discuss how the library is progressing and identify how best the support team can help and will work closely with the senior volunteer organiser for each library to identify and deliver what support is needed. The team will also provide necessary updates as library procedures and services change.

The local organisations we are working with have shown a great deal of energy, passion and ideas for improving their local library, and for making greater community use of the library buildings outside of library opening hours. We believe they will be able to bring many benefits to their communities.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games**  
**29 May 2012**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**CONTACTS AND REFERRALS**

**Select Committee recommendations:**

1. Additional finance should be released from the Directorate carry forward to enhance the proposed resource increase as outlined in Appendix I to the committee's report (and attached to this recommendation). Without an additional injection of approximately £1m per annum it will not be possible to maintain a safe service without further raising the eligibility criteria and thus redefining core business for children's social care. The impact of such action will be that partners who are already feeling vulnerable will have to manage even more risk themselves, without support or resource, and children may be at risk of harm.
2. The possibility of funding the essential increase in legal support for care proceedings from central budgets rather than the Children's Services budget be explored.
3. A whole systems approach is taken in developing an early help strategy and the health, well being and safeguarding plans and that the implementation of these plans promotes the adopting of a family approach that includes services for parents who would otherwise not necessarily be eligible for adult service provision e.g. mental health service or drug and alcohol advice services.
4. The service reviews and revises the Eligibility Criteria for children's social care - to include consultation with partners and ensure that the safeguarding 'system' owns this and supports the development of 'step down' and other targeted services for children, young people and their families in an effort to prevent the 'revolving door' syndrome.
5. The service develops partnership opportunities to manage and share risk. This would include exploring partnership options to manage referrals to children's social care and the safeguarding 'front door'.
6. Surrey Safeguarding Children Board provides scrutiny and challenge of the safeguarding system to ensure that service provision remains appropriate to meet need and ensure that children identified as likely to be at risk, are able, to be properly safeguarded.

**Response:**

1. I welcome the Children & Families Select Committee recommendations in relation to the 'Capacity and Demand Paper' presented by the Deputy Director for Children, Schools and Families on 24 April 2012. I am very supportive of the recommendations to increase capacity both within Children's Services and Legal Services. The financial outturn report for 2011/12 recommends that £1.2m per annum be funded from the current directorate carry forward for the next 3 years (total of £3.6m).
2. These recommendations are referenced in the Outturn report, as part of the

carry forward decision making.

3. I welcome the recommendation in relation to developing an early help strategy. The Directorate is currently commissioning 3 key change projects. One of these is focused on Early Help. This project will work across the directorate and with partners, council and county wide to agree a definition of early help, develop a Surrey strategy and a systematic approach to supporting children, young people and their families. This strategy will be used to support future commissioning of services based on need to improve safeguarding and future life chances of children and would thus include services that help to support parents to address their own challenges that impinge upon parenting ability such as domestic abuse, mental health and drug and alcohol misuse.
4. I welcome the recommendation in relation to reviewing and revising the Eligibility Criteria. The current Eligibility Criteria has been recently reviewed and revised. It is now being shared with partners through a range of workshops to ensure that there is collective understanding and acceptance of thresholds for intervention. This engagement and consultation is being supported by the SSCB.
5. I welcome the recommendation in relation to developing partnership opportunities to manage and share risk. The service is working in partnership with the police to look at the option of a 'shared front door' to manage contact and referrals into children's services. A co sponsored Rapid Improvement Event will take place the week commencing 25 June involving a range of stakeholders to progress this.
6. I welcome the recommendation in relation to the Surrey Safeguarding Children's Board. The SSCB provides the safeguarding governance across the partnership. It has endorsed and supported the work to date and will continue to have a monitoring and scrutiny role to ensure that children are adequately safeguarded.

**Mary Angell**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Families**  
**29 May 2012**