

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 25 February 2014 and will take effect on Thursday 6 March 2014 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 05/03/14.**

The following represents a summary of the decisions taken by the Cabinet. It is not intended to represent the formal record of the meeting but to facilitate the call-in process. The formal minutes will be published in due course to replace this decision sheet.

County Members wishing to request a call-in on any of these matters, should contact the Senior Manager for Scrutiny or relevant Democratic Services Officer.

The Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday, 25 February 2014 considered the following matters and resolved:

- **PUBLIC QUESTIONS** (Item 4b)

One question has been received from Mr Sawyer, Vice-Chairman of Banstead Village Residents Association. The question and the response was tabled and is attached as Appendix 1.

- **ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES** (Item 6)

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

Recommendation 1

That a feeder link is introduced for Auriol Junior School for children attending The Mead Infant School for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children attending The Mead Infant School
- d) Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other schools which have a feeder link and reciprocal sibling links
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within close proximity
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There was overall support for this proposal
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at The Mead Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Auriol Junior School

Recommendation 2

That tiered sibling criteria are introduced for Reigate Priory for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings in to the same school, this would only apply if it is not their nearest school
- The pressure on places means that on balance a greater disadvantage might be caused to local families than to future siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- There was overall support for this proposal
- It reduces the likelihood of local families having to travel to schools that are further away

Recommendation 3

That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children attending Meadowcroft Infant School for September 2015, in addition to the existing feeder link with Trumps Green Infant School, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School or Meadowcroft Infant School
- e) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Meadowcroft Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to St Ann's Heath Junior School

Recommendation 4

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School for September 2015 so that these schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 5

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools for September 2015 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 6

That criteria for admission to nursery for two year olds who are eligible for the free extended provision are introduced for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children who will have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
- d) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for clear, fair and transparent criteria
- The criteria are consistent to those used for other years of entry
- They are lawful and comply with the School Admissions Code
- They will enable parents to understand how places will be allocated at nurseries which choose to admit children at two years old
- It supports the Government's agenda of extending free nursery provision to families on low income

Recommendation 7

That, subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to admission arrangements as they have proposed, the catchment area for Esher CofE High School is extended for September 2015 to include the whole of Claygate village.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for families in Claygate to have a greater opportunity of being offered a local Surrey school
- It coincides with an increase in PAN at Esher High thereby minimising the

- impact on other families applying for Esher High
- There was overwhelming support for this proposal
- This proposal is linked to a separate proposal by Hinchley Wood School to extend its catchment area and to introduce feeder links which, if not introduced in line with this proposal, would lead to an untenable increase in applications for Esher High. This recommendation is therefore conditional on the changes at Hinchley Wood being agreed before this recommendation is ratified by Full Council
- If Esher High School becomes an Academy on 1 March 2014, before ratification of the recommendation by Full Council, the school's Governing Body will need to ratify the recommendation of Cabinet in order to ensure the admission arrangements have been lawfully determined

Recommendation 8

That admission priority based on a catchment is introduced for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School for September 2015 so that, after siblings, children who live within the published catchment area for the school would receive priority for a place ahead of those who do not, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children living within the catchment area of St Andrew's CofE Infant School
- e) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It helps to support the future viability of this school
- It provides for a joined up approach to admissions in the area of Farnham
- It helps to protect the existing feeder link from St Andrew's to South Farnham School
- It is supported by the Governing Body of St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School as it is recognised that this is a step towards formalising the links between these schools

Recommendation 9

That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay is decreased from 30 to 15 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will provide for a better use of resources within the school
- It will reduce the impact of in year admissions on the school
- It will not lead to a pressure on school places because the number will better reflect numbers on roll
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 10

That the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School is decreased from 64 to 60 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will enable the school to meet its duty with regard to infant class size legislation
- It will enable the school to optimise the most efficient use of its sites
- It will reflect the number that the school is working to maintain after the initial offers are made

- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 11

That Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic School and St Andrew's Catholic School are added to the list of own admission authority schools which will be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that there will be a consistent approach in selecting schools which will be taken in to account when assessing 'nearest school' when applying the admission arrangements of community and voluntary controlled schools
- It ensures that there is equity in the application of admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools County wide

Recommendation 12

That Camelsdale Primary School in West Sussex is discounted for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that families who live nearer to Camelsdale Primary School but who are unlikely to be offered a place there will not be disadvantaged in their applications for their nearest community Surrey school
- It is consistent with the approach taken with other out of County schools for which Surrey parents are generally unsuccessful based on catchment

Recommendation 13

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2015 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1, of the submitted report, which include the following changes:

- i. Bell Farm Primary School – removal of Junior PAN
- ii. Bishop David Brown – increase in PAN from 120 to 150
- iii. Esher High School – increase in PAN from 210 to 240
- iv. Holmesdale Community Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- v. The Hythe Community Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- vi. Manorcroft Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 58 to 60
- vii. Meath Green Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 70 to 90
- viii. Onslow Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix. St Ann's Heath Junior - increase in Junior PAN from 64 to 90
- x. St Mary's C of E (VC) Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 25 to 30
- xi. Stamford Green Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where a decrease in PAN is proposed the decrease has already been agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school
- Where increases in PAN are proposed the schools are increasing their intake to respond to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2014 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 14

That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2015, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Appendix 1 and its Annexes, of the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The existing arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey's sustainability policies]

• **CHANGES TO FIRE ENGINE DEPLOYMENT IN THE NORTH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH (Item 7)**

That the following proposals be proposed:

- Officers should identify and deliver a permanent site for a single fire engine station within a three miles radius of Burgh Heath, to serve the north of Reigate and Banstead.
- Until such time as a permanent site is available, to relocate the second fire engine from Epsom to a temporary fire station within the same geographical area, to deliver improvements against the Surrey Response Standard.
- Authority be delegated to the Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to assess the options to relocate the second fire engine from Epsom and to identify an available location which meets the requirements identified in this report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The relocation of a fire engine into the proposed area will secure improvements against the county wide Surrey response standard. Whilst it may not be the optimal location this still delivers improvements against the response standard to meet the operational imperative that is compounded by the reduction in the provision of fire cover due to the temporary removal by London Fire Brigade of Purley's fire appliance. The fire station is being refurbished from summer 2014 and the fire engine is being moved further away to Mitcham which will have a detrimental impact on response times when requests are made by SFRS under section 13 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004.

It provides an opportunity to work with Blue light partners and other agencies to collocate to further integrate service provision and share information to generate efficiencies through shared spaces and networking.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities Select Committee]

- **SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH** (Item 8)

1. That Surrey businesses be congratulated on their success in achieving significant economic growth in recent years, which means that the gross value added of the Surrey economy is now in excess of £32 billion a year.
2. That the progress made with both of the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), of which Surrey is a member, in making the case for additional investment in the county be noted and that the Deputy Leader, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment, should agree the final Strategic Economic Plans for both LEPs in accordance with the approach set out in this report.
3. That the county council be represented by either the Leader or Deputy Leader in the proposed new local authority governance arrangements for Enterprise M3 (EM3) and Coast to Capital (C2C) Local Enterprise Partnerships.
4. That the financial implications of the ongoing work with Local Enterprise Partnerships, including the potential to secure additional funding for transport and infrastructure schemes and for skills development given that the LEPs are intending to bid for £850-£950 million for the period 2015-2021 be noted.
5. That it be noted the Surrey Connects Board are currently considering a range of options for their future operation and that decisions on any financial and organisational changes that are needed in the county council, once that consideration is concluded, should be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure in discussion with the Deputy Leader
6. That the arrangements for enhancing collaboration with district and borough councils, including potential areas for joint working to secure additional benefits across the whole of Surrey be noted.
7. That an all member workshop on economic growth and the Local Enterprise Partnerships be held in March 2014.

Reasons for Decisions:

The approach set out in this report will assist the Council in achieving the 'Confident in our Future' Corporate Strategy 2014-19 (as agreed by Cabinet on 4 February 2014 and by County Council on 11 February 2014), which includes a specific priority to make Surrey's economy strong and competitive. In particular, it will support the council in its efforts to secure additional investment in Surrey, more flexibility to meet the distinct needs of the county and more joint working with boroughs and districts to promote economic growth. Additional investment in strategic and local infrastructure, in skills and in employment and business support will help to promote economic growth across the county, maintain the quality of life for residents and develop Surrey's already very strong offer as a place to do business.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment and Transport Select Committee]

- **MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT** (Item 9)

1. That the forecast revenue budget for 2013/14 to underspend by £2.1m on services, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 1) of the submitted report, be noted.
2. That the forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end were £61.3m, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 79) of the submitted report, be noted.
3. That the forecast capital expenditure and investment of £232.6m against a budget of £224.7m, as set out in the Appendix (paragraphs 83 to 89) of the submitted report be noted.
4. That the transfer of £2m from increased business rates and government grants to the Budget Equalisation Reserve for supporting future years' budgets, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 62 and 67) of the submitted report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

To comply with the agreed strategy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **FORMATION OF WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE** (Item 10)

1. To recommend to County Council the establishment of a Woking Joint Committee to deal with both executive and non-executive functions from 1 June 2014 in place of the current Local Committee in Woking which will cease to function from that date.
2. To agree (as set out in Annex A of the submitted report):
 - that the current Local Committee executive functions be delegated to the Woking Joint Committee
 - that the Surrey County Council element of the new joint SCC/WBC executive functions be delegated to the Joint Committee
 - to recommend to Council that the current non-executive functions delegated to the Local Committee be delegated to the Woking Joint Committee
 - that the advisory functions that will come under the remit of the Woking Joint Committee be agreed.
3. That the functions that Woking Borough Council has delegated to the Woking Joint Committee, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report, be noted.
4. That the Woking Joint Committee Constitution, including the Standing Orders under which it will operate, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report be agreed, and authority be delegated to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to agree to any minor amendments to the Constitution which may be required.

5. To recommend that Council agrees to the relevant changes to the County Council's Constitution to enable the Joint Committee to be established and become operational, as set out in Annex B of the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions:

Cabinet and Full Council agreement is required to establish a Woking Joint Committee in place of the current Local Committee arrangements; to delegate recommended executive functions to the newly formed Woking Joint Committee; and to agree the new Constitution and Standing Orders under which the newly formed committee will operate.

The new Joint Committee will simplify and speed-up local decision making processes, enabling for the first time, all functions and budgets delegated to it by both authorities to be jointly decided upon.

- **SCHOOLS EXPANSION PROGRAMME FROM SEPTEMBER 2014** (Item 11)

That the expansion of Lyne and Longcross Infant School, as detailed in the submitted report, and subject to the consideration and approval of the detailed financial information for the school as set out in Part 2 of this agenda (item 21) be approved and that Lyne and Longcross Infant School (increase by 120 places to 210 places) and the school be changed from an infant to a primary school.

Reasons for Decisions:

The scheme is essential to meeting basic need in Surrey. The scheme delivers a value for money expansion to the school, which supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide additional school places for local children in Surrey. The project and building works are in accordance with the planned timetables required for delivery of the new accommodation at the school.

[The decisions on this item can be called in either by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the Children and Education Select Committee]

- **EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT** (Item 12)

1. That the grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support be extended for two additional years from 1 April 2014.
2. That the service remains with the current lead provider Surrey Disabled People's Partnership (SDPP) on behalf of the "getWIS£" consortium.

Reason for Decisions:

There is a continuing demand from residents of Surrey for advice, information and support about welfare benefits especially with regard to changes as a result of the Welfare Reform Act (2012). From 1 April 2013, the providers have seen 1,448 people and helped them claim £940,416 of benefits they were entitled to.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **BLOCK CONTRACT WITH HILLCREST CARE FOR 20 INDEPENDENT FOSTERING PLACEMENTS** (Item 13)

That a new contract be awarded to Hillcrest for three years from 1 April 2014 until 31 March 2017.

Reasons for Decisions:

Surrey County Council commissions its other IFA requirements through a Regional Framework Contract with 11 South East Local Authorities. This requirement was tendered in 2011/12. The Framework Contract started on 1 April 2012 and is due to end on 31 March 2017.

Under the Block Contract with Hillcrest, SCC pays one of the lowest rates for IFA placements in the South East of England. The Council is seeking to continue this best value arrangement until the Regional IFA Framework contract comes to an end. An award of a 3-year contract to Hillcrest will mean that both contractual arrangements for IFA placements will be aligned. This will allow a full option analysis to be carried out with Children's Services and Children's Commissioning and development of the placement strategy for the entire area of Looked After Children services.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **ICELANDIC BANK DEPOSIT** (Item 14)

- (1) That the overall position be noted.
- (2) That the successful outcome with regard to the sale of the £10m Landesbanki investment be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

Given recent developments within Iceland and the LGA collective negotiation offer, as well as the underlying uncertainty that existed with regard to full repayment of its claim, the Council needed to fully consider the available offers by interested third parties to buy out its claim in Landsbanki. To enable this, the Council authorised the LGA to negotiate on its behalf and concluded a successful outcome.

- **AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS** (Item 15)

1. That new contracts be awarded until 2017 under newly agreed terms from 2014 with Virgin Care Services Limited (VCSL) and Central Surrey Health Limited (CSHL) a Surrey-based social enterprise, whilst joint commissioning arrangements are agreed with the NHS.
2. Milestones be agreed to enable early action to be taken before 2017 if a joint commissioning framework cannot be agreed with the NHS. These milestones will be measured and will inform the decision on whether this service should be re-tendered earlier than 2017. If a joint commissioning framework cannot be agreed with the NHS by April 2015, the service will be re-tendered and new contracts will be awarded from April 2016, taking advantage of a break clause in both contracts which enables early

termination.

Reasons for Decisions:

Although commissioned by two organisations (Surrey County Council and the NHS), as far as the child or young person at Surrey's maintained Special Schools is concerned, they are accessing one service. If Surrey County Council (SCC) were to re-tender this service alone, it could potentially mean that two different providers would be going into the same school. This could cause disruption and dissatisfaction to our vulnerable service users.

Significant progress has been made with the NHS over the last six months, with agreement from the Health and Wellbeing Board to establish joint commissioning arrangements in Surrey for the delivery of paediatric therapies.

For joint commissioning to take place our contract arrangements with providers need to be aligned, therefore the recommendation is that new contracts should be awarded until 2017 in line with termination of NHS block contracts with the same providers.

This will enable SCC and the NHS to jointly commission the delivery of paediatric therapy services in Surrey providing single and equitable outcomes focused services for children and young people.

Tendering at this stage would not support the local authority's aim to agree joint commissioning arrangements with the NHS to deliver the paediatric therapy service in Surrey. The current shared commissioning arrangements for this service means that contracting with new providers may only add confusion and further dissatisfaction to our service users. By using the same providers as the NHS, SCC has been able to secure competitive rates for these services. Running a competitive process would not necessarily remove the existing contractors from the service delivery as it is likely that they would win the tenders or parts of the tenders.

Improving the management of the contract will still go ahead with the existing providers and it avoids the variable performance in services that is sometimes experienced by end-users when a new contractor mobilises at the start of a new contract.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 16)**

That the decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

- **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (Item 17)**

RESOLVED that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of 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.

PART TWO – IN PRIVATE

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BUSINESS WERE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE BY THE CABINET. SET OUT BELOW IS A PUBLIC SUMMARY OF THE DECISIONS TAKEN.]

- **EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT (Item 18)**

That the grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support, with Surrey Disabled Partnership (SDPP) be extended for an additional two years from 1 April 2014.

Reasons for Decisions:

The existing grant agreement will expire on 31 March 2014.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **BLOCK CONTRACT HILLCREST CARE FOR 20 INDEPENDENT FOSTERING PLACEMENTS (Item 19)**

This item was the confidential annex for the Block Contract with Hillcrest Care, which detailed the Financial and Value for Money implications and the recommendation and reasons for decision are set out within item 15.

- **AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS (Item 20)**

That new Surrey County Council contracts be approved to cover the period 2014 – 2017, as set out in the recommendations for item 15, as amended.

Reasons for Decisions:

Set out within item 15.

- **LYNE AND LONGCROSS COFE INFANT SCHOOL: EXPANSION (Item 21)**

1. That the business case for the project to expand Lyne and Longcross Infant School at a total cost, as set out in the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and the Leader of the Council be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Runnymede area.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by either the Council Overview and

Scrutiny Committee or the Children and Education Select Committee]

- **ST JOHN THE BAPTIST CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL (Item 22)**

This item was withdrawn.

Public Questions

Question (1) from Mr Mike Sawyer, Vice-Chairman of Banstead Village Residents Association to ask:

In the context of the current PSP review and impending closure of the London Fire Brigades Purley Station, we recognise the need for, and benefits of, siting a fire appliance in the Burgh Heath/Banstead area with direct access to the A240 or A217. With regard to the change of “preferred location” from Burgh Heath to the busy Banstead High Street as a site for a fire appliance we deplore the inadequate “consultation” in our immediate area and ask that we be told:-

1. Why, given the length of time that it has been known that the LFB’s station at Purley will close for at least 18 months from this summer without short term replacement cover, has it not been possible to secure a site that meets the fire service’s requirement (as stated at the public consultation meeting in January 2013) of direct, or virtually direct, access onto the A217 or A240?
2. Why was the only public meeting to discuss this proposal held in Ewell Village when siting only affects Banstead Village and *its* surrounding area, when Banstead has many meeting rooms that could have been made available for a vastly greater public response?
3. Why has the former Ambulance station adjacent to the A217 not been secured as the long term, or even interim, site, when it has existing garaging and the potential for re-opening the access onto, and across, the A217, and shared messing with the retained Ambulance HQ buildings? This is especially hard to understand as the site owners are known to be moving the main headquarters establishment from this location.
4. What practical research has been carried out on the delays inherent in siting the new station in the High Street – other than theoretical computer based modelling? We were told that this modelling does not have information specific to the congestion in Banstead High Street. Whilst it is practical to expect a fire tender to gain access to an emergency *in* the High Street, it is an entirely different practical problem to make all calls *from* the High Street – with its’ and the surrounding roads’ congestion as the starting point for each journey.

Reply:

- (1) Property Services working with Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) have found it difficult to secure a permanent site and this is why SFRS intend to locate to a temporary location. This will ensure that the Service can meet its response targets. This includes the reduction in the reliability of fire cover in that part of the county due in part the closing of Purley Fire Station for a period of at least 12 months from summer 2014. We will continue to search for a suitable site that is closer to our optimal location in the wider identified area in the consultation. Once a suitable site/premises has been found, securing it will be subject to a separate Business Case and Cabinet decision.
- (2) This was also discussed at the public meeting. We explored around 20 venues between Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead and Bourne Hall was the only available venue for this date, with the suitable capacity and accessibility criteria. A comprehensive consultation and communications plan was established to target those who are likely to be most affected by the proposals. We used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as a range of communication channels to gather the views of our stakeholders and Item 7, Annex 3 – Consultation report highlights in more detail the

methodology, analysis, key findings and next steps from the consultation process. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service organised a public meeting on 9 January 2014 that was publicised through the consultation website and also in 200 outlets, including libraries, community centres, churches, schools and post offices. The event was also publicised to 200 groups and individuals invited to complete an online survey and through social media sites, Twitter and Facebook. County and local Members were also briefed on the event so they could raise it with their constituents.

- (3) SCC Property Services and the Service continue to investigate available sites/premises in search for a permanent site. This work will continue and should a suitable long term site become available then this will be worked through accordingly.
- (4) The modelling commissioned by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service to identify the optimal location for a fire station is modelled on our incidents to examine historical trends and incident locations, along with appliance utilisation, demand (temporal and geographical) and time spent at incident. Due to the fact that it looks at historical data it will indirectly take into account local variations, as it will consider the time taken to respond to an incident in that area.

Our ambition for the future is to operate not from fixed fire stations but use fire engines for community work and dispatch them when they're out and about, so they can be mobilised from anywhere.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
25 February 2014

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

Democratic Services Lead Manager

Rachel Crossley - x419993

rachel.crossley@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet and Regulation

Senior Manager

Katie Booth - x417197

katieb@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Business Manager

James Stanton - x419068

james.stanton@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Committee Manager

Anne Gowing - x419938

anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

Regulatory Committee Manager

Cheryl Hardman - x419075

cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Victoria Lower - x132733

victoria.lower@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Andy Spragg - x132673

andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Huma Younis - x132725

huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny

Senior Manager

Bryan Searle - x419019

bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Manager

Helen Rankin – x419126

helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Damian Markland - x132703

damian.markland@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Ross Pike - x417368

ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Tom Pooley - x419902

Thomas.Pooley@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Jisa Prasannan – x132694

jisa.prasannan@surreycc.gov.uk