

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2014 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr John Furey
*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)	*Mr Michael Gosling
*Mrs Mary Angell	*Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Helyn Clack	Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr Mel Few	*Mr Tony Samuels

Cabinet Associates:

*Mr Steve Cosser	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Clare Curran	Mr Mike Goodman

* = Present

[Prior to the start of the meeting, the Leader of the Council made an urgent statement in relation to the flooding in Surrey – Appendix 1]

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

25/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Denise Le Gal and Mike Goodman.

26/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 4 FEBRUARY 2014 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

27/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

28/14 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

The Leader of the Council said that the report re. the Schools Expansion Programme from September 2014 (item 11) had been amended to remove references to St John the Baptist School because the decisions on this school have been withdrawn from this meeting and therefore item 22 has also been withdrawn.

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were none.

29/14 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 2.

30/14 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

No petitions were received.

31/14 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

No representations were received.

32/14 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There were none.

33/14 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES [Item 6]

Following the statutory consultation on proposed changes to Surrey's admission arrangements for September 2015, Cabinet was asked to consider the responses and make recommendations to the County Council on admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and Surrey's coordinated schemes for September 2015.

The report covered the following areas in relation to school admissions:

- Auriol Junior School (Stoneleigh, Ewell) - Recommendation 1
- Reigate Priory School (Reigate) – Recommendation 2
- St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 3
- Meadowcroft Infant School (Chertsey) and St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 4
- Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools (Thames Ditton) – Recommendation 5
- Admission criteria for two year olds applying for nursery - Recommendation 6
- Esher CofE High School (Esher) – Recommendation 7
- St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School (Farnham) – Recommendation 8
- Published Admission Number for Year 3 at The Dawnay School (Great Bookham) – Recommendation 9
- Published Admission Number for Reception at North Downs Primary School (Brockham) – Recommendation 10
- Own admission authority schools to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 11
- Out of County schools not to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 12
- Published Admission Numbers for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 13

- Admission arrangements for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 14
- Coordinated Admissions Schemes – Recommendation 15

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning presented the report and said it was a complex and lengthy report. She highlighted the proposed arrangements for Reigate Priory School (recommendation 2) and the proposals for Esher High School, which would be subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to their admission arrangements (recommendation 7).

Cabinet Members were given an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

The Leader of the Council asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, who confirmed that the Equalities Impact Assessment was comprehensive.

He also reminded Members that these recommendations would be considered by the County Council at its meeting on 18 March 2014.

Finally, he thanks the Principal Manager Admissions and Transport (Strategy) and her team for an excellent report.

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

Recommendation 15

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2015/16 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2015 are similar to 2014
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

34/14 CHANGES TO FIRE ENGINE DEPLOYMENT IN THE NORTH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for Community Services invited the Cabinet Associate for Fire and Rescue Services to introduce the report. She began by saying that the changes to fire deployment in Reigate and Banstead would have some impact on Epsom and Ewell.

She reminded Cabinet that, in March 2013, they had approved Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's (SFRS) proposal to operate a chain of single fire engine stations running through the boroughs of Epsom and Ewell (E&E) and Reigate and Banstead (R&B).

Part of the plan was to create a new fire station within the Burgh Heath area. However, no site has been found in this area and therefore Cabinet was being asked to approve the provision of a new fire station within a wider area (a three mile radius) around Burgh Heath. Until a permanent site is identified SFRS intend to relocate to a temporary location within the same area, which would still deliver an improvement in the response standard. This is in order to enable SFRS to meet its response targets, which have become an operational imperative due to a reduction in the reliability of the fire cover in that part of the County due in part to London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority closing Purley Fire Station for a period of 18-24 months from summer 2014.

She also drew attention to paragraph 34 of the report, which stated that there would be continued engagement with the relevant committee in Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead. Referring to the Equalities Impact Assessment and the impact of the proposals on people with protected characteristics, she confirmed that modelling had predicted slightly longer response times but they were still within the Surrey Response Standard.

Finally, she tabled a small amendment to recommendation (3), inserting 'interim' before Strategic Director Adult Social Care and adding in, 'in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services'.

RESOLVED (as amended):

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.

35/14 SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH [Item 8]

The Deputy Leader said that the Cabinet had agreed in February 2013 the importance of promoting Economic Growth in Surrey and he was proud of the role of the County Council in it. He highlighted some of the measures that would help businesses to grow and succeed:

- The apprenticeship scheme for Surrey businesses, which had resulted in the creation of more than 500 apprenticeship places
- The rollout of a county wide high speed broadband network
- 60% of county council spend with local small and medium sized enterprises that had resulted in almost £1m per day being spent with local companies
- A major programme of road schemes

He also referred to the Surrey Employment and Skills Board which was established in April 2013 and the Local Transport Bodies.

He said that Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) were expected to take a lead role in the day to day management of the European Structural and Investment Fund for 2014 – 2020 programme and he referred to the funding opportunities through the Local Growth Deals.

A summary of draft Strategic Economic Plans for Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3 were attached as Annexes to the report.

Finally, he tabled an amendment to recommendation (3), adding in 'either the Leader or' before the Deputy Leader.

RESOLVED (as amended):

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 the 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 full 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.

36/14 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 9]

The Leader of the Council presented the Council's financial position at the end of period 10 (January) of the 2013/14 financial year and said that the Council's financial strategy had four key drivers to ensure sound governance in managing finances and providing value for money:

(1) Keep any additional call on the council taxpayer to a minimum

- That there had been a £1.1m improvement on the revenue forecast since December and the forecast was for a £2.1m underspending.

The improvement would have been greater but for the additional costs faced in tackling the flooding

- This was the fourth consecutive year that the council had a small underspending.

(2) Continuously drive the efficiency agenda

- At the end of January, services were making good progress in delivering efficiencies and forecast achieving over £61m on-going savings for the full year against a stretch target of £68m savings
- Underspends had been identified and delivered by services to cover the shortfall this year.

(3) Develop a funding strategy to reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and government grant income.

- Reducing reliance on government grants and council tax was key to the Council's ability to balance budgets in the longer term. Significant in the Council's ability to achieve this was the Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund. By year end it was forecast that over £59m would have been invested, and net income of £700,000 generated by the end of this year. Rental savings could also total over £1m over the next 10 years.

(4) Continue to maximise our investment in Surrey

- The council's capital programme not only improved and maintained service delivery, it was also a way of investing in Surrey and of generating income for the council. This year the budget was £224m.
- Finally, he said that, in addition to the £59m capital investment in assets, it was estimated that £193m would be invested in service delivery, from improving roads to the creation of more school places. However, with any large capital project there would be some delays with planning issues and archaeological finds.

Other Cabinet Members were invited to highlight the key points and issues from their portfolios, as set out in the annex to the report.

Cabinet Members also thanked all staff who had worked tirelessly, and often outside normal working hours, during the recent flooding emergency.

RESOLVED:

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.

37/14 FORMATION OF WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Community Services said that she was delighted to present the report for the proposal of a Joint Committee of Surrey County Council (SCC) and Woking Borough Council (WBC) which would be the first of its kind to be established in Surrey.

Both Surrey County Council's Cabinet and County Council approval was needed to establish the Joint Committee, to agree to delegate recommended functions to the committee and to agree the Constitution and Standing Orders under which this committee would operate. Woking Borough Council had sought approval from its own Executive and Full Council earlier in February.

She highlighted the possibility of deciding that representatives from the voluntary sector may be co-opted onto the joint committee. She also said that the Chairmanship of the committee would be a County Council appointment but the Vice-Chairmanship would be a Borough appointment.

Functions jointly delegated by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council were also set out within the report.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- It was a good example of partnership in practice and a good template to take forward
- Other Districts and Boroughs should be encouraged to follow and establish joint committees
- The joint committee would enable greater local accountability and residents would be more involved in decision making
- Encourage Woking to act as its local Health and Well Being Board and oversee and set priorities for general health and wellbeing matters within the framework of Surrey's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- The joint committee had the full support of Woking Borough Council
- No substitutes would be permitted for both County and Borough Members
- A belief that this could be a template that could be used throughout two-tier Government

Cabinet Members publically thanked the Programme Manager and Lead Manager for Community Safety and Partnership and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and their teams for their hard work in formulating the arrangements for the Woking Joint Committee. They also acknowledged the role that the Leader of Woking Borough Council had played in supporting the proposals.

In putting the recommendations to the vote, the Leader of the Council said that he hoped for all-party support for these proposals when the item was considered at County Council on 18 March 2014.

RESOLVED:

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.

38/14 SCHOOLS EXPANSION PROGRAMME FROM SEPTEMBER 2014 [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that there was significant demand for new school places within Runnymede and there was an opportunity to increase provision at Lyne and Longcross Infant School to meet demand for primary school places in this area.

This expansion was also supported by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning and the Headteacher, Governors and parents of this school.

RESOLVED:

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 change 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 individual project and building works are in accordance with the planned timetables required for delivery of the new accommodation at the school.

39/14 EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that this report sought approval to extend the Grant Agreement for Welfare Benefits Advice, Information and Support for two years from 1 April 2014.

A one year grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support was awarded in April 2013 after a competitive bidding process. The agreement included the option of extending for a further two years, which he was recommending to Cabinet.

He also referred to the case studies, attached as Annex 1 and which illustrated the benefits of this advice and support.

Finally, he proposed a small amendment to recommendation (2) – deleting 'should' and adding 's' to remain.

The Leader of the Council said that the provision of this service was important and referred to the Equality and Diversity and the Corporate Parent / Looked After Children implications set out in the report.

RESOLVED (as amended):

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.

40/14 BLOCK CONTRACT WITH HILLCREST CARE FOR 20 INDEPENDENT FOSTERING PLACEMENTS [Item 13]

In presenting this report, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families said that the County Council had a statutory duty to provide suitable alternative accommodation for children that become Looked After either under Section 20 or 31 of the Children Act 1989 and as part of this provision Surrey County Council (SCC) had a block contract for 20 placements with Hillcrest Care Services Ltd (Hillcrest).

In 2013 Procurement and Commissioning reviewed the contract with Hillcrest and assessed the options regarding future delivery (beyond March 2014). Thorough review of the contract as well as future commissioning intentions resulted in a recommendation that a new 3-year contract was awarded to Hillcrest because this was the best option and there would be no disruption to children receiving this care.

Finally, she drew attention to the comprehensive Equalities Impact Assessment attached to the report.

RESOLVED:

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.

41/14 ICELANDIC BANK DEPOSIT [Item 14]

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Business Services, the Leader of the Council presented the report which concerned the outcome of the sale of the priority claim of the Council as a Landsbanki depositor/creditor.

He made the following amendments to the report:

(i) Paragraph (9) of the report: **Delete** consultation with the Chairman of the County Council and **replace with** the Chairman of Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

(ii) What Happens Next: Add in: 'Landsbanki' so it now reads:

Officers to close the **Landesbanki** accounts with regard to the sale transaction and write off irrecoverable balance to the Financial Investments Reserve.

Members were confident that the £1.6m relating to Glitnir would be paid in full at a future date and agreed that this was a successful outcome. They complimented finance officers, and in particular the Strategic Finance Officer, for their efforts in pursuing this claim.

RESOLVED:

- (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.

42/14 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS [Item 15]

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that currently, both Surrey County Council (SCC) and the National Health Service (NHS) in Surrey entered into contracts with providers of paediatric therapy services in Surrey to provide services to Surrey children with special educational needs and disabilities who attended Surrey schools.

The provider organisations were Virgin Care Services Limited (VCSL) and Central Surrey Health Limited (CSHL). The County Council and the NHS in Surrey had agreed to move as soon as possible to a joint commissioning arrangement.

As the SCC contracts terminate on 31 March 2014 and the NHS contracts terminate on 31 March 2017, April 2017 is the agreed date to commence joint commissioning.

She also proposed an amendment to Recommendation (2), adding after April 2016:

‘taking advantage of a break clause in both contracts which enables early termination.’

In his capacity as Local Authority Governor of the Abbey School, the Chairman of the Council was invited to address Cabinet. He said that the provision of speech and language therapy for special schools was critical and this report was welcomed. He hoped that the joint commissioning would come to fruition and asked that during the negotiation of the contracts that the pay and conditions for staff be addressed to ensure consistency.

Finally, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment and said that in Surrey there were over 5000 children and young people with Special Educational Needs statements.

[The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board abstained from this item]

RESOLVED (as amended):

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.

43/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 16]

RESOLVED:

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.

44/14 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.

**45/14 EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS
ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT [Item 18]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care drew Cabinet's attention to the competitive tendering process and the scoring results of this confidential annex to item 12.

RESOLVED:

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.

**46/14 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 were set out within item 13.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families also informed Members that the recent negotiations had resulted in a commitment from Hillcrest Care to offer additional bespoke services.

**47/14 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES
TO SURREY SCHOOLS [Item 20]**

This item was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning and was the confidential annex for the award of contracts for the delivery of therapy services to Surrey Schools, which detailed the Financial and Value for Money Implications. She said that the proposal was to extend the existing contracts at current prices to enable longer term service redesign.

[The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board abstained from this item]

RESOLVED:

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.

48/14 LYNE AND LONGCROSS COFE INFANT SCHOOL: EXPANSION [Item 21]

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that there was strong support from the parents of this school and other local schools for this expansion and commended the recommendations to Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

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.

49/14 ST JOHN THE BAPTIST CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL [Item 22]

This item was withdrawn.

50/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 23]

That non-exempt information relating to items considered in part 2 of the meeting may be made available to the press and the public, as appropriate.

[Meeting closed at 3.30pm]

Chairman

Flooding Statement

As everyone in the county will know, many of our residents and business have suffered some of the worst flooding in living memory.

More than 3,600 families have been affected and nearly 1,300 people have been rescued by Surrey firefighters. But these numbers don't begin to convey the full impact on our residents, who are now counting the personal, emotional and financial cost.

Our staff and Members have been working round the clock with the police, Environment Agency, the military and local councils to support our communities to get through a situation that has, for many people, literally turned their lives upside down.

While Surrey fire crews have rescued families from the floods, our social care teams have made sure vulnerable people remain safe and well. In addition, our teams have been working hard to keep as many roads and schools open as possible. Not to mention supplying and distributing more than 50,000 sandbags.

With the flood waters now going down the work has not stopped and our focus has turned to helping affected communities to recover. We have worked with our borough and district colleagues to set up recovery centres to provide people with advice and support. A concerted effort has started on the clean up operation.

I am sure I speak, not only for my Cabinet colleagues, but also for all county council Members when I say how grateful I am to all those who have helped and volunteered to assist the county and local communities to get through this.

The work to help families to get back on their feet is not yet done and the cost to the county is only just emerging. The cost alone of putting our roads back in shape currently stands at £12.5 million and is set to rise. So, we must look to the future and that is why we are now in discussion with central government about what measures can be taken to limit the chances of this happening again. It is vital we leave no stone unturned to ensure our communities are properly protected in the years to come.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
25 February 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

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