

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET**

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 21 March 2011.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 1 FEBRUARY 2011 AT 2.00PM  
AT COUNTY HALL**

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

Members:

|                             |                           |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| *Dr Andrew Povey (Chairman) | *Mr Tim Hall              |
| *Mr David Hodge             | *Mrs Kay Hammond          |
| *Mrs Mary Angell            | *Mr Ian Lake              |
| *Mr Michael Gosling         | *Mr Peter Martin          |
| *Dr Lynne Hack              | *Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos |

\* = Present

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**01/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

There were none.

**02/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 21 December 2010 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 December 2010 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**03/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Dr Povey declared a prejudicial interest concerning the Revenue and Capital Budget 2011/12 to 2014/14(item 6), the adult social care elements of the Budget Monitoring Report for August 2010 (item 7), the adult social care elements of the 2010/11 Quarterly Business report (item 9) and the Vision for Adult Social Care: Capable Communities and Active Citizens (item 11) because he was a director of a company that supplied social care to adults in Surrey and had contracts with Surrey County Council. He withdrew from the meeting for the consideration of these items and took no part in the discussion and decisions thereon.

**04/11 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

There were none.

**05/11 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

There were none.

**06/11 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2011/12 TO 2014/15 (Item 6)**

Dr Povey declared a prejudicial interest regarding the Adult Social Care elements of this item because he was a director of a company that supplied social care to adults in Surrey and had contracts with Surrey County Council

He withdrew from the meeting for the consideration of this item and took no part in the discussion and decision thereon.

The Deputy Leader introduced the report and started by amending recommendation (g), from £11.5m to £11.8m due to the latest Government announcement.

He cited the achievements of this Administration to date, which included (i) Value for Money, (ii) a four year rolling financial revenue plan, and (iii) public value reviews (PVRs) for all services. He was delighted to announce that these reviews would result in savings of £74m over the next three years. He also explained that the Coalition Government had changed the nature of grants to reduce specificity and ring-fencing.

He was also pleased with the monthly budget monitoring reports received by Cabinet which enabled them to have more up to date information on the budget. He also said that he hoped that the closure of accounts would take place earlier this year.

He announced that the County Council would be investing a further £12m in Surrey Highways over the next four years and informed Cabinet that he had now signed the new highway contract with May Gurney, to commence on 28 April 2011.

He explained the underspending on the capital budget and also informed Cabinet that the Authority would be working in partnership with Hampshire County Council to drive down costs within the schools capital budget.

Finally, he said that, for the first time in the history of Surrey, the County Council was setting a zero council tax increase and hoped that Cabinet would approve the recommendations to be considered at the County Council meeting on 8 February 2011.

Each Cabinet Member was invited to comment on the budget for their portfolio.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that his service had produced half the savings required for the forthcoming year. He considered that the service had a two-way dialogue with front line services and the changes would benefit the community overall. He acknowledged that more work was needed on the capital issues and the infrastructure in Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency referred to Annex 2 and the PVR savings, in particular the recruitment PVR and also the in-sourcing of property maintenance. He acknowledged the amount of work that had been undertaken to achieve the savings.

The Cabinet Member for Transport said that highways was an important issue for Surrey residents and he was pleased that the new contract had been signed with May Gurney. He said that the current contractors had been working well throughout this winter, filling a pothole every 10 minutes.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning made two points. Firstly, relating to the Early Intervention Grant, which would continue to be ring-fenced and, secondly, on schools' capital. He said that the schools' capital programme was the biggest challenge facing the County Council but it would be building classrooms, mostly at existing schools, over the next four

years, to accommodate the increased birth rate in Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families said that the Government settlement had badly affected the Children's Service, with the loss of several grants. However, the County Council had made £5m available from other services so that vulnerable children could be protected.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety reminded Members that tough choices had been made to achieve this year's budget and robust challenge had been needed to obtain efficiencies and Value for Money. She said that these steps had resulted in the County Council being in a better position than other Councils.

She referred to the proposed savings for the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and said that the Public Safety Plan was currently out for consultation and hoped that members of public would read it and contribute to the consultation process.

In summing up, the Deputy Leader acknowledged the excellent work of the Surrey Pension team and made reference to the national award that they had recently won.

He stressed that there was no place for complacency and that there was more work to do. It was important to work together because different ways of working were needed.

Finally, on behalf of all Members, he expressed grateful thanks to the Head of Finance, who would be retiring at the end of March, for his hard work and service to the people of Surrey.

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:**

- (1) That the budget requirement for 2011/12 is £708.9m;
- (2) That the Council Tax precept be set at £556.2m;
- (3) That Council tax band D be set at £1,116.36, which is a 0% increase;
- (4) That powers be delegated to the Deputy Leader and the Head of Finance to finalise detailed budget proposals to cover areas of the funding settlement subject to late notification by the Coalition Government;
- (5) That a risk contingency be maintained to mitigate against non-delivery of reductions and efficiencies of £8m;
- (6) That a new earmarked severe weather/civil emergency reserve of £5.0m be created;
- (7) That balances totalling £11.8m to 2011/12 be applied;
- (8) That Strategic Directors be requested to bring forward 2012/13 savings as far as possible to minimise the reduction in balances in

2011/12;

- (9) That sustainable revenue funding be applied to capital programme;
- (10) That capital programme proposals (specifically fund essential schemes over 4 year period, schools and non-schools, to the value of £466m including ring-fenced grants) be agreed;
- (11) That it seeks to secure capital receipts over the 4 year period to 2014/15 of £79m;
- (12) To agree to stabilise contributions to the pension fund at the rate currently in payment, which is in the interests of stability and affordability of employer contributions;

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Head of Finance produce all necessary formal recommendations to support the proposals for County Council, including prudential indicators and treasury management strategy.
- (2) That the Corporate Leadership Team maintains robust procedures so Cabinet can monitor achievement of efficiencies and service reductions through the quarterly Cabinet Member accountability meetings.
- (13) That all invest to save proposals and capital schemes have an approved business case before expenditure can be committed.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The County Council will meet to agree the budget and council tax on 8 February 2011.

**07/11 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR DECEMBER 2010 (Item 7)**

Dr Povey declared a prejudicial interest regarding the Adult Social Care elements of this item because he was a director of a company that supplied social care to adults in Surrey and had contracts with Surrey County Council. He withdrew from the meeting for the consideration of that part of the item and took no part in the discussion and decision thereon.

The Deputy Leader took the chair for that part of the item.

The Deputy Leader introduced the report and said that it provided Members with an accurate position of the Council's accounts as at the end of December 2010. He drew Cabinet's attention to the forecast underspend (Annex A, page 1) of £26.1m but said that £19.3m of this figure was proposed carry forward requests which would be considered at a future Cabinet meeting. He was also pleased that the £8m risk contingency against not achieving service savings had not been required.

Other Cabinet Members had an opportunity to comment on the budget position, and made the following points:

- That much of the underspend was funding already allocated to enable works to be carried out in the forthcoming year.
- It was 'good news' that the Children, Schools and Families budget was predicting an underspend this year, although the SEN Home to School Transport continued to be an issue.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the budget monitoring position and projected year end variances be noted.
- (2) That the quarter 3 reporting on the balance sheet be noted.

**Reasons for decisions:**

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

**08/11 2009/10 ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER (Item 8)**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency who said that he was pleased to report that the External Auditor's 2009/10 Annual Audit Letter had (i) issued an unqualified opinion on the Council's financial statements, (ii) issued an unqualified statement on Value for Money, (iii) stated that the Surrey County Council Pension Fund financial statements were complete and of good quality and the opinion on these was unqualified, (iv) that the preparation for the introduction of International Financial Reporting Standards was progressing, and (v) the profile and importance of governance at the Council had been raised and weaknesses were being addressed.

He also thanked the Audit and Governance Committee for its comments.

Members were delighted that this was the first time in three years that the County Council had received an unqualified opinion from the External Auditor and were pleased that the County Council now had a clear vision for its direction and that improved governance arrangements were in place.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the contents of the 2009/10 Annual Audit Letter be acknowledged.
- (2) That the Audit and Governance Committee be requested to monitor progress on the implementation of the actions required.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To ensure that the Cabinet is satisfied that all material issues have been raised and represented correctly in the 2009/10 Annual Audit Letter and that progress on recommendations is monitored.

**09/11 2010/11 QUARTERLY BUSINESS REPORT (Item 9)**

Dr Povey declared a prejudicial interest regarding the Adult Social Care

elements of this item because he was a director of a company that supplied social care to adults in Surrey and had contracts with Surrey County Council. He withdrew from the meeting for the consideration of that part of the item and took no part in the discussion and decision thereon.

The Deputy Leader took the chair for that part of the item.

The Deputy Leader said that this report reflected on the performance of the whole organisation and was structured around the objectives set out in the Corporate Strategy. He mentioned the importance of continuous improvement through PVRs, the STARS training programme, the 'Making a Difference' conversations and the Score Card (Appendix 1).

Cabinet Members reported on areas of high performance within their portfolios and outlined actions being taken to address those areas where targets were not being met.

The Leader drew attention to the Leadership Risk Register (Appendix 3) in which the importance of Business Contingency, in the event of an emergency was highlighted.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Council wide outturn on customer feedback, finance, workforce and performance be noted.
- (2) That the Leadership Risk Register be noted.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To ensure effective business management of the County Council to deliver improved outcomes and value for money for Surrey residents and to support delivery of *Making a Difference*, the Corporate Strategy.

[Note: Due to the amount of public interest in the Public Value Review of Library Services, the Chairman re-ordered the agenda and took this item next.]

**10/11 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF LIBRARY SERVICES (Item 12)**

Comments from the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee and the response from the Cabinet were tabled at the meeting (Appendices 1 and 2 respectively).

The Cabinet also received a response, tabled by Unison, to the Public Value Review of the Library Service.

The Chairman of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee presented her report and welcomed the response from the Cabinet, particularly in relation to the engagement with local communities during the next three months. However, she was still concerned about the proposals concerning the mobile library service and requested that assurance was given that the Cabinet would consider all proposals put forward by local communities on alternative proposals over a longer timescale than one month. She also said that the Cabinet had not responded to recommendation (d) in the select committee's report concerning the Member Reference Group and was advised that the Deputy Leader had

taken up this point.

The Chairman said that more than one option for the mobile library service had been put forward in the report and it was important to move forward as soon as possible.

Mr Mallett, County Councillor for West Molesey was also invited to address the meeting. He said that some of his comments had already been reflected in the Unison letter and also by the Chairman of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee. He said that he was concerned with the recommendations in the report concerning the closure of the mobile library service and some libraries and also that the Member Reference Group had not signed off the final version of the report. He was also concerned about the lack of involvement of the divisional Members in the affected areas. He said that he had also attended the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee the previous week for this item, and that the report had been substantially amended / updated for Cabinet.

Finally, he considered that the consultation for the mobile library should also be three months. He also requested details of the assessment methodology for each library, which the Chairman agreed could be made available.

Mr Peter Wadham, former Chairman of Bramley Parish Council was invited to speak. He referred to the letter which had been sent to Cabinet Members and made reference to the Bramley Parish Plan which stated a strong enthusiasm for delivering services locally. He said that Bramley welcomed localism and the opportunity for greater involvement in the library.

However, he was concerned that there would not be local support if the County Council forced the issue. He said that, given the location of Bramley, straddling both sides of A281, together with other local factors, it did not make sense for residents to drive into Guildford to use the library facilities. He also requested the library assessment including the scoring and asked for confirmation that the County Council would meet all other costs apart from the staffing. Finally, he requested a postponement of the Cabinet's decision so that a proper local consultation could take place.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games responded to Mr Wadham's points and said that she would request that officers circulate the methodology to him after the meeting. She also said the decision could not be postponed.

The Deputy Leader said that residents' expectations of Library Service provision were changing and it was important to think about libraries as 'culture centres'.

He said that currently 8000 hours of voluntary service was already undertaken in Surrey libraries.

He confirmed that he recognised the importance of elected Members having the necessary information and had already arranged meetings with the local Members of each of the eleven libraries that may be earmarked for the community partnering approach. He stressed the importance of dialogue with parish councils and voluntary organisations so that imaginative ideas could be developed to ensure the future of the service.

He gave an assurance that, after the initial consultation period to establish



possibilities, there would be a period of detailed work done (until 1 September 2011) where there were genuine opportunities to establish community partnerships.

He also said that the virtual library should be encouraged.

He confirmed that the County Council would provide the buildings, the stock and that there would be WiFi in all libraries. However, it would be the responsibility of the communities to provide the staffing (for which the Council would provide training) and also to decide the opening hours.

On the mobile library service, he said that it had been a difficult decision but that all existing users of the service would be consulted on the future options.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games thanked the Strategic Director for Customers and Communities and the Library Lead PVR Manager for their work on this review and acknowledged their difficult task in bringing this review to its conclusion. She reiterated some of the Deputy Leader's points and stressed the importance of working with communities to provide a way forward.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety drew Members' attention to the robust Equality Impact Assessment attached as Appendix 3 to the report.

The Chairman said that 'opportunity' was the recurrent theme running through the debate on this PVR. It was about working together and change and doing things differently and gave an undertaking that Bramley would have a fair deal in the review.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) To work with Parish Councils, local charities, community groups and organisations, with the aim of inviting interest to establish community partnership at selected libraries, and co-designing and developing a Surrey model for locally managed and partnered libraries, and that a progress report be submitted to Cabinet following the consultation period.
- (2) That local committees lead in driving the community partnering approach for libraries forward.
- (3) To consult with existing users of the mobile library borrowers and equality advisory groups, to co-design a sustainable and value for money service including consideration of appropriate and affordable support to enable borrowers to continue to access library services, with a focus on using e-technology, community transport and voluntary driver schemes. This requires a proportion of savings to be redirected to providing alternatives. The actual cost will be unknown until consultation is completed, but initial estimates suggest a maximum total annual cost of £109,000 is required between 2012-13. It is expected that this sum would reduce by 15% per annum in 2013-14 and 2014-15. In 2012-13 net annual saving would be £330,000.
- (4) That withdrawal of the mobile library service be agreed. Thereafter annual savings of £439,000 in library controllable expenditure savings and £7,000 in annual corporate savings (insurance and parking)

would be achieved.

- (5) That implementation of the action plan should start immediately, led by Peter Milton, Head of Cultural Services.
- (6) That progress be reported on a quarterly basis to the PVR Steering Board and the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee.
- (7) That the recommendations set out in the implementation action plan, attached to the submitted report, be agreed.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To move the Public Value Review of Surrey Library Service into the consultation and implementation phase.

**11/11 THE JOINT COMMISSIONING OF HEALTH, CARE AND EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IN SURREY (Item 10)**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families asked Cabinet to agree to the governance and service arrangements to take forward, with NHS Surrey, the development of a formal joint agreement. She said that a version of this report would be presented to the NHS Surrey board at its meeting on 11 March 2011.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the County Council work with NHS Surrey and Surrey GPs to develop joint commissioning arrangements for relevant health, care and education support services for children and young people.
- (2) That a Children and Young People's Joint Commissioning Steering Board be established to develop joint commissioning and support the children and young people contribution to the local implementation of the Health and Social Care Bill.
- (3) That with NHS Surrey and Surrey GPs, the Council draw up and consults on a Children and Young People's Joint Commissioning Plan that is informed by a Children and Young People Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.
- (3) That a joint commissioning service be created with NHS Surrey to manage and support these arrangements with the service hosted by the Council.
- (4) That for the County Council, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families oversee the development of these arrangements referring the formal agreement with NHS Surrey and GPs to Cabinet at an appropriate time.
- (5) That pending the finalisation of governance and scrutiny arrangements to accompany the local implementation of the Health and Social Care Bill, the Children and Families Select Committee be responsible for the overview and scrutiny of these developments.

**Reasons for decisions:**

Cabinet endorsement into this approach is required to enable the Cabinet Member for Children and Families and Council officers to develop with NHS Surrey and GPs the formal arrangements and agreement for joint commissioning.

**12/11 A VISION FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE: CAPABLE COMMUNITIES AND ACTIVE CITIZENS (Item 11)**

Dr Povey declared a prejudicial interest regarding this item because he was a director of a company that supplied social care to adults in Surrey and had contracts with Surrey County Council. He withdrew from the meeting for the consideration of this item and took no part in the discussion and decision thereon.

The Deputy Leader took the chair for that part of the item.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that the 'Vision for Adult Social Care – Capable Communities and Active Citizens' published by the Government in November 2010 was the first in a series of publications relating to Adult Social Care. He also amended the recommendation in the report, deleting the last part of the sentence ' and endorse the service response to it' so that the recommendation now read ' that the key elements of the vision be noted'.

**RESOLVED:**

That the key elements of the vision be noted.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The new vision for Adult Social Care produced by the Government supports the strategic direction taken by Surrey County Council Adult Social Care and its aims to improve and streamline services for Surrey residents.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the following decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet be noted:

**(1) SLYFIELD AREA REGENERATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT**

That the content within the report submitted be noted and the principle of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan be supported.

**Reasons for decision**

To formalise Surrey County Council's support in principle for the Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Environment – 15 December 2010)

**(2) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: PETITION RE CLAYGATE PARKING CHARGES**

That the response attached at Appendix 1, to the submitted report, be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 15 December 2010)

**(3) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: MEMBER QUESTIONS**

That the responses to the Member questions attached at Appendix 2, to the submitted report, be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to Member questions.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 15 December 2010)

**(4) REQUEST TO ADOPT NEW ROADS**

That the adoption of those roads set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted and listed below be authorised.

Furze Close, Horley

Former Majestic House, Land north of the High Street extending to Mill Mead and Fairfield Avenue, Staines (planning application reference SP/09/00566)

Former Majestic House, Land north of the High Street extending to Mill Mead and Fairfield Avenue, Staines (planning application reference SP/10/0017)

Bulldog Nursery, Town Lane, Stanwell

Land opposite 43A and 47 Thames Street, Sunbury on Thames

South Tadworth Farm, Epsom Lane North, Tadworth

**Reasons for decision**

These requests fully meet Surrey County Council's current policy on road adoption.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 15 December 2010)

**(5) REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING PERMIT COSTS FOLLOWING PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

That a traffic regulation order is made confirming that the County Council intends:

- a) to set a fee of £50 per year for the first residents parking permit
- b) that any subsequent parking permits issued to the same household will

be £75 (except Guildford where the existing £80 upper fee will remain)

c) that daily residents permits will be £2 each

d) that any replacement permits will be £15.

#### **Reasons for decision**

To ensure the county council effectively and efficiently manages on-street parking in Surrey by having appropriate charges for parking permits.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 15 December 2010)

#### **(6) APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE SUPPLY OF ICT HARDWARE TO SUPPORT CHILDREN WITH A STATEMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEED AND SUPPLY OF THE ASSOCIATED SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE SERVICES**

That a framework agreement to commence on 1 February 2011, expiring on 31 January 2015, without an option to extend, be awarded to the tenderer detailed in the report submitted at a value as set out in the report.

#### **Reasons for decision**

The existing contract will expire on 31 January 2010. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the above contract award provides best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 15 December 2010)

#### **(7) PROPOSED LEASE FOR REPLACEMENT DISASTER RECOVERY DATA CENTRE**

That the acquisition of the lease of premises in Guildford for provision of the Disaster Recovery Data Centre, on the terms reported at Annexe 1 to the report submitted, be approved.

#### **Reasons for decision**

To ensure the County Council realises the objectives set out in the approved "Making a Difference " business case approved by Cabinet on 28 September 2010.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 15 December 2010)

#### **(8) PIPPBROOK HOUSE, DORKING**

That settlement of the dilapidations claim with Mole Valley District Council in the sum and on the terms reported be approved.

#### **Reasons for decision**

To ensure the County Council discharges fully its contractual obligation

under the terms of the lease.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 15 December 2010)

**(9) BUDGET VIREMENT – PROCUREMENT TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

That the part year budget virement of £453,000 from Procurement to Adult Social Care be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

To reflect the change in the management of the Social Care Placement team.

(Decision of Deputy Leader – 15 December 2010)

**(10) SPORTING EVENT**

That Surrey County Council, in partnership with Elmbridge Borough Council, hosts the sporting event, as detailed in the report submitted, with no additional financial consideration.

**Reasons for decision**

The event will showcase the county and bring wider reputational benefits and ongoing legacy benefits to the area of Surrey.

(Decision of Leader – 5 January 2011)

**(11) OATLANDS INFANT SCHOOL - PROPOSAL TO ENLARGE THE PREMISES**

That the proposal to expand Oatlands Infant School to 270 places from 1 September 2011 and to increase the published admission number (PAN) from 60 to 90 be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional infant places are required in the local area. Oatlands is a popular school, categorised as outstanding by Ofsted and had adequate space to accommodate this increase.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 12 January 2011)

**(12) TRANSFER OF BUSINESS SUPPORT BUDGETS FROM SERVICES TO DIRECTORATE SUPPORT**

That the ongoing revenue budget virement of £259,000 for 2010/11 (£1.7m ongoing effect) within the Customers and Communities staffing budget be approved.

**Reasons for decisions**

To align financial and management responsibility for the new directorate wide business support function.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games – 12 January 2011)

**(13) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: PETITION RE BLETCHINGLY ROAD ZEBRA CROSSING PETITION**

That the response attached at Appendix 3, to the submitted report, be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 12 January 2011)

**(14) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: PETITION RE AIRTRACK**

That the response attached at Appendix 4, to the submitted report, be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 12 January 2011)

**(15) REVIEW OF ON STREET PARKING CHARGES**

(1) That a statutory consultation and publication of a notice of proposals is carried out in each Surrey district and borough (as appropriate) confirming that the County Council intends:

- (a) to make Traffic Regulation Orders the effects of which would be:
  - To remove existing voucher parking in Woking and Weybridge and convert it to 'pay and display' parking. A limited number of bays would be converted to resident only parking on the outskirts of Woking
  - To convert some existing free parking bays to 'pay and display'
  - To introduce new 'pay and display' parking
- (b) to set a proposed parking tariff of:

|        |                                  |
|--------|----------------------------------|
| High   | £1.40 per hour or 70p for ½ hour |
| Medium | £1.00 per hour or 50p for ½ hour |
| Low    | £60p per hour or 30p for ½ hour  |

The proposals in (a) above are detailed on the drawings listed in Annex 1 to the report submitted and the proposed tariffs for the 'pay and display' areas ((b) above) are detailed on the drawings listed in Annex 2 to the report submitted, which were available on the Surrey County Council website from 11 January 2011 and which will be distributed to all Surrey County Councillors and MPs with an explanatory letter.

- (c) that the 11 Local Committees will be consulted as their areas come forward in the programme.
  - (d) that the comments and objections for each area are considered by the Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport prior to any Traffic Regulation Orders being made.
- (2) That the process to procure on street charging infrastructure such as pay and display ticket machines and a 'cashless' payment system is started and a further report on the tender outcome is brought to a future meeting of the Cabinet Member for approval to proceed.
  - (3) That a process be devised prior to any final decision that illustrates how any surplus made from individual areas is distributed, i.e. a percentage to be agreed will be retained for highway works where the surplus has been generated.
  - (4) That a review be carried out by the Parking Team during 2012/13 (if these proposals go ahead) in consultation with Local Committees to determine whether any other parking restrictions are needed to tackle displacement as a result of the on street charging proposals.
  - (5) That Local Committees are able to fund new Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ), or amendments to existing CPZs from their locally determined budgets subject to legal and programming considerations, i.e. any changes would need to fit in with the proposed on street 'pay and display' programme described in the report submitted.

#### **Reasons for decision**

Charging for parking helps the County Council effectively and efficiently manage on-street parking in Surrey and has the following benefits:

- 'Pay and display' makes short term parking easier to enforce and improves turnover of the available parking space.
- Free on street and 'pay and display' off street parking encourages drivers to look for on street parking and increases congestion and CO<sup>2</sup> emissions in town centres.
- A policy of setting higher charges for on street 'premium' spaces also encourages drivers to go straight to a car park, reducing congestion.
- Any surplus generated from on street charging can be used to maintain or improve highway infrastructure.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 12 January 2011)

#### **(16) WOODLANDS SCHOOL, LEATHERHEAD – ESSENTIAL PROJECT**

- (1) That officers be authorised to extend the commission of the consultant to develop full specification and drawings and undertake a tender exercise to achieve an actual tender cost.
- (2) That officers be authorised to appoint and place an official order with a contractor to complete the works.



## **Reasons for decision**

The proposal delivers value for money and supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide appropriate education facilities to meet the needs of all children according to their age, ability, aptitude and special educational needs.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 12 January 2011)

### **14/11 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (Item 14)**

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

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

### **15/11 SURREY VOLUNTARY ACTION NETWORK CONTRACT (SVAN) (Item 15)**

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games commended this report to Cabinet. She said that the proposal to change the funding arrangement from ten individual grants to a single contract with SVAN had been put forward by the Council for Voluntary Services and confirmed that this new proposal would provide an opportunity for savings.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the change of funding from individual grants to a single contract to provide support and development services to Voluntary Community Faith Sector (VCFS) groups in Surrey be approved.
- (2) That approval be given to negotiate with SVAN the award of a one year contract extendable for up to three years, which will be subject to a 30% saving in April 2012 and an annual review by the County Council Procurement Review Group.

#### **Reasons for decisions:**

The economic crisis has created opportunities to re-look at alternative ways of delivering quality services that also ensure value for money. Research has shown that VCFS groups that access support, when they need it, are more robust. This contract, delivered through the SVAN, provides an opportunity to modernise and enhance the way support services are delivered to frontline VCFS groups in Surrey. Moving from ten individual grants to one contract will also streamline administrative processes and provide opportunities for future efficiencies.

### **16/11 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS (Item 16)**

#### **(a) PROPOSED LEASE RENEWAL QUADRANT COURT, WOKING**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency introduced this report and responded to Members' queries on the Heads of Terms.

**RESOLVED:**

That the acquisition of a new reversionary lease of Quadrant Court, Woking, on the terms attached as Annexe 1 to the submitted report, be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To ensure the County Council realises the objectives set out in the "Making a Difference " business case approved by Cabinet on 28 September 2010 and secures long term accommodation for its main office provision in the west of the county.

**17/11 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 17)**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**[The meeting closed at 4.25pm]**

---

**Chairman**

**SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration:** Public Value Review of Surrey Library Service

**Date Considered:** 20 January 2011

The Select Committee supported the general direction of the PVR and recognised the need to make improvements and efficiencies. They welcomed the principle of the community partner approach, which would allow local people to deliver tailored library services in their area, thus potentially avoiding closures.

However, Members acknowledged that community partnerships require ambitious and willing groups of volunteers in order to be successful. Groups will need sufficient time and support to become established and progress is likely to be variable in different areas. The Committee therefore seeks assurance that local groups will be given sufficient time to prepare an appropriate bid, with support from the County Council. The Committee considered that communities should be made fully aware of the likelihood of closure at some small libraries if they are not able to form a community partnership.

Although Members acknowledged that the mobile library service was currently an expensive service to run, they value very highly the support that this service provides to some of the county's most vulnerable people. With the possible closure of some smaller libraries, the mobile library service could become even more valuable. As a result, the Committee felt that consultation on the future of mobile libraries should not take place in isolation from the branch network, nor within the 30-day timescale indicated by the Cabinet Member. As proposed for the library network, the consultation on mobile libraries should give sufficient time to develop alternative proposals for running the service.

With no experience of how the community partnership approach might work in practice, Members felt that they were only able to endorse exploring this approach with the libraries listed as 'phase one' of the proposals. The Committee wishes to receive a report that reviews the progress of community partnerships in phase one, which will then allow Members to make an informed decision about endorsing any extension of the community-partnering programme.

Finally, Members were very concerned to learn that the Member Reference Group had not been asked to sign off the final report, which the Deputy Leader has indicated is an integral part of the process. Members were unaware of some of the detail contained in the final recommendations. The Committee agreed that this should be conveyed to Cabinet and the PVR steering group to ensure that future PVRs followed the correct process.

The Select Committee therefore recommends to Cabinet:

- (a) That sufficient time is given in the consultation for the formation of community partnerships with appropriate support from the County Council. Communities should be made fully aware at the start of the consultation that if they are unable to form such a partnership their local library may close.
- (b) That the present proposal to provide only a one month consultation period before withdrawing the mobile library service should be dropped and local groups should be given sufficient time and opportunity to develop alternative

proposals to the current mobile service.

- (c) That Cabinet approves the exploration of a community partnership approach for phase one ONLY. Further transfers from 2012/13 onwards should only be considered once a full review of phase one has been completed, with the full involvement of the Select Committee.
- (d) That in future PVRs, the Member Reference Group is always made fully aware of the final PVR report and has the opportunity to add its comments as part of the report prior to its consideration by the Cabinet.

**Steve Cosser – Vice-Chairman of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee**

**PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF LIBRARY SERVICES**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

The Cabinet wishes to thank the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee for the time and effort they have given to the library services PVR and for the helpful nature of their comments.

- (a) We fully support the recommendation from Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee that sufficient time is given in the consultation for the formation of community partnerships with appropriate support from the County Council. That communities should be made fully aware at the start of the consultation that if they are unable to form such a partnership their local library may close.
- (b) We intend to consult with all the registered users of the mobile service. We think that consultation will take longer than one month. We would consider all proposals put forward by local communities to develop alternative models to the current mobile service consistent with the objective of helping people to use the mobile service.
- (c) Community Partnered Libraries are a new approach to delivering the library service in Surrey. The Cabinet is committed to a full review of the development and implementation of phase one of community partnered libraries before extending this approach to other libraries, who may wish to take advantage.
- (d) We note the comments on the use of the Member Reference Group with the development of the library service PVR. There has been a recent review by members of the operation of member reference group and a number of changes have been identified, some have already been put in place.

**David Hodge, Deputy Leader**

**Denise Saliagopoulos, Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games**

**1 February 2011**