

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

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Cabinet at its next ordinary 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**

18/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)

There were none.

19/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 1 February 2011 (Item 2)

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2011 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

20/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

- (1) Dr Povey declared a prejudicial interest concerning the Approval to Award a Contract for the provision of Dementia Nursing Care and Intermediate Care Services at Redwood Care Home, Guildford (item 14), 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.
- (2) Mr Hall declared a personal interest in the Public Value Review of the Countryside Service (item 9) because he was a member of Surrey Wildlife Trust.
- (3) Mrs Hammond declared a personal interest in the Public Value Review of the Countryside Service (item 9) because she was a member of Gatwick Greenspace Partnership.

21/11 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)

(a) Petition

A petition containing 112 signatures regarding Bagshot Library was presented at the meeting by Valerie White.

This petition was taken together with the Cabinet Decisions Called in – Public Value Review of Library Services - item 5(a).

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games tabled a response to the petition.

RESOLVED:

That the response set out in Appendix 1 be agreed.

(b) Member's Questions

Member's questions were received from Mrs Watson and Mrs Searle.

The questions and agreed responses are set out at Appendix 2.

Mrs Watson asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety who had independently evaluated the Programme Manager's post. The Cabinet Member agreed to provide a written response.

22/11 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)

[Note: the Chairman agreed to re-order the agenda and take the Teenage Pregnancy – Scrutiny Task Group Report (item 5(c)) as the first report under this item.]

(c) TEENAGE PREGNANCY- SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT

Report of the joint task group of the Children and Families and Education, Learning and Development Select Committees and the Health Scrutiny Committee

On behalf of the task group, the Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee presented the report. He thanked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families for her response. He acknowledged that many of the task group's seventeen detailed recommendations had been overtaken by events and the White Paper.

He said that the two key messages arising from the task group's work were: (i) the work undertaken in all Surrey schools to prevent unwanted pregnancies and the importance of learning from best practice; and (ii) the wonderful individual work that the task group had seen when compiling the report.

He thanked Margaret Hicks, Steve Cosser and the four officers for their work in formulating the report and hoped that this work would be beneficial to Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families thanked the task group for an excellent piece of work and commended the recommendations in her written response to Members.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the plans and strategies the County Council has in place in response to the Final Report into Teenage Pregnancy, Appendix A to the submitted report, be agreed.
- (2) That the Health Scrutiny Committee receive an update on the action

plan in approximately six months to highlight any successes and challenges and to ensure that the plan is still focused on the key outcome of reducing teenage conceptions.

Reasons for decisions:

Cabinet endorsement of this approach enables the Cabinet Member for Children and Families and officers to develop existing policy, strategy and operational delivery in relation to teenage pregnancy via the new Health and Well-being Board.

(a) CABINET DECISIONS CALLED IN – PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF LIBRARY SERVICES

Report of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee

The Cabinet decision in respect of the library service public value review, particularly in relation to the community partnership approach at selected libraries and the withdrawal of the mobile service had been called-in by the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee.

At its meeting on 1 February 2011 the Cabinet agreed:

- (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.

The Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee met on 22 February 2011 and received a number of petitions, residents' questions and Member questions. A number of local Members whose divisions were affected by the plans also spoke to the committee.

The Chairman of the select committee presented the committee's report to Cabinet and requested that Cabinet abandon current plans for community partnership or closure of the eleven identified libraries pending further analysis of alternative options to community partnership. She drew Cabinet's attention to the main concerns raised by local Members and residents, which were set out in paragraphs 4 and 12 of the report.

The Cabinet considered the report of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee, together with a petition from local residents concerning Bagshot library and Member and resident representations, from Mr Kington and Mrs James respectively, in reviewing its original decision. The Deputy Leader made a statement explaining the drivers for change within the library sector and acknowledged that difficult decisions had to be made in order for Surrey to continue to have a modern and sustainable library service. He also advised that the Public Value Review of Library Services had taken into account various criteria when devising the Surrey Model of Community Partnered Arrangements for the service.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games thanked the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee for its input and responded to the points made by the Committee Chairman and the other representations.

In the discussion which ensued the following points were taken into account by Cabinet in reviewing its original decision and in considering the recommendations of the select committee.

- Cuts in Local Government Budgets had compelled the County Council to make some difficult decisions.
- The PVR had identified libraries that were not providing Value for Money. 11 of the 52 libraries had been identified at the lower end of the spectrum.
- This decision had been well considered and was open and transparent.
- The costs associated with running mobile libraries and the different options for serving local communities.
- The desire to help communities set up and run their local library.
- That the County Council would provide the building, fund the running costs, provide all stock and IT, including WiFi Broadband for public use.
- Training and development would be provided for the volunteers but it was recognised that they would not be professional librarians.
- The contact centre would be available for queries.
- The importance of going forward with the consultation.
- Libraries in the Divisions of three of the Cabinet Members were affected by these proposals.
- This was an exciting opportunity to build the library service into

something fit for the community and Members hoped that the affected areas would rise to the challenge.

In the light of the above and after considering all the points made by Cabinet Members, the Cabinet agreed that its original decision, taken at its meeting on 1 February 2011 (minute no. 10/11), and as detailed below, be confirmed.

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.

(b) CABINET DECISIONS CALLED IN – SURREY VOLUNTARY ACTION NETWORK CONTRACT (SVAN)

Report of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee

The Cabinet decision in respect of the change of funding from individual grants to a single contract to provide support and development services to Voluntary Community Faith Sector groups in Surrey and the award of a one year contract, particularly in relation to the serious disquiet over the changes to the contract raised by the Woking Association of Voluntary Service, was called-in by the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee.

At its meeting on 1 February 2011 the Cabinet agreed:

- (1) That the change of funding from individual grants to a single contract to provide support and development services to Voluntary, Community and 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 3 years, which will be subject to a 30% saving in April 2012 and an annual review by the County Council Procurement Review Group.

The Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee met on 22 February 2011 and held a productive discussion with representatives from SVAN, officers and the Cabinet Member.

The Chairman of the select committee referred to the Surrey Compact and presented the committee's report to Cabinet and requested that Cabinet:

1. gave more time to negotiating the SVAN contract, with the aim of having a contract in place by 1 April if possible. During the additional negotiating period, the Cabinet should:
 - a. Take steps to provide legal advice on the prospect of conflict of interest;
 - b. Ensure SVAN's mediation processes are followed, taking place as soon as possible (in light of 1 April target).
2. continued in its efforts to find a collective solution including Woking CVS. However, efforts to find a collective solution should not prejudice agreement on revised arrangements.

The Cabinet considered the report of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee, together with a statement tabled by the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games (Appendix 3), in reviewing its original decision. The statement from the Cabinet Member proposed an additional recommendation.

In the light of the above, the Cabinet agreed that the decision taken at its meeting on 1 February 2011 (Minute no.15/11) be confirmed, as

set out in resolutions (1) and (2) below, with the addition of resolution (3):

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 3 years, which will be subject to a 30% saving in April 2012 and an annual review by the County Council Procurement Review Group.
- (3) That efforts to find a collective solution that includes Woking CVS be continued. However, efforts to find a collective solution should not prejudice efforts by the majority of SVAN members to enter into a single contract from 1 April 2011.

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 10 individual grants to one contract will also streamline administrative processes and provide opportunities for future efficiencies.

To respond to the concerns of Woking CVS.

**23/11 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR JANUARY 2011(PERIOD 10)
(Item 6)**

The Deputy Leader introduced the report and said that the out-turn report would be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 24 May. Also, he hoped that details of services' carry forward requests would be available by mid May. He reminded Cabinet Members / Strategic Directors that there would be a robust challenge of any carry forward requests. Finally, he considered that the individual reports were self-explanatory.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning re-emphasised the need for carry forwards, citing the Children, Schools and Families budget and the uncertainties created by new legislation i.e. the Academies Act.

Other Cabinet Members had an opportunity to comment on the budget position for their portfolios.

RESOLVED:

That the budget monitoring position and projected year end variances 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.

24/11 CONSULTATION ON SURREY'S ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2012 FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS (Item 7)

Following the statutory consultation on Surrey's Admission Arrangements for September 2012 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools, the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning asked Members to consider the responses and to make recommendations to Council.

Mr Wood, a member of the public, was invited to speak on the George Abbot admission criteria, particularly in relation to the determination of the Schools Adjudicator for 2011 admissions concerning children from Ripley. He said that he was part of a campaign group 'Local Schools for Local Children' at George Abbot School. He considered that the ruling made by the Schools Adjudicator in October 2010, for 2011 admissions, giving children in Ripley priority above other children for whom George Abbot was their local school was unfair. He said that his campaign group had strong local support, including Ann Milton MP, and that he had a petition with 411 signatures on it. He hoped that the Admissions policy for 2012 would revert to the previous criteria.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning accepted the points made by Mr Wood and confirmed that the Admission Arrangements for 2012 would be reverting to normal policy. However, he said that the Office of the Schools Adjudicator could rule again in favour of Ripley children.

The Cabinet Member advised that the number of changes made to the policy for 2012 were relatively minor. He drew Members' attention to: (i) recommendation (7) which increased the number of preferences under Surrey's coordinated scheme for secondary admissions from three to six; (ii) recommendation (8) the actual wording to be sent to parents, as set out in Annex 2e; and (iii) recommendation (11), the change of the admission arrangements for George Abbot School for September 2012 to those applied prior to the Schools Adjudicator's determination in October 2012

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

That the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2012 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools be agreed:

Recommendation 1

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Thames Ditton Infants Schools is agreed for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There was no majority in agreement or disagreement of this proposal (24 agreed and 25 disagreed)
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings into the same school, this will only

apply if it is not their nearest school

- The pressure on places in the area of the school combined with the extra classes that were admitted to Thames Ditton Infants in 2009 and 2010 mean that on balance, a greater disadvantage might be caused to families in the local area than to siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- It is intended that the use of the tiered sibling criteria will only apply for 2012/13 admission whilst the school still has a year group with an extra class. As such the admission policy for the school will be reviewed for 2013/14 admissions
- This decision should feed into a wider review of the use of the Tiered Sibling criterion needs to be carried out so that the County Council has a clear County wide approach on the policy and the circumstances under which it believes it is warranted to give priority to children for whom a school is nearest as opposed to giving priority to siblings

Recommendation 2

That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Thames Ditton Infant and Junior schools is agreed for September 2012 so that priority for admission to Thames Ditton Junior School will be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children attending Thames Ditton Infant School
5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
6. Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal to introduce feeder school criterion (34 agreed and 3 disagreed)
- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at infant/junior schools that are in very close proximity
- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for the Junior school and when making applications for siblings
- As the Infant school has admitted two extra 'bulge' classes it is not proposed at this stage to introduce a reciprocal sibling link between the two schools as this might have a detrimental effect on families applying to the Junior school from the local area

Recommendation 3

That a reciprocal sibling link is agreed between Merrow Church of England (Controlled) School and Bushy Hill Junior School for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal (27 agreed and 4 disagreed)
- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at infant/junior schools that are in very close proximity
- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for siblings
- This arrangement would enhance the feeder link between the two schools.

Recommendation 4

That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Eastwick Infant and Junior schools is not implemented for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- Whilst the majority of respondents supported this proposal (41 agreed and 29 disagreed), there was strong opposition from another school within the Effingham Learning Partnership
- Further analysis would need to be done on the impact that this proposal might have on other schools in the area
- This proposal would need to be considered alongside other changes that are being explored within the Effingham Learning Partnership

Recommendation 5

That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Earlswood Infant School and Brambletye Junior School and associated reciprocal sibling link is agreed for September 2012 so that priority for admission to Brambletye Junior School will be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Children attending Earlswood Infant School
4. Siblings
5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
6. Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal (24 agreed and 3 disagreed)
- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at infant/junior schools that are in very close proximity
- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for the Junior school and when making applications for

siblings

Recommendation 6

It is recommended that the proposed changes to PANs for September 2012 as follows:

- i) *Oatlands School to increase its PAN from 60 to 90
- ii) St Andrew's CofE Primary to increase its PAN from 52 to 60
- iii) *Boxgrove Primary School to increase its PAN from 60 to 90
- iv) Eastwick Infant School to increase its PAN from 75 to 82 to allow for 7 children within the school's Special Needs Support Centre
- v) Banstead Junior School to increase its PAN from 70 to 80
- vi) *Shortwood Infant School to increase its PAN from 27 to 30
- vii) *Spelthorne Junior School to increase its PAN from 70 to 60
- viii) Hale School to decrease its Junior PAN from 20 to 2
- ix) *Maybury Infant School to decrease its PAN from 40 to 30

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There were no major objections to changes in PAN
- School Commissioning support all of these changes and where the school name is denoted by a star (*) the proposals are in line with separate proposals to expand or amalgamate the schools
- Where increase in PANs have been requested this will enable more children to gain admission to these schools thus increasing parental preference
- Where reduction in PANs have been requested it will enable those schools to better manage their delivery of the National Curriculum and their school budgets
- Despite representation from families and schools in the Epsom and Ewell area there are presently sufficient places within a range of Junior age providers in the area to accommodate the extra 30 children who will be leaving Wallace Fields Infant School in 2012. As such there is no planning need to provide additional spaces at Wallace Fields Junior School. The Admissions team will work with parents at Wallace Fields Infant School to make them aware of available places and support them in the application process. If however demand in the area increases and the availability of places reduces the County Council would provide additional spaces if they were required

Recommendation 7

That it is agreed to increase the number of preferences under Surrey's coordinated scheme for secondary admissions 2012/13 from three to six.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There was an overall majority in support of the proposal (101 agreed and 46 disagreed)
- Parents would be able to apply for the schools that they preferred in

their true order of preference

- It would maximise a parent's opportunity to be offered a school of their preference
- It would be likely to support undersubscribed schools which may see an increase to their preference numbers
- It would make the process more equitable for parents when compared to parents living in the London boroughs
- Clear information would be published so that parents would be aware that whilst the maximum number of preferences would be six, they would not have to name six preferences if they did not choose to

Recommendation 8

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2012/13 are agreed as set out in Annex 2e of the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There was a clear majority in support of the proposal (51 agreed and 1 disagreed)
- The coordinated schemes would enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions

Recommendation 9

That Surrey's Relevant Area for admissions is agreed as set out in Annex 3 of the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- All respondents supported this proposal
- The Relevant Area for admissions must be agreed every two years and no changes have been proposed

Recommendation 10

That the admission arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2012 are agreed with the exception of:

- i) **Annex 2a**, Section 8, Paragraph c) i) - the admission arrangements for George Abbot School (see Recommendation 11)
- ii) **Annex 2a**, Section 11 – amendment to how reverse sibling will apply when a parent is applying for a Reception and a Junior school place (see Recommendation 12)
- iii) **Annex 2b** - the sibling link for Downsway with St Mary's CofE Junior School (see Recommendation 13)

Reasons for Recommendation:

- This would 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 arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduce travel and support Surrey's Green Policies
- Despite representation from families living within Tatsfield, the introduction of a tiered sibling policy for Tatsfield Primary School would be likely to impact on preferences from outside the village. The school relies on attracting children from outside the village in order to sustain its viability and as to date all children from Tatsfield have got into the school it is not deemed necessary to make a change to the criteria at this time
- Despite representation from some families and schools in the Epsom and Ewell area who requested the introduction of a tiered sibling policy at Wallace Fields Infant and Junior schools, a wider review of the use of the Tiered Sibling criterion needs to first be carried out so that the County Council has a clear County wide approach on the policy and the circumstances under which it believes it is warranted to give priority to children for whom a school is nearest as opposed to giving priority to siblings. Any such change should be subject to full consultation and as such this will be reviewed ahead of the consultation process for 2013
- No change is proposed to the policy on multiple births because whilst in practice all Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools will try and admit children of multiple births by admitting over PAN, there would be occasions when this would not be possible, such as under Infant Class Size legislation

Recommendation 11

That it is agreed to change the admission arrangements for George Abbot School for September 2012 to those that applied prior to the Schools Adjudicator's determination in October 2010 so that priority for admission to George Abbot School will be as follows:

1. Looked After Children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings
4. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
5. Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendation:

- There was strong opposition to the proposal to retain the admission arrangements that had been determined by the Schools Adjudicator for 2011 with 62 respondents in disagreement that children in Ripley should be given priority above other children for whom George Abbot is the nearest school

- The determination of the Schools Adjudicator only applied to 2011 admissions and left the County Council free to determine its own arrangements for 2012
- Previous adjudications were not upheld which demonstrates that this matter is not clear cut and that the latest decision by the Schools Adjudicator is just one view on the matter
- George Abbot is currently well established as a school that serves the local community and the arrangements as determined by the Schools Adjudicator have the potential to lead to a more scattered intake and might disadvantage children in other rural areas who do currently get into the school
- Further analysis would need to be done on admissions within the area to ascertain if arrangements should be reviewed in order to accommodate children living in rural areas
- The County Council will continue to consider transport requests for children in the Parish of Ripley to get to their nearest school if they do not get a place at George Abbot

Recommendation 12

That it is agreed to amend the wording on how the reverse sibling criteria will apply when a parent is applying for a Reception and a Junior school place from:

‘At the initial allocation for these schools the Year 3 applicants will be dealt with first, before the Reception applicants’;

to:

‘At the initial allocation, when a parent is applying for both a Reception and a Junior school place, neither child will be treated as a sibling under the sibling criterion until after the offer day. At that time, if a place has been offered to only one child, the waiting list position for the other child will be adjusted to reflect the fact that they expect to have a sibling in the school or a school on a shared or adjoining site at the time of admission’.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- The reverse sibling policy was introduced for 2011 admissions to maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at the same school or at a school on a shared or adjoining site
- As a result of this year’s admission process it has become apparent that, logistically, this policy cannot be applied when a parent has made an application for a Reception and a Junior school place because until the allocation is run neither the parent nor the Local Authority would know whether either child might be offered a place
- Prior to their application the parent would not know which school to apply for under sibling priority and after application the Local Authority would not know to which school sibling priority might be agreed

- Reception and Junior allocations are run at the same time and there is very limited time between the date of allocation and the date that offer letters are sent to amend priority according to any siblings that may have been offered as part of the Junior allocation
- To try and do this would result in children lower down the preference list losing an offer. However within a coordinated process lower preferences are discarded as higher preferences are offered and it would not be possible to manually resolve these cases in the time allowed. Coordination of places across County borders further complicates the matter.
- The wording that has been recommended maximises the use of the reverse sibling policy as far as it can be practicably implemented and ensures that siblings that are offered as part of a Reception or Junior allocation are treated as such when waiting lists are ranked post-offer.

Recommendation 13

That it is agreed to remove the sibling link for Downsway with St Mary's CofE Junior School for September 2012.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- This link is not supported by St Mary's CofE Junior School, Southwark Diocese or other schools in the Oxted area
- The suggestion has been put forward that this arrangement might have a detrimental effect on other infant schools in the area
- This criteria has not previously presented any issues because all children have got into Downsway
- If it needed to be applied the sibling priority could not be assessed without the support of St Mary's
- Further analysis involving all Oxted primary schools and the Diocese should be carried out before considering whether this arrangement be reintroduced in the future

Recommendation 14

That no changes are made to the admission arrangements of the following schools, but that a further analysis is carried out ahead of consultation on admission arrangements for 2013 to identify if changes are necessary in the light of the comments that were received:

- Farnham Heath End
- Rodborough School
- Warlingham School

Reasons for Recommendation:

- Only a small number of comments have been made against the admission arrangements for these schools which might not be representative of the views of schools or parents in the area of each school
- There is not currently sufficient evidence which would support a change to the admission arrangements for these schools
- Representations have been made in response to the consultation,

which would mean that if any change were proposed it would not itself be subject to consultation. This would not be good practice without clear justification and a need for change.

25/11 SCHOOLS' BUDGET 2011/12 (Item 8)

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning said that this report sought Cabinet approval to the principles to be applied in allocating the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), which was a ring-fenced grant, for 2011/12. The total available DSG for 2011/12 was estimated at £687.14m. He referred to the Annexes – the proposed allocations set out in Annex 1 and the Centrally Managed Budget detailed in Annex 2.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the key principles for the allocation of the Dedicated Schools Grant increase, as set out in the report submitted, and the provisional total Schools Budget for 2011/12 be approved.
- (2) That authority to make fine-tuning decisions (resulting from information currently awaited) be delegated to the Acting Strategic Director, Children, Schools & Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning, in order that individual schools' budgets can be calculated.

Reasons for decisions:

Approval of the total Schools Budget is required in order to allocate schools' budgets by the statutory deadline of 31 March 2011.

26/11 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF THE COUNTRYSIDE SERVICE (Item 9)

The Deputy Leader said that this Public Value Review illustrated how the County Council could deliver the Countryside Service differently. He confirmed that work on the property aspects of the Countryside Estate was on-going. He also publicly thanked the Countryside Manager, the lead officer in this review for his work.

The Cabinet Member for Environment stressed the importance of all services contributing to the savings required to be made by the County Council. She said that this review provided an opportunity for town / parish councils to take an appropriate role in maintaining some Rights of Way. She also advised that parking charges would be introduced at Countryside Estate car parks.

She drew attention to Annex 2, which provided a summary of Countryside Partnerships and confirmed that the County Council would be focussing on its statutory obligations. She confirmed that there would be a twelve week consultation period with partners concerning the proposals to reduce expenditure.

Members had a short debate concerning the issue of access agreements with private owners and charging for car parks, after which recommendation 4 was amended to insert 'and that Members are kept informed' after 'partner bodies'.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the recommendations set out in the Action Plan, attached as Annex 3 to the submitted report, be approved.
- (2) That implementation of the Action Plan should start immediately, led by the Assistant Director Operations, Highways and Countryside.
- (3) That progress be reported quarterly to the PVR Steering Board and to the Countryside PVR Member Reference Group.
- (4) That the review of partnerships set out in Annex 2 to the submitted report be issued for consultation with partner bodies and that Members are kept informed, prior to a decision on the County Council's involvement by the Cabinet Member for Environment in consultation with the Assistant Director Operations, Highways and Countryside.

Reasons for decisions:

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

27/11 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF ROAD SAFETY (Item 10)

The Public Value Review of Road Safety was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Community Safety. She confirmed that the Safety Camera Partnership, Road Safety Engineering, and the Safer Travel Team had been within the scope of the review.

She stressed the importance of partnership working, particularly with Surrey Police and Surrey, Fire and Rescue. She also drew attention to Appendix A, which illustrated the progress made in Surrey over the last five years, towards Central Government targets on collision and casualty reduction.

She was particularly pleased with the progress made through the 'Drive Smart' initiative and said this approach should become the overarching theme of the council's future road safety strategy.

She confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment had been carried out and commended the twelve recommendations, which would deliver savings of just under £500k, as set out in the action plan, to Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the recommendations set out in the action plan, attached as Appendix C to the submitted report be approved.
- (2) That implementation of the action plan should start immediately, led by the Road Safety Team Manager.
- (3) That progress be reported quarterly to the PVR Steering Board, the Drive SMART Road Safety and Anti-Social Driving Board and either to the Transportation Select Committee and/or the Safer and Stronger

Communities Select Committee.

- (4) To note the Leader's agreement to the amendment of the Scheme of Delegation to include the function to endorse the annual programme for investment of the centrally managed safety scheme budget in Table 2 of paragraph 8.2 of the Scheme of Delegation (responsibility for executive functions exercised by Cabinet Members).
- (5) That the Police Authority be supported in the policy of expanding the use of speed awareness courses incrementally to improve road safety and to increase cost recovery, and that the Drive SMART Road Safety and Anti-Social Driving Board be responsible for monitoring the incremental changes.

Reasons for decisions:

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

28/11 SURREY TRANSPORT PLAN (Item 11)

The Cabinet Member for Transport introduced the Surrey Transport Plan and said Surrey County Council as a Local Transport Authority was required by legislation (Local Transport Act 2008 and Transport Act 2000) to produce a Local Transport Plan (LTP). Surrey's first LTP was submitted to Government in July 2000 and dealt with the period 2001/02 to 2005/06. The second Plan was published in 2006 and relates to the years from 2006/07 to 2010/11. Surrey's third LTP had to be in place by the time the current plan expired in April 2011. It was partly an aspirational document which comprised two main elements – transport strategies and implementation programmes. The Cabinet Member advised that the options plan would be available in July.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

- (1). The approval of the Surrey Transport Plan, for publication on the Surrey web site on 1 April 2011.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Strategy, Transport and Planning, in discussion with the Cabinet Member for Transport for any final changes that may be necessary to allow publication of the plan on 1 April 2011.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the next stages of work on the Plan as outlined in this report be noted, which will include additional necessary strategies and developing options for future levels of integrated transport expenditure for the financial year 2012/13 and beyond.
- (2) That the Members of the Surrey Transport Plan Task Group be thanked for their work in developing the Plan thus far.
- (3) That the retention of the Task Group to steer development of the remainder of the plan and the implementation programmes be

approved.

Reasons for recommendations/decisions:

To seek Council approval of the Plan as part of the Policy Framework. To inform Members of the process required to develop and implement Surrey's statutory Local Transport Plan.

29/11 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 12)

RESOLVED:

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

(1) SPELTHORNE INFANT AND NURSERY SCHOOL AND SPELTHORNE JUNIOR SCHOOL

That the following proposals be approved:

- (1) that Spelthorne Infant and Nursery School extends its age range from 3-7 to 3-11 on 1 September 2011; and
- (2) that Spelthorne Junior School be closed on 31 August 2011.

Reasons for decision

It is County Council policy, where the majority of children transfer for their Junior (Key stage 3) education to one school that consideration is given to amalgamation. This is the case for Spelthorne Infant and Nursery School and Spelthorne Junior School. The proposal will create a new, larger school that will be attractive to headteachers and other staff and will provide consistency for pupils across the primary phase Key Stages. The outcome of the consultation was broadly favourable and the governing bodies are supportive of the change.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning– 16 February 2011)

(2) THE FUTURE OF THE BOURNE INFANT SCHOOL AND SOUTH FARNHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL

That the publication of statutory notices such that:

- The Bourne Infant School would close on 25 May 2011; and
- South Farnham Junior School would expand its age-range on 26 May 2011 to become a primary school operating on the sites of the two existing schools
- The change to the proposed admission arrangements, to accept the tiered sibling rule for reception age children at the Bourne site, as set out in paragraph 32 of the submitted report

be approved.

Reasons for decision

The proposal secures sustainable primary age education for two outstanding schools going forward. It supports the council's objectives of securing a primary model of education and promotes high standards within this local area.

The Council will need to address the ongoing concerns of parents in Year 1 and identify appropriate provision for those pupils making preferences for school places in September 2012. These applications will be made between September 2011 and January 2012.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning– 16 February 2011)

(3) EXPANSION OF MAYBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL

That the publication of statutory notices such that:

- Maybury Infant School becomes a primary school with a Published Admission Number of 30 and extend its age range from Year 2 (age 6+) to Year 3 (age 7+) on 1 September 2011
- all children would remain on roll at Maybury Primary School - for September 2011 parents/carers of current Year 2 pupils may want their child to go on to the school which they have been allocated
- the age range would extend by a further year each subsequent year - from Year 3 (age 7+) to Year 6 (age 10+) - from 1 September 2012

be approved.

Reasons for decision

Additional junior places in Woking are necessary. Changing Maybury Infant School into a primary school would increase parental choice and be a cost-effective way to provide the most effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning– 16 February 2011)

(4) PROPOSED USE OF VALLEY END, CHOBHAM AS SUITABLE ALTERNATIVE NATURAL GREENSPACE (SANG)

That Valley End, Chobham be approved for use as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace in connection with development at Fairfield House, Sunningdale, and receive £52,000 section 106 payment for capital improvement work to the site but not for the loss of uplift in value.

Reasons for decision

Valley End, Chobham meets the County Council's criteria for use as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, except with regard to payment for uplift in value. In this instance failure to proceed with the proposals for the SANG would have the risk of involving the County Council in legal action

brought by the developer. Agreement of Valley End for a SANG would enable public access to the site to be improved together with interpretation, seating and habitat management at no additional cost to the County Council.

As this Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace was approved at a planning appeal prior to the County Council's policy on this issue being formally approved, the related legal agreement does not take account of the uplift in value which is accepted in this case only and exceptionally.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Environment– 16 February 2011)

(5) PROPOSALS FOR CHARGING FOR PRE-APPLICATION ENQUIRIES ON TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLANNING MATTERS

- (1) That scheme of charging detailed in the report submitted be implemented by Planning and Development Control Group (Transport Development Planning) from 1 April 2011 as a pilot for one year.
- (2) That, prior to introduction, Surrey Planning Officers' Association be notified of the system.
- (3) That the process be included within the TDP web pages on Surrey County Council's web site.
- (4) That the process be monitored and the process and costs and charges reviewed six months after implementation, and then again after one year, to assess whether the scheme should continue, or be modified.
- (5) That detailed Project Time Sheets be maintained as part of the review process.
- (6) That the findings be reported to Minerals and Waste Planning, so that they can consider adopting a similar regime.

Reasons for decision

To produce an income stream for an area of statutory work that currently receives no direct funding.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Environment– 16 February 2011)

(6) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: PETITION

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 – 16 February 2011)

(7) PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY AT KILN FIELDS,

HASLEMERE

That the County Council applies to the Magistrate's Court for an order to be made under section 116 of the Highways Act 1980 stopping up the former road at Kiln Fields, as shown edged black on drawing number 016.0119-108P4.

Reasons for decision

The stopping up is necessary to legalise the situation that exists on the ground and to ensure that the residents of Kiln Avenue (the new development) have "clean title" to their properties.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 16 February 2011)

(8) REQUEST TO ADOPT NEW ROADS

That the adoption of the road set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted and listed below be authorised:

6A to 8 Wrecclesham Road, Wrecclesham, Farnham.

Reasons for decision

The request fully meets Surrey County Council's previous policy on road adoption.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 16 February 2011)

(9) CONTRACT AWARD FOR A217 REIGATE HILL FOOTBRIDGE REFURBISHMENT

That the contract to carry out refurbishment works to the A217 Reigate Hill Footbridge be awarded to Dean and Dyball Civil Engineering.

Reasons for decision

Tenders were received from five contractors to carry out the works. Tenders were assessed using the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) method. The contract has been awarded to Dean and Dyball Civil Engineering because their tender submission has been assessed as giving the best value for money.

Failure to complete the works would lead to closure of the long distance footpath, the North Downs Way, and potential prosecution for failing to maintain a listed building.

(Decision of Cabinet Member fro Transport – 16 February 2011)

(10) CAPITAL BUDGET RE-PROFILING 2010/11 TO 2011/12 AND 2012/13 - IMT

That this item be withdrawn.

Reasons for decision

All requests for capital re-profiling will be considered together as part of the

year-end report being presented to Cabinet on 24 May 2011.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 16 February 2011)

(11) CAPITAL BUDGET RE-PROFILING 2010/11 TO 2011/12 EPM

That this item be withdrawn.

Reasons for decision

All requests for capital re-profiling will be considered together as part of the year-end report being presented to Cabinet on 24 May 2011.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 16 February 2011)

(12) GUILDFORD CHILDREN'S CENTRE, HAZEL AVENUE, GUILDFORD - CHILDREN'S CENTRE CAPITAL PROGRAMME

That officers be authorised to appoint and place an official order with Homelodge to complete the works as detailed in the preferred Option 2 as detailed in the report submitted to provide a standalone timber building.

Reasons for decision

The proposal delivers a value for money, energy efficient, high quality scheme at the centre, which will enhance and improve the facilities currently being offered. It will also address recent Ofsted comments.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 16 February 2011)

(13) KINGFIELD INFANT SCHOOL, WOKING – PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME

- (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 suitable education facilities to meet the needs of the full curriculum.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 16 February 2011)

(14) SANDCROSS PRIMARY SCHOOL, REIGATE, PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME

- (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 a value for money, energy efficient, high quality scheme at the school that will enhance the education provision, supporting the Authority's fulfilment of its statutory obligations. Release of funding is required at this stage to enable the project to be concluded by September 2012.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 16 February 2011)

(15) ST JOHN'S C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL, DORKING, PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME

- (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 a value for money, energy efficient, high quality scheme at the school that will enhance the education provision, supporting the Authority's fulfilment of its statutory obligations. Release of funding is required at this stage to enable the project to be concluded by September 2012.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 16 February 2011)

30/11 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (Item 13)

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.

[Note: The Chairman re-ordered the agenda to take item 15 before item 14]

31/11 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS (Item 15)

(a) ACQUISITION OF GROVE FARM, ESHER

A report requesting urgent approval to purchase 30 Hectares (74 acres) of land in Esher for strategic purposes was tabled at the meeting. In

accordance with Access to Information Rule 6.05(f) (Special Urgency), the Chairman of the Change and Efficiency Select Committee had agreed that the decision could not reasonably be deferred because of the urgency of securing the site to meet the demand for school places bearing in mind the property is presently being marketed. In accordance with Select Committee Rule 7.03(o)(ix) the decisions below are not subject to call-in.

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency said that there was an immediate long term need for additional primary school places in the Esher and Thames Ditton area and that the acquisition of Grove Farm, Esher was the best option to address this need. He also drew Cabinet's attention to the risk implications section of the report.

Members strongly supported this proposal but agreed to amend the recommendation so that the approval of the final price was subject to the approval of the Deputy Leader rather than the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning, together with the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency.

RESOLVED:

That the strategy of acquiring Grove Farm, Esher at open market value on terms to be authorised by the Asset Plan Delivery Manager be approved with final price subject to the approval of the Deputy Leader and the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency.

Reasons for decisions:

To ensure Grove Farm is acquired now as part of the current marketing exercise thereby enabling the greatest flexibility for providing school places for the area of need.

32/11 APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF DEMENTIA NURSING CARE AND INTERMEDIATE CARE SERVICES AT REDWOOD CARE HOME, GUILDFORD (Item 14)

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 this item.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That a fixed price and volume contract for the provision of Dementia Nursing Care and Assessment Services at Redwood Care Home be awarded to the provider as detailed the report submitted to commence on or after 1 June 2011, for a duration of 3 years with an option to extend for 2 years at a value as detailed in the submitted report.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Acting Head of Estates Planning and Management for a lease to be entered into with the provider for a term co-terminus with the contract, subject to agreed terms and conditions.

Reasons for decisions:

The existing contract will expire on 31 May 2011. An options analysis deemed a tender process to be the most appropriate way to secure value for money going forward and to meet needs beyond this date. To this end, a full tender process in compliance with the requirements of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed.

This procurement process has secured a cashable saving through a reduction in block beds and a reduction in the unit cost. In addition to this, the service specification has been developed into a dementia service; hence SCC will secure a more complex service for less money.

The provider is ranked first in both the quality and pricing elements of the tender evaluation. Throughout the tender process they have demonstrated their ability to deliver best value to the Council, and as such it is agreed that they be awarded this contract.

33/11 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 15)

RESOLVED:

That no information be made available to the press or public in relation to the items considered in Part 2 of the agenda.

[The meeting closed at 4.15pm]

Chairman

**CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES
RESPONSE TO BAGSHOT LIBRARY PETITION**

Thank you for your expressing your concerns for the future of Bagshot library.

Across the country public services are coming under increasing financial pressure. Local authorities are looking for creative solutions to deliver the breadth and quality of services that residents expect. In Surrey we have been carrying out a number of public value reviews looking at how services are used by residents, what will be needed in the future and the resources available to deliver them.

The County Council has responsibility for a wide range of functions and allocates its budgets to deliver these services. There is a rigorous budget setting process for determining its expenditure against strategic priorities. County Councillors have a difficult task in allocating the budget across a wide range of services and people have different views on priorities.

The public value review of libraries made a number of recommendations about the future of the service. In particular it confirmed that the County Council is keen to maintain the network of 52 libraries and build on the success of the service. Based on the review's findings, we have taken the decision to maintain a core network of libraries run by the council, and to offer a number of libraries to communities to run in partnership with us.

Although Surrey County Council faces budget pressures of over £200 million I must make clear that the intention of the County Council is to avoid closing libraries if possible, and that we hope that by engaging the energy and commitment of the local community, we hope can sustain libraries which are marginal (in resource and performance terms) due to low levels of use and budget pressures.

We believe our model for arrangements for community partnered libraries is much more comprehensive than many of the arrangements that you may have heard about in the national press. We have an opportunity in Surrey not only to maintain but build on the service with greater involvement from the community that will enable libraries to be better connected to local community activity and ensure a modern and sustainable library for the future.

The County Council hopes that residents in Bagshot will rise to occasion to put Bagshot library at the heart of its community - and make it a hub for range of local activities.

**Denise Saliagopoulos,
Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games
1 March 2011**

Members Questions

Two Questions from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

Question 1

Why has an additional post of Programme Manager in the Youth Development Service been created at a salary of almost £75,000 per annum, when the service is reducing the number of front line posts following a reduction in budget of over £2million for 2011/12? Could the necessary work not be undertaken at far lower cost by using existing in house Surrey staff?

Reply:

Services for Young People is implementing a change programme that was approved by Cabinet and based on the needs of young people. We require specialist management capacity to make this change happen over the next 12 months. The programme will deliver an increased and improved service for less money. This means more front line services despite the reduction in budget. Faced with the prospect of cutting services the council took the decision over a year ago to do something different. Over the next 12 months we aim to save £2.5 million on top of previous cuts in 2009/10 of £0.5 million and the in year cut of £2.1 million in 2010/11. This programme of change will deliver more services for young people than we currently deliver for less money, increase the number of young people participating in education, training or employment and half the number of young people in the criminal justice system. The programme is made up of nine projects and considerable complexity. We need someone with the right project and programme management expertise to deliver this challenging transformation. Change costs money, we could choose not to invest in change and simply cut, do less for less. The cuts could be made by existing heads of department but we do not want to cut in a way that simply means less service. We are choosing to invest a comparatively small amount in specialist management capacity over the next year to deliver more for less. The programme manager job was independently evaluated, approved by the director, advertised openly (internally and externally) and represents good value when compared to the return on investment. Young people in Surrey deserve a better service not a smaller one that is why we are taking this approach. Without this additional capacity the council will be forced to cut services rather than increase efficiency.

Kay Hammond
Cabinet Member for Community Safety

Question 2

In view of the fact the Council is spending over £32m per annum on fees for SEN pupils at independent special schools and out of county placements, which is much higher than any other county, what action is being taken to provide more special needs places in Surrey to reduce this expenditure?

Why has only £177k of the £26 million capital budget allocated in January 2010 for resolving this been spent so far?

What is the reason for the slow progress in implementing the SEN strategy agreed at the meeting of the Cabinet on 5 January 2010?

Reply:

Surrey County Council, like all other Authorities nationally, have a duty to comply with the SEN Code of Practice (2001) in relation to the provision and placement of children with Statements of Special Educational Need. Under the legislation within this framework, parents have the right to express a school preference if their child holds a Statement of Special Educational Need. Additionally, they also have the right to appeal any placement decision made by Surrey County Council to the Special Educational Need and Disability Tribunal if they disagree with our recommendations. Parents in Surrey have very high expectations for their children and continue to express preferences for independent schools over Surrey's own provision. Surrey County Council strongly believes that our schools provide excellent provision and many of our mainstream and 87% of our special schools are classed as "good or outstanding" by Ofsted. However, many Surrey parents appeal through the tribunal system, using a legal team, to access independent schooling.

It should be clear that Surrey is not alone in this experience as other Authorities are experiencing the same challenge and subsequent high costs. This situation has come to the notice of the Government and Local Authorities await the SEN Green Paper to clarify if this legislation will be reformed.

In order to address this growing issue and budget pressure, Surrey County Council has joined six other Authorities (Hampshire, East Sussex, West Sussex, Brighton and Hove, Medway and Kent) to form the South East 7 Group. Through this group, SEN is a main priority. The SE7 Group are developing closer joint working in the South East region, including working closely with Government on the forthcoming SEN Green Paper. Representatives of the group - including myself - recently met with Minister of State Sarah Tether to discuss these issues. The changes we are proposing should ensure tighter commissioning, the development of joint protocols and better value for money. However, changes in legislation will be needed to stem the growing trend of parents using the Tribunal to access independent school places.

It is also worth noting that Surrey County Council has remained committed to providing a wide range of high quality specialist provision, when many other Authorities have significantly reduced their specialist provision. However, we are also an Authority that places more children into specialist provision than our statistical neighbours. This continues to be subject of a wider national debate; for example, the more provision provided does result in higher expectations from parents and other professionals for specialist provision, which in turn, results in more requests for independent sector specialist provision.

The agreed Capital Strategy, which sits behind the SEN Strategy is vital to maintaining the reversal of the trend of increasing NMI placements. The first part of the Strategy was to improve the organisation and delivery of SEN Services. This

has slowed the year on year increase in placement numbers. Changes to this and procurement/financial management activity has meant that the expenditure in 2010/2011 financial year has been contained within budget. The next step will be the incremental improvement in quality, capacity and the nature of educational need that SCC schools and resource centres will manage through the Capital Strategy. The SEN Strategy hypothesises a reduction in placements in NMI schools over the next three to five years from the current 595 to about 350. This change, if achieved, will initially save the County Council its £2.5m contribution and thereafter free up DSG to redistribute to schools and services.

Although Cabinet agreed the SEN Strategy in January 2010 and an 'in principle' capital sum of £26m, the SCC Capital Strategy was not finally adopted until May 2010. Following that officers began consultation on the change process for a number of the SEN Strategy proposals that will result in some additional capacity in Surrey maintained provision but mainly will enable children with a greater level of need to be placed in Surrey schools. This also works well in conjunction with Strategies in the Children's Service such as Aiming High for Disabled Children which offers short breaks and one stop assessments.

Special Needs Support Centres (SNSC): A strategy Group has been set up to manage the project; Revenue cost changes have been arranged; Nine primary aged Centres have been consulted about changes needed to support the inclusion of children on the ASD spectrum; visits arranged to determine the physical changes needed against a specification. These are currently being costed so that the whole project can be re presented to Investment Panel for agreement in early April. Most schools are hoping to commission work locally; small changes might be finished by Sept 2011, larger by Dec 2011.

Speech, Language and Communication Needs Centres (SLCN): all these secondary aged Centres have been consulted regarding SCC proposals to either remain as SLCN, change to ASD spectrum or close. Following consultation further consideration is being given to the operation of the secondary centres for ASD as the consulted schools are not willing to support the proposed model. An alternative is being planned at this time.

Nurture Groups: Research has been undertaken to determine the location of five Nurture Groups by a Strategic Planning Group. This work is now concluded and feasibility Studies are to be undertaken at 6 schools to provide appropriate accommodation. Revenue funding has been acquired to implement some Nurture Group provision on a phased basis. The feasibility costs will be presented to Investment Panel as soon as possible.

Special Schools:

1. Following a lengthy search for appropriate space, an option for the relocation and building for Portesbery School has been found. Consultation with the school is about to begin.
2. Gosden House School - initial consultation has started with the school about proposals to provide for secondary aged boys.
3. Sunnydown School - consultation has started with the school about proposals to change the special educational need that they provide for from Emotional and Learning Difficulty to Asperger Difficulties.

A revised profile of capital spending has recently been agreed with the Investment Panel now totalling £30m. This includes a newly identified pressure at Freemantles school, and an updated cost for Portesbery School based on our experience to date.

Peter Martin
Cabinet Member for Children and Learning

Question 3 from Pauline Searle (Guildford North)

If, as the Strategic Director for Customers and Communities repeatedly stated at the Safer and Stronger Communities call in meeting on 22 February, the recommendations of the Library Service PVR are not about finances, but about empowering communities and improving local libraries; why did the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games also repeatedly state that if a community does not take up the offer to run it's own library, that their library would face closure?

Reply:

Primary drivers' and 'imperative' are the two contexts for my remarks - if the primary driver had indeed been solely about the budget then the imperative would have been for immediate and draconian decisions to make savings by reducing the size of the branch network as urgently as possible. The eleven libraries at the low end of the assessment spread sheet represent the libraries where there is a business case, based on the criteria, to consider how the service can achieve best value from our resources.

Although the financial predicament is ultimately inescapable we have been very clear throughout the PVR process that the county council aspires to the challenge of keeping the full network of 52 branch libraries open. The PVR has always advocated the message of increasing local community empowerment as a means of delivery and achieving wider social / community benefits ... and allowing the branch network to be maintained.

We do recognise that these libraries are valued within their communities and therefore our immediate imperative is to see if we can use this local support to ensure the survival of these local libraries within the surrey network. If this can be achieved with community partnered arrangements then we will not have to consider the business based cost-saving decisions for closure.

Denise Saliagopolous
Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games

Response to Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee Call-in of the Surrey Voluntary Action Network (SVAN) Contract

I welcome the discussion held at the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee Call-in. Although I understand that Woking CVS has some concerns over the proposed single SVAN contract and the partnership agreement between SVAN members, I would like to re-iterate that the proposal for the single contract has come from the Network itself and County Council officers have worked hard to facilitate this request. The proposal came out of a review that aimed to bring more efficient ways of working and fairer funding across the Network. The Network's proposal addresses these aims and their approach reflects changes being made by other VCFS groups in Surrey and across the UK. I would like to highlight that given the efficiency savings that we are likely to make in 2012, if we do not move towards the fairer funding distribution through the single contract, it is likely that some of the CVSs would no longer be viable – this would have a much greater impact on a number of areas in Surrey. With the single contract, if any CVS is unable to provide a service in their area, the SVAN members will work together to ensure service users' needs are met.

I would like to thank the Select Committee for their recommendations. Cabinet will take advice on the prospect of conflict of interest. I do not believe we have the power to "ensure" the SVAN mediation processes are followed, but to "note" that they will be enacted. The revised partnership agreement and invitations to meet have been sent by the Network to Woking CVS. Officers will offer to facilitate meetings, but it would be more helpful to provide mediation through a national body such as the National Association for Voluntary Action.

It is important that a single contract is agreed by 1st April so that the SVAN members are clear about their organisations' positions at the start of the financial year. I agree that if one CVS does not wish to be part of that contract, it must not prejudice the position for the nine others. Woking CVS also needs to understand that any SCC funding allocated for support and development, will be in line with the SVAN proposals under that contract.

It is therefore my view that the Cabinet decision of 1 February still stands, with the addition of a third recommendation. Cabinet is therefore asked to:

1. Approve the change of funding from individual grants to a single contract to provide support and development services to VCFS groups in Surrey,
2. Give approval to negotiate with SVAN for award of a one year contract extendable for up to 3 years, which will be subject to a 30 percent saving in April 2012 and an annual review by the County Council Procurement Review Group,
3. Continue in its efforts to find a collective solution that includes Woking CVS. However, efforts to find a collective solution should not prejudice efforts by the majority of SVAN members to enter into a single contract from 1st April 2011.

**Denise Saliagopolus,
Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games
1 March 2011**