

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 26 APRIL 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**

**56/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

There were none.

**57/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 29 March 2011 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the meetings held on 29 March 2011 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**58/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Dr Povey declared a prejudicial interest concerning the Approval to award a one year contract for the provision of Carers Breaks Services (item 13) and the adult social care elements of the 2010/11 Quarterly Business Report (item 7), because he was a director of a company that supplied social care to adults in Surrey and had contracts with Surrey County Council. He undertook to withdraw from the meeting in the event of any discussion concerning adult social care in item 7 and 13 respectively.

Dr Hack declared a personal interest concerning the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and Surrey County Council Draft Memorandum of Understanding (item 8) because she was a Reigate and Banstead Borough Councillor.

**59/11 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

**(a) Member's Questions**

Member's questions were received from Mrs Watson and Mrs White. The questions and agreed responses are set out at Appendix 1.

**60/11 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

**(a) DETAILED SERVICE BUDGET AND DRAFT DIRECTORATE STRATEGY**

**Report of the Education, Learning and Development Select Committee**

**RESOLVED:**

That the response from the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning, set out in Appendix 2 be agreed.

**(b) SURREY VIRTUAL SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN IN CARE  
PROGRESS REPORT**

**Report of the Education, Learning and Development Select Committee**

**RESOLVED:**

That the response from the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning, set out in Appendix 3 be agreed.

**61/11 2010/11 BUDGET CARRYFORWARD REQUESTS (Item 6)**

The Deputy Leader said that this report set out, in principle, the revenue (Annex A) and capital (Annex B) underspent budget carry forward requests into the 2011/12 financial year. He drew Cabinet's attention to an addendum to Annex B of 2010/11 Budget Carry Forward requests concerning NHS Campus re-provision, which was tabled at the meeting (Appendix 4). Finally, he said that the final 2010/11 Budget Outturn report would be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 24 May 2011.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the revenue carry forward requests as set out in Annexes A and B, as amended, to the submitted report be approved.
- (2) If, following the final closure of the 2010/11 accounts in early May, the underspending on some budgets increase, and consequently the carry forward request also increases, it be agreed that these will be resubmitted to the Cabinet at its meeting on 24 May.
- (3) If the carry forward requests reduce, it be agreed that the Deputy Leader has delegated authority to approve a lower amount.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To approve project and programme budget carry forwards as early as possible in the financial year to enable managers to complete them.

**62/11 2010/11 QUARTERLY BUSINESS REPORT (Item 7)**

The Deputy Leader introduced the Quarter 4 business report and said it was important to use this report in a timely way to track and manage the finances, performance and risks to the Council, the shape and development of the workforce and the outcome that was being delivered for residents.

He said that the report provided information about residents' satisfaction, costs and the Strategic Planning Framework and thanked everyone involved in the Public Value Reviews, which had identified savings to be made across the Council.

On staff matters, he reported a fall in sickness absence and the continued investment in staff training through the STARS programme. He also confirmed that the Performance Management Framework was a revised version on the 2010 report.

Finally, he said that he would like to write a 'Thank you' to all staff for their hard work and support during the last 12 months.

The comments of the Audit and Governance Committee were tabled at the meeting (Appendix 5) and the Chairman of this committee was invited to speak. He asked for reassurance that the relevant Cabinet Members would closely monitor the risks highlighted by his committee. He also expressed concern about the S256 agreement with NHS Surrey and the 'collectability' of the outstanding debt.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that the governance and membership of the Health and Well Being Board was yet to be decided. It would not be an official body until the legislation had passed through Parliament. However, he agreed to keep the Audit and Governance committee updated and on the S256 agreement, to provide a written response.

The Leader drew Cabinet's attention to paragraph 34 of the report, which stated that a revised Leadership Risk Register had been agreed following a meeting of the Strategic Risk Forum.

Each Cabinet Member was invited to comment on both the Directorate Strategies for 2011/12 – 2014/15 and the key performance targets and key commitments for 2011/12 for their individual portfolios.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Council wide outturn on customer feedback, finance, workforce and performance be noted.
- (2) That the Leadership Risk Register be noted.
- (3) That consideration be given to ascertain if any further actions beyond those already underway in Directorates are required.
- (4) That the 2011/12 basket of key indicators and their targets be approved.
- (5) That the Council's revised Performance Management Framework, in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Code of Corporate Governance, be approved.

**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.

**63/11 REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL AND SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL DRAFT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (Item 8)**

The Leader said that this report set out the key strategic aims for building partnerships with Districts and Boroughs as exemplified by this Memorandum of Understanding with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.

The Cabinet Members for Transport and Change and Efficiency said that they were the County Council's representatives on the Joint Board and stressed the County Council's role in the way forward for joint working. A number of

Members acknowledged the challenges outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding and expressed some reservations and concerns but nevertheless agreed to support the recommendations.

The Leader requested a progress report back to Cabinet in twelve months, together with an update on the pilots in Mole Valley and Woking.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the strategic collaboration with Districts and Boroughs as exemplified by the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council be supported.
- (2) That the work in developing the draft MoU as a strong basis for strategic collaboration be acknowledged.
- (3) That the Leader be authorised to agree any minor changes prior to signing the MoU on behalf of the county council.
- (4) That the Leader or Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members for Transport and Change and Efficiency be appointed to represent the Council on the Joint Board referred to in the MoU, subject to decisions requiring approval of the Council being reported through the Council's existing governance arrangements.
- (5) That the Chairman of the Local Committee be briefed regularly about the work of the Joint Board and that local Members be invited to attend the Joint Board to provide input to discussion about matters in their locality.
- (6) That the arrangements for the Joint Public Sector Board be noted and endorses the longer-term arrangements for this body to become the Local Strategic Partnership for the area be endorsed.
- (7) That the phrase "There are no new financial commitments within the MoU itself and proposals arising from it will require the relevant approvals from each respective authority" be added to the Memorandum of Understanding preface.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To establish a framework and governance arrangements for partnership activity between Surrey County Council and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council. The Executive of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council has already agreed to the recommendations above.

**64/11 TACKLING ILLEGAL MONEY LENDING (Item 9)**

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety introduced the report and referred to legislation as set out in recommendation (1). She also highlighted the work to date across England and, in particular the activity in Surrey since the team launched in February 2010.

She said that the funding for the project was provided by the Treasury and asked Cabinet to endorse the recommendations, including the agreement to delegate further decisions to authorise Birmingham City Council to discharge this function to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the discharge of its function of the enforcement of Part III of the Consumer Credit Act 1974 be carried out in Surrey by Birmingham City Council (pursuant to Section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972, Regulation 7 of the Local Authority (Arrangements for Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2000 and Section 13 and 19 of the Local Government Act 2000).
- (2) That further decisions to authorise Birmingham City Council to discharge this function be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety.

**Reasons for decisions:**

This proposal, if agreed, will provide additional protection for Surrey residents at no additional cost. This area of law enforcement requires specialist resource, expertise, techniques and facilities which Surrey Trading Standards Service would not otherwise have access to.

**65/11 RECONFIGURING IN-HOUSE SHORT BREAK RESIDENTIAL PROVISION FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (Item 10)**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the report and said that the report had already been to the Children and Families Select Committee. She thanked the committee for its comments, which were supportive of the recommendations and included with the agenda.

She said that the review of in-house provision was part of a wider review of services to children with complex needs, which concluded in December 2010. She considered that Applewood was a purpose built facility that would be able to accommodate children and young people with complex needs that Squirrel Lodge was unable to provide for.

She referred to the consultation undertaken with parents, carers, children and staff and assured Members that there would be no gap in provision. Finally, she confirmed that the current provision at Ruth House would be unchanged.

**RESOLVED:**

That the following proposals for the future provision of in-house residential short breaks be approved:

- (1) To close Squirrel Lodge.
- (2) To open Applewood.
- (3) To maintain current provision at Ruth House at 10 short-break beds per night.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The review of in-house short break provision for children with complex needs concluded the following:

- Squirrel Lodge is a specialist service, provided for families where there has been an agreed assessment and care plan. The current provision of services represents poor value for money
- Squirrel Lodge is no longer fit for purpose for those children with high needs who need to access short break services
- The Council's two purpose built facilities, used as part of a broader

offer including externally provided day time and overnight services, can offer increased capacity to meet the needs of children with high level needs, within financial capacity

- Applewood can provide improved care and support to children and young people with very high needs in a modern and well equipped setting
- Deploying the short breaks resources in this configuration brings into use the currently vacant Applewood short break beds and should achieve savings in the region of £0.8m per annum that will contribute to the overall savings required of the Council.

This review of short breaks provision is an early phase of wider review of services to children with disabilities and further opportunity exists to develop the range of service provision.

## **66/11 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 11)**

### **RESOLVED:**

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

#### **(1) DECISION TO DISSOLVE THE SOUTH EAST FIRE AND RESCUE CONTROL CENTRE LIMITED (SEFRCC)**

- (1) That the authority's agreement with the decision of the Board of Directors of South East Fire and Rescue Control Centre Limited that the Company be closed and that it be dissolved by making application for the Company to be struck off the Register of Companies be confirmed.
- (2) That the authority's agreement with the recommendation of the Board of Directors to dispense with the requirement to hold an AGM this year be confirmed.

#### **Reasons for decision**

In light of the cancellation of the Fire Control project, and in the absence of any realistic prospect of the Company having a similar or other purpose, the Board of Directors have agreed that the Company's business and activity be ceased with immediate effect and that the Company be closed in a solvent manner as soon as practicable. The agreement of Surrey County Council as the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority to these decisions is sought by the Board of Directors of South East Fire and Rescue Control Centre Limited.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 30 March 2011)

#### **(2) PROPOSAL TO REMOVE RESIDENTIAL PROVISION AT WEY HOUSE SCHOOL, BRAMLEY, GUILDFORD**

That the publication of a statutory notice proposing that Wey House change its status from a residential special school for 36 day places and 18 residential places to a day special school for primary aged boys with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties with 34 day places on the 1 September 2011 be approved.

### **Reasons for decision**

A decision on the future of the school needs to be taken as the suspension of residential provision cannot continue indefinitely.

Officers note the responses to the consultation from parents, pupils and staff and these views have been considered carefully. In light of the popularity of the current extended day model, the difficulties that the school experienced in the past and the good progress the school has made with respect to educational outcomes, officers remain of the view that the school can best sustain this progress as a day school.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 6 April 2011)

### **(3) 'SCHOOL SPECIAL' BUS SERVICES FROM SEPTEMBER 2011**

- (1) That bus services 663 and 678 originally proposed for withdrawal, be retained from September 2011.
- (2) That an average daily cash return fare of £2.10 on Local Bus School Specials be sought and applied by operators from September 2011.
- (3) That an impact review be conducted prior to working towards an average £2.50 fare from September 2012 on Local Bus School Specials.

### **Reasons for decision**

To enable two services to continue without an additional cost impact and to facilitate a level of fare that is affordable, maximises net cost savings and value for money and also reduces financial risk to the Council

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 6 April 2011)

### **67/11 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (Item 12)**

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

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

### **68/11 APPROVAL TO AWARD A ONE YEAR CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF CARERS BREAKS SERVICES (Item 13)**

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 the item and took no part in the discussion and decision thereon.

The Deputy Leader took the chair for this item.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care was invited to introduce the

report and explained that the market was currently not suitable for a competitive tender exercise and therefore officers were recommending a fixed price contract for one year.

The Deputy Leader requested that the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, as part of her Equalities brief, reviewed the specific Equalities and Diversity clause within the terms and conditions of the contract.

**RESOLVED:**

That the award of a one-year contract to the nominated provider, as set out in the submitted report, for the provision of Carers Breaks services from 1 June 2011 be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

- The existing grant arrangement does not allow SCC to assess if we are receiving value for money or to closely monitor the outcomes of the service.
- This move from grant to contract will secure SCC an improved arrangement with the provider, securing more service for the same level of funding.
- The market is currently not suitable for a competitive tender exercise.
- A review of the service and market stimulation throughout 2011 will facilitate a meaningful tender exercise for 2012 (if appropriate). There may also be scope for this service to be aligned with our existing Home Based Care services following a market stimulation exercise.
- There are about 106,000 carers in Surrey, 51,000 of who provide in excess of 20 hours of care per week and 23,000 of who provide in excess of 50 hours of care per week. At present, breaks services are provided to just 6,500 carers and therefore there is still a gap between need and provision.
- Carers contribute to the 'Big Society' by providing unpaid care services, which allow individuals to continue to live in their local communities. This saves the publicly funded authorities in Surrey in excess of £1bn per annum by minimising the level of support required from the State. It is important that carers are supported to ensure that they do not feel isolated by their role.

**69/11 THE PROVISION OF TRAINING SUPPLIERS FRAMEWORK TO SUPPORT THE COUNCIL'S TRAINING PROGRAMMES (Item 14)**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency commended this Framework Agreement for the provision of training providers and said that he was pleased to report that this contract would deliver substantial cost savings. He thanked officers involved in this tender process for their hard work.

He also agreed to provide the Deputy Leader with a revised Lot 2, Appendix 1.

**RESOLVED:**

That a framework contract be awarded, to commence on 16 May 2011, expiring in 2014 with an option to extend for 1 year to the suppliers



indicated in Appendix 1, of the submitted report, and to a value up to £16 million.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The existing contract will expire on 30 April 2011. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

**70/11 SURREY FIRST DATA CENTRE (PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND FIT OUT) (Item 15)**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency said that the acquisition of a property lease and associated expenditure was the latest stage in the provision of a Surrey First Data Centre for the council and its partners.

Members had a short discussion about the levels of interest from Surrey First Partners and the cabinets and capacity required within the Data Centre.

The Cabinet Member for Environment stressed the importance of energy efficiency and requested that energy costs be renewed as part of the commissioning phase.

**RESOLVED:**

That the acquisition of a property in Salfords, Redhill on a leasehold basis and the contract award to the supplier for the fit-out provision of the new Surrey First Data Centre, as set out in the submitted report, be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To minimise any delays in the formal contract award process so that the Surrey First Data Centre can be implemented in the quickest possible timescale and reduce the risk on the Council of the existing Data Centre failing.

**71/11 RELICENSING OF NOVELL SOFTWARE (Item 16)**

The Cabinet Member for change and Efficiency requested approval for renewal and approval of the contract for Novell Software.

Members questioned the number of licences required by the County Council over the next three years including the options set out in paragraph 5 of the report together with the details concerning user numbers and costings set out in paragraph 15 of the report.

After discussion it was agreed to revise the recommendation so that the final decision for approval was delegated to the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Deputy Leader.

**RESOLVED:**

That the final decision for approval for the purchase of the three-year renewal for the Novell software product set and associated support be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, in consultation

with the Deputy Leader.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The Novell software suite is a fundamental part of the current IT infrastructure and needs to be properly licensed and supported.

**72/11 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 17)**

**RESOLVED:**

That information for the item considered in Part 2 of the agenda could made available to the press or public at the appropriate time.

**[The meeting closed at 3.25pm]**

---

**Chairman**

**ITEM 4 - PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Members Questions**

**Question (1) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

Since the Channel 4 Dispatches Programme:"Undercover Social Worker" on 7 June 2010 can an assurance be given that unqualified Family Support Workers are not carrying out any of the functions that must be performed by a qualified Social Worker?

**Reply:**

The role of the Family Support Worker (FSW) is distinct and different from that of a Qualified Social Worker.

A Qualified Social Worker (QSW) holds case responsibility for children subject to a Child Protection Plan or Looked After Children.

Family Support Workers hold case responsibility for some children in need. They and their work is subject to robust management oversight. They do not undertake tasks that should be the responsibility of a Qualified Social Worker.

All Looked After children (LAC) and those subject to a Child Protection (CP) plan in Surrey are allocated to Qualified Social Workers.

FSW's undertake tasks suitable to their level of skill and experience. They do not undertake tasks that should only be completed by QSW's, however they will work with or to QSW's on more complex CP or LAC cases. CIN cases may be allocated to a FSW depending on level of complexity and intervention required. They will always be supported and have their work overseen by a supervisor who will have a Social Work qualification.

The compiling of evidence into reports is usually undertaken by a member of staff who holds the most direct information. All reports are overseen and checked by managers.

**Mary Angell**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Families**  
**26 April 2011**

**Question (2) from Fiona White (Guildford West):**

On 9 March 2011, the Assistant Director for Young People sent an email to all Members titled "**Fit for the Future: Services for Young People Transformation Programme**".

The email outlined a markedly different transformation programme to that agreed by Cabinet on 21 December 2010 and concluded "The alternative proposals put forward by YDS have improved our plans for transformation and will now be built into the Fit for the Future programme by the transformation project team."

The County Council's scheme of delegation to officers states that:

**"Officers in the exercise of functions delegated by this Scheme may not:**

- 7.1 make key decisions (as defined in Article 6 of the Constitution);**
- 7.2 change or contravene policies or strategies approved by the Council or the Cabinet;**
- 7.3 create or approve new policies and strategies;"**

When will the proposals outlined in the email of 9 March 2011 be presented to Members to make the decision on the Services for Young People Transformation Programme?

**Reply:**

The Cabinet decision at the 21 December 2010 meeting resolved:

- (3) That the "continued development of the seven indicative operating models set out in the report" be approved and officers be asked to "present further reports for approval as appropriate" be approved.
- (4) That progress be reported quarterly to the Services for Young People: *fit for the future* Project Board.

The email circulated to members on the 9th March 2011 was seeking to keep members informed of progress in relation to the continued development of the operating models as required by points 3 and 4 above set out in the minutes.

At the 21 December 2010 Cabinet approved the strategic direction towards adopting a commissioning model for Services for Young People, adopted a youth strategy to increase participation in education, training and employment and approved the continued development of indicative operating models. There has been no policy change in relation to any of the above, the strategic direction towards commissioning is the same, the youth strategy to increase participation has not changed and we are continuing to develop the indicative models. The operating models presented to Cabinet were indicative of what would be required to deliver the policy objective; Cabinet was not asked to approve a management structure but to agree a direction of travel.

Elements of a recent proposal made by staff have been incorporated into the *fit for the future* model. These changes have not lead to significant difference to what was presented at Cabinet in December and pertain to the management structure of the proposed Youth Support Service. These management decisions were agreed at the Services for Young People: *fit for the future* programme board which includes three Cabinet Members, one of which chairs the board and a further Member who

represents the perspective of local committees.

It is envisaged that there will be a further report to Cabinet in relation to award specific contracts, reports to Local Committees throughout the year to support local decision making and an update report to Education, Development and Learning Select Committee in July.

**Kay Hammond**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Safety**  
**26 April 2011**

**DETAILED SERVICE BUDGET AND DRAFT DIRECTORATE STRATEGY**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE EDUCATION, LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE**

The surplus has arisen from the trading activity of the department and careful cost control. This does create the opportunity to 'invest to save' and also to improve the service provided to schools and customers.

The approval of carry forward requests of this nature, which are new initiatives and projects, are to be considered at the Cabinet meeting of the 24 May 2011, when the 2010/11 budget outturn will be reported.

**Peter Martin**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Learning**  
**26 April 2011**

**SURREY VIRTUAL SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN IN CARE PROGRESS REPORT**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE EDUCATION, LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE**

An IT solution is being explored through the Technology Board. This would allow for electronic reconciliation and reduce the volume of manual data reconciliation required. The benefits of a successful solution through this route would include timely transfer of data for staff. It is subject to scoping for cost-effectiveness and impact but will be addressed through the Board.

There is a need to ensure reliable data is shared between the Virtual School and Children's Social Care systems and to do this there will be nominated representatives to oversee that this sharing of data happens in a timely manner.

The data managers from the Children's Performance team and the Virtual School will work together to reconcile the data to enable effective reporting. Sheila Jones, Head of Countywide Services for Children's Social Care will ensure this takes place.

A schedule of reports has been compiled so there is agreement for frequency of data sharing, whether on a weekly or monthly basis.

**Peter Martin**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Learning**  
**26 April 2011**

**2010/11 Budget Carry Forwards Requests - Addendum**

**Annex B of the report should be amended to include a further request for the carry forward of a capital budget by the Adult Social Care Directorate.**

**Adult Social Care**

<b>Capital scheme</b>	<b>Estimated carry forward (£'000)</b>	<b>Reason for not being completed by 31 March and risks of not completing</b>
NHS Campus Reprovision	892	At the end of February, it was anticipated that the purchase/adaptation of the required properties would be completed by year end and therefore the grant funding would be fully spent. However, some aspects of the project have been delayed resulting in a balance of £892,000 remaining unspent at year end of a total budget of £5.1m. These remaining funds are required by the service to complete the project in 2011-12 and the purchase and adaptation of properties is continuing to take place in April /May 2011.

The total carry forward for capital should increase to £15.7m



**AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: 2010/11 Quarterly Business Report**

Following the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on 7 April 2011, the Audit and Governance Committee wishes to highlight its concerns around the following risks on the Leadership Risk Register as at the 28 March 2011 (Item 7 – Annex 3):

- L9 NHS Reorganisation:

The Governance and Membership of the Health & Well-being Board does not provide sufficient strategic oversight of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and is not able to deliver the Joint Health & Well-being Strategy in partnership with District & Borough Councils and GPCC. This is a particular risk in the light of the financial position of NHS Surrey. **(High level risk).**

- L6 Resource Allocation System in Adults personalisation:

Application of Self Directed Support does not in practice facilitate achievement of the savings required by the Medium Term Financial Plan. **(Medium level risk).**

The Audit and Governance Committee asks for reassurance that the relevant Cabinet Members are closely monitoring the above risks.

**Nick Harrison**  
**Chairman of Audit and Governance Committee**