

## MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 18 July 2011.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 21 JUNE 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**

**87/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

There were no apologies for absence.

**88/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 24 May 2011 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2011 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**89/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Dr Lynne Hack declared a personal interest Minute Item 106/11. Reason: She is a Borough Councillor for Reigate and Banstead.

**90/11 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

**(a) Petitions**

- (i)** An e-petition containing 1,046 signatures was presented by Gillian Woods requesting that Warlingham Library remain open as a valuable community resource for the use of all.

The key points from her presentation were:

- Children who use a library are twice as likely to be above average readers.
- Warlingham Library is at the heart of the community and serves a range of functions. Many users would be unable to travel to alternatives.
- The libraries, along with the Fire Service, are the “jewels in Surrey’s crown”.
- Financial support should be considered if the community chooses to take over the running of the library. Costs should not fall onto the community partnership.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games tabled a response to the petition. A further response would also be

sent to the lead petitioner addressing the additional points that she had raised in her presentation.

The Council is keen to see the library reconstituted as a community service over the coming months. No one was better placed to ensure the local identity and community pride of the local library than the local community itself. A community run facility could have many benefits, including greater flexibility over opening hours and freedom over how the library can serve its locality. The Council would be committed to looking after the building and the running costs involved and would ensure a good supply of books. The full range of library services offered at other locations would remain available to those using the library.

**RESOLVED:**

That the response set out in **Appendix 1** be agreed.

**91/11 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

**(a) ON STREET PARKING CHARGES**  
**Report of the Environment and Transport Select Committee**

A report setting out the recommendations made at the Environment and Transport Select Committee's meeting on 24 May 2011 was tabled at the meeting (attached as **Appendix 2**).

In agreeing to refer the matter back to the Local Committees, Cabinet Members noted the need for a timely resolution.

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposals in relation to on-street parking in Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead be referred back to their respective Local Committees for reconsideration, and that the Local Committees agree any amendments to the proposals for their Borough within the framework and criteria agreed by the Cabinet, with an expectation that these meetings take place before the end of July 2011.

**Reason for decision:**

Referral of the decisions to the Local Committees would be consistent with the approach adopted in the other nine Boroughs and Districts, and would achieve the aim of maximising the involvement of Local Committees in decision-making for their area.

**92/11 2010/11 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT (Item 6)**

The annual review of the Council's governance framework is a statutory requirement of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011. The Annual Governance Statement (AGS) provides a comprehensive assessment of governance arrangements and the internal control environment across all activities for the financial year ending 31 March 2011.

The 2010/11 annual governance review found that overall governance arrangements are appropriate. The AGS identified specific areas of

improvement in order to meet best practice and work towards these was ongoing.

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency tabled amended wording for the section of the Annual Governance Statement on Roles and Responsibilities.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the 2010/11 Annual Governance Statement, as revised by the amended text tabled at the meeting and attached as **Appendix 3**, be approved and the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council be authorised to sign the AGS ready for publication with the Statement of Accounts.
2. That the Audit & Governance Committee monitor progress on the implementation of the actions required and report to Cabinet as appropriate.

**Reasons for decisions:**

There is a statutory duty to annually review and report on governance. The identification of issues in governance and internal control and a responsive approach to addressing those issues is viewed as best practice.

**93/11 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR MAY 2011 (PERIOD 2) (Item 7)**

The May 2011 Month End Finance Report was tabled at the meeting. The May 2011 projection for the 2011/12 service revenue budget outturn was for a small underspend across the directorates.

The Council's 2011/12 revenue expenditure budget had been revised upwards to £1,611.4m. This reflected a number of changes to government grants since the budget was set and the approved carry forward of underspent budgets in 2010/11 to the current financial year.

The Council's approved in-year capital budget of £122.8m for 2011/12, part of a wider four-year capital programme of £466.2m, had been supplemented by a further £29.8m. This followed the closure of the 2010/11 financial year and accounts and reflected the underspent budget from the previous financial year.

Efficiencies and service reductions were in line with the target of £59.3m required in the Medium Term Financial Plan 2011/15 to deliver the 2011/12 budget. Of the £59.3m efficiencies and service reductions, £42.1m had been classified as an 'amber' risk, with the remainder being 'green'. The latest assessment following the month end monitoring for May was for £9m of 'amber' risks to become 'green'.

It was agreed that tables in future budget monitoring reports would include a column showing amounts being carried forward where appropriate.

**RESOLVED:**

That the grant changes set out in paragraph 3 of Annex A to the report (as tabled at the meeting and attached as **Appendix 4**) and summarised below be reflected in the budgets of the relevant services:

- Increases to Standards Fund and other education related grants

- totalling £488,400 within Children's Schools and Families;
- The Adult and Community Learning Grant was £38,800 lower than the budget;
  - The Music Grant within Surrey County Arts was confirmed as £244,800 higher than assumed in the budget;
  - A reduction in the Sing-Up Grant, also within Surrey County Arts, of £20,600;
  - A reduction to the Council Tax Freeze Grant of £36,200, due to changes to the tax base in one of the district councils, which was notified late.

**Reasons for decisions:**

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

**94/11 SURREY LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (Item 8)**

The Surrey Local Government Association (SLGA) comprises all twelve principal authorities in Surrey. It was established to protect and promote the interests of the people of Surrey through co-operation between the elected principal councils on local public services and representation on public issues at the regional, national and European levels. There have been many changes in the political environment since the SLGA was formed and a new group had been proposed which would be better suited to fulfilling its role.

The proposed Surrey Leader's Group would provide a strong representative body for local government in Surrey, act as a forum for the discussion of strategic issues, for relationship building and as a lobbying voice. It would be comprised of the Leaders (or equivalent) of all borough and district councils and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the County Council and would meet approximately monthly.

The constitution of the SLGA required the approval of all its constituent authorities for its dissolution. Subject to the necessary agreements, the SLGA would be formally wound up on 30 June 2011 and assets and monies of the Association transferred to the Surrey Leaders' Group on 1 July 2011 or as soon as practicable thereafter.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the dissolution of the Surrey Local Government Association be approved.
2. That the intention to establish a Surrey Leaders' Group in accordance with the draft constitution attached to the agenda be endorsed.
3. That the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader be authorised to agree any minor amendments to the constitution of the Surrey Leaders' Group that may arise following consideration by all Councils.
4. That work take place with the Surrey Leaders' Group to establish effective and appropriate arrangements to ensure that Cabinet Members continue to have regular networking opportunities with District and Borough Leaders, senior members and officers.
5. That the transfer of the assets and monies of the SLGA to the Surrey

Leaders' Group be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The constitution of the Surrey Local Government Association requires the approval of all its constituent authorities for its dissolution.

**95/11 SURREY MINERALS PLAN (Item 9)**

The Surrey Minerals Plan is the planning framework for the County Council in its role as mineral planning authority. It identifies areas and policy considerations for future mineral development in Surrey and provides guidance to developers who wish to put forward proposals. Once adopted, all planning applications for mineral development will normally have to be determined in accordance with the Plan.

The Core Strategy had been deemed to be soundly based by the Planning Inspector and appropriate for the planning of the county over the next 15 years. The Inspector's report supported the Council's policy framework for future mineral development. This included the approach to the location and extent of future quarrying which seeks to avoid significant impacts upon Surrey's communities and environment, and to protect key environmental interests.

Mrs Yvonna Lay, Councillor for Egham Hythe and Thorpe, addressed the meeting with concerns about the Inspector's report. In particular, the report was felt to potentially prejudice planning issues and future applications, did not address local flooding or traffic concerns and proposed a development area which was close to a primary school. Mrs Lay therefore asked that a decision on the Plan be deferred.

Cabinet Members discussed the issues raised and noted that the Inspector's recommendations were binding. The issues commented on by the Inspector in her report would need to be considered further at the planning application stage for individual sites. The Planning and Regulatory Committee would determine individual planning applications for mineral working in line with the Minerals Plan, unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The Plan specified the preferred areas for development. Without an adopted Plan, all areas of Surrey would be deemed to be permissive for mineral development applications. Surrey had been the only county in the southeast to have negotiated a reduction in the amount of extraction required (by approximately 50%). The adoption of the Plan would protect a large number of sites and reflected the success of the case and evidence base which the Council had put forward.

A short summary of how the Plan and planning applications would operate together would be produced before the meeting of the County Council to aid the understanding of the role that the Plan fills and the next steps involved.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the County Council be recommended to adopt the *Core Strategy* and *Primary Aggregates* DPDs with changes recommended by the Inspector (Annexes C and D).
2. That the County Council be recommended to adopt the *Minerals Site Restoration* SPD (Annex E) and the revised *Minerals and Waste Development Scheme* (Annex G).

3. That the County Council be recommended to approve the publication of the *Aggregates Recycling DPD* (Annex F) for representations on its soundness and legal compliance and subsequent submission to Government for independent examination.
4. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director for Strategy, Transport and Planning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for the Environment, to make any minor amendments to the *Aggregates Recycling DPD* prior to publication for representations following Cabinet and Council consideration.
5. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for the Environment to approve any schedule of suggested amendments following representations on the *Aggregates Recycling DPD*, to be submitted with the DPD to the Government for independent examination.

**Reasons for decisions:**

- 1 – 3. To secure completion of the major elements of the Minerals Plan, fulfilling the associated legal requirements for LDFs.
4. To accommodate any subsequent corrections and updates.
5. To ensure Member views are taken into account in any minor changes made before submission (any major changes would require Cabinet/County Council approval and re-consultation).

**96/11 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN 2011 – 2020 (Item 10)**

The Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority Public Safety Plan for 2011-2020 sets out a framework for proposed improvements to fire and rescue services in Surrey during this period. The Plan continues to build on the strategic ambitions as described in the previous Public Safety Plan and describes the intentions to build on the successes that have been achieved so far.

Comments had been received on the Public Safety Plan from the Communities Select Committee. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety tabled a response (the comments and response are attached as **Appendix 5**).

Paul Greenwood addressed the meeting on behalf of the Surrey Fire Brigades Union and expressed concerns about the proposed financial savings, especially in light of a statement made by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government relating to shining a light on council spending and the need to protect frontline services. Mr Greenwood also raised concerns about the effects on life safety that increased response times may have in relation to the seriousness of fires and road traffic collisions. The FBU requested that the Cabinet commit to implement changes to reflect feedback from engagement with stakeholders and that working relationships continue to be developed with neighbouring fire and rescue services, as raised by the Communities Select Committee. Furthermore, there should be a record of the arrangements with other services and where they are not suitable, the PSP should be changed accordingly. The Surrey FBU welcomed the decision to review the governance arrangements for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and urged

the Cabinet to prioritise this area of work to allow the Service to work more closely with other fire and rescue services.

The Cabinet noted the high esteem in which Surrey's Fire and Rescue Service was held by residents and the view that it was a "jewel in Surrey's crown". The Service had been assessed as performing well by the Audit Commission and it was recognised that Surrey is one of the safest places to be in the UK. The fire and rescue service was not exempt from the requirement to make savings and the Public Safety Plan was a ten year plan which had been designed as a framework so that it could be flexible and responsive to changes over time. The plan has been well researched and had undergone a comprehensive consultation process, as recognised by the Communities Select Committee.

The implementation of an agreed response standard would enable performance to be measured more accurately and the need for clearer communication on this issue had been identified. The Fire and Rescue Service would continue to respond as quickly as possible and the effectiveness of the Plan would be monitored on an annual basis. Concerns were noted from the residents of north Surrey, particularly from the Spelthorne area, however up to five fire engines could attend parts of this borough within 10 minutes. Further discussions and consultations were taking place to improve joint working with partners near the borough's borders. The importance of firefighters' training and prevention measures, both for fire incidents and vehicle collisions, were noted to be crucial to the success of the Plan.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Fire and Rescue Authority Public Safety Plan for 2011-2020 be approved for implementation.
2. That the Two Year Action Plan that supports the Public Safety Plan be approved for implementation.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The Public Safety Plan meets the statutory requirement to develop and publish an integrated risk management plan.

The Public Safety Plan provides the strategic direction for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and enables effective budget planning to meet the requirements of the medium term financial plan.

The Public Safety Plan creates a framework for change, providing the flexibility required to respond to further opportunities and challenges.

**97/11 ISLE OF WIGHT 999 FIRE AND RESCUE CALL TAKING AND MOBILISING (Item 11)**

The proposed merger of the Isle of Wight (IOW) Fire and Rescue Service and Surrey Fire and Rescue Service emergency mobilising controls at Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's facility in Reigate would provide a sustainable and improving Operational Assurance regime with reinvestment through income generation that will benefit both authorities.

Comments had been received from the Communities Select Committee. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety tabled a response (the



comments and response are attached as **Appendix 6**).

**RESOLVED:**

1. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, in discussion with the Strategic Director Customers and Communities and the Deputy Leader, to agree the terms of an agreement with the Isle of Wight Fire Authority under which SFRS will provide a 999 fire and rescue call taking and mobilising service to the Isle of Wight [on the terms set out in the report].
2. That an elected Members' panel and project board be set up to oversee the development of the project and operational transfer of IOW's call handling and emergency mobilisation to SFRS.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The decision allows both services to achieve the most valuable elements of the original DCLG FireControl project aims: improving efficiency, enhancing technology and building resilience. This decision is based on principles of localism and is not an imposed solution. It provides a better operational solution for both services and gives Surrey the ability to sustain and improve its mobilising and communications systems post the DCLG FireControl project, in time for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

It will provide a sustainable and improving Operational Assurance regime with reinvestment through income generation that will benefit both Surrey and the Isle of Wight in the long-term, the rational reinvestment of income will help assure future resilience.

**98/11 YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2011-12 (Item 12)**

The Youth Justice Plan sets out the aims and objectives for the youth justice partnership as agreed by its governance body the Youth Justice Management Board. The Youth Justice Service is one of Surrey's most successful partnerships. Bringing together staff from a range of disciplines and agencies the service has consistently performed to a high level and 2010/11 has seen strong external validation of this. The Youth Justice Board describes Surrey as being "at the forefront of performance in the South East of England" and the recent HM Inspectorate of Probation inspection in March 2011 gave an overwhelmingly positive endorsement of practice.

Priorities for 2011/12 had been identified as:

- Successful integration of youth justice functions into the Surrey Youth Support Services.
- Continuing high performance in respect of Youth Justice with particular attention to reducing offending, reducing involvement of looked after children and young people in the criminal justice system.
- Implementation of wide-ranging restorative justice initiatives with Surrey Police and Criminal Justice Board partners.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Youth Justice Plan 2011/12 be recommended to County Council.

**Reasons for decision:**

The Youth Justice Plan reflects the aspirations for the County Council for the Youth Justice statutory partnership and supports the aims of reducing crime and the fear of crime while also increasing public confidence in the criminal justice system.

**99/11 POLICY REVIEW OF SERVICES TO CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (Item 13)**

The Cabinet received an update on the changing Government agenda in regards to children, families and education, and the potential impact on services to Children, Schools and Families and Surrey County Council. The new Government came into office in Spring 2010 and had introduced a number of reviews of policy, guidance and legislation for children, schools and families. The Spending Review had also led to a 19% reduction in the resources available. The Cabinet discussed the new and planned legislation and national policy reviews and noted the need to ensure that this shift in direction was acted upon locally. In taking account of this new policy landscape, the Council would need to ensure there is a balance between the national agenda and the needs and aspirations of children, young people and families in Surrey.

The Cabinet discussed the potential impacts of the Welfare Reform Bill. It was noted that foster carers, children with disabilities and children with complex needs could potentially lose out under aspects of the Bill. In particular, fostering could be affected by the proposals around additional rooms. It was agreed that these concerns would be taken up by letter and through the Local Government Association.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the key changes in guidance, policy and legislation and the implications for the Children Schools and Families Directorate be noted.
2. That the Directorate's approach to responding to these be endorsed.
3. That the development of a new children and young people's policy and planning framework be agreed that not only responds to the changing national policy landscape but establishes a distinctive vision and strategy for Surrey children, young people and their families. This will be developed during the summer and autumn, with the aim of being completed for Cabinet approval in 2012.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To enable the Directorate to start the policy review and consultation over services to children, schools and families.

**100/11 PROPOSED CHANGES TO SERVICES IN BUS REVIEW PHASE 2 AREAS (Item 14)**

Changes to main network bus services and subsidy had been proposed in "Phase 2" areas of the Surrey Bus Review. These changes would lead to an annual saving of £1.469m (including school service withdrawals already approved) in subsidy costs. Revised proposals had been developed to the benefit of bus users following public consultation and a procurement exercise. In particular, the proposals included measures to address the

issues raised over services 34, 35, 48, 409, 411 and 500. Reductions in frequency and fragmentation of services had been kept to a minimum. The revised proposals also enabled further optional enhancements to be considered on bus routes where service level issues had been raised as part of the consultation.

Mr John Orrick, Councillor for Caterham Hill, addressed the Cabinet on the need for prompt publication of the timetables and his concerns relating to the reduction in the number of buses which currently travelled up Caterham Hill. This had the potential to reduce the links between the hill and the valley areas and could require residents to make a connection in Caterham.

The Cabinet Member for Transport tabled revised recommendations.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the changes to main network public bus services and subsidy levels in Phase 2 areas be agreed on the basis described in this report and the award of Contracts detailed in the Part 2 Annex be approved for the one, four or five year terms relating to each contract.
2. That the changes to bus services and service levels shown in Annex B on the basis of new subsidy levels in Annex D be agreed.
3. That the introduction of Sunday service on route 3 every 90 minutes (option c in the report) at a cost of £14,800 per annum be agreed on the basis set out in the report.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To develop a network of public bus provision which is fit for purpose, commercially viable and financially sustainable. The addition of a Sunday service on route 3 provides the best value enhancement to service levels.

[Note: Item 15 was taken before item 14]

**101/11 LEADER/ DEPUTY LEADER/ CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 15)**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**(1) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: PETITION**

That the response attached at Appendix 1 be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 18 May 2011)

**(2) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: PETITION**

That the response attached at Appendix 2 be agreed.

### **Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 18 May 2011)

### **(3) THE FUTURE OF THE BOURNE INFANT SCHOOL AND SOUTH FARNHAM JUNIOR SCHOOL**

That the following proposals be approved:

- That the Bourne Infant School would close on 25 May 2011.
- That 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.
- That the admission arrangements are moderated such that pupils currently on roll at The Bourne Infant School retain sibling priority for younger siblings whilst they remain at the Bourne Infant site.

### **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.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 18 May 2011)

### **(4) EXPANSION OF MAYBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL - DECISION**

That the following proposals be approved:

- 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.
- Additional classrooms would be provided.

### **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 – 18 May 2011)

### **(5) CHANGE OF CATEGORY OF PEWLEY DOWN INFANT SCHOOL VIA CLOSURE AND RE-OPENING - DECISION**

That the following proposals be approved:

- Pewley Down Foundation Infant School, Guildford will close on 30 June 2011
- Pewley Down Voluntary Aided Infant School will open on the same site on 1 July 2011

#### **Reasons for decision**

The school is a successful and popular school. Schools working together, particularly infant and junior schools into which most children transfer either as federations or through amalgamation is in line with SCC policy as it would lead to educational benefits for the children and the communities served by the schools.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 18 May 2011)

#### **(6) APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF TRANSPORT OF HOT MEALS TO SCHOOLS IN SURREY**

That the contract for the provision of transport of hot meals to Schools in Surrey to the company as detailed in the submitted report, be approved. The contract to commence on 1 September 2011 and expire on 31 August 2013 with an option to extend for a further two 1-year periods.

#### **Reasons for decision**

The existing contract will expire on 31 August 2011. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed.

The evaluation panel consider, following a thorough evaluation process, that the company detailed in the submitted report, have the capability to deliver the service at the best value to the Council.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 18 May 2011)

#### **(7) ST PETER'S C of E (Aided) PRIMARY SCHOOL, FARNHAM (WRECCLESHAM) – BASIC NEED PROGRAMME**

1. That officers be authorised to confirm the Diocese extends the commission of the consultant to complete the design development and undertake a tender exercise to achieve an actual tender cost.
2. That the business case be approved for the release of capital funding and the letting of a contract to complete the works, subject to costs being contained within the budget, as set out in the submitted report.

#### **Reasons for decision**

The scheme delivers a value for money expansion of the school that supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide much needed additional school places for local children. Release of the funding is required now so that building can commence in September 2011 in order to deliver the new accommodation by September 2012.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 18 May 2011)

**(8) DISPOSAL OF TRIZANCIA HOUSE, CHERTSEY ROAD, WOKING**

That the disposal of Trizancia House, Chertsey Road, Woking to the bidder set out in the submitted report be authorised, subject to a satisfactory soil survey and environmental audit.

**Reasons for decision**

To dispose of a property no longer required for service delivery for the best possible consideration.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 18 May 2011)

**(9) SOCIAL CARE CHANGE PROGRAMME: (TRANSFER HOMES – TRANCHE 3)**

- (1) That a contract be awarded for the transfer of care and support services from Surrey & Borders NHS Trust at Cedarwood Lodge and The Pines to the supplier as detailed in the submitted report.
- (2) That as part of the contract negotiations, officers from the PLD Commissioning team will seek a saving in the region of 5-10% year on year for the term of the contract period for Cedarwood and The Pines.
- (3) That the service user from Tudor Beech Lodge moves to a new placement with Field Lane Care & Support based on their proposed annual fee as set out in the submitted report.
- (4) That the care & support contract with, the supplier as detailed in the submitted report, be noted and that it will be for 3 years plus an option to renew for 12 months after each successive year for two years (5 years in total).
- (5) That as part of the care contract, the supplier be required to prepare a development proposal which seeks to enhance the delivery of care to a 'person-centred' model of care; this will include the consideration of supported living for the service users.
- (6) That the service user from Tudor Beech be placed under the Council's standard Individual Placement Agreement.

**Reasons for decision**

The reasons for undertaking this course of action were outlined in the Strategic Implementation Plan produced at the outset of the programme (January 2007), in particular that SABP are disinvesting in services not determined as a core function of the Health Service, and the SCCP services are Social Care provision. In addition, the service must transfer to address the quality and financial viability of the service. This course of action is deemed to be the only way in which to resolve these issues bearing in mind compliance with national directives towards the provision of supported living as the preferred option for service users.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health – 18 May 2011)

**(10) PROCEDURAL MATTERS: PETITION**

That the response attached at Appendix 3 be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Environment – 18 May 2011)

**(11) APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION OF ON STREET PAY AND DISPLAY TICKET MACHINES**

That the supplier as detailed in the submitted report be approved to supply pay and display ticket machines for on street parking in Surrey at a maximum unit cost, as set out in the report.

**Reasons for decision**

Having completed a tender and procurement process in line with EU directives, the evaluation panel consider that the supplier detailed in the submitted report, best meets the County's requirements on cost and quality to deliver the service at the best value to Surrey County Council for this Framework Contract, which will enable the Council to purchase the equipment when required.

Award of the contract to the recommended supplier will provide a means of collecting payment for on street parking charges where they are implemented across Surrey. Machines supplied by the recommended supplier are considered to best meet the requirements of functionality, reliability, appearance, upgradeability and price.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport – 18 May 2011)

**(12) FUNDING FOR SOUTH FARNHAM SCHOOL TO ALLOW THE SCHOOL TO TAKE A BULGE CLASS INTO YEAR 3 IN 2012**

That South Farnham Junior School should be provided, as soon as possible, with the necessary funding as detailed in the submitted report in 2011/12 to allow them to provide the necessary resources to admit an additional 30 pupils (i.e. 76 pupils to Year 3) in September 2012.

**Reasons for decision**

In order that, following the merger of the Bourne with South Farnham School, pupils at other infant schools are not disadvantaged in seeking a Year 3 place at South Farnham in 2012.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 27 May 2011)

**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.

**103/11 PROPOSED CHANGES TO SERVICES IN BUS REVIEW PHASE 2 AREAS (Item 17)**

The decision on this item was taken in Part 1 of the meeting and is set out in Minute Item 100/11 above.

**104/11 APPROVAL TO APPOINT SUPPLIERS TO A FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF TAXI TRANSPORT IN SURREY - PHASE 1 (Item 18)**

The Cabinet considered the award of a framework agreement to the recommended suppliers for the provision of taxi transport services for home to school, adult social care and children's taxi transport in zones one and two to commence on 1 August 2011.

**RESOLVED:**

That a contract be awarded for the Framework Agreement for the phase 1 provision of taxi transport, to commence on 1 August 2011, expiring in 2014 with an option to extend for 1 year and at a value of up to £20 million (as set out in Appendix 1 of the Part 2 report).

**Reasons for decisions:**

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

**105/11 APPROVAL FOR FLEXIBLE ENERGY PURCHASING CONTRACTS THROUGH LASER FRAMEWORK FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 2012 – 2016 (Item 19)**

The Cabinet considered arrangements for energy purchasing contracts based on the results of an evaluation process and details of why the recommended contract award would deliver best value for money.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That SCC commits to the energy purchasing contracts through LASER Flexible Framework for the provision of electricity and gas to commence on 1 October 2012 - 2016.
2. That a mixed basket of PIA and PWP purchases be adopted to spread the procurement risk, with some corporate sites placed on the PWP



option.

3. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency and the Head of Procurement and Commissioning to instruct LASER to include SCC energy requirement into its flexible buying strategy and to evaluate and award new contracts from 1 October 2012 to 2016.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The decision provides best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

**106/11 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS (Item 20)**

**(a) FUTURE AREA OFFICE PROVISION IN THE EAST OF SURREY**

The Cabinet considered arrangements for future area office provision in the East of Surrey.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the freehold purchase of the property specified in the Part 2 report be approved at a maximum price not exceeding that set out in Annex 3 to the report, together with the two long lease interests over the associated car parking spaces.
2. That the purchase of the property be subject to the successful completion of the proposal set out in Recommendation 2 of the Part 2 report, the terms of which to be approved by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency.
3. That the associated fit-out of the property be approved at a cost not exceeding the estimate specified in the Part 2 report with any additional cost to be subject to agreement by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency.

**Reasons for decisions:**

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

**[The meeting closed at 4.35pm]**

---

**Chairman**

**CABINET – 21 JUNE 2011**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**PETITION**

A petition containing 1056 signatures has been received as follows:  
'Save Warlingham Library – We the undersigned request that Warlingham Library remain open as a valuable community resource for the use of all'.

**Reply**

As part of the County Council's commitment to improving the way we do business for the residents of Surrey, the Library Service has undergone a Public Value Review (PVR) and the report went to Cabinet on 1 February 2011 with its recommendations confirmed at the meeting in March

The PVR recognised that the Library Service is a high performing service that is popular with residents but Surrey County Council, like all other local authorities, faces budget pressures of over £200 million over the next 4 years and is planning a sustainable service offer...and I'm afraid that even important and much valued front-line services like libraries cannot be protected from this harsh economic reality. In addition to the financial situation, there are a number of other drivers for change within the library sector that the service must address and respond to in order to be a modern and sustainable service fit for future circumstances - and, across the country, libraries and the model of delivery are being redesigned.

The County Council is keen to maintain the network of 52 libraries and the report advocated the maintenance of a core network of libraries run by the authority but, in line with the aspirations of the 'Big Society' agenda, it also recommends opportunities for communities to become involved with the sustainability of the network through the model of community partnered libraries. The Cabinet accepted the PVR report recommendation that Warlingham library, along with ten other libraries, was to be part of this initiative for their future operations management.

Libraries suitable for community partnering were identified through application of a set of 12 factors covering use, cost and social need. It is inevitable that the smallest also have low levels of use, which will remain so while Surrey County Council can only fund limited opening hours. Community partnering could open the way to extending opening hours, making better use of the resources in the library and increasing access to the benefit of the local community ... hence the County Council wish to invite communities to get involved and take on the management of these local libraries through a partnership relationship with the County Council.

The county would provide a building, IT and stock; the community would take on responsibility for the stewarding, the opening hours, and, where not already installed, the council will also install self-service to further assist the development of community libraries. The Government is keen to develop the 'Big Society' ideal through the Localism agenda that it is promoting - the Council supports this ideal and, where there is the desire and capacity for community-based organisations, allow them to run their local library. The County Council believe that its local 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 believe that we have created 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.

I understand from Mr Hodge (your local County Councillor) that you have played an important role in establishing a steering group to work with officers of the County Council on developing a bespoke community partnership model for Warlingham and I sincerely thank you for that. The detailed points you raise will be addressed in those discussions but, in summary, there will be ongoing management support from Surrey Libraries to assist the community with library operations matters, etc. Surrey County Council will take responsibility for any necessary requirements under CRB; the introduction of self-service terminals will address data protection issues for users, etc; and health & safety, where this relates to premises, etc attributable to Surrey County Council, would continue as now. It would, however, be down to the local community organisation running the library to recruit/manage volunteers ... and to ensure that opening hours are guaranteed.

I hope that you would agree that the opportunity for your local library to be able to continue under these arrangements is a better option than a draconian decision to simply close the library.

The County Council would very much hope that the range of activities that you have mentioned would be able to continue under any future arrangements made for Warlingham to be a community partnered library...and to continue to serve the community of Warlingham.

**Denise Saliagopoulos**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**21 June 2011**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**DATE: 21 JUNE 2011**

**REPORT OF: ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE**



**SUBJECT: CALL-IN OF CABINET DECISIONS OF 24 MAY 2011 IN RELATION TO ON-STREET PARKING IN ELMBRIDGE AND REIGATE & BANSTEAD**

**KEY ISSUE/DECISION:**

In accordance with Article 7.03(o)(iv) Cabinet is required to reconsider its decisions of 24 May 2011 in respect of the introduction of on-street parking charges in Elmbridge (Minute 78/11) and Reigate & Banstead (Minute 79/11), amending the decisions or not, before adopting final decisions.

**BACKGROUND:**

- 1 At its meeting on 24 May 2011, the Cabinet made decisions about the introduction of on-street parking charges in Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead following consideration of the consultation responses for those Boroughs. Three Members of the Environment & Transport Select Committee (Stephen Cooksey, Will Forster and Chris Frost) called-in the decisions on the following grounds:

‘This decision did not have the same level of scrutiny and member involvement as the other Boroughs and Districts covered by the On-Street Parking Task Group of the former Transportation Select Committee and therefore failed to address issues raised by the Task Group or to benefit from the extended consultation afforded to other parts of the County.’

- 2 The call-in was considered by the Environment & Transport Select Committee at its meeting on 15 June 2011.

**DISCUSSION AT THE SELECT COMMITTEE MEETING**

- 3 The reasons for the call-in of the Cabinet’s decision were explained by the three Members who had initiated the process, and centred around the fact that Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead had been treated differently to the other Boroughs and Districts in the County. The particular concern highlighted was that, by excluding the two Boroughs from the On-Street Parking Task Group’s considerations and by making the decisions at Cabinet level, there had not been the same level of Member involvement and scrutiny.
- 4 It was confirmed that the public consultation process in Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead was the same as that underway, or planned, for the other nine Boroughs and Districts, and therefore it was not appropriate to repeat that part of the consultation. The Committee also felt that it would not be necessary to

reconvene the Task Group to consider the proposals for Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead, as details of the Task Group's findings in relation to other Boroughs and Districts are already publicly available to help inform discussions as necessary.

- 5 The Select Committee concluded that, in order to ensure a consistent approach to the handling of on-street parking decisions across the County and to allow those decisions to be fully informed by the local knowledge of Members, the Cabinet should be asked to review its decisions of 24 May 2011 in relation to Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead. It was therefore unanimously agreed to recommend to the Cabinet that its decision in relation to on-street parking in those areas should be referred back to the relevant Local Committees.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Select Committee recommends that the proposals in relation to on-street parking in Elmbridge and Reigate & Banstead be referred back to their respective Local Committees for reconsideration, and that the Local Committees can agree amendments to the proposals for their Borough within the framework, time frame and criteria agreed by the Cabinet.

#### **REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Select Committee concluded that referral of the decisions to the Local Committees would be consistent with the approach adopted in the other nine Boroughs and Districts, and would achieve the aim of maximising the involvement of Local Committees in decision-making for their area.

---

#### **Contact Officer:**

Bryan Searle  
Senior Manager, Scrutiny & Appeals

020 8541 9019

#### **Sources/background papers:**

Environment & Transport Select Committee reports for the meeting held on 15 June 2011

---

**CABINET – 21 JUNE 2011**

**2010/11 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT**

The following text replaces the section on Roles and Responsibilities set out on page 3 of Annex A to the report.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Constitution of the Council sets out the roles and responsibilities of Select Committees, Regulatory Committees, the Cabinet and the Council. It also sets out functions delegated by the Leader to Cabinet Members, Committees and officers, together with the Member and Staff Codes of Conduct and the Member/Officer Protocol.

The County Council, comprising 80 elected Members, sets the framework within which the Cabinet operates through the corporate plan, budget and major policy plans. It elects the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council annually and appoints the committees of the Council. It also elects the Leader of the Council for a four year period and may remove him/her from office. All executive powers are the responsibility of the Leader and they can then delegate what they wish to other Members (Cabinet and local) and officers.

The Cabinet consists of the Leader, Deputy Leader and 8 Cabinet Members, with each Member holding the brief for a portfolio of services. Decisions can be taken by individual members of the Cabinet or collectively by the full Cabinet. The Leader determines what decisions are delegated to individual Members and this is set out in Table 2 of the Scheme of Delegation (Part 3 of the Council's Constitution).

The Cabinet leads the preparation of the Council's policies and budget and makes recommendations to the County Council on the major policy plans and the budget and Council Tax. The Cabinet and Cabinet Members take decisions within this framework of plans and procedural rules approved by the Council, including key decisions in the forward plan. It is held to account by the Council for its performance.

Standing Orders govern the procedural elements of Councillor business, whilst Financial Regulations set out how financial activity is carried out and how financial interests are safeguarded.

The functions of the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer are specified by statute and set out in the Constitution. The Monitoring Officer (Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Chief Executive's Office) is responsible for ensuring lawfulness and fairness in decision-making. The Chief Financial Officer/Section 151 Officer (Acting Assistant Director of Finance and Strategic Assets, Change and Efficiency Directorate) is responsible for ensuring lawfulness and financial prudence in decision-making.

The Assistant Director for Finance and Strategic Asset's role involves the management of the finance and strategic assets functions as well as taking responsibility for Section 151. In February 2011 a Corporate Board was established, focussing on the way the organisation is run and this meets monthly. The Assistant Director for Finance and Strategic Assets permanently sits on this alongside the Head of Human Resources & Organisational Development and the Corporate Leadership Team.

## May 2011 Month End Finance Report

### Executive Summary

This is the first budget monitoring report for the 2011/12 financial year. At this early stage the focus of the report is on whether efficiency targets are on track and whether there are any significant known changes to service pressures from those included in the medium Term Financial Plan.

The May 2011 projection for the 2011/12 service revenue budget outturn is for a small underspending across the directorates. The table below summarises this by directorate.

	£m Budget	£m Forecast	£m Variance
Adult Social Care	331.3	331.2	-0.1
Children, Schools and Families	285.1	285.2	0.1
Schools	615.8	615.8	0.0
Customers and Communities	69.2	69.2	-0.1
Environment and Infrastructure	121.6	121.5	-0.1
Change and Efficiency	93.2	93.2	0.0
Chief Executive's Office	14.9	14.9	0.0
Policy initiatives	1.7	1.7	0.0
Central Income / Exp	66.6	66.5	-0.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,599.4</b>	<b>1,599.2</b>	<b>-0.3</b>

The Medium Term Financial Plan for 2011/12 included a budget of £8m set aside as a Risk Contingency. Following the 2010/11 outturn, a further £4m was carried forward and added to the contingency budget, which will only be used if there is an overspending at the year end.

The in-year capital budget is forecast to underspend by £7.1m. As this is due to delays in projects starting, this funding will be required in 2012/13 to fund the completion of the projects.

### Recommendation

1. The Cabinet is asked to confirm that grant changes in paragraph 3 are reflected in the budgets of the relevant services.

## Revenue Budget

1. The Council's 2011/12 revenue expenditure budget was set at £1,588.7 million at the Council meeting on 8 February 2011. The revenue expenditure budget shows all expenditure funded through either local taxation or government grants. Since then, there have been a number of changes to government grants and also the Cabinet has approved the carry forward of underspent budgets in 2010/11 to the current financial year. This has led to an updated budget of £1,611.4m, as summarised in Table 1 and explained in paragraphs 2 and 3.

Table 1 – Movement of 2011/12 revenue expenditure budget

	<b>£m</b>
Original Budget	1,588.7
Carry forwards approved 22 April 2011	22.0
Carry forwards approved 24 May 2011	11.7
Amounts already included in MTFP	-11.6
<u>Changes to Government Grants</u>	<u>0.6</u>
Updated budget	1,611.4

2. The Cabinet approved to carry forward £22m at its meeting on 26 April 2011, and a further £11.7m on 24 May 2011. Included in the carry forwards was a total of £11.6m, which was already included in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) budget. This was £8m risk contingency and £3.6m to even out the reduction in budgets over two years.
3. When the MTFP 2011/12 was agreed by the Council in February 2011 government departments had not determined the final amount for a number of grants. Services therefore made an estimate of the likely level of grant. The general principal agreed by Cabinet was that any changes in the final amounts – whether higher or lower – would be represented in the service's expenditure budget. The changes to government grants to date are summarised below.
  - Increases to Standards Fund and other education related grants totalling £488,400 within Children's Schools and Families;
  - The Adult and Community Learning Grant was £38,800 lower than the budget;
  - The Music Grant within Surrey County Arts was confirmed as £244,800 higher than assumed in the budget;
  - A reduction in the Sing-Up Grant, also within Surrey County Arts, of £20,600;
  - A reduction to the Council Tax Freeze Grant of £36,200, due to changes to the tax base in one of the district councils, which was notified late.
4. The Cabinet is asked to confirm that these grant changes are reflected in the budgets of the relevant services.
5. In addition to the £8m Risk Contingency agreed as a part of the MTFP in February 2011, the Cabinet also approved a further £4m in May 2011 as a part of the carry forward of the 2010/11 budget underspending. This was to reflect the unknown impact of the significant legislative change over the next year.
6. Services have been monitoring their budgets to the end of May 2011, and making a forecast of the year-end position. Excluding the Risk Contingency, which now



totals £12m, the 2011/12 revenue budget is forecast to be balanced. Table 2 shows an analysis of the year end forecast by directorate.

7. Following a Rapid Improvement Event (RIE) to examine and implement improvements to the budget monitoring process, a risk-based approach to monitoring has been used in three pilot areas. These are the Children's Service, Waste Management & Reduction, and Highways & Countryside Service. The risk-based approach identifies higher risk budgets and focuses resources on monitoring those areas, with more frequency than lower risk budgets. This approach will be rolled out to all services over the coming months once the methodology has been reviewed and agreed.

**Table 2 – Summary 2011/12 Revenue Budget Outturn Forecast**

	<b>Original MTFP Budget £000s</b>	<b>Full Year Updated Budget £000s</b>	<b>Full Year Projection £000s</b>	<b>Full Year Variance £000s</b>
Adult Social Care	324,881	331,266	331,186	-80
Children, Schools and Families	283,362	285,125	285,187	62
Schools	616,248	615,750	615,750	0
Customers and Communities	68,285	69,242	69,163	-79
Environment and Infrastructure	121,109	121,582	121,503	-79
Change and Efficiency	88,759	93,218	93,218	0
Chief Executive's Office	14,888	14,935	14,935	0
Policy initiatives	1,000	1,697	1,697	0
Central Income / Exp	62,161	66,636	66,543	-93
<b>Service Revenue Expenditure</b>	<b>1,580,693</b>	<b>1,599,451</b>	<b>1,599,182</b>	<b>-269</b>
Risk Contingency	8,000	11,987	0	-11,987
<b>Total Revenue Expenditure</b>	<b>1,588,693</b>	<b>1,611,438</b>	<b>1,599,182</b>	<b>-12,256</b>

8. **Adult Social Care – forecast underspending of -£0.1m.** The directorate begins the year with two legacies from 2010/11. On the one hand, £7.2m of savings carried forward that are not committed against spending deferred from 2010/11; and on the other hand, £6.4m of the savings made against the £32m recurring savings target incorporated in the 2010/11 budget were one-off, and need to be replaced. The result is that the underspend carried forward can be used - for 2011/12 only - to replace the savings made by one-off means in 2010/11. That leaves a balance of £0.8m to cover any pressures emerging in the new year, and this is considered sufficient at this stage.
9. The trends in the year to date do not suggest any demand pressures beyond those built into the budget, and the new efficiency savings of £28.2m remain on track at present, but at a comparatively early stage best categorised as 'amber'.
10. Members will be aware that an additional £10.6m is to be spent on actions jointly agreed with the PCT to help the whole health and social care system: that additional income has not yet been added to the revenue budget. When it is added next month, it will be offset by additional spending, and so will not alter the forecast of an outturn at budget. That additional spending should, however, serve to reduce the chances of extra pressures developing in-year.

11. **Children's Schools and Families – forecast overspending of +£0.1m.** The small overspending relates to Schools and Learning and the Transport Co-ordination Centre around school transport for Special Educational Needs (SEN). This remains to be one of the greatest funding pressures for the Directorate, although there are measures in place to manage this.
12. The other main budget risk areas are around Social Care and SEN placements and care packages. Volumes are increasing, although in social care unit costs are reducing, which is keeping forecast costs well within budget. However, the volatility of this demand and resultant costs are difficult to predict.
13. An area of significant uncertainty is the Academies agenda and the impact this will have on future funding for the Directorate and the County Council generally.
14. The £10.5m efficiencies target within the MTFP is currently on track with a 'green' risk assessment.
15. **Customers and Communities – forecast underspending of -£0.1m.** The overall projection for the Directorate is an underspend of just under -£0.1m on a total budget of £69.2 million. This is due to a surplus on fee income within the Registration service.
16. The forecast balanced budget reflects that the achievement of the targeted £2.5m savings is on track.
17. **Environment and Infrastructure - forecast underspending of -£0.1m.** The services within the directorate are currently on-track for close to a balanced budget at the year end.
18. Within the Waste Management and Reduction Service, a full review of data provided by contractor will be conducted in July based on data from the first quarter. Early indications are for a full year underspend, but this is not yet reflected in the outturn projection because further work is required to validate figures provided. Also budget pressures may arise from risks related to the Eco Park development.
19. The projection for local bus contracts assumes phase two of the Bus Review is successfully implemented as approved in the June report to Cabinet. An underspend may arise in relation to Transport for London cross boundary routes, but further work on this is required.
20. The forecast underspending reflects that the achievement of the targeted £8.3m savings is on track.
21. **Change and Efficiency – forecast balanced budget.** The services within the directorate are currently forecasting that their net expenditure will be within or close to the budget at the year end
22. The achievement of the £5.6m efficiency savings is currently on track, with £3.5m classed as an 'amber' risk and the remainder as 'green'.
23. **Chief Executive's Office – forecast balanced budget.** The 2011-12 revenue budget includes efficiency savings of £1.6m built into the base. The PVR is on track to achieve savings of £2.9m by 2013/14.
24. **Central Income and Expenditure – forecast underspending of -£0.1m.** This forecast is based on earning higher interest from the short-term investment of the Council's cash balances so far this year. With the prospect of a rise in interest rates later in the year, this could increase further.
25. The achievement of £2.7m savings within the MTFP is currently on track.

## Monitoring of Efficiencies

26. The MTFP 2011/15 includes a target £59.3m of efficiencies and service reductions that need to be achieved for the 2011/12 budget to be delivered. These savings will not just happen, but require action by the service and regular monitoring.
27. As a continuation of the successful process used last year, each efficiency will be monitored and reported to the Change Board on a monthly basis.
28. For the year to date, the efficiencies and service reductions are in line with the target required. Of the £59.3m efficiencies and service reductions, £42.1m were classified as an 'amber' risk, with the remainder being 'green'. The latest assessment following the May month end monitoring is for £9m 'amber' risks becoming 'green'.

## Capital Budget

29. The Council approved an in-year capital budget of £122.8m for 2011/12 within the MTFP, as a part of a wider four-year capital programme of £466.2m. Following the closure of the 2010/11 financial year and accounts, the current in-year capital budget has been supplemented by a further £29.8m of underspent budget from last year's budget.
30. Table 3 shows the in-year and scheme life budget for each directorate

Table 3 – 2011/15 Capital Budget

	<b>Full Year Budget £'000</b>	<b>Full Year Projection £'000</b>	<b>Full Year Variance £'000</b>	<b>Project Life Budget £'000</b>	<b>Project Life Projection £'000</b>	<b>Project Life Variance £'000</b>
Adult Social Care	2,068	2,068	0	3,841	3,841	0
Children, Schools and Families	5,523	4,988	-535	7,320	7,320	0
Customers and Communities	2,978	2,978	0	8,138	8,138	0
Environment and Infrastructure	38,748	38,748	0	126,049	126,049	0
Change & Efficiency	98,084	96,507	-1,577	327,246	327,246	0
Chief Executive's Office	5,192	182	-5,010	20,642	20,642	0
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>152,593</b>	<b>145,471</b>	<b>-7,122</b>	<b>493,236</b>	<b>493,236</b>	<b>0</b>

31. Within the Children's, Schools and Families capital budget is the Extended Schools project, which is funded from government grant. The Investment Panel has so far approved spend for this year of just over £0.7m, with the balance to be spent in 2012/13. This will be on the outdoor areas of maintained nursery schools.
32. The Change and Efficiency capital budget includes the building works for schools. There is a net in-year forecast underspending of -£1.6m, although this will be spent over the scheme life of the projects.
33. The in-year projection for Schools' Basic Need is for an overspending of £1.8m based on work carried out within EPM to profile the spend for the individual projects. This overspending will be carried forward and reduce future years budgets.
34. EPM (Other Programmes) - several of the schemes in the programme are starting in the latter part of the year, which will result in an in-year underspending of £3.4m. This funding will be required in 2012/13 to complete the projects.

35. The Chief Executive's Office capital budget includes the £5m for Superfast Broadband. As outlined in Surrey Partnership Plan, the Surrey Strategic Partnership has committed to ensuring that access to superfast broadband is available to all business and residential premises in Surrey by the end of 2013. In addition to this the Surrey Public Sector Network (SPSN) project will focus on broadband access for Public Sector and third sector bodies.
36. There will be no capital expenditure on the Superfast Broadband or SPSN projects in 2011/12. Revenue costs of up to £350,000 are expected in 2011-12, but these costs cannot be capitalised until both projects have been successfully implemented. This will be funded from the revenue budget.

**COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE****Item under consideration:****SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN 2011-2020****Date Considered: 9 June 2011**

- 1 The Committee considered the draft Public Safety Plan for 2011-2020 and congratulated officers for their hard work in producing such detailed proposals. Officers were also commended for the way that they had consulted with and kept Members informed throughout the process of developing the Plan.
- 2 The twelve outcomes outlined in the Plan were supported by the Committee, although it expressed some concern about the opposition from the public and stakeholders to outcomes one to three. These outcomes relate to response standards, matching provision to predicted demand, and the balance of service provision across the County. The importance of the Service continuing to engage with staff, stakeholders and the general public to address the reservations in these areas was stressed.
- 3 Representations were received from the local County Councillor and a Member of Spelthorne Borough Council highlighting their specific concerns about incident response times in the event of the proposed night-time closure of Staines Fire Station. The Committee noted that cover would be provided from other Surrey Fire Stations and/or by the London Fire Brigade and that, whilst the Plan aimed to provide appropriate levels of cover from within Surrey's own resources, mutual cross-border co-operation with other fire and rescue services was a key element of the response provided.
- 4 Concern was also expressed at the meeting about the level of cover for Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead as a result of the changes proposed in the Plan. The Committee agreed that its Public Safety Plan Working Group would continue to meet on a quarterly basis to ensure robust scrutiny of the Plan, and as part of this the Working Group would carefully review any impacts arising from the changes, especially in Spelthorne, Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.
- 5 The importance of genuine cross-border co-operation between Surrey and neighbouring fire and rescue services, particularly London, was stressed. The Committee acknowledged that much had been done to improve co-ordination and co-operation with the London Fire Brigade and other neighbouring fire and rescue services, but expressed some concern that Surrey might be vulnerable if the required level of response was not provided. The Committee therefore suggested that the Cabinet seeks assurances that suitable arrangements are in place to provide the most appropriate emergency response in Surrey, especially in the north of the County, where strong reciprocal arrangements with the London Fire Brigade are essential.

- 6 The Committee supported the proposal to have five Firefighters on each fire engine responding to a call instead of the current four, as this would enable more incidents to be dealt with using a single engine or, where more than one engine was required, allow more to be achieved by the first crew arriving at the scene. It was agreed that members of the Committee would be invited to visit the control centre to observe the mobilisation process, in order to see how decisions about the level of response were made. The Committee also agreed to include an item on its future work programme about the location of fire stations in the County and their suitability for operational purposes.

**The Select Committee recommends to Cabinet:**

- (a) That the twelve outcomes outlined in the Public Safety Plan 2011-2020 be supported.
- (b) That, in view of the negative consultation feedback to outcomes 1, 2 and 3 in the Plan, the Service continues to engage with staff, other stakeholders and the general public regarding their reservations in these areas.
- (c) That the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and the Chief Fire Officer continue to develop close working relationships with the London Fire Brigade and other neighbouring fire and rescue services and that assurances be sought that Surrey would receive an appropriate level of support in the event of incidents, especially in the north of the County.

Steve Cosser  
Chairman

**RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority Public Safety Plan 2011 – 2020**

I thank the Select Committee for their response and thorough consideration of the Public Safety Plan. I also recognise the significant contributions by the PVR member reference group.

I would like to address specifically the issue of the emergency response standard. The current response standard was aspirational in that it focussed on a percentage of the population; however the population in the county is not static, therefore the ability to measure our performance against this standard has been technically impossible. Similarly the research has shown incidents affecting life and property occur across the county and are not necessarily confined to those areas where there are more people; many of the vehicle collisions that cause death or serious injury occur on our more rural roads.

The new standard is based on the number of incidents attended and therefore it would be difficult to make a direct comparison with the old standard, even though the times may appear to have increased.

The new emergency response standard is appropriate for Surrey; it is clear, measurable and based on our current performance. As such it will enable us to identify areas where we may be able to improve our performance on an incident-by-incident basis as well as supporting our longer term aspirations to change the location of some of our fire stations.

However, I must remind people that emergency response is only one aspect of our work to make Surrey safer. A far more significant impact on personal and community safety can be achieved by preventing some incidents from occurring and providing people with the skills to help themselves when they do happen.

Specifically with regards to the select committee recommendations, I reply as follows

- (a) Noted and thank the Select Committee for their scrutiny of the PSP
- (b) Communications is a key facet of the PSP implementation plan and specific focus will be provided to raising awareness of the way emergency response arrangements are provided for the county.
- (c) One of the targets for the first two-year action plan is to update our arrangements with neighbouring fire and rescue services, which should be complete by end of this year. Indeed I met with the Chairman of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority last Friday to discuss, amongst other things, this very issue.

**Kay Hammond**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Safety**  
**21 June 2011**

**COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE****Item under consideration:****ISLE OF WIGHT 999 FIRE AND RESCUE CALL-TAKING AND MOBILISING****Date Considered: 9 June 2011**

- 1 The Committee considered the proposal to merge the Isle of Wight's Fire and Rescue Service emergency mobilising control function with Surrey's control centre in Reigate, and supported the commencement of discussions about a formal agreement for the transfer. The Committee noted that the Service recommend that an elected Members' panel and officers project board is set up to oversee the development of the project and requested that, where appropriate, consideration be given to involving the Public Safety Plan Working Group in this process.
- 2 The Committee also agreed that the Public Safety Plan Working Group should scrutinise call handling times under the new arrangements to ensure that Surrey Fire & Rescue Service continues to meet its target of answering emergency calls within 7 seconds.
- 3 It was felt that, in order to maximise opportunities for income generation, the Surrey Fire & Rescue Service should seek similar arrangements with other local authorities.

**The Select Committee therefore recommends to Cabinet:**

- (a) That the proposal to enter into a formal agreement with the Isle of Wight Fire and Rescue Service to provide their emergency fire and rescue call-taking and mobilisation service be supported.
- (b) That the Surrey Fire & Rescue Service pursues similar arrangements with other local authorities, in order to maximise opportunities for income generation.
- (c) That the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, in consultation with the Chairman of the Communities Select Committee, consider how the Public Safety Plan Working Group can be involved in supporting the project to merge the Isle of Wight emergency mobilising control function with Surrey's control centre in Reigate.

Steve Cosser  
Chairman



**RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Isle of Wight 999 Fire and Rescue call –taking and mobilising**

Once again I thank the committee for their deliberations and in response to their recommendations

- (a) I am pleased that the Select Committee support the proposal and confirm a Memorandum of Understanding is currently being drawn up to support the project before the contractual arrangements are in place.
- (b) It is important to ensure that the Isle of Wight project succeeds and subsequent to that it could provide a model for us and others to take in the future, as such it has already generated much interest from central Government, and therefore it is important that we put our efforts into delivering this project successfully before we commit resources to other authorities.
- (c) The proposed project governance model provides member scrutiny, additionally the Chief Fire and Rescue Advisor has been asked to provide external national sector scrutiny and PricewaterhouseCoopers has been retained to provide an independent audit function (the first audit will be during Aug or Sept 2011). I will liaise with the Chairman of the Communities Select Committee to discuss the Committees' involvement in the project.

**Kay Hammond**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Safety**  
**21 June 2011**