

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2011 AT 2.00PM  
AT COUNTY HALL**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mrs Kay Hammond
Mrs Mary Angell	*Mr Ian Lake
*Mrs Helen Clack	*Mr Peter Martin
*Mr Michael Gosling	*Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos
*Mr Tim Hall	*Mr Tony Samuels

\* = Present

**PART ONE**  
**IN PUBLIC**

Prior to the start of the meeting, the Leader made two announcements regarding the Surrey Library Service. The first related to the County Council providing 20% of the current library opening hours per week with support from a member of the Library Service for the Community Partnered Libraries and secondly, that the following nine libraries – Ash, Caterham Hill, Frimley Green, Hersham, Horsley, Knaphill, Lightwater, Shepperton and West Byfleet be included in the core library service.

**161/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

There were apologies from Mrs Angell.

**162/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 1 November 2011 (Item 2)**

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

**163/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

There were no declarations of interest.

**164/11 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

There were none.

**165/11 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

**(a) Update report from the reconvened On-street parking task group**

The recommendations of the Environment and Transport Select Committee, on-street parking task group were discussed. The Cabinet Member considered that the key point was to ratify the decision concerning on street parking charges being the responsibility of local committees, as announced at the last County Council meeting. He also drew attention to the ongoing work and said that a full assessment of all working proposals needed to be completed before formalising the Cabinet's position.

The Cabinet's response is attached as **Appendix 1 to these minutes.**

**(b) Design Services Review**

The recommendations of the Environment and Transport Select Committee were discussed. The Leader considered that a move towards a 4 year design programme would be helpful and he also confirmed his support for a carry forward of any funding relating to undelivered schemes into the 2012/13 budget.

The Cabinet's response is attached as **Appendix 2 to these minutes.**

**166/11 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR OCTOBER 2011 (PERIOD 7)  
(Item 6)**

A revised report including Annex A and B was tabled at the meeting.

The Leader introduced the report and drew attention to the October 2011 projection of a £4.3m underspend of the service revenue budget. He also highlighted possible future budget pressures and the proposed carry forwards and transfers to reserves, as set out in Table 2.

He also endorsed the proposals to have a wider 24 month budget process which would assist services to manage their budgets more prudently.

Members commended all Directorates for keeping spend within Budget and achieving savings of £59.3m this year, in addition to savings made last year. Members also acknowledged the challenging times ahead which would entail further budget reductions of £200m over the next 5 years.

Finally, the Leader provided an explanation of the capital budget underspend, much of which relates to the Schools' Basic Need Programme.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the grant changes (Annex A, paragraph 1 and Annex B) reflected in the Directorate Budgets be noted
- (2) That the budget monitoring position and projected year end variances (Annex A, paragraph 2) be noted.
- (3) That the carry forward requests totalling £2.5m (Annex A, paragraph 52) be approved.

**Reasons for decisions:**

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

**167/11 TIME FOR LEADERSHIP – LEADING THE CHANGE AGENDA (Item 7)**

The Deputy Leader drew attention to the revised recommendation, tabled at the meeting.

He said that the report set out how Surrey County Council would build on its strategy of developing partnerships as a key way to deliver benefits to residents, ensuring resilience and achieving efficiencies. He also said that the County Council would continue to work, in partnership, with authorities within the South East 7 to achieve efficiencies and savings.

He highlighted examples of 'Partnerships in Action' set out in Annex 2 and also the partnership models and their governance set out in paragraphs 34 – 36 of the main report. Finally, he asked Members to support the creation of a shared procurement model with East Sussex County Council, as detailed in paragraph 25-27 of the report.

Cabinet Members agreed that the report clearly set out the County Council's strategy for the future and cited other examples of partnership working, such as:

- Tell Us once Strategy – delivered by the Surrey Registration Service
- Contact Centre partnerships with Kent County Council
- Provision of Education Services with Babcock 4S
- Developing a property strategy to work with Hampshire County Council

The Leader informed Cabinet that he would be meeting the Leader of Kent County Council on Thursday. Finally, he thanked the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency and her staff for producing the report

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the strategy to share services in partnership with other organisations be endorsed.
- (2) That the specific directorate work that contributes to successful partnerships be endorsed.
- (3) That the creation of a shared procurement model with East Sussex County Council be supported

The Leader of the Council to delegate the decision to establish a procurement partnership with East Sussex County Council, as set out in paragraphs 25-27, to the Deputy Leader in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, subject to approval of the business case.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The content and actions set out in the paper provides the authority with a framework to take forward its work, in a cost effective way and achieve significant savings for the authority.

**168/11 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 8)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as attached as **Appendix 3 to these minutes**, be noted.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To note the decisions taken by Members under delegated authority.

**169/11 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 9)**

**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 paragraphs 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**P A R T T W O - I N P R I V A T E**

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

**170/11 CHILDREN SERVICES PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW – FINALISING RECOMMENDATIONS (Item 10)**

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning presented the report and drew attention to the revised recommendations, tabled at the meeting.

He informed Members that a communications plan was in place and that families, staff and Local Members would be informed of the proposals by the end of the week.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That further discussions with Freemantles School with a view to pursuing option C, consulting with staff and families and referring the responses to any consultation to the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, in consultation with the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families be approved, before a final decision is made.
- (2) That the development of procurement arrangements for the management of Applewood be approved.

The Leader of the Council to delegate the decision concerning recommendation (1a) above to the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, in consultation with the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families.

**Reasons for decisions:**

These recommendations when combined will, subject to a series of contractual negotiations, realise savings of between £0.5m and £1m. Where the savings reached through these arrangements are greater than £0.71m it should be possible to implement the savings target for the over-arching review of services to children with complex needs without there being a reduction in the care budgets available to families.

**171/11 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 12)**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**[The meeting closed at 2.40pm]**

---

**Chairman**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE'S ON-STREET PARKING TASK GROUP**

**Background**

1. On 10 November 2011 the Environment and Transport Select Committee considered a report from the reconvened Environment and Transport Select Committee Parking Task Group concerning on street parking charges and enforcement.
2. The Select Committee had agreed to reconvene the task group at its meeting held on the 15 September 2011 to further examine the issues surrounding the finances and business cases for the proposals to introduce on-street parking charges.
3. At full council on the 11 October, the newly appointed Leader, Mr David Hodge, announced a change in proposals to introduce on-street charges, namely that decisions of the Local Committee will not be subject to Cabinet call in. The task group considered changes to the policy in light of their previous recommendations to Cabinet, which were reported and considered on the 24 May 2011.
4. It should be noted that if through efficient operations a financial surplus arises from managing on street parking, this can only be used as defined under Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). This restricts use of any surplus for the maintenance and/or improvement of the Highway including environmental works or additional parking provision. Members need to be aware that the Road Traffic Regulation Act is not a revenue generating Act and that there is case law which makes it quite clear (Cran – v-London Borough of Camden) that in setting parking charges a highway authority cannot take into consideration extraneous financial matters such as the aim of generating income for other Council projects, however worthy such projects might be.

**Recommendations from the Environment and Transport Select Committee**

***The following recommendations were approved by the Select Committee***

1. *The decision to implement, or not implement, on street parking charges should be taken solely by Local Committees without the possibility of call in from the Cabinet.*
2. *Local Committees are allowed to set on street parking charges, and also the prices of on street parking permits, where and at what cost they consider appropriate.*
3. *The introduction of any such scheme should be cost neutral to Surrey County Council.*
4. *It should be at the discretion of the Local Committees whether they wish to insist that the cost of enforcement following the introduction of on street parking charges in individual towns, or locations within their District or Borough, should also be cost neutral.*
5. *Local Committees should liaise with SCC Officers and Enforcement Partners and then decide upon the required levels of enforcement and provision of payment methods and machines, subject to legal compliance and*

*recommendation 2 that the schemes must be cost neutral to Surrey County Council.*

- 6. Any surpluses remaining from on street parking charging revenues within a particular District or Borough, after enforcement, administration and servicing charges have been deducted, should be allocated to the respective Local Committee to decide how they should be spent. Surpluses must only be spent in accordance with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act.*
- 7. Any surplus arising and spent as permitted by the Local Committees should be additional to the 'normal' allocation from the Highways budget i.e. Pay and Display should not subsidise conventional, required expenditure.*
- 8. SCC Officers to provide breakdowns of cost estimates for enforcement and servicing charges for the introduction of on street parking charging schemes within each area.*
- 9. Any proposed enforcement authority must produce a standardised financial report as determined by SCC, detailing all expenditure and costs associated with on street parking enforcement, prior to any contract being signed.*
- 10. Any 'body' is entitled to be considered as a potential enforcement authority providing that they are cost neutral to SCC, and they complete the standardised cost spreadsheet and it is accepted by the relevant Local Committee.*
- 11. These financial reports are to be agreed and accepted by the Local Committee of any area that will be enforced by an authority other than the respective local authority.*
- 12. The profit, or any incentive for any enforcement authority has to be balanced opposite the risks being taken and then agreed by SCC, the Local Committee and where applicable, any enforced authority.*
- 13. SCC should ensure that where on street charges are introduced the benefits of a more efficient enforcement practice are demonstrated immediately.*
- 14. SCC should also use their best endeavours to implement permitted improvements within 12 months, should any surpluses arise in areas where Local Committees have agreed to introduce on street charging.*

**Response:**

5. The detailed work undertaken by the Environment and Select Committee Task Group is appreciated and will contribute to ensuring that on-street parking operations are properly managed within Surrey.
6. Cabinet firmly supports the recommendation that the decision to implement, or not implement, on street parking charges will be taken solely by Local Committees without the possibility of call in from the Cabinet. It is expected that Local Committees will give due consideration to the advice of Officers in making these decisions.
7. Earlier this year the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment wrote to all of our District and Borough agents involved with on-street parking enforcement. The suggestion was to look at joint working between the districts and county, to minimise costs for all parties. This was enthusiastically endorsed by our agents, hence over the autumn there has been a considerable amount of progress in developing proposals for joint working. This may impact on operational details, such as how surpluses and deficits are managed. These are being finalised and will be reported to Cabinet and the Select Committee in the New Year.
8. In view of the ongoing work, Cabinet is unable to formally endorse all recommendations at this time. Full assessment and consideration of the joint working proposals need to be completed before formalising Cabinet's position.

**Summary and proposed way forward**

9. The decision to introduce on-street parking charges will be the responsibility of the appropriate Local Committee. Cabinet will not call in these decisions as there is no longer a countywide programme to consider on-street parking charges.
10. The final proposals from the Districts and Boroughs will be reviewed and reported in the New Year

**Ian Lake**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**  
**29 November 2011**



**CABINET RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Surrey Highways – Design Services Review**

- 1) The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment welcomes the Select Committee input in supporting officers shape the future direction and strategy of the Highway Design Services.
- 2) Following a review with the Strategic Director, the Cabinet Member can confirm the following response to the concerns raised as part of Select Committees recommendations:

- **Officers explore opportunities to accelerate Service Transformation**

Following meeting, officers have agreed to integrate process re-design with Rapid Improvement Team, which is currently reviewing section 106 planning processes. Officers have also met with May Gurney to appoint dedicated Process Improvement Officer to support process re-design from delivery side. Exploiting best practice identified in scheme commissioning from Rapid Improvement Team and dedicated May Gurney resource will enable new processes to be implemented in May rather than September 2012.

- **Officers explore opportunities to move to 4 year design programme for 2012/13 budget**

The key change of a transition from an annual design programme to a four-year design programme has been prioritised within Highways Senior Management Team, and senior officers will work with Members and key stakeholders to implement recommendations as soon as it is practical to do so.

Officers will also begin working with Local Committee Chairman, to determine if a solution can be implemented on an area basis rather than waiting for a county-wide solution to be fully implemented.

- **Concern that any funding related to undelivered schemes be ring fenced and rolled over to the 12/13 budget**

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment has reviewed concerns with the Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer, and subject to Cabinet approval, is able to endorse Select Committee recommendation that any local transport schemes, not delivered in 2011/12 programme be carried over to 2012/13 budget.

**Ian Lake**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**  
**29 November 2011**

**CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS**

**23 NOVEMBER 2011**

**(i) PROCEDURAL MATTERS - PETITIONS**

That the response attached at Appendix 1 be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning - 23 November 2011)

**(ii) CONSULTATION ON ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND CO-ORDINATED SCHEMES FOR SEPTEMBER 2013 ADMISSIONS**

That the proposed admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools and Coordinated Schemes for 2013, to include the changes set out in the submitted report, be approved for public consultation and that both options (phased and immediate introduction) for the tiered sibling rule be consulted on for Wallace Fields Infant and Junior Schools.

**Reasons for decision**

There is a statutory requirement to consult on admission arrangements every three years or sooner, if there is a proposal to change any part of a school's admission arrangements. The Local Authority is proposing changes to the admission arrangements and as such there is a statutory duty to consult.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning - 23 November 2011)

**(iii) PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL PLACES AND CREATION OF PRIMARY PROVISION IN WALTON AND HERSHAM**

That the objections from Cleves School be noted, but on balance, that the proposals be implemented on the following basis.

- Bell Farm Junior School to expand and extend its age-range from 7-11 to 4-11 from 2012.
- Burhill Community Infant School to expand and extend its age-range from 3-7 to 3-11 from 2014.
- Grovelands School to expand and extend its age-range from 3-7 to 3-11 from 2014.

**Reasons for decision**

These proposals meet the demand for additional places in the Walton and Hershaw area in the future.

There is clear demand from parents of pupils in the local area for these proposals. The consultation responses demonstrate the very strong support that exists in the local community for these proposals.

These proposals are in line with the Council's overarching strategy for primary all through provision

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning - 23 November 2011)

**(iv) SPEED LIMITS AT VARIOUS SITES IN MOLE VALLEY**

That the following recommendations be agreed:

1. No change be made to the speed limit on the A24 Leatherhead Road, with the speed limit remaining at 40mph.
2. The speed limit on the A24 Horsham Road be reduced to 50mph, anti-skid surfacing provided on the southbound approach to the Beare Green roundabout and carriageway markings.
3. The speed limit on the A24 Mickleham By-pass be reduced to 50mph.
4. No change be made to the speed limit on the D301 Blackbrook Road, with the speed limit remaining at 40mph and carry out traffic management improvements north of Red Lane, in the vicinity of The Plough public house.

**Reasons for decision**

To implement the conclusions made by the Cabinet Member at the site visits, following the Local Committee's request for support for their preferred speed limits.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment - 23 November 2011)

**(v) PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF COUNTRYSIDE PARTNERSHIPS**

- (1) That the recommendations set out in Appendix 3 of the submitted report, to achieve £130,000 savings for 2012/13, be agreed.
- (2) That the proposed reviews take place during 2012 to ensure the sustainability of the key Partnerships that the County Council continues to support.
- (3) That progress be reported back to the Cabinet Member during 2012/13 for implementation in 2013/14.

### **Reasons for decision**

The recommendations are designed to ensure that the County Council only directly supports those partnerships that deliver Surrey County Council statutory services or deliver Surrey County Council service priorities.

In addition, they are designed to ensure that the Partnerships become more self-sustaining with less reliance on public sector finance.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment - 23 November 2011)

### **(vi) LAND AT CORNERWAYS, THE LONG ROAD, FARNHAM**

That the land shown edged red on the plan at Annexe 1 to the submitted report, be declared surplus to the County Council's requirements and that future negotiations on the sale price be agreed with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes.

### **Reasons for decision**

The land is no longer required for highway purposes.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment - 23 November 2011)

**RESPONSE TO A PETITION SUPPORTING THE PROPOSED EXPANSION OF ST MATTHEWS SCHOOL IN DOWNSIDE, COBHAM**

**The Petition**

'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to support the proposed expansion of St Matthews School in Downside, Cobham, to include a One Form Entry Junior Department, as there is a chronic shortfall of school places for the local children.

St Matthews is a highly rated and oversubscribed, excellent state school serving Cobham and Downside families. 86% of our children come from Cobham, Downside and Stoke D'Abernon.

Due to a well publicised chronic shortage of school places in this area, and in particular junior places in the Cobham area, our children will find it difficult to secure their continued education. At St Matthews our children increasingly will have nowhere to go when they leave us.

St Matthews has officially been sanctioned as "in an area of basic need" by Surrey Local Education Authority and funding has been allocated to allow us to expand, so that pupils can stay with us until they are 11 years of age. In addition we have been gifted the land by the Parochial Parish Council. We have the funding and the land and we cannot lose this much needed opportunity to provide school places in Cobham.'

**Response**

The County Council acknowledges the success of St Matthews and has been supportive of the school's and Diocese's aspiration to become a primary school. The County Council recognises that the distribution of St Matthew's pupils has changed over the last few years and that more pupils are now located in the Cobham urban area, perhaps reducing their access to the wider range of Junior provision that has served the school up to now.

Whilst demand for junior places can be accommodated within existing provision together with any new provision we may make to meet the additional demand now arising at reception age, we recognise that this could strain the sensible organisation of school provision.

On the other hand, the planning difficulties of obtaining permission to build on Green Belt land are substantial and may be insurmountable. Inevitably, pursuing this proposal will take some considerable time and is fraught with uncertainty. We need to consider if the proposal should be pursued or if, regrettably, it should be set aside. In doing so we also must have regard to the changing local educational landscape and the effect that a Free School may have on current provision and any expansion plans on the part of the Local Authority. We therefore intend to reconsider the options available with the local schools and with the planning authorities before coming to a decision whether to continue support for this project.

**Tim Hall**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Learning**