

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 19 March 2012.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON TUESDAY 31 JANUARY 2012 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

01/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)

There were no apologies.

02/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 20 December 2011 (Item 2)

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 December 2011 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

03/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

There were none.

04/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)

(a) Public Questions.

Three questions had been received from members of the public. The questions and agreed responses are attached as **Appendix 1 to these minutes**.

In addition to the questions of which written notice had been given, there were some supplementary questions. A summary of the questions and responses is set out below.

(1) Mr Robertson

After a detailed and comprehensive introduction to his supplementary question, Mr Roberson referred to the Cabinet's recommendation to increase council tax this year and said that he would be scrutinising all Surrey County Council contracts to ensure that they offered Value for Money. He considered that the increased costs of the waste contract

would not stand up to scrutiny and asked what the Council proposed to do.

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment agreed to provide a written response concerning the finance aspects of his question within 10 days of the meeting. The Cabinet Member also strongly refuted the suggestion that the Charlton Lane site was a 'testbed' and said that the Ecopark was a sound proposition and he had confidence in it.

(2) Mr Gilbert asked:

' Can we be reassured that Cabinet Members have been, and all councillors will be before the Council meeting next week, be fully briefed on the implications of Government's response following the consultation on its Local Government Resource Review (the consequences of which over the next five years will fundamentally change the relationship between County Councils and Boroughs / Districts – more of a tsunami than a slight sea-change) and so be able to make enlightened decisions on the soundness of the assumptions underlying the new five year Medium Term Financial Plan and proposed precept increase on 2.99% based on that plan?'

The Leader said that a significant amount of time had been spent on the Local Government Resource Review and, since August, and officers had considered the eight technical papers. However, the Council did not have the final details. These were expected later in the spring / summer, after which the council would have an indication of the way forward.

(3) Mr Beaman said that Surrey County Council was one of the few Councils that were proposing to reject the 'freeze money' and increase the council tax. He asked what was different in Surrey and would it be different in an election year. The Leader explained that Surrey contributed £6billion to the Exchequer plus £250m in business rates collected from Surrey businesses, which went to assist other councils in the country but the council received the lowest Government grant in the county. He considered that as Leader, he had a moral duty to deliver services for all residents and believed that the recommendations proposed in the budget paper to be discussed later in the agenda were right for Surrey.

(b) Members' Questions.

Four questions were received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills). The questions and agreed responses are attached as **Appendix 2 to these minutes**.

In addition to the questions of which written notice had been given, Mrs Watson asked some supplementary questions. A summary of the questions and responses is set out below.

Mrs Watson reiterated her point about no papers being available for select committees to scrutinise and also that there had been no explanation to explain the difference between the 2.5% increase

presented at previous select committee meetings with the proposed 2.99% council tax increase.

The Leader referred to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee's response, paragraph 2 and attached as Appendix 4. He also said that the select committees had an important role to play once the budget had been set.

The Leader considered that it was important that Members received upto date and timely information which was why finance officers had only given presentations to select committees. He confirmed that Surrey businesses had been consulted and also said that the Council was trying to protect front line services.

On agency staff costs, he said that the figures were presented to Cabinet on a monthly basis, that the Council was going through a transformation process and vacancies were not being filled until positions had been clarified which had resulted in a slight increase in agency costs. In addition, he said that requests for the use of consultants were always considered and agreed by the Chief Executive and himself.

Finally, he considered that the Council was a more transparent and efficient organisation than in the past.

05/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)

(a) Community Recycling Centres

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment thanked the committee for their report and drew attention to his tabled response.

The response is attached as **Appendix 3 to these minutes**.

[Note: the Budget Monitoring Report for December 2011(Period 9) was taken next]

06/12 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR DECEMBER 2011 (PERIOD 9) (Item 8)

The Leader drew attention to the revised report including Annex A and B tabled at the meeting. He also advised Members of the typo on page 1, Annex A, which should state 'Recommendations for Cabinet on 31 January 2012 not 20 December 2011.'

He said that this report represented an important part in the financial cycle because the end of December was also the end of Quarter 3. He highlighted key points from the report which included:

- That the council was on target to meet its £59.3m savings in 2011/12.
- The need to raise the general reserves to £30m.
- Table 5 – 2011/15 Capital Budget and Table 6 – the Capital budget Scheme Life Position.

Cabinet Members were given an opportunity to comment on the Budget Monitoring within their portfolios and made the following points:

- People with Learning Disabilities Budget – increased by £0.7m from November – it was hoped that it would stabilise by next month.
- The abolition of the Policy Initiatives Budget and the carry forward request to set up a Community Improvement Fund and Surrey Growth Strategy was an opportunity for localism.
- A small overspend in the budget for children coming into care. However, it was recognised that there was a statutory responsibility to safeguard children and Children’s Services was a volatile budget.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the grant changes reflected in directorate budgets (Annex A, paragraph 1 and Annex B be noted and approved.
- (2) That the budget monitoring position and projected year end variances (Annex A, paragraphs 1 and 2) be noted.
- (3) That the transfer of £0.3m from the redundancy budget to the provision for future years (Annex A, paragraph 46) be approved.
- (4) That the transfer of the remaining £4m Children, Schools and Families risk contingency budget to a new Investment Reserve (Annex A, paragraph 48) be approved.
- (5) That the transfer of £1m from the Land Acquisition Reserve to the Investment Reserve (Annex A, paragraph 48) be approved.
- (6) That the carry forward of a further £2.5m of revenue budget to 2012/13 (Annex A, paragraph 50) be approved.

Reason for decisions:

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

07/12 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2012/13 TO 2016/17 (Item 6)

The Leader presented the Revenue and Capital Budget for 2012/13 to 2016/17 which built on the current Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2011 – 2015. He also drew Cabinet's attention to the comments tabled from the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Budget and his response. (Appendix 4a and 4b).

He explained the reasons why, regrettably, Surrey County Council had rejected the Government's one-off grant of 2.5% for 2012/13 to freeze council tax for one more year. He said that the offer was not right for Surrey because it would lead to a £70m financial black hole over 5 years. He also said that this budget would protect front line services, school places and support localism, with more involvement for local committees. He also stressed the need to develop an income strategy which would reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and Government grant income.

He confirmed that the budget plan built on the Public Value Review work which has taken unnecessary costs from budgets. He said that the £30m to be held as the reserves balance would enable the County Council to meet unforeseen events or to mitigate any possible effect of not achieving the proposed net spending reductions. He also drew attention to the capital programme for 2012 – 2017, as set out in paragraphs 88 – 98 of the report.

Finally, he said that the detailed proposals concerning the council tax rates and precept level would be circulated as part of the Leader's report to Council.

Other Cabinet Members had an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

Key points were:

- Continued investment was required for Highways and Schools.
- Protecting vulnerable adults was essential.
- Very few local authorities had a five year Medium Term Financial Plan.
- The County Council had long term challenges i.e. 20% increase in the birth rate and £244m would be required to build the schools / classrooms for the additional school places
- Surrey County Council's Government grant was lower than any other Council and therefore the council needed to raise most of its funding from council tax. Examples and figures of differences between councils and the Government grant they received were quoted.
- School capital grant comparisons were set out in Table 7, page 19 of the report.
- The Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2012/13 could only be used for one off expenditure only and would result on funding shortfalls in future years.
- Consultation and engagement with the public, including face to face meetings, had been undertaken in November 2011 and a meeting with Surrey MPs would take place on 1 February. Also, meetings with Surrey Businesses, Voluntary Sector and the Unions had taken place.

- Cabinet Members had been examining budgets since last summer and had spent a great deal of time looking at the figures, prior to coming to the decisions set before the Cabinet today.
- Increased demand for Children's Services.
- Adopting a more business approach with the development of an income strategy for Surrey's assets and increased partnership working with Surrey's Districts and Boroughs.
- The importance of protecting front line service and the need for solid, reliable and long term foundations.

After a comprehensive debate, the Cabinet unanimously:

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

- (1) That the council tax requirement for 2012/13 be set at £574.8m.
- (2) That the Council tax band D be set at £1,149.66, which represents a 2.99% increase.
- (3) That powers be delegated to the Leader and the Chief Finance Officer to finalise detailed budget proposals to cover areas of the funding settlement if any late notification is made by the Government.
- (4) That a risk contingency be retained, to mitigate against non-delivery of reductions and efficiencies of £8m.
- (5) That a new earmarked economic downturn reserve of £4.4m be created.
- (6) That a new earmarked interest rate risk reserve of £3.2m be created.
- (7) That the approved carry forward revenue budgets from 2011/12 totalling £15.2m be applied to 2012/13.
- (8) That the sustainable revenue funding be applied to the capital programme.
- (9) That capital programme proposals (specifically to fund essential schemes over the five year period, schools and non-schools, to the value of £681m including ring-fenced grants) be agreed.
- (10) To seek to secure capital receipts over the five year period to 2016/17 of £69m.
- (11) That the proposals for prudential indicators and the treasury management strategy set out in Annex 5, paragraph 3, be submitted to full County Council on 7 February 2012.
- (12) That the Corporate Board maintains robust procedures so Cabinet can monitor achievement of efficiencies and service reductions through the monthly budget monitoring Cabinet reports and the quarterly Cabinet Member accountability meetings.
- (13) That all revenue invest to save proposals and capital schemes have an approved business case before expenditure can be committed.
- (14) That £6m be provided as a one off amount for the Invest to Save fund, from which services can borrow funds and repay.

Reasons for decisions:

The County Council will meet to agree the summary budget and council tax on 7 February 2012.

08/12 ONE COUNTY ONE TEAM: CORPORATE STRATEGY 2012 - 2017

The Leader drew Cabinet's attention to the comments tabled from the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Corporate Strategy and his response. (Appendix 5a and 5b)

He said that the Corporate Strategy set out the purpose and philosophy of the County Council and was an 'easy to read' document which explained the roles of the Chief Executive and the Leader, in achieving the vision for 2017. He also provided an explanation of the Strategy Bookcase.

Cabinet Members welcomed the document which clearly set out the Council's strategy for residents and also reflected the current position of the County Council.

They commended the Corporate Strategy 2012 – 17 to Council for approval at its meeting on 7 February 2012.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the *One County One Team*, Corporate Strategy 2012 - 2017 be endorsed and recommended that it be presented to the County Council meeting on 7 February 2012 for approval; and
- (2) That the suite of Strategies that support the delivery of the Corporate Strategy which will be presented to the Cabinet for approval in February and March 2012 be noted.

Reasons for decisions:

Surrey County Council's Strategic Planning Framework requires that the Corporate Strategy is reviewed and refreshed annually alongside the Medium Term Financial Plan. The Corporate Strategy, as part of the Council's Policy Framework (as set out in the Council's Constitution), must be approved by the County Council.

09/12 2011/12 – QUARTERLY 3 BUSINESS REPORT (Item 9)

The Cabinet noted the latest council-wide results on customer feedback, finance, workforce and performance together with the Leadership Risk Register. In particular, Cabinet Members noted that:

- The overall public satisfaction with the County Council was 3 percentage points higher than in Q2, 2011/12, as was the public perception that the Council was good Value for Money.
- 94% of residents were satisfied with their neighborhood.

- The detailed information, set out in the Corporate Report Card (Annex 1).
- The launch of the Council's Digital Press Office.
- The Employee Survey Results, set out in paragraphs 41 – 46 of the report.

Members of the Cabinet discussed particular performance developments in their portfolio areas.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games praised the customer satisfaction with the Contact Centre and welcomed the centre to its new premises at County Hall. Members were invited to visit it.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families provided a detailed explanation of the target re. Looked After Children's annual health and dental checks.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety acknowledged that the increase in the number of people killed or seriously injured was disappointing and reassured Members that the Drive Smart Board was considering options to address this, which would be reported back to Cabinet at a later date.

Cabinet Members discussed sickness absence and agreed that special circumstances applied to Adult Social Care workers working with vulnerable residents and therefore, their absence rates should be reported separately in next year's data.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Council wide outturn on customer feedback, finance, workforce and performance be noted.
- (2) That the Leadership Risk Register be noted.
- (3) That remedial action underway in Directorates be noted and it be considered if any further actions are required.

Reason for decisions:

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

10/12 ADVOCACY SERVICES SURREY (Item 10)

This report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health. He said that Advocacy was needed to support people who needed a representative to make their voice heard. The provision of an Advocacy Service for Surrey had been through an extensive service design with users, carers and staff and he had confidence in the recommended provider.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety made reference to the Equality Impact Assessment and confirmed that the County Council supported

independent living and this service would be a significant step towards this aim.

RESOLVED:

That a three-year grant agreement (with the option to extend for a further one year subject to good performance, available funding and a requirement to continue the service provision) be awarded to Surrey Disabled People's Partnership (SDPP) for the provision of Generic Advocacy Services across Surrey to commence as from 1 April 2012.

Reason for decisions:

Currently, several organisations receive a year on year grant agreement to provide advocacy services, which does not demonstrate value for money for SCC or equity of provision. This arrangement also provides limited security for the provider. A three-year grant agreement period with the option to extend for a further one year has demonstrated that Surrey advocacy service users and SCC will obtain better value for money.

**11/12 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW: SCHOOLS AND LEARNING SERVICE
(Item 11)**

Mr Townsend, Chairman of the Member Reference Group for this Public Value Review was invited to speak. He began by thanking the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning and his team, Babcock 4S and his two other Member colleagues of the Member Reference Group. He said that to focus the review, they had concentrated around the seven themes, as listed in paragraph 11 of the report.

He also said that the review was recommending the development of four quadrants with each one responsible for managing their schools, pupils and families. The review was also recommending one overall Leader and a Leadership team for Special Educational Needs.

He highlighted the remaining recommendations in the report on (i) Babcock 4S contract, (ii) School organisation for primary education, (iii) the importance of speech and language therapy in schools, which he said, would initially need to be resourced on an 'invest to save' basis.

Finally, he referred to the comments from the Education Select Committee, which were tabled.(Appendix 6)

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning also began by thanking the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning and his team for their work on the review. He considered that the research had been fascinating, with well thought out conclusions. He hoped that the recommendations would allow for closer integration and promote standards of good schools serving their community. He also hoped that the outcome of the review would result in improved employability for all young people.

He reaffirmed his commitment to Babcock 4S as Surrey County Council's improvement partner and also welcomed the proposals for the restructure of

the Special Educational Needs Leadership Team. He recognised that 'one size' did not fit all and said that the Authority would work hard to ensure that each solution was right for individual communities.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety requested assurance that the large schools building programme would be managed well and that services would work together to obtain 'Value for Money'. Both the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning gave this assurance and said that they were confident that the additional school places could be delivered at a competitive rate.

The Deputy Leader considered that this was an excellent report and considered that the recommendations would ensure the continuous improvement of the Education Service.

Finally, the Leader thanked the officers involved in this review, which he hoped would enable Surrey to become a leading Education Authority and an effective champion of the rights of every local child to a first class education.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That a clear determination be made, to continue to manage a strong and active education service, championing the needs of local children, their parents and families, working to promote a first class school and wider educational offer. This will include a full role securing the supply of school places, monitoring and assuring school standards and leading school improvement. Surrey will work with its partners to ensure that the County Council is clearly identified as a leading education authority and an effective champion of the rights of every local child to a first class education and preparation for learning and work in a successful later life.
- (2) That the findings of the Public Value Review be endorsed and the recommendations set out in Paragraphs 12-54 of the submitted report and the Action Plan be agreed.
- (3) That formal consultation commences on the organisational changes outlined in paragraph 17 of the submitted report.

Reason for decisions:

To move the PVR into the implementation phase so that improved outcomes and value for money are delivered for residents of Surrey.

12/12 RESULTS OF THE ANNUAL CHILDREN'S SERVICES ASSESSMENT 2011 (Item 12)

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families was pleased to formally note the results of the 2011 Annual Children's Services Assessment. Ofsted had assessed Surrey as performing well and highlighted seven areas of strength and two areas of further improvement which she confirmed would be a priority for the Directorate.

She was also pleased to announce that Surrey had won an award, from Award UK Public Sector Digital Awards, for its Integrated Children's System (ICS) Implementation Project for best project delivery. This project recorded the assessment, intervention and review of children's social care and was in partnership with Liquidlogic.

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment considered that these achievements were an excellent example of the 'One Team' approach and congratulated officers for getting to this position.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning referred to the Corporate Parenting / Looked After Children implications, paragraph 19 of the report and publically thanked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families for her efforts and achievements on the Corporate Parenting Board.

Finally, the Leader said that this was a good example of the use of consultants and where their expertise was essential to develop the Integrated Children's System.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the results of the Annual Children's Services Assessment and the improvements Surrey has sustained after moving from a position of being inadequate to performing well in the two years prior to this assessment be noted.
- (2) That the areas for further improvement be noted and the work of the county council to strengthen and improve services to children and young people continues to be prioritised.
- (3) By publishing this report, that the Annual Children's Services Assessment be available to the public on the Council's website.
- (4) That the Annual Children's Services Assessment be referred to the Children and Families and Education Select Committees.
- (5) That the Annual Children's Services Assessment be presented to the Council's statutory partners for services to children and young people.

Reason for decisions:

Although there is no longer a regulatory requirement that the Council responds to the Annual Children's Services Assessment, it is good practice to share these results.

13/12 POLICY FOR ELECTIVE HOME EDUCATION (Item 13)

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning said that the revised policy for Elective Home Education (EHE) had been developed by a working group set up by the Education Select Committee.

The Deputy Leader drew attention to the EHE register which had 546 children on it, a substantial number for which, as stated by the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games, no funding was received from Government to provide this service.

In view of her concerns for safeguarding children, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families proposed an additional recommendation which was agreed and set out as recommendation (2) below.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the policy for Elective Home Education set out in Appendix A, to the submitted report be approved.
- (2) That the policy for Elective Home Education be reviewed against any new guidance set out in 'Working Together to Safeguard Children' when published.

Reason for decisions:

There is a need to refresh the Council's policies in respect of home education, which have not been reviewed for some years. The policy revision has been undertaken through the Education Select Committee and will lead to a more positive working relationship with the home educating community. The policy clarifies the Councils priorities in respect of safeguarding issues for this group of children.

14/12 INCREASING LOCAL DELIVERY AND LOCAL DECISION MAKING FOR HIGHWAYS HORTICULTURE SERVICES (Item 14)

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment introduced the report and said that these proposals were an exciting opportunity, which represented an important stage in partnership working with Boroughs, Districts and some Parish Councils, and was another step towards making sure local services matched the needs of the community. He drew attention to Table 1 which set out the position in terms of responses to the offers. He also provided a further verbal update to Members. Finally, he referred to the financial position, summarised in Table 2 of the report.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the delegation of budgets for highways horticulture to those districts and boroughs and parishes accepting the offer for the period 2012/13 to 2015/16 as set out in Table 1 (paragraph 20 of the submitted report) be approved.
- (2) That the authority to enter into streetscene agency agreements with districts and boroughs be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment in consultation with the Assistant Director Highways

Reason for decisions:

Adopting these recommendations will enable:

- more responsive highways horticulture services that can meet local needs on a cost effective basis

- more joined up activities at a local level that ensures residents get more seamless and efficient highways and grounds maintenance services through being managed at a more local level
- confidence and trust to be developed by all parties opening up the opportunity for more collaboration on streetscene and other services which involve authorities at different tiers of local government.

15/12 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 15)

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by the Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as attached as **Appendix 7**, be noted.

Reason for decision:

To note the decisions taken by Members under delegated authority.

16/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 16)

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.

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.

17/12 INCREASING LOCAL DELIVERY AND LOCAL DECISION MAKING FOR HIGHWAYS HORTICULTURE SERVICES (Item 17)

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment informed Members that this report followed on from item 14. He proposed adding in 'in the first instance' to recommendation 1 and commended the recommendations to Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the award of contracts by the County Council to preferred tenderers for those districts and boroughs who did not accept the offer in the first instance be approved.
- (2) Given the extended time period over which districts and boroughs are making their decisions and the need to be able to give contractors sufficient time to mobilise the contract to start on 1 April 2012, which the authority for awarding contracts be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment in consultation with the Assistant Director Highways.

Reasons for decisions:

Adopting these recommendations will enable:

- a flexible and timely county response to decisions for accepting or declining the offer
- highways horticulture services to continue to be provided on a cost effective and timely basis.

18/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 18)

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 4.20pm]

Chairman

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Question 1 from Mr Malcolm Robertson

What your predecessors were told in the original 'World Class Waste Solution' Report was often misleading, and the passage of time has led to the Solution becoming third rate. The figures for your Waste Contract are a financial nightmare. The planned gasifier is an inefficient, polluting, wholly unnecessary way of incinerating just 11% of Surrey's waste, which could and would be better off recycled. A far more cost effective solution would be to increase your efforts at recycling and scrap the overpriced incinerator and the attendant exorbitant gate fees which you will be charged. This will then leave you without the need to hike up the Council Tax unnecessarily. Why do you want Surrey County Council taxpayers and business rate payers to pay the County several hundred million pounds for a project which everyone else can see is doomed from the start?

Reply:

Surrey County Council's waste strategy aims to minimise waste at the point of production, recycle 70% of what is left and recover value from the remaining 30%. This provides the best outcome in terms of cost and environmental benefits and avoids disposal to landfill.

Setting ambitious levels of recycling and appropriately sizing the infrastructure required to deal with the remaining waste ensures that there is no danger of reducing recycling.

In the last 5 years Surrey residents have reduced waste by 15% and increased recycling by 17%, in both cases twice the national average rate of improvement. Surrey's overall recycling rate is now about 55% - a tremendous achievement, supported by our residents.

The Eco Park will provide one of the most technically advanced waste management facilities in the country, managing waste in a sustainable way and providing a new source of renewable energy.

Unless necessary infrastructure, such as the Eco Park, is built to support increased recycling and avoid landfill, Surrey's residents will face additional costs of millions of pounds. if we do nothing, by 2015, our bill for landfill tax alone will be £13m a year.

This is why it is vital that the Eco Park construction proceeds as soon as possible.

Ian Lake
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
31 January 2012

Question 2 from Mr Gerald Gilbert

In the spirit of open government and transparency, when will the Cabinet start to make its recommendations on budget proposals to councillors more meaningful and intelligible to both councillors and local taxpayers alike?

Reply:

The introduction at the beginning of the Cabinet report sets out in simple bullet point format the purpose of the paper to aid understanding by Members and residents alike. The recommendations at the end of the paper, necessarily include the statutory required recommendations that the full Council will, if recommended by the Cabinet, then consider at the Council meeting on 7 February. The individual recommendations have been kept deliberately simple and concise to aid understanding. My report to the Council on 7 February will show in a simple and understandable way what the Council's total income and expenditure will be in 2012/13.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
31 January 2012

Question 3 from Mr David Beaman

My name is David Beaman, Independent Member for Upper Hale on Farnham Town Council which was not fortunate enough to be offered any Central Government grant to keep its precept unchanged and will, therefore, be seeking to increase its precept after holding the precept unchanged for 2 years mainly through efficiency savings. I do not, however, see the logic in Surrey County Council turning down an offer from Central Government of a grant of 2.5% to keep Council Tax levels unchanged and then seeking a 2.99% increase in Council Tax from its residents. Like most local authorities a significant proportion of Surrey County Council's income is generated from Central Government grants, which I appreciate are being reduced anyway, and the grant being offered is not guaranteed to continue into future years but why burden the Council Tax payers when there is an offer that would enable you to keep Council Tax unchanged for at least this year?

Reply:

The Coalition's council tax freeze would create a £70m financial black hole over five years. That sum is equivalent to wiping out Surrey's road maintenance budget for more than two years.

All councils have been offered a one-off grant of 2.5% for 2012/13 if they freeze council tax for another year. But it means that Surrey would be £14m down in every subsequent year. Last year support funding from central government to manage the freeze lasted for a number of years to cushion the impact but this year it is a one-year grant that disappears in future years.

With the number of people aged over 85 doubling in the next 20 years, some of the most heavily used roads in the UK and a near 20% increase in the county's birth rate over the past decade, Surrey faces enormous pressure on its budgets for elderly

care, roads maintenance and school places. If the freeze was taken, it would mean in five years' time, the council would either not be able to maintain Surrey's roads, provide the school places needed or the elderly care services residents rely on.

The amount of public money the council plans to spend on services will be the same next year as it is this year – it's just that Surrey's government grant is going down. Next year it will fall by about £15m.

This is not about wanting to spend more money. Surrey's plans mean the council will not be spending any more in 2017 than it did in 2010. Savings of £130m over the past two years and a target of £330m by 2016 are allowing the council to soak up the pressure of increasing demand on services.

A 2.99% council tax increase in April, which would add 64 pence a week to a band D home in Surrey, would allow the council to increase the money available to Surrey's local committees to spend on local road maintenance schemes by more than 100%. In addition, it would provide around an extra £60,000 to each local committee to spend on youth services and increase members' allocations by 50% for community projects.

At its meeting on Tuesday 31 January Surrey's Cabinet will consider the 2.99% increase, which would be below the current rate of inflation of around 4.8%. The Cabinet's recommendation will go forward to a meeting of Surrey's Full Council on Tuesday 7 February where a final decision will be taken

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
31 January 2012

Member Questions

Four Questions from Hazel Watson (Member for Dorking Hills)

Question 1:

The first paragraph of the role of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee set out at the Annual General Meeting of the County Council stated "Monitoring performance, risk and budget across all services", how can the Committee perform this function, when at the 20 January meeting under the item on the County Council Draft Budget, no papers were provided to members to perform either the role of overview or the role of scrutiny?

Reply:

I believe it is important that when the Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertake to examine the budget proposals, they do so with the latest available information. As late as the Friday before the first select committee critical financial information was still being received from both Central Government and district and borough councils, and this information has a significant impact on our budget proposals. You will be aware that in previous years there have been problems when financial information changes after papers have been circulated to committees and members have asked that they only use the most up to date figures in their discussions. I think it right therefore that when the Overview and Select Committee met on 20 January they were presented with the most up to date figures by officers.

Question 2:

Who is responsible for issuing the instruction to officers that Members of the Council should not be provided with copies of the PowerPoint presentations or any background papers at the recent budget briefings to Select Committees?

Reply:

As I have said in answer to the previous question, I believe it important that members have the most up to date financial information to review this important budget and this is why officers have presented it at the select committee meetings.

Question 3:

Kent County Council published its detailed 59 page "Draft Budget Book 2012/13" on 20 December 2011, giving Kent residents and businesses one month to examine the detailed plans and comment on them. By contrast Surrey County Council published a far less detailed outline budget with no details of proposed cuts to services and no time for detailed consultation, a month later. Why cannot Surrey County Council conduct the budget setting process in the open and transparent way in which its neighbour does?

Reply:

In developing a 'draft' budget it is important that the financial information supporting any of the proposed service changes is as accurate as possible. Much of this

information is not known in December and would have to be based upon assumptions. Openness and transparency in the budget setting process is not just about publishing a draft budget. It is much more important to engage people in the process. I have done this through a series of meeting throughout the autumn on the budget, for example with the business community.

Question 4:

In December 2010 the figures below were reported for Consultant and Agency spend 2006/7 to 2010/11. What are the equivalent figures for 2010/11 and 2011/12?

Year	Consultancy	Agency	Total
2006/07	£3.9m	£15.7m	£19.6m
2007/08	£6.1m	£12.2m	£18.3m
2008/09	£7.1m	£13.2m	£20.3m
2009/10	£6.3m	£13.4m	£19.7m

Reply:

I have said many times that I believe that the best people to do our work are the staff we employ. You will be aware that as part of the PVR process we have saved over £10m by not going to external consultants. But there are always times when we do not possess the necessary skills, experiences and capacity in-house and it would not be the best use of our resources to employ someone permanently. However, I am committed to only using external consultants when absolutely necessary and I am therefore please that our expenditure has continued to fall to £5.2m in 2010/11 and £4.9m this year.

Over the past year, the Council has achieved an overall reduction in the cost of staff. As we face the tough financial environment of the next few years we have to think seriously about replacing staff and filling vacancies when services are to be transformed in the near future. Contained within the reduction in staffing costs is a swing from permanent contracted (fixed) staffing cost to casual (variable) staffing costs as we increase our flexibility in these uncertain times. In the 12 months to November 2011 the cost of agency staff is £12.75m compared with £11.77m for the 12 months to end November 2010, while the cost of permanent staff fell from £174.3m to £168.4m over the same period.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
31 January 2012

CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

UPDATE ON COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRE PERFORMANCE REPORT

I want to personally thank Steve Renshaw, members of the select committee and the waste management team for this helpful and informative report.

The community recycling centres are highly valued by our residents and over the past five years, the service provided at these sites has gone from strength to strength. We are undertaking an ambitious refurbishment programme as part of our PFI contract with SITA Surrey. Five sites have already been redeveloped into modern split-level recycling centres and another two redevelopment projects are currently underway. We have also worked extensively with our contractor SITA Surrey to improve levels of customer service, including opportunities to recycle many more materials.

The results have been impressive. The proportion of waste that is recycled at our sites has increased from a level of 45% in 2007/8 to over 70% today and we will continue to push levels of recycling and recovery still further.

Feedback from site users has been very positive and the council has recently received an award from the Reigate Society for the newly redeveloped Earlswood Community Recycling Centre.

We must not however be complacent. Increasing the amount of waste that we reuse, recycle or recover value from will help us to reduce our reliance on landfill, which is becoming increasingly expensive and is damaging to the environment.

I am pleased that the select committee has recognised the range of initiatives that are currently being undertaken to improve the service to our customers and divert more waste from landfill and has provided confidence for these to continue.

The additional staffing trial has shown that we can extract more recycling at little or no cost. There is also the added benefit of improved customer service as a result of having more staff to assist members of the public using the sites.

Given the uptake of the extended opening hours trial last year, I agree with the select Committee that the cost of continuing with the trial cannot be justified, particularly given the current economic climate. However, in this respect, I would note that, whilst other authorities are closing sites, our fifteen community recycling centres remain open 363 days each year.

Overall, I strongly support the recommendations of the Select Committee.

Ian Lake
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
31 January 2012

COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: BUDGET 2012/2013

Date Considered: 20 January 2012

- 1 The Committee received an oral update on the proposed budget for 2012/2013 and discussed the proposal not to accept the Council Tax Freeze Grant, and were generally in agreement with the direction taken.
- 2 The Committee also reflected on the process of Member involvement in the budget process, and felt that the series of Select-Committee budget workshops held since in the autumn had provided a good opportunity for Members who attended, to understand and discuss the concepts and direction for specific Directorates. These had been open to all interested Members to attend, and built on the information provided at the more general Member Seminars.
- 3 Concern was expressed that detailed figures for CAE/Corporate/CEO areas were not made available to the Committee at its workshop in January or at the following formal Committee meeting, which reduced the ability of members of the Committee to understand and scrutinise the service budgets. It was proposed that the overall process should be reviewed with officers in order to ensure that this Committee and the Select Committees could provide the most effective scrutiny of the budget in future.
- 4 Select Committee chairmen reported on their Committee's deliberations of the Directorate-level budgets and highlighted any specific risks which had been identified, although overall it was not felt necessary for the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee to make any recommendations about the relative budget levels between Directorates.
- 5 In relation to the proposed Council Tax increase of 2.99%, it was suggested that this increase should only be included in the budgets of front-line services, rather than to all services equally and the non allocated amount be held in a reserve for virements which became necessary during the year, including the full increase in the non front line services e.g. CEO would reduce focus on cost reductions required.

The Select Committee therefore recommends to Cabinet:

That consideration be given to only applying the proposed Council Tax increase of 2.99% to the budgets of front-line services, rather than to all services equally, with the balance held centrally and allocated during the year to key projects at the Leader's request.

Mr Mel Few
Vice-Chairman Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2012/13 TO 2016/17

I thank the members of the Council Overview and Scrutiny for their work on the budget and welcome their comments, especially around the budget process this year. This is an improvement on past years and as you say, those Members who attended the workshops and seminars had a good opportunity to understand the issues.

In relation to the role of the COSC and the budgets of Change and Efficiency and the Chief Executive's Office I agree that this process needs to be reviewed. I have therefore asked the Chief Finance Officer to work with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the committee to develop a more effective scrutiny of these budgets.

The increase in council tax of 2.99% consists of two elements. The first is following our Medium Term Financial Plan to increase council tax by 2.5% - which is below inflation. This increase not only covers the loss of funding from government grants, but also the increased budget pressures on front line services. For 2012/13 non front line service budgets have decreased in order that resources are used on front line services. (by a total of £5.2m or 5%)

The second element of the council tax rise, which is 0.49%, is for very specific areas. This is £1.6m for local committees for use on local highways schemes; £0.7m for local committees to use on youth preventative projects, and a further £0.3m for individual member allocations.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
31 January 2012

COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item under consideration:

ONE COUNTY ONE TEAM, CORPORATE STRATEGY 2012-2017

Date Considered: 20 January 2012

- 1 The Committee has considered the draft Corporate Strategy for 2012-2017 and noted the range of more specific strategies which will support the delivery of the Council's overall priorities. Overall the Committee felt that the Corporate Strategy was clear and easy to read, and that the introductory paragraph, whilst quite forthright, set the context for the Council's progress since 2008 and demonstrated the commitment to being open and honest.
- 2 The Committee accepted the principle that a strategy document should be aspirational and challenging, but cautioned against including commitments which were not necessarily within the control of the County Council. For example, whilst the sentiment that 'every child has a great start to life' was inherently worthy, there were many aspects in relation to this which were beyond the influence of the County Council. It was felt that residents would read statements included in the Strategy as a list of promises, and therefore the commitments should be qualified to keep them relevant to the role of the Council. The Council might otherwise be perceived as having failed in relation to its targets.
- 3 The need to ensure that the priorities in the Strategy were measurable was stressed by the Committee. Also, whilst recognising the value of keeping the document as brief as possible, it was felt that investments proposed in the 'key actions' box on the first page (for example improving roads and tackling congestion) should be reflected in the priorities listed for 2012/2013.
- 4 Finally, whilst the Strategy mentions devolving decision-making to a more local level as one of the priorities for 2012/2013, the Committee felt that the subject of localism could be given greater emphasis in the document.

The Select Committee therefore recommends to Cabinet:

That, subject to the comments above, the *One County One Team* Corporate Strategy 2012 - 2017 be endorsed and presented to the County Council for approval at its meeting on 7 February 2012.

Mr Mel Few
Vice-Chairman Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2012/13 TO 2016/17

I thank the members of the Council Overview and Scrutiny for their work on the budget and welcome their comments, especially around the budget process this year. This is an improvement on past years and as you say, those Members who attended the workshops and seminars had a good opportunity to understand the issues.

In relation to the role of the COSC and the budgets of Change and Efficiency and the Chief Executive's Office I agree that this process needs to be reviewed. I have therefore asked the Chief Finance Officer to work with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the committee to develop a more effective scrutiny of these budgets.

The increase in council tax of 2.99% consists of two elements. The first is following our Medium Term Financial Plan to increase council tax by 2.5% - which is below inflation. This increase not only covers the loss of funding from government grants, but also the increased budget pressures on front line services. For 2012/13 non front line service budgets have decreased in order that resources are used on front line services. (by a total of £5.2m or 5%)

The second element of the council tax rise, which is 0.49%, is for very specific areas. This is £1.6m for local committees for use on local highways schemes; £0.7m for local committees to use on youth preventative projects, and a further £0.3m for individual member allocations.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
31 January 2012

EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF SCHOOLS & LEARNING

Date Considered: 19 January 2012

At its meeting on 19 January 2012 the Education Select Committee considered the Public Value Review of Schools & Learning. Overall the Committee was pleased with the direction of travel and thanked the officers and Member Reference Group for their hard work. The Committee also supported the recommendations around special educational needs and were pleased to see the service is looking to reduce the number of placements in the NMI sector, however it was noted that this had been a long-standing objective of the Council.

Therefore the Committee recommends that:

- (a) Cabinet supports the direction of the recommendations in the Public Value Review; and
- (b) That the Committee monitors the number of placements in our NMI schools on a twice-yearly basis.

Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Chairman of the Education Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

11 JANUARY 2011

(i) GATWICK DIAMOND LOCAL STRATEGIC STATEMENT AND MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

1. That the Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement and Memorandum of Understanding be endorsed.
2. That authority be delegated to the Deputy Leader in conjunction with the Assistant Director Strategy, Transport and Planning, for the programme of implementation implied.

Reasons for decision

This decision is an agreement of a concordat or statements of intent with other local authorities. This is one of the Deputy Leader's decision-making responsibilities.

It will enable Surrey County Council to fulfil its duty to cooperate under the Localism Act and also demonstrate the council's ability to work across boundaries in the Gatwick Diamond economic area.

It supports a One Team approach, by supporting seven other councils to fulfil their duty to cooperate with Surrey County Council. This includes Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council and Tandridge District Council. The statement will inform their local development plans.

(Decision of Deputy Leader – 11 January 2012)

(ii) SPECIAL NEEDS SUPPORT CENTRES – CREATION OF A NEW CENTRE AT CUDDINGTON COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL

That the proposal to create a new 14 place Special Needs Support Centre at Cuddington Community Primary School from September 2012 be implemented.

Reasons for decision

There are no further views to consider since the publication of statutory notices. The Local Authority should therefore proceed to implement the proposal so that the facility is ready for September 2012.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 11 January 2012)

(iii) ST JAMES C of E PRIMARY SCHOOL, WEYBRIDGE

That the project be approved so that it can proceed to the next stage e.g. detailed drawings and design, planning permissions, and to tender for contractors, with the release of capital funding subject to the detailed business case being considered by the Cabinet Member, and then the full contract to build the classrooms can be awarded.

Reasons for decision

The proposals deliver value for money and are fundamental to the Schools Basic Need programme approved by the Cabinet in March 2010 and by Investment Panel in Sept 2010.

(Decision of the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes – 17 January 2012)

(iv) THAMES DITTON JUNIOR SCHOOL

That the project be approved so that it can proceed to the next stage e.g. detailed drawings and design, planning permissions, and to tender for contractors, with the release of capital funding subject to the detailed business case being considered by the Cabinet Member, and then the full contract to build the classrooms can be awarded.

Reasons for decision

The proposals deliver value for money and support the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the area.

(Decision of the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes – 17 January 2012)

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON TUESDAY 28 FEBRUARY 2012 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 Mary Angell
*Mrs Helen Clack
*Mr Michael Gosling
*Mr Tim Hall

*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mr Ian Lake
*Mr Peter Martin
Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos
*Mr Tony Samuels

* = Present

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

19/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos.

20/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 31 January 2012 (Item 2)

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 January 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

21/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

Mr Tony Samuels declared a prejudicial interest in Minute item 36/12 – Property Transaction: Disposal of the Former Adult Learning Centre, Dene Street, Dorking and left the room during the discussion of this item.
Reason: He knew one of the parties involved as a former client.

22/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)

(a) Public Questions.

One question had been received from a member of the public. The question and agreed response are attached as **Appendix 1 to these minutes**.

In addition to the question of which written notice had been given, a supplementary question was asked. A summary of the question and response is set out below.

(1) Mr Malcolm Robertson

Mr Robertson, citing disagreements he had with the case for the proposed Eco Park in Charlton Lane, Shepperton, asked whether the

council would agree to the appointment of an independent person, such as a Queen's Counsel, to investigate the authority's conduct in relation to its waste contract. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment replied that the council would not be proceeding on the basis suggested. The council had taken decisions relating to waste on the evidence available and the Cabinet Member, having seen the technologies involved, was very satisfied that the Eco Park would provide a successful solution.

(b) Members' Questions.

One question had been received from Mr Colin Taylor (Epsom and Ewell SW). The question and agreed response are attached as **Appendix 2 to these minutes.**

23/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)

(a) Update Report for Looked After Children

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families drew attention to her tabled response. The response is attached as **Appendix 3 to these minutes.**

(b) 2012 Legacy Report

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment drew attention to his tabled response. The recommendation and response are attached as **Appendix 4a and 4b to these minutes.**

(c) Older People's Mental Health and Dementia

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health drew attention to his tabled response. The recommendation and response are attached as **Appendix 5a and 5b to these minutes.**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health noted that a letter was being drafted to be sent to all those involved who were to be congratulated and that he and the Select Committee Chairman would both be signing this.

24/12 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR JANUARY 2012 (PERIOD 10) (Item 6)

The January 2012 projection for the 2011/12 service revenue budget outturn showed a net underspending of £4.3 million. In addition to the funding already identified to support the 2012/13 budgets, services had identified a further £6.4m to support continuing projects, new government initiatives (such as troubled families) and also to cover additional risks for the future, such as the impact of the Olympics on the county. The Medium Term Financial Plan target of £59.3m of savings in 2011/12 was forecast to be exceeded by £0.8m. These savings were in addition to the £67m saved the previous year. The council's available balances were projected to be £28.6m at the year end.

The in-year capital budget had remained at £177m and was forecast to underspend by -£34.8m by the year end, mainly due to the re-profiling of projects but also due to some schemes forecast to be completed under budget. This represented an increase of £1.7m from the December 2011 projection.

The Leader drew attention to the revised report, including Annex A and B, tabled at the meeting. He noted that all services were now meeting their objectives and living within their budgets.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the budget monitoring position and projected year end variances (as set out in paragraph 1 of Annex A to the report) be noted.
- (2) That the carry forward of a further £6.4m of revenue budget to 2012/13 (as set out in paragraph 66 of Annex A to the report) be approved.
- (3) That government grant changes (as set out in paragraph 3 of Annex B to the report) be reflected in directorate budgets.

Reason for decisions:

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

25/12 SCHOOLS' BUDGET 2012/13 (Item 7)

Schools and specific school support services are funded by Dedicated Schools Grant. The Cabinet considered the principles to be applied in allocating the Dedicated Schools Grant in 2012/13, which would enable the calculation and distribution of individual schools' delegated budgets. It was noted that this year's funding position had been made more complex by the first year of the academy programme.

Following the receipt of updated data confirming pupil numbers, all schools would be issued with delegated budgets for 2012/13 in March 2012. The budgets delegated to each Surrey school, detailing the amounts provided for every individual formula factor, are published annually and are available on the council's website from mid-March each year.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning noted that the small increase in funding available to support increased numbers represented good news for Surrey. The increase in the Pupil Premium would also benefit the most deprived areas of the county. No school would lose funding except where there had been a decrease in pupil numbers. The proposed budget showed that the council was funding schools and making a tremendous difference.

The continued decline in the funding which the council received for sixth form education was noted. This placed pressure on the Education service and could be exacerbated by the rise in the participation age in 2013.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the methodology for the allocation of the Dedicated Schools Grant increase as set out in the report and the provisional total Schools Budget for 2012/13 be approved.
- (2) That the Assistant Director, Schools & Learning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning, be authorised to make minor adjustments (resulting from information currently awaited) in order that individual schools' budgets may be calculated

Reasons for decisions:

To enable the allocation of schools' budgets by the statutory deadline of 31 March 2012.

26/12 CONSULTATION ON SURREY'S ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2013 FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES (Item 8)

The Cabinet considered the responses received to the statutory consultation on Surrey's Admission Arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools and Coordinated Schemes for September 2013. The Local Authority was not proposing changes to the admission arrangements that were determined for the majority of Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2012.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families noted that the proposals included a small number of changes which reflected requests received from schools and communities. The only major change being proposed was in relation to the introduction of tiered sibling criteria at Wallace Fields School. Following discussions with the school, this change would take place on a phased basis in order to be fair to those who were mid-system.

The council's policy was clear in stating that attending a feeder school did not give a pupil any entitlement to transport. The Leader noted that this remained the case and advised that the booklets sent out to parents should draw attention to this fact as part of raising awareness. He also noted that, as corporate parents, the council's top priority would remain looked after children.

The September 2013 admissions arrangements, as recommended by the Cabinet, will be set by the full County Council at its meeting on 20 March 2012.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

Recommendation 1

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Hinchley Wood Primary School is agreed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address

- d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- f) Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendations

- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings into the same school, this will only apply if it is not their nearest school
- The pressure on places in the area of the school combined with the extra class that was admitted to the school in 2011 means that on balance, a greater disadvantage might be caused to families in the local area than to siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- It is intended that the use of the tiered sibling criteria will only apply whilst the 'bulge' class is still in the school. Notwithstanding any further changes the admission policy for the school will be reviewed once the bulge class is due to leave the school.

Recommendation 2

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for North Downs Primary School is removed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- e) Any other applicant according to straight line distance from their home address

Reasons for Recommendations

- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at the same school
- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for school and when making applications for siblings
- It would ensure that parents are not dissuaded from applying for the school

Recommendation 3

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Thames Ditton Infant School is removed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- e) Any other applicant according to straight line distance from their home address

Reasons for Recommendations

- It would keep families together and maximise the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at the same school

- It would provide parents with some 'peace of mind' when making applications for school and when making applications for siblings
- It would ensure that parents are not dissuaded from applying for the school

Recommendation 4

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Wallace Fields Infant School is agreed for September 2013 on a phased basis so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children who will have a sibling at Wallace Fields Infant School on the date of their admission and that sibling was on roll at that school at the end of the 2012/13 academic year
- d) Other children who will have a sibling at Wallace Fields Infant School or Wallace Fields Junior School on the date of their admission and for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- f) Other children who will have a sibling at Wallace Fields Infant School or Wallace Fields Junior School on the date of their admission and for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- g) Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendations

- It would ensure that families with siblings already at the school could continue to benefit from the sibling criteria whilst the sibling remained on roll at the school
- It would support families who had already made their preference decisions based on the current arrangements
- It would ensure that the school can serve the families of children currently on roll and that there would be minimal damage to the school community
- It would ensure that there would be no increase in traffic as families with siblings already at the school would only have to travel to one school
- In time it would support families within the local area so they would not be displaced in favour of siblings who lived further away
- It would enable parents who are considering applying for a place from 2013 to consider the impact on younger siblings if the school was not their nearest
- This approach is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school

Recommendation 5

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Wallace Fields Junior School is agreed for September 2013 on a phased basis so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children who will have a sibling at Wallace Fields Junior School on the date of their admission and that sibling was on roll at that school at the end of the 2012/13 academic year

- d) Other children who will have a sibling at Wallace Fields Infant School or Wallace Fields Junior School on the date of their admission and for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- f) Other children who will have a sibling at Wallace Fields Infant School or Wallace Fields Junior School on the date of their admission and for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- g) Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendations

- It would ensure that families with siblings already at the school could continue to benefit from the sibling criteria whilst the sibling remained on roll at the school
- It would support families who had already made their preference decisions based on the current arrangements
- It would ensure that the school can serve the families of children currently on roll and that there would be minimal damage to the school community
- It would ensure that there would be no increase in traffic as families with siblings already at the school would only have to travel to one school
- In time it would support families within the local area so they would not be displaced in favour of siblings who lived further away
- It would enable parents who are considering applying for a place from 2013 to consider the impact on younger siblings if the school was not their nearest
- This approach is supported by the Headteacher of the school

Recommendation 6

That Hamsey Green is removed as a feeder school to Warlingham School so that the admission arrangements for Warlingham School would be as follows:

- a) Looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children who live within the fixed catchment area (as shown on the map Annex 9)
- e) Any other applicant

Reasons for Recommendations

- This proposal was supported by all schools in the area
- There was support for this proposal from respondents
- It would create a more level playing field for parents applying for the school with priority being applied on distance within catchment
- Local children would not get displaced in favour of non-sibling applicants who lived further away and outside of the catchment

Recommendation 7

It is recommended that Cabinet agree the proposed changes to PANs for September 2013 as follows:

- i) Cranmere Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60
- ii) Thames Ditton Junior to increase its PAN from 90 to 120 for one year only

- iii) Cuddington Croft Primary to introduce a Junior PAN of 6
- iv) Banstead Junior to increase its PAN from 80 to 90
- v) Horley Infant to increase its PAN from 80 to 90
- vi) Windlesham Village Infant to increase its PAN from 40 to 60
- vii) Hillcroft Primary to increase its PAN from 45 to 60
- viii) Potters Gate Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60
- ix) Beaufort Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60
- x) Westfield Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60

Reasons for Recommendation

- There were no major objections to changes in PAN
- Each request is with the support of the school
- School Commissioning support all of these changes
- Increasing the PAN at these schools responds to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The increase at Thames Ditton Junior School will enable more children within the 'bulge' class at the infant school to transfer to the junior school

Recommendation 8

That a sibling link between Long Ditton Infant School and Long Ditton St Mary's CofE (Aided) Junior School, for the purposes of admissions to the infant school, is deferred until 2014 when agreement might be reached with the junior school ahead of their consultation.

Reasons for Recommendation

- For a reciprocal sibling link to be in place Long Ditton St Mary's CofE (Aided) Junior School must also have consulted and be intending to determine the link as part of their admission arrangements
- The junior school have not yet consulted on a change as their admission arrangements remain with the Diocese and so to avoid any mismatch of admission arrangements the Local Authority and the school will coordinate their consultations for 2014 if this is to be introduced

Recommendation 9

That a sibling link is introduced between Meath Green Infant and Meath Green Junior School so that children receive sibling priority for either school if they have a sibling attending either school.

Reasons for Recommendation

- There was an overall majority in support of the proposal (58 agreed and 2 disagreed)
- This would support families with more than one child
- It would remove the uncertainty when siblings attend the infant/junior school
- It would provide continuity for parents
- It would support car free travel arrangements as families would be more likely to get their children in to both schools
- It would support the links between the two schools

Recommendation 10

That the list of schools considered to admit local children remain as it existed for 2012, other than for the removal of St Lawrence C of E Primary

School (Surrey Heath) and St Peter's C of E Primary School (Waverley) from the Year 3 list.

Reasons for Recommendations

- With pupil numbers and pressure on places increasing, the 2013 admission intake for the faith schools proposed to be included in the list of schools that admit local children may not be reflective of historic patterns of intake
- St Lawrence C of E Primary School (Surrey Heath) and St Peter's C of E Primary School (Waverley) no longer have a Year 3 PAN and therefore should not be taken into account when considering nearest school for the Year 3 intake

Recommendation 11

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2013/14 are agreed as set out in Annex 10, which includes the proposed change to the policy regarding adding names to waiting lists.

Reasons for Recommendations

- The coordinated schemes for 2013 are similar to 2012 except for the policy on adding names to waiting lists
- The coordinated schemes would enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- There was general support for making the change to adding names to higher preference waiting lists automatically
- This would provide for transparency and equity for parents
- It would reduce customer contact with schools and the Local Authority
- It would provide for a clear message to be communicated to parents in offer letters and the school admissions booklet

Recommendation 12

That the Nursery admission criteria for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for 2013/14 are agreed as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Where there is a social or medical need for a place at that school
- c) Where a child is expected to have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
- d) Children who will turn 4 years old between 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014 (this is to give priority to older children who will be due to transfer to Reception in the next academic year and hence only have one year left to attend nursery)
- e) Children who will be 3 years old between 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014 (these children will be able to stay on in nursery for another year in 2014/15 as they will not be due to start Reception until September 2015)

Reasons for Recommendations

- The criteria would be compliant with the School Admissions Code
- Provides for an equitable way of deciding between applicants
- Responds to schools requests to review the admission criteria
- Provides for more transparent and equitable criteria against which parents can assess how they will be measured

Recommendation 13

That the admission arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2013 are agreed with the following amendments:

- That paragraph 14 is re-worded to reflect the intention that, subject to there being physical capacity within the school, in the case of multiple births where only one place remains, each child would be offered a place as long as they are ranked consecutively in their order of priority for the school
- That a statement on transport is included within the published admission arrangements which confirms that eligibility for transport will be assessed in accordance with Surrey's Home to School Transport policy, that feeder links do not confer an automatic right to transport and that if applications are not made for nearer schools (whether in or outside the County) then transport will not be provided to a school that is further away if the child would have been eligible for a place at a nearer school had they applied.

Reasons for Recommendations

- This would ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduce travel and support Surrey's Green Policies
- Infant Class Size legislation now provides for children from multiple births to be an exception and so, as long as the first child was admitted through normal admission rules (i.e. not through having a Statement of SEN) no school would have to take qualifying measures if they had more than 30 in a class as a result of admitting a child from a multiple birth
- It ensures that parents are alerted to the Home to School Transport policy at the earliest stage

Reasons for decisions:

The September 2013 admissions arrangements will be agreed by the full County Council at its meeting on 20 March 2012.

27/12 CHANGE & EFFICIENCY PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW: TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT (Item 9)

Surrey County Council is undertaking Public Value Reviews (PVRs) of all the services and functions it provides. All PVRs share a primary objective which reflects the council's ambition to deliver improved outcomes and value for money for the residents of Surrey. The Training & Development Public Value Review ran from February to December 2011.

The Training and Development function is part of the Human Resources & Organisational Development Service and provides training and development services to over 10,000 core Surrey County Council staff, elected Members and external partners. The service has been recognised for its innovation, having been shortlisted for the Public Digital Awards for its STARS

programme, and the high standard of training provided in Surrey. Notable success stories included its work with foster carers and its ongoing commitment to increase apprenticeships year on year.

Surrey was also noted to be leading the way in terms of the benchmarking of public services and the changes implemented via the Public Value Review process aimed to ensure that the service becomes a leading provider of training, learning and development serving the UK public sector. This would be in line with the council's commitment to be at the leading edge of local authorities and to look to generate income in new and imaginative ways.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the PVR recommendations be agreed as set out below:
 - i.) To create a strong partnership(s) to deliver excellent training
 - ii.) To provide more flexible ways of learning through implementing E-learning
 - iii.) Modernise the existing Training & Development Service so it is an efficient business, fit for partnering and able to deliver services to external organisations.
- (2) That implementation of the action plan attached as Appendix A to the report start immediately, led by the Head of HR & Organisational Development.
- (3) That progress be reported quarterly to the PVR Steering Board and the Member Reference Group.

Reasons for decisions:

To move the Public Value Review of Training & Development into the implementation phase and drive improved outcomes and value for money for the residents of Surrey.

28/12 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DIRECTORATE (Item 10)

The Environment and Infrastructure Public Value Review (PVR) is part of a three-year programme to look at all services provided by the Council. PVRs aim to deliver improved outcomes and value for money for the residents of Surrey. The Environment and Infrastructure Public Value Review ran from January 2011 to February 2012. The PVR complements the service-based PVRs which had already taken place within the directorate, including highways, waste management, bus subsidy, countryside management and the transport coordination centre, and focuses on cross-cutting areas programme of work and ways of working that will deliver improvements underpinning the delivery of services. The savings from the Public Value Review recommendations will also contribute to the directorate savings commitment of £19.4 million by 2017.

Cabinet Members noted the collaborative work which had been carried out in partnership with Boroughs and Districts and the development of the MSc in Highways Engineering with the South East 7 regional group of councils.

The commitment to ongoing training and development in a changing role was welcomed.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the recommendations set out in the Action Plan attached as Annex A to the report be agreed.
- (2) That implementation of the Action Plan start immediately, led by the Assistant Director, Environment.
- (3) That progress be reported quarterly to the PVR Steering Board and to the E&I PVR Member Reference Group.

Reasons for decisions:

To move the Public Value Review of the Environment and Infrastructure directorate into the implementation phase so that improved outcomes and value for money are delivered for the residents of Surrey.

29/12 CARERS GRANT FUNDING (Item 11)

The Cabinet considered the award of grant agreements to provide support for carers to deliver continued provision of priority services. Following inclusive co-design and a bidding process undertaken jointly with NHS Surrey and full support from the council's Procurement service, the allocation of 34 grants had been recommended with a value of £2.6 million a year for three years with the option for a further year subject to good performance. The grant awards would enable the continued provision of priority services whilst also giving support to 22% more carers from within existing resources.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health noted that the contract would increase the number of adult carers supported from 13,000 to 16,000 and the number of young carers supported from 1,200 to 1,350. A high proportion of the funding would be allocated within Surrey and it was noted that this was an endorsement of the council's aim to promote local provision whenever it was the right thing to do.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That 34 three-year Grant Agreements (with the option to extend for a further one year subject to good performance, available funding and a requirement to continue the service provision), as set out in **Appendix 6 to these minutes**, be awarded for the provision of Carers Support Services across Surrey to commence as from 1st April 2012.
- (2) That the Grant Agreements make clear where relevant that continued payment of the health funded element beyond 2012/13 is dependent on its continued receipt by the Council from the NHS.
- (3) That the Adult Social Care Select Committee review performance and outcomes achieved for carers through these services at least annually.

Reasons for decisions:

To fund suitable organisations to deliver the outputs and outcomes required for carers services in Surrey whilst enabling a 22% increase in numbers of carers supported giving greater value for money for Surrey carers and the County Council and a financial saving of £21,500.

30/12 INVESTMENT IN MONITORING & REPORTING TECHNOLOGY FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCES (Item 12)

Investment in the Council's systems and technology is fundamental to the success of the wider Financial Management Public Value Review and of the financial management vision of the organisation: To make the most of every pound to deliver improved outcomes for residents. Additional net savings had been identified across the full Financial Management PVR business case as a result of the procurement process for investment in monitoring and reporting technology for financial management and human resources.

The recommendations for this item were agreed under Minute item 34/12 in Part 2 of the meeting.

31/12 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 13)

That the decisions taken by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as attached as **Appendix 7**, be noted.

Cabinet Members noted the additional decision in relation to Isle of Wight 999 Fire and Rescue Call Taking and Mobilising which had been taken by the Cabinet Member for Community Safety since the publication of the agenda. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's partnering agreement with Isle of Wight Fire and Rescue was the first project of its type in the country, would provide a better operational solution for both services and provided a blueprint for future agreements.

Reason for decision:

To note the decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

32/12 APPROVAL TO AWARD FRAMEWORK AGREEMENTS FOR THE PROVISION OF HOME BASED CARE AND SUPPORT SERVICES (Item 14)

The Cabinet considered the arrangements for the award of a framework agreement for the provision of Home Based Care and Support Services.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency and the Strategic Director for Adult Social Care, in consultation with the Head of Legal Services, award a framework agreement for the provision of Home Based Care and Support Services.

Reasons for decisions:

To enable the award of a framework agreement under delegated authority on the advice of the Council's Monitoring Officer, namely that Members may have a prejudicial interest in this item of Cabinet business.

33/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 15)

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.

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.

34/12 INVESTMENT IN MONITORING & REPORTING TECHNOLOGY FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCES (Item 16)

This item was a Part 2 Annex to agenda item 12. The decisions made under this item also relate to Minute Item 30/12.

During the discussion of the award of the contract, the importance of implementing the new system in a timely manner was noted. Penalties would be included in the contract to ensure that it was implemented within a reasonable timescale and without unnecessary delay.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee be requested to review the implementation of the technology.
- (2) That a training programme be developed to support the implementation outlined in the Part 2 annex to the report.
- (3) That the award of the contract be approved in line with the recommendation set out in the Part 2 annex to the report.

Reasons for decisions:

To implement the recommendations and action plans of the Financial Management PVR so that improved outcomes and value for money are delivered for the residents of Surrey.

35/12 REFURBISHMENT OF LITTLETON LANE TRAVELLERS SITE, SHEPPERTON (Item 17)

The Cabinet considered the refurbishment of the Littleton Lane Travellers Site in Shepperton to bring the site up to a standard that is fit for purpose.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the refurbishment of the Littleton Lane Traveller site be agreed as summarised in paragraph 4 of the submitted report.

- (2) That the capital allocations be approved based on the scheme reported and the Chief Property Officer be authorised to tender and award a contract for the works in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder within the updated cost envelope.
- (3) That initial site preparation works prior to 31 March 2012 and award of the main contract be authorised.
- (4) That the decant arrangements be approved as set out in the submitted report.

Reasons for decisions:

To bring the site up to an appropriate and compliant standard, eliminate health and safety risks to residents and visitors and safeguard the grant funding received by the County Council towards the project.

36/12 PROPERTY TRANSACTION: DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER ADULT LEARNING CENTRE, DENE STREET, DORKING (Item 18a)

The Cabinet considered the disposal of the property following a marketing exercise.

RESOLVED that the disposal, by way of a freehold sale or by the granting of a long leasehold interest (125 years or longer), of the Former Adult Learning Centre, Dene Street, Dorking be approved as set out in the report and the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency, in consultation with the Leader, be authorised to complete the disposal on the basis set out in paragraph 9 of the report.

Reasons for decisions:

To dispose of a property no longer required for service delivery for the best possible consideration, whilst retaining the freehold interest.

Please note: Mr Tony Samuels declared a prejudicial interest and left the room during the consideration of this item.

37/12 PROPERTY TRANSACTION: DISPOSAL – NORTH-WEST SECTOR DEVELOPMENT, HORLEY (Item 18b)

The Cabinet considered the disposal of the land extending to some 64 acres held by the County Council.

RESOLVED that the disposal of the land required to deliver the development of the North West Sector development in Horley subject to the agreed terms and conditions be approved and the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency, in consultation with the Leader, be authorised to complete the disposal on the basis set out in paragraph 11 of the report.

Reasons for decisions:

To dispose of land as part of the North West Sector development in Horley.

38/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 19)

RESOLVED that information relating to the items considered in Part 2 of the agenda could be made available to the press and public at the appropriate time.

[The meeting closed at 3.10pm]

Chairman

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC QUESTION**Question 1 from Mr Malcolm Robertson**

"In a Press Release dated 15/12/09, the then Council Leader said "I am very pleased to announce that we are scrapping plans for any EfW incinerators in Surrey. Today I will be instructing that the planning applications for incinerators at Capel and Trumps Farm be withdrawn".

As subsequent Cabinet Reports confirm this has become S.C.C policy.

However, the then Cabinet Member for the Environment proposed an 'eco park' - to include a 'gasifier' - for Charlton Lane, Shepperton. Whether she was confused, or merely failed to appreciate that a 'gasifier' is also an incinerator under the Waste Incineration Directive is not known, but her attempt to exclude 'gasifiers' from the Countywide ban on incinerators which the Leader had just introduced was both unreasonable, illogical and absurd.

We've discovered a lot about gasifier/incinerators, for example, the Department of Energy and Climate Change currently says about them: " they are still considered to be emerging and unproven technologies for the treatment of waste biomass and mixed municipal waste where there are number of technical issues to resolve, for example, achieving intended throughput and air emission standards". And also how any gasifier built to work in the U.K. will have a potentially dangerous major breakdown within a short time of construction, requiring substantial down time and a massive effort of re-engineering. Gasifiers have all exceeded national and international limits for the emission of highly toxic chemicals. Safety is not a luxury which can be compromised, particularly when a plant will be built so close to houses.

Far from being more efficient than Energy from Waste incinerators, gasifiers are far, far less efficient. SEPA rated a 60,000 tonne gasifier at under 15% efficient. The Applicant itself confirmed the gasifier/incinerator was so inefficient it could not be regarded as recovery, and as a result it joins landfill, right at the bottom of the Waste Hierarchy, below where an EfW incinerator would be. Nor can using municipal waste as a fuel legally be described as renewable energy, because it fails to comply with the relevant Directive. Furthermore, unlike EfW plants which burn continuously, a batch system gasifier requires a starter fuel - gasoil- to be used on each occasion it lights up. Millions of litres of fossil fuel will be used up, in starting the batches, unlike the continuous burn of an EfW incinerator. Capacity of the plant is also now a considerable issue, because the gasifier's reference plant has had a lot of trouble in actually burning the waste, taking on several occasions well over 40 hours per batch to complete this simple task. As a result the plant will simply have insufficient time to deal with the proposed 60,000 tonne capacity.

Therefore to maintain a distinction between gasifier/incinerators and EfW incinerators which implies that gasifiers are in any way better, is totally false. There is however considerable evidence now available which shows that gasifiers are much worse. There is no need for either type in Surrey. Consider whether a true 'World Class Waste Solution' can possibly be achieved by burning potential recyclate and massive quantities of fossil fuel and sending their remains up the 49 metre (or higher) chimney of a gasifier.

Will you therefore please confirm that gasifiers also come under the Countywide ban on incineration, and if not, provide a full explanation as to your reasons?"

Reply

Surrey County Council's Waste Disposal Authority Action Plan was agreed by Surrey County Council's Cabinet on 2 February 2010.

The Action Plan includes a clear reference to developing gasification technology as well as the use of interim energy from waste facilities.

Gasification is classed as an advanced thermal treatment technology in the same way as pyrolysis and as with all thermal treatment technologies it is regulated under the EU Waste Incineration Directive.

Mr Ian Lake
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
28 February 2012

Member Questions

One question from Mr Colin Taylor (Member for Epsom and Ewell SW)

Question 1 from Colin Taylor (Epsom and Ewell SW):

"At the Council meeting on 15 June 2010, following announcement of the Coalition Government's agreed programme, I proposed the following Motion:

This Council notes the Government's decision to allow councils to return to the former more democratic committee system.

This Council agrees to return to the committee system with effect from the next Annual Meeting of the Council following the enactment of the legislation.

On the advice of the then Leader, members decided:

That this motion be referred to the Change & Efficiency Select Committee for consideration, Under Standing Order 12.6 the select committee must report back to the County Council at the earliest possible meeting.

The minutes do not record what Dr Povey said, but my recollection is that this was on the basis that the details of the government's proposals were not yet available for members to consider.

Subsequently the Localism Act has introduced the promised provisions. I understand that as a result a number of other councils, including Sutton and Kingston, will revert to the Committee System in May 2012.

Meanwhile I have not heard from the Change & Efficiency Select Committee and it has subsequently been wound up. Can the Leader tell me whether he has delegated another Select Committee to consider the above motion?

One of the reasons for proposing the motion was a recollection of what the then Leader said at my first Council meeting in 2001, when this Council moved to *Executive Arrangements*, to the effect that it was doing so only because it had been imposed on the county by the then Labour government and that it was intended to change back as soon as the next Conservative government made that possible.

Does the Leader share the view expressed by Mr Skellett in 2001 the changes imposed by Labour when in government should be reversed, or does he share the apparent relish of his immediate predecessor for the powers conferred by the current *Strong Leader* model?"

Reply

I have asked Democratic Services to check the records and it seems that the motion was not discussed at Change and Efficiency Select Committee following the Council meeting in June 2010. As the Member rightly states, this Select Committee no longer exists and therefore I would suggest that it be considered by the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee, post May 2013 (as explained below).

Since the County Council last operated a committee model, a number of things have changed. Greater delegation of powers for Members and officers has changed the culture of decision-making, leading to a swifter decision-making process and clear operational responsibility for officers. At the same time, Members have gained significant powers to hold partners to account through the scrutiny process (e.g. health and policing partners.)

Looking ahead, there are even more changes on the horizon, with the introduction of Police & Crime Panels and Health & Well-being Boards, as well as the potential greater emphasis on working in partnership to deliver our core services. These changes, both current and future, have altered the role of Members, with a greater emphasis on supporting early policy development and holding decision makers to account, as well as looking more widely than the County Council to the work of partners.

I personally believe that retaining a Leader & Cabinet model provides the necessary flexibility to adjust to these changes, keeping a streamlined, central decision-making structure where it is necessary without duplicating the partnership arrangements elsewhere. In addition, it ensures a strong scrutiny function is also retained to hold the Cabinet to account.

One of the key arguments for introducing a committee system is to allow more Members to be directly involved in decision-making. However, in line with Government policy, this could be achieved through maximising the role of local committees, delegating decisions to the lowest level and allowing all Members to be actively involved in the decisions affecting their local area.

As a direct result, there would be a smaller number of decisions to be taken centrally and it would be inefficient to introduce a number of committees to take these decisions. These decisions would inevitably be strategic and cross-cutting, more effectively managed through retaining the leader/cabinet model, held to account by scrutiny committees.

As mentioned above, local government is undergoing a significant period of change, both in the way it delivers services and how it is governed. With this scale of change and many of the specific details not yet known, I think it would be unwise to rush into a change in our democratic structures at the present time.

A much more effective approach would be to use the next year to review our current practices, learn from best practice elsewhere and consider how we ensure the Council continues to operate effectively in the future, both in terms of its decision-making but also in ensuring that we retain a high-level of scrutiny. Whilst I would encourage Members to consider and debate the options during the next year, any decision to return to a committee model of governance could not be reversed for at least 5 years. With this in mind, it is more appropriate for any such decision to be left open to the new Council to consider following the next election in 2013.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
28 February 2012

CABINET RESPONSE TO THE CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: *UPDATE REPORT FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN*

Date Considered: 10 January 2012

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that Cabinet supports increasing referrals of looked after children to the state funded mainstream boarding schools in the County when they can offer appropriate places.

RESPONSE

Children's Services and Schools and Learning would consider maximising the use of Gordon's and the RA&A for our Looked After Children. We currently successfully support the placement of a number of children in these schools through the Pathfinder Scheme as an alternative to children needing to become Looked After. However, it would be inappropriate to set a target for this, as each child would need to be considered individually.

We would ensure that one of these schools is considered in the first instance when seeking an appropriate placement for a Looked After Child who is currently out of education. In such cases, we would need to consider what care arrangements would be available outside of school terms, in order to assess whether a placement would be suitable.

**Mrs Mary Angell
Cabinet Member for Children & Families
28 February 2012**

COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: Cabinet Response to Select Committee Recommendations on 2012 Legacy Report (20 December 2011)

Date Considered: 15 January 2012

The Communities Select Committee at its meeting of 1 December 2011 considered the 2012 Legacy Report. The Chairman had agreed to accept the late report on the grounds that it should be taken as urgent business so that the Select Committee's view could be reported to the Cabinet when it considered the report at its meeting on 20 December 2011.

There was a wide-ranging discussion, which included:

- The potential to promote Surrey although members suggested that the report lacked detail on the potential for Tourism within Surrey.
- The Committee noted the cost of the projects against the potential income to the County.
- There was discussion that the two events were largely self-standing rather than legacy items.
- Members acknowledged the importance of retaining and using the knowledge base of officers following the Olympics.
- Members were concerned that funding for these events should not distort the County's overall priorities for Highways maintenance and improvements.
- There was a suggestion that new improved cycle tracks should be provided to form part of the legacy.

The Committee went on to consider its views on the report and its recommendations. A legacy was felt to be important and therefore, the projects identified in the report were positively received. However, there was concern amongst Members that the financial investment in the two events should not be to the detriment of the funding and plans for road improvements or distort in any way the planned road maintenance and improvement programme for Surrey.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET ON 20 DECEMBER 2012

The Committee therefore decided to submit the following recommendations to Cabinet to be considered with the report:

- To recognise the importance of legacy and endorse the projects included in the report.
- To ensure that the road maintenance and improvement programme continues as planned and is not distorted by the Olympic 2012 Legacy projects.

Although a response was received from the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games, and was included in the Meeting Agenda on 19 January 2012, the Select Committee did not feel this response adequately addressed the Select Committee recommendations. The response is included below.

“Reply

The Select Committee met on the 1st December and considered the Cabinet Report on the 2012 Legacy. The Committee recognised the importance of legacy and endorsed the projects included in the report. All steps have and will be taken to ensure that the road maintenance and improvement programme continues as planned and is not distorted by these Olympic 2012 Legacy projects.

Denise Saliagopoulos
Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games”

RECOMMENDATION

The Select Committee would like to request that the response is redrafted to more directly and comprehensively address the Select Committee recommendations.

STEVE COSSER
Chairman of the Communities Committee

CABINET RESPONSE TO THE COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: Cabinet response to the Select Committee's recommendation on the 2012 Legacy Report (Cabinet - 20 December 2011)

Date Considered: 19 January 2012

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee submitted the following recommendations to Cabinet on 20 December 2011 to be considered with the report:

- To recognise the importance of legacy and endorse the projects included in the report.
- To ensure that the road maintenance and improvement programme continues as planned and is not distorted by the Olympic 2012 Legacy projects.

Although a response was received from the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games, and was included in the Meeting Agenda on 19 January 2012, the Select Committee did not feel this response adequately addressed the Select Committee recommendations. The response is included below.

“Reply

The Select Committee met on the 1st December and considered the Cabinet Report on the 2012 Legacy. The Committee recognised the importance of legacy and endorsed the projects included in the report. All steps have and will be taken to ensure that the road maintenance and improvement programme continues as planned and is not distorted by these Olympic 2012 Legacy projects.

Denise Saliagopoulos
Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games”

The Select Committee would like to request that the response is redrafted to more directly and comprehensively address the Select Committee recommendations.

RESPONSE

Investment in the two legacy events is not to the detriment of funding for highways maintenance or improvements. The Council has agreed future capital and revenue budgets for both road maintenance and transport improvements that are higher than those provided historically. These include a significant increase in the provision to be allocated through Local Area Committees. In addition to this the Council has submitted a £16m bid to the Government's Local Sustainable Transport Fund. If successful (in late Spring) this will add to the 4.5m already won from the same fund. This additional external funding will provide for a range of measures including promoting cycling.

Mr Ian Lake
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
28 February 2012

ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: OLDER PEOPLE'S MENTAL HEALTH AND DEMENTIA STRATEGY

Date Considered: 22 February 2012

At its meeting on 22 February 2012, the Committee considered a report on the Older People's Mental Health and Dementia Strategy. This was an update on implementation of the strategy and highlighted key work the Service has done in improving standards of care for Surrey residents with dementia and Alzheimer's disease. Given the increasing ageing population, this area of work is incredibly important, and the Committee believes it is an area that needs to continue to receive support.

RECOMMENDATION

Therefore the Select Committee recommends to the Cabinet:

- (a) That the Cabinet congratulates the Service on its excellent work and national recognition in the field of dementia care, and that the Cabinet assures the Select Committee that this important area of work continue to receive the support and funding necessary.

John Furey
Chairman, Adult Social Care Select Committee

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

**Item under consideration: OLDER PEOPLE'S MENTAL HEALTH AND
DEMENTIA STRATEGY**

Date Considered: 22 February 2012

RECOMMENDATION

The Select Committee recommends to the Cabinet:

- (b) That the Cabinet congratulates the Service on its excellent work and national recognition in the field of dementia care, and that the Cabinet assures the Select Committee that this important area of work continue to receive the support and funding necessary.

RESPONSE

The Adult Social Care Select Committee received an update on the implementation of this 5 year strategy at its meeting on 22 February 2012. The report highlighted a number of success stories which included:

- The employment of 18 Dementia Navigators who offer support and advice to people with dementia and their carers.
- National recognition for the development of a local reporting tool which is being marketed as a model of good practice.
- Partnership working with Districts and Boroughs establishing wellbeing centres for dementia, in partnership with our District/Borough colleagues.
- Public engagement with GP practices in Woking to raise awareness of dementia and the production of a DVD entitled 'Living with Dementia in Surrey'
- Investment in crisis services and psychiatric liaison services through partnership grant to address avoidable admissions to acute hospitals.
- Investment in day care services and a reduction in residential placements.

The Chairman of the Adult Social Care Select Committee, John Furey, recommends that the Cabinet congratulates the service on its excellent work and national recognition in the field of dementia care and that the Cabinet assures the Select Committee that this important area of work continues to receive the support and necessary funding.

The Cabinet is asked to endorse this recommendation.

**Mr Michael Gosling
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health
28 February 2012**

Carers Prospectus Grant Evaluation Summary

Work Category	Budget 2012/13	Winning Bid (s)	No. Bids	Winning Bidder(s)	Added Bid Value (Additional benefits this grant bidding process achieved)
1) Surrey Wide Young Carers Support	£618k	£618k	1	Action for Carers (Surrey)	Numbers of young carers supported to increase from 1200 a year to 1350 (12.5% increase)
2) A Voice for Carers/Carer Awareness/ Training	£158k	£157.5k	1	Action for Carers (Surrey)	Advice given to increase from 1500 to 2000 carers a year (33% increase) New system of focus groups to improve carer engagement. Increased impact of carer led staff training Innovative new approaches to using technology to provide carers with information including use of "Apps"
3) GP Carers Recognition Project	£79k	£78.5k	1	Action for Carers (Surrey)	Support for work with GPs that is critical for work with CCGs and improving joint work with health
4) Enabling Carers Training	£50k	£50k	12	11 Allocations of £3k for local organisations aligned to District/ Boro	Carers to benefit from training to increase from 500 to 1400 carers a year (180% increase)

Work Category	Budget 2012/13	Winning Bid (s)	No. Bids	Winning Bidder(s)	Added Bid Value (Additional benefits this grant bidding process achieved)
				boundaries Action for Carers (Surrey) £9000k Rethink £ 8000	
5) Carers Back Care Service	£269k	£269k	3	Action for Carers, Carers of Epsom, White Lodge Organisations will collaborate to cover Surrey	Numbers of carers supported around moving and handling to increase from 700 a year to 820 (17% increase)
6) Carers and Employment Service	£173k	£173k	1	Action for Carers (Surrey)	Numbers of carers supported to increase from 267 to a year to 470 (76% increase)
7) Independent Local Carers Support Services allocated by Borough / District	£984k	Elmbridge - £102k		Carers Support Elmbridge	Numbers of carers supported is to increase from 11,381 to 13,700 a year to (20.1% increase) Carers organisations will undertake a new "light touch carers support evaluation" and allocate new small scale carers services.
		Epsom & Ewell - £74k		Carers of Epsom	
		Guildford - £108k		Carers Support Guildford	

Work Category	Budget 2012/13	Winning Bid (s)	No. Bids	Winning Bidder(s)	Added Bid Value (Additional benefits this grant bidding process achieved)
		Mole Valley - £84k		Mole Valley Carers Support	Increased support to Personalisation/SDS process
		Reigate & Banstead - £108k		Funding split between Carers of Epsom (North of M25) & East Surrey Carers Support Assoc. (South of M25)	
		Runnymede - £76k		Carers Support Runnymede	
		Spelthorne - £87k		Carers Support Spelthorne	
		Surrey Heath - £76k		Carers Support Surrey Heath	
		Tandridge - £81k		East Surrey Carers Support Assoc	
		Waverley - £104k		Carers Support Waverley	

Work Category	Budget 2012/13	Winning Bid (s)	No. Bids	Winning Bidder(s)	Added Bid Value (Additional benefits this grant bidding process achieved)
		Woking - £ 84k		Carers Support Woking	
		£984k			
8) Leisure Services for People with Learning Disabilities	£135k	£121.5k	1	Royal Mencap	Numbers of Leisure services for people with a learning Disability enabling carers to have a break to increase from 400 to 530 a year (32% increase)
9) Mental Health Carers Support Service	£134k	£127k	1	Rethink	Numbers of carers supported to increase from 11,381 to 13,700 a year (20.1% increase)
10) Benefits Advice for Carers	£50k	£50k	2	Surrey Welfare Rights	800 carers supported (new service)
TOTAL:	£2,650,000	£2,628,500 = saving of £21,500			

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

15 FEBRUARY 2012

**(i) SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
PROCUREMENT PARTNERSHIP**

That, having consulted with the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, the establishment of a procurement partnership with East Sussex County Council on the basis of the attached business case, be approved.

Reasons for decision

This report, and supporting papers, provide a clear description of the benefits of establishing a procurement partnership model between Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council; in order to increase the opportunity to leverage our external spend, strengthen our current procurement capacity and capability by building a stronger and more resilient team, and to position SCC at the forefront of the regional procurement discussions

(Decision of Deputy Leader – 15 February 2012)

**(ii) APPOINTMENT OF NOMINEES – APPLICATIONS TO ADMINISTER THE
ESTATES OF DECEASED SERVICE USERS**

1. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be appointed to apply as nominee in applications to administer the estate of the two persons named in the submitted report.
2. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal copies of each of the nominations made for the purposes of each application.

Reasons for decision

To enable the Council to apply to administer the estates of deceased debtors and recover debts more effectively.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 15 February 2012)

**(iii) VIREMENT OF BUDGET FROM AGENCY PLACEMENTS TO SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL FOSTER CARERS' ALLOWANCES**

That the revenue budget virement of £710,000 from Agency Placements to Foster Care Allowances be approved

Reasons for decision

The recommendation will better align the budgets with the service expenditure and improve budgetary control.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Families – 15 February 2012)

(iv) ST PAUL'S CE PRIMARY SCHOOL, ADDLESTONE: PROPOSED CHANGE FROM VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED TO VOLUNTARY AIDED

That the proposal for St Paul's CE VC Primary School, Addlestone to change category from Voluntary Controlled (VC) to Voluntary Aided (VA) on 1 September 2012 be approved.

Reasons for decision

Provision of sustainable education would benefit all children in the area served by the school.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 15 February 2012)

(v) REQUEST TO ADOPT A NEW ROAD: FLORENCE WAY, KNAPHILL

That, under the Scheme of Delegation and in line with Surrey County Council's previous road adoption policy, the adoption of the road at 4-52 Florence Way, Knaphill, Woking, GU21 2FE as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report be approved.

Reasons for decision

The request to adopt the road at 4-52 Florence Way, Knaphill, Woking, GU21 2FE fully meets Surrey County Council's previous policy on road adoption.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 15 February 2012)

23 FEBRUARY 2012

(vi) ISLE OF WIGHT 999 FIRE AND RESCUE CALL TAKING AND MOBILISING

That the terms of the partnering agreement with the Isle of Wight Fire and Rescue Service be approved

Reasons for decision

This proposal 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 as opposed to Regional Control Centre. 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 and is expected to attract £1.9m funding from DCLG, in time for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympics Games, furthermore providing a platform for future expansion.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 23 February 2012)

(vii) DRAFT SKILLS AND EMPLOYABILITY PLAN FOR SURREY 2012 - 2016

That the draft Skills and Employability Plan for Surrey 2012-16 be agreed for consultation for three months.

Reasons for decision

The plan addresses new statutory requirements and seeks views through consultation as to how these should be addressed with partners in Surrey

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 23 February 2012)

(viii) EPSOM AND EWELL LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK - AWARD OF CONTRACT

That the award of a contract for a twelve month period to Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, for 100% of the contract value of £84,000, to prevent young people from becoming NEET or first time entrants into the criminal justice system in Epsom and Ewell be approved.

Reasons for decision

The recommendations will support the council's priority to achieve full participation in education, training or employment by young people aged 16 to 19.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 23 February 2012)