

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 Friday 4 May 2012.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON TUESDAY 27 MARCH 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 Helyn Clack
*Mr John Furey
*Mr Michael Gosling

*Mr Tim Hall
Mrs Kay Hammond
Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr Peter Martin
*Mr Tony Samuels

* = Present

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

39/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mrs Hammond and Ms Le Gal.

40/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 28 February 2012 (Item 2)

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 February 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

41/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

There were none.

42/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)

Members' Questions.

One question had been received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills). The question and agreed response is attached as **Appendix 1 to these minutes**.

Mrs Watson said that one of the aims of the Public Value Review was the setting up of Steering Groups and asked the Cabinet when this would happen.

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning confirmed that Steering Groups for each Youth Centre would be up and running soon and that he hoped that the Steering Group for the Youth Centre in Mole Valley would be operational by the summer.

43/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)

(a) Highways Maintenance Prioritisation

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment drew attention to his tabled response, which is attached as **Appendix 2 to these minutes**.

(b) Transition from Children's to Adult Services

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health drew attention to his tabled response, which is attached as **Appendix 3 to these minutes**.

Whilst the Chairman of the Adult Social Care Select Committee was pleased with the success of the Squirrel Lodge project, she was concerned that this property had been earmarked for disposal by Estates, Planning and Management and it was due to the Member Asset Panel that this service was challenged and a use for the building was identified.

The Leader responded by stating that this challenge was now the responsibility of the Investment Panel who ensured that full Business Cases were put together and considered for each accommodation project.

44/12 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR FEBRUARY 2012 (PERIOD 11) (Item 6)

The Leader drew attention to the revised report, including Annex A and B, tabled at the meeting. He commended the work undertaken by each Directorate, which enabled Members to see a more consistent approach on how budgets were being managed.

He considered that the council now had a measured approach to budgets and cited the carry forward requests and in particular the specific carry forward request for child protection as examples.

He also said that the capital budget underspend of £36m was not unusual because most of this underspend related to Schools' project and delays in obtaining planning permission etc. He said that savings of £2m had been made in this budget which was due to efficiency savings and joint partnership working with Hampshire County Council.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health was pleased to report that his Directorate was on target to achieve £28m savings this year.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games said that this report was easy to read and understand and drew attention to paragraph 55, Annex A where the new Community Improved Fund was

mentioned. She said that this new fund had generated significant interest in local communities.

Finally, the Deputy Leader considered that this report was excellent news and commended all Directorates for their performance.

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 £3.8m of revenue budget to 2012/13 (as set out in paragraph 63 of Annex A to the report) be approved.
- (3) That the creation of a specific reserve to cover the rising budget pressure for child protection be approved, and the transfer of £1.3m to this reserve be agreed.
- (4) That government grant changes (as set out in 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.

45/12 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN AND DIRECTORATE STRATEGIES 2012 TO 2017 (Item 7)

The Leader said that the Medium Term Financial Plan and Directorate Strategies for 2012 – 2017, followed on from the approval by the County Council of the overall revenue and capital budgets for 2012 – 17 on 7 February 2012. He acknowledged the detail contained in the annexes to the report – Annex A split into three sections, section 1 – the overview, section 2 – detailed budgets and section 3 – strategies and relevant committee papers, Annex B – fees and charges, Annex C – the one side Strategy Document for each Directorate and Annex D – summary of the Equalities Impact Assessment.

Members noted the following amendments:

- Paragraphs 8 and 23 – amend £680.6m to £680.4m
- Page 3 – table 1 – MTFP total – amend £1,512.0m to £1,512.8m
- Paragraph 25 – table 2013/14 figures – amend £145.3m to £145.4m
- Paragraph 58 – amend £205m to £206m

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health said that when his Directorate's Policy Budget was published on line, there would be an opportunity to drill down to enable further detail relating to the 'other care' budget.

Members congratulated officers for producing a very comprehensive report with detailed facts and figures. Attention was also drawn to the on-line publication of all payments made by the county council of more than £500.

Cabinet Members thanked officers for the comprehensive Equality Impact Assessments and confirmed that the Cabinet had taken due regard of them and noted the analysis of actions and mitigating action required.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning commented on the statistics, for his Directorate, and the need to understand the reasons for the growth in some areas, as set out on page 35 of Annex A.

The Leader thanked the Chief Executive, the Strategic Directors and those officers that had responsibility for budgets, including the Chief Finance Officer and her team. He praised the quality of the finance reporting, both in this report and also the reports which were considered by the Cabinet on 30 January 2012 and the County Council on 7 February 2012.

Finally, it was agreed to amend recommendation (1) so that any final amendments to the Medium Term Financial Plan could be agreed by the Leader, the Chief Executive and the Chief Finance Officer.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That, subject to minor amendments agreed by the Leader, Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer, the Medium Term Financial Plan 2012 – 2017 (Annex A) be approved.
- (2) That fees and charges approved under delegated authority be ratified and other fees and charges proposals (Annex B) be approved.
- (3) That the Directorate Strategies 2012-2017 (Annex C) be approved.
- (4) That a programme of reporting through quarterly Cabinet Business Reports and monthly budget monitoring reports be approved.

Reasons for decisions:

The Directorate Strategies set out the vision, objectives and priorities for each Council Directorate and demonstrate how they will support the delivery of the *One County One Team* Corporate Strategy and the Council's ambition to be the most effective Council in England by 2017. The 2012-17 Medium Term Financial Plan is a five year balanced budget that is aligned to the Corporate Strategy and Directorate Strategies. It reflects assumptions about the current local and national financial, economic and political environment. Regular reporting through the year will enable progress to be effectively tracked and managed.

46/12 ONE COUNTY, ONE TEAM: OUR COMMITMENT TO PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT (Item 8)

The Deputy Leader said that he was delighted to present this strategy, which had been developed following the approval of the Corporate Strategy by the

County Council in February 2012. He said that he had tabled a response to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendations – Appendix 4 and 5 respectively.

He stressed the importance of working in an open and transparent way and confirmed his support for public involvement.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment which set out any mitigating action to reduce any negative effect of this strategy.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the One County One Team - our commitment to public involvement be approved.
- (2) That progress be tracked by the Council's Quality Board, chaired by the Chief Executive and attended by the Deputy Leader.

Reasons for decisions:

Surrey County Council is committed to increasing the involvement of residents and communities in the decisions that affect them and their local areas, and to being open and transparent in its work. *One County One Team - our commitment to public involvement* sets out the Council's commitment and approach to public involvement.

47/12 ONE COUNTY, ONE TEAM: FAIRNESS AND RESPECT STRATEGY 2012 - 2017 (Item 9)

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, the Leader introduced the report. He referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment and also the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendations and the Cabinet response, which were tabled at the meeting – Appendix 6 and 7 respectively.

He said that, whilst the Cabinet accepted most of the recommendations made by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, they did not consider that adding a priority for 'preventing pollutants getting into the biological chain' to the Fairness and Respect Strategy would add any value to this agenda.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the One County One Team, Fairness and Respect Strategy 2012-2017 be approved.
- (2) That progress towards the priorities it contains be reported to the Cabinet as part of its quarterly business report.

Reasons for decisions:

Approving the *One County One Team, Fairness and Respect Strategy 2012-2017* will ensure the Council fulfils its statutory responsibilities to publish equality objectives by 6 April 2012. In addition, the Strategy also supports the delivery of the Council's commitment to promote fairness and respect in the services it provides.

48/12 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES (Item 10)

The Cabinet response to the Adult Social Care Select Committee recommendations was tabled at the meeting – Appendix 8.

The Chairman of the Adult Social Care Select Committee was invited to speak and began by thanking Simon Laker, the Review Lead Officer and his team. She considered that this Public Value Review was an exemplar for how they should be conducted. She also thanked Mr Samuels because he had chaired this Member Reference Group prior to being appointed to the Cabinet.

She said that she had 'long championed' the rights of people with Learning Difficulties. She said that she was keen to reduce the original number of recommendations to a more manageable number. She also wanted to ensure that the Adult Social Care Select Committee and its Member Reference Group monitored the progress of the action plan regularly. Finally, she said that she was pleased that Jo Poynter would take over the Review Lead role after Simon Laker moved to his new role.

Mr Butcher, County Councillor for Cobham also spoke and said that this was a helpful report. However, he made a number of suggestions, in particular, that the action plan should indicate who is the responsible officer for each of the recommendations set out in the implementation plan and also what criteria would be used for judging the success. He also drew attention to paragraph 29 (v) which mentioned the partnership working with Elmbridge Borough Council taking place in Cobham, which was piloting a new model of day activities.

The Leader responded to some of the points made and with reference to performance measures, he said that Surrey County Council had the highest number of people with Learning Difficulties and that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health and his Strategic Director would have responsibility for the delivery of the outcomes sought in this review.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health said that Surrey's position was a historical casued by the closure of several long stay hospitals in the county but stressed that these people were Surrey residents. He confirmed that he would be ensuring that the recommendations were implemented and welcomed the monitoring of its progress by the relevant select committee.

He said that there had been extensive involvement of the whole community in this Public Value Review. He also drew attention to the 'Easy Reading' version of the report, which was tabled at the meeting and

welcomed by other Cabinet Members. It was suggested that copies of this document were placed in Surrey libraries.

He also said that Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) had been undertaken for each of the recommendations and that they had been considered by the Learning Disability Board. The full version of the EIAs were available on the web and in the Members Reading Room.

The Chairman of the Adult Social Care Select Committee confirmed that the consultation process had been challenging and successful. It had also included the involvement of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Finally, she considered that the proposed investment requested was essential for the successful implementation of the recommendations.

The Leader said that the Cabinet would be agreeing the investment requested.

Other points made by the Cabinet Members included:

- A reference to telecare equipment (paragraph 29, vii) and the announcement made by the Leader at County Council concerning further investment.
- That the depth and breadth of the Public Value Review was astonishing.
- The review had focussed on providing a better quality of life for people with learning difficulties.
- The importance of social care teams in boroughs and districts.
- The review would not make savings at the expense of quality.
- Front line staff working with people with learning difficulties made a significant difference to their lives.
- Partnership working with boroughs / districts and NHS would make it easier to achieve the outcomes of this review.

Finally, the Leader personally thanked both the Review Lead Officer and the Strategic Director for Adult Social care for this excellent piece of work.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the recommendations set out below and in detail in pages 24 -35 of the submitted report be endorsed and that implementation of the action plan be agreed to start immediately.

The recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation 1: Personalisation

By 1 April 2015 we will deliver £2.5m efficiencies by:

- Developing personalised support options with strategic suppliers, including clearly priced, locally developed options for personal support, day activities, respite and short breaks.
- Completing a coordinated programme of reviews to deliver personalised services that meet the assessed needs, improve outcomes and offer value for money for the following specific groups:

- a) 150 young people over 15 years of age expected to transition into Adult Social Care over the next three years (avoiding long-term costs)
- b) 300 individuals over 65 years of age currently supported by specialist learning disability services (delivering £0.5m efficiencies by 2014)
- c) 223 individuals currently accessing respite/short break services across social care, health services and the independent sector
- d) 100 individuals currently receiving high cost packages of care in and out of Surrey
- e) 750 individuals currently accessing day services (including Surrey County Council's in-house services)
- f) 460 individuals currently receiving Supporting People funded services.

Recommendation 2: Accommodation

By 1 April 2015 we will deliver £2.4m efficiencies by developing personalised accommodation options for people with learning disabilities, with strategic suppliers and housing partners and deliver a shift from residential and nursing care to individualised community accommodation options where appropriate to their needs.

Recommendation 3: Health

We will develop integrated commissioning with health partners to determine appropriate packages of care and support, to ensure health and wellbeing needs are met effectively, and implement "responsible commissioner" guidance.

Recommendation 4: Transport

By 1 April 2015 we will deliver £2m efficiencies by reviewing the transport needs of individuals as part of their supported self-assessment. This will maximise each individual's benefit entitlement, address areas where there has been historic double-funding, and promote independence.

Recommendation 5: Transition

We will influence how services are planned and delivered for young people with learning disabilities by working with children, schools and families to identify individuals earlier, jointly understand and assess needs, and facilitate service developments that support personalisation.

We will ensure people with a learning disability over the age of 65, and those with early onset dementia are supported to access, through existing pathways (e.g. Dementia pathway), a range of services that best meet their assessed needs.

Recommendation 6: Respite

We will cease to commission respite and short breaks in residential services where people permanently live, as the Care Quality Commission considers it poor practice.

Recommendation 7: Quality assurance (including workforce and safeguarding)

We will implement a standard approach to quality assurance and contract monitoring across services commissioned for people with learning disabilities.

Recommendation 8: Information and communication

We will improve sources of accessible information relating to services and support for people with learning disabilities.

Recommendation 9: Stronger partnerships

We will shape and develop the existing market of services in response to our ambition for personalisation by working with our partners, including family/carer groups, The Learning Disability Partnership Board, Surrey Care Association, health colleagues, advocates, and Borough/Districts

- (2) That the allocation of a one-off investment of £1.1m be approved. This will fund dedicated additional social work capacity, aligned to each borough and district and partner health services, to work with individuals and their family/carers to take forward the above. This investment will ensure the personalisation ambition is realised and will generate recurring savings building to £8.1m from 2015.

Reasons for decisions:

This Public Value Review has over the last 12 months identified the need for a strategic shift in the way that services for people with learning disabilities are commissioned and delivered in Surrey. The recommendations outlined above are supported by a broad range of stakeholders and partners and implementing them will deliver Surrey's ambition of personalised services and improved outcomes for people with learning disabilities and their family/carers. The recommendations represent a commitment to developing a market to support the personalisation ambition through greater choice of affordable options from strategic suppliers of accommodation, care and support, day activities, and respite. The recommendations will also deliver at least £8.1m recurrent savings by 2014/15 and additional savings to the Medium Term Financial Plan as shown in the Public Value Review recommendations saving chart of £8.2m (total £16.3m on page 39 of the submitted report).

49/12 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 11)

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

Reason for decision:

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

50/12 PRESTON REGENERATION (Item 12)

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that the Cabinet was being asked to approve a recommendation that would result in an investment programme enshrined in a Statement of Intent, with associated budgetary provision, between Surrey County Council and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council to regenerate the Preston area.

Mrs Joan Spiers, Leader of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council was invited to speak. She began by setting out the background to the regeneration of the Preston Ward. She said that Preston was one of the most deprived areas in the county and thanked the Leader / Deputy Leader for taking this initiative forward. She considered that the new leisure centre, improvements to sports facilities, a new skills centre and highways improvements would be a tangible benefit for local residents.

The Leader agreed that partnership working made a difference and hoped that looking back in five years time, you could see the improvements and that the families would have a better quality of life and be proud to live in the area.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health said that the majority of the Preston ward was in his division and that he was pleased that finally the prospect of delivering the regeneration scheme for the area was being taken forward.

Mr Harrison, who was the other local Member for the area was invited to speak. He considered that the key point would be keeping to the details and ensuring the figures were consistent and the initiatives were deliverable. He also considered that the new facilities would be beneficial to the whole Banstead area.

RESOLVED:

That, by entering into a revised Statement of Intent based on the principles outlined within the report and subject to the final draft being approved by the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, the Regeneration of the Preston Ward be agreed.

Reasons for decisions:

For the County Council to show leadership and support in the regeneration of the Preston Ward by giving financial support that will re-provide youth provision in the form of a new skills centre and a considerable investment to improve the infrastructure within Preston.

51/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 13)

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

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.

52/12 PRESTON REGENERATION (Item 14)

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes advised the Cabinet of the County Council's financial commitment to the Preston Regeneration Project.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, said that he chaired the Preston Regeneration Board.

RESOLVED:

That, by entering into a revised Statement of Intent supported by a Schedule of Works that would result in an estimated capital expenditure as set out in the submitted report, and subject to final approval by the Strategic Director of Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration, with further scrutiny by the Investment Panel, the Regeneration of the Preston Ward be agreed.

Reasons for decisions:

For the County Council to show leadership and support in the regeneration of the Preston Ward by giving financial support that will re-provide youth provision in the form of a new skills centre and a considerable investment to improve the infrastructure within Preston.

53/12 CONTRACT AWARDS FOR TWO TERM MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS AND A FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL SERVICES (Item 15)

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that this report was the first of a series of similar decisions to be presented to the Cabinet over the next few months.

Whilst Members welcomed the opportunity for local contractors, they agreed to amend the last sentence of paragraph 31 (additional shown in italics) so that it now reads:

'the appointed contractors do have exclusive contractual rights to receive all specified work within their contract area, *subject to contract terms*'.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That Surrey County Council enter into Term Contracts for Cyclical Maintenance and Responsive and Repairs for East and West Surrey areas as detailed in Annex 1 of the submitted report.
- (2) That the appointment of selected firms onto a Framework Agreement for Professional and Technical Services as detailed in Annex 2 of the submitted report be approved.

Reasons for decisions:

SCC has tendered Term Contracts for Cyclical and Reactive maintenance services to replace the existing countywide Term Contract, which terminates on 31 August 2012. The reason for two contracts is to spread the workload and end reliance on a single contractor and to provide a back up facility in case of contractor failure.

A 4-year Framework Contract, for professional and technical services, has been procured on behalf of Surrey Boroughs and Districts and the Surrey Police Authority as part of the Surrey Collaboration Project. This framework again allows rapid and administratively simple call off arrangements through mini-competitions saving time and money for SCC and other Authorities. This report requests approval to appoint selected contractors to this professional and technical services framework.

54/12 CONTRACT AWARD FOR A FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF TEMPORARY BUILDINGS (Item 16)

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes presented the report and said this Framework Agreement would have five suppliers appointed, with base rates agreed, which would enable the County Council to deliver temporary buildings within a shorter timescale and with some efficiency savings.

RESOLVED:

That selected contractors be appointed onto a Framework Agreement for the provision of temporary buildings jointly with Hampshire County Council as detailed in Annex 1 of the submitted report; and that the authority to award contracts for the annual provision of temporary buildings procured under this Framework be delegated to the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes.

Reasons for decisions:

The report requests approval to appoint selected contractors to the Temporary Building Framework. Further to the award of the Framework contract for temporary buildings authority is requested to delegate the award of individual contracts let under this Framework to the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member

for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, in order to permit rapid delivery of requirements to deliver to deadlines to meet needs to accommodate increased numbers of pupils.

55/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 17)

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, in relation to the Preston Regeneration Project (items 12 and 14) and also the release of photographs of the proposed temporary classrooms (item 16).

[The meeting closed at 3.40pm]

Chairman

RESPONSE TO QUESTION

Question from Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

As from 1 April all of the County Council's Youth Centres will be managed by external organisations. The County Council agreed to set up steering groups relating to each Youth Centre including young people, councillors and others representing the local community to have a local input into the work of each Youth Centre. When will these steering groups be established, what will their terms of reference be and their membership? Do you agree with me that the Youth Centre steering groups should be in place by 1 April to ensure that youth centres are meeting the needs of local young people?

Reply:

On 1 April the council's new arrangements for delivering youth services will commence and the new service will cost the Surrey tax pay 25% less than it did in 2009. This innovative new model of service delivery is part of the council's policy to support localism. The purpose of the steering groups will be "to provide local leadership to the youth club and ensure the provision is integrated with the community". The steering group will not be a managing committee for the building but will be ensuring a local 'fit' and engagement with the local community. The contract to manage the youth work is not dependant on the steering group being in place and good community engagement takes time. Steering groups do not need to be in place in April, I would hope that they are up and running by the end of the year.

Mrs Kay Hammond
Cabinet Member for Community Safety

CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

Highways Maintenance Prioritisation Task Group

I would like to thank Steve Renshaw, Members of the Select Committee and the highways team for this helpful and informative report.

It is vital that we have a robust system of prioritisation for maintenance of our highways that is transparent and supports local decision making. I am satisfied that the main proposals in Select Committee report will improve our current arrangements for this.

Turning to the five recommendations on pages two and three of the cover report; I accept and welcome recommendations (i), (ii), (iii) and (v). The financial implications of them are provided for in the Medium Term Financial Plan elsewhere on this agenda. With regard to recommendation (iv), I fully accept that the ICT systems could be usefully improved and that it would be worth doing a business case for that. Recommendation (iv) however, appears to go further to seek Cabinet agreement to the consequent budget provision. I am happy to consider that budget implication when it is presented as a Business Case but am unable to agree to recommending provision until this is presented.

John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
27 March 2012

ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: TRANSITION FROM CHILDREN'S TO ADULT SERVICES

Date Considered: 13 March 2012

At its meeting on 13 March 2012, the Committee considered a report on the transition pathway for children with disabilities into adult social care. One of the key concerns for the Committee was the availability of appropriate housing for young adults with disabilities, especially dwellings that are accessible and near to friends, family and higher education facilities.

The Committee were pleased to hear about a project in Woking that has turned an unused SCC property into supported living housing for six young people with disabilities. This will result in an estimated savings to adult social care of around £144k per year in care & support cost. As such, the Committee are keen to see this type of project replicated using other SCC-owned assets.

Therefore the Select Committee recommends to the Cabinet:

- (a) That it learn from the success of the Squirrel Lodge project and insist that many further similar housing opportunities are investigated as soon as possible.

**Sally Marks
Vice-Chairman, Adult Social Care Select Committee**

Response

Squirrel Lodge Project

Background

Surrey County Council (SCC) owns Squirrel Lodge in Woking. Until recently it was used as an in-house children's short breaks service. This service closed in July 2011 because the building was not suitable for its intended purpose.

The PVR for people with learning disabilities identified that there was a need for housing accommodation for young adults in transition. Due to location and size of Squirrel Lodge it was felt that it could be used for supported living for up to 6 young adults with autism. Historically many young people with high support needs, such as Autism, would need to move out of county due to lack of provision and appropriate housing.

A full Business case was put together using assumptions based on previous accommodation projects. It identified the projected cost avoidance in developing this scheme of £24k per head, resulting in a full year effect of £144k in developing this scheme for 6 people.

A business case for the property to be used to provide supported living, was prepared. In making the recommendation, the capital asset value of the site was outweighed by the revenue savings of providing this service locally.

Surrey County Council will continue to own this property and Surrey's Supported Accommodation and Independent Living Service (SAILS) will be the landlord in the interim. The longer term plan is to identify a Social Registered landlord to take responsibility for the property

Following a tender process to identify an appropriate care & support provider, it is expected that the service will start in September.

The Squirrel Lodge Project when completed will be thoroughly reviewed and where appropriate replicated across the County.

The Select Committee highlighted the lack of available suitable housing in Surrey and wanted to explore the option of using other vacant accommodation that might be in Surrey County portfolio.

Action:

PVR for people with learning disabilities as part of Recommendation 2 : Housing Accommodation could review vacant accommodation held in Surrey's portfolio to assess suitability.

Business cases would be required for each initiative to ensure the release of property would meet a need that can't be met through other housing routes, provide value for money and address issue of Social landlord and tenancy arrangements.

Michael Gosling
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health
27 March 2012

COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item under consideration:

ONE COUNTY ONE TEAM, OUR COMMITMENT TO PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Date Considered: 15 February 2012

- 1 The Committee has considered a report setting out the proposed approach to public involvement and transparency. It was noted that the public consultation on the Strategy had been open for a period of three months, but that only six responses had been received, and there was some concern that the proposed approach was not adequately informed by the views of the public. However, it was also acknowledged that the low response rate may be a result of the fact that the topic was not controversial or that those consulted were broadly happy with the proposals.
- 2 The Committee made the following comments in relation to the draft Strategy and improving public involvement:
 - 'Have Your Say' sessions at the Local Committee level may improve the public response to consultations.
 - Where possible, response requests should be personalised and targeted, explaining in what capacity the recipients are being asked to respond and why.
 - The central role of Members in consulting with the public should be given greater emphasis.
 - The importance of ensuring that information was available in accessible formats was reiterated.
 - Officers should seek to ensure the cost-effectiveness of any consultation undertaken.
 - Reference should be made to the Surrey Compact, as this was a key element of the Council's relationship with the voluntary sector.
 - The Council should ensure that the Consultation Institute's seven best practice principles for public engagement were fully reflected in the Strategy.

The Select Committee therefore recommends to Cabinet:

That the Committee's comments, as set out above, be incorporated into the revised Involvement & Transparency Strategy.

Mr Mel Few

Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

UPDATE ON 'ONE COUNTY ONE TEAM, OUR COMMITMENT TO PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT'

The Leader and I want to personally thank members of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their helpful input to the development of our commitment to public involvement.

I strongly support the comments of the Committee. The feedback has been taken into account and has helped to shape the 'commitment' presented to the Cabinet on 27 March 2012 for approval.

Our commitment to public involvement is an important part of our One Team approach and recognises the important role local Members and Local Committees play in consulting and representing the views of the public.

Our 'commitment' also places great importance to ensuring that we involve people and share information in an accessible way by making information for residents easy to find and recognising that people like to have their say and get involved in different ways.

Recognising the importance of providing good value, the approach we will take for individual involvement and consultation exercises will be proportionate to the importance, complexity and value to the public of the specific issue.

Our 'commitment' makes specific reference to the Council's commitment to working with the voluntary, community and faith sectors through the Surrey Compact principles and code of practice, and the Consultation Institute's 'best practice principles' which have been used to help develop guidance for Council staff. This guidance includes advice on how to select the appropriate method to maximise participation and response rates in any involvement activity.

Peter Martin
Deputy Leader
27 March 2012

COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item under consideration:

ONE COUNTY ONE TEAM, FAIRNESS AND RESPECT STRATEGY 2012-2017

Date Considered: 15 February 2012

- 1 The Committee has considered a report setting out the draft priorities for the Fairness and Respect Strategy and the process for ensuring that these aligned with the Council's Corporate Strategy for 2012-2017.
- 2 The Committee noted that key groups, including representatives of the voluntary, community and faith sectors, had been involved in the development of the Strategy to help ensure that it reflected their needs and that the priorities identified were relevant to the work of the Council and deliverable. Some concern was expressed at the meeting that the Council was relying to some extent on a top-down approach, although it was recognised that it was difficult to address the desires of all the residents at all times. The Committee suggested that the resident forums set up by the Borough and District Councils could be used to help understand the aspirations of local people.
- 3 In considering how effectively the draft priorities addressed those of the Corporate Strategy, it was suggested that the priority to increase training and employment opportunities in Surrey should not just focus on young people aged 19-25. Also, whilst understanding the value of having a workforce which was representative of the communities served by the County Council in terms of effective service delivery, it was important to ensure that the processes to achieve a representative workforce should themselves meet the principles of fairness and respect.
- 4 Overall the Committee supported the general direction of the draft Strategy, subject to the comments below, and agreed to receive a progress report at its meeting in October 2012. Relevant issues would also be considered at a future meeting of the Environment & Transport Select Committee.

The Select Committee therefore recommends to Cabinet:

That the following amendments be made to the draft fairness and respect priorities contained in the Strategy:

- a) The phrase 'and aspirations' should be added to the penultimate priority to read 'Increase our understanding of the needs and

aspirations of Surrey's residents and their differing experiences of Council services.'

- b) The implications for the Strategy of the urban/rural split in the County should be considered further.
- c) The priority in relation to the Corporate Strategy outcome of being a low-carbon and sustainable County ('ensure rural communities have access to services through new technology') should be included in the economy section, and replaced with a more appropriate priority along the lines of 'preventing pollutants getting in to the biological chain'.
- d) The priority to increase employment and training opportunities should have a broader focus than just young people aged 19-25.

Mr Mel Few
Chairman Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

ONE COUNTY ONE TEAM: FAIRNESS AND RESPECT STRATEGY 2012 - 2017

Committee Recommendations	Council Response
<p>The phrase ‘and aspirations’ should be added to the penultimate priority to read ‘Increase our understanding of the needs and aspirations of Surrey’s residents and their differing experiences of Council services.’</p>	<p>Accepted – amendment made</p>
<p>The implications for the Strategy of the urban/rural split in the County should be considered further.</p>	<p>Within the Fairness and Respect Strategy the Council has included the priority, “increase our understanding of the needs and aspirations of Surrey’s residents and their differing experiences of Council services”. As part of the Council’s work to implement this priority there will be an opportunity to undertake specific research that enhances the Council’s understanding of Surrey’s urban and rural areas.</p>
<p>The priority in relation to the Corporate Strategy outcome of being a low-carbon and sustainable County (‘ensure rural communities have access to services through new technology’) should be included in the economy section, and replaced with a more appropriate priority along the lines of ‘preventing pollutants getting in to the biological chain’.</p>	<p>Protecting Surrey’s environment is a key outcome in the Council’s Corporate Strategy and a range of strategies and plans are already in place to reduce levels of pollution. These include: the Surrey Rural Strategy; Surrey Biodiversity Plan; and the Surrey Transport Plan – Climate Change Strategy.</p> <p>Given the wide ranging activity already being undertaken it was felt that adding a priority on “preventing pollutants getting in to the biological chain” to the Fairness and Respect Strategy would not add any value to this agenda.</p>
<p>The priority to increase employment and training opportunities should have a broader focus than just young people aged 19-25.</p>	<p>The Council is undertaking a series of actions to ensure residents, of all ages, are provided with employment and training opportunities. Key actions include: increasing the number of young people in education, employment and training; shifting more of the Council’s spending to local business to support the local economy and create jobs; and providing a wide range of apprenticeship placements.</p> <p>In support of the Council’s wider employment agenda, analysis undertaken as part of the development of the Fairness and Respect identified that working-age residents aged 19-25 had seen the largest increase in unemployment since the 2008/09 recession. This analysis suggested that additional support needed to be provided to this group of residents in order to reduce their higher rates of unemployment.</p>

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

**PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING
DISABILITIES**

Thank you for the recommendation to Cabinet from the Adult Social Care Select Committee following its meeting on 13th March 2012.

I note the Select Committee's endorsement of the PVR of Services for People with Learning Disabilities recommendations, implementation plan and £1.1m investment proposal. I will share this and the Select Committee's thanks for the PVR officer group, specifically the project lead Simon Laker, with the Cabinet at its meeting on 27 March 2012.

Michael Gosling
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health
27 March 2012

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON TUESDAY 24 APRIL 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)	*Mr Tim Hall
*Mrs Mary Angell	Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Helyn Clack (arrived 2.45pm)	*Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr John Furey	*Mr Peter Martin
*Mr Michael Gosling	Mr Tony Samuels

* = Present

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

56/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Hammond and Mr Samuels.

57/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 27 March 2012 (Item 2)

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 March 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

58/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

There were none.

59/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)

Members' Questions.

Two questions had been received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills). The questions and agreed responses are attached as **Appendix 1**.

In response to Mrs Watson's first question, the Leader of the Council read out a press release and this is attached as **Appendix 1A**.

In response to her second question, Mrs Watson said that she would look forward to the Woodfuel policy being presented at a future Cabinet.

60/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)

(a) Localism

The response from the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games was tabled and is attached as **Appendix 2**.

The Leader thanked the Communities Select Committee for its excellent report which demonstrated the Council's commitment to Localism and partnership. He said that he would be asking the Chairman of the Communities Select Committee, together with the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games and relevant officers to work together to drive this agenda forward once the Public Value Review on local committees had reported to Cabinet.

The Chairman of the Communities Select Committee said that he had been disappointed with the written response because it was a significant decision of the task group that more should be done to drive the Localism agenda forward and he wanted their work to be properly considered. However, he welcomed the Leader's suggestion and he acknowledged that there could be some tough challenges ahead.

(b) Championing Parents

The response from the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning was tabled and is attached as **Appendix 3**.

The Chairman of the Education Select Committee was invited to present her committee's report. She said that the task group work had been very intensive and had involved several stakeholder meetings and thanked the Democratic Services officers for their input into the report.

She informed Cabinet that the task group felt that there is no 'one size fits all' definition of what Championing Parents means. However, the Council could make a commitment to 'championing parents' in four distinct ways:

- Providing clear and accessible information and guidance for parents
- Providing enhanced support around the admissions process
- Providing targeted support for parents and carers of vulnerable children
- Listening to and enabling parents to have equal access to information and services

She made reference to the letter to the task group from Michael Gove and said that she would be sending him a copy of the task group's report.

Referring to the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning's response, she requested a meeting with him, together with her Vice-Chairman to ensure that the recommendations moved forward.

In response, the Cabinet Member thanked the task group for their report and confirmed that he would work with the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning to draw up an action plan for the task group's 36 recommendations. He also said that this report complemented the Primary Vision and some of the Directorate's on-going work and hoped that he could work with the service and the select committee to drive this work forward.

Both the Cabinet Member for Children and Families and the Leader made reference to 'Championing Children' and asked that the select committee broaden their brief in future to include vulnerable or disadvantaged children. The Leader stressed the importance of all Members recognising their role as corporate parents to ensure that Looked after Children receive the education they deserve.

Cabinet Members thanked the Chairman of the Education Committee for this report.

(c) Domestic Violence Target

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families confirmed that the Council was taking the issue of domestic violence seriously and confirmed the acceptance of the Communities Select Committee's recommendation.

The response from the Cabinet Member for Community Safety was tabled and is attached as **Appendix 4**.

61/12 PROVISIONAL BUDGET OUTTURN REPORT 2011 - 2012 (Item 6)

The Leader drew attention to the revised report, including Annex A, B and C, tabled at the meeting and also the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendation concerning the Environment and Infrastructure carry forward request, together with the response from him, which is attached as **Appendix 5A and 5B** respectively.

He informed Members that the Council's accounts for the financial year 2011/12 closed on 20 April and that the final outturns would be presented at the next Cabinet meeting on 29 May.

He was pleased to report that the County Council had kept within budget and was currently forecasting an underspend of £4.2m. He also said that services were requesting a further £1.3m of revenue budget to be carried forward into the new financial year 2012/13.

Referring to the capital budget, he reported that savings had been made but that schools and assets data was still being finalised and would be reported to the next Cabinet meeting.

Referring to Annex 3, he said that the Olympics Risk Contingency was incorrectly included in the Children, Schools and Families revenue budget. It

should be within the Customer and Communities revenue budget and would be amended accordingly.

He also proposed the transfer of £11,000 2011/12 uncommitted Member's allocations, Customer and Communities Capital Budget to the Community Improvement Fund together with any further underspend from the 2011/12 Member Allocations, Customer and Communities Revenue Budget. This was agreed and an additional recommendation drafted at the meeting.

Finally, the Leader drew attention to the Council's Debt Management (pages 4/5 , Annex A) and reported that, whilst he was pleased that the overall trend for overdue debt was falling, he would be asking the Chairman of the Finance Task Group (Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee) to examine and consider options for the recovery of every penny that is recoverable.

The Deputy Leader thanked both the Chief Finance Officer and her team for the good financial reporting and the Directorates and the portfolio holders for delivering balanced budgets. The Leader reiterated this and made particular reference to the difficulties of managing the Adult Social Care and Children's Services' Budgets.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the budget monitoring position and interim year end outturn (Annex A, paragraph 1) be noted.
- (2) That government grant changes be reflected in directorate budgets; (Annex B).
- (3) That the carry forward of a further £1.3m of revenue budget to 2012/13, and £16.9m of capital (Annex C) be approved.
- (4) That further capital budget carry forward requests be reviewed on 29 May 2012.
- (5) That the transfer of £11,000 2011/12 uncommitted Member's Allocations, Customer and Communities Capital Budget are transferred to the Community Improvement Fund together with any further underspend from the 2011/12 Member Allocations, Customer and Communities Revenue Budget 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.

62/12 2011/12 QUARTER 4 BUSINESS REPORT (Item 7)

The Deputy Leader drew Cabinet's attention to the Surrey Resident's Survey results – the best since the survey began in 2008 and set out in Annex 1 of the report. He informed Members of the different methods for customer engagement with a significant rise in public engagement via social media (Surrey Matters e-newsletter, Surrey Matters Twitter account, Surrey News Twitter account and the Digital Press Office). He also highlighted other key customer indicators, namely the contact centre's satisfaction rate of 95% and the improved complaints performance across Directorates.

He drew attention to the Leadership Risk Register (Annex 3) and was pleased to report that, since the last quarter, L12 – Learners with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities budget transfer risk had been removed from the Leadership Risk Register.

Finally, he informed Members that the Council's existing Quality Management Framework had been refreshed in line with the new Corporate Strategy and was attached as Annex 5.

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

- By working in partnerships, Procurement had delivered £34m of cashable savings.
- Despite pressures in Adult Social Care and Children's Services, the services had managed to achieve a net reduction in staff.
- Reducing CO2 emissions – it was hoped that the Energy Task Group would bring the performance back on track for 2012/13.
- Adult Social Care – many teams are now co-terminous with colleagues in Districts and Boroughs and they are working well together to improve services for their clients.
- It was acknowledged that sickness rates for Adult Social Care front line staff would be higher due to the circumstances of their work.
- The percentage of highway schemes being completed had increased.
- The successful completion of a campaign to encourage employers to create 200 apprentice places across the county in 100 days, of which 10% were Looked After Children from Surrey.
- The indicators concerning Child Protection Plans were now green. However, the number of Looked After Children completing a health and dental check was still an area for improvement, although there had been improvements since last year.
- Work was on-going to improve the income generated in the Customers and Communities Directorate.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Council-wide outturn on customer feedback, finance, workforce and performance be noted.
- (2) That the Leadership Risk Register (Annex 3) be noted.
- (3) That remedial action underway in Directorates be noted and consider if any further actions are required.
- (4) That the measures (Annex 4) that will be included in the 2012/13 Business Report Scorecard to track progress against the priorities set out in the *One County One Team* Corporate Strategy be approved.
- (5) That the refreshed One County One Team Quality Management Framework (Annex 5) be approved.

Reasons for decisions:

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

63/12 WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY ACTION PLAN (Item 8)

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment began by informing Cabinet that legislation and Surrey County Council's Plan for Waste Management had been endorsed by Cabinet in 2010 and that he considered it was now timely for a review of the current action plan.

He said that there had been impressive improvements to targets and the reduction in waste to landfill had resulted in significant savings on landfill tax. He also considered that a 70% recycling rate at Community Recycling Centres by 2013/14 was achievable.

He hoped that the Surrey Waste Partnership would continue to deliver more efficiencies and savings and that delivery of this strategy would be further enhanced by the Council's work with the South East 7 group of authorities. Finally, he expressed thanks to all officers involved in the Waste Partnership arrangements.

The Leader acknowledged the achievements to date and requested that the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment write to the Surrey Waste Partnership Strategic Members Group. He also informed Cabinet that the Chief Executive would be leading on joint work on waste with the South East 7 group of authorities, with colleagues from Kent County Council.

RESOLVED:

That the attached Waste Disposal Authority Action Plan outlining how Surrey County Council will deliver its commitment to Surrey's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy – A Plan for Waste Management – through to 2014 be approved.

Reasons for decisions:

The proposed Waste Disposal Authority Action Plan is an update of the County Council's current action plan approved by the Cabinet on 2 February 2010 and covers the period 2012-14.

The action plan supports more effective joint working with Surrey's district and borough councils in delivering Surrey's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy - A Plan for Waste Management, 2010.

The delivery of this strategy is further enhanced by our work with the South East 7 group of authorities to transform the way that we think about waste.

Effective collaborative working with both Surrey's collection authorities and neighbouring disposal authorities will enable us to maximise the value of

materials, deliver contract efficiencies and achieve cost savings for the Surrey taxpayer.

64/12 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 9)

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

Reason for decision:

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

65/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 10)

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.

66/12 APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACTS FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH JOURNEYS TRANSPORT SERVICES - SURREY (Item 11)

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment said that this report was another example of partnership working and stressed the importance of a multi-supplier Framework Agreement with Surrey County Council and NHS Surrey for this transport contract. He referred to the Personalisation agenda and the common standards now being developed, such as a centralised booking system.

Other Cabinet Members also expressed their support for this initiative. The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games drew attention to pages 18/19 of the Equalities Impact Assessment, which set out the details of the wide range of stakeholders consulted and the analysis and assessment undertaken.

RESOLVED:

That a framework agreement to commence on the 1 October 2012, expiring on 30 September 2016 to the suppliers detailed in Appendix 1 of the submitted report be approved.

Reasons for decisions:

The existing contracts will expire on 30 September 2012. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

67/12 APPOINTMENT OF SUPPLIERS TO A FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF TAXI TRANSPORT IN SURREY (Item 12)

Introducing the report the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment said that the report sought the approval to award a Framework Agreement to recommend suppliers for the provision of taxi transport services for home to school, adult social care and children's taxi transport phase 2 in geographical zones 3,4 and 5. He considered that this framework was the way forward and a good example of joint working. Finally, he commended the work undertaken by officers to achieve this agreement.

The Leader drew attention to the Equality Impact Assessment attached to the report and which clearly demonstrated that equalities issues had been considered. He was also pleased that many local companies were included in the list of suppliers.

RESOLVED:

That a Framework agreement for the provision of taxi transport services across: Runnymede and Spelthorne (zone three); Woking and Surrey Heath (zone four); and Guildford and Waverley (zone five) to the suppliers listed in Appendix 1 of the submitted report be approved.

This will commence on 21 May 2012, expiring on 30 April 2016.

Reasons for decisions:

The existing contracts will expire on 31 July 2012. New routes will be called off from the framework with effect from 21 May 2012, but to maintain service continuity existing contracts will remain in place until the end of the academic year which is 31 July 2012. After this time a full review of all routes will be conducted and placed under the framework. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process. This process has also delivered not only supplier reduction of 210 suppliers but also introduced robust contract management arrangements and an improved service specification.

68/12 REFURBISHMENT OF CONSORT HOUSE, REDHILL (Item 13)

A report requesting urgent approval to approve the arrangements for the award of a contract for the refurbishment of Consort House was tabled at the meeting. In accordance with Access to Information Rule 6.05(f) (Special

Urgency), the Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed that the decision could not reasonably be deferred as this would cause a delay in the award of the contract which would, in turn, lead to extended delays in a key project to transfer staff into accommodation as part of the 'Making a Difference' initiative. This would require an extension of lease on alternative accommodation at cost to the Council.

In accordance with Select Committee Rule 7.04(o)(ix) the decisions below are not subject to call-in.

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, the Leader introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the award of a contract for the refurbishment of Consort House, to the contractor to be selected as a result of the completed procurement process at a total cost not exceeding the original fit-out budget agreed by Cabinet in June 2011, be approved.
- (2) That the decision to award the contract upon receipt of the outcome of the tender process be delegated to the Strategic Director for Change & Efficiency in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Assets & Regeneration Programmes.

Reasons for decisions:

To ensure the County Council realises the objectives set out in the Consort House Cabinet report in June 2011 and to permit a value for money fit-out of Consort House to suit requirements.

69/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 13)

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, in relation to the approval to award contracts for Surrey County Council Adult Social Care journeys and NHS Surrey non-emergency patient transport services in Surrey (item 11) and the appointment of suppliers to a framework agreement for the provision of taxi transport in Surrey (item 12).

[The meeting closed at 3.20pm]

Chairman

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Member Questions

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

In view of the recent judgment with regard to the Surrey County Council's ongoing expensive High Court battle with library users and residents over "Community Partnered Libraries", will the Leader agree to cut the Council's losses and stop the plans, or is he prepared to face ever increasing costs, not only financially to the Council but also to his political credibility and face a similar backlash to the one his predecessor faced over the ill-conceived on-street parking proposals?

Reply:

A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council

Question (2) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

In an answer to a question from me to the Cabinet on 20 December 2011 regarding the County Council's Woodfuel Policy, the then Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment stated in his answer:

"This would deliver multiple benefits of income generation and wider rural economic development, biodiversity and climate change mitigation."

He concluded his answer with the statement:

"Therefore, as Cabinet Members for Transport and Environment and Change and Efficiency, Helyn Clack and I have requested that current guidance is further developed to propose a clear policy and action plan and we expect to consider it for Cabinet approval early in the new year."

Given the multiple benefits stated by the then Cabinet Member, can the new Cabinet Member for Transport and the Environment state why there are still ongoing delays in coming forward with a policy, and when a policy is going to be presented for approval?

Reply:

I am pleased to inform the Cabinet, of the positive progress that has been made in this area. In particular, in developing a sound evidence base of the wood resource potential from the existing woodlands across Surrey. This has considered not only wood fuel but also higher value timber products, given the importance of encouraging a diverse and stable market. An initial assessment of the wood resource potential has been made and some of the key issues for consideration have been put forward.

Key players in woodland management and wood fuel supply chain, were brought together last week in a workshop at Surrey Sports Park, to review the findings so far and to ensure that the County is considering and responding to the real economic, social and environmental issues that must be balanced. The feedback generated by this event is currently shaping the plan referred to by Mrs Watson and I will be glad to update the Cabinet on the recommendations and proposed business cases, as this work develops.

John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment

Council to take libraries decision again

Posted by [SurreyNews](#) · April 24, 2012

Filed Under [judicial review](#), [surrey county council](#)

Surrey County Council will take a decision on its libraries plans again, following a judicial review.

Earlier this month, Mr Justice Wilkie upheld a technical challenge over a decision to create 10 community-run libraries staffed by volunteers, although he did not criticise the policy itself.

With that in mind, the council has decided to bring the proposal back to a Cabinet meeting on 19 June, when it will consider all the work that has been done to develop a comprehensive training package for volunteers.

In the weeks leading up to that meeting, the council will carry out a further consultation about equalities training for volunteers at community libraries.

Helyn Clack, Surrey County Council's Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games, said: "Our aim all along has been to keep all 52 of Surrey's libraries open while elsewhere in the country branches are closing. Allowing communities to run libraries enables us to do this and it is still the council's policy.

"Although the council had done a lot of work to develop equalities training, the High Court ruled there should have been more detail in the Cabinet's papers about it at the meeting last September, so we are going to take the decision again, with all the information we need about volunteer training.

"A huge amount of work has already gone into ensuring volunteers are properly trained to help all library users. I'm certain that this training would enable volunteers to provide an excellent service. There are a lot people eager to begin running their local library."

The matter was due to go back to court in May as part of the judicial review. However, the council has carefully considered Mr Justice Wilkie's judgement and feels it is not in the best interests of library goers or taxpayers to return to court. The council's lawyers will now work on the wording of a legal agreement, called a consent order, with solicitors acting for the claimants who brought the judicial review against the council.

In his judgement earlier this month, Mr Justice Wilkie did not criticise the proposals for community partnered libraries or the various consultations that have been carried out by the council.

However, he did uphold a technical challenge that the Cabinet should have had more information in front of it about the work that the council had already done to develop equalities training for volunteers when it made its decision in September.

ENDS

CABINET MEMBER RESPONSE TO LOCALISM TASK GROUP REPORT

I would like to thank Steve Cosser and the other members of the Task Group, Eber Kington, Sally Marks and John Orrick for their work on this important subject.

My response to the Task Group recommendations as set out below should be seen against the backdrop of key decisions made by the Council and the Cabinet over the last few months:

- on 7 February 2012 the Council approved the budget and the *One County One Team, Corporate Strategy* which sets out our vision – to be the most effective Council in England by 2017;
- on 27 March 2012 the Cabinet approved the *Medium Term Financial Plan and Directorate Strategies 2012-2017*;
- on 27 March 2012 the Cabinet also approved –
One County One Team, Our Commitment to Public Involvement
One County One Team, Fairness and Respect Strategy 2012-2017

Together these documents set out the strategic direction of the Council for the next five years.

Recommendation 1

A vision is developed, linked to the Corporate Strategy and Vision for 2017, that sets out what Localism means for Surrey

Response: The *One County One Team, Corporate Strategy* sets out the vision to be the most effective Council in England by 2017 and specifically covers localism. The Strategy says:

“Individuals, families and communities across Surrey have different needs and aspirations. To meet these it is crucial we develop new relationships that increase their control over how services are designed and provided. This move to greater localism will develop in different ways. We will stimulate changes by engaging with and listening to residents, moving some decision-making powers and funding to local levels, and being transparent about what we do and how much it costs. “

The quarterly business report also being considered at this Cabinet meeting includes the latest results from the Surrey Residents' Survey. They are the best results ever since the Survey began in 2008 for residents' perceptions of value for money (50%), feeling able to influence decisions affecting the local area (42%) and feeling informed (57%). The level of overall satisfaction with Surrey County Council (69%) is at its highest level since quarter two in 2008/09. 94% of residents continue to be satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live.

Recommendation 2

The brief for Localism within the Cabinet is reviewed with the aim of giving increased emphasis to the policy

Response: As the Portfolio Holder for Community Services and the 2012 Games, which includes this area of work, I am committed to working with Members and officers to ensure localism is given focus in delivering our *One County One Team Corporate Strategy*. My Cabinet colleagues and I fully support this agenda and will work together to ensure it happens in Surrey.

Recommendation 3

That all County Council services be assessed to identify which services or parts of services might be better delivered or significantly influenced more locally.

Response: This is well underway. The County Council is committed to reviewing all of its services and functions through the three- year Public Value Review programme with more local delivery resulting e.g. in the Youth Service or in Adult Social Care where Council staff are co-located locally. The County Council is also working with partners to set up locally based cross service and cross functional teams to deliver the Government's Troubled Families programme.

Recommendation 4

The Surrey Values and Behaviours are linked to the Policy to enable staff to interpret and apply it in their every day work and Localism is embedded into learning and organisational development programmes

Response: The Council's values are at the heart of our desire to make a difference for residents and service users in Surrey. They encourage us to:

- actively *listen* to others and expect to be listened to;
- take *responsibility* in all that we do at work;
- work to inspire *trust* and trust in others; and
- *respect* so we are supportive and inclusive and committed to learning from others.
-

The *One County One Team Corporate Strategy* says

“We will invest in the people who work for Surrey. We will make sure that they have the right equipment, training and development to support their work. This investment will improve our productivity and the quality of the work we do for residents. It will also support a one team culture where we work in a creative and innovative way for the benefit of residents.”

Recommendation 5

The Volunteering Strategy and Commitment to Involvement Strategy take into account the Localism Policy to enable individuals and communities to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the Policy

Response: The Council's *One County One Team, Commitment to Public Involvement*, is aligned to the vision for localism described in the *Corporate Strategy* and makes clear the important role public involvement, openness and transparency play in promoting a more local approach. Work on volunteering is also being aligned with the *One County One Team Corporate Strategy* and all Members have recently been invited to contribute to a survey about the future role of the Surrey Compact.

Recommendation 6

The policy and vision for Localism are shared with Partner Organisations and Key Stakeholders to secure buy-in and participation

Response: The *One County One Team Corporate Strategy* says:

“we will work with our partners in the interests of Surrey. Putting residents’ interests first means setting aside organisational boundaries and traditional roles. We will work with whoever is best placed to help improve services for Surrey residents. This could range from co-designing specific services with residents to formal arrangements with social enterprises or partners such as other councils and the private, voluntary, community and faith sectors”.

We are already working closely with partners for example through SE7 and Surrey First, and will continue to seek further opportunities. Members have a key role to play in this.

Recommendation 7

A more dynamic and fluid form of accountability is developed to cope with the Localism Agenda

Response: I agree clear accountability is essential. *The One County One Team Corporate Strategy* says:

“We will regularly review our progress in implementing this Strategy and will share updates against the key measures and commitments with residents”.

Recommendation 8

The role of local Members as community leaders and champions and the support for them to achieve this should be enhanced by the development and implementation of an e-communication strategy

Response: The commitment to Members in the *One County One Team Corporate Strategy* is to develop and equip us to deliver excellent service, ensuring we have the right equipment, training and development to support our work to improve services for the residents of Surrey. We need to develop new relationships that help residents to increase their control over how services are designed and delivered. This move to greater Localism will develop in different ways in our local areas.

Recommendation 9

The Member Development Steering Group develops a programme to support Members to implement the Localism Policy including induction in the Surrey Values and training in e-communication

Response: I agree. Members are already making good use of the Member Portal and we will include localism in the induction programme for new Members after the 2013 County Council elections.

Recommendation 10

That Local Committees should continue to be developed in a way which:

- **Supports the role of the individual divisional member as community leader;**
- **Maximises the resources available to the Committee for local determination;**
- **Recognises the need for Committees to adopt different approaches and delivery for the differing needs and aspirations for their differing communities;**
- **Ensures effective local support for each Committee.**

Response: The points raised will be fed into the work being carried out as part of the Public Value Review of the Community Partnerships Team which is due to report to the Cabinet in October 2012.

Recommendation 11

Appropriate internal structures (with both senior Member and officer representation) are established to ensure that the Localism Policy is driven forward effectively.

Response: Officers will continue to support the various Member structures in place - Cabinet, Select Committees and Local Committees - to ensure that localism is delivered.

Recommendation 12

Measures of success are developed, with resident input, to assess progress with the implementation of the Localism Agenda

Response: As mentioned in my response to recommendation 1, the Council already has measures in place which track resident satisfaction and perception across a number of key areas captured through the quarterly Surrey Residents' Survey. These results, which are reported to the Cabinet and the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee each quarter, include resident satisfaction with the way the Council runs

things, perceived value for money, satisfaction with their neighbourhood as a place to live and most importantly in relation to the localism agenda, how well informed residents feel (about Council services) and the extent to which they feel able to influence decisions affecting their local area. This information is published at a Surrey-wide level but can also be broken down into results for each of the 11 Districts and Boroughs in Surrey.

Helyn Clack

Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games

24 April 2012

CABINET RESPONSE TO EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

REPORT OF THE CHAMPIONING PARENTS TASK GROUP

Recommendation 1: That the Council promotes its vision for education, as stated in the Public Value Review report, to parents.

Response: I welcome this recommendation. The Council is engaging with schools, parents and other partners to develop this vision and plan for children and young people's education and attainment. The "Primary Vision", recently agreed by Primary Schools and the County Council is an important step within this overall process.

Recommendation 2: That the Council defines its strong strategic role in 'Championing Parents' by committing to:

- Provide clear and accessible information and guidance for parents
- Provide enhanced support around the admissions process
- Provide targeted support for parents and carers of vulnerable children
- Listen to and empower parents

Response: Again, I welcome this recommendation. The Council's role in championing parents will be developed through the current work to develop our Children and Young People's Strategy 2012-17. In particular, targeted support for parents and carers of vulnerable children will be reviewed as part of our approach to 'early help' (preventative and early intervention services) currently being led by the Assistant Director for Children's and Safeguarding, and targeted support for parents and carers of disabled children will be reviewed as part of our overall approach to children with disabilities currently being led by the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning. This latter work will include the County Council's response to the SEND Green Paper aimed to provide a more holistic and integrated assessment and service provision for parents and families which is open and transparent to its users. On admissions, we have seen improvements in parental success in obtaining places of choice in both the primary and secondary phases for September 2012, and we will continue to support parents, though noticing that with the proliferation on admissions authorities and distinct admissions policies this process grows ever more complex.

Recommendation 3: That the Council encourages all schools to publish transparent performance data on their websites as well as enhanced information on wider services including after-school clubs, pastoral care and the results of parent surveys.

Response: I broadly welcome this recommendation. I do note that many Surrey parents (and parents nationally) are now well-practised in accessing performance and inspection data from the DFE and Ofsted websites, so there it is open to question whether this will add to the total knowledge in circulation, but schools would be wise to frame their national results in their own way. The Council will encourage

schools to carry out this recommendation by continuing to develop effective working relationships through the four strong education teams, each led by an area education officer, and through our collaboration with Babcock 4S.

Recommendation 4: That the Education Select Committee produces a report to full Council after its annual scrutiny of school performance, and that this is made available to parents via publication on the Surrey County Council website.

Response: I would prefer officers to prepare an annual report on school performance to be considered by both the Select Committee and the Cabinet. I would be anxious if there were different reports circulating each of which bore the imprimatur of Surrey County Council. But I would welcome an annual report.

Recommendation 5: That the Chairman of Education Select Committee writes to Ofsted detailing the Task Group's concerns regarding Parent View and requesting that the impact of this website is monitored going forward.

Response: I think this would be very helpful.

Recommendation 6: That the Council considers ways to ensure that existing guidance and information produced by the Family Information Service is accessible for parents and utilised by professionals working with families. This should include:

- A review of where FIS publications sit on the public website (for example, include the 'Thinking About School' document on the page for admissions, rather than simply the FIS area where parents may not think to look for it if they do not know it exists).
- Request that schools include a link to the FIS page on their websites – recognising that school sites are the first port of call for parents looking for information.
- Consider a communications campaign both internally and with key partners to ensure that officers (particularly those working with hard-to-reach groups) are aware of existing information and guidance that they can signpost parents to.

Response: I support this recommendation. The EYCS will continue to review the information held on the website and, in particular, that held within the Family Information Directory, to enable greater levels of access and ease of access for parents and professionals. A review will be undertaken as to where FIS publications sit on the public website and how these can be accessed from other parts of the SCC website and school websites. Discussion with the FIS team will be needed to ascertain an appropriate timeframe for this. The EYCS is working with Babcock 4S to establish Family Communication Champions in schools to raise parents' awareness of the information held on the website. The EYCS will consider a wider communication campaign and report to the Select Committee on progress and action.

Recommendation 7: That the Annual Report to the Adjudicator regarding admissions be submitted to the Education Select Committee for scrutiny, following

consideration by the Admissions Forum.

Response: I am happy to support this.

Recommendation 8: That the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning and the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning respond to concerns raised about schools not following the spirit of the School Admissions Code and published admissions arrangements.

Response: I welcome this recommendation. It may be appropriate to seek further guidance for local authorities on how best to challenge unlawful or unfair practices, as current guidance is weak.

Recommendation 9: That the Schools and Learning Service ensure that all admissions information is provided in plain English and seeks the Crystal Mark for its admissions publications.

Response: I am happy to agree this recommendation. We all want admissions publications to be as accessible as possible, given the complexity of the processes.

Recommendation 10: That the Schools and Learning Service review the best practice support with the admissions process provided by some Children's Centres and FIS outreach workers and assesses the viability of replicating this model across Surrey for the next admissions cycle.

Response: Within existing resources, the Early Years Service will consider looking to existing support workers to cover support on admissions, targeting those who most find the process difficult. This will include joint work with the (schools) admissions team if that is helpful.

Recommendation 11: That the Schools and Learning Service analyse late applications to identify if there are any particular trouble spots and reports to the Education Select Committee on its findings.

Response: I am happy to agree.

Recommendation 12: That the Schools and Learning Service reviews its support to parents from hard-to-reach groups when they seek in-year access to schools. The review of the Fair Access Protocol, carried out annually by the Admissions Forum, should be brought to the Education Select Committee for scrutiny.

Response: This recommendation is somewhat problematic as regards setting processes for in-year admissions for schools and parents in 2013, because, from 2013, in-year admissions will be passed back to the admission authority for each school to process. Many schools will therefore now receive applications directly from parents. This should be considered as part of the work currently being taken forward

to develop our approach to early help.

Education Select Committee scrutiny of the Fair Access Protocol may help to strengthen the role of the Admissions Forum.

Recommendation 13: That the Schools and Learning Service recognises the short timeframe available for responses following the offer of primary school places in April, and continues to offer effective and timely support during this critical period.

Response: The service is all too aware of the short period involved and will continue to offer this support.

Recommendation 14: That the Council promotes the value of Children's Centres in targeting hard to reach groups and playing a vital role in children's early education and that the Education Select Committee (with the Children & Families Select Committee) scrutinise this area within the next year to ensure that efficiencies do not have an adverse impact on hard to reach groups.

Response: Within the existing service plans set out in the PVR, I welcome this recommendation. It could also be considered as part of the work being taken forward to develop our approach to early help.

Recommendation 15: That the Council and Phase Councils should emphasise the importance of the Home School Link Worker role and the difference it can make to families in Surrey.

Recommendation 16: That the Council should consider developing a vision for the role of Home School Link Workers, and that the Education Select Committee reviews with schools how it is working going forward.

Response to 15 and 16: There has been much praise for the work undertaken by Home School Link Workers in recent years, as well as concerns that as staff employed by individual schools and confederations, there is some potential for lack of consistency. Phase 2 of the Review of the Schools and Learning Service will include a proposal to establish a lead role for overseeing the work of Home School Link Workers within each Area Education Team (following on from the work of the current Parent Support Advisory Team). These recommendations will also be considered as part of the work to develop our approach to early help.

Recommendation 17: That the Council considers whether volunteers and/or Parents Champions could support Home School Link Workers in a network.

Response: Although I am generally keen to make use of voluntary support, this recommendation will need to be carefully considered. Increasingly much of the work of the HSLW involves working with targeted families with children at the edge of the social care threshold and forms part of the children's workforce in securing safeguarding. In this context there need to be clear boundaries set around work and activities that can be undertaken by volunteers as opposed to paid professionals.

Recommendation 18: That the Council supports a consistent approach to the training of Home School Link Workers across the county, following on from the work of the Parent Support Advisory Team.

Response: I support this recommendation, although all our staffing issues need to be considered within the overall framework of budget pressures.

Recommendation 19: That the Council reinforces the message that the Pupil Premium should be used to directly benefit those children that it is intended for, and provides guidelines for where it might best be directed.

Response: I am very happy to enforce the message, although I recognise that schools have the freedom to use various means to achieve the end in question. I think it is also fair to note that although pupil premium funding has notionally expanded, other changes in the national financial regime are likely to mean that many schools serving more disadvantaged communities in Surrey are likely to receive less funding in future years.

Recommendation 20: That the Education Select Committee scrutinises how schools are using the Pupil Premium, and how it relates to attainment and progress, on an annual basis.

Response: I think it would be very helpful for the Select Committee to look at how schools address the needs of their disadvantaged pupils, both from pupil premium and within overall funding. I believe this could be achieved without imposing additional reporting requirements on schools, which I think is an important consideration.

Recommendation 21: That the Council does more to promote the Partnership With Parents Service. Specific measures could include:

- Ensuring that all parents are made aware of PWP as a matter of course when their child goes for a SEN assessment.
- Encourage schools to include information on PWP as part of their induction information for parents, and in their complaints procedures.

Recommendation 22: That the Council recognises the value of Family Voice as a vehicle for parental engagement and gives consideration to whether it can facilitate further local groups for parents of children with SEN.

Response 21 and 22: I broadly welcome these recommendations. PWP and groups representing the views of parents will be key partners in developing a new approach to SEN service delivery in line with the SEND Green Paper.

Recommendation 23: That the Council finds examples of best practice in specific

schools of supporting Looked After Children and ensures that this learning is disseminated across the county.

Response: I welcome this recommendation and the role of the Virtual School will be key to its implementation. Designated Teachers for Children in Care are the 'field force' of the Virtual School and it is a statutory requirement that they are supported and trained by staff in the school, who are then well placed to identify best practice and encourage peer modelling across the local authority.

Annual Conferences for Designated Teachers have become a forum for networking for this group, in addition to providing a programme to support and respond to their training needs. On these occasions best practice is identified and discussed and colleagues take their new strategies back into their schools across the County.

The Virtual School staff will support the implementation of this recommendation, by identifying schools that excel in their support for children and young people in care.

Recommendation 24: That the Council, through the Education Select Committee and the Children and Families Select Committee, scrutinises procedures for seeking appropriate admissions for Looked After Children and looks at ways to increase our support in this area, as part of the Council's corporate parenting responsibility within Surrey's education system.

Response: I welcome this recommendation. The Virtual School team would welcome the support of both Select Committees to continue to develop best practice around admissions, across phases and sectors, for children and young people in care in Surrey. Currently, we are in the final stages of agreeing a 'Protocol for Admission of Children in Care' with the Admissions Team and are keen to promote this with schools and other education settings. We have agreed that we need to scrutinise the timescale of 20 school days in which admission of children and young people in care should take place, and report upon our performance in this regard. The support from Committee Members in terms of advocacy for our pupils, and their admission would be invaluable. There are particular concerns for pupils entering care, or returning to Surrey in Years 10 and 11 in terms of their admission, and we would value support to encourage schools to work with us in acknowledging that these young people need immediate responses in order to avoid disruption to their learning and future outcomes.

Recommendation 25: That the Council includes mandatory training for all foster carers on education and admissions as part of its training programme.

Response: I can confirm that it is mandatory for foster carers to show evidence of learning about and promoting educational attainment as part of their achievement of the Foster care standards. All foster carers are expected to work towards achieving the foster care standards and as part of this they complete a work programme that includes both training and evidencing application of learning through examples of work. As part of this award, foster carers will need to evidence that they have shown understanding and awareness of how to promote educational potential. Through the foster carer reviews there is a monitoring process in place to review what training carers have undertaken. In terms of a specific Surrey based coverage of education and admissions, the Foster Carers' Handbook has recently been revised and now includes a substantial section on 'Education' written by members of the Virtual School Team. In addition, specific training can be provided in conjunction with the Virtual

School, who are equipped and prepared to deliver training in a variety of formats on a variety of topics including admissions, key stage expectations, special educational needs, understanding attachment issues and their impact on learning and behaviour, management of behaviour, transitions, home activities to support education, financial capability and many more. They seek opportunities to positively engage with foster carers wherever possible. This engagement forms part of the on-going development of a tailored and effective approach to training for carers.

Recommendation 26: That the Education Select Committee monitors and communicates any clarification by the Department for Education of the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders within the education system.

Response: I welcome this recommendation.

Recommendation 27: That the Schools and Learning Service clarifies its policy with regard to Free Schools.

Response: I welcome this recommendation. The standing position on Free Schools is that the County Council welcomes and supports the development of these schools where they are likely to deliver high quality education and where their creation meets a rising need for pupil places within the county, but has concerns if the development of additional provision above the level of need where this may cause either existing provision or the new free school to function inefficiently or fail.

Recommendation 28: That the Schools and Learning Service develop and promote a toolkit that addresses how the Service will engage with Free School proposer groups, while focussing on the Directorate aim that every Surrey child will be allocated a school place at a good school that supports them to meet their potential.

Response: I welcome this recommendation. Outlining expectations early on in the process could ensure that there is maximum engagement between the County Council and the school proposer groups and so relationships can be developed early on. We regret that the duties on Free School proposers to involve the County Council in their deliberations are not stronger.

Recommendation 29: That the Chairman of the Education Select Committee asks the Secretary of State for Education to clarify the role of the Local Authority as champion of parents in ensuring that genuine local consultation on Free School proposals takes place.

Response: It would be very valuable to have this clarification.

Recommendation 30: That the Schools and Learning Service consider its role in ensuring that local parents are engaged in genuine consultation on Free School proposals and in reporting on this to the Department for Education, and report to Education Select Committee on how this will be addressed.

Response: I welcome this recommendation. Sharing best practice on consultation

processes could help to provide a more standardised approach as well as ensuring sure that all required parties are considered equally in genuine consultations. I do, however, have to emphasise that the County Council does not control these consultation procedures.

Recommendation 31: That the Schools and Learning Service review the fitness for purpose of the Memorandum of Understanding and Data Sharing Protocol being developed with Academy Schools for Surrey Free Schools.

Response: Initial work has been undertaken on this documents and I would very much welcome the conclusion of these discussions. This of course entails the agreement of the Academies and Free Schools as well as the County Council.

Recommendation 32: That the Education Select Committee continues to review the impact of free schools and academies on education delivery in Surrey.

Response: I welcome this recommendation.

Recommendation 33: That the Children, Schools and Families directorate looks into the possible benefits of establishing a forum (both physical and via social media) through which to regularly communicate with parents. This should include reviewing the pilot 'Parent Panel' which is being established at West Sussex County Council.

Response: I am very happy for officers to explore this development.

Recommendation 34: That the Chairman of the Education Select Committee encourages local Members to visit schools in their division on an annual basis as part of their 'democratic mandate' to stand up for the interests of parents and children.

Recommendation 35: That the Chairman of the Education Select Committee prepares a report based on the findings of these visits to present at Council, and ensures that any overarching issues are addressed through the scrutiny process.

Response to 34 and 35: I welcome these recommendations.

Recommendation 36: That as part of the engagement strategy being developed across all Select Committees, the Education Select Committee will look for ways in which to further consider the views of parents in its work.

Response: I welcome this recommendation.

Tim Hall
Cabinet Member for Children and Learning
24 April 2012

APPENDIX 4

CABINET RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

PERFORMANCE AGAINST THE CABINET'S DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TARGET

Select Committee recommendation

The Communities Select Committee recommends that Cabinet reviews the information in the quarterly balanced score card on domestic violence and that the current indicator is replaced with a top level indicator linked to measuring the number of incidents of repeat victimisation and which compares information with that of similar authorities.

Cabinet Response:

I would like to thank the Communities Select Committee for their recent consideration of a report on recent performance against the domestic violence¹ performance indicator. Their critique of the current indicator, their recognition of the seriousness of the effects and impact of domestic abuse on both residents and public services in Surrey and their desire for an effective target to better focus work in this area is most helpful.

I am happy to accept their recommendation to measure the number of incidents of repeat domestic violence victimisation and that this is contextualised by comparing performance against similar authorities.

Kay Hammond
Cabinet Member for Community Safety
24 April 2012

¹ The term 'domestic violence' is used to refer to the criminal classification of this particular crime. Whereas the term 'domestic abuse' is used to refer to a wider set of actions beyond violence including, for example, financial and psychological abuse and control. Domestic abuse is the generic term generally used in Surrey.

COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item under consideration:

BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR DECEMBER 2011 (PERIOD 9)

Date Considered: 15 February 2012

- 1 The Committee considered the budget monitoring report for December 2011 at its meeting in February 2012, which highlighted a projected under-spend of £4.566M against the Environment & Infrastructure capital budget. The report explained the various elements within the capital budget which were expected to be under-spent, which included £0.8M for road maintenance.
- 2 It was noted that £0.6M of the road maintenance budget under-spend related to surface dressing schemes, which needed to be undertaken between April and October because of the high risk of failure at other times of the year. The under-spend was a result of the change to the highways contractor last year, which meant that the period available for carrying out surface dressing schemes was limited to June to October. Other projected under-spends included on-street parking schemes, economic regeneration and Walton Bridge.
- 3 The Committee was keen to ensure that all the schemes in the existing Environment & Infrastructure capital budget should be protected, and it was agreed that the projected under-spends should be carried forward to the 2012/2013 financial year. This position was confirmed by the Committee at its meeting in April 2012.

The Select Committee therefore recommends to Cabinet:

That the entire Environment & Infrastructure capital budget under-spend be carried forward for 2012/13.

Mr Mel Few
Chairman OF Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR DECEMBER 2011 (PERIOD 9)

Select Committee recommendation:

That the entire Environment and Infrastructure capital budget under-spend be carried forward for 2012/13.

Cabinet Response:

I, as Leader, and the Cabinet are fully aware of the reasons for the delays in highways maintenance and other capital schemes, and of the need for these to be completed. The Cabinet will fully endorse the carry forward of the Environment & Infrastructure capital budget to the new financial year.

**David Hodge
Council Leader
24 April 2012**