

## MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 15 October 2012.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON TUESDAY 24 JULY 2012 AT 2.00PM  
AT COUNTY HALL**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Mary Angell	*Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr John Furey	Mr Peter Martin
Mr Michael Gosling	Mr Tony Samuels

\* = Present

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

**96/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item 1)**

There were apologies from Mr Martin, Mr Gosling and Mr Samuels.

**97/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 19 June 2012 (Item 2)**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**98/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

There were none.

**99/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS (Item 4)**

**Petition – Epsom Phab**

A petition was presented by Ms Zoe Giles, on behalf of Epsom Phab Youth Club, calling on the council to provide a suitable meeting place for Epsom Phab to ensure that it could continue. A response from the Cabinet Member for Community Safety is attached as **Appendix 1**.

**Questions from Members**

One Member question was received from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills). A response is attached as **Appendix 2**.

**Public Questions**

Six public questions were presented to the meeting as attached at **Appendix 3**. Five supplementary questions, as summarised below, were asked relating to the community partnered libraries proposals to be considered at the meeting:

- Ms Sue O'Connell asked why a member of staff could not be permanently retained in community partnered libraries to provide ongoing support.
- Mr Adi Screwvala asked a question about the community partnered library model being proposed.
- Mr Michael Alsop asked a question about training arrangements for volunteers as part of the community partnered libraries proposals.
- Mr Lee Godfrey asked whether the proposals for community partnered libraries were out of proportion to the problem.
- Mrs Jenny Meineck asked a question about cost savings to be made as part of the community partnered libraries proposals and whether the community partnered agreements should be revised to remove cost savings as a measure of success.

The Chairman advised that it would not be possible to give answers to the questions relating to the Community Partnered Libraries item, which was to be considered later on the agenda, until the Cabinet had reached a decision on that item. It would therefore not be appropriate for the Cabinet Members to attempt to answer the questions prior to the discussion on that item taking place. It was therefore agreed that written responses to questions 2-6 and the supplementary questions asked at the meeting would be sent to the questioners. These responses are included in **Appendix 3 to these Minutes**.

#### **Petition – Library Service**

A petition was presented by Jenny Meineck on behalf of Gary Green of Surrey Libraries Action Movement in relation to Surrey Libraries. It was agreed that a written response would be sent to the lead petitioner. The response to the petition is attached at **Appendix 4 to these Minutes**

#### **Member Motion referred by Council**

Mrs Jan Mason addressed the Cabinet on the following motion referred from the meeting of Council on 17 July 2012:

‘The Council calls upon the Cabinet to review its current Community Partnership Library policy so as to develop a more widely supported alternative.’

The response to this motion was considered as part of the discussion on Public Value Review: Surrey Library Service – Community Partnered Libraries (minute reference: 100/12).

[Note: the agenda was reordered to consider the Public Value Review: Surrey Library Service – Community Partnered Libraries prior to the Select Committee reports]

## **100/12 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW: SURREY LIBRARY SERVICE – COMMUNITY PARTNERED LIBRARIES (Item 6)**

With the agreement of the Chairman, Mr Nick Harrison (Banstead West) and Mr Geoff Marlow (The Byfleets) addressed the Cabinet on the arrangements for community partnerships prior to their consideration of the proposals.

The Chairman introduced a detailed discussion on the item. It was noted that many different models were being used and explored across the country for the provision of library services and that, prior to any decision, the Cabinet would need to be satisfied on key questions to ensure that the proposals were right for Surrey.

The issue of community partnered libraries had returned to the Cabinet for a further decision following the outcome of a judicial review of the decision previously taken on this matter. Whilst the review judgment did not criticise the policy generally, it had found that specific awareness of equalities training issues for volunteers needed to have been demonstrated more clearly at the decision making stage., Additional consultation had been carried out and the Cabinet would reconsider the issues involved before making a final decision.

During detailed questioning and debate on the proposals, the following points were made:

- The judge had not made any criticism of the original consultation. The additional consultation was felt to be adequate, particularly with regard to giving consideration to protected characteristics as set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act, and had received a reasonably good response. The consultation had involved asking people how they might be affected and the responses received would be taken on board. The further equality impact assessment carried out would inform any training offered.
- The postponement of the implementation of the policy due to the judicial review process had meant that savings originally predicted for the current year would not be achieved. Community partnered libraries would create savings in the longer term, which may in turn be reinvested back into the service, however the main financial benefit was to be seen in terms of sustainability. The libraries identified for community partnering were serving less than 6% of the county's library users and usage had been in decline. The Public Value Review of the Library Service had identified these libraries as not being sustainable. Whilst other authorities had targeted similar libraries for closure given the pressures on public finances, Surrey had developed a policy with the intention of both retaining these libraries and setting them free to serve the community better.
- Volunteers interested in being involved in community partnered libraries had already expressed their interest in extending hours, including opening on Sundays. At present, library branches could only remain open when paid staff were present. The low usage and cost of maintaining staff in small libraries meant that such libraries could only presently be open for shortened hours. The additional cost of extending hours for libraries with such low usage by utilising paid staff could not be considered an effective use of taxpayers' money. Suggestions that paid staff be available alongside volunteers would not address this concern.

- The proposals contained a commitment to provide community partnered libraries with paid staff support for 20% of their opening hours. This would include support for opening, book recommendations to users and ongoing engagement training. This support would be available to those community libraries that needed it until they were fully sustainable and fulfilling their roles. This was noted to be a good offer that had not been available when the matter was reported to Cabinet last September.
- The high quality and skills of potential volunteers who had already come forward was noted. Submissions in support of moving forward on the proposals from volunteers associated with Virginia Waters, Byfleet and New Haw libraries were acknowledged.
- Details of training for volunteers and how the training would be cascaded were set out in the report. It was noted that this was a more detailed description of the training than previously considered and that additional measures had been proposed to ensure full consideration of equalities issues, including an understanding of protected characteristics. It was noted that initial training was critical and the quality of training and support provided would ensure that this was cascaded. Whilst addressing the duties under the law, the training arrangements also recognised that volunteers know and understand their community and that training would need to keep pace with changing communities.
- The Cabinet considered and debated in detail the recommendations and action plan set out in sections 10 and 11 of the Equalities Impact Assessment attached to the report. It was agreed that officers be instructed to ensure that the equalities recommendations be implemented in full with regards to recruitment, training and access for the community.
- The wider community benefits of the proposals were also debated. Many of the volunteers who had come forward to help run their local libraries had been passionate about improving the range of services provided. Residents should be supported in providing local innovation and utilising the existing resource.
- The proposals were confirmed as remaining compliant with the council's duty under the Public Libraries and Museums Act. It was noted that the shape of the library service was constantly evolving, with many choosing to use online services via virtual libraries.
- The positives of the proposals were recognised as well as some potential negatives. Where there was the possibility of impact on different groups, the scope of this had been fully considered in the Equality Impact Assessment and mitigation proposed.

Following a lengthy examination of the issues involved, the Cabinet Members agreed that the points which had been raised by Members, the petition, the public questions and during the course of the debate had been addressed.

It was therefore AGREED that, having considered the subject matter, the motion referred from the Council meeting on 17 July 2012 was lost and this would be reported back to the next Council meeting.

**Cabinet then RESOLVED:**

Having taken account of all matters identified in the report, including the results of the consultation exercises, the Equality Impact Assessment, and

the petition, the discussions and representations at the meeting, the Cabinet confirmed:

- (1) That the recommendation of the Public Value Review to establish Community Partnership Libraries at the ten locations of Bagshot, Bramley, Byfleet, Ewell Court, Lingfield, New Haw, Stoneleigh, Tattenhams, Virginia Water and Warlingham be implemented to ensure a sustainable future for those libraries based on the SCC model.
- (2) That the implementation of the Community Partnership Libraries takes account of the revised timetable as set out in the submitted report for successful implementation. Cabinet will receive a further progress report in September 2013.
- (3) Endorsement of the training programme for volunteers including the Equalities and Diversity training concerning individuals with protected characteristics, and specifically requires officers to ensure that recommendations under section 10 and 11 of the EIA are implemented to ensure full access to the community partnered libraries.
- (4) That the next meeting of the Council be advised that, following debate on the motion referred by the Council at its meeting on 17 July 2012, the motion was lost.

**Reason for decisions:**

The Surrey offer of community partnership is a strong offer which provides a strategic solution to libraries which are on the margins of sustainability, improving their cost effectiveness and empowering communities to take control of, shape and develop their local libraries. While communities see this as a challenge, there has been a positive response to taking this task on board by the steering groups and their supporting volunteers. The experience gained through Byfleet has been invaluable in providing a testing ground for training and procedures and demonstrates this is a workable strategy. The ideas commitment and enthusiasm put forward by volunteers in all the communities demonstrates that there is the needed energy and creativity present to enable these libraries to remain open through partnership.

In working on developing this strategy the County Council has taken account of feedback received and results of the various consultation exercises and although some negative impacts have been identified, on balance keeping these libraries open through partnership, combined with ongoing training and support to the volunteers, will meet the overall concern of the public that their libraries should not close.

**101/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND ANY OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL (Item 5)**

**(a) IMT Project Rollout update**

A response to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee was agreed and is attached as **Appendix 5**.

**(b) Water Management**

A response to the Environment and Transport Select Committee was agreed and is attached as **Appendix 6**.

**(c) Interim Report of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Task Group**

A response to the Environment and Transport Select Committee was agreed and is attached as **Appendix 7**.

**(d) Social Worker Recruitment**

A response to the Children and Families Select Committee was agreed and is attached as **Appendix 8**.

**102/12 LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND (LARGE BID) – SURREY TRAVEL SMART (Item 7)**

Surrey County Council had been awarded £14.304 million from the Department of Transport's Local Sustainable Transport Fund. The Local Sustainable Transport Fund aims to reduce carbon emissions and promote economic growth by encouraging alternative modes of transport to the private car. The award of £14.304million from the Large Bid fund followed on from Surrey County Council's success in receiving £3.93 million from the Key Component part of the Fund in July 2011.

The funding would be put towards projects such as the planned park and ride scheme in Guildford, the Sheerwater Link Road in Woking and many smaller walking and cycling schemes which would improve existing routes. Delivery of the projects would depend on a shortfall of £1.696 million over the three financial years being made up and schemes would be progressed with partner authorities where appropriate.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the £14.304 million grant funding offer from DfT indicated in Table 2 of the submitted report, subject to the terms and conditions set out in their DfT letter 6 July 2012 be accepted.
- (2) That the additional local contribution of £1.696 million, over the three financial years (2012/13 to 2014/15) be approved in principle, with the detail to be worked out. A number of possible sources of funding have been identified. Where necessary we will seek formal agreement with partners and within the county council's democratic processes to use this funding.
- (3) An Equalities Impact Assessment be carried out as part of the development of each of the transport schemes that underpin the successful project.

- (4) That an Annual draft Programme and Plan be submitted to the Local Committees for Guildford, Woking and Reigate and Banstead detailing schemes for implementation in the respective areas.

**Reason for decisions:**

Agreement to the high level draft Programme and Plan will enable the detail of schemes to be developed and agreement sought with the appropriate Local Committee.

**103/12 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S STRATEGY 2012 – 2017 (Item 8)**

The Children and Young People's Strategy 2012-2017 sets out the Council's ambitions and priorities for Surrey's children and young people over the next five years. It was developed through engagement with elected Members; practitioners from Surrey County Council and partner organisations; parents, and children and young people. The strategy is underpinned by the Lifecourse Outcomes for Children and Young People. This is a new way of thinking about childhood development in Surrey that identifies the outcomes that children and young people should achieve at each stage of their development. This approach is intended to develop a common narrative for aspirations for children and young people in Surrey and, over time, will become a corner piece of the commissioning framework.

The five-year strategy will be delivered, with partners, through three plans. The first of these, the Young People's Employability Plan, was also included on the agenda for the Cabinet meeting (agenda item 9) for consideration and approval. The Health, Wellbeing and Safeguarding Plan and the Education and Achievement Plan would be presented to Cabinet from January 2013 onwards following further engagement and development.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Children and Young People's Strategy 2012-17 and Lifecourse Outcomes as an overarching framework for developing more detailed delivery plans be approved.
- (2) That it be agreed that the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families can sign off any subsequent amendments to the Strategy and Lifecourse Outcomes, provided there are no substantive changes.

**Reason for decisions:**

The Strategy and Lifecourse Outcomes have been developed through wide-ranging consultation, and are broadly supported by those parents, children and young people, Members, officers and external partners who contributed. The Strategy and Lifecourse Outcomes provide a shared vision and priorities for developing coordinated, value-for money services that deliver the best possible outcomes for Surrey's children, young people and families. Their approval by Cabinet will enable the delivery of the proposed priorities, and set a foundation that develops the council's partnership approach and informs shared priorities for children and families.



## 104/12 YOUNG PEOPLE'S EMPLOYABILITY PLAN 2012 -16 (Item 9)

The Young People's Employability Plan for Surrey 2012-2017 sets out the route to full participation in education, training and employment with training for young people aged 16-18. The Plan also addresses the new statutory requirements for raising the participation age to 17 in 2013 and 18 in 2015.

The raising of the participation age would have a significant effect on communities in the future. Full participation will improve outcomes for young people, particularly those groups who are over represented amongst those Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) such as young people with learning difficulties and disabilities, care leavers and young people who have offended.

Free school meal provision would be extended to those eligible Year 12 students, from September 2012, who chose to study at a college rather than a school sixth form. This would be on the basis that sufficient safeguards were put in place to ensure that the entitlement for meals would only apply to those who could be shown to be regularly attending classes. Further consideration would also be given to extending free school meal provision to those eligible Year 13 students from September 2014, in line with the changes to the participation age, however this would be dependent on funding being available.

A response to the Education Select Committee's recommendation was agreed and is attached as Appendix 9 to these Minutes.

### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Young People's Employability Plan 2012-2017 be approved.
- (2) That provision of free school meals from 2012 for all eligible Year 12 students be approved, regardless of whether they study at a school sixth form or college in line with changes to the raising of the participation age.
- (3) That provision of free school meals, subject to the Council's financial planning, from September 2014 for all eligible Year 13 students be considered, regardless of whether they study at a school sixth form or college in line with the raising of the participation age to 18.
- (4) That the Assistant Director for Young People in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Safety be authorised to sign off subsequent amendments to the Employability Plan, provided there are no substantive changes.
- (5) That the response to the recommendations from the Education Select Committee be agreed as set out in **Appendix 9 to these Minutes**.

### **Reason for decisions:**

The plan addresses new statutory requirements for Surrey County Council and sets out the approach to achieve full participation of young people aged 16-18 in education, training and employment.

**105/12 BUDGET MONITORING FORECAST 2012/13 (PERIOD ENDING JUNE 2012) (Item 10)**

The Cabinet considered the monitoring report covering the first quarter of the financial year. In setting the 2012/13 budget and the five year Medium Term Financial Plan, a challenging savings target of £71.1 million had been set. At the end of the first quarter some new budget pressures had emerged, particularly in regard to child protection. These pressures had contributed to a forecast overspending of £1.8m on service budgets. A risk contingency provision of £9m, which the council had established as part of its sound and robust budget planning, would be used in part to off-set the forecasted service overspending from the increase in child protection cases.

The net forecast underspending was noted to be -£0.4m, or 0.03% of the total budget. The capital budget was at an early stage of the year and, by its nature, included a number of uncertainties on timings and costs. The current forecast for the year was broadly in line with the budget. The council was also on target to achieve £69.5m of efficiencies in the Medium Term Financial Plan, although £5.2m of these were noted to be at risk and would continue to be monitored closely. The council's outstanding debt had continued its downward trend for both care and non-care categories.

The Chairman noted that the targets which had been set were challenging and that child protection issues were a serious concern. Staffing levels were noted to be within an acceptable range for a healthy organisation and it was agreed that a baseline figures should be included for comparison in future staffing cost reporting. Savings would become more difficult as time went on and robust monitoring would continue on a monthly basis. The county council, together with the district and borough councils, would be submitting an 'expression of interest' in business rates pooling to the Government. It was noted that this did not commit any of the parties at this stage but would allow further work to take place to assess the potential benefits. It was anticipated that a report on this matter would be discussed with the Surrey Leaders Group before a further report setting out any proposals was brought to Cabinet in October 2012.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety welcomed the investment of the Fire Capital Grant of £1.5m towards the funding of the ongoing Fire Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Programme.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the projected revenue budget (Annex – Section 1 of the submitted report) and the capital programme direction (Section 2 of the submitted report) be noted.
- (2) That the first quarter other financial information (Annex – Section 4 of the submitted report) and treasury position (Section 4 of the submitted report) be noted.
- (3) That the transfer of the remaining 2011/12 Invest to Save budget of £0.5m to the Investment Renewal Reserve (Section 1 of the submitted report) be approved.

- (4) That the Fire Capital grant (£1.5m) to be contributed to the Fire Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Programme; (Section 2 of the submitted report) be approved.
- (5) That government grant changes be reflected in directorate budgets (Annex – Section 3 of the submitted report).
- (6) That the Deputy Leader's decision on the Growth Fund (£630,000) to transfer the responsibility to manage the fund from Customer and Communities to Environment and Infrastructure; (Section 1 of the submitted report), and the transfer of £0.5m from the New Homes Bonus to Environment and Infrastructure; (Section 1 of the submitted report) be ratified.

**Reason for decisions:**

To comply with the agreed strategy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

**106/12 2012/13 – QUARTERLY BUSINESS REPORT (Item 11)**

The Cabinet considered the latest quarterly business report, measuring progress against the priorities set out in the One County, One Team Corporate Strategy 2012/17. Cabinet Members welcomed the new reporting format which was noted to be clearer and easier to read.

Surrey County Council was performing well with seven out of ten residents currently satisfied with the way the Council runs things. Other key performance measurements included:

- A survey of residents had produced the highest result ever achieved with regard to viewing Surrey as a place to live.
- The work of partners was acknowledged, including the work by May Gurney to achieve all of their Key Performance Indicators.
- Surrey was ready to deliver a safe and successful Olympic Games experience and had received praise in the media about how the county looked. Particular praise was noted to be due to the 2012 Team, Highways and Asset Management staff.
- For the first time, no young people were reported to have been sentenced to custody. This was in part attributable to the work of youth support services in conjunction and partnership with the police.
- Plans to deliver an additional 1,197 required school places for September 2012 were on track to be delivered within time and to budget.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Council-wide outturn on customer feedback, finance, workforce and performance be agreed.
- (2) That the Leadership Risk Register be noted.

**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.

**107/12 PUBLIC SERVICES NETWORK (UNICORN PROCUREMENT) (Item 12)**

The Cabinet considered a report setting out background information to the award of a contract which would be considered in Part 2 of the meeting due to its commercial sensitivity. The contract would enable the provision of a computer network and telephony managed service provision (called UNICORN) for Surrey County Council (SCC) to commence on 13 August 2012. The new arrangement would save a significant amount of money, merging 40 existing networks down to just one, and demonstrated the efficiencies that Surrey achieves through effective procurement processes.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted as a background paper to item 19.

**Reason for decision:**

To note the background information.

**108/12 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL PARTNERSHIP WORKING (Item 13)**

Surrey County Council is committed to working together with Districts & Boroughs to achieve shared objectives. The establishment of a Strategic Partnership Board under a Memorandum of Understanding with Woking Borough Council formalises current arrangements and better enables discussions about local priorities and desired outcomes. The agreement sets out areas of partnership activity that the two councils will focus on in Woking. The Memorandum of Understanding provides a framework for joint activity and would influence the planning and resources in both organisations.

The Chairman noted that partnership working would continue to be the way forward and acknowledged the good work which had been produced through a similar arrangement with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That strategic collaboration with Districts and Boroughs as demonstrated by the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Woking Borough Council be supported.
- (2) That the MoU with Woking Borough Council be endorsed.
- (3) That the Leader or Deputy Leader and two Cabinet Members, to be identified by the Leader of the Council, be appointed to represent the Council on the Strategic Partnership Board, subject to decisions requiring approval of the Council being reported through the Council's existing governance arrangements.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To establish a framework and governance arrangements for partnership activity between Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council.

**109/12 TO APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE THE TRANSPORT COORDINATION CENTRE TO ACT AS THE CENTRALISED BOOKING SERVICE, INCLUDING ASSESSMENT OF ELIGIBILITY FOR NHS SURREY'S NON EMERGENCY PATIENT TRANSPORT SERVICE FROM 1 OCTOBER 2012**

The Cabinet considered an agreement in principle for the council's Transport Coordination Centre to act as the Centralised Booking Service for NHS Surrey's Non-Emergency Patient Transport Services from 1 October 2012. As part of this role, the Transport Coordination Centre would be undertaking an assessment of eligibility for access to Non-Emergency Patient Transport Services. The delivery of the Centralised Booking Service activity would be funded by NHS Surrey.

The Equality Impact Assessment listed a proposed review date of November 2012. Cabinet Members noted that the review might benefit from taking place after six months to enable it to be informed by further information collected.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the principle of the Transport Coordination Centre delivering a Centralised Booking Service, including assessment of eligibility, for access to Non-Emergency Patient Transport Services on behalf of NHS Surrey be approved.
- (2) That a contract for the delivery of Centralised Booking Service be developed in partnership with NHS Surrey, and the responsibility for delivery be delegated to the Strategic Director, Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services for approval by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The Public Value Review of the Transport Coordination Centre considered by Cabinet on 26 October 2010 agreed the implementation of an action plan that included areas for joint Surrey County Council/Primary Care Trust partnership working and areas for joint tendering. The report is the latest stage of that work looking at a one stop shop Centralised Booking Service. A Surrey County Council operated Centralised Booking Service will be able to advise those not eligible for Non-Emergency Patient Transport Services of alternatives available to them. Alternatives might include public transport, community transport and voluntary transport schemes operating in the resident's area. This will add real value to the current Centralised Booking Service function and is supported by customer groups, the aim being to ensure that eligible users are assisted and non eligible residents sign posted to alternatives.

**110/12 LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 15)**

The Leader drew attention to the revised Annex 1 to the report, tabled at the meeting, which included details of the decisions taken by the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning on 19 July 2012.

**RESOLVED** that the decisions taken by the Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as set out in **Appendix 10 to these Minutes**, be noted.

**Reason for decision:**

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

**111/12 SUPERFAST BROADBAND IN SURREY (Item 16)**

Surrey County Council's 'One County, One Team' Corporate Strategy 2012 – 2017 sets out an ambition to ensure that all Surrey's businesses, households and community organisations could gain access to Superfast Broadband.

Whilst some parts of the county are relatively well served by the commercial broadband industry, there are large areas that currently experience speeds well below the national average of 6.7mbps. There is an increasing digital divide in Surrey as BT Openreach expand their Next Generation Access (NGA) broadband network, which will cover approximately 80% of premises. The remaining 20% - approximately 93,000 premises are set to miss out without intervention.

As a result, the County Council entered into a procurement process to select a private sector company to lay the necessary infrastructure in those areas of the county that would otherwise miss out. The results of that process and contract award would be considered by the Cabinet in Part 2 of the meeting due to the commercial sensitivity of the details involved. The council had allocated £20 million capital funding to this project.

The Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendations in relation to Superfast Broadband in Surrey and the response from the Deputy Leader are attached as **Appendix 11 and 12 to these Minutes** respectively. The Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Mr Mel Few (Foxhills and Virginia Water), addressed the Cabinet on the need for appropriate communication with residents and, in particular, to ensure that the benefits to the economy were emphasised.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted as a background paper to agenda item 20.

**Reason for decision:**

To note the background information.

**112/12 PROVISION OF A CARE AND SUPPORT SERVICE AT SQUIRREL LODGE, WOKING (Item 17)**

The Cabinet considered a report setting out background information to the award of a contract which would be considered in Part 2 of the meeting due

to its commercial sensitivity. The contract would enable the provision of an Autism Specialist Personal Care and Support Service at Squirrel Lodge in Woking. The contract would commence on 6 August 2012.

It was noted that the Equality Impact Assessments for this item had been circulated with Part 2 of the agenda. Whilst the documents had been made available on the Council's website, it was agreed that the papers should be considered in public at a Cabinet Member decision making meeting. This would also enable the documents to be updated with the latest information available at that time.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the recommended suppliers (as detailed in item 21) be appointed for the provision of a Personal Care and Support Service at the Council owned Squirrel Lodge.
- (2) That the Equality Impact Assessments be updated and considered by the Cabinet Member for Community Safety at a public decision making meeting at the earliest opportunity.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The recommended supplier submitted the most economically advantageous tender scoring suitably well in both the quality and price elements to obtain a high ranking score. Throughout the procurement process, suppliers have been required to demonstrate their ability to deliver best value to the Council and individuals receiving support.

**113/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Item 18)**

**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.

**114/12 PUBLIC SERVICES NETWORK (UNICORN PROCUREMENT) (Item 19)**

Further to the item considered in Part 1 of the meeting (minute reference: 107/12), the Cabinet considered the award of a contract for the provision of a computer network and telephony managed service provision (called UNICORN) for Surrey County Council (SCC) to commence on 13 August 2012.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) Approval be given to proceed with the award of contract to commence on 13 August 2012 for the provision of a fully managed UNICORN

network and infrastructure for seven years, with an option to extend for five years, to the preferred bidder as set out in paragraph 11 of the Part 2 report to Cabinet.

- (2) Delegation be given to award additions to this contract, with values over £500,000 but less than £1m, to the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency and subject to PRG (Procurement Review Group) review on a case by case basis.
- (3) Approval be given for Capital expenditure in 2012/13 as set out in paragraph 27 of the Part 2 report to Cabinet.
- (4) That the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee be requested to make arrangements to monitor the progress on this matter on a six monthly basis.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The existing Surrey CC contract would expire on 31 March 2013. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendation provides best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

**115/12 SUPERFAST BROADBAND IN SURREY (Item 20)**

Further to the item considered in Part 1 of the meeting (minute reference: 111/12), the Cabinet considered the award a contract for the provision of superfast broadband infrastructure in Surrey. This will enable the Council to discharge its commitment within its Corporate Strategy to provide access to superfast broadband across the county.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) Subject to EU State Aid approval, the award of the Surrey Superfast Broadband contract to the recommended tenderer identified in paragraph 1 of the Part 2 report to Cabinet be approved and a formal agreement be entered into on the basis of that reached through the competitive dialogue process (which closed on 2 May 2012) and the recommended tenderer's final submission of 11 June 2012.
- (2) That the establishment of a Joint Operation Centre (JOC) between Surrey County Council and the successful tenderer be approved for the purpose of implementing this contract as outlined in paragraph 24 of the Part 2 report to Cabinet.
- (3) That 0.6% of premises in the County will fall into the project's infill deployment programme and that due to exceptional costs associated with providing infrastructure to these properties, deployment to these premises will be considered on a case by case basis, with final decision on deployment made by the Project Board in conjunction with the Deputy Leader.



**Reasons for decisions:**

A strong commercial contract that is both state aid compliant and offers a good deal for Surrey had been negotiated. The award of a contract for the provision of superfast broadband infrastructure in Surrey enables the Council to discharge its commitment within its Corporate Strategy to provide access to superfast broadband across the county.

**116/12 PROVISION OF A CARE AND SUPPORT SERVICE AT SQUIRREL LODGE, WOKING (Item 21)**

Further to the item considered in Part 1 of the meeting (minute reference: 112/12), the Cabinet considered the award a contract for the provision of an Autism Specialist Personal Care and Support Service at Squirrel Lodge in Woking. The contract would commence on 6 August 2012.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That a contract be approved, to commence on the 6 August 2012, expiring on 5 August 2017 with an option to extend for a maximum of two further years to the recommended tenderer identified in paragraph 1 of the Part 2 report to Cabinet at the agreed hourly rates in accordance with individuals assessed needs.
- (2) That the Equality Impact Assessments be updated and considered by the Cabinet Member for Community Safety at a public decision making meeting at the earliest opportunity.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To provide best value for money in the provision of a Personal Care and Support Service at the Council owned Squirrel Lodge for the Council and individuals receiving support following a thorough evaluation process.

**117/12 ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ST PETERS WAY, CHERTSEY**

The Cabinet considered potential property transactions in the Chertsey area.

**RESOLVED:** That the acquisition of the land identified in the Part 2 report to Cabinet be approved for the amounts and on the basis recommended.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To acquire land to potentially meet the demand for secondary school places in the area and/or to fulfil in the reconfiguration of current operational assets in the area.

**118/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 23)**

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

- 114/12 Public Services Network (Unicorn Procurement)
- 115/12 Superfast Broadband in Surrey

- 116/12 Provision of a Care and Support Service at Squirrel Lodge, Woking

**[The meeting closed at 5.25pm]**

---

**Chairman**

**Petition – Epsom Phab**

A petition from Ms Zoe Giles of Epsom Phab which has a total of 580 online signatures which states:

'We petition the council to provide a suitable meeting place for Epsom Phab to ensure it carries on.'

**Reply:**

Thank you for the petition that you have presented here today.

I completely understand and recognise the anxiety that you all have about the future of Phab's ability to hold your weekly youth club at Lintons Lane. I also understand the great attachment you have to the building as it has served you so well for many years. Phab plays a vital role for young people every Friday evening and we need to do everything we can to protect the service you provide. We have been working hard with both the freeholder of Lintons and the potential purchaser to have as long a period as possible before all the user groups, including Phab, need to vacate. It is therefore particularly pleasing for me to announce this afternoon that, subject to contract, vacant possession for Lintons will be 31 December 2013. This will give us all much more time to secure alternative venues to ensure the continuation of the important work we all do.

Following the Cabinet Decision made here on 20 December 2011, a working group was set up and I would like to thank Phab for the hardwork you have put into this. I know you have trawled through every building that is available in the Epsom area – some 57 - and have visited many of them to assess whether or not they are suitable. I also know that Surrey County Council space planners and architects have also visited to see how some venues can be made suitable where at first sight they have been turned down. I understand that Phab have not been able to agree that any of these venues are suitable with moderate alterations which is why I am particularly pleased that Nescot, just outside the town centre of Epsom, is willing to continue to discuss how Phab can make use of the planned new facilities for students with learning disabilities.

I can report to Cabinet and to you all that Surrey County Council has recently worked with FE Colleges in Surrey to successfully secure £1.3 million of capital for NESOCOT and £200k capital for East Surrey College - specifically to develop education and training opportunities for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities.

These new facilities at NESOCOT will provide education and training opportunities for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities at the heart of the college, with plans for a flexible learning environment, tailored to their needs, including a cafe and college shop, enabling young people to sell products they have themselves grown in the garden or made in the kitchen. This prepares them with skills and experiences that support their progression to employment. Many of these young people are those will also attend Phab's club on a Friday evening.

Whilst NESOCOT will use these facilities extensively, it is possible for PHAB to have use of the facilities at your current club times. In my view these facilities offer the

best alternative to Lintons and indeed will be far better in many ways, having been specifically developed for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities. I urge PHAB now to work closely with NESCOL so that the future facilities meet their needs. We will do all we can to facilitate the discussions.

Further, I am confirming today that Surrey County Council will finance the provision of an outdoor Multi-Use Games Area, or "MUGA", with floodlighting, subject of course to agreement of location with NESCOL and PHAB and planning permission, through a budget provision of upto £125k. This addresses the remaining specific area that PHAB had identified as not provided in the facilities at NESCOL. These facilities can also be enjoyed for the rest of the week by other users.

I am satisfied that the works at Nescot can be completed in good time for them to be ready by 31 December 2013.

After six months of engagement and another 18 months before vacant possession, I believe it is now reasonable for a member decision to be taken which we will look to do in the next couple of weeks to allow the sale of Lintons to go through and Phab, together with the other user groups, to be successfully relocated to good alternative venues by 31 December 2013.

**Kay Hammond**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Safety**  
**24 July 2012**

**MEMBER'S QUESTION AND RESPONSE**

**To the Cabinet Member for Children and Families**

**Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:**

In your answer to my question on run away children to full council you provided the following statistical answers:

*How many children are known or estimated to have run away from care in Surrey in each of the past three years for which figures are available?*

- 2009/10 42, 9 of whom were unaccompanied asylum seeking children
- 2010/11 23, 5 of whom were unaccompanied asylum seeking children
- 2011/12 28, 7 of whom were unaccompanied asylum seeking children

*How many Surrey children have been placed in care "out of authority" in each of the past 3 years for which figures are available?*

Due to the active numbers of children who are looked after during the year, we use end of reporting year snapshots to assess the numbers of Looked After Children who are in the different types of placements. This is following the lead of the government and the following are the end of year figures submitted to the government through the statutory returns.

*Number of children in non-surrey provision\* at 31 March in each reporting year (number in children's homes and % in brackets):*

2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
293 (32 - 11%)	247 (33 - 13%)	273 (33 - 12%)

*The percentage of all LAC in non-surrey provision:*

2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
37%	33%	34%

\*excludes children placed for adoption, missing and placed with parents.

*How many children placed by Surrey in out of authority placements are known or estimated to have run away from care in each of the past three years for which figures are available?*

2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
20	19	13

A recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request reference 06443 provided the following statistics:

2) How many children have gone missing from the care of your local authority? Please include all types of LA care - foster placements, care homes etc.

2005/2006 = 16

2006/2007 = 10  
2007/2008 = 19  
2008/2009 = 32  
2009/2010 = 16  
2010/2011 = 16  
YTD (31/07/11) = 3

Please note these figures show children that have gone missing at any time during the year. Many of these children subsequently returned to care.

3) How many migrant children have gone missing from the care of your local authority?

2005/2006 = 8  
2006/2007 = 4  
2007/2008 = 13  
2008/2009 = 18  
2009/2010 = 10  
2010/2011 = 3  
YTD (31/07/11) = 2

4) How many children in the care of your local authority are suspected victims of trafficking?

2005/2006 = 1 – Referred via Surrey Police / found in a Cannabis factory / absconded from Foster care within 24 hours (Male)  
2006/2007 = 1 – Same as above (Male)  
2007/2008 = 0  
2008/2009 = 2 – (1) As above (2) As above however did not abscond, placed in foster care, referral to Home Office National Referral Mechanism for trafficking which came back as confirmed as trafficked. Work with young person from children services and NSPCC regarding impact of trafficking and protective behaviours work. (Males)  
2009/2010 = 2 (1) As above for 2005/2006. (1) Eritrean Female, referred via Police, was due to be removed to Italy having unknowingly claimed Asylum there on way to UK. Absconded from our care prior to removal however returned she to our care, she disclosed her situation and claims of trafficking. Referral, as described above, was made however referral resulted in young person not being trafficked.  
2010/2011 = 2 – Referred via Surrey Police / found in a Cannabis factory / absconded from Foster care/Supported lodgings within 24 hours (Male's)  
YTD (31/07/11) = 1 – Referred via local Prison who had concerns that the female of Nigerian nationality was younger than her stated age. Initial investigations by the Asylum Team and Police have highlighted that young person has been trafficked and we are awaiting official confirmation from the Home Office as above.

5) How many children who have gone missing from the care of your local authority are suspected victims of trafficking?

2005/2006 = 1

2006/2007 = 1  
2007/2008 = 0  
2008/2009 = 2  
2009/2010 = 2  
2010/2011 = 2  
YTD (31/07/11) = 2

Could the Cabinet Member please provide information to explain the anomalies between the two sets of statistics?

**Reply:**

The information as set out below details the methodology applied to the questions as asked in the FOI requests. The wording and interpretation of questions within the FOIs are critical to the response and the methodology applied. If the wording is ambiguous then clearly the service has to make a decision about how to interpret what information has been requested.

The service has been through the previous FOI responses 06443 (August 2011) and 05477 (January 2011) to understand the difference between the figures provided at that time, with the information provided to Mrs Watson this week. When answering 06443, a part of the response was based on work that had previously been completed for FOI 05477 - which was a request on a clearly headed document from the All Party Parliamentary Group on Human Trafficking.

**Response to FOI 06443**

When answering FOI 06443 the service was mindful of two aspects;

- A) the original question about missing children was: "How many children have gone missing from the care of your local authority? Please include all types of LA care – foster placements, care homes etc".

The service interpreted this to mean children who started to be missing in the year and so did not include children who had begun to be missing in a previous year and were still missing. There is a sound statistical reason for doing this because it prevents double counting, for example if a child had gone missing in the 09/10 year and was still missing in 10/11 and was included in the figures for both years, it could create the impression that more children were going missing than was actually the case.

- B) the question was specifically about child trafficking in that the applicant stated: "I'm carrying out some research on the prevalence of child trafficking in the south."

When children are recorded as missing there are two choices, which are set out by the government: 'Missing whereabouts known' and 'Missing whereabouts unknown'. Sometimes children will be 'missing' from their placement but the service knows where they are, for example at a boy/girlfriends house and the social worker is in touch with them. This is classed as missing whereabouts known. Where a child has gone missing and it is not known where they have gone they are classed as missing whereabouts unknown, for example if unaccompanied asylum seeking children had gone missing without any known contact address they would fall into this group.

Since the service knew the focus of this FOI request was on children being trafficked it was considered to be more helpful to provide information only on children who were missing and whose whereabouts were unknown.

Therefore the methodology to collate data in this case was as follows:

1. Identify the new instances of children going missing during the year
2. Identify from the above the instances where the child was missing whereabouts unknown.

This gave an answer of 16 young people who went missing in 2009/10.

## **Reply**

The information that was recently provided to Mrs Watson was based on an ongoing piece of work. This work looked at all the children who were missing in the year (including those that had started to be missing in previous years), whose whereabouts were both known and unknown and looked at a range of other factors which included the type of placement from which young people were missing. The purpose is to look at all pertinent factors in their broadest sense.

Therefore the methodology for this internal reporting was as follows:

1. Identify children who were missing at any point during the year (including children who were still missing from previous years).
2. Children were included within this group if they were classed as 'missing whereabouts known' or 'missing whereabouts unknown'.

This gave an answer of 42 young people who were missing in 2009/10

The question from Mrs Watson was not about a specific aspect of missing children and required the number of children 'known or estimated to have run away'. The outcome of this was that the figures provided to Mrs Watson were different from the FOI 06443 which was specifically about children who had the potential to have been trafficked and didn't include children who went missing in previous years.

Neither sets of information are incorrect; different methodologies were applied to meet the requirements of the information requested.

FOI 06443 was answered in August 2011 and some of the information had been provided in an earlier FOI in January 2011. It was reused to ensure consistency in our FOI responses. It is also worth noting that when looking at old data, there is the possibility of some inconsistencies in the results due to the improvements in the quality of the data e.g. an asylum seeking young person originally thought to have been 17 is later discovered to be 18 and the record is corrected.

**Mary Angell**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Families**  
**24 July 2012**



**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

**Question 1 from Mr David Beaman, Farnham, Surrey:**

The planning consent that was given for the Coxbridge Business Park, Farnham was subject to a number of conditions including a Section 106 agreement. This agreement was subject to variation with £300,000 being required to provide a new bus service linking Coxbridge Business Park with Farnham Railway Station and Town Centre to be paid at a rate not exceeding £75,000 per annum for 4 years with the first annual payment being due when 101 people were employed on the site. I understand that the first payment of £75,000 was made to Surrey County Council in October 2010 and the bus service commenced operation in October 2011. The Section 106 agreement also required payment of £37,000 for bus stops and £1,750 for bus stop maintenance.

In relation to this Section 106 agreement I would be grateful to receive information regarding the following viz:

1. Was the provision of a bus service subject to competitive tender?
2. The bus service is operated by Waverley Hoppa - how much subsidy is being provided and is this subsidy being provided on a net or gross cost basis?
3. If the subsidy required for what purpose is any unspent sum from the £75,000 received being used?
4. Have the sums of £37,000 for bus stops and £1,750 for bus stop maintenance been received?
5. If the sums for bus stops and bus stop maintenance have been received how have they been spent?

I look forward to receiving your reply.

**Reply:**

1. A procurement led competitive tendering exercise was carried out. Three transport operators submitted bids and the contract awarded to Waverley Hoppa on the basis of a price/quality assessment.
2. The annualised cost of this contract is approximately £68,500. The contract has been let on a minimum cost basis, with fares revenue being returned to SCC.
3. Any unspent subsidy/fares revenue will be "banked". At the end of the funding period the "banked" funds will be either used to operate the bus for a further period, if necessary, or returned to the developer. This will be subject to discussion.
4. These sums have been received.
5. An initial programme to upgrade the bus stops along West Street, Farnham was carried out during 2011. This provided modern bus stop poles, flags and timetable cases at bus stops on this route section. This phase cost approximately £9,000. A further phase of work will include providing

accessibility improvements at certain bus stops which will assist passengers boarding and alighting from buses, and the installation of passenger waiting shelters.

**John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**  
**24 July 2012**

**Question 2 from Ms Sue O'Connell, Guildford, Surrey:**

Bramley has presented a pragmatic joint paid/volunteer community partnered model that will bring the community along with it, cost SCC almost no more to implement (not that SCC is saving any money anyway) and is sustainable. We were promised an answer on this by the Chief Executive months ago but are yet to receive one. Will SCC adopt this joint model and therefore allow Bramley to move forward with a model that works for both SCC and Bramley?

**Reply:**

As the Leader explained at the Cabinet meeting on 24 July the question which you asked related to the libraries paper which Cabinet were considering later on in the meeting. As part of its discussion the Cabinet gave consideration to the general issue you raised as part of their debate of the item. As the Leader assured you - once Cabinet had reached a decision, a written reply would be sent to each questioner.

The Public Value Review of the Library Service recommended that the County Council maintain a core strategic network of libraries run by the authority and advocated the message of local community empowerment as a means of delivery to allow the Surrey network of 52 libraries to be maintained. Many of the ten libraries now being considered for Community Partnered Library arrangements have been considered for closure in the past, in some cases more than once.

The need to get best public value from the library budgets at these ten libraries was true at the time of the PVR report and remains true now. The CPL initiative saves £381,000pa ( the cost of salaries at the libraries) but the County Council's views on what happens to this savings are changing. At Cabinet we debated our concern that simply putting the cost of staff back into these libraries will not solve the fundamental problem of low levels of use / declining use across these libraries which, though well loved by their residents, who want SCC to keep them open, and well cared for by their staff, are not achieving enough use to continue to be viable in their current form.

Without a change of strategic approach to how we deliver these libraries in these communities, these libraries will consistently find their cost-effectiveness under scrutiny. The community partnership model is the strategic choice business model being adopted by library authorities around the country for securing the future for libraries which are at the margins of sustainability.

The changes proposed by Bramley Parish Council are not seen as small changes as, by making Bramley a satellite of Guildford, the responsibility for the governance of the library remains with SCC which, in our opinion, does not achieve the PVR objective of community partnership in local libraries. We were very encouraged when, at a time when the basic CPL operational model was known, there was an early expression of interest from Bramley Parish Council made at a meeting of the

Local Committee, in taking this initiative forward. The local organisations that we have been working with have show great energy, passion and ideas for improving their local library and for making greater community use of the library buildings outside of library opening hours. Although latterly your group, when it met the Chief Executive, made it clear that your preferred route was not to take responsibility for the library on the basis of the CPL model we had hoped that as a highly regarded council, you would work in partnership with us under this initiative and develop innovative and exemplary community-led arrangements for Bramley library that would be both a great inspiration and source of local civic pride and ensure a secure and sustainable future.

The Surrey offer of community partnership is a strong offer which provides a strategic solution to libraries which are on the margins of sustainability, improving their cost effectiveness and empowering communities to take control of, shape and develop their local libraries. While communities see this as a challenge, there has been a positive response to taking this task on board by the steering groups and their supporting volunteers. The experience gained through Byfleet has been invaluable in providing a testing ground for training and procedures and has demonstrated that this is a workable strategy. The ideas commitment and enthusiasm put forward by volunteers in all the communities demonstrates that there is the needed energy and creativity present to enable these libraries to remain open through partnership.

In working on developing this strategy the County Council has taken account of feedback received and results of the various consultation exercises and although some negative impacts have been identified, keeping these libraries open through partnership, combined with ongoing training and support to the volunteers, will meet the overall concern of the public that their libraries should not close.

**In response to the supplementary question:**

The letter from Bramley Parish Council putting forward a model where Bramley Library became a satellite of Guildford, supported by volunteers, was noted.

As indicated in the Cabinet report, paragraph 6 onwards, SCC has looked at a variety of models, including your proposal. As expressed in the Cabinet report, the news is that this model would not empower the community to manage and develop their library in the way which is needed to make these libraries more viable over the longer term.

The Cabinet report states that, should the CPL initiative be agreed, the plan will be to have all 10 libraries transferred by April 2013, with a review of CPL's reported to Cabinet in September 2013. There are no plans to keep staffing at these libraries longer than necessary in order to achieve the savings on staff salaries which are required, while what happens to these savings is reviewed by SCC as part of the annual budget planning process.

For any library which becomes a community partnered library, the guidance and support from the CPL Support Team will be on-going, and they would be able to advise and guide your volunteer force in the running of the library.

The County Council's intention is to keep all its library network open, by working with communities in partnership in 10 locations, and by keeping the library open, avoid disenfranchising any part of the Bramley community.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**24 July 2012**

**Question 3 from Mr Adi Screwvala, West Byfleet, Surrey:**

Given that there are no financial savings to be made for the Community Partnership Library proposal and that there are difficulties and opposition to its implementation in its present form, will the SCC Cabinet agree to amend its proposal to maintaining at least one paid professional staff member in every library to manage the core library service supported by volunteers to enhance the service? This would result in the best of both worlds making the library service sustainable and have the full support of the Surrey residents.

**Reply:**

As the Leader explained at the Cabinet meeting on 24 July the question which you asked related to the libraries paper which Cabinet were considering later on in the meeting. As part of its discussion the Cabinet gave consideration to the general issue you raised as part of their debate of the item. As the Leader assured you - once Cabinet had reached a decision, a written reply would be sent to each questioner.

The Public Value Review of the Library Service recommended that the County Council maintain a core strategic network of libraries run by the authority and advocated the message of local community empowerment as a means of delivery to allow the Surrey network of 52 libraries to be maintained.

It is our duty, as the guardian of public expenditure, to get best public value from the library budget. If the primary driver for this initiative had been solely about the budget then the imperative would have been for immediate and draconian decisions to make savings by reducing the size of the branch network as urgently as possible. As it is we have sought to find a solution to their viability by engaging the local community in their management and development to increase use, and expand their role in the community. The community partnership model is an arrangement that secures the future for these ten libraries - many of which have been considered for closure in the past, in some cases more than once.

The CPL initiative saves £381,000pa (the cost of salaries at the libraries) but the County Council's views on what happens to this savings are changing. At Cabinet we debated our concern that simply putting money back into these libraries and maintaining at least one paid member of SCC Library staff supported by volunteers in each of these libraries does not achieve the objectives of community partnership in local libraries and will not solve the fundamental problem that without a change of strategic approach to how these libraries are delivered in these communities, they will consistently find their cost-effectiveness under scrutiny.

**In response to the supplementary question:**

The Cabinet report in para 6 onwards refers to a range of models which have been considered. The model of having a paid SCC library manager to run the core service together with volunteers to enhance the service does not provide an effective solution to what needs to be achieved for these libraries.

The fundamental problem of these 10 libraries, which is low levels and/or declining use, reducing their long-term viability, will not be solved by retaining SCC managers. A way of re-energising and changing them is required. Where the responsibility for the governance of the library remains with SCC, it would not achieve the PVR objective of community partnership empowering local communities to take on board the management and development of their libraries.

The Byfleet has a strong steering group and cohort of trained volunteers willing and capable to run the libraries. Due to the judicial review they have had to remain, from the date of the review, under SCC supervision, until the Cabinet decision was known.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**24 July 2012**

**Question 4 from Mr Michael Alsop, West Byfleet, Surrey:**

How are the cabinet going to ensure that the training given to volunteers under the CPL proposals will be sufficient, bearing in mind the comment of the Judge at the Judicial Review of "the bland approach to training"? The concerns relate to the identification of training needs for individual volunteers, which appears to be based on comments made by the general public. Has there been any attempt given to the identification of the training needs of volunteers through a training needs analysis linked to a job description? There is further concern over the delivery of the training through a cascade process using volunteers who themselves are not trainers. How will they be trained as trainers?

**Reply:**

As the Leader explained at the Cabinet meeting on 24 July the question which you asked related to the libraries paper which Cabinet were considering later on in the meeting. As part of its discussion the Cabinet gave consideration to the general issue you raised as part of their debate of the item. As the Leader assured you - once Cabinet had reached a decision, a written reply would be sent to each questioner.

Experienced staff within the CPL support team and library service looked at the outputs achieved by staff and to be achieved by volunteers, operational, behavioural and legislative, and drew up detailed training plans and materials in for use by the support team and volunteer groups based on identified needs.

The joint responsibility of the partners for training is enshrined in the MOU and KPIs which are monitored monthly by a meeting between support team lead and steering group lead. Customer feedback and satisfaction levels are also included in the regular monitoring.

At a higher level quarterly reviews are undertaken of Cabinet indicators, which include a CPL indicator, which is reported to Cabinet. This includes a review of each CPL, if a review is unsatisfactory this will merit explanation and trigger a remedial action programme if needed.

The identification of training needs for volunteers has been informed by consultations and discussions outlined in the report and also by the results of the postal consultation exercise undertaken with registered members of the 10 CPLs during May and June.

The consultation was designed to provide specific information about the development of equities training planned for volunteers at these libraries and obtain views for users about the impact on the various equalities characteristics of the proposed CPL changes.

The major volume of training needed is operational and is delivered on site live with library users via the CPL support team and then by trained volunteers. Where cascade training- classroom sessions fully supported by a range of learning materials and the website is carried out by volunteers it is monitored and supported by the CPL team on an ongoing basis. It has been piloted at Virginia Water with evaluation and follow up support and has been well carried out and well received.

The training materials range provided, also trialled at Byfleet, have been found by the volunteer team leader easy to use.

Training will always be under development in the partnership and reflect the partners needs and training to whole volunteer teams not just team leaders will be provided where the partner wishes. The volunteers have come forward from all walks of life with transferable skills including training and supervision, but where SCC and the CPL have identified training skills as an issue this will be provided.

To clarify, the Judge's comments have been misquoted: having reviewed the amount of work that was done in putting together the training plan he was critical of the lack of information that was then provided to the Cabinet about this at its meeting in September 2011 not about the training plan itself.

The Judge acknowledged that officers had learnt much about the level of training, and ongoing support CPLs would need and had a list of training requirements following their discussions with the CPLs' steering groups about what would be needed. He also acknowledged that there was already significant experience in recruiting, training and managing volunteers which officers were able to use in developing the CPL model and in considering how they would recruit and train their volunteer.

#### **In response to the supplementary question:**

The Cabinet report and EIA both reflect the importance of training recognised by SCC and its full consideration of this for the volunteers. These reports also reflect what has been learned from working directly with the volunteers, and the consultation.

The library service's original aim was to deliver the training to lead volunteers, who would then be responsible for cascading to all volunteers. This is the process which will now be followed for updates once each CPL is up and running. In practice however the CPL support team have identified that training is the critical issue for the successful running of the library and therefore a significant amount of extra training support has been and will be offered to these libraries who are preparing to transfer. Currently approximately 300 volunteers have already been trained. The support team is clear that they will accommodate as many volunteers as possible who wish to receive the full training. Responsibility for all training and updates being fully and effectively cascaded sits with the CPL steering groups.... and where we have reached this stage of development with some of the groups this does not appear to be an issue with those actually involved with managing CPLs.

Cascade training is used extensively in the library service itself, and the library service is looking within each steering group for one or more people to take charge of ensuring volunteer training and updating takes place, along with a shift pattern for volunteers with a shift lead responsible for each shift team. The CPL team with each steering group will assess needs and tailor training to each library's needs informed by their skills audit of their volunteers. The appropriate use for that library of direct CPL training and cascade training will be agreed, and training the trainers training will be provided by the CPL team where needed.

Some volunteer groups already have experienced trainers and teachers on board, and SCC will work with groups where training skills need to be built up. Training will be monitored by the CSLT, through evaluation, review of records, and monthly meetings with steering groups.

Within the groups of volunteers being trained feedback given to the support team indicates that the experience of being trained has developed good team skills and morale - and a sense of satisfaction in making a contribution to their community.

**Helyn Clack**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**24 July 2012**

**Question 5 from Mr Lee Godfrey, Weybridge, Surrey:**

SLAM wrote a letter to David Hodge on the 9th July regarding the CPL policy. The letter suggested a way forward between the two extremes of, on the one hand, having the libraries staffed entirely by paid staff and, on the other hand, having the libraries staffed entirely by volunteers. The proposal was for paid staff to work alongside volunteers, enabling all of the benefits of the CPL policy but also the stability and sustainability of having paid staff in place. This proposal, the letter said, would be a far simpler solution to that currently proposed and would likely cost less. Why has this sensible proposal not been recognised in any of the documents put to cabinet today on the CPL policy? And will the cabinet be giving this proposal serious consideration today?

**Reply:**

As the Leader explained at the Cabinet meeting on 24 July the question which you asked related to the libraries paper which Cabinet were considering later on in the meeting. As part of its discussion the Cabinet gave consideration to the general issue you raised as part of their debate of the item. As the Leader assured you - once Cabinet had reached a decision, a written reply would be sent to each questioner.

Following the Judicial Review the Council entered into a consent order that quashed the decision taken by the Cabinet in September 2011 the objective of the Cabinet report to today's meeting is to again consider the implementation of the PVR recommendation for Community Partnered Libraries following the Cabinet's first consideration of the findings of the Libraries Public Value Review (PVR) in February 2011.

The recommendation of the Public Value Review of the Library Service was that the County Council maintain a core strategic network of libraries run by the authority and

advocated the message of local community empowerment as a means of delivery to allow the Surrey network of 52 libraries to be maintained. Many of the ten libraries now being considered for Community Partnered Library (CPL) arrangements have been considered for closure in the past, in some cases more than once.

The community partnership model is the strategic choice business model being adopted by library authorities around the country for securing the future for libraries. The PVR considered alternative models and, following research into CPLs elsewhere, devised a Surrey model for arrangements for community partnered libraries that has some of the most comprehensive provisions for support available to community organisations who take on the role of managing these libraries.

Without a change of strategic approach to how we deliver these libraries in these communities, these libraries will consistently find their cost-effectiveness under scrutiny. At Cabinet we debated our concern that simply putting money back into these libraries and maintaining paid staff supported by volunteers in each of these libraries does not achieve the objectives of community partnership in local libraries, does not give the community a leadership or governance role over the future of these libraries to improve and develop their use, and will not solve the fundamental problem that without a change of strategic approach to how these libraries are delivered in these communities, they will consistently find their cost-effectiveness under scrutiny.

We have been very encouraged that the local organisations that we have been working with have show great energy, passion and ideas for improving their local library and for making greater community use of the library buildings outside of library opening hours.

Paragraph 6 of the report deals with alternative models that have been suggested and 6.2 explains why they are not considered to be desirable. As I said during the debate on this item, “volunteers are committed to keeping library buildings open for longer than we are currently able to do” whilst other Cabinet colleagues pointed to the innovative ideas coming from volunteers to optimise the use of library buildings.

#### **In response to the supplementary question:**

In response to your supplementary, the strategic financial issues faced by the County Council, and the need to find a new way forward for the 10 libraries are not seen as tiny problems by Surrey County Council.

Every part of the County Council has to contribute to managing the financial pressures, and £381,000 is not an insignificant sum, however SCC decides to use it following the annual budget review for libraries.

The Surrey Community Partnership model is not in itself a complex solution: volunteers manage and develop their library, which remains closely integrated within the library service, supported by a sound partnership offer and a dedicated support team. Performance of both partners is monitored, for the benefit of the public by the Memorandum of Understanding, performance indicators and lease or licence, and evaluation. The overarching wish of the public, to keep their libraries open, without loss of access or services is maintained. Community partnership is well established in other library authorities across the UK and growing consistently as a way to keep local libraries open where levels of use do not make them a cost-effective use of ratepayers' money.



**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**24 July 2012**

**Question 6 from Mrs Jenny Meineck, Epsom, Surrey:**

With regard to the Agreement to be signed by Community Partnership Libraries I would like to know what will happen if Surrey County Council fails to keep its side of the agreement? In the Generic draft agreement 'Partnership Offer and Heads of Agreement' dated 28/11/11 It says on page 12: A key measure of success is that the agreements laid out in this document are kept to. Surrey County Council reserves the right to withdraw management of the library from the Community Partner if it felt that measures of success are not being met and are likely to not be consistently met in the future. Though sufficiently concerning performance in any one of the measures of success could be grounds for withdrawing from the partnership, SCC will only actively measure a small number of key measures of success. SCC's library service will also have to abide by a series of measures of success that demonstrate its commitment to the partnership. Failure to abide by these, including failure to meet responsibilities laid out in this document, will provide the Community Partner grounds from withdrawing from the partnership. Meeting and exceeding the measures of success on the part of the Community Partner will make a strong case for allowing the Community Partner further control and freedom around how the library is used and run. And repeats this in Appendix A, Para 2: If SCC consistently fails to meet its responsibilities that Community Partner may choose to withdraw from the agreement to run the library. In both of the above situations it appears to me that the Community Partner will be losing out. If CPL does not meet the measures then SCC can close it. If SCC does not meet the measures, it is saying that CPL can withdraw – then what? Close the library?

**Reply:**

As the Leader explained at the Cabinet meeting on 24 July the question which you asked related to the libraries paper which Cabinet were considering later on in the meeting. As part of its discussion the Cabinet gave consideration to the general issue you raised as part of their debate of the item. As the Leader assured you - once Cabinet had reached a decision, a written reply would be sent to each questioner.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SCC and each CPL partner has continued to be developed and includes the obligations of both partners in making the relationship work. This is supported by a set of performance indicators against which both partners performance will be measured and monitored. The partnerships will evolve and it is recognised over time that agreements and performance measures will have to be mutually revised to reflect this.

If there is a failure in performance by either partner then we will work together in an agreed way and within an agreed timetable to remedy the problem. If the situation cannot be remedied then, according to the nature of the problem, the community partner can give notice to SCC or SCC can give notice to the community partner within the terms of the MOU.

What needs to be noted is this is an arrangement based on working together - in partnership - and that SCC will make every effort to meet its obligations and work

with the partner towards a solution. However if a solution cannot be found and a partnership is dissolved, SCC may take a range of actions including seeking to find or set up an alternative community group to manage the library. If this is not possible, then a report on the situation in that community would be presented to Cabinet for decision on a way forward.

**In response to the supplementary question:**

This extract is from an early version of the Memorandum of Understanding and drafts have now moved on considerably. It is our duty, as the guardian of public expenditure, to get best value from all our budgets and all services have an obligation and responsibilities to keep all expenditure under review and to operate at the lowest achievable controllable cost. It is appropriate for all CPLs to have the same regard to the imperative to control and reduce costs as applies to all council services funded by public money / and for them to share the collective initiative to reduce wasteful and unnecessary use of resources and achieve efficiency.

**Helyn Clack**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**24 July 2012**

**Petition - Surrey Libraries**

An e-petition from Mr Gary Green of Surrey Libraries Action Movement, which has a total of 2432 signatures (including 835 on a paper petition) which states:

'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to withdraw their current proposals for changes to the library service and undertake a full, open, public consultation on the future of Surrey Libraries.'

**Reply:**

Cabinet acknowledges receipt of this online petition that ran on the SCC public website (ePetitions) from 26 August 2011 to 26 February 2012 - and notes that in a county of 1.2 million residents, and where there are circa 400,000 members of the library service, that it attracted 2,432 signatures.

The Public Value Review of the Library Service recommended that the County Council maintain a core strategic network of libraries run by the authority and advocated the message of local community empowerment as a means of delivery to allow the Surrey network of 52 libraries to be maintained. This recommendation was agreed in principle at the Cabinet meeting in February last year.

Many of the ten libraries now being considered for Community Partnered Library arrangements have been considered for closure in the past, in some cases more than once. Without a change of strategic approach to how we deliver these libraries in these communities, these libraries will consistently find their cost-effectiveness under scrutiny. The community partnership model is the strategic choice business model being adopted by library authorities around the country for securing the future for a number of libraries in their network where they have, for various reasons, had to review the extent of the their library network.

The Surrey offer of community partnership is a strong offer which provides a strategic solution to libraries which have low or declining levels of use and which will empower communities to take control of, shape and develop their local libraries. While communities see this as a challenge, there has been a positive response to taking this task on board by the steering groups and their supporting volunteers. The experience gained through Byfleet has been invaluable in providing a testing ground for training and procedures and has demonstrated that this is a workable strategy. The ideas commitment and enthusiasm put forward by volunteers in all the communities demonstrates that there is the needed energy and creativity present to enable these libraries to remain open through partnership.

In working on developing this strategy the County Council has taken account of feedback received and results of the various consultation exercises and keeping these libraries open through partnership, combined with ongoing training and support to the volunteers, will meet the overall concern of the public that their libraries should not close.

**Helyn Clack**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**24 July 2012**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**IMT PROJECT ROLL-OUT UPDATE**

At its meeting on 16 May 2012 the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report updating progress on the implementation of key IMT projects. One of the projects reviewed was the procurement of a new Property Asset Management System (PAMS) to improve the process for surveying and managing the Council's property portfolio. Procurement of PAMS was approved by the Cabinet to enable the in-sourcing of a number of previously externalised services currently provided by consultants.

The Committee was informed that procurement of the system had been delayed by a challenge to the procurement arrangements by a company which had been unsuccessful following the tendering process. The costs of this challenge, both in terms of the legal proceedings and the subsequent delay in implementation of the system, have been met by the County Council. The Committee was concerned that unsuccessful challenges such as this should result in an increased burden on taxpayers, and felt that procurement law should be brought in line with planning law so that costs fall to the appellant in the event of an unsuccessful challenge.

**Therefore the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends to the Cabinet:**

That Surrey MPs and MEPs be lobbied to support a change to the law relating to procurement, so that in the event of a challenge to the procurement process by an unsuccessful bidder not being upheld, the legal costs are met by the appellant, similar to existing arrangements with planning law.

**Response:**

On 16 May 2012, the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee made the following recommendation:

'That Surrey MPs and MEPs be lobbied to support a change to the law relating to procurement, so that in the event of a challenge to the procurement process by an unsuccessful bidder not being upheld, the legal costs are met by the appellant, similar to existing arrangements with planning law.'

This is based on the (incorrect) understanding that the Authority has received a formal challenge to the procurement process and, in defending itself, had incurred legal costs.

**PAMS Project**

As previously stated, the Authority has not received a formal challenge to the procurement process although it is true that an unsuccessful bidder had informally queried the outcome. This has manifested itself in the following:

Debrief meeting on 26 January 2012 between bidder and Authority's procurement lead

Receipt of two FOI requests (ref: 07474 and 07532)

Receipt of 4 letters from bidder to the Authority's procurement lead

Receipt of a further 2 letters from bidder to Surrey County Council's Chief Executive

The burden on the Authority was the time taken to prepare responses to these enquiries which, with the exception of the debrief meeting, were over and above the activity that would normally take place with an unsuccessful bidder.

#### **Procurement Response to Recommendation**

Under normal litigation processes, a court will look at the merits of a case before allowing it to proceed and it is in a court's gift to award costs against claims which should not have been brought. If the PAMS procurement had come to court there would have been an opportunity for the Council to request costs in the case if it had gone to full hearing and the claim had been unsuccessful. It is also likely that a court would not allow a challenge to proceed if there is no basis or merit in the arguments put forward.

In summary, the recommendation seeks to lobby for something that is already achievable.

On the broader principle, anyone can lobby for change but how successful it will be will be dependent on the force of the argument and whether it is a unique, one-off problem which is only applicable to a small group or one which is of wider significance and application.

Individual Members and/or political parties are of course free to lobby MPs and MEPs for changes in legislature should they wish to do so.

**Denise Le Gal**  
**Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency**  
**24 July 2012**

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

**WATER MANAGEMENT**

The Environment and Transport Select Committee recommends:

That a policy be drafted on integrated water management, which sets out what Surrey County Council can and will do, in working with partners to address the challenges and risks facing Surrey in this regard.

**Response:**

I welcome the recommendation by the Environment and Transport Select Committee that the County Council should develop a policy position on integrated water management.

I have asked the Environment Service to lead this work, which will need to encompass:

- Our role as the Lead Flood Authority, including the Lower Thames as a key priority
- Water supply and demand, including the plans of the water companies to meet medium/long-term supply
- The local effect of water issues including flood risk, water quality and new development.

I have asked for a draft policy position to be considered by the Environment and Transport Select Committee within six months which will:

- Clearly set out the County Council's position on water management issues in Surrey
- Establish an agreed set of actions to address areas of risk/opportunity
- Define lead responsibilities and stakeholder relationships
- Establish process to ensure that members have timely information on water management issues within their local area.

**John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**  
**24 July 2012**

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

**INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) TASK GROUP**

The Environment and Transport Select Committee recommends that the Cabinet:

- i) Considers and notes the 12 Key Findings of the Task Group, as outlined in Section 51 of the attached report.
- ii) Continues to work with districts and boroughs in order to consider how we might make decisions about infrastructure priorities in a two tier area.
- iii) Considers how to engage with the Development industry to enable discussions at member and officer level around issues of mutual concern and interest. This could include hosting events open to developers and all districts and boroughs.
- iv) Recognises the Task Group's concern about the potential impact of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on CIL receipts, and investigate and quantify this risk and report back to the Select Committee.
- v) Endorses and oversees the joint work on viability across Surrey now being supported by the County Council to provide a consistent approach to assessing viability in different parts of the County in order to reduce public sector costs, make CIL charging levels easier to defend at examination and ensure that development remains viable.
- vi) The Task Group praises the work of the Joint Officer Working Group and asks the Cabinet to recognise the importance of effective joint working on CIL, and continue the work of the group.

**Response:**

I welcome the overall thrust of the recommendations from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Task Group of the Environment and Transport Select Committee. Preparing for the introduction of CIL is crucial to both Surrey County Council and to the district and borough councils to ensure that we can provide the necessary infrastructure to support and mitigate the impacts of development in the county.

In relation to the Task Group's specific recommendations:

- i) Note the Task Group's Key Findings (outlined in Section 51 of their report). Indeed the Task Group has been working closely with officers preparing for the introduction of CIL and helped shaped the approach. I also note that much detailed information from officers has been included as annexes to the Task Group report.
- ii) Agree that it is crucial that we continue to work with districts and boroughs in order to consider how we might make decisions about infrastructure priorities

in a two-tier area.

- iii) Will ask officers to engage with the Development industry to enable discussions at member and officer level around issues of mutual concern and interest, and to investigate the possibility of hosting events open to developers and all districts and boroughs.
- iv) Recognise the Task Group's concern about the potential impact of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) on CIL receipts. This is of particular importance for some Surrey districts and officers have been working jointly to investigate the issue and quantify the risks. I support the recommendation that officers report back on this to the Select Committee.
- v) Endorse joint work between Surrey County Council and the districts and boroughs on viability across Surrey. Indeed we have funded external support and advice for districts and boroughs to provide them with a consistent approach to assessing viability and help reduce public sector costs, as well as make CIL charging levels easier to defend at examination and ensure that development remains viable across the county.
- vi) Echo the Task Group in praising the work of the Joint Officer Working Group. This is an important area where we need to ensure effective joint working across the county. I welcome continued input from the Task Group to support this activity. I am particularly keen to ensure that they focus on how we work with partners to secure the necessary funding to mitigate the impacts of development in the county as well as agreeing the priorities for investment.

**John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**  
**24 July 2012**



**CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**SOCIAL WORKER RECRUITMENT**

The Children and Families Select Committee recommends that Cabinet:

- (a) Supports the Children's Service in exploring the greater use of workers with other skills or qualifications rather than full social work degrees; and,
- (b) Works with other local authorities to raise with Government the need for a focus on the costs of social work reform and the impact of raising the status of the social care profession for employers on the recruitment and retention of social care staff.

**Response:**

(a) I welcome the recommendation of the Select Committee and am pleased to announce that Children's Services shall be taking forward over the next few months actions to actively implement this recommendation. I can inform the Cabinet that Children's Services and the Youth Support Service are developing a service using the skills of non-social work trained staff to address the needs of teenagers in need. In October 2012, the Youth Support service will be providing a targeted Child in Need service to 13 – 18 year olds. This will focus upon earlier intervention with this group of children and young people that will prevent them coming into care, entering the youth justice system becoming homeless and enable them to achieve their potential. This will I am able to say to the Cabinet ensure that Children's Services will be able to focus upon the core business of protecting children at risk of significant harm.

In addition, as part of the programme for Early Help, Children's Services are developing links with Early Years staff in Children's Centres and with Home School Link Workers on partnership working to prevent further family breakdown. I am pleased to inform the Cabinet that as part of the Early Help Change Programme, the service is researching the level of need and the professional resource available and from October 2012 to January 2013 will be testing out new models of working together using a range of professionals inside and out of the directorate.

(b) I am pleased that the Select Committee has highlighted the importance of this issue and welcome its' endorsement of the action being done within Surrey to improve the recruitment and retention of social work staff through the Workforce Development Plan. I am happy to announce that Children's Services have been proactive in responding to the challenge of the Social Work Reform Board and are currently working with regional partners to influence the courses and development of social work teaching in local universities. There are now in place agreements with key universities in the region. In addition, we are working with regional partners to manage the labour market to ensure equity of pay and reward across the area.

In addition, the Social Work Reform Manager, senior HR and Head of Safeguarding will be consulting with colleagues in the region to make joint representation to government on the impact of reform upon recruitment of social workers.

**Mary Angell**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Families**  
**24 July 2012**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE**

**THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S EMPLOYABILITY PLAN 2012-16**

The Education Select Committee recommends to the Cabinet:

- (a) That it supports the aims of the Employability Plan;
- (b) That it requests that officers explore and cost a scheme to provide transport for young people for whom transport is a barrier to employment, education and training;
- (c) That it requests that officers explore the possibility of a bursary for free school meals for students in Year 12.

**Response:**

I welcome the Education Select Committee's support for the Young People's Employability Plan 2012-2017.

I am pleased with the recommendation that officers explore a scheme to provide transport for young people for whom this is a barrier to their participation in education or training and draw attention to the related proposed action in section 4.3 of the Young People's Employability Plan.

Finally, I fully support the recommendation that officers explore the possibility of a bursary for free school meals for all students in year 12, irrespective of whether they attend a school sixth form or college.

I draw attention to the proposed action in section 4.4 of the Young People's Employability Plan and the associated recommendation to Cabinet, which delivers action to address the affordability gap for young people who would have received free meals in school. This is a nationally ground breaking proposal and addresses a long standing inequality in the provision of free meals for eligible Year 12 students.

**Kay Hammond**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Safety**  
**24 July 2012**

**CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS**

**JULY 2012**

**(i) NATIONAL HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME (HMEP) PROGRAMME AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT**

That Atkins Management Consultants be awarded the additional package of work, as set out in paragraph 7 of the report, to be fully funded by Department for Transport.

**Reasons for decision**

A contract for delivery of the HMEP Change Management programme phase 1 and phase 2 was awarded in September 2011 following a tender exercise in compliance with the requirements of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders and the recommendation provides the best value for money approach for the Council and to the DfT.

(Decision of Leader of the Council – 4 July 2012)

**(ii) APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR SALTING AND SNOW CLEARANCE SERVICES**

That an agreement for the provision of salting and snow clearance services be awarded on the basis set out in paragraph 1 of the report.

**Reason for decision**

The existing contract for the provision of salting and snow clearance services 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.

Nationwide Gritting Services (NGS) through the evaluation process scored the highest, for both quality and price thus ensuring that SCC receives best value for money.

The recommendations in this paper show that Surrey County Council will make an estimated minimum annual saving of £11,000 per annum, which provides best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 11 July 2012)

**(iii) ST JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL, GUILDFORD - EXPANSION TO MEET THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL PUPIL PLACES**

That, subject to the approval of the expansion proposals by the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning at the decision making meeting on 19 July:

1. the business case for the expansion of St Joseph's RC VA Primary School, Guildford be approved.

2. the release of capital funding be approved to allow the Diocese to award a contract and undertake the works subject to actual tender costs being within the approved estimated cost of the project.

**Reason for decision**

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

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 11 July 2012)

**(iv) PROPOSAL FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF A PERMIT SCHEME UNDER THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 2004**

1. That the development of permit scheme proposals continue in collaboration with East Sussex County Council.
2. That formal consultation on the introduction of a permit scheme in Surrey proceed as set out in the report.
3. That the outcome of the consultation be reported to Cabinet prior to a decision on whether to proceed with the introduction of a permit scheme in Surrey.

**Reasons for decision**

To proactively consider the introduction and operation of a permit scheme in Surrey will enable a future decision to be taken on any scheme implementation. Should the decision to proceed be positive, we will need to have satisfied the DfT requirements on submission of the scheme, which includes having consulted on the proposals. Working collaboratively with another local authority on this project enables the sharing of best practice, resource and costs.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 11 July 2012)

**(v) GUILDFORD-GODALMING-HASLEMERE BUS SERVICES – BUS REVIEW PHASE 3**

1. That bus services 70, 71 and 92 (Guildford-Godalming area-Haslemere-Midhurst) be maintained from 2 September 2012 at their current levels.
2. That the planned supplementary public consultation exercise does not proceed as it is no longer required.
3. That interested parties be informed, including local Members, Waverley Borough Council and the public.

**Reasons for decision**

To allow a pattern of operation on the bus services concerned that is fit for local needs and sustainable.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 11 July 2012)

**(vi) APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES**

That a framework contract be awarded to commence on 1 August 2012 for a period of 2+2 years to Atkins Limited at an estimated value of £200k per annum from SCC and an undefined expenditure from the other authorities listed in paragraph 3 of the report.

**Reasons for decision**

The existing contract has expired and a full tender process in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendation provides best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 11 July 2012)

**(vii) ALLOCATION OF SURREY GROWTH FUND 2012/13**

1. That funding from the Surrey Growth Fund be allocated to the projects listed in Annex 1 to form a programme of priority economic development activity in Financial Years 2012-13 and 2013-14.
2. That the allocation of the remaining balance of the Surrey Growth Fund be deferred to a future meeting with the intention that it be available to promote apprenticeships through matched funding with the Government's Apprenticeship Grant for Employers.

**Reasons for decisions**

The activities correspond with the aims and objectives of the Surrey Growth Fund and support the delivery of the council's corporate strategy 2012-17. The proposed programme of activity will enable the County Council to improve its capacity for bidding for external funding to support local sustainable economic growth.

(Decision of Deputy Leader – 11 July 2012)

**(viii) APPROVAL OF SCHOOL DEFICITS 2012/13**

- (1) That the level of school balances be noted.
- (2) That the two licensed deficit requests exceeding 5% of budget, as set out in Annex 1 to the report be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

Approval of schools' deficits will ensure that schools are operating within the County's Scheme for Financing Schools and set the parameters in which recovery plans can be developed.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

**(ix) PROPOSAL TO PERMANENTLY EXPAND ST DUNSTANS PRIMARY SCHOOL FROM 2 FORMS OF ENTRY (420 PUPILS) TO 3 FORMS OF ENTRY (630 PUPILS) FROM SEPTEMBER 2013**

That the proposal to permanently expand St Dunstan's Catholic Primary School from 2 to 3 forms of entry be agreed and implemented as set out in paragraph 1 of the submitted report.

**Reasons for decision**

The expansion proposal will address pressure for primary places, including specific pressure for Catholic places, in Woking and is supported by the feedback received from the consultation.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

**(x) POTTERS GATE CE PRIMARY SCHOOL PROPOSED EXPANSION**

That the Statutory Notices be published indicating the Council's intent to permanently expand Potters Gate CE Primary School from one to two forms of entry as set out in the submitted report.

**Reasons for decision**

Expanding this school will allow the Council to admit those people who name the school as their preferred option and to meet its wider statutory duty to offer all applicants a school place.

It will enable a diversity of provision to be maintained within the Farnham area and be part of a strategy that enables Farnham residents to access to a local Primary School.

A programme of building works at the school will improve the general fabric of the school buildings and enhance the learning experience for pupils, parents and staff.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

**(xi) THORPE CHURCH OF ENGLAND INFANT SCHOOL CHANGE TO A PRIMARY SCHOOL - DECISION**

That the following proposals be approved:

- Thorpe Church of England Infant School would become a primary school on 1 September 2013.
- All children would remain on roll at Thorpe Church of England Primary School and for September 2013 parents/carers of Year 2 pupils would remain on roll to enter Year 3 at Thorpe Church of England Primary School unless they wish their child to go on to a school which they have been allocated.
- Thorpe Church of England Infant School would extend its age range by one year each year from 1 September 2013 until 1 September 2016.
- The number of places at the school would increase by 30 each year until it is an all through primary school.

- Additional classrooms would be provided in time for Year 3 pupils for September 2013.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in this area are necessary. Changing Thorpe CofE Infant School into a primary school would enhance community cohesion and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

**(xii) EXPANSION OF TRUMPS GREEN INFANT SCHOOL - PUBLICATION OF STATUTORY NOTICES**

That the publication of statutory notices be approved, such that:

- Trumps Green Infant School will expand on 1 September 2013.
- The PAN would increase from 30 to 60 in September 2013.
- The school would increase its number of places by 30 pupils each year from 2013 until it has fully expanded.
- Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 90 to 180 places.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional infant places in the area are necessary. The expansion of Trumps Green Infant School would increase parental choice and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

**(xiii) EXPANSION OF ST ANN'S HEATH JUNIOR SCHOOL - PUBLICATION OF STATUTORY NOTICES**

That the publication of statutory notices be approved, such that:

- St Ann's Heath Junior School will expand on 1 September 2015.
- The PAN would increase from 64 to 90 in September 2015.
- The school would increase its number of places by 26 pupils a year until 2018, when it will have fully expanded.
- Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 256 to 360 places.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in the area are necessary. The expansion of St Ann's Heath Junior School would increase parental choice and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)



**(xiv) DARLEY DENE INFANT SCHOOL CHANGE TO A PRIMARY SCHOOL - PUBLICATION OF STATUTORY NOTICES**

That the publication of statutory notices be approved, such that:

- Darley Dene Infant School would become a primary school on 1 September 2013.
- The Published Admission Number (PAN) would be 30.
- Darley Dene Infant School would extend its age range by 1 year each year until 1 September 2016.
- The school would increase its number of places by 30 pupils each year from 2013 until it has become an all through primary school.
- Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 90 to 180 places.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in the area are necessary. The expansion of Darley Dene Infant School would increase parental certainty of progression for their children and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

**(xv) CHARLWOOD INFANT SCHOOL CHANGE TO A PRIMARY SCHOOL - PUBLICATION OF STATUTORY NOTICES**

That the publication of statutory notices be approved, such that:

- Charlwood Infant School would become a primary school on 1 September 2013.
- The Published Admission Number (PAN) would be 15.
- Charlwood Infant School would extend its age range by 1 year each year until 1 September 2016.
- The school would increase its number of places by 15 pupils each year from 2013 until it has become an all through primary school.
- Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 90 to 120 places.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in the area are necessary. The expansion of Charlwood Infant School would increase parental certainty of progression for their children and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

**(xvi) EXPANSION OF ST JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL -  
DECISION**

That the following proposals be approved:

- St Joseph's Catholic Primary School Guildford will expand on 1 September 2013.
- The PAN would increase from 60 to 90 in September 2013.
- The number of pupils would increase by 30 each year until the increased number of children have progressed through the school, when there will be 90 places per year from Reception to Year 6.
- The capacity of the school will increase from 420 to 630 places.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in Guildford are necessary. The expansion of St Joseph's Catholic Primary School would increase parental choice and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 19 July 2012)

### Programme for funding through the Surrey Growth Fund

Headline Priority	Resource	Outcome	Deliverables	Est'd spend FY 2012-13	Est'd spend FY 2013-14
Development of a Rail Strategy	Rail expert – consultancy or short term contract (3-6 months)	<p>Rail Strategy influences the investment plans of Network Rail and the rail companies to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the upgrade of North Downs line linking Reading and Gatwick Airport</li> <li>▪ investment in improving Redhill and Guildford Stations</li> <li>▪ improved rail access to Heathrow Airport from the south</li> <li>▪ Strategy identifies how capacity and reliability of services can be increased to meet demand on the main commuter lines to London that pass through Surrey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ a Rail Strategy by end March 2013</li> <li>▪ this would support Surrey Future</li> </ul>	£30,000	

Headline Priority	Resource	Outcome	Deliverables	Est'd spend FY 2012-13	Est'd spend FY 2013-14
<p>Support for delivering the council's priority on economic development and for LEPs</p> <p>Surrey Connects is the council's equivalent to the West Sussex and Hants county councils in-house teams that support their respective LEPs (Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3)</p>	<p>2x Economy Manager/ Officer (initially 1 year fixed term/ secondment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ more foreign direct investment in Surrey</li> <li>▪ more government investment in Surrey</li> <li>▪ more funding for Surrey secured through the EM3 and C2C LEPs</li> <li>▪ stronger county council relationship with significant local companies</li> <li>▪ businesses of key local significance continue to be located in Surrey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ participation in relevant LEP action groups and project delivery to secure investment in Surrey</li> <li>▪ supporting inward investment activity, including research, development both of a Surrey and key sector propositions, monitoring the UKTI pipeline and managing investment enquiries passed by UKTI</li> <li>▪ a business engagement strategy for the council</li> </ul>	<p>£40,000 - (including on-costs)</p>	<p>£120,000 (including on-costs)</p>
<p>Pension Fund investment to support local economic growth</p>	<p>Independent investment expert</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ more investment in local economic growth that benefits both Surrey businesses and the Surrey Pension Fund (in terms of the overall rate of return on investment)</li> <li>▪ investment by the Surrey Pension Fund levers in other monies from partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ develop/ produce a more detailed investment proposal for consideration by the Surrey Pension Fund</li> </ul>	<p>£20,000</p>	

Headline Priority	Resource	Outcome	Deliverables	Est'd spend FY 2012-13	Est'd spend FY 2013-14
Secure a return from Olympic investment	6 FTEs (on one year fixed term contracts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ a lasting benefit from investment to date is captured and legacy established</li> <li>▪ legacy events in Surrey are secured</li> <li>▪ council priorities to achieve economic development, to promote health and wellbeing and to protect and enhance Surrey's natural assets are met</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ a tourism strategy and action plan</li> <li>▪ delivery of legacy cycling events including securing sponsorship and ancillary local events including the continuation of the School Games</li> <li>▪ a comprehensive, high quality Visit Surrey web presence</li> <li>▪ a tourism marketing and communications strategy and commence implementation</li> <li>▪ development of a partnership with Surrey's tourism sector to build Surrey's brand and offer</li> </ul>	£240,000	£145,000

**TOTAL    £330,000    £265,000**

## **COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **Item under consideration: SUPERFAST BROADBAND IN SURREY**

#### **Date Considered: 11 July 2012**

At its meeting on 11 July 2012 the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered a report setting out the background to the Superfast Broadband project and outlining the bids which had been received from the two potential.

The Committee noted that delivery of the contract as proposed would be unprecedented nationally in terms of the level of access to superfast broadband which would be achieved in the County. Although the project was an investment in infrastructure and was not intended to provide direct financial benefit to the Council, the Committee acknowledged the economic, social and environmental benefits which it would bring to Surrey. It was noted that there would also be reputational benefits for the County Council arising from the fact that the project would enable the delivery of superfast broadband for residents significantly earlier (and with greater coverage) than most other councils.

The Committee was keen to ensure that the opportunities for positive publicity arising from the project were realised, but also recognised the need to ensure that any publicity reflected the experiences of Surrey residents. It was noted that the solution proposed in one of the bids would mean that a very small minority of properties in the County (0.3%) would need to be subject to individual consideration about the viability of providing superfast broadband, and therefore the publicity would need to acknowledge the experience and expectations of those affected. It was also agreed that the criteria for determining the viability of those properties subject to individual consideration would be shared with the Committee.

The proposal to establish a Joint Operations Centre between the County Council and the contractor to oversee the implementation of the project was noted, and the Committee requested that details of the proposed governance arrangements and organisation structure be provided before the contract was signed.

Overall the Committee recognised the benefits which would arise from the availability of superfast broadband throughout the County and endorsed the procurement process so far. The Committee was also satisfied that contract provisions outlined in the report and discussed at the meeting were sound, and supported the proposal to seek Cabinet approval of the preferred supplier. The Project Team was commended and thanked for its work.

Therefore the Committee recommends to the Cabinet:

- (a) That the proposal to award a contract for the provision of superfast broadband to the preferred supplier be approved.
- (b) That a comprehensive communication strategy be put in place to ensure that the opportunities for positive publicity arising from the project are realised, whilst recognising the need to be realistic and reflect the experiences of the minority of residents for whom there will need to be further consideration of the viability of providing superfast broadband.

**MR MEL FEW**

**Chairman of the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**SUPERFAST BROADBAND IN SURREY**

The Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends to the Cabinet:

- (a) That the proposal to award a contract for the provision of superfast broadband to the preferred supplier be approved.
  
- (b) That a comprehensive communication strategy be put in place to ensure that the opportunities for positive publicity arising from the project are realised, whilst recognising the need to be realistic and reflect the experiences of the minority of residents for whom there will need to be further consideration of the viability of providing superfast broadband.

**Response:**

I welcome the recommendations provided by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee and provide the following response.

One of the first tasks for Surrey County Council and its supplier, is to agree the final implementation programme and project communications plan. Coordinating key messages to reflect what communities can expect to see in their areas will be paramount to the success of the project. Whilst there will be headline messages that are suitable for general Surrey wide distribution, specific localised messages and engagement will be managed in any hard to reach areas.

The Superfast Broadband project team and corporate communications are coordinated to ensure a managed process is followed with our supplier for press coverage after the Cabinet's decision to award contract. The key messages will focus on:

- The Surrey County Council Cabinet has taken the decision to award a contract for the provision of superfast broadband to homes and businesses in Surrey.
  
- Surrey County Council and its supplier will work closely together over the forthcoming months to finalise the deployment schedule. Detailed information on what to expect when and where will be available in the Autumn.
  
- It is anticipated that the implementation of this project will be complete by the end of 2014.

**Peter Martin  
Deputy Leader  
24 July 2012**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET HELD ON 25 SEPTEMBER 2012  
AT 2PM AT COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Mary Angell	*Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr John Furey	*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)
*Mr Michael Gosling	*Mr Tony Samuels

\* = Present

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

**119/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

There were none.

**120/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (24 JULY 2012): [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**121/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**122/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

There were none.

**123/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER  
COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

There were none.

[Please note that the Chairman re-ordered the agenda and took this item next.]

**124/12 WOKING TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION [Item 10]**

This report was a summary of the full details which were outlined in agenda item 12 in Part Two of the agenda.

Mr John Kingsbury, Leader of Woking Borough Council was invited to address Cabinet and began by thanking the Leader for the opportunity to speak. He said that the joint working between Surrey County Council (SCC) and Woking Borough Council (WBC) was already delivering benefits for residents and cited examples, such as the co-location of the police station within the Borough offices. He also referred to the newly re-furbished Woking Library.



On the Bandstand Development, he said that WBC owned the freehold of both shopping centres and had committed their council to the improvements that could be delivered by the Bandstand Square Development, thereby creating upto 1000 jobs. However, WBC needed to work with SCC, as a partner to bring the joint venture to fruition. Finally, he considered that it was one of the most exciting projects that WBC had been involved with.

The Leader considered that partnership working with all Boroughs and Districts was critical and that the County Council needed to promote jobs and businesses to deliver improved services for residents.

Mr Forster, the local Member for Woking South, was invited to speak. He urged Cabinet to support the joint venture, in order to stimulate economic growth in the area. He also said that it was important that the fire station was located in the right place and included provision for enhanced training.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety said that today, Cabinet were only taking a decision in principle. However, she agreed that it was important to find the right site for the new fire station.

Other Cabinet Members congratulated Mr Kingsbury and WBC for working together with SCC to enable successful partnership working to attain the regeneration of the area and achieve successes such as the newly refurbished Woking library.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the information set out in the submitted report be noted.
2. That participation in a Joint Venture with Woking Borough Council to be known as 'Bandstand Square Developments Ltd' as outlined in agenda item 12 of the meeting be agreed.

#### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The development will deliver a significant regeneration of Woking Town Centre and will create additional employment both during the development phase and in the longer term.

SCC will benefit from the provision of a new fit-for-purpose Fire Station in Woking. The new Fire Station will be constructed in accordance with the requirements of Surrey Fire & Rescue Service and will include the provision of enhanced training facilities.

#### **125/12 BUDGET MONITORING FORECAST 2012/13 (PERIOD ENDING AUGUST 2012) [Item 6]**

The Leader drew Cabinet's attention to the following points:

- The Council was facing increasing demand for its services, whilst continuing to meet the challenges of achieving a savings target of £71m this financial year.
- Current Budget pressures are: (i) growth in child protection cases (£2m), (ii) growth in cases of people with learning difficulties and older people care (£2.7m), (iii) increased road repairs (£0.5m).

- An overspend of -£1.6m was currently being forecast. However, in order to achieve this, delivery of the savings in the Medium Term Financial Plan was crucial.
- On staffing year to date expenditure was below budget by £2.5m, for the end of August, although the forecast demand for child protection was likely to lead to only a small underspending at the year end.
- Balance between contracted and complementary staff was at 92%.
- The number of occupied posts in August was 7,200 and 263 posts were being recruited at the end of the month.
- The Council was on track to deliver the building of new classrooms and at lower cost due to improved procurement and partnership working with Hampshire County Council.
- Other significant developments had been the approval of the Superfast Broadband and Public Sector Phone Network (Unicorn) projects.

Other Cabinet Members were given the opportunity to comment on the budgets for their portfolios and made the following points:

- That pressures in Adult Services were occurring faster than re-configuring of the service for the long term delivery.
- There were demographic pressures both in Children's and Adults Services.
- Children Services had delivered budget savings over the last two / three years. However, there would be challenges in the delivery of savings this year. Projections for children on child protection plans had already been reached and there was an escalation in demand for service so early intervention was considered essential.
- Two pressures in the Environment and Infrastructure Budget were the Concessionary Fares Scheme and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the projected revenue budget (Annex 1 – Section A) and the Capital programme direction (Annex 1 - Section B) be noted.
2. That government grant changes be reflected in directorate budgets; (Annex 1 – Section C)

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To comply with the agreed strategy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

**126/12 WINTER SERVICE DEVELOPMENT FOR 2012/13 [Item 7]**

The comments of the Environment and Transport Select Committee's, Winter Maintenance Task Group were attached as Appendix 1, together with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment's response (Appendix 2).

The Leader began by saying that delivery of the Winter Service Plan for Highways was one of the most important aspect of the Council's work and invited the Chairman of the Environment and Transport Select Committees to present the Winter Performance Task Group's report.

Mr Renshaw began by stating that this report was a further refinement of the policy developed two years ago. He thanks officers from both Highways and Democratic Services who had supported the cross party task group. Finally, he said that he hoped that the Tatsfield Parish Trial, to provide information boards on roads affected by snow and advising drivers that they were impassable, would be a success and then rolled out to other areas in Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment stressed the importance of communication and said that the County Council had worked to improve this. He said that residents input had been valuable and that the council had responded to their concerns. He also informed Cabinet that all council grit bins would be fitted with bar codes which, through a computer system would provide more accurate information in relation to the topping up of the grit bins.

He also said that all gritters would be fitted with GPS trackers and thermal mapping of salt routes. He confirmed that he was satisfied that the Equality and Diversity issues had been examined in close detail and had been addressed. Finally, he referred to the revised recommendations that had been tabled, and further amended recommendation (3).

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games expressed her support and said that she was pleased that the Beare Green depot was being retained for the winter service and also, that local farmers would be available, under a new five year contract, to provide additional assistance in rural areas if required.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the recommendations of the Winter Performance Task Group, as amended and set out below, be approved:
  - That the “people solution” Gritting Route Network, implemented in 2010/11, be formally maintained as the council’s gritting network, incorporating the minor amendments resulting from resident and officer feedback.
  - That the Gritting Route Network be supported by the provision of a Quad Bike, enabling difficult to reach areas to be fully supported.
  - That the pre-season salt level stocks be maintained at 16,000t.
  - That Beare Green Depot be retained for the winter service between October and April, subject to a further review and possible identification of another suitable depot in that part of the County in the future.
  - That all Grit Bins be fitted with bar codes to enable officers to remotely monitor stock refills and provide confidence to residents regarding re-filling, at a total cost of £39,000.
  - That communities be allowed to purchase additional Grit Bins at a total cost of £1,000 for a 4 year period, and that Parishes and other statutory bodies are licensed to provide grit bins on the highway, at their own cost.
  - That Cabinet approves the Surrey Winter Service Plan 2012/13 (Annex 1 of the submitted report).

- That Cabinet review each year, the current £2.361m budget allocation within the next Medium Term Financial Plan to ensure the existing level of service is maintained, subject to future funding or budgetary issues.
- 2. That a response be provided for each recommendation, agreeing actions as appropriate.
- 3. That the Members of the Winter Performance Task Group be thanked for their work.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

These recommendations are the result of the Task Group's report on the performance of the service operation during the 2011/12 winter season and recommendations for the development of the service for the 2012/13 winter season.

**127/12 LGO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FINANCIAL COMPENSATION  
[Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning said that this case involved a 14 year old child and that the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) had investigated a complaint brought by a family that stated, due to delay in assessment, their child was disadvantaged and without education. The LGO found maladministration leading to injustice in this case.

She said that the case went back several years and that various parts of the organisation had not worked together as effectively as it could. She believed that the re-organisation of the service had addressed the communication issues of the past and the service would work closely to support the child and the family.

The Leader asked for assurance that lessons had been learnt from this case and this was confirmed.

The Assistant Director of Schools and Learning confirmed that a multi-disciplinary professionals meeting had been set up, as requested by the Local Government Ombudsman.

**RESOLVED:**

That, following the finding of maladministration leading to injustice, the financial remedy of £6,700 as proposed by the LGO be approved.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The complaint has been fully investigated and the service accepts that there have been failings on their part. These are that the SEN Service, Children's Service and the Education Welfare Service failed to work together appropriately. These shortcomings have been addressed by arranging a meeting where all disciplines are represented, together with attendance by a member of Legal Services who can appropriately advise on the legal options available so that these can be appropriately considered.

In discussion with the service the LGO has set out his view regarding settlement of this matter which is accepted by the service:

Namely, that the Council should set aside £1,000 as compensation for its failure to provide suitable education for the child between April 2010 and September 2010. It should acknowledge that, as a Council, it also failed to ensure that the child could access the education available to him, particularly after Easter 2011. The Council should set aside a further £5,000 as compensation for this failure. The total sum of £6,000 is to be used for the child's education to try to make up for the education lost. The Council should liaise with the complainants on how to identify how this money can best be used for the child.

The LGO also recommends that the Council set aside a further £200 in recognition of its failure to provide OT between November 2010 and January 2011. This should also be used toward the child's education.

The Council should also pay the complainant compensation of £500 for her anxiety and Distress.

### **128/12 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 9]**

To note any delegated decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as set out in a revised Annex 1 (and attached as a Appendix to these minutes), be noted.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken by Members under delegated authority.

### **129/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 11]**

#### **RESOLVED:**

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

## **PART TWO – IN PRIVATE**

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

### **130/12 WOKING TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes confirmed that SCC's participation would be in the form of development loan funding to this Joint Venture, which would be provided equally by SCC and WBC. WBC would repay all loan funding upon completion of the development and take ownership of the freehold. SCC's approval was limited to a commitment to funding Phase 1 of the development at this stage.

Mr Forster, local Member for Woking South, was invited to speak and gave his support to this joint venture.

Members agreed to discuss the membership of the Project Board outside the meeting.

Cabinet agreed to amend the recommendations so that they clearly stated that they approved the recommendations, subject to contract and 'in accordance with the principles of the Memorandum of Terms' (Annex 1 of the submitted report).

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety made reference to the new Woking fire station, the challenging timescale for its delivery and said it was critical that all relevant services worked together.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That, subject to contract, participation in a Joint Venture with Woking Borough Council and Moyallen to be known as Bandstand Square Developments Ltd and provision of funding for the Phase 1 development be agreed, in accordance with the principles of the Memorandum of Terms attached as Annex 1 of the submitted report.
2. That the establishment of appropriate governance arrangements, as set out in paragraphs 28-31 of the submitted report, namely the establishment of SCC Bandstand Development Member Board to oversee and approve detailed arrangements, comprising the Leader, and two Cabinet Members with the S151 Officer acting in an advisory capacity be authorised.
3. That the SCC Bandstand Development Member Board to authorised to agree appropriate contractual arrangements on behalf of the County Council, following completion of appropriate due diligence, by officers.
4. That the relocation of Woking fire station be agreed in principle, with full approval being delegated to the Leader, the Cabinet Member for Assets & Regeneration programmes, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and the Chief Fire Officer on receipt of a detailed report.

5. That the Strategic Partnership Board, established following the report to Cabinet on 24 July 2012 be agreed, to oversee the joint work of the respective councils, and this Board will act in an advisory capacity to the respective member groups holding delegated authority.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The benefits of participation include the regeneration of Woking Town Centre and improvement to the long-term viability of the existing retail offer in the town. The development will create additional employment in both the development phase and the longer term. SCC will additionally benefit from the provision of a new fit-for-purpose Fire Station. Both WBC and SCC will benefit from any associated growth in the council tax base, with the possibility, subject to government policy, of additional funding from the New Homes Bonus and the localisation of Business Rates. SCC's financing costs will be offset by the interest payments received from the Joint Venture.

**131/12 GUILDFORD FIRE STATION - NEW BUILD [Item 13]**

Cabinet were requested to award a contract for the delivery of Guildford Fire Station to the principal contractor.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That a contract for the delivery of Guildford Fire Station to the principal contractor be approved.
2. That the release of up to a maximum of capital funding, as set out in paragraph 5 of the submitted report, for the overall budget for delivery of the project be authorised.
3. That the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Leader, Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and Cabinet Member for Community Safety oversee the delivery of the new fire station to completion, with progress to be reported to Investment Panel.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The current facility is no longer fit for purpose and requires significant investment to remediate outstanding and ongoing maintenance items. A new build fire station will achieve the outcomes desired in the SFRS Public Safety Plan 2011 – 2020 through providing modern, efficient, low cost premises that are DDA compliant and meet equality and diversity targets with training facilities to meet modern fire service duties.

**132/12 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR TWO BASIC SCHOOLS NEEDS PROJECTS AND DELEGATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SIMILAR CONTRACT AWARDS [Item 14]**

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes introduced a revised report which was tabled at the meeting. He explained that these two basic Schools needs projects were in response to an increasing demand for school places across Surrey and the Council had established, in its Medium Term Financial Plan 2012-2017, a Capital Programme to fund the provision of additional places in a number of schools. He confirmed that the relevant local Members had been consulted.

Cabinet Members were pleased that the delivery of school places was moving forward.

**RESOLVED:**

1. Following a mini-competition tendering exercise and extensive pre-construction preparation, contracts be awarded for 2012/13 schools capital construction projects at Potters Gate and Bell Farm to the contractors identified in paragraph 7 of the submitted report.
2. That the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency, ensures formal agreement in writing with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning and the S151 officer, to authorise the award of future schools capital construction contracts, above £500k in value, where a mini-competition procedure has been followed under a Framework Agreement previously approved by Cabinet. Authorisation will be formally minuted with the S151 officer retaining the paperwork.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Additional school places are needed by September 2014 to meet an increase in pupil numbers. The award of contracts will enable construction to commence on two school projects and the proposed delegation will aid the delivery of future schools projects by shortening the contract award process.

**133/12 CONTRACT AWARD: PROVISION OF MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS [Item 15]**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency introduced the report which set out details of a contract to the recommended bidder for the provision of the council's mobile communications. The scope of the contract was to provide mobile handsets, voice and data provision for remote communications and would replace an existing two year contract and would result in significant savings for the Council.

**RESOLVED:**

That approval be given to proceed with the award of a two year contract on the basis set out in the report to the supplier identified in paragraph 23 of the submitted report.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The current contract is due to expire and the current tariffs are now uncompetitive. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendation provides best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.



## **134/12 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS [Item 16]**

### **(a) WOKING PRIORITY HOMES - DISPOSAL OF LAND AT MOOR LANE [Item 16a]**

This item was withdrawn and deferred to the next Cabinet meeting.

### **(b) NORTH REDHILL SCHOOL AND MERSTHAM LIBRARY PROPOSALS [Item 16b]**

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes commended the proposal for acquisition of land in Battlebridge Lane and said there was a need to provide a new site for a 2FE primary school in the North Redhill and Merstham area. A site had been identified that was owned by the Diocese of Southwark.

He also confirmed that both local Members had been consulted.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the acquisition of land at Battlebridge Lane, Redhill for a new 2FE primary school at a cost set out in paragraph 5 of the submitted report and subject to planning consent being forthcoming for the school, be approved.
2. That the Authority enters into an unconnected commitment to sell the existing Merstham Library, Merstham to the Diocese of Southwark site at open market value in the event it becomes available for disposal.

#### **Reasons for Decisions:**

To secure the proposed school site it is the requirement of the owners, the Diocese of Southwark that the County Council also enters into a separate, but unconnected, contract to sell the existing library site at Merstham, if it becomes available for sale in order to fulfil its community needs within Merstham.

## **135/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 17]**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That information relating to the items considered in Part 2 of the agenda may be made available to the press and public at the appropriate time:

Meeting closed at 3.40 pm

---

**Chairman**

**ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration:  
Report of the Winter Maintenance Task Group**

**Date considered: 19 September 2012**

1. The Select Committee considered the report of the Winter Maintenance Task Group, which reconvened in July 2012 and made a number of recommendations. The Task Group previously reported to Cabinet in July 2011, when various recommendations were approved for introduction in the 2010/11 winter season and further actions for the Task Group were identified.
2. The Select Committee supported the report of the Task Group, and endorsed its recommendations to the Cabinet.

**Grit bins:**

3. The Committee was informed that additions to Surrey's gritting network included a further fleet of 16 gritting vehicles to be provided by May Gurney. A licensing agreement to enable Parishes to purchase and place their own grit bins on the network was also due to be introduced, and Members were particularly supportive of this proposal.
4. The Committee was supportive of the proposal to introduce a barcoding system to monitor grit bin restocking, though it was stated that not all bins would be barcoded in time for next winter. It was noted that there would be a rolling programme ready for the 2013/14 season.
5. Concern was expressed that there was not sufficient provision for grit bins to be placed at schools. Officers responded that there were criteria in place for the appropriate placement of grit bins, though there was also the opportunity for Members to place additional bins on the network through their own allocations.
6. Members requested that they be provided with a grit bin resupply cost for when the £1000 funding for a four year period had elapsed, as it was felt that after this time the grit bin would still be serviceable. Officers informed the Committee that this would be incorporated into Surrey's winter service provision going forward.

**Salt stocks:**

7. Surrey's salt stock levels were discussed, and officers advised that Surrey currently has a salt storage capacity of 16,000 tonnes, with 10,000 tonnes being used last winter. These supplies are automatically replenished at the end of the season and during summer, when the cost of salt is cheaper. It was noted that there was a level of variance in the work required from year to year, and though annual costs were at a fixed sum paid to May Gurney, any funding not used was to be reinvested in the network.
8. Members expressed concern at the Council's ability to replenish salt stocks during an extreme weather event, when up to 1000 tonnes per day of salt could be used and

Central Government had the ability to strategically acquire part of Surrey's stocks for use elsewhere.

**Finances:**

9. Officers were asked to clarify the reasoning for a built-in £150,000 contingency fund. The Committee was informed that through the Medium Term Financial Plan the overall budget had been reduced and there was a need to justify spending of the contingency budget because problems had been experienced in the past during severe snow events.

**Communication:**

10. Officers advised that the Tatsfield Parish Trial detailed in the Winter Service Plan (whereby the Parish would provide information boards on roads advising drivers of snow events), would be operating at a relatively low cost. It was suggested that if successful, this process be rolled out to other Districts and Boroughs should they be interested.

**The network:**

11. Concern was expressed that the gritting network was not being extended, however overall the Committee was supportive of the Task Group's recommendations and felt that they addressed the concerns Members had expressed from the previous winter season.

**The Select Committee recommends to Cabinet:**

That the recommendations of the Winter Performance Task Group (as set out in item 7), be endorsed.

**Steve Renshaw**  
**Chairman of Environment & Transport Select Committee**

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

**WINTER SERVICE DEVELOPMENT FOR 2012/13**

The Environment and Transport Select Committee recommends:

1. The recommendations of the Winter Performance Task Group and the attached Winter Service Plan 2012/13 be considered for adoption.
2. A response be provided for each recommendation, agreeing actions as appropriate.
3. The Members of the Winter Performance Task Group be thanked for their work.

**Response:**

I would like to thank the Select Committee for their scrutiny of the Winter Service Report and Plan, and particularly the Task Group who have played a key role in the review of the Winter Service.

In their discussion, the Committee raised two specific issues at their meeting on 19th September, and I would like to confirm the response given by officers at that meeting. The first issue concerned the cost of re-stocking grit bins after the four year period has elapsed. These will be included in the winter service provision in the future, unless the priorities in that area change meaning that a grit bin is no longer required after the initial period.

The second issue concerned the role that Parish Councils can play in the Winter Service, particularly with regard to them erecting signs on roads advising of local problems. This will be considered further following the trial of this approach by Tatsfield Parish Council.

**John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**  
**25 September 2012**

**CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS**

**SEPTEMBER 2012**

**(i) APPROVAL OF BUDGET VIREMENT IN EXCESS OF £250,000**

That the virement for £1.4m be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

The virement has a neutral impact on the net directorate budget overall. The purpose of the virement is to update the budget in line with developments during the year thus making budget monitoring more meaningful and encouraging improved financial management.

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

**(ii) REQUEST BY HOLY TRINITY CE JUNIOR SCHOOL, GUILDFORD FOR A LICENSED DEFICIT**

That the request by Holy Trinity CE Junior School, for a licensed deficit of £99,000, repayable over three years, to part fund the building of a new school hall be approved.

**Reason for decision**

The proposal will allow a successful school to provide extended and improved accommodation at no cost to the council.

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

**(iii) GOSDEN HOUSE SCHOOL, BRAMLEY – PUBLICATION OF STATUTORY NOTICE**

That a statutory notice be published indicating the Local Authority's intention to remove residential provision at Gosden House from September 2013.

**Reason for decision**

The school is currently in deficit. Should nothing change, this deficit will significantly increase in the future. The current residential provision is viewed as an important part of the school but it does not meet any educational need as currently defined in children's statements. Maintaining residential provision at the school would make it difficult for the school to put its finances on a sustainable footing affecting its core function of educating pupils. The extended day model will go some way to meeting the social/play/friendship needs raised by pupils and parents in the consultation. The Senior Management Team of Gosden House support this proposal.

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

**(iv) BURPHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL – EXPANSION TO TWO FORM ENTRY**

That the following proposals be approved:

That Burpham Primary School expands to become a two form entry (2FE) primary school on 1 September 2013.

That the Published Admission Number (PAN) would be 60.

That the number of pupils would increase by 30 each year until the increased number of children have progressed through the school, when there will be 60 places per year from Reception to Year 6.

That the capacity of the school will increase from 210 places with 10 places in the Speech, Language and Communication Unit, to 420 places with 10 places in the Speech, Language and Communication Unit.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in Guildford are necessary. The expansion of Burpham Primary School would increase parental choice and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

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

**(v) NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL IN HORLEY**

1. That the Southwark Diocesan Board of Education be agreed as the council's preferred Proposer for a new one form entry primary school in north east Horley
2. That SCC hold discussions with Southwark Diocesan Board of Education over how the new school provision will serve the needs of the Horley area, including its admissions arrangements.
3. That the Department for Education be informed that the Southwark Diocesan Board of Education is the council's preferred Proposer for a new one form entry primary school in north east Horley.

**Reasons for decision**

Overall the Southwark Diocesan Board of Education proposal is assessed to be best able to provide the additional high quality places to meet the needs of the Horley area. Southwark Diocesan Board of Education primary schools typically deliver a high quality education in similar communities to that of Horley and it is reasonable to assume a new school would also be able to do so. Southwark Diocesan Board of Education has a track record of provision of high performing schools in similar communities to that of Horley. The Southwark Diocesan Board of Education school would also provide faith places in an area where there are none, increasing diversity of provision.

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

**(vi) THORPE COFE (VA) INFANT SCHOOL**

- (1) That the business case for the expansion of Thorpe C of E Infant School be approved.
- (2) That the delivery of the scheme be approved to a maximum value as set out in paragraph 4 of the report, to allow the Diocese to award a contract and undertake the works. This is subject to the Diocese and governing body meeting any project costs in excess of this approved funding allocation.

**Reasons for decision**

The scheme delivers a value for money expansion of the school that supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide much needed additional school places for local children and is fundamental to the Schools Basic Need programme approved by the Cabinet in March 2010 and by Investment Panel in Sept 2010. Release of the funding is required now so that building can commence as soon as possible in September 2012 in order to deliver the new accommodation by September 2013.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes – 11 September 2012)

**(vii) APPROVAL OF BUDGET VIREMENTS IN EXCESS OF £250,000**

That the four virements, set out in the submitted report, be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

Each of the virements has a neutral impact on the net directorate budget overall. The purpose of each virement is to update the budget in line with developments during the year thus making budget monitoring more meaningful and encouraging improved financial management.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Families – 12 September 2012)

**(viii) LOCAL PREVENTION COMMISSIONING 2012/13**

That the Local Prevention contract be extended for five months to 31 August 2013.

**Reasons for decision**

The local needs assessment for at risk young people has not changed, there are no significant performance concerns with the current provider and the recommendations in this report address specific Member feedback.

The benefits of the amended timetable include a longer period of time for providers to prove their performance, at least 9 months evidence for Members to evaluate before making longer term strategic commissioning decisions, more time for market development and the alignment of the commissioning cycle with the academic year which will provide greater consistency of service to young people.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 12 September 2012)

**(ix) REQUEST TO ADOPT NEW ROADS**

That, under the Scheme of Delegation and in line with Surrey County Council's previous road adoption policy, the adoption of the following roads be authorised:

- Hillbury Gardens, Warlingham (as set out in Annex 1),
- Tealby & Hillerton, Brighton Road, Lower Kingswood (as set out in Annex 2),
- Horley North East Sector (as set out in Annex 3),
- Land between Monument Way East and Albert Drive, Sheerwater (as set out in Annex 4).

**Reasons for decision**

The request to adopt the road at Hillbury Gardens, Warlingham and Tealby & Hillerton fully meets Surrey County Council's previous policy on road adoption.

The request to adopt land between Monument Way East and Albert Drive and Horley North West Sector fully meets Surrey County Council's current policy on road adoption.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 20 September 2012)

**(x) REQUEST TO STOP UP HIGHWAY RIGHTS OVER LAND FRONTING 75 FAIRMILE LANE, COBHAM**

This item has been withdrawn from this meeting.

**(xi) PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY AT YEW TREE WALK, EFFINGHAM**

That an application to the Magistrate's Court for an order stopping up Yew Tree Walk, Effingham as a highway, in accordance with the provisions of section 116 of the Highways Act 1980 be approved, and that the cost be borne by the County Council, providing that written confirmation be obtained from the residents that no claim will be made by them for a retrospective payment for the previous surfacing work.

**Reasons for decision**

To rectify the long-standing anomaly with respect to the status of Yew Tree Walk.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 20 September 2012)



**(xii) MAINTENANCE OF GRASS VERGES AT BISHOP FOX ESTATE, WEST MOLESEY – AGREEMENT OF FINANCIAL PAYMENT**

That Surrey County Council transfers £65,000 to Elmbridge Borough Council to contribute towards the maintenance of grass verges at Bishop Fox Estate, West Molesey, subject to Planning Infrastructure Contribution (PIC) money being available prior to commencement of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) being implemented.

**Reasons for decision**

To agree arrangements for the maintenance of grass verges on the Bishop Fox Estate, West Molesey in perpetuity.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 20 September 2012)