



We're on Twitter:
[@SCCdemocracy](https://twitter.com/SCCdemocracy)



Supplementary Agenda and Reports

for the meeting of

THE COUNTY COUNCIL

to be held on

10 OCTOBER 2017

(i)

(ii)

The following papers were not available at the time of publishing the main agenda. Please bring them with you to the meeting.

13 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS

(Pages 1
- 34)

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 Democratic Services by 12 noon on Monday 9 October 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2017 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr Mike Goodman
*Mr John Furey (Vice-Chairman)	* Mrs Mary Lewis
* Mrs Helyn Clack	* Mr Colin Kemp
*Mrs Clare Curran	* Mr Tim Oliver
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr Chris Botten, Member for Caterham Hill
Mr Stephen Cooksey, Member for Dorking and the Holmwoods
Mr Jonathan Essex, Member for Redhill East
Mrs Kay Hammond, Chair of the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee
Mr Bob Gardner, Chair of the Environment and Infrastructure Select
Committee
Mrs Hazel Watson, Member for Dorking Hills
Ms Sinead Mooney, Member for Staines
Ms Rose Thorne, Member for Godstone
Mr Nick Harrison, Member for Nork and Tattenhams

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

140/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

No apologies were received.

141/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 18 JULY 2017 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 July were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

142/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

143/17 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

1 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Questions were received from Mrs Hazel Watson and Mr Jonathan Essex. Responses to these can be found at Appendix 1.

Supplementary questions

Q1. Mrs Watson sought further clarity on the reasons why the sites owned by Council which had been identified for development were deemed to be commercially sensitive as detailed in the response to the question. The Leader of the Council stated that he was not prepared to discuss the details of the 36 sites identified by Surrey County Council (SCC) in a public forum for fear as this could jeopardise any future deals for these sites.

Q2. Mrs Watson indicated that there was nothing commercially sensitive about the annual costs of running the sites listed within the question and suggested that the real reason for not releasing this information was because it would be embarrassing to the Cabinet. The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services advised Mrs Watson that some of the sites contained within her list were currently in use. He further stated that the Council had an Asset Management Plan which it was implementing more detail about which would be provided at the next meeting of the Corporate Services Select Committee. Regarding Mrs Watson's query about commercial sensitivity, the Cabinet Member stated that releasing details about SCC's Asset Management Plan could have a knock on impact on surrounding property sites hence the reason it was agreed that this information should not be made public.

Q3. Mr Essex sought assurance that the Surrey County Council's property company does not operate in the same way as any other property company and put securing 20 per cent profit before provision of affordable housing on land owned by the council. He asked whether the Council would prioritise building affordable housing on land that it owns which has been earmarked for development. Mr Essex also sought confirmation from Cabinet Members that SCC would not put land that it owns in the greenbelt forward for housing development. The Leader of the Council reiterated SCC's policy in regard to building on the greenbelt as outlined in the response to Mr Essex's original question. He further highlighted that district and borough councils, as the local planning authorities in Surrey were ultimately responsible for what SCC would be able to develop.

144/17 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

A question was received from the Waverley Tenants Panel and a response is attached at Appendix 2.

As a supplementary question, Mrs Greenslade asked the Cabinet how it would expedite residents' assessments to ensure that those who required housing related support were not left without it. The Cabinet Member for Adults stated that SCC would continue to meet its legal obligations in regard to supporting vulnerable adults as enshrined in the Care Act. The Cabinet Member further emphasised that work was ongoing to ensure that those who required housing related support were not left without assistance prior to any assessment should the recommendations in item 6 of the agenda be agreed by the Cabinet.

145/17 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

Three petitions had been received on the following matters:

- 'Shaping Surrey's Community Recycling Centres 2017' (526 signatures received)
- 'Save Surrey's Tips' (3245 signatures received)
- 'Stop their plans to cut fire and rescue cover in Spelthorne by 50%' (1355 signatures received)

Responses to these can be found at Appendix 3.

Ms Lesley Bushnell presented the petition entitled 'Save Surrey's Tips', she was informed by the Leader of the Council that the Cabinet Member would provide a response to the petition during his introduction to item 7 'Consultation on Proposed Changes to Surrey's Community Recycling Centres'. While presenting petition to Cabinet, Ms Bushnell made the following points:

- Ms Bushnell highlighted the large number of signatures that the petition had attracted which she stated was demonstrative of the strength of feeling there is in Surrey about community recycling centres (CRCS).
- The petitioner expressed support for the proposal in the report's recommendations to retain all CRCs currently operating in Surrey but suggested that reducing the opening hours of CRCs would be self-defeating. In particular, Ms Bushnell stated that making it harder for residents to dispose of their waste responsibly would lead to an increase in instances of flytipping generating additional clean up costs for the Council. Ms Bushnell also highlighted that longer car journeys and larger queues at CRCs would have an adverse impact on the environment through increased vehicle emissions.
- In reference to the recommendation contained within the report to stop the free daily allowance of chargeable waste at CRCs, the petitioner indicated that this would jeopardise SCC's ability to achieve the Government's 70% waste recycling rate target by 2030.
- Ms Bushnell invited Cabinet Members to revisit the recommendations to reduce CRC opening hours and to stop the free daily allowance of chargeable waste in light of the concerns that she raised during her statement.

Mr Andy Pattinson presented the petition entitled 'Stop their plans to cut fire and rescue cover in Spelthorne by 50% '. While presenting petition to Cabinet, Mr Pattinson made the following points:

- He made reference to the large number of signatures that the petition had attracted as well as drawing attention to the actions and demonstrations which had taken place locally as evidence of the concerns that local residents had about the proposed reductions to the fire and rescue cover in the area. Mr Pattinson further called on Cabinet to release the results of the public consultation which SCC had undertaken regarding fire and rescue in Spelthorne and suggested that these had not been made public due to the unpopularity of the changes that were being proposed.
- The petitioner highlighted that Surrey has fewest number of fire officers per head of population in the country and that within the

county Spelthorne already has the fewest number of fire officers. Mr Pattison expressed concern that further reductions to fire and rescue provision in Spelthorne would put the safety of residents at risk particularly give the large number of high rise tower blocks in the borough. The petitioner stated that Spelthorne should have two fully crewed fire engines available for dispatch at all times as well as a water rescue team by virtue of its location on the River Thames and urged Cabinet to review proposed changes to fire and rescue coverage in the area.

The Cabinet Member for Communities thanked Mr Pattison for presenting the petition and stressed that the views of residents would be taken into account when deciding on any future changes to fire and rescue coverage in Spelthorne.

146/17 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

None received.

147/17 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

Reports were received from the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee in relation to Community Recycling Centres and the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee in relation to the Surrey Business Rates Retention Pilot. Responses to these can be found at Appendix 4.

Mr Bob Gardner, Chairman of the Environment & Infrastructure Select Committee presented the Cabinet with a summary of the recommendations made by a member of the Committee in regard to Item 7 entitled 'Consultation on Proposed Changes to Surrey's Community Recycling Centres (Cost Reductions)'. These recommendations can be found in the report submitted by the Select Committee at Item 5. Mr Gardner articulated particular concerns that Committee Members had about potential increases in flytipping on account of the reduced opening hours of CRCs and the removal of the free daily allowance on chargeable waste suggesting that the additional costs incurred by the Council from flytipping would outweigh the savings made by implementing the recommendations contained within the report.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport thanked Members of the Environment & Infrastructure Select Committee for their input on the proposals and advised Mr Gardner that he would respond to the specific points raised during his introduction to Item 7.

148/17 PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE FUNDING OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES [Item 6]

Mr Chris Botten, Local Member for Caterham Hill, opened discussions on this item, highlighting that he understood the serious financial challenges facing SCC but that reductions to Housing Related Support could have a significant impact on vulnerable residents in Surrey. Mr Botten read out a statement from the Chair of Tandridge District Council's Housing Association which drew attention to the implications that agreeing the recommendations within the report would have on those in sheltered accommodation. The Member further

suggested that it would be more productive for SCC to work in collaboration with district and borough councils on the delivery of Housing Related Support. Mr Botten also stressed that blanket cuts to Housing Related Support would ultimately have a detrimental impact on SCC's adult social care budget in the medium to long term and suggested that Cabinet defer any decision on the recommendations until financial modelling had taken place to understand the future impact of cutting this service on the adult social care budget.

Mr Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adults, introduced the report on Proposals for the Future Funding of Housing Related Support and began by acknowledging a number of representations from residents and housing associations which did not meet the criteria to be treated as petition but highlighted that the comments made within the representations mirrored those received during the consultation process.

The Cabinet Member advised that requests have been made by some districts and boroughs to delay implementation of the proposed changes and indicated that the service was in discussion with these authorities to understand the impact, if any, on the proposed savings outlined in the report if implementation was delayed.

Mr Few provided some background to the proposed changes to Housing Related Support informing Members that the scheme was introduced in 2003 by the Labour government and, at that time, was funded through a ring fenced grant. This grant was removed leaving the funding entirely to the County Council, thereby making this service non statutory. In light of the allocated savings target given to the Adult Social Care Directorate of £26m this year it had been necessary for the service to once again revisit all non-statutory services.

The Cabinet Member stated that the Council spent approximately £9 million on the provision of Housing Related Support, £4 million on older people and people with disabilities and £4.5 million on socially excluded and disadvantage groups. He advised that elderly and disabled people who received this benefit and required additional support would be met by the service subject to the normal assessment process

Attention was drawn to a detailed consultation which had taken place with older people and those with learning disabilities who were in receipt of the grants. The results of this can be found in paragraph 17 of the report. Specific mention was made to the response to question 2, annex 3, where 50% of respondents stated that they used the service less than once per week or did not respond whereas 25% used the service weekly and a further 25% on a daily basis. It was highlighted that following the responses to the detailed consultation, it had been decided to retain 30% of grants for older adults. For disabled people and socially excluded groups 80% of the grant would be retained and the service would be reconfigured accordingly.

Cabinet was further informed that a detailed Equalities Impact Assessment had taken place and advised that the results of this could be found within Annex 7 to the main report.

The Cabinet Member for Member for Children indicated that she appreciated the concerns raised by residents about the proposed changes to Housing

Related Support but highlighted that it was necessary on account of the serious financial challenges confronting the Council. Ms Curran provided an anecdote about a sheltered housing unit in her ward which had undergone changes similar to those proposed within the recommendations. She stated that residents of this sheltered housing unit had opposed the changes but the concerns they had raised about losing an onsite warden had been mitigated by community groups and residents' personal budgets which suggested that reductions to Housing Related Support would be less significant than anticipated. The Cabinet Member stated that she had been reassured by the Mr Few's comments about targeting Housing Related Support towards the most vulnerable and that the service appears to be alert to the potential impacts and risks of reductions in this funding stream.

Ms Curran sought more clarity on the impact that reductions in Housing Related Support would have on health partners. The Cabinet Member for Adults stressed that it was hard to assess what the implications of reducing this impact would be on Surrey's healthcare providers and commissioners but highlighted the significant progress that had been made in reducing the Council's contribution to Delayed Transfers of Care (DTOCs) which was helping to save the NHS money.

Mr Colin Kemp, Cabinet Member for Highways, advised that he was Executive Member for Housing at Woking Borough Council which enabled him to see both sides of the debate. He welcomed the extensive consultation that SCC had undertaken regarding the proposed changes to Housing Related Support. Mr Kemp acknowledged that reductions in funding would present some challenges locally but stressed that SCC would work with district & borough councils to understand how they could work together differently to ensure continued to support for Surrey's vulnerable residents.

RESOLVED:

The Cabinet agreed that:

1. Surrey County Council will no longer provide funding for Housing Related Support for people with learning, physical and sensory disabilities and services for older people; and
2. That Surrey County Council will continue to fund Housing Related Support for the socially excluded - those with mental health issues, those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, ex-offenders and the gypsy and traveller community.

Reasons for decisions

The recommendation to cease Housing Related Support funding for older people and people with disabilities is made for the following reasons:

1. It will deliver an estimated saving of £2.8m (70% of the budget) based on the planning assumption that 30% of the budget will be needed in locality teams to meet an increase in demand from eligible needs of residents.

2. It will cease any dual funding, where Surrey County Council is funding a care package and Housing Related Support for an individual, and will mean we assess people based on their current need.
3. Local information and support is available to residents in their communities and online should they need to find out about care, community and health information and support available.
4. Evidence obtained from all other local authorities that were able to provide benchmarking information demonstrates they have already ceased and/or remodelled provision.
5. Residents will be able to ask for an assessment; if they have eligible needs they will receive a personal budget.
6. It is aligned with the Council's Family, Friends and Communities approach to maintaining wellbeing and independence.

The recommendation to continue funding Housing Related Support services for socially excluded and disadvantaged people is made for the following reasons:

1. In November 2016, Cabinet agreed housing related support services for socially excluded groups should be protected.
2. A co-designed, transparent approach has been taken with district and borough colleagues, providers and wider stakeholders.
3. The recommendation will deliver a saving of £0.9m (20% of budget) to be delivered with the minimum impact on people who use services and carers.

149/17 CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SURREY'S COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES (COST REDUCTIONS) [Item 7]

The Cabinet received a statement from Mr Jonathan Essex, Local Member for Redhill East. In his statement, Mr Essex made the following observations:

- The Member welcomed that the recommendations contained within the report did not propose closure of any of Surrey's CRCS stating that this demonstrated the Cabinet had listened to some of the concerns of residents as expressed during the public consultation. Mr Essex did, however, articulate his concerns about the potential implications of reducing the opening hours of CRCs suggesting that it could increase instances of flytipping in the county and could discourage residents from recycling.
- He stressed that in line with supporting the amended motion at the council meeting that SCC had committed to investigate further options to improve the recycling service and that increasing recycling to meet our recycling target instead would save 5-6 million pounds, as confirmed by officers at the recent Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee. SCC should look to accelerate improvement of recycling rates across Surrey to exceed our 70 per cent target through 'invest to save' measures as an alternative to the current proposals. Also investing in new recycling (as opposed to energy from waste)

infrastructure would give SCC an added incentive to raise recycling rates.

The Cabinet received a statement from Mr Stephen Cooksey, Local Member for Dorking South and the Holmwoods. Mr Cooksey made the following points in his statement:

- The Member stated that CRCs had been one of SCC's few success stories over recent years by deterring flytipping and enhancing recycling rates. The package of extended closure times and removal of the free daily allowance of chargeable waste proposed within the report would make it more difficult for people to recycle and, as a result, could lead to more flytipping and less recycling.
- Attention was drawn to the 13,000 responses submitted during the public consultation which Mr Cooksey used to highlight the strength of feeling that existed among Surrey residents about the importance of CRCs.
- Particular concerns were expressed about Dorking CRC which, if the recommendations were agreed, would be closed four days a week. The Member suggested that Cabinet Members from the Mole Valley area should oppose the recommendations based on that fact alone.
- Mr Cooksey criticised the lack of clarity in the report stressing that projections had not been provided on flytipping, recycling rates or the potential revenue arising from the sale of recycled goods.
- Finally, the Member suggested that removal of the free daily allowance could be open to legal challenge and that this should be investigated in more detail by the Council.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Mr Mike Goodman, introduced the report and highlighting that the public consultation was fundamental in shaping the future of CRCs and that no decision had been taken on them prior to the consultation taking place. Mr Goodman thanked all of the residents and stakeholders who had taken part in the consultation. The Cabinet Member stated that the consultation process had also encompassed discussions with district and borough councils as well as local Members to arrive at the recommendations, a revised set of which were tabled at the meeting and are attached to these minutes as Appendix 6. A list of proposed CRC opening hours was also tabled at the meeting and is attached to these minutes as Appendix 7. It was noted that no Liberal Democrat Councillor had made representations by letter or email to the Cabinet Member during the consultation phase to help shape the future of CRCs in the County. Mr Goodman divulged that more savings were required and that it would be necessary to find these within other parts of the service.

Mr Goodman responded to the specific point raised by Mr Essex in regard to generating income through recycling and reducing the cost of waste disposal. He highlighted that SCC has been working with district and borough councils through the Surrey Waste Partnership in a bid to drive up recycling rates across the County which would help to deliver savings for SCC and its district and borough partners. He also drew attention to efforts being made by the Council to improve recycling rates in flats but indicated that although improvements were being made they would take a while to fully embed. Mr Goodman advised that SCC was looking to invest in infrastructure to generate

more income through the sale of recycled goods stating this goal would take place in the medium to long term.

The Cabinet Member stressed that he understood residents' concerns about potential increases in flytipping due to reduced CRC opening hours but highlighted that these concerns were not supported by evidence. Flytipping had continued to fall in the County despite previous reductions in CRC opening hours on account of the Council's robust strategy for tackling flytipping, a strategy which had been replicated nationally due to its success. Mr Goodman indicated that the service was in the process of developing a system that would provide data to enable SCC to target its efforts to tackle flytipping more effectively while work with landowners would continue to prosecute those who dump waste on private land.

The Cabinet Member advised that CRCs, in tandem with improved sorting of black bags had improved recycling rates by 2.7%. Improving recycling rates further would rely on educating residents on bringing refuse to CRCs to maximise the amount which can be recycled. It is hoped that doing this will drive a further £400,000 in savings over the coming years. Increasing the number of recycling shops will also maximise the benefit to the County by passing on some of the income generated to charities.

The Cabinet Member for Highways reiterated residents' concerns about flytipping and emphasised that the majority of offenders are individuals who charge to pick up refuse and then dump it a few hundred metres along the road. Residents should ensure that they employ reputable companies to pick up waste who will dispose of it responsibly. In regard to CRCs, Mr Kemp highlighted that ordinarily visits to the tip are planned occasions rather than done on a whim. SCC was simply asking residents to work with them in order to achieve the savings that the Council is required to make by planning visits to CRCs around the revised opening hours as outlined in the tabled schedule. The Cabinet Member asked Mr Goodman where the additional savings that the service was required to make would come from. He was informed that the Council would work with Suez to design a programme that would drive further efficiencies from the existing contract.

Mr Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adults, suggested that composting green waste and selling it at CRCs could generate some income for the Council, Mr Goodman confirmed that he would investigate this proposal in more detail.

Mr Goodman was asked whether people who live in Surrey can still use Crawley CRC as it is the closest tip for some residents and he confirmed that Crawley CRCs was still open to people who reside in Surrey.

The Leader of the Council indicated that by listening to residents' concerns as captured by the public consultation, the Cabinet had demonstrated the core values that underpin what SCC does. He thanked officers for the work they had done which had enabled the Council to keep all of its CRCs open despite its significant financial challenges.

RESOLVED:

The Cabinet agreed that:

1. a strategic network of CRCs will remain open for seven days a week. Other sites will be open at specified times as per the tabled document listing proposed CRC opening times.
2. That the four CRCs at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham remain open in light of the views submitted in the public consultation. Details of the proposed times of operation will be tabled at the Cabinet meeting;
3. That the free daily allowance of chargeable waste from the construction, alteration or repair of homes and gardens such as rubble, plasterboard and soil is stopped from December 2017, as set out in paragraphs 27 to 28 of the submitted report;
4. vans and trailers are excluded from CRCs at Bagshot, Caterham, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham and Warlingham from December 2017 as set out in paragraphs 29 to 31 of the submitted report;
5. Residents from Bracknell Forest and Wokingham are excluded from Camberley, and that the Strategic Director, Environment & Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agrees any further restrictions on non-Surrey residents using the sites in Camberley and Farnham following further discussions with Hampshire County Council, as set out in paragraphs 32 to 35 of the submitted report.
6. Cabinet supports maximising the use of all CRC sites and achieving the best public value and that work continues to progress further efficiency measures at CRCs for example as stated in paragraphs 36 to 37 of the submitted report.
7. the Surrey Waste Partnership is supported to promote the better use of kerbside services and other waste disposal services.

Reasons for decisions

At present there is spare capacity at the CRC network because of a reduction in throughput due to the previous changes. An adequate service can be retained if the above additional efficiency measures are implemented that will achieve an estimated cost reduction in a full year of £1.08 - £1.56 million. **Table 3** in paragraph 43 gives a breakdown by efficiency measure. These recommendations take note of the views expressed in the public consultation and, the impact to the public (including those with protected characteristics) and the environment. If these recommendations are introduced it will reduce costs and provide better value for money for the Surrey taxpayer, whilst still maintaining a comprehensive service that supports the strategic aims of increasing recycling and reducing landfill, and meets its legal requirements as a Waste Disposal Authority.

150/17 THOMAS KNYVETT COLLEGE, ASHFORD - SCHOOLS BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT [Item 8]

The item was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Education who stated that Schools Basic Need Funding was a success story for the Council which had received a good settlement from Central Government, funding which had

been fought for by the Leader of the Council. The settlement had enabled SCC to provide a considerable number of school places over the previous four years keeping pace with demographic demand in the County.

In regard to Thomas Knyvett College, Mrs Lewis gave details of the project and stated that it would provide 300 additional places by utilising latent capacity within the school which would cope with population increases in the area over the next few years. The Cabinet Member further highlighted that Thomas Knyvett was rated 'Good' and stated that she was confident that the school would retain this rating while it was being adapted to provide these additional places.

The Cabinet Member for Adults asked Mrs Lewis to explain how the Council secures expansion to a school that sits within a Multi-Academy Trust. He was informed that expansion in academies is secured in the same way that it is at a Community School, through cooperation and partnership building. SCC can theoretically force a Community School to expand but in reality it doesn't constitute a practicable solution in most circumstances.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion, as set out in submitted Part 2 report, the business case for the provision of accommodation sufficient to enable two additional forms of entry (300 places) at Thomas Knyvett College be approved.

Reasons for decisions

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places to meet the needs of the population in Spelthorne Borough by providing Year 7 places when and where they are needed.

151/17 DE STAFFORD SCHOOL, CATERHAM - SCHOOLS BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT [Item 9]

Mr Chris Botten, Local Member for Caterham Hill, provided a statement stressing his support for increasing the number of places at de Stafford School. Mr Botten emphasised the quality of the education provision in Caterham and thanked the Cabinet for the steps it had taken to improve schools in this area. The Local Member drew attention to the significant improvements which had been made to de Stafford School over recent years which now had excellent leadership and governance.

The Cabinet Member for Education thanked Mr Botten for his comments and added that de Stafford was also a highly inclusive school with a higher percentage of SEND pupils than is the average across the County. Mrs Lewis indicated that de Stafford School was rated 'Good' by Ofsted and informed Cabinet that the Headteacher is confident of maintaining the standard of education provision while construction work takes place to expand the school.

The Leader of the Council mentioned that SCC had worked closely with Tandridge District Council to provide better facilities and resources for schools in Caterham which had substantially improved education provision in the area.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion set out in the submitted Part 2 report, the business case for the provision of an additional 1 Form of Entry (30 places per year) providing, in total, 150 secondary places at De Stafford School from September 2018, be approved.

Reasons for decisions

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places, relative to demand.

152/17 ST MARY'S OXTED CHURCH OF ENGLAND JUNIOR SCHOOL - SCHOOLS BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Education introduced the report and advised Cabinet that St Mary's was an outstanding school. Not content to rest on its laurels, St Mary's was currently in the process of Down's Way Infant School to create an all through Primary School in Oxted. The additional 480 places that the building project provided would ensure that there were enough school places in the area despite demographic pressures created by an increasing population. Mrs Lewis stated that she was confident St Mary's was capable of retaining its 'Outstanding' Ofsted rating while construction work was taking place to provide the additional school places.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion set out in the submitted Part 2 report, the business case for the provision of an additional one Form of Entry worth of junior places in Oxted & Limpsfield be approved.

Reasons for decisions

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places, relative to demand.

153/17 SURREY BUSINESS RATES RETENTION PILOT 2018/19 [Item 11]

Mrs Kay Hammond, Chair of the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee (OBSC) provided a statement to Cabinet regarding the Business Rates Retention Pilot Scheme. She advised that the OBSC had received a presentation from officers on the Pilot and that the proposal for Surrey to put itself forward for inclusion in the scheme had attracted unanimous, cross-party support from Members of the Committee. Mrs Hammond reiterated that recommendation from OBSC that the Council pursues the scheme and wished Cabinet Members support in their negotiations with district and borough councils.

The Leader of the Council stated that he was meeting with the Leaders of the district and borough councils on Wednesday 27 September to discuss submitting a bid to enter into the Business Rates Retention Pilot. He highlighted that collectively the County can make a strong bid to the Secretary of State for inclusion in the Pilot. Mr Hodge did, however, stress that inclusion in the scheme would not solve the financial difficulties being faced by SCC and its district and borough partners.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet agreed the following:

- i. To develop a joint application with the eleven boroughs and districts for Surrey to be a pilot for the 2018/19 100% Business Rates retention Scheme
- ii. That the council understand and agree that the pilot may not include a 'no detriment' clause
- iii. To note that the Leader, in consultation with the Chief Executive and Director of Finance, will take the final decision to submit an application for a Surrey wide pilot involving the county council and eleven borough and districts councils
- iv. That Surrey County Council is the lead authority for this pilot.

Reasons for decisions

The opportunity to become a pilot authority for the 100% Business Rates Retention Scheme aligns with the council's strategy of seeking to influence the development of the local government finance system and to nurture partnership working. In addition, if successful, being a pilot will enable local retention of all business rate growth within the county for use to assist in ensuring financial stability and sustainability as well as to invest in economic prosperity.

154/17 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 12]

The Leader of the Council read out the statement below regarding Cabinet's monthly budget monitoring report following which each Cabinet Member was asked to provide a brief outline of the budget position for the services within their portfolio.

'Today I present the budget monitoring report for period five of 2017/18, up to 31 August 2017.

In February this council set its budget for 2017/18 in the face of: significant rising demand pressures (particularly in social care); falling Government funding and continuing restraint on our ability to raise funds locally. To balance 2017/18's budget the council had to make plans to deliver an

unprecedented £104m. This challenge comes on top of making over £450m savings since 2010.

Within the £104m savings target, the council has agreed plans for £95m savings, with £9m savings to be identified. After five months of the financial year, services have already achieved over £46m of savings and another £28m on track for delivery, with £8m facing potential barriers. £12m savings are now thought to be unachievable in this year (including £6m in Adult Social Care, £3m in Early Help and £3m in Waste Disposal).

The council's 2017/18 budget includes significant demand and cost pressures, mostly in social care. In some services a small change in volume can lead to significantly increased costs. In the first five months of the year, demand has increased above what was expected even a short time ago. In Children's Services, demand, and the complexity of the demand, continues to increase and is expected to add a £9m pressure by the end of the financial year. In Public Health, retendering a major contract is forecast to delay planned changes and add a pressure of up to £2m. Partially offsetting these pressures, there are forecast underspends elsewhere, including in Schools & SEND, Highways & Transport.

The combined impact of delivering lower savings than planned and demand rising faster than anticipated is a forecast overspend of £21m for 2017/18. This is a £3m improvement on the overspend forecast as at 30 June 2017, reported to Cabinet in July 2017. However, considerable risks of volatility remain in some key budgets that are outside the council's control and the forecast year end position could worsen by up to £13m. This could put the forecast overspend over £30m.

The Local Government Finance Act requires the council to ensure its expenditure (including spending already incurred in year and anticipated to be incurred) does not exceed its available resources. In response, Cabinet as advised by the Section 151 Officer, is developing a recovery plan to ensure a balanced in-year budget. Cabinet will consider the recovery plan in its next budget monitoring report in October.

Given the gravity of this forecast position, it is vital members and officers continue their actions to identify and implement ways to mitigate the impact of savings shortfalls and service pressures. The council needs to identify and implement alternative savings and cost reductions quickly to address the ongoing issues affecting the 2017/18 budget and the council's future financial sustainability.'

The Cabinet Member for Adults advised that there had been a deterioration in the budget position for the Adult Social Care directorate over the last month. The Council was continuing to deal with growing demand for social care services which meant there was a projected of £6 million overspend in the Adult Social Care budget. This had being offset by an additional £4 million in income that it was anticipated would be generated through increased fees and charges on social care services provided by residents. There was some concern around the implications that winter pressures could have on the Adult Social Care budget but some encouragement could be taken from SCC's performance on Delayed Transfers of Care.

Ms Clare Curran stated that there was a £11.5 million overspend in the Children, Schools and Families budget for the financial year 2017/18. The

financial sustainability of Children's Service was at risk on account of the high number of calls that the Council was receiving that were reporting concerns about the welfare of a child. Ofsted and the Department of Communities & Local Government had also placed specific requirements on the Directorate in relation to caring for vulnerable children that was creating additional cost pressures on the budget and therefore contributing further to the projected shortfall. The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) was also experiencing levels of demand significantly beyond what had been expected when it had first been established. The MASH was proving to be exceptionally resource intensive on account of the large numbers of staff that were required to manage this demand.

The Cabinet Member for Education stated that the change from Special Educational Needs Statements (SEND) Statements to Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP) had led to a 25% increase in the number of children who qualified for support for services that SCC is obliged to provide. The service did, however, have a £1.8 million underspend projected due to staff vacancies.

Mr Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport indicated that there was a forecast overspend of £2.5 million within his portfolio's budget. This was partly due to the fact that it had been necessary to revisit the savings expected to arise from the review of community recycling centres. It was anticipated that contract negotiations with Suez would help to drive out further efficiencies although if these were not achieved then the service's potential overspend could be £4 million.

The Cabinet Member for Communities indicated that the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's (SFRS) savings plan was £0.3 million short of balancing her portfolio's budget. It was expected that staff savings, fleet reductions and changes to pension arrangements would close this shortfall.

Mrs Helyn Clack informed Cabinet that there was a forecast overspend within the SCC's Public Health budget arising from the difficulty in negotiating a new contract for the provisions of sexual health services.

Mr Tim Oliver highlighted that further changes could be made within his portfolio's budget by more effective and ubiquitous use of digital communications by Council staff and Members. In particular he stressed the need to reduce the amount of paper used at meetings.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Mr Colin Kemp, indicated that an increase in energy prices had created some pressure within the budget for the highways service. £500,000 in savings had been found but there was a degree of risk to these and so it would be necessary to monitor these carefully. Mr Kemp advised that the recommendations contained within the report including a request for Cabinet Members to approve a draw down of £18,000 from Highways & Transport's capital carry forward from 2016/17.

RESOLVED:

That the following be noted:

1. Forecast revenue budget outturn for 2017/18, is £21m overspend (paragraph 1 of the submitted report). This includes:
 - £9m savings to be identified,
 - £12m savings considered unachievable in 2017/18,
 - £11m service demand pressures
 - £11m underspends and additional income.
2. Significant risks to the revenue budget (paragraphs 38 to 42) could add £13m to the forecast overspend:
 - £4m in Adult Social Care
 - £8m in Children, Schools & Families and
 - £1m in Place Development & Waste
3. Forecast planned savings for 2017/18 total £83m against £95m agreed savings and £104m target (paragraph 43 of the submitted report).
4. The Section 151 Officer's commentary and the Monitoring Officer's Legal Implications commentary in paragraphs 15 to 18 of the main budget monitoring report to Cabinet that the council has a duty to ensure its expenditure does not exceed resources available and move towards a sustainable budget for future years.
5. Cabinet will receive a recovery plan for consideration in October 2017.

The the following be approved:

6. £18,000 draw down of Highways & Transport's capital carry forward from 2016/17 (paragraphs 60 to 62 of the submitted report).
7. £2.9m amendments to schools' devolved capital budgets (paragraphs 63 to 66 of the submitted report).

Reasons for decisions

This report is presented to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

155/17 TRANSFER OF EMPLOYMENT OF CORONER'S OFFICE STAFF FROM SURREY POLICE TO SCC [Item 13]

The report was introduced by Ms Denise Turner-Stewart who asked Cabinet to agree proposals to transfer staff working for the Coroner's Office but employed by Surrey Police over to the employment of SCC to agree funding for a case management system. Funding responsibilities would be phased over the of five years in order to mitigate the immediate impact on SCC's budget. The Cabinet Member stated that SCC was responsible for funding the Coroner's Service in the County but highlighted that for some years Surrey Police had accepted responsibility for financing some Coroner's Office staff. They were, however, under no statutory obligation to do so and, given that it was not a core policing role, negotiations had taken place about bringing these staff into the Council's employment. Ms Turner-Stewart emphasised that bringing all staff under a single employer would help to create a more transparent cohesive and efficient Coroner's Service.

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services expressed his support for the proposal. He suggested that the change could provide an opportunity to reflect on how the Coroner's Service operates in order to embed improvements and drive out efficiencies.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet agreed:

1. to the proposed transfer of staff and noted the associated MTFP pressures that will commence in 2019-20; and
2. that Surrey County Council would agree and document future service levels and mutual obligations in a Service Level Agreement or mutual Agreements with Surrey Police and the Senior Coroner.

Reasons for decisions

This transfer will provide a single source of support to the Surrey Coroner recognising SCC's role in supporting the Coroner Service and the nature of the role of Coroner's Officer.

Defining the services that each of the three parties can expect of each other will provide the Coroner with clarity about future support arrangements and ensures transparency of the use of public funds

There is clear evidence from those areas where a transfer has been undertaken that the service runs more efficiently where just one agency has overall responsibility for providing the Coroner with a comprehensive support package and ultimately can lead to improvements to the experience of bereaved residents in line with SCC's corporate Resident Experience priority.

156/17 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER / INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 14]

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by Cabinet Members / Investment Board since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1 be noted.

Reasons for decisions

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

157/17 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 15]

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.

158/17 THOMAS KNYVETT COLLEGE, ASHFORD - SCHOOLS BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT [Item 16]

The Cabinet Member for Education said that this report contained the confidential financial and value for money information relating to item 8.

RESOLVED:

1. That the business case for the project to expand Thomas Knyvett College (secondary school) by 300 places, at a total cost, as set out in the submitted report be approved;
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education, the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services and the Leader of the Council be approved; and
3. That the authority to approve the award of contracts for works be delegated to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Education, Head of Procurement and Section 151 Officer when a competitive tender is procured through the new Orbis Construction Framework.

Reasons for decisions

The proposal delivers and supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places to meet the needs of the population in Spelthorne Borough.

159/17 DE STAFFORD SCHOOL, CATERHAM- SCHOOLS BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT [Item 17]

The Cabinet Member for Education said that this report contained the confidential financial and value for money information relating to item 9.

RESOLVED:

1. That the business case for the project to expand De Stafford Secondary School by 150 additional places, at a total cost as set out in the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services, the Cabinet Member for Education and the Leader of the Council.

Reasons for decisions

The proposal delivers and supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places to meet the needs of the population in Tandridge Borough.

160/17 ST MARY'S OXTED CHURCH OF ENGLAND JUNIOR SCHOOL - SCHOOLS BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Education said that this report contained the confidential financial and value for money information relating to item 10.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Business Case for the project to expand St Mary's C of E Junior School, Oxted, by 120 places at a total cost as set out in the submitted report, be approved;
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education, the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services and the Leader of the Council be approved
3. That authority to approve the award of contracts for works be delegated to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Education, Head of Procurement and Section 151 Officer when a competitive tender is procured through the Southern Modular Building Framework.

Reasons for decisions

The proposal delivers and supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places to meet the needs of the population in Tandridge.

161/17 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS [Item 19]

The report was introduced by Mr Tim Oliver who informed Cabinet that they were asked to approve a property disposal. He advised that a late bid had been received for the property but on balance it was felt that the original offer as contained within the recommendation within the report was the preferable option.

RESOLVED:

The Cabinet is asked to authorise the sale of land, as set out in the submitted report, following a marketing exercise and negotiations with adjoining owners and developers.

Reasons for decisions

The land is no longer required to support service delivery or capable of generating a significant income. The capital receipt will contribute to the funding sources available to the Council in support of its delivery of services to its residents.

162/17 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 20]

It was agreed that non-exempt information may be made available to the press and public, where appropriate.

Meeting closed at 4.20 pm

Chairman

CABINET – 26 September 2017

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members Questions

Question (1) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

The Leader of the Council, in his Leader's Statement at Council on July 11th 2017, said:

"We're also working with district and borough colleagues on a housing strategy and have identified several dozen sites to deal with the chronic housing shortage".

Please could he list the "several dozen sites" that SCC and the boroughs & districts have identified for housing.

Reply:

Thank you for your questions, I am able to advise that Surrey County Council (SCC) Cabinet will shortly be considering a Cabinet Paper on this specific subject matter to bring forward at scale and pace the delivery of housing across a number of sites across Surrey.

By working closely with District & Boroughs, a number of strategic opportunities are being explored together that will help bring forward sites to deliver housing that meets the needs of residents across Surrey.

As for the list of sites at this time I can advise that within the SCC ownership there are 36 sites currently identified. Some sites are currently classed as vacant but generating income and the Council continues to examine its assets to enable SCC to optimise Service Delivery whilst identifying income generation ideas.

As the Member has already listed in her second question she must accept and recognise the information requested is commercially sensitive at this time to ensure that SCC is able to retain the maximum benefits from any redevelopment proposals.

As SCC progresses matters I will ensure members are made aware of information that can be released without compromising commercial factors.

**Mr David Hodge CBE
Leader of the Council
26 September 2017**

Question (2) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

What are the costs per annum of retaining each of the following County Council owned vacant buildings with regard to any head rent, rates, security, general maintenance or any other direct costs? Please provide the costs per building and the period of time each building has been vacant:

Former Pond Meadow School, Pond Meadow, Guildford.

Former Lime Tree School, Alexander Road, Reigate RH2 8ED
Brockhurst, Brox Road, Ottershaw, KT16 0HQ
Former Spelthorne Clinic, Spelthorne Junior School, Feltham Hill Road, Ashford.
The Former Manor School, Magdalen Crescent, Byfleet.
Elm Grove Hersham Road Walton on Thames KT12 1LZ
Sycamore Centre, 14 West Hill, Epsom, KT19 8HR
Former Depot, 14a Ladymead, Guildford
Bramley Grounds Maintenance Depot, Gosden Common, Bramley.
7, 8, 9, 10, 11 Gosden Common, Bramley, Guildford. GU5 0AD
Dorking Centre, Dene Street, Dorking.
Former Depot, Chalkpit Lane, Guildford Road, Great Bookham.
Bentley Centre, Banstead
Merstham Youth Centre Radstock Way, Merstham, Redhill
Glenthorne, Rookery Road, Staines.
The Oast House, Kingston Road, Staines.
White Cottage, 34 Kingston Road, Staines.
Malthouse, Kingston Road, Staines.
Former Portesbery school, Portesbery Road, Camberley GU15 3SZ
Coachman's, France Hill Drive, Camberley
Dormers, Foxon Lane Caterham CR3 5SG
Former Warlingham Boys Club, Chelsham Road, Warlingham.
Bletchingley AEC, Sytchens Lane, Bletchingley
Depot at Beech Grove Yard, Caterham.
Longfield, Killicks Road, Cranleigh
Cobgates, Farnham
Old Fire Station, High Road, Byfleet
Woking Youth Centre, Walton Road, Woking, GU21 5DL
Cartref, Moor Lane, Woking GU22 9RB

Reply:

As the Member is aware, she has submitted a significant list of assets that requires a considerable amount of officer time to investigate and respond to and, as stated in response to her first question, it would be inappropriate to provide any material that would compromise the commercial interests of the Council.

Mr David Hodge CBE
Leader of the Council
26 September 2017

Question (3) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

Please can you confirm what proportion of the housing proposed in the new strategy announced by the Leader at Council on July 11th will be:

- a) at an affordable or social rent; and
- b) built on green belt land?

Reply:

- a) I can advise that each scheme will be independently assessed and that when presented to the relevant local planning authorities the schemes presented will be those that aim to assist the relevant local policies on affordable and social rent whilst delivering schemes that are financially viable.
- b) I am sure we can agree that more housing is much needed in Surrey. The council has an existing policy about protecting the Green Belt and schemes will need to be designed with the requirements of the planning authority's Local Plan in mind.

Mr David Hodge CBE
Leader of the Council
26 September 2017

Question (4) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

The overall County Council's recycling rate for last year was reported as 57.7%. Please could the Cabinet Member outline what extra resources will be deployed in order to meet (or indeed exceed) the County Council's agreed strategy of at least 70% recycling, in the light of his plan to reduce the opening hours of CRCs and end the free daily allowance?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. Firstly I would point out that Surrey County Council is not removing any of the recycling facilities from its community recycling centres (CRCs) so residents will still be able to recycle the same wide range of materials. In addition, as reported to Cabinet, officers will be working with Suez to increase the recycling rates at CRCs by further black bag sorting. I therefore do not expect the proposed changes to impact negatively on the recycling rate at our CRCs.

The greatest potential for increasing recycling lies with the borough and district council kerbside collection service. Whilst the collection services offered by Surrey district and borough councils are broadly similar, there is a significant difference in recycling rates between individual districts and boroughs. The Council continues to work as part of the Surrey Waste Partnership to encourage greater levels of participation in recycling schemes through targeted publicity campaigns and working on specific initiatives such as improving the recycling offering for flatted properties. Significant resources are being employed by the Surrey Waste Partnership in both of these areas and Surrey County Council will continue to support these important initiatives.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment & Infrastructure
26 September 2017

CABINET – 26 September 2017

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question 1: Brenda Greenslade - for Waverley Tenants Panel

"In relation to the Housing Related Support proposal, have Members of Surrey County Council's Cabinet taken into consideration the comparison between the costs of continuing the funding for the Managers of Waverley Borough Council Sheltered Housing Schemes and the cost of some of the residents having to go into full time care homes if they no longer have the support of a manager in their unit? The cost of 24 hour care in a care home would not only be very much more but also there are fewer and fewer places available for an ever growing older population which is forecast to grow considerably in Waverley in the coming years.

Reply:

Continued cuts to funding, rising costs and increasing demand for key services means the need for Surrey County Council to find savings has reached unprecedented levels. Housing Related Support funding is no longer ring fenced and our future practice will be guided by our duties under the Care Act 2014. Surrey County Council (SCC) will ensure everyone is treated consistently under the Care Act and is assessed based on their current need. These proposed changes mean a shift from the current universal offer, to target the limited funding the County Council has available on those adults with eligible needs.

Providers meet the costs of employing a scheme manager through various income streams, including rent, service charges, charitable funds and by the minimum contribution made by the County Council's Housing Related Support. Withdrawal of Housing Related Support funding will not necessarily mean the service will end or that the scheme manager service will be withdrawn. It will very much depend upon Waverley Borough Council's response to the County Council's decision. Waverley may find alternative funding streams to retain the service unchanged, they may reduce or remodel their offer.

If residents who are currently in receipt of Housing Related Support have an on-going need for support they will be able to request an assessment of their needs. If, as a result of this assessment they qualify for support under the Care Act eligibility criteria, they will receive funding through a personal budget from Surrey County Council. It is anticipated that personal budgets will be used in a variety of ways to meet individual needs. It might for example, include support from a home based care agency alongside informal support from family, friends and the local community. It would be unlikely to mean a move into a care home with 24 hour care although this may be the right choice for some people.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adults
26 September 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET

Tuesday 26 September

RESPONSES TO PETITIONS

The Petition concerning 'Shaping Surrey's Community Recycling Centres 2017'

It states: "We the undersigned residents of Surrey, call on Surrey County Council not to close the Community Recycling Centre in Bond Road, Warlingham, which is a vital local amenity. We believe its closure would be a major withdrawal of services and lead to increased flytipping and congestion at the Caterham Hill recycling centre"

Submitted by Mr Charles Lister

Signatures: 526

The Petition concerning 'Save Surrey's Tips!'

It states: "We the undersigned call upon Surrey County Council to reverse its decision to close Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham, and oppose its plans to significantly reduce the opening hours of all other CRCs across the county by two days per week, and introduce further charges for the disposal of waste.

We believe that the closure of these amenities and reduced opening hours of others could lead to an increase in fly-tipping leading to further costs for boroughs, districts and landowners as well as the blight to the environment.

We call upon the County Council to ensure that all sites remain open, with no reduction in opening hours or increase in charges"

Submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson on behalf of the Liberal Democrats

Signatures: 3245

The Cabinet's combined response

Surrey County Council had to regrettably put forward proposed changes to the Community Recycling Centre (CRC) service in a public consultation out of necessity due to the financial challenges being faced. Continued cuts to funding, rising costs and increasing demand for key services means that the need to find savings has reached unprecedented levels. This year alone we need to make savings of more than £100m – that's about 10% of our overall budget.

The public consultation received 13,637 responses, which is considered to be one of the largest responses the council has received to a consultation. The council would like to thank everyone who took part and gave their opinion on the proposals in the consultation.

On 17 August I met with the leader to discuss the consultation results. The public had clearly made their views known and we both agreed that we should recommend to cabinet that we would not permanently close any of the four CRC sites.

Having listened to the views from residents and stakeholders, we have recognized the need to maintain these sites for as long as possible as set out in today's Cabinet report.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
26 September 2017

The Petition concerning 'Stop their plans to cut fire and rescue cover in Spelthorne by 50%'

It states: 'We are pleased that Staines Fire Station has been given a reprieve but we believe that adequate fire and rescue cover can only be provided by ensuring that there are two whole-time staffed fire appliances based in Spelthorne - as at present.'

Submitted by Andy Pattinson on behalf of UNISON,

Signatures: 1355

The Cabinet's response

Increasing demand for essential services such as adult social care and school places, coupled with reduced Government funding, means Surrey County Council is under pressure to find efficiencies and savings on all the services it provides for the county's residents, including fire and rescue.

As part of this the fire and rescue cover in Spelthorne was reviewed and following a consultation in 2013, it was decided to close Sunbury and Staines fire stations and replace them with one new fire station at an optimum location to serve the area. It was agreed at that time that the new station was to have one full-time crew and one on-call crew, subject to it being possible to provide an on-call crew.

A further consultation on proposals regarding fire cover in Spelthorne took place between 29 November 2016 and 20 February 2017. One of the proposals was that the new station should be staffed by a full-time crew only. The Council received a high volume of responses and these are being considered alongside other factors. The consultation report with final recommendations on crewing arrangements will be presented to the Cabinet for decision at a date in the future.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Communities
26 September 2017

CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE SELECT COMMITTEE

**Consultation on Proposed Changes to Surrey's Community Recycling Centres (Cost Reductions) [item 7]
(Considered by the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee on 7 September 2017)**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee recommended:

- a) That Cabinet reconsider the removal of the free daily allowance.
- b) That a network of CRC sites across the county are open 7 days a week.
- c) That a more robust method for recording fly tipping is agreed and implemented in partnership with district and boroughs which includes fly tipping on private land.
- d) For more work to be done around further reuse and black bag sorting, so more advantage can be taken of commercial opportunities.

RESPONSE:

I would like to thank the Select Committee for considering this very important matter. As I have said before, I very much regret having to put forward proposals for changes to our community recycling centre (CRC) service but given the financial position of the council, we have no choice but to reduce our spend across all services.

Residents were very clear that they did not want to see permanent closure of their local community recycling centre. We have listened to our residents and as a consequence I will not be recommending the permanent closure of any CRC. However in order to make savings we will need to reduce the opening days of our CRCs as well as make other changes to the service. I have listened carefully to what the Select Committee have said and confirm that whilst we will have to reduce the number of days we open our CRCs, we will maintain a network of strategic sites which will be open 7 days per week. We will also ensure that all sites are open at the weekend, where planning consent allows.

I recognise that both residents and the Select Committee had strong feelings against removal of the free daily allowance for chargeable waste, however the savings that will be achieved through implementation of this proposal are an absolute necessity given that we are no longer going to achieve savings through the permanent closure of four CRCs. It has to be recognised that even with the removal of the free daily allowance for chargeable waste, there will still be a significant shortfall in the level of savings that are required.

I would concur with the Select Committee that we need to do more work in relation to reuse and black bag sorting and this forms part of our proposals for further cost savings. Just this week our contractor, Suez, has commenced a trial selling electrical goods that have been safety tested and we hope that this will form part of our expansion of reuse activities.

I would agree that we need to work with district and borough colleagues to improve the way that fly tipping incidents are recorded and ensure greater consistency between district and boroughs. The Surrey Waste Partnership have employed a Partnership and Intelligence Officer to work with districts and boroughs to ensure intelligence is shared and this includes a greater consistency in the way data on fly-tipping is collected and recorded.#

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
26 September 2017

CABINET RESPONSE TO OVERVIEW AND BUDGET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Business Rates Retention Pilot [item 11]

(Considered by the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee on 14 September 2017)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee noted its support for the Council's application, under delegated authority to the Leader, to join the Business Rates Retention Pilot 2018/19 alongside the 11 Surrey District & Borough Councils.

RESPONSE:

I thank the committee for its support of the business rates retention pilot application and for recognising the importance of this matter to Surrey.

Mr David Hodge CBE
Leader of the Council
26 September 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 26 September 2017

ITEM 7 – CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO SURREY’S COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES (COST REDUCTIONS)

REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Cabinet agree:

- i. That a strategic network of CRCs will remain open for seven days a week. Other sites will be open at specified times as per the tabled document listing proposed CRC opening times.
- ii. the four CRCs at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham remain open in light of the views submitted in the public consultation. Details of the proposed times of operation will be tabled at the Cabinet meeting;
- iii. the free daily allowance of chargeable waste from the construction, alteration or repair of homes and gardens such as rubble, plasterboard and soil is stopped from December 2017, as set out in paragraphs 27 to 28;
- iv. vans and trailers are excluded from CRCs at Bagshot, Caterham, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham and Warlingham from December 2017 as set out in paragraphs 29 to 31;
- v. Residents from Bracknell Forest and Wokingham are excluded from Camberley, and that the Strategic Director, Environment & Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agrees any further restrictions on non-Surrey residents using the sites in Camberley and Farnham following further discussions with Hampshire County Council, as set out in paragraphs 32 to 35.
- vi. Cabinet supports maximising the use of all CRC sites and achieving the best public value and that work continues to progress further efficiency measures at CRCs for example as stated in paragraphs 36 to 37.
- vii. the Surrey Waste Partnership is supported to promote the better use of kerbside services and other waste disposal services.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

At present there is spare capacity at the CRC network because of a reduction in throughput due to the previous changes. An adequate service can be retained if the above additional efficiency measures are implemented that will achieve an estimated cost reduction in a full year of £1.08 - £1.56 million. **Table 3** in paragraph 43 gives a breakdown by efficiency measure. These recommendations take note of the views expressed in the public consultation and, the impact to the public (including those with protected characteristics) and the environment. If these recommendations are introduced it will reduce costs and provide better value for money for the Surrey taxpayer, whilst still maintaining a comprehensive service that supports the strategic aims of increasing recycling and reducing landfill, and meets its legal requirements as a Waste Disposal Authority.

This page is intentionally left blank