

# Cabinet- Supplementary Agenda



**Date & time**  
Tuesday, 21 July  
2020 at 2.00 pm

**Place**  
REMOTE

**Contact**  
Vicky Hibbert or Huma  
Younis  
Room 122, County Hall  
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020  
8213 2725

**Chief Executive**  
Joanna Killian



**We're on Twitter:**  
**@SCCdemocracy**

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or  
huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

**Cabinet Members:** Mrs Natalie Bramhall, Mr Mel Few, Mr Matt Furniss, Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Mrs Julie Iles, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mrs Sinead Mooney, Mr Tim Oliver and Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

**Deputy Cabinet Members:** Miss Alison Griffiths, Miss Marisa Heath, Mr Mark Nuti and Mrs Becky Rush

## Supplementary Agenda

### **4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

#### **a Members' Questions**

(Pages 1  
- 2)

A question has been received from Mr Jonathan Essex. A response from Cabinet is attached.

### **5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL**

(Pages 3  
- 8)

Cabinet to consider the following:

#### **A. Community Projects Fund Task and Finish Group report.**

(Cabinet response attached)

#### **B. Adults and Health Select Committee: Scrutiny of the Decision on the Change of Route to Market for Two Extra Care Housing Sites report.**

(Select Committee report and Cabinet response attached)

**Joanna Killian**  
**Chief Executive**  
Monday, 20 July 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET – 21 JULY 2020****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):**

On 14th July the Surrey Mirror reported that Surrey County Council are putting up 132 property lots for auction, including ground rents in East Grinstead (see <https://www.cliveemson.co.uk/properties/219/6/> for details).

- i) Please can you confirm the market value and expected capital receipts from these 132 lots; and
- ii) Please can you provide a schedule of the ground rents charged by Surrey County Council on the other residential properties that it owns the freehold for.

**Reply:**

Thank you for your enquiry regarding the forthcoming online property auction, hosted by Clive Emson, Land and Property Auctioneers.

The auction is for 132 lots spread over the South East and South West of England, with no Surrey County Council owned assets for sale in this auction.

**Mr Mel Few**  
**Cabinet Member for Resources**  
**21 July 2020**

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET- 21 July 2020**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY PROJECTS FUND TASK AND FINISH GROUP (Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee)**

**Recommendations:**

The Task Group recommends:

- a) That the Fund includes scalable governance measures that reflect the scope of the bids made to the Fund;
- b) That the funding thresholds and timing of funding rounds can flex to approve suitable projects that may fall slightly outside the proposed rules;
- c) From the beginning of the Fund, the council actively engage with residents and communities to offer support and feedback to those interested in accessing the fund to ensure that less experienced members of the community are able to access the Fund in the same way as more developed community or charitable organisations;
- d) The council's communication plan must include widespread publicity and that bespoke branding be developed to promote the Fund;
- e) That an annual review mechanism is developed to allow for public scrutiny of the activity, delivery and performance of the fund, for example via an annual report that is scrutinised by the Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee at a future meeting.

**Mr John O'Reilly**  
**Chairman of the Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee**

---

**Cabinet Response:**

We welcome the report of the Community Projects Fund Task and Finish Group and the recommendations they have put forward, which we have looked to ensure are reflected in the design of the Fund that is set out for Cabinet. The positive and constructive discussions that took place at the meetings of the group have played a key role in helping shape the process and criteria for delivery of the Fund.

In developing the Fund, we have made it a priority that we achieve the right balance between ensuring a level of due diligence that provides accountability and value for money, while at the same time ensures the Fund is accessible to communities. In managing and administering the Fund it is intended to streamline processes as much as is possible, with the level of detail required as part of a submission reflecting the level of funding being bid for. The funding thresholds that have been proposed will help us to manage the bids coming in, with smaller project proposals that fall within the lower threshold requiring more of a 'light touch' application process while larger projects will require more detail to be provided.

The aim is to keep the administration of the Fund as flexible as possible, with the thresholds able to be reviewed over the five years and the profile of spend able to be responsive to the amount of bids received, and amount of money left in the Fund at the end of each year.

We believe that for the Fund to be successful, it must meet the requirements of *all* communities and potential applicants rather than only catering for particular groups or parts of the county. We have recommended to Cabinet that further community involvement is incorporated, and that a piece of exploratory “co-development” work is undertaken with a representative group of residents to consider all aspects of the process before the formal launch of the Fund. As part of the resources to deliver the Fund we have highlighted the potential need to support communities to develop bids as well as enable capacity building in the voluntary sector to take place.

Publicising the Fund will be critical in ensuring we generate real interest and energy in the community to submit proposals. In the lead up to the launch, and then subsequently for the opening of each funding window, a communications and engagement campaign will take place to highlight the Fund and its purpose. In addition more targeted communications will be used if it is found that certain communities are not engaging with the Fund once it is opened. Work is already underway with the Communications Team around designs and branding for publicity materials.

We welcome the recommendation that a review of the effectiveness and impact of the Fund be carried out and scrutinised by the Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee and will deliver an annual report to the Committee.

**Reply from Mr Mark Nuti  
Deputy Cabinet Member to the Leader  
21 July 2020**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 21 JULY 2020****SELECT COMMITTEE: ADULTS & HEALTH SELECT COMMITTEE****SUBJECT: SCRUTINY OF THE DECISION ON THE CHANGE OF ROUTE TO MARKET FOR TWO EXTRA CARE HOUSING SITES**

Note: This paper should be read in conjunction with the Decision on the Change of Route to Market for Two Extra Care Housing Sites reports (Items 9 & 16, Cabinet, 21 July 2020).

**INTRODUCTION:**

1. On 14 July 2020, Members of the Adults & Health Select Committee scrutinised the Decision on the Change of Route to Market for Two Extra Care Housing Sites, which is subject to a Cabinet decision on 21 July 2020. This scrutiny formed part of an update report on the wider Accommodation with Care and Support transformation programme, and the Select Committee heard evidence from the following Cabinet Members and officers:
  - Sinead Mooney – Cabinet Member for Adults and Health
  - Mel Few – Cabinet Member for Resources
  - Jon Lillistone – Assistant Director for Commissioning, Adult Social Care
  - Steve Hook – Assistant Director for Learning Disability and Autism
  - Peter Walsh – Property Account Manager for Adult Social Care
2. As outlined in the Decision on the Change of Route to Market for Two Extra Care Housing Sites report to Cabinet, the two sites owned by the Council and agreed to be used for Extra Care Housing developments are as follows:
  - Former Brockhurst Care Home, Brox Road, Ottershaw, Runnymede
  - Former Pinehurst Resource Centre, Camberley, Surrey Heath
3. A Cabinet paper in October 2019 recommended that the delivery model for these two sites was through a Joint Venture. Due to a delay in delivery and a pressing need for Extra Care Housing accommodation, an alternative delivery now needs to be agreed.

**KEY AREAS OF DISCUSSION:**

4. The Select Committee expressed concern at the **lack of progress** that had been made in the building of Extra Care Housing to date. Members heard that the Cabinet Member for Adults & Health and officers shared their frustrations with the slow progress made, but they expressed confidence that they were now moving at pace and that the change of route to market for two Extra Care Housing sites would only help accelerate this further.

5. Members raised concerns about the **length of contracts** and were informed that the approach to these would be done in a way that was flexible and allowed the Council to be responsive over time to changes in the model of care. Further to this, Members heard that Council-owned land would be leased to a development and housing management strategic partner(s) for 125 years on peppercorn rent, and that the developer would be responsible for maintenance of the grounds and every day running costs, with a separate contract for a separate care provider.
6. Another area of concern raised by the Select Committee related to the reasoning behind the Council deciding not to apply to be a **registered social landlord**. Several Members questioned whether this approach was the correct one and were informed that Cabinet had considered this in October 2019 but had decided that the better option was the build and operate model, allowing the Council to work closely with established registered providers of Extra Care Housing. The Select Committee also heard that the flexibility of the contracts being offered would allow for a change in approach in the future if required, keeping open the possibility of the Council applying to become a registered social landlord if circumstances changed.
7. The Select Committee discussed the possible use of **capital investment** and the associated financial figures, as outlined in recommendations 2 and 3 in the Part 2 Cabinet report. Members heard that the aim was to avoid or limit as far as possible any capital investment by the Council, but that this could be necessary if the winning bidder in the tender required it as part of their proposal. However, the Select Committee received assurance that the savings would significantly outweigh the costs of capital investment, even if the full costs were required.
8. Regarding potential risks, the Select Committee raised the possibility that the Council could be unable to identify Adult Social Care (ASC) funded residents for all of the units. In response, the Cabinet Member for Adults & Health explained that ASC would seek to identify individuals suitable for Extra Care Housing a year in advance of the units' completion, and that the Council would ensure it worked closely with district and borough council colleagues to ensure any vacancies are filled as quickly as possible. Members welcomed this approach and asked that it remained a priority.
9. It was explained to the Select Committee that the recommended approach (to tender for a development and housing management strategic partner(s) for Extra Care Housing schemes on Council-owned land on a design, build, finance and operate basis with up to a 125-year lease) had several strengths. Namely, these related to there being less financial risk to the Council because there would be little to no capital requirement, the ability to procure a development and housing management strategic partner(s) who had a track record of delivering Extra Care Housing, and registered providers of Extra Care Housing being able to access Homes England grant funding.
10. The Select Committee also heard about the tender exercise which will be completed during summer 2020 in order to identify a development and housing management strategic partner(s) of Extra Care Housing at the former Pond Meadow School site. Officers explained that market engagement had been conducted for the former Pond Meadow School site and that positive feedback had been received, despite the challenges raised by the Covid-19 pandemic.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

11. The Select Committee welcomes the change of route to market for two Extra Care Housing sites, notwithstanding the concerns mentioned above, inasmuch as it represents a much-needed change in the pace of delivery.
12. Members do not feel they have been provided with the level of information required to fully understand the rationale behind the change in approach and the associated financial figures. Furthermore, the Select Committee is disappointed that it was not able to spend more time reviewing the relevant documents. Moving forwards, the Select Committee asks that scrutiny is involved at an earlier stage in the decision-making process.

**Bernie Muir**  
**Chairman of the Adults & Health Select Committee**

---

**Cabinet Response**

We welcome the feedback from the Select Committee in this report and the recognition of the improved pace of delivery for increasing affordable Extra Care Housing capacity in Surrey.

We are pleased the Select Committee endorses the change of route to market for the two Extra Care Housing schemes recommended in the July 2020 Cabinet report and that the committee also notes that the recommendation will help accelerate the pace of delivery for affordable Extra Care Housing in Surrey

The Select Committee's support for Adult Social Care's Accommodation with Care and Support Strategy reinforces the council's ongoing strategic commitment to delivering improved outcomes for Surrey's residents through the delivery of specialist accommodation.

**Reply from Ms Sinead Mooney**  
**Cabinet Member for Adults and Health**  
**21 July 2020**

This page is intentionally left blank