



Supplementary Agenda

Item 13

for the meeting of

**THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

to be held on

**10 DECEMBER 2024**

(i)

(ii)

**13 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS**

(Pages 5  
- 30)

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 December 2024.

*(Note: 26 November 2024 Cabinet minutes included)*

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 26 NOVEMBER 2024 AT 2.00 PM  
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL, COUNCIL CHAMBER, WOODHATCH  
PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 8EF.**

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

Cabinet Members

(\* present)  
\*Tim Oliver (Chairman)  
\*Natalie Bramhall  
\*Clare Curran  
\*Matt Furniss  
\*David Lewis  
\*Mark Nuti  
\*Denise Turner-Stewart  
\*Sinead Mooney  
\*Marisa Heath  
\*Kevin Deanus

Deputy Cabinet Members:

\*Maureen Attewell  
\*Paul Deach  
\*Steve Bax  
\*Jonathan Hulley

Members in attendance:

Cllr Fiona Davidson, Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee  
Cllr Richard Tear, County Councillor for Bagshot, Windlesham and Chobham  
Cllr Trefor Hogg, Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**149/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

There were no apologies.

**150/24 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 29 OCTOBER 2024 [Item 2]**

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

**151/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

#### **152/24 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

##### **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

There were three member questions. A response from the Cabinet was published in the supplementary agenda.

##### **153/24 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were four public questions. A response from the Cabinet was published in the supplementary.

Peter Lawrence thanked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care for a response to his question and highlighted the importance of needing more accommodation for people with severe autism in the county. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care stated that she was happy to meet with the questioner and discuss further.

Sam Neatrou asked a supplementary question in relation to his original which was if the Cabinet could you confirm what percentage of the pavements would be shared use under the new proposed scheme and what the minimum and the typical widths would be. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure stated that in the proposed scheme, the shared pavement would be 40%, 5% of which would be of a minimum width of 1.8 metres but the majority would be over three metres of the remaining shared pavement.

##### **154/24 PETITION: SAVE SWIFT LANE [Item 4c]**

There was one petition. A response to the petition was published in the agenda.

Richard Wilson, the petitioner presented his petition to the Cabinet. The following key points were made:

- Explained that he had been using the recycling centre at Swift Lane Bagshot for 25 years and at the public meeting in Bagshot last Wednesday, people said they had been using it for over 40 years or even 50 years.
- 12,000 people are in the catchment area for the CRC and 1250 of them have signed the petition to save Swift Lane.
- Residents pay their council tax and expect decent public services. Closing the CRC will force residents to travel an additional 13 mile round trip to Camberley CRC which will cost residents in time and money.
- Closing the CRC will lead to extreme congestion and will put another 12,000 cars on the roads of Camberley.
- Sporadic antisocial behaviour by a few is not a reason for mass punishment of the whole local population. The shortcomings of

this site have existed for over 40 years. The Council should address the issues and not use them as a pretext to close the site to save a small amount of money.

- Closing the site will lead to an increase in fly tipping and a vast increase in carbon emissions from cars caught in congested traffic crawling to the other side of Camberley.
- Keeping the CRC open six weeks longer would allow people to dispose of their Christmas trees.

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure responded to the petition thanking the petitioner for attending the meeting. The following key points were made by the Cabinet Member:

- Surrey County Council's experience is that previous changes to CRC facilities, such as reduced opening hours and days, have not resulted in any increased fly tipping.
- Swift lane is the closest CRC to 12,428 households. Of these, 7894, which is 63.47% of these households will see no increase in drive time when accessing the nearest alternatives which are Woking or Camberley CRCs. 4,544 households would have a drive time no longer than 20 minutes or 7.8 miles to the closest alternative site.
- The alternative sites are split level sites and take increased number of items which would be better than what residents are currently experiencing at Swift Lane.
- Camberley CRC would be opened an additional day per week if the Swift Lane site was to close. Traffic movements at Camberley would be monitored, and it may be that the site can open earlier at weekends should the evidence suggest earlier opening would benefit residents.
- Residents of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead will be directed to Lyne in Chertsey which would not impact on Camberley CRC.

### **155/24 BAGSHOT COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRE [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure introduced the report which recommend the permanent closure of the Community Recycling Centre (CRC) at Swift Lane, Bagshot. The Bagshot CRC site was small, unmodernised and not fit for purpose. The site had a number of issues including not being split level meaning that members of the public had to climb steps in order to place items in the collecting containers. The site suffered vandalism and the perimeter fence to the site had been driven into a number of times. Fly tipping had occurred both within the site and outside of the entrance. Staff at the site receive daily threats and although measures were being taken to protect staff, the site was not safe. The Camberley CRC would be opened an additional day a week if the closure of Bagshot was agreed. Closing the site would result in a small saving of £105,000. The Cabinet Member

217

reiterated that the recommendation to close Bagshot CRC was not to achieve financial savings but because the site was not safe and fit for purpose.

The Local Member Cllr Richard Tear spoke on the item and thanked the Cabinet Member and officers for speaking and consulting with him before the item came to Cabinet. Cllr Tear raised three issues. The first issue was around communications. Whilst a survey was carried out in Bagshot, the villages surrounding the area which use the CRC had been ignored including West End, Chobham and Lightwater. With regards to mitigation, the issues with the site had been built up over a number of years and it was disappointing that these issues were not dealt with at the time. Lastly, for any residents that use Camberley CRC this would require a long wait in traffic especially at the roundabout by Frimley Park hospital. This would cause a great deal of aggravation for residents. The Cllr had been contacted by a number of residents who did not want the site to close but recognised that if the problems with the site could not be mitigated then there would be no other choice but closure.

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure explained that Suez staff along with officers could look at ways of accelerating throughput at Camberley CRC. There was a recognition that the travel time for residents was not convenient but attending a fit for purpose and safe CRC would make a difference for residents. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities thanked the Local Member for attending the meeting and representing his residents views. The Deputy Leader stated that she did not think it was appropriate for the council to be operating a site where there were significant concerns over not just the safety of the operatives and the staff but of the wider public.

The Leader recognised the sensitivities around closing the CRC which was a well-liked facility. The closure had nothing to do with savings but health and safety issues on the site which the council was ultimately responsible for. The Leader hoped the Local Member would work with the local council to report back on any issues created from the closure.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet agree to the closure of the Community Recycling Centre (CRC) at Swift Lane, Bagshot and as a consequence agree to the opening of the CRC at Wilton Road, Camberley for an extra day a week (Tuesday).
2. That Cabinet allow those residents of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead who currently use the Bagshot CRC to use Lyne CRC, Chertsey as an alternative.

**Reasons for Decisions:**



The Bagshot CRC site is small, unmodernised and not fit for purpose. It is not an 'unsafe' site (SUEZ have obligations to keep the site safe and lawful) but there are hazards – for example, users of the site park their cars in the centre of the plot, and then walk across the path of moving vehicles to access the various waste containers.

The site has to close for container exchange, leading to inconvenience & a build-up of queues. There is no means of compacting waste in the containers which means that they will be taken off the site with spare capacity – creating more of a carbon impact per tonne in terms of haulage and increased vehicle movements. These issues do not occur at modernised sites.

There is an ongoing pattern of vandalism, fly tipping and unlawful entry at the Bagshot CRC site which happens out of hours (i.e. when the CRC is closed and overnight). Staff have been threatened by (some) users of the site who are attempting to bring non-acceptable (potentially unlawful) material onto the site. Rather than confront the user, for their own safety, the staff have had to accept the waste as presented.

Fly tipping has occurred both within the site and outside of the entrance. The existing perimeter fencing does not present a sufficient barrier to these episodes, which often involve the use of mechanical equipment. Material fly tipped has in the past included hazardous materials such as asbestos. Prevention measures would be difficult and costly to implement and could include reinforced walls with climb prevention, enhanced 24 hr security guard presence and additional lighting.

SUEZ have recorded 801 instances of fly tipping across all Surrey CRC sites between January 2019 and August 2024. Of these, 531 (66%) were at Bagshot CRC. Of the other 14 sites, Lyne Lane CRC, near Chertsey, experienced 89 fly tipping incidents (11%) in the period. Fly tipping incidents at all of the other 13 sites combined make up the remaining 23%.

SCC's waste contractor, SUEZ, retain incident logs which have recorded 48 nuisance incidents (fly-tipping, break ins, vandalism, anti-social behaviour) at Bagshot CRC between 2nd January and 25th August 2024. No other SCC CRC suffers such high levels of nuisance-based disruption. This disruption impacts on site staff and users negatively, the site often having to close to allow remedial action. A summary of the SUEZ incident logs is included at Annex C.

Despite the high levels of disruption, a review of complaints received from users of the site by SUEZ since January 2023 shows that 23 complaints have been recorded across the CRC estate, none of which relate to Bagshot CRC. SUEZ believe that this reflects the empathy felt by users for the on-site staff, recognising the difficulties the site presents.

The access road is narrow and itself suffers from fly tipping.

Swift lane is not accessible on foot, so closure won't impact pedestrian visitors.

The nearest alternative site is Camberley CRC which is approximately 6 miles away from the Bagshot CRC and has a travel time between the two sites (by car) of approximately 15 minutes. Alternative CRC sites are located within 10 miles

Analysis undertaken by SCC's Transport Modelling specialists shows that the Swift Lane CRC in Bagshot is the closest CRC to 12,428 households. If the Bagshot CRC was to close:

- 7,894 (63.5%) would see no increase in drive time when accessing the nearest alternative CRC (Lyne, Woking or Camberley) if the Bagshot site was to close; and
- 4,544 (36.5%) would have a maximum drive time of 20 minutes (covering 7.8 miles) to their nearest alternative CRC site.

A map marked up with postcode 'clusters' in the Bagshot CRC catchment area showing the closest alternative sites is included at Annex D

The site is owned by Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) who lease it to SCC. The site will be returned to SHBC if it closed.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)*

#### **156/24 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

#### **157/24 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

The Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee introduced the Children not in school (CNIS) report explaining that in 2023/24, 7165 children between the ages of 5-16 were not in full time education for a variety of reasons. The Select Committee welcomed the appointment of a children not in school service manager who has oversight of this cohort and works in partnership with other professionals both inside and outside the Council, to ensure these children and young people have access to suitable education as quickly as possible. The Select Committee was concerned about the consequences and life choice chances of those

children and young people who were severely absent from school especially given the high proportion of these children who have an EHCP or require SEND support. Concerns were also raised around the number of alternative provision hours being offered to children and young people not in mainstream schooling and the safeguarding implications of children not being in school. The Chairman asked that the Cabinet Member share the CNIS policy, destination data of severely absent children and more information regarding the encouraging schools attendance forum.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning shared the same concerns as the Select Committee and recognised the very significant safeguarding implications of children not being in school. The Cabinet Member spoke about the consequences of children not being in school including impacts on friendships and life chances. The Cabinet Member also stated concerns around the hours of provision that are provided for children who have packages of alternative provision. The Cabinet Member was happy to share details requested by the committee and the steps that are being taken with schools to encourage attendance.

With regards to the interim budget recommendations, the Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee explained that further work was being done on the budget and no comments would be made at the moment. The Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee presented the interim recommendations from his Select Committee. A key area of concern was needs assessment, which was graded as needing improvement by the CQC. This was particularly important in the budget as demand management for improvements to the needs assessment process would be a challenging area for budget savings. Managing demand in general would require careful attention. The transformation programmes would also be a key enabler to achieving a balanced budget. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care welcomed the hard work and focus the Select Committee had put into budget review process.

The Leader explained that the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee had debated the London Road Guildford Active Travel Scheme and referred the decision back to Cabinet for re-consideration with a number of comments. A report from the committee had been included in a supplementary agenda. The Leader explained that at its October Cabinet meeting there had been a lengthy discussion on the scheme. The discussion could be viewed on the webcast of the meeting. The Leader stated that there was nothing that the Select Committee raised at their 19 November meeting that wasn't already accounted for by the Cabinet. No new evidence had been put forward by the Select Committee. There had been many meetings with stakeholders and interested parties about the three stages of the scheme. At its meeting the Cabinet had the benefit of the ARUP report and from hearing from a number of witnesses Various correspondence

had been sent to the Cabinet from residents about the scheme. The Cabinet did not believe there was any new information that changed their original decision made on 29 October 2024. The decision therefore stands and this part of the scheme would not be progressed. The Leader thanked the Select Committee for their input.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Children not in school report and Interim budget Recommendations from Select Committees be noted.
2. In respect of the call-in report on the London Road Guildford Active Travel Scheme - the Cabinet confirmed that the following decision taken on 29 October 2024 still stands.

***Decision from 29 October Cabinet Meeting:***

*It is recommended that Cabinet:*

1. *Notes the contents of the independent technical review of section 1 and its conclusions concerning whether the scheme complies with current design guidance.*
2. *Proceeds with the construction of Section 1 –based on the strength of support from the local community, alongside the conclusions of the independent technical review.*

*There were THREE votes FOR and SIX votes AGAINST. The decision was therefore not carried.*

**Reasons for Decisions**

The Cabinet agreed that no new evidence had been provided by the Select Committee and all the key issues raised by the Select Committee had already been considered by the Cabinet.

**158/24 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]**

There were four decision for noting.

**RESOLVED:**

That the decisions taken since the last Cabinet meeting are noted.

**159/24 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning. The following key points were made:

- It was explained that the directorate was working towards five key priorities. The council had embarked on a comprehensive improvement journey and it was expected that children's services would be inspected again by Ofsted next year.
- The report set out some of the work being done to strengthen practice and to help to improve children's lives and life chances. Significant council resources had been invested in early intervention and prevention work.
- In March 2023 Surrey Signed the Care Leaver Covenant - a national inclusion programme that supports care leavers aged 16 to 25 to live independently. As a Partner of the Care Leaver Covenant, we have agreed to support and facilitate the Covenant's primary aim, by promoting opportunities and offers to care leavers and raising awareness of the Care Leaver Covenant amongst our networks.
- Progress had been made on services for children with SEND, with significant work done in line with the published Improvement Plan. Progress and achievements had been made in delivering on our SEND capital programme in building and expanding a whole range of schools.
- The Cabinet Member covered improvements made by Home to School Travel Assistance (H2ST) team and congratulated them on the successes they had been able to achieve in terms of service delivery.
- The Cabinet Member thanked staff, both within the Directorate and out amongst our partners, particularly in schools, in districts and boroughs who work so hard to improve the lives of children and young people across Surrey. The council is on its way to delivering far better services than it ever did in the past.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Cabinet Member of the Month report is noted.

**160/24 EQUITY IN EDUCATION - NO LEARNER LEFT BEHIND - SURREY'S LIFETIME OF LEARNING STRATEGY [Item 10]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning who explained that Surrey had a diverse and vibrant education landscape and had educational outcomes at each key stage above the national average. There were however some cohorts of children and young people who have significantly poorer outcomes than their peers in other parts of the country. The Surrey Lifetime of Learning Strategy will ensure that we take the necessary actions across the partnership, to close the gaps in terms of educational outcomes, exclusions and attendance. It will also ensure that Surrey adults can access learning opportunities, in high quality provision, that develop new skills or secure new qualifications to help them succeed at any time they need to. The work would be led by

223

the Surrey Education Partnership and was chaired independently drawing on partners across the education landscape. The Surrey Lifetime of Learning Strategy had been to the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee and the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee explained that the Select Committee had reviewed the strategy in September and noted the partnership's vision. The Select Committee was supportive of the vision and the partnership approach but did not feel that they were in a position to endorse the strategy. The Select Committee viewed the strategy presented as a partnership agreement rather than a strategy as it did not describe a specific course of action and would therefore welcome an understanding as to what actions would be taken by any partners to enable the vision to become a reality. The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning explained that the Surrey Education Partnership would develop an action plan around the four key priorities and the Select Committee would be asked to review the progress that is being made with this.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approves the Surrey Lifetime of Learning Strategy and its publication.
2. That Cabinet endorses the ambition of the Surrey Education Partnership that no learner is left behind, and agrees the partnership ambition, principles and priorities for children, young people and adults as outlined in the strategy for 2024-30.
3. That Cabinet agrees to contribute as a key partner to the ambition, principles and priorities for children, young people and adults as outlined in the strategy for 2024-30.

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

Whilst most of the children, young people and adults in Surrey achieve, thrive, belong and live well, this is not the case for everyone.

In Surrey, children from less-well off homes start school already educationally behind their peers, and this gap persists throughout school and into further and higher education. In many instances outcomes are weaker than similarly disadvantaged learners in other parts of the country.

In some areas of Surrey, adults are less able to secure economic well-being because of skills and qualification gaps.

We are aware that attendance is a significant factor in achieving the best outcomes, and that in Surrey exclusion from school and poor attendance is too high.

Studies have also shown direct links between education and factors such as health and life expectancy rates, with academic achievement playing a potentially significant role in reducing health inequalities by shaping life opportunities.

This strategy will ensure that we take the necessary actions across the partnership, to close the gaps in terms of educational outcomes, exclusions and attendance. It will also ensure that Surrey adults can access learning opportunities, in high quality provision, that develop new skills or secure new qualifications to help them succeed at any time they need to.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee)*

[Following this item, on the advice of the Monitoring Officer, the Leader read out Minute 141/24 which related to the London Road Guildford Active Travel Scheme and explained that at the meeting on 29 October 2024 these recommendations were not accepted and therefore the decision was not carried. The Leader asked the Cabinet to confirm they were happy to stand by this decision which was agreed.]

#### **161/24 2025/26 DRAFT BUDGET AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY TO 2029/30 [Item 8]**

The item was introduced by the Leader of the Council who reminded everyone of the four priority objectives of the council which were all encapsulated in the Community Vision 2023 and ensuring nobody was left behind. A survey had been undertaken with residents around the budget which informs the budget setting process. The Leader explained that this year was probably more difficult than most in that there was a new government with a new agenda. A number of messages needed to be relayed to the new government. The NHS had been awarded £22.6b and adult social care only £600m. The council would lobby the government to review this and award more funding to adult social care. There needed to be a reform of the SEND system as the current system did not work for families, schools and councils. One of the biggest challenges for the council was the cost of placements for children. It was positive to see the Secretary of State announce measures to cap and contain placement costs particularly for non-maintained placements. The council would continue to lobby the government on the formula for highways funding especially as Surrey has some of the busiest roads in the country. The issue around costs of home to school transport would also be raised. The council spends over £70m a year on this service.

In the current financial year the budget requires the delivery of £54m of efficiencies and while the council was making good progress against

this target, in-year pressures, specifically in relation to adult's and children's social care placements and Home to School Travel Assistance, means we are currently forecasting an overspend for 2024/25. Recruiting to key front line roles was essential but equally it was important the organisation was the right size. The increase in National Insurance contributions and the national living wage will have an impact on next years budget and on residents. The Chancellor had announced £1.3b additional funding for councils, £600m of which would be distributed under the adult social care formula. The remaining £700m had been ring fenced and the expectation was that this would be distributed on a deprivation formula or enhanced deprivation formula. From 2026 onwards there would be a funding review with multi year settlements. If the council was to go on previous modelling, the council would be a significant loser in terms of government funding. The council had built up its reserves but reserves can only be used once and were not intended to be used to supplement revenue on a on a daily basis.

The Leader explained that the council had a gross budget of £1.2b and £74m efficiencies need to be found. £54m of efficiencies had been found leaving a gap of £17.4m this assumes a 2.99% Council tax increase. The local government finance settlement would be announced just before Christmas. The current draft budget assumes a council tax increase of 2.99%. The council would continue to look for further savings and efficiencies where those were appropriate. The council's capital programme would be geared towards longer term revenue savings. A number of the programmes had been reviewed in light of increasing inflation and costs. The council was focused on investing in prevention and early intervention. The final budget would come back to Cabinet in January and then Full Council in February. The Leader confirmed that £18m funding had been committed to Farnham for improvement works to start in January 2025.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources explained the work that had gone into the budget setting process and next steps moving forward. It was explained that Members had been fully engaged with the budget setting process via the Select Committees and member development sessions. The Select Committees would be reviewing the draft budgets again next week. The next stage of the public consultation would also start after the Cabinet has approved the draft budget. The council had continues to use its budget envelope approach where directorates have identified the pressures that they face and then try and balance those pressures by developing efficiency proposals. Officers were thanked for getting the draft budget to its current stage.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet notes the 2025/26 Draft Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy to 2029/30, including progress to date in



setting out spending pressures and efficiencies, as set out in Annex A.

2. That Cabinet notes the provisional budget gap of £17.4m for 2025/26 and the next steps required to close the gap.
3. That Cabinet notes the proposed Draft Capital Programme for 2025/26 to 2029/30 of £1.4bn set out in Section 6 of the report and Annex B.
4. That Cabinet notes the summary of Resident Engagement and next steps set out in Section 9 of the report.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

In January 2025, Cabinet will be asked to recommend a Final Budget for 2025/26 to full Council for approval in February. The draft budget sets out proposals to direct available resources to support the achievement of the Council's corporate priorities, balanced against a challenging financial environment, giving Cabinet the opportunity to comment on the proposals and next steps.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**162/24 COORDINATED ADMISSIONS SCHEME FOR SEPTEMBER 2026  
[Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning explained that the coordinated admissions scheme for 2026 would be presented to Full Council in December for ratification. The Council must publish its coordinated admissions scheme for 2026 in accordance with the requirements of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Coordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations and the School Admissions Code by 1 January each year. The changes to the scheme were minor and highlighted in red in Annex 1 of the report.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet makes the following recommendation to the County Council:

**Recommendation**

That the coordinated admissions scheme that will apply to all applicants and schools for 2026 is agreed as set out in Annex 1.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

- The coordinated admissions scheme for 2026 is essentially the same as 2025 with dates updated

- There are several changes that have been made to the primary and secondary schemes as points of clarification (see paragraph 9), but these do not alter current practice
- The coordinated admissions scheme will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated admissions scheme is working well
- The Local Authority has a statutory duty to publish its coordinated admissions scheme for 2026 by 1 January 2025
- The proposed scheme meets the statutory requirements of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Coordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012 and the School Admissions Code

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee)*

### **163/24 APPROVAL TO PROCEED: CORONER'S SERVICE DIGITAL POST-MORTEM & MORTUARY FACILITY [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience introduced the report explaining that the Coroner's Service was seeking to deliver a digital post-mortem service in Surrey. This would contain rising costs for pathology services and provide an enhanced service by using available technology to significantly reduce the number of invasive post-mortems that take place in the county. The Coroner received an average of 3,500 referrals per year. Approximately 2,400 Coronial post-mortems are carried out each year. Initial analysis shows that with digital capability, the need for invasive post-mortems in Surrey would reduce to approximately 600 cases p/a. Initial investment would be required which would lead to significant savings in the future.

The Leader welcomed the investment in the Coroners service and recognised the positive impact this would have on residents.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approves the proposal to deliver a digital post-mortem service in Surrey.
2. That Cabinet grants delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive & Executive Director for Resources to approve the transfer of £1.15m capital pipeline to budget to successfully deliver a Digital Post-Mortem Service in Surrey, following endorsement by Capital Programme Panel and subject to the annual revenue impact, including borrowing costs, being no more than £90k, as per the current Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

3. That Cabinet notes the intention to commission a third-party provider to deliver a digital post-mortem scanning service, the costs of which will be met from the service revenue budget.
4. That Cabinet agrees to delegate approval of the necessary steps to deliver this proposal up to +/- 10% of the budgetary tolerance level, including procurement route to market, any contract award decision and any other legal documentation required to facilitate the approvals within this report, to the Deputy Chief Executive & Executive Director for Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Fire & Rescue and Resilience.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The current model of post-mortem provision for the Surrey Coroner's Service is not sustainable due to increasing costs and ongoing challenges in providing a high-quality service for the deceased and bereaved families. There is currently no digital post-mortem capability in Surrey. This technology is used for only a small number of deceased (predominately faith and child deaths) who must be transported out of county. Other areas with digital post-mortem capability report that approximately 70-75% of all post-mortems can be done digitally. Investing in digital capability and the necessary infrastructure needed will minimise current risks in service delivery and enable efficiencies in the longer term through a significant reduction in invasive post-mortems.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)*

### **164/24 APPROVAL TO PROCEED: REGISTRATION & NATIONALITY SERVICE - NEW OPERATING MODEL [Item 13]**

The report was introduced by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities who explained that the report was seeking approval to take forward a new registration and nationality service operating model to modernise delivery of the service. This would require (in principle) capital expenditure of up to £2m. The current model was not fit for purpose. The new operating model would provide a more localised, efficient and commercially minded service. The Cabinet Member explained that Surrey County Council's Registration and Nationality Services was the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> busiest in England and Wales for birth and death registrations respectively (based on volume of registrations). The service was self-funding and contributed to the council's overall budget. The new model would address maintenance and capacity issues in existing buildings and would create more localised offices across Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing and Public Health welcomed the report and recognised that the registration and nationality service was always looking at improving its services for residents. The Leader explained that he had recently met with the Vice Lord-Lieutenant of Surrey who attended a nationality service and had commented on her positive experience of the nationality service.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approve the proposed new operating model for the Registration & Nationality Service.
2. That Cabinet approve (in principle) capital expenditure of up to £2m (excluding VAT) as included in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the delivery of the new service model, noting that the proposal will be self-funding through a later capital receipt from asset disposal and increased service income.
3. That Cabinet delegate authority (i) to approve individual schemes/projects within the overall budget and a 10% tolerance (ii) to enter into any required legal documentation agreements and (iii) any procurement and contract award, to the Deputy Chief Executive & Executive Director for Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Customer & Communities and Property, Waste & Infrastructure.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The current model of delivery for the Registration & Nationality Service is not fit-for-purpose in the long term. The proposed new operating model will reduce the number of dedicated single-use sites, whilst expanding provision across the county through greater co-location with other Council services and innovative use of existing assets for ceremonies. Whilst requiring some upfront investment, which is largely repaid within the programme period, the new service model will intensify use of the Council's property estate and enhance services for residents that can flex with changing needs, i.e. Government reform or Council priorities. This will enable the delivery of a sustainable operating model; generate increased income from maintainable and appropriate assets and provide services from locations that align with customer demand.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)*

**165/24 RIGHT HOMES, RIGHT SUPPORT: OLDER PEOPLE'S RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING CARE DELIVERY STRATEGY [Item 14]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care. Cabinet was being asked to approve the Residential and Nursing Care Delivery Strategy to improve our residential and nursing care offer for older residents in Surrey within the wider Right Homes, Right Support Strategy. The Residential and Nursing Care Strategy would enable the council to deliver care homes that are fit for purpose and offers a wide range of services to meet complex needs. Paragraph 8 within the report explained the projected future demand for residential, enhanced residential and nursing care. The Leader commended the report and explained that there had been many discussions around supported living, extra care housing and residential and nursing care.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approves the Right Homes, Right Support: Older People's Residential and Nursing Delivery Strategy.
2. That Cabinet approves £3.6m of capital funding from the Council's capital pipeline for the Older People's Residential and Nursing Delivery Strategy to:
  - i. Undertake the necessary Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Stage 0 Strategic Definition Studies, RIBA Stage 1 Feasibility Studies, and market engagement across the whole Council owned care home portfolio.
  - ii. Enable a strategic business case to be developed across the whole care home portfolio.
3. That Cabinet notes the direction of travel for care homes on Council owned land (set out in recommendation 2) and the possible need for public consultation on the proposed future use of sites.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Approval of the Strategy set out within this report will:

- a) Enable independence and improved outcomes for Surrey's older residents for as long as possible through delivering specialist care home accommodation, which will play a key role in the prevention of early admissions into acute hospitals and into long term care home placements that may not be necessary.
- b) Ensure that there is sufficient care home provision available to meet the increasing older peoples' population in Surrey and that can support people with complex mental health needs and complex physical frailty.

- c) Enable us to address the current, and future, deficit in available capacity from the wider care market. Despite extensive steps taken to address prices paid, developing new contracting arrangements, and investing in care home capabilities across the Surrey care market, we need new opportunities and improved capacity to enable the best outcomes for residents.
- d) Enhance our offer of support to providers to improve quality and outcomes for all residents receiving care and enable them to deliver services to meet increased demand and complex needs.
- e) Long standing strategic contracts commissioned by the Council will be managed through robust expiry planning to ensure there is minimal disruption to residents, carers, families and operational teams.
- f) Ensure that we develop (subject to detailed market engagement, feasibility studies and outcomes of possible public consultation) the most commercially viable and financially sustainable strategic business case for the Council to achieve its Residential and Nursing Care Strategy for Surrey's older residents.
- g) Ensure effective use of the Council's assets to deliver improved outcomes for our residents, that is financially sustainable and means 'no one is left behind'.

*(The decisions on this item can be call-in by the Adults and Health Select Committee)*

**166/24 DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER ABBEYWOOD CARE HOME, ASH  
[Item 15]**

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure explained that the council was rationalising its surplus property estate. Services within the council had been offered the property in question for re-use but this offer had not been taken up. As a result the property was part of an open marketing campaign where bids were received. The Leader commented that vacant properties were offered to services within the council for re-use before they were placed on the market for sale.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. That Cabinet approves the sale of the former Abbeywood Care home at Ash to the party noted in the part 2 report and on the terms recommended.

3. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Executive Director Environment Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property, to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Cabinet has previously endorsed rationalisation of the surplus estate, and the reported bid follows an open marketing campaign of the former Abbeywood care home at Ash, where bids were received after eleven viewings and enquiries. The bids are as reported in the part 2 report.

Full status and funding enquiries have been made of the recommended bidder and further information on the company is in the part 2 report.

To enable the disposal, Cabinet is to formally declare an asset surplus to operational requirements under the Surrey County Council's (The Council) Constitution.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**167/24 DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER CARE HOME, ARUNDEL HOUSE, GARRETT'S LANE, BANSTEAD [Item 16]**

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure explained that the council was rationalising its surplus property estate. Services within the council had been offered the property in question for re-use but this offer had not been taken up.

As a result the property was part of an open marketing campaign where 29 bids had been received from a mix of private sector residential and care home developers. The Leader commented that the council engaged with district and boroughs when a building was being sold in the local area.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. That Cabinet approves the sale of Arundel House, Garretts Lane, Banstead, to the party and on the terms provided in the part 2 report.
3. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Executive Director, Environment, Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

233

Cabinet has previously endorsed rationalisation of the surplus estate, and the recommended bid follows an open marketing campaign of the former care home facility at Arundel House, Garretts Lane, Banstead, where a total of twenty-nine unconditional and conditional bids were received.

To enable the disposal, Cabinet is to formally declare an asset surplus to operational requirements under the Surrey County Council's (The Council) Constitution.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**168/24 DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER BARNFIELD CARE HOME AT UPFIELDS, HORLEY, SURREY [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure explained that the report sought approval to the freehold disposal of the former care home, Barnfield on Upfields, Horley, following an open marketing campaign. The asset was offered with full vacant possession and 10 bids had been received. Council services had been offered the property and had confirmed that the property did not support current modelling.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. See Exempt Minute
3. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Executive Director, Environment, Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Cabinet has previously endorsed rationalisation of the surplus estate, and the recommended bid follows an open marketing campaign of the former Barnfield care home at Horley where a total of 10 bids (1 unconditional and 9 conditional) were received.

To enable the disposal, Cabinet is requested to formally declare an asset surplus to operational requirements under the Surrey County Council's (The Council) Constitution.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*



## **169/24 2024/25 MONTH 6 (SEPTEMBER) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 18]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources who explained that at Month 6 the Council was forecasting an overspend of £18.6m against the 2024/25 revenue budget. This was a £1.9m deterioration on the M5 position. All Directorates were working on developing mitigating actions to offset forecast overspends, to deliver services within available budgets. In order to ensure ongoing financial resilience, the Council held a corporate contingency budget of £20m and over recent years had re-established an appropriate level of reserves. With regards to Capital, at Month 6, capital expenditure of £325.5m was forecast for 2024/25. This was £9.0m more than the re-phased budget and was due to an acceleration of projects. It was explained that there was also a new risk arising from potential VAT charges to non-maintained independent schools which may increase the number of parents seeking council funding through an EHCP. The Cabinet Member referred the Cabinet to the second recommendation in the report which sought Cabinet approval to write off of an Adult Social Care debt which was over £100,000, in accordance with Financial Regulation 21.4.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue budget and capital budget positions for the year.
2. That Cabinet approves the write off of an Adult Social Care debt which is over £100,000, in accordance with Financial Regulation 21.4. Further details are available in the Part 2 report. The write off is necessary as part of a negotiated settlement following a complaint and dispute resolution, which leaves a residual amount to be written off.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

This report is to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for information and for approval of any necessary actions.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

## **170/24 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 19]**

**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.

**171/24 APPROVAL TO PROCEED: CORONER'S SERVICE DIGITAL POST-MORTEM & MORTUARY FACILITY [Item 20]**

A part 2 report was presented by the Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience. Cabinet Noted the preferred site for a permanent digital post-mortem facility. A separate part 2 minute would be done for this item.

**RESOLVED:**

See Exempt Minute E-26-24

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 163/24.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)*

**172/24 APPROVAL TO PROCEED: REGISTRATION & NATIONALITY SERVICE - NEW OPERATING MODEL [Item 21]**

A part 2 report was presented by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities. Details were provided of how capital receipts would be delivered and used to enable the proposed new operating model for the Registration & Nationality Service to be self-funding. A separate part 2 minute would be done for this item.

**RESOLVED:**

See Exempt Minute E-27-24

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 164/24.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)*

**173/24 DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER ABBEYWOOD CARE HOME, ASH [Item 22]**

A part 2 report was presented by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure. Details were provided on the property transaction and who the property in question was sold too. A separate part 2 minute would be done for this item.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. See Exempt Minute E-28-24.
3. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Executive Director Environment Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property, to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 166/24.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**174/24 DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER CARE HOME, ARUNDEL HOUSE, GARRETT'S LANE, BANSTEAD [Item 23]**

A part 2 report was presented by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure. Details were provided on the property transaction and who the property in question was sold too. A separate part 2 minute would be done for this item.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. See Exempt Minute E-29-24.
3. See Exempt Minute E-29-24.
4. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Executive Director, Environment, Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Exempt Minute E-29-24.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**175/24 DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER BARNFIELD CARE HOME AT UPFIELDS, HORLEY, SURREY [Item 24]**

A part 2 report was presented by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure. Details were provided on the property transaction and who the property in question was sold too. A separate part 2 minute would be done for this item.

**RESOLVED:**

1. Formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. See Exempt Minute E-30-24.
3. Delegates authority to the Executive Director, Environment, Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Exempt Minute E-30-24.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**176/24 2024/25 MONTH 6 (SEPTEMBER) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 25]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources who gave details of the debt write off. It was explained that work would be done with the service to understand if there were any other debts the Cabinet needed to be aware off. A separate part 2 minute would be done for this item.

**RESOLVED:**

See Exempt Minute E-31-24.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Exempt Minute E-31-24.

**177/24 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 26]**

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

Meeting closed at 16:04

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank