

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 26 March 2013 and will take effect on Monday 8 April 2013 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered.

CALL-IN DEADLINE: 5/04/13.

The following represents a summary of the decisions taken by the Cabinet. It is not intended to represent the formal record of the meeting but to facilitate the call-in process. The formal minutes will be published in due course to replace this decision sheet.

County Members wishing to request a call-in on any of these matters, should contact the Senior Manager for Scrutiny or relevant Democratic Services Officer.

The Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday, 26 March 2013 considered the following matters and resolved:

- **PUBLIC QUESTION** (Item 4b)

One question had been received from a member of the public. The question and the response was tabled and is attached as Appendix 1.

- **REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL** (Item 5)

A A report from the Environment and Transport Select Committee's task group, concerning Countryside Management was included in the agenda. The Cabinet response was tabled at the meeting. (Appendix 2).

B Comments from the Environment and Transport Select Committee concerning the New Approach to Highways Maintenance was included in the agenda under item 10. The Cabinet response was tabled at the meeting. (Appendix 3).

C A report from the Children and Families Select Committee's task group concerning Supporting Families was included in the agenda under item 12. The Cabinet response was tabled at the meeting. (Appendix 4).

- **MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2013 - 2018** (Item 6)

1. That the detailed service revenue and capital budgets for the years 2013-18, including amendments resulting from government funding changes announced after the 2013/14 budget be approved (Annex 1 of the submitted report).
2. That the publication of the detailed service revenue and capital budgets as set out in the 2013-18 Medium Term Financial Plan be approved.
3. That the lower capital government grant to support the schools basic need programme be noted and the additional use of £2m internal or external borrowing in 2013/14 and 2014/15 be approved.
4. That the fees and charges approved under delegated powers be endorsed and other fee and charge proposals, as set out in Annex 2 of the

submitted report, be approved.

5. That the Public Health Equalities Impact Assessment be brought back to the next Cabinet meeting on 23 April 2013.

Reasons for Decisions

The 2013 – 18 MTFP is a five year budget that is aligned to the corporate and directorate strategies. It reflects assumptions about the current local and national financial, economic and political environment. Regular reporting through the year will enable progress to be effectively tracked and managed.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by The Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **BUDGET MONITORING FORECAST 2012/13 (PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 2013)** (Item 7)

1. That the projected revenue budget underspend (Annex 1 – Section A of the submitted report) and the capital programme direction (Section B of the submitted report) be noted.
2. That government grant changes be reflected in directorate budgets (Section C of the submitted report).
3. That the use of the unused contingency for the Olympic Games be approved, to respond to the winter damage to roads.

Reasons for Decisions

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

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **STRENGTHENING THE COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO INNOVATION: UPDATE ON OUR INNOVATION JOURNEY** (Item 8)

1. That the good progress made so far to strengthen innovation capacity and capability be acknowledged and the findings from the peer challenge be welcomed.
2. The Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency continue to work with colleagues to develop and implement the strategic framework for innovation, incorporating the recommendations from the peer challenge.
3. The learning and evaluation from innovation work be reported back to Cabinet and Council via the Chief Executive's six monthly progress reports, the next of which will be published in summer 2013.

Reasons for Decisions

To further refine and strengthen the Council's approach to innovation so it can exploit new opportunities, navigate significant challenges and achieve improved

outcomes and value for money for Surrey's residents.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **STRENGTHENING THE COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO INNOVATION: MODELS OF DELIVERY** (Item 9)
 1. That the progress and achievements delivered to date through a range of existing delivery models be acknowledged.
 2. That the primary objective the council seeks to achieve by developing its approach to trading is to deliver public value for Surrey residents and businesses be confirmed.
 3. That the creation of a Surrey County Council Shareholder Board ('the Board') with responsibility for exercising 'shareholder control' over any limited ('trading') companies established by the council be approved and the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency and Chief Executive, be asked to establish the Board.
 4. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, to establish a trading company that will deliver in the first instance 'business services' and in order to do so:
 - a. to consider and approve a business case, which must satisfy the statutory requirements and the criteria set out in paragraph 28 and 29 of the submitted report; and
 - b. to approve the Articles of Association including the naming of Directors of the company.
 5. That the opportunities that a range of delivery models provides be acknowledged, future proposals (expressed as options appraisals and business cases) from services across the council over the three-year period 2013 – 2016 be welcomed and the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency be asked to lead a programme of work that will review service delivery models including currently traded activity.

Reasons for Decisions

In the current financial and funding climate for local government it is essential that the council continues to focus on delivering public value to the residents of Surrey.

The council recognises that a range of delivery models are already and should continue to be used to provide services that best meet the needs of Surrey residents and businesses. Building on existing successes, the recommendations set out in this report will enable the council to continue to anticipate and respond to the challenges it faces and represent the next phase of its approach to ensure Surrey residents receive good quality public services.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **FROM REACTIVE TO PLANNED: A NEW APPROACH FOR HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE** (Item 10)
 1. That the adoption of Surrey Priority Network (SPN) (2013) as Surrey's road classification for maintenance be approved and the authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to approve future local adjustments to the SPN, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report.
 2. That the revised Highway Safety Inspection Policy, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be approved, subject to the development of robust processes and systems to ensure that risks are assessed and authority to agree those processes and systems be delegated to the Strategic Director of Environment and Infrastructure and the Strategic Director of Change and Efficiency, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.
 3. That the Town Centre Management agreement with Woking Borough Council be approved, and the authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Highways to finalise the agreement with Woking Borough Council according to the terms set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions

These proposed changes will provide the following benefits:

- Increase the frequency of highway inspections, ensuring defects are identified sooner.
- Improve the planning of defect repairs, leading to an improved standard of repair and less repeat visits.
- Improve the overall condition of the network by carrying out larger scale repairs.
- As a consequence, improve the management of risk across the highway network.
- Enable Woking Borough Council to invest in their town centre by complementing County Council services and providing a higher level of service than the County Council would be able to provide.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment and Transport Select Committee]

- **CHILDREN'S HEALTH, WELLBEING AND SAFEGUARDING PLAN 2013 / 2014** (Item 11)
 1. That the approach to supporting Children, Young People and Families' Health and Wellbeing, as set out in the plan submitted with the report, be approved.
 2. That the publication of the Children's Health, Wellbeing and Safeguarding plan be agreed. (Annex 1 of the submitted report)
 3. That the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, can sign

off any subsequent amendments to the Plan, provided there are no substantive changes.

Reasons for Decisions

To note the plan for positively supporting the health and wellbeing of children, young people and families in Surrey and to agree to delivery.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Families Select Committee]

- **SURREY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMME (Item 12)**

1. That the strategy and implementation of the Surrey Family Support Programme, by local teams in Elmbridge, Guildford, Spelthorne, Reigate and Banstead, Waverley, and Woking Borough Councils be approved.
2. That a local discretionary criteria of families of concern be added to the Government's criteria for families to join the programme.

Reasons for Decisions

In order to achieve the best outcomes for local families with multiple needs, the national programme has been adapted to better suit Surrey communities.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Families Select Committee]

- **EMERGENCY RESPONSE COVER LOCATIONS: EPSOM AND EWELL AND REIGATE AND BANSTEAD (Item 13)**

That the proposals for the improved deployment of single fire engine fire stations running through the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead, including the delivery of two new fire stations in Salfords and the Burgh Heath area be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

1. To mitigate the impact of changes at Horley as a result of the West Sussex Fire and Rescue Authority's decision to withdraw their fire engine.
2. To improve the fire engine response coverage in Surrey. This is measured through modelling analysis and performance data.
3. To improve the fire service provision across Surrey.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities Select Committee]

N.B. Comments from the Communities Select Committee together with the Cabinet response were tabled at the meeting. Appendix 5 and 6 respectively

- **INVESTMENT IN SAFE CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE (Item 14)**

That the decision to accept the grant be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

Reasons for Decisions

Tackling cyclist KSI rates is a corporate priority. The rate of cyclist KSIs in Surrey has more than doubled in the last four years. The schemes will directly benefit areas of high cyclist KSI rates, by making cycling a safer option for residents that live, work and shop in the town centres. It will deliver economic benefit by making it more possible for people to cycle, reducing travel costs and congestion. It will support the County Council's ambition to secure a cycling legacy from the 2012 Olympics and will support development of Surrey's visitor economy.

Consultation with residents in Walton-upon-Thames and Leatherhead, identified that 89% of people would welcome the introduction of safe, segregated cycle routes. Of the people surveyed, 44% of cycle owners and 82% of non-owners identified road safety issues as a deterrent to cycling.

The relevant Local Committees have formally approved the proposed schemes.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment and Transport Select Committee]

- **SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH: COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE SECTION 278 DELIVERY OF THE SHEERWATER LINK ROAD, WOKING** (Item 15)
 1. That the agreement fee be waived and commuted payments or a bond for the Sheerwater Link Road/ Bishop David Brown scheme be not required.
 2. That the internal costs arising from the above recommendation be funded from New Homes Bonus receipts.

Reasons for Decisions

Surrey County Council wants to assist Woking Borough Council in the delivery of this economically important project that will contribute a significant beneficial effect on the Borough, County, and wider South East Regional economies. This will not only have a substantially positive effect on the residents of Surrey (especially current and future residents of East Woking), but also it will benefit those who work in East Woking and travel through it.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment and Transport Select Committee]

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Item 16)

That the decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as set out in Appendix 7 be noted.

Reason for Decisions

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

- **WESTFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, WOKING: EXPANSION BY ONE FORM OF ENTRY FROM SEPTEMBER 2013** (Item 17)

That the expansion and adaptation of Westfield Primary School, as detailed in the submitted report, be approved in principle, subject to the consideration and approval of the detailed financial information set out in agenda item 22.

Reasons for Decisions

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

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **AWARD OF TWO YEAR CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF TEMPORARY AGENCY STAFF** (Item 18)

That the award of a two year new contract under a national framework which commenced April 2011 (contract notice 2010/s 209 3197760) be approved, so as to continue the provision, for the supply of temporary staff.

Reasons for Decisions

The current contract works well in delivering temporary agency staff to the Council. However after consultation with stakeholders there are aspects within the service provision that users would like to see improved.

A project team has been formed consisting of representatives from Human Resources, Procurement, Children's and Adult Services to consider and create a strategy for the long term use of temporary staff.

This review will take into account market conditions and industry performance as well as recent changes in legislation regarding temporary agency workers. It will focus on the best options for delivering the Councils requirements and will potentially create innovative solutions to meet those needs.

The contract will provide the time required to complete and implement the outcomes of the review.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF MANAGED PRINT SERVICES** (Item 19)

(1) That the award of a four year framework agreement, which will be made available for use by Surrey County Council, all local authorities and all public sector bodies in the South East be approved. (Financial details were set out in the Part 2 Annex, item 23 on the agenda)

(2) That the award for Surrey County Council's specific print solution (as a mini competition from the framework) to the bidder identified in the Part 2 Annex (item 23) for a 5 year contract, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

Surrey County Council (SCC) needs to modernise its approach to printing by offering a holistic and flexible print solution that fits organisational and operational needs.

The Council has a wide range of devices that print, photocopy, fax and scan which are of different makes and models. Currently there are 1800 networked printers and numerous photocopiers, plus standalone printers/photocopiers in various teams. These devices are spread across 143 buildings. This wide range is difficult to support/maintain and therefore expensive. The Council also needs to buy and stock a wide range of consumables for the devices makes and models. The current cost of printing and photocopying is approximately £1,275,000 per annum.

A move to Multi Functional Devices (MFDs) offers the ability to scan, fax, photocopy and print from a single machine, with resultant cost savings and rationalisation of equipment. Such devices also offer increased security, along with a reduction in print wastage and carbon.

SCC has entered a framework agreement (which will be open to all local authorities and all public sector bodies in the south east). This will give the Council a route to market for all its print needs. The framework will also facilitate a longer term collective approach to the delivery of printing across Surrey or a larger region such as the South East 7.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **WASTE MANAGEMENT: PROPOSAL TO DELIVER ECOPARK (Item 20)**
 1. That the actions proposed in this report be approved, and a further report be required by the end of July 2013, which provides the necessary information to enable the Cabinet to approve the actions to deliver the Eco Park.
 2. That the positive discussions with DEFRA be noted and a realignment of grant with planned spend profile be supported.

Reasons for Decisions

The recommendations are necessary to provide proper authority to:

1. Deliver the Eco Park which represents a corporate priority for the Council.
2. Avoid significant cost implications to the Council.
3. Provide assurance to contractual and funding partners to the Council.
4. Demonstrate ongoing commitment to value for money for the UK taxpayer.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment and Transport Select Committee]

- **WESTFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, WOKING: EXPANSION BY ONE FORM OF ENTRY FROM SEPTEMBER 2013 (Item 22)**
 1. That the business case for the project to expand Westfield Primary School up to a maximum 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 be agreed by the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency and the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, in consultation with the Leader.
3. That the award of the contract to carry out the works to provide the additional pupil places be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

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

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF MANAGED PRINT SERVICES** (Item 23)

1. That a framework agreement be awarded across three lots (capital goods, managed services and consumables) and available to authorities across the South East region, to commence on 5 April 2013.
2. On award of this framework a 5 year contract be subsequently awarded to the supplier named in the submitted report, for the provision of a managed service to meet Surrey County Council's printing requirements, at an estimated value as set out in the submitted report, to commence on 15th April 2013.

Reasons for Decisions

Surrey County Council (SCC) needs to modernise its approach to printing by offering a holistic and flexible print solution that fits organisational and operational needs.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee]

- **STRENGTHENING THE COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO INNOVATION: MODELS OF DELIVERY** (Item 24)

Confidential Annex for item 9.

- **AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF PAEDIATRICS SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS (Item 25)**

That the award of new contracts to the existing providers be approved for one year on financial terms to be negotiated but not to exceed the annual value of the current contracts.

Reasons for Decisions

The County Council needs to deliver these services to meet children's stated needs. Officers in Children's Services and Procurement have been working with colleagues in Health over the last 12 months to seek to develop a joint commissioning approach and strategy for new contracts to be awarded from April 2013. It has not been possible to agree this joint approach due to the organisational changes that the PCT and newly formed Clinical Commissioning Groups have been going through during this period.

The Council therefore proposes to award contracts with the current providers in order to ensure continuation of these services from April 2013 to March 2014.

[The decisions on the item can be called in by the Education Select Committee]

ITEM 4(b) - PROCEDURAL MATTERS**Public Questions****Question (1) from Mr David Beaman**

On Wednesday 13th March Surrey County Council announced a "hit list" of 16 projects to be delivered during the life of the next County Council between 2015 and 2019 to reduce traffic congestion. Whilst this "hit list" included 2 schemes in Farnham it did not include a Wrecclesham Relief Road. It is now over 10 years since Surrey County Council commissioned a review to look at the options for relieving traffic through Wrecclesham which recommended traffic management measures and improvements to public transport in the short term with construction of a relief road in the longer term. Since construction of the relief road now appears to be highly unlikely in the near future what traffic management measures and improvements to public transport are proposed for implementation in the short term to relieve traffic through Wrecclesham especially given the additional traffic that will inevitably be generated by the development of the new Whitehill and Bordon new eco town.

Reply:

Surrey Highways officers have been in discussion with their counterparts in Hampshire and the transportation consultant for the development on measures to ameliorate any increase in traffic using the A325 through Wrecclesham which results from the Whitehall Borden ecotown. The development is expected to be implemented over a number of years and mitigation measures will concentrate on reducing the severance caused by the A325 and A31 Farnham Bypass, which would include signalisation of the mini roundabout at School Hill incorporating pedestrian red man/green man crossings and controlled pedestrians in both Wrecclesham Hill and on the the A31 at Red Lion Lane.

In the short term, the Local Committee for Waverley meeting on 15 March agreed to fund a speed management scheme for the A325 Wrecclesham Hill as part of its programme of minor improvement schemes for 2013/14.

John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
26 March 2013

**CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE
AND COUNTRYSIDE TASK GROUP**

COUNTRYSIDE MANAGEMENT TASK GROUP REPORT

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 – The Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure should review the contract between Surrey Wildlife Trust and Surrey County Council. This review should include:

- All aspects of the contract;
- The development and measurement of more clearly defined outputs that ensure value for money;
- A review of the governance arrangements;
- The development of a communication strategy to promote the benefit of the partnership arrangements to Members of the County Council and Surrey residents and;
- That the Environment & Transport Select Committee reviews the Countryside Estate's asset management plan at a future meeting.

Timescale: report to Environment & Transport Select Committee – October 2013.

Recommendation 2 - The Strategic Director for Change & Efficiency reviews the management arrangements for the Council's Small Holdings and Farm Estate to ensure that they retain value and maximise economic returns.

Timescale: report to Environment & Transport Select Committee – October 2013.

Recommendation 3 – The Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure reviews and refreshes the approach to rural and countryside partnership working. This review should include:

- A revised register of all partnerships within the County, setting out the purpose of each organisation and financial contributions and representation from the County;
- That this register is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure it continues to be relevant;
- That a culture of partnership (rather than direction) is encouraged and fostered within the County, to encourage dialogue and facilitation between the Council and stakeholders and;
- That Surrey County Council actively engages with the (new) Surrey Nature Partnership, with the County representative on this body being the Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment.

Timescale: report to Environment & Transport Select Committee – July 2013.

Recommendation 4 – The Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure reviews and refreshes the approach to the rural economy. This review should consider that:

- The County Council maintains policies, which enable residents to live and work in the rural community. This will require working with partners to facilitate both affordable housing and job opportunities (including apprentices);
- The County Council supports the development of the wood fuel industry in Surrey and encourages co-operation between the owners of smaller woods; and
- The County Council considers, where suitable, the prioritisation of the use of wood fuel in its own buildings, subject to approval of a business case.

Timescale: report to Environment & Transport Select Committee – July 2013.

Recommendation 5 – The Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure reviews and refreshes the approach to tourism. This review should consider that:

- Specific management plans are created for iconic locations in Surrey;
- Where appropriate, the Olympic Legacy is used as a catalyst for key decisions; and
- Objectives are agreed with the AONB to reflect the strength and potential of the brand for Surrey.

Timescale: report to Environment & Transport Select Committee – July 2013.

RESPONSE

I welcome the report of the Environment and Transport Select Committee and its task group and note their recommendations. The Cabinet Member will consider the task group recommendations early in the new Administration and make a detailed response at that time.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
26 March 2013

CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

FROM REACTIVE TO PLANNED – A NEW APPROACH FOR HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the recommendations set out in the New Strategy for Highways Maintenance report, be endorsed.

RESPONSE

It is acknowledged that the New Strategy for Highways Maintenance has been discussed in detail by the Select Committee and I welcome their endorsement of the recommendations. Officers will continue to develop and implement processes to ensure adequate monitoring of the new strategy following introduction. This will also include putting in place an effective communications strategy. The recommendations will be introduced in phases during the forthcoming year, 2013/14.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
26 March 2013

CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SELECT COMMITTEE

REPORT OF THE SUPPORTING FAMILIES TASK GROUP

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Cabinet approves the stated objectives of the Surrey Family Support Programme.
2. That the Cabinet asks that the Strategic Director of Children, Schools and Families provide clarity over how the objectives of the Surrey Family Support Programme relate to the wider objectives of the Directorate Public Value Programme.
3. That Cabinet reviews the outcomes for a sample of the families a year after completing the Programme.
4. That the Cabinet receives an analysis of the costs of families included within the Surrey Family Support Programme and projected savings to the public purse.
5. That the Cabinet encourages the Borough and District Councils to develop a mechanism for involving and raising the awareness of elected Members through local governance structures, including Local Committees.

RESPONSE

I would like to thank the Task Group for undertaking a very detailed and thorough investigation into the Family Support Programme as it was being developed with our public partner agencies. Officers have worked closely with the Task Group and as a result many of the ideas and proposals made by the Task Group were agreed and or anticipated as the new programme was developed.

The Surrey Family Support Programme is a new and innovative way for the Council to work with families with multiple and complex needs using a new model of joint working with partners. The programme will no doubt evolve as we learn what works best for the families in the programme and as we develop our working practice.

In response to the Task Group's five recommendations I have the following response:

1. I am pleased that the Task Group supports the objectives of the programme. These objectives will be agreed as part of my report to the Cabinet on the Family Support Strategy.
2. There was always an overlap between the work of the Family Support Programme (Troubled Families) and the Family Support work stream of the Children, Schools & Families Directorate Public Value Programme.

The reason for this is because both pieces of work are concerned with working with families and specifically families who present with a range of needs across all family members. The task of the Family Support Programme was to put in place a programme of work to turn around the lives of over 1,000 families by 2015. That work programme is now established and will go live shortly.

The Public Value Programme is looking to develop innovative ways of working that will raise service quality, improve family outcomes and at the same time reduce the Children, Schools & Families budget by £40M by 2017.

In all likelihood the work of the Family Support Programme will have a great influence on the final recommendations of the Public Value Review which will in turn make some changes to the Family Support Programme. The Strategic Director for Children, Schools

& Families will report later this year on the Public Value programme and address the issues raised regarding the relationship between the Family Support programme and the PVP work streams.

3. A key success measure of the Family Support Programme will be whether we can demonstrate that the programme has a lasting and sustainable impact on the families who take part. I am happy to agree that the Cabinet reviews the progress of the Family Support Programme and its impact on family outcomes including an examination of family outcomes one year after a sample of families leaves the programme.
4. The Government has made a strong case to suggest that this way of working with families with multiple and complex needs will save money for tax payers. Work is in hand to track the before and after Council costs of a sample of the families who join the programme and this will inform the future development of the programme.
5. Our partnership approach to the Family Support Programme will mean that in each borough and district there will be some local governance and scrutiny arrangements for the local programme and its outcomes. We will of course encourage borough and district councils to raise awareness of the programme with their elected members through these local arrangements. Local Committee chairman may decide to call in reports on the Troubled Families programme for their particular borough or district. This has already happened in Waverley and Spelthorne.

Mrs Mary Angell
Cabinet Member for Children and Families
26 March 2013

COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: Scrutiny of Consultation for Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead Emergency Response Cover Locations

Date Considered: 21 March 2013

At its meeting of 21 March 2013 the Communities Select Committee considered a report from the Fire and Rescue Service on the proposed changes to the emergency response cover in the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead. This issue had also to some extent been discussed at the Committee's meeting of 16 January 2013 as part of the item considering the progress of the Public Safety Plan.

The Communities Select Committee raised a number of issues to include:

- 1) clarity, information and justifications around the selection of new locations being considered;
- 2) public and member engagement during the consultation process;
- 3) impact of the changes on areas of deprivation and vulnerable residents;
- 4) impact of the changes on first and second fire engine response times.

The Committee acknowledged that the proposed changes were a response to West Sussex Fire and Rescue Authority's decision to relocate their fire engine based at Horley and terminate their agreement to provide cover in that area.

The Committee felt that the Service had invested considerable time considering alternative proposals to respond to this change.

The Committee recognised that the proposed changes did diminish the second fire engine response times in Epsom & Ewell, and some concerns were expressed about the impact this would have in the area. However, the Committee generally accepted that on average this borough would continue to have one of the best response times in the County. The Committee noted that the proposed changes would improve the cover and average response times in Reigate and Banstead. Therefore, the majority of the Committee felt that these proposals were an appropriate response to the changes in Horley as it provided equitable cover taking the County as a whole.

The recommendation to endorse the Service's proposals was voted on by the Committee. The majority of the Committee voted to endorse the proposals. There was one vote against the proposals.

The Committee agreed to the recommendation to review the implementation plan for the proposed changes.

Recommendation

Communities Select Committee recommends that Cabinet approves the proposed changes to the emergency response cover in the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.

STEVE COSSER

Chairman of the Communities Select Committee

CABINET RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

SCRUTINY OF CONSULTATION FOR EPSOM & EWELL AND REIGATE & BANSTEAD – EMERGENCY RESPONSE COVER LOCATIONS

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Communities Select Committee recommends that Cabinet approves the proposed changes to the emergency response cover in the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.

RESPONSE

I am pleased to note that the Communities Select Committee recommends that Cabinet approves the proposed changes to the emergency response cover in the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.

I was at the Select Committee with officers and responded to the issues raised during the meeting. In respect of the four specific points that have been raised, I will provide a further summary response.

(1) Clarity, information and justifications around the selection of new locations being considered

SCC Property Services are responsible for identifying and securing appropriate sites for the location of the new fire stations. Fire Officers are working with officers from Property Services on this matter and support has been offered by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council. When suitable sites have been identified and we are able, the necessary clarity and information will be provided. Any change of use will of course be subject to the usual planning permission process.

(2) Public and member engagement during the consultation process

As a result of the initial feedback received I agreed to extend the consultation to 12 weeks to ensure that there was sufficient opportunity for interested parties to have their say. The full consultation plan is available as an appendix to the consultation report but I can assure you it was thorough and every reasonable effort was taken to encourage participation.

(3) Impact of the changes on areas of deprivation and vulnerable residents

A significant amount of modelling and research has been undertaken in developing these proposals and the impact on vulnerable residents has been assessed through the EIA. This shows that, in Surrey, vulnerability from fire is not linked to deprivation but there appears to be a link with age, mobility and mental health issues. The Service are working closely with Adult Social Care colleagues to target those most at risk and provide them with the prevention and protection measures that can make a real difference to them. Indeed fire and rescue critical incidents can and do occur anywhere in the county and that is why we are making these changes to improve the balance of service provision across Surrey, which is an agreed outcome of the Public Safety Plan.

(4) Impact of the changes on first and second fire engine response times

The Cabinet report and appendices provides more detail on the modelled impact of the changes on fire engine response times. Across Surrey, and specifically within Reigate & Banstead, the modelled average response time for the first fire engine improves and two-thirds of all incidents are resolved with only one fire engine in attendance. However, the biggest impact on life safety can be made through effective prevention and protection work, which supports our emergency response arrangements. The work with Adult Social Care to target vulnerable people to support them in their homes and the award winning *safe drive, stay alive* programme for young drivers

are good examples of where we can make a positive difference.

Mrs Kay Hammond
Cabinet Member for Community Safety
26 March 2013

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

MARCH 2013

(i) PETITION – HELICOPTER NOISE

That the response attached at Appendix 1 be approved.

Reasons for decision

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment –
13 March 2013)

(ii) LICENSING OF THE SURREY HILLS TRADEMARK TO SURREY HILLS ENTERPRISES COMMUNITY INTEREST COMPANY

1. That the Trademark be licensed to Surrey Hills Enterprises to use commercially for an initial period of three years at no cost, and to be reviewed at the end of that term.
2. That the final wording of the Trademark licence be agreed by officers and signed off by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
3. That the Trademark be licensed to the Community Interest Company (CIC) once the Head of Legal Services has advised that the CIC is properly established and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Board have approved the licence.

Reasons for decision

The Surrey Hills AONB Board and the County Council are keen to see the Surrey Hills Trademark developed into a significant brand for Surrey, to support businesses in the County and to encourage visitors. The CIC has the ability to trade freely and can therefore sub licence the Trademark and generate an income and as the company has a community interest that income has to be used for the purposes set out in the CIC Memorandum and Articles of Association. In addition, the CIC has an asset lock whereby anything transferred into the company has to be retained by the company for the community interest.

This will help develop the Surrey Hills brand, help promote local businesses and allow the income to be used to fund activities in the Surrey Hills that deliver the AONB management plan. The licence will only be for three years initially to see how it works and ensure that all parties are getting the expected benefit from the Trademark.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment –
13 March 2013)

(iii) A PROPOSAL TO RELOCATE PORTESBURY SPECIAL SCHOOL, CAMBERLEY FROM ITS CURRENT LOCATION TO A NEW SITE AND TO INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF THE SCHOOL FROM 70 TO 105 PLACES

1. That the proposal be implemented and Portesbury Special School be relocated to the old Blackdown Primary School site and expanded from 70 to 105 places.

2. That officers prepare a full planning application to be considered by the Planning Authority and that the proposal be implemented subject to the agreed budget set by Cabinet.

Reasons for decision

The current site and buildings are deficient and a solution has been required for some time. The consultation showed that there is strong support from the school, Governors and the local community on this proposal. Now that a suitable site has been identified that is acceptable to both the school and parents, the Local Authority should seek to proceed with the proposal to and to seek planning approval on the scheme.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 13 March 2013)

(iv) TO DETERMINE A PROPOSAL TO EXPAND ESHER COFE (VC) HIGH SCHOOL

1. That the school be enlarged by 2 forms of entry (from 6 FE to 8 FE).
2. That the school undertakes a building remodelling programme on its present site managed by Surrey County Council. This will add teaching accommodation and improve the use of space on campus and enable the school to accommodate 1200 students (PAN 240).
3. That this expansion be effective from 1 September 2015.

Reasons for decision

Esher High is a popular school and successful which delivers a high quality education. It was rated by OFSTED at its last inspection (Nov 2009) as an outstanding school. It also holds a number of awards and is recognised as a National Teaching School, a National Support School and a Lead school for educating Gifted and Talented students. The provision of additional places at Esher High meets the government's policy position to expand successful schools in order to meet parental preferences.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 13 March 2013)

(v) PROPOSED EXPANSION OF ST MARTIN'S COFE VA INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS, EPSOM

1. That the admission for St Martin's Infant School be approved as 3 FE from September 2014
2. That the admission for St Martin's Junior School be approved as 3 FE from September 2017
3. That additional accommodation be built at both schools and a suitable travel plan be agreed.

Reasons for decision

There is an immediate requirement for more primary school places in Epsom which is evidenced by data. This proposal to expand two popular and successful schools is in response to this need and the additional places will benefit local parents and children.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 13 March 2013)

(vi) CHARLWOOD INFANT SCHOOL: CHANGE TO A PRIMARY SCHOOL - DECISION

- (1) That Charlwood Primary School would decrease its Published Admission Number from 30 to 15 on 1 September 2013.
- (2) That no Year 2 children would remain on roll at Charlwood Primary School, but would continue to progress to other schools for their junior education.
- (3) That the school would become a restricted age primary school.
- (4) That Charlwood Primary School would extend its age range by 1 year on 1 September 2016.
- (5) That Charlwood Primary School would then extend its age range by 1 year each year until 1 September 2019, when it would become an all-through primary school.

Reasons for decision

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

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 13 March 2013)

(vii) SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL PREVENTION COMMISSIONING 2013 - 2015

1. That the allocation of £8,500 to Personalised Prevention be approved
2. That the local needs specification as set out in Annex A of the submitted report, be considered by providers focusing on the identified needs of Epsom & Ewell and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group be approved.

Reasons for decision

1. The Youth Task Group was set up by the Local Committee for the purpose of advising the Local Committee in relation to youth issues, with particular reference to prioritising needs in respect of SCC Services for Young People resources devolved to the Local Committee. The Task Group has identified key priorities for Epsom & Ewell to prevent young people becoming Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). This report brings forward recommendations from the Task Group on how the local commissioning resource should be targeted.
2. The recommendations focus on key geographical neighbourhoods and community priorities. However the Task Group agreed that there should be borough-wide access to any commissioned services. Following a workshop the Task Group discussed and agreed key risk factors for Epsom & Ewell and these were used to produce a local specification for the Local Prevention Framework for 2013-15 as set out in Annex A of the submitted report.
3. Following agreement of the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, proposals to address the identified priority areas and risk factors will be sought from providers. The Commissioning and Development team will create a short-list of bids for

consideration of the Task Group. The Task Group will then consider the shortlist before final proposals for award of grant(s) are brought to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety. The commissioned services would then commence on 1 September 2013.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 15 March 2013)

(viii) ABBEY BARN TRUST

That the cash currently held by the council, plus the proceeds from the sale of investments in full be transferred to the Community Foundation for Surrey, so they are able to utilise the funds through the Runnymede Community Fund Panel and the young people of Runnymede are able to utilise the funds.

Reasons for decision

The County Council is confident that the Community Foundation for Surrey is a very suitable vehicle to distribute long term funds in the form of grants to the young people in Runnymede. This will be with full involvement of local people, is in line with the intentions of the original trust and value for money as additional funds will be generated to support the bequest.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 15 March 2013)

RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING HELICOPTER NOISE

The Petition

“We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to help stop excessive helicopter noise over the county from non essential flights.”

Submitted by Mr Andy Lush

Signatures: 241

Further details from petition creator:

Surrey is regularly overflowed by noisy commercial and private helicopters, causing serious environmental health issues. The Civil Aviation Authority will not act. The vast majority of these flights are non-essential leisure and commuting trips. Affected residents in Surrey have had enough. We call on Surrey County Council to raise this issue at the highest level, and insist on protection for its residents from this extremely unpleasant and intrusive noise pollution.

Response

Firstly I would like to thank Mr Lush and the residents who signed the petition for raising this issue. The Council fully supports residents' rights to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes free from excessive noise pollution and recognises the concerns felt by those affected by aircraft noise.

The Council recognises the deficiency of the current regulatory framework and shares the petitioner's concern that this is an area which requires action at a national level. In this response I will set out the action which the Council is pursuing both to see strengthened controls over aircraft noise pollution, including helicopters, at a national level and measures which could be taken at a local level to help address local issues in Surrey.

The national picture – current regulations

Whilst there are regulations surrounding safety issues associated with helicopter flights, there are currently few controls over their noise. The main safety regulations regarding helicopters are incorporated within the Rules of the Air Regulations (2007), which form part of the Air Navigation Orders (2009). Safety regulations include:

- The 500 feet rule - Except with the written permission of the CAA, an aircraft shall not be flown closer than 500 feet to any person, vessel, vehicle or structure.
- The 1,000 feet rule - Except with the written permission of the CAA, an aircraft flying over a congested area of a city town or settlement shall not fly below a height of 1,000 feet above the highest fixed obstacle within a horizontal radius of 600 metres of the aircraft.
(Police helicopters are exempted from both the 500 feet and 1,000 feet rules).

The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) is the organisation that deals with helicopter noise complaints. Helicopters flown according to the 'Rules of the Air' are given immunity from controls in relation to noise under the Civil Aviation Act 1982, the Air Navigation Regulations and the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Section 76 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982: “No action shall lie in respect of trespass or in respect of nuisance, by reason only of the flight of an aircraft over any property at a height above the ground which, having regard to wind, weather and all the circumstances of the case is reasonable, or the ordinary incidents of such flight, so

long as the provisions of any Air Navigation Order... [broadly, the regulations governing licensing, air-worthiness, rules of the air and air traffic control] have been duly complied with."

There are specific restrictions for helicopters flying in the London and London City Control Zones. Single-engine helicopters are required to fly along designated routes; multi-engine helicopters can travel on more direct routes. Outside of these areas and Air Traffic Controlled airspace, helicopters are free to fly routes in accordance with the height restrictions set out above.

Further details can be found in the attached SASIG paper "The Impact of Helicopters". Also attached is a copy of Civil Aviation Authority report on planning controls - Helicopter Activity and Private Landing Sites.

The national picture – lobbying for change

Surrey County Council is a member of SASIG, the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group of the Local Government Association. SASIG is a national group of local authorities with an interest in strategic aviation issues. These local authorities comprise a population of around 12 million people, over a fifth of the total population of England.

Surrey County Council works through SASIG to coordinate with other Local Authorities in a strategic manner on national aviation policy so as to reconcile economic, social and environmental issues.

In March 2011, the Government launched a scoping exercise towards developing a new sustainable policy framework for UK aviation. The Council and its partners in SASIG used this opportunity to call on the Government to include helicopter noise in the aviation framework as follows:

"Helicopter activity should be included in a new noise management regime, to address the associated impacts. Impacts from helicopter flights are related to the fact that the craft are flown using visual reference to the layout of buildings, transport routes, open spaces, etc. on the ground ('visual flight rules'), i.e. not along any predefined routes; the craft tend to be flown at lower altitudes than aircraft; and helicopters have specific noise characteristics." (Par. 6.10, pg.25)

Following the initial scoping exercise, the Government launched a consultation on its draft aviation policy framework in June 2012. The consultation included the following information in relation to helicopter noise:

4.90 We received a number of responses on the subject of helicopter noise, particularly in London. Unlike commercial aircraft, helicopters do not fly very high and therefore their noise has the potential to impact on people living along the entire length of their flight path. This means that in an area which experiences a concentration of helicopter movements, there is scope for considerable disturbance. Many people have commented on the relatively greater annoyance from helicopter noise.

4.91 Helicopters must meet internationally agreed noise standards prior to the issue of a Certificate of Airworthiness. While it is possible to regulate airports and aerodromes, in many cases helicopters may not use these facilities. Helicopters are subject to Rules of the Air Regulations, which require minimum heights to be maintained, but there are no restrictions on helicopter movements within uncontrolled airspace. Within the London area, single engine helicopters are required to follow certain routes, though these are designed for safety rather than noise purposes. We would encourage NATS and the CAA to look at these issues overall, as well as in the context of work to review London airspace and we will consider how to address noise from helicopters in our review of the 2002 guidance.

The consultation ran until 31 October 2012. SASIG again took this opportunity to lobby for the inclusion of measures to address helicopter noise impact in the proposed legislation. SASIG's response to the consultation and the report informing its comments, setting out the regulations for helicopters and the community impacts and focusing on noise and controls, are attached to this response.

The Government's approach to the management of noise from general aviation and helicopters has been that it is not appropriate for the Government to intervene. The Government maintains the stance that local environmental issues are best resolved at a local level where possible.

SASIG does not agree that there are sufficient local powers for adequate local resolution of noise from general aviation and helicopters. SASIG has therefore called for the application of the Secretary of State's 'section 5 power' (Civil Aviation Act 1982), placing a duty on an aerodrome operator to have regard to the need to minimise adverse effects on the environment.

The Government should also take a proactive approach to reducing the impact of helicopters by using incentives to phase out noisier helicopters. In order to encourage newer and less noisy types of helicopters SASIG believes it is necessary to reduce the noise standard from the current level of 81 dB(A). In general, in seeking to reduce the number of older and noisier helicopters, the Government could use incentive/disincentive schemes to encourage phasing out of these helicopters.

SASIG has also lobbied for the development of a system of monitoring helicopter movements across additional areas of the UK and not just London. Currently, the CAA only monitors helicopter movements in London. In order to understand and quantify the impacts of helicopters in the UK, it is necessary to undertake more effective monitoring of helicopter movements across the UK and not just in the London Control Zone.

SASIG has called on the Government to recognise the role of heliport consultative groups in establishing local regulations to reduce impacts on communities and involve them and other groups in the development of legislation to address helicopter noise.

In addition to lobbying through SASIG, Surrey County Council also submitted its own separate response to the Government consultation on its draft aviation policy framework which directly addressed the issue of helicopter noise and shows the seriousness with which the Council takes this matter. The Council's response, which is set out in the attached letter (see questions 12, 20 and 21), included the following views:

Unlike commercial aircraft, helicopters do not fly very high and therefore their noise has the potential to impact on people living along the entire length of their flight path. This means that in areas which experience a concentration of helicopter movements, there is scope for considerable disturbance. There is much feedback from the public in Surrey on helicopter noise and the relatively greater annoyance this causes. Policies included in the Framework to address this issue would be most welcome.

Legislation should be introduced to address helicopter noise and to extend the movement restrictions applicable to London. Permitted development rights for landing areas could be removed. The current exemption with regard to helicopter noise in the Environmental Protection Act 1990 could be revised.

The Government's response to the consultation and details of any proposed legislation is currently awaited. The petitioner will be advised of the response once received. Surrey County Council will continue to lobby both through SASIG and directly to promote the need for long-term, sustainable aviation policies that lead to a reduction in the environmental impact of aviation whilst securing appropriate social and economic benefits.

Local context – issues raised by the petition

In addition to continuing to lobby for effective controls on the adverse impacts of helicopter noise, the Council has also worked with partners at a local level to examine some of issues affecting Surrey residents.

An analysis of the location of signatories to the ePetition has shown that the majority reside in the north of the county and, in particular, grouped parallel to the boundary with London. This coincides with the alignment point of one of the main routes for helicopter flights into London (route H7 on the map below).



Further investigation, including work carried out into this issue by the London Heliport Consultative Committee, has pointed to one of the significant contributing factors to the complaints being leisure and social helicopter flights from Surrey airfields, particularly Redhill Aerodrome, lining up with the entry point to the set entry route to London over specific areas in the north of the county. This traffic ‘funneling’ leads to a number of flights taking place over the same areas and, therefore, often affecting the same residents disproportionately. This situation is added to by the presence of key racing events (Epsom Derby etc) in the area which can lead to significant additional number of helicopter flights at certain times of year.

I commend the steps already taken by the operator of Redhill Aerodrome to advise pilots using its airfield of the issues experienced by residents (attached). The aerodrome operator has asked its pilots to adhere to voluntary measures, including travelling at additional height and re-routing away from areas where complaints have been reported, to improve the situation for those residents affected. I will be contacting the aerodrome operator’s consultative committee to see if there are other ways to improve the sharing and effectiveness of this advice with the aerodrome’s users. Also, as a matter of local concern, I will be copying in the Local Committee Chairmen for the affected areas. They will be able to consider how best to take any local issues forward with their Borough and District colleagues at a future date.

Monitoring and reporting

Having considered the ways in which the Council is working at both the national and local levels on this issue, it is worth noting the positive direct role which local residents can play. In addition to the complaint reporting which can be made via the CAA, the operator of Redhill Aerodrome has put in place local arrangements for the public reporting of aircraft noise issues (<http://www.redhillaerodrome.com/index.php/flying-complaint>). The aerodrome operator has shown a willingness to engage with the local community to address issues which have been raised and I urge residents who feel they have been affected to make use of those reporting arrangements. Such reports can be most effective when they include any details the resident might have about the aircraft/helicopter involved, the time and location of any instances and contact details for any follow up questions.

The aerodrome consultative committee receives regular reports on the noise complaints which have been submitted. If residents engage with the aerodrome operator it should be possible to identify if part of the problem does originate with these flights and whether or not voluntary measures are proving successful in encouraging pilots to fly with additional consideration of the potential impact on residents. Should it be discovered that there is another identifiable source of helicopter traffic affecting the area, then the same arrangements could also be used.

I hope residents will support the measures being taken at both the national and local level to address their concerns.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
13 March 2013

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

Democratic Services Lead Manager

Rachel Crossley - x419993

rachel.crossley@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet and Regulation

Senior Manager

Katie Booth - x417197

katieb@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Business Manager

James Stanton - x419068

james.stanton@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Committee Manager

Anne Gowing - x419938

anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

Regulatory Committee Manager

Cheryl Hardman - x419075

cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny

Senior Manager

Bryan Searle - x419019

bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Manager

Rachel Yexley - x419133

Rachel.yexley@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Leah O'Donovan - x417030

leah.odonovan@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Tom Pooley - x419902

Thomas.Pooley@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Jisa Prasannan - x420280

jisa.prasannan@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Andy Spragg - x132673

andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Victoria Lower –x132733

Victoria.lower@surreycc.gov.uk