

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 24 September 2013 and will take effect on Thursday 3 October 2013 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 2/10/13.**

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, 24 September 2013 considered the following matters and resolved:

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

Four questions had been received from members of the public. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as Appendix 1.

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

 - **CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE - INCREASING THE EMPLOYABILITY OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN SURREY [Item 5a]**

The recommendation of the Children and Education Select Committee was circulated with the agenda. The response of the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning was tabled at the meeting and is attached as Appendix 2.

 - **ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE – ADULT SOCIAL CARE BUDGET 2013/14 [Item 5b]**

The recommendation of the Adult Social Care Select Committee was circulated with the agenda. The response of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care was tabled at the meeting and is attached as Appendix 3.

- **BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR AUGUST 2013** (Item 6)

1. That the forecast revenue budget underspend for 2013/14, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 1-5 of the submitted report be noted.
2. That the forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 62-65 of the submitted report be noted.
3. That the forecast capital budget position for 2013/14, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 66-71 of the submitted report be noted.
4. That management actions to mitigate overspends, as set out throughout Annex 1 of the submitted report be noted.

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]

- **TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS ON 2014-15 AND 2015-16 LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT AND REVISED POOLING PROSPECTUS** (Item 7)

That the final responses to the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) technical consultations be endorsed.

Reason for Decisions

DCLG's consultations are detailed and technical. However, they have important funding implications for Surrey County Council and local government overall. As such, it is important Cabinet appreciates what DCLG's proposals mean for the council.

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

- **GUILDFORD SURREY BOARD** (Item 8)

1. That the establishment of a Guildford Surrey Board comprising representatives of the County Council, Guildford Borough Council and other relevant service agencies to progress shared strategic priorities be approved.
2. That the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, including the shared priorities for the new Board be agreed.
3. That the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business Services be authorised, to agree memoranda of understanding with other relevant public service agencies where applicable.

Reasons for Decisions

The above recommendations will improve strategic collaboration between Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and other public service agencies in Guildford.

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

- **SURREY RAIL STRATEGY** (Item 9)

1. That the Surrey Rail Strategy and five suggested priorities: Crossrail 2 (regional route), the North Downs Line, access to airports, access to stations (car parking) and access to London from Camberley, Bagshot and Frimley be noted.

2. That the list of schemes on which Surrey County Council should immediately begin active engagement with government and the rail industry, including on Crossrail 2 (regional route) and the electrification of the North Downs Line (paragraph 13 of the submitted report) be approved. Also, that further work be conducted to quantify car parking problems at certain stations around the county and if appropriate, further action be considered, in consultation with the rail industry.
3. That officers work with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment on developing options for Surrey County Council involvement in specific projects and initiatives. These will be reflected in an implementation plan to be integrated with the Surrey Transport Plan. As part of the Surrey Transport Plan, the implementation plan will need to be approved by Cabinet and Full Council. Proposals which progress specific schemes, including business cases, will be brought back to Cabinet.

Reasons for Decisions

Delivering the Surrey Rail Strategy will support the county council's priorities to promote sustainable economic growth and secure investment in infrastructure. The Surrey Rail Strategy would benefit Surrey residents and businesses by driving economic growth, maintaining global competitiveness, reducing impacts on the environment and accommodating sustainable population growth.

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

- **WINTER SERVICE DEVELOPMENT FOR 2013 / 14** (Item 10)

That the recommendations of the Winter Performance Task Group, set out in paragraph 3 of the submitted report and the Winter Service Plan 2013/14, included in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

These recommendations are the outcome of a Task Group meeting, held on 26 July 2013, to discuss winter service performance during 2012/13 and the development of the service for the 2013/14 winter season.

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

- **CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES SECTION 75 AGREEMENT WITH SURREY CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUPS (CCGS)** (Item 11)

1. To proceed to legal negotiations with the Surrey CCGs on an overarching Section 75 Pooled Funding Agreement which will initially cover the continuing arrangements for targeted CAMHS and the HOPE services (the quantum contributions have been identified in paragraph 12 of the submitted report).
2. That authority be delegated to make amendments to the Section 75 Agreement, enabling the effective use of the agreement and the inclusion of additional services, to the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families and/or the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, or Cabinet, in

accordance with financial regulations, with advice from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Section 151 Officer.

Reasons for Decisions

By entering into an overarching section 75 Agreement, the intention is to improve health and social care outcomes for children, young people and their families regardless of whether funding originates from the CCGs or the Council and to deliver services cost effectively.

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

- **CONTRACT AWARD - EARLY HELP (VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FOR FAMILIES WITH A CHILD UNDER FIVE YEARS OLD) (Item 12)**

That the contract be awarded to the provider on the basis described in the Part 2 annex (agenda item 18) to deliver the Service.

Reasons for Decisions

The service will deliver increased quality through a strengthened and outcome focused service specification, ensure enhanced and clearly monitored contract delivery and move to a streamlined Countywide service model, with the lead Provider forming a consortia covering all Districts and Boroughs.

The recommended contract award ensures that the new service will be delivered at a reduced cost than currently paid and will move to a more coherent and streamlined service model, delivering services across the County of Surrey for the contract period of two years, with the option to extend for an additional year.

The Children's Social Care and Wellbeing commissioning team will be the lead commissioner for this contract.

Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) will contribute to the funding of this contract annually, this is an historical arrangement. They will contribute 15% of the total contract value for this service for the first year and we will be seeking further contributions for the remaining contract duration. Colleagues from the CCG have been involved in the recommissioning process ensuring that both Social Care and Health needs are aligned.

The Council will also strongly benefit from the additional resources contributed to the service through fundraising, which will ensure additional services are delivered to families in Surrey.

[The decisions of this item may be called in by the Children and Education Select Committee]

- **PROVISION OF ADVERTISING SERVICES FOR STATUTORY NOTICES (Item 13)**

1. That the background information, as set out in the submitted report be noted.
2. That the award of the contract be agreed, following consideration of the procurement process set out in item 20, the Part 2 Annex.

Reasons for Decisions

The existing contract will expire on 31 October 2013. A tender process has been completed, and the recommendations arising out of the above process provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process. The procurement activity is expected to deliver savings of 10% per annum through the use of composite notices, closer working relationships, targeted distribution and alternative designs requiring less advertising space. Also, the contract ensures the Managed Service Provider passes on all discounted rates that the newspapers offer.

The new contract rates are in line with the current rates but the difference is they are fixed for the contract duration; therefore the projected spend is £540,000 per annum, compared to the current spend of £600,000 per annum, without incurring any inflationary costs.

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

- **HORLEY NORTH EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL - A NEW SCHOOL PROVIDING 210 PLACES AND 26 PRE-SCHOOL PLACES** (Item 14)

That the construction of a new primary school, as detailed in the submitted report, be agreed in principle subject to the consideration and approval of the detailed financial information set out in Part 2 of this agenda (item 19).

Reason for Decisions

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

[The decisions on this item can be called in by either the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee and / or the Children and Education Select Committee]

- **SCHOOL EXPANSION AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT IN THE FARNHAM AREA** (Item 15)

- (1) That approval be given for the South Farnham Academy to enhance leadership alongside developing and implementing a sustainable school improvement programme at Pilgrim's Way school.
- (2) That approval be given to transfer £750,000 from an existing scheme in the capital programme for capital investment in the South Farnham Academy to facilitate an increase in capacity in the area, through added infrastructure and the proposed leadership improvements.
- (3) That approval to the above is based on tangible and agreed performance measures that South Farnham Academy will implement at Pilgrim's Way within 2 academic years. These improvements will be monitored regularly by the local authority and Babcock 4S and through an annual review by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning.

Reasons for Decisions

Progress and outcomes for pupils at Pilgrim's way school are of significant concern and early indications from the 2013 performance results show that previous improvements have plateaued. A poor Ofsted judgement is now a very

serious possibility. Officers are confident that this leadership intervention will rapidly realise improvements to underperformance.

South Farnham Academy is a very popular and oversubscribed school and its long term success indicates its ability to support and lead improvements at Pilgrims Way school. The ability to admit more pupils overall into successful schools will ensure greater stability for the area and support the Council's aspirations to provide appropriate facilities for local children in Surrey. This scheme of adaptation at the Academy's Bourne site which will facilitate the provision of a further form of entry, increasing from 2 to 3 forms of entry, supports the expansion of popular and successful schools and will meet future demand. Combined with reputational improvements to Pilgrim's Way through its sponsorship by the South Farnham Academy represents a whole locality solution to the quality and quantity of school places in the area.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Education 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, together with the decision taken by the Chief Executive, under Urgency Powers, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken under delegated authority.

- **CONTRACT AWARD - EARLY HELP (VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FOR FAMILIES WITH A CHILD UNDER FIVE YEARS OLD) (Item 18)**

That contracts be awarded to Home Start Surrey (HSS) for the provision of the Early Help (Volunteer Support for Families with a child under 5) Service at the value, as set out in the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions

The service will deliver increased quality through a strengthened and outcome focused service specification, ensure enhanced and clearly monitored contract delivery and move to a streamlined Countywide service model, with one lead provider forming a consortia covering all Districts and Boroughs.

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

- **HORLEY NORTH EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL - A NEW SCHOOL PROVIDING 210 PLACES AND 26 PRE-SCHOOL PLACES (Item 19)**

That the business case for the project to construct a new primary school be approved, with the cost not exceeding the sum set out in the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions

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

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

- **PROVISION OF ADVERTISING SERVICES FOR STATUTORY NOTICES** (Item 20)

That a Contract be awarded to Alexander Advertising International Ltd for 3 years with the option to extend for a further year, at an estimated value as set out in the submitted report, for the provision of Advertising Services for Statutory Notices to commence on 1 November 2013.

Reasons for Decisions

The existing contracts will expire on 31 October 2013. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

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

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS: CORONER SERVICE RELOCATION** (Item 21)

1. That the purchase of the freehold interest of Woking Magistrates Court for a total consideration as set out in the submitted report, be approved
2. That a contract be awarded for the fit out of the acquired property at a total cost as set out in the submitted report, subject to an appropriate procurement exercise.

Reasons for Decisions

As a consequence of the changes to the statutory responsibilities of the Coroner arising from the implementation of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009, the current Woking Coroner's Court no longer provides suitable or appropriate accommodation. Woking Magistrates Court has been identified as a multi-purpose site suitable for providing office accommodation for the Coroner, the Assistant Coroners, the Coroner's PA and the Coronial Staff (15-20 staff provided by Surrey Police and 2 staff provided by SCC), court accommodation for simultaneous Jury and non-Jury Inquests and archive storage for non-public Coronial records.

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

ITEM 4(b) - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question (1) from Mr Mike Giles, Chairman Westhumble Residents' Association

In answer to a question on costs, Surriya Subramaniam answered that "Surrey County Council has not received, nor will receive, payment from any partners in relation to the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey for closure of the roads on 4 August 2013. The event is being run in Surrey on the basis that it will be delivered at zero cost to local residents, with officer time being provided to liaise with the event organiser and ensure that delivery is safe and in the best interests of the residents and businesses of Surrey. The event organiser will be charged for costs relating to any road works over and above the road maintenance programme, and costs associated with preparation of the Traffic Orders for closing the roads."

If the event organisers pay no other charges than those mentioned, could SCC please clarify how "zero cost to local residents" can be achieved, considering the time and effort involved in liaison, preparation and placing of signage prior to the event plus subsequent removal, erection and removal of barriers, policing on the day, etc., etc., both in relation to this year's event on 4 August and over the next five years of proposed Ride London events, or in relation to other cycling events in the area which may require council involvement, and to arrive at any conclusion, has a cost/benefit analysis been conducted and made available for public scrutiny?

Reply:

Thank you very much for taking the time you have taken to contact me with regards to the query regarding the costs relating to the delivery of the Prudential London - Surrey 100 and Classic.

This event is a joint 5 year project between Surrey County Council and the Mayor of London's Office. The London Surrey Cycle Partnership, (which is a partnership between the London Marathon Company and Sweetspot, a Surrey based events company), were selected as the event delivery organiser.

As part of this agreement I was keen to ensure that we maximised on the long term potential benefits to businesses and residents across Surrey as part of our legacy following the Olympic Games. From the outset the planning principle was that there would be no direct cost to the County, Borough and District Councils while accepting that some officer time would need to be allocated to ensure the safe delivery of the event alongside our statutory requirements. This is the same approach that we have taken with other events in the County.

In relation to the example given for the creation of and deployment of the signs for the event there was no cost to the County Council other than to review the plans of the event organiser to ensure that the arrangements met with our requirements. The event organiser, London Surrey Cycle Partnership did use our Highways Contractor to produce and place the signs required, this was achieved through a contract between the event organiser and the Highway contractor and payments were made between these two parties.

Surrey County Council does not normally have a relationship with companies involved in the supply and deployment of barriers, and as such could not provide a contact to a supplier. In this case London Surrey Cycle Partnership sourced barriers from a national company, but again officers from Surrey County Council were involved in reviewing the deployment plan of the barriers to ensure that safety aspects were adhered to.

It is the intention to maintain the same delivery model for the Prudential London-Surrey 100 and Classic in future years. It is important that the event is financially sustainable and that any financial costs and risks are covered by the event organiser. We are following the same model used in the successful delivery of the London Marathon for the past 30 years that has seen the benefit for business on the route as well as support to charities through donations from the event participants and the charitable trust.

Surrey County Council works closely with Surrey Police on a range of activities across County. I do not hold the information regarding the detail of how the policing was provided as part of the event delivery, other than to highlight that as with the Olympic events, we worked closely to ensure the safe and successful delivery of the event.

Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
24 September 2013

Question (2) from Mr Peter Crews

Who gave final approval to the draft minutes of the Cabinet Meeting on 23/7/13 before those minutes were published on the Council's web site?

Reply:

Thank you for your question.

In line with Democratic Services standard procedures, following the meeting, the minutes were drafted by the Committee Manager who attended the meeting. They were then circulated to the officers who provided reports for the meeting, as well as to the Cabinet and Cabinet Members who were present, to give them the opportunity to comment on any matters of accuracy. The draft minutes were then published on the website, with a message explaining that they are subject to confirmation at the next formal meeting of the Cabinet. If the Cabinet agree the minutes at today's meeting, this will constitute formal approval.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
24 September 2013

Question (3) from Ms Jenny Desoutter

Regarding Road Closure Policy

In answer to my previous question (25 June 2013), you stated that the Ride London cycle event of 4 August 2013 was good for business, and you acknowledged that the closure of roads, and removal of the civil rights of movement along public highways would disrupt the lives of "tens of thousands" of people. You stated that an impact assessment had been done, and you also gave assurances that emergency services would be allowed access.

In actual fact, many legitimate Surrey businesses have lost money, and charities such as Wildlife Aid were affected. Also, in the event, several cases have occurred in which emergency vehicles were not allowed immediate access, aggravating risk. Many instances of suffering, hardship, loss of income and inconvenience to citizens' lawful rights to pursue their own lives, for example to return to their homes from hospital or from holidays, or to get to work, to visit sick relatives, or to attend family functions, have also been recorded. Many workers were "laid off" as businesses had to close, and lost money.

It was evident from the outset that through preventing lawful right of movement, and access to the highways infrastructure of the county over such a wide area, not only loss of freedom, and loss of revenue, but also loss of life could be precipitated where essential travel is disrupted. Not everything in life can be pre-planned around a particular event. Risk is increased where swift, flexible responses are impeded.

My question relates to your policy of imposing widespread, day-long road closures throughout the county for a non-essential sporting event, and issues raised by unintended outcomes. For clarity it is sub-divided into 4 parts:

1. Since 4 August 2013 was a prime holiday Sunday when many rural businesses such as pubs, and golf clubs, would expect to have good takings, and families spend money going out for the day, in making their judgements, have SCC ascertained, and taken into account, the extent of loss of revenue to private businesses in Surrey, due to inaccessibility because of road closures sanctioned by SCC, on 4 August 2013, and if so can SCC state what is the total sum in financial terms (in figures) lost to private businesses in Surrey on that day, and how many Surrey workers lost income on that day because of the road closures? If not when will this figure be available?
2. In the light of the many untoward incidents in Surrey which have been reported in the public domain (for example in The Surrey Advertiser, The Dorking and Leatherhead Advertiser, and The Telegraph) - can SCC now state a) how many untoward incidents involving medical and similar emergencies occurred throughout Surrey due to road closures on that day, and b) how many notifications of objection and difficulty you have, to this date, either had expressed directly to you through letter, email or other, from individuals or organisations, including any you have become aware of through discussion or through the press or through the network of the internet, for example through the online petition called Stop Surrey becoming a Race Track?
3. Given that you have stated publicly that you would ensure that *"those who needed to get through"* would be able to have access, and given the issues surrounding prevention of access even to emergency services, can you state clearly HOW the need for access - bearing in mind that had it not been for SCC's decision to allow large-scale, day-long closures of roads all citizens could have made their own decisions regarding need to travel, and emergency services would have followed normal protocols - is judged, by whom these judgements are made; and by what legal right, and in the light of what training those who are making the judgements are empowered to do so?
4. How do these figures compare with those cited in the post Olympic Cost Benefit Analysis Report (*"public response to the Olympics had been very positive, with over 500 residents providing feedback. Of these 500 responses only 4 were complaints"* - I quote from the meeting of the Communities Select Committee, 16 January 2013, item 74/13). And are the responses and outcomes arising from the 4 August event in line with the impact assessment you had commissioned, or do they give rise to concerns you had failed to anticipate, and suggest that it is time to review a policy which, without due diligence, places the lives, freedom and safety of Surrey residents in a position of increased dependency and risk?

Reply:

1. The Prudential Ride London-Surrey is a long term commitment, and each year we will learn from the previous year and improve all aspects of the event. An economic impact report is being prepared by the event organiser, and we will note its content and work with the event organiser and partners to increase the benefits for both local business and to local communities.
- 2(a) Unfortunately, emergencies take place all too regularly on any given Sunday, and we are proud they are dealt with by exceptional, well trained and hard working professionals. We

have been told by Surrey Fire and Rescue that there were no incidents that were outside their normal operating timescales on Sunday 4 August. We are not responsible for the Ambulance Service, but understand that they also continued their service provision throughout the event. This is a tribute to the efficiency of the emergency services and to the painstaking planning that went into the event.

- 2(b) We are aware of a number of online petitions, including the one you mention: 'Stop Surrey becoming a Race Track' and another titled 'Surrey County Council: Continue to support the Ride London Cycling event each year', and that over 2000 Surrey residents rode in the event. Over 20 Surrey charities had cyclists riding for them raising money for good causes. We want to make opportunities for ordinary Surrey residents like Emily Read, who rode for her daughter Evie, diagnosed with a rare blood disease, and Tina Howard who rode in memory of her mother.

We don't keep a tally of all the written and verbal comments that we have received on the event. What is important is that we continue to listen to everyone's point of view. For next year's event we will pay particular attention to how we can work with the event organiser to reduce impact of the event on residents and businesses.

3. It is important to correct your opening statement, in that the emergency services were not prevented access during the event. Access was guaranteed for all emergencies and critical travel, such as carers travelling to vulnerable people. The control room had representatives from the emergency services sitting beside the event organisers, and all emergencies were allowed through by the event organiser. The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey may be a new event to Surrey. However, the event organisers have worked on many similar events in the past: The London Marathon, The Tour de France, The Olympic Road Cycling, Tour of Britain, all of which have equipped the people involved with the experience to deal with most eventualities as safely as possible.
4. The London 2012 Games were a high point in this country's sporting and cultural heritage, and this was reflected in the tide of positive sentiment after the event. We are grateful for the many Surrey residents who have provided constructive suggestions on how to improve next year's Prudential RideLondon-Surrey events. We are listening and acting on these suggestions. Next year, we will again put safety as our top priority, and we will redouble our efforts to reduce impact and increase benefits to communities and businesses.

Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
24 September 2013

Question (4) from Mr Allen Widdowson

Children throughout Elmbridge Borough are finding it harder and harder to secure places at Local Schools within the Borough. This is particularly the case for children who live close to the borders of Kingston and Epsom.

At the Surrey CC meeting 23 April 2013 Linda Kemeny updated the Council on plans for an expansion of Esher High, adding a further 30 places in 2015. And in the light of this the Council was reviewing the Esher High's catchment area for 2015 to ensure that additional places are allocated fairly. These plans should go some way to alleviate the pressure in some parts of the Borough, particularly in KT10 (Claygate).

Given the recent attempt to vary admissions criteria at Hinchley Wood to give priority to applications from both KT10 (Claygate) and KT7 (Thames Ditton) over those from Long Ditton,

Elmbridge, KT6. What assurance can the Council provide that action will be taken to ensure that ALL Elmbridge children will have an equal and fair opportunity to access local secondary schools, within the Borough, before any more children are placed at a significant disadvantage.

Reply:

The vast majority of children living in Elmbridge have taken up places in one of the 4 secondary schools in the borough. Each year we analyse parental preferences and the 2013 figures demonstrate that, of all the offers made to the secondary schools in Elmbridge, only 8 were to children out of the County. Taking in to account that all the Elmbridge schools have a defined catchment area, this would seem to demonstrate that the admission arrangements for the Elmbridge schools are providing places for local children. Our record for meeting parental preference in Surrey is strong with the County Council providing a higher percentage of parents with a school of their preference than many of the London Boroughs.

Officers are aware of a particular issue which has affected Claygate residents this year and officers are working with local secondary headteachers to try and find a solution that gives families more assurance of a school place within a reasonable travelling distance in future.

All but one of the four Elmbridge Secondary schools are academies and, as such, are their own Admissions Authority and set their own admissions criteria. All schools and academies must follow the School Admissions Code and this ensures that all children have equal and fair access to school places. There is no evidence to suggest that Elmbridge children are at any disadvantage in this regard.

Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
24 September 2013

CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

**Increasing the Employability of Young People in Surrey
(considered by Select Committee on 31 July 2013)**

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That Cabinet consider how students who are unlikely to be eligible for a combined plan will be supported following the introduction of Education, Health & Care Plans (EHCP) and the cessation of School Action and School Action Plus, so as not to jeopardise their chances of post-16 participation in Education, Training and Employment.

RESPONSE

Cabinet recognises the concerns of the Children and Education Select Committee in relation to the introduction of Education, Health & Care Plans (EHCP) and the cessation of School Action and School Action plus. New legislation in the Children and Families Bill will replace the School Action and School Action plus categories with a new single category: Additional Special Education Need Support (ASENS). In Surrey, the ASENS category of children will be supported through their school's local offer.

We are expecting schools to be able to demonstrate that their local offer will meet the requirements of pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) who do not meet the threshold for an EHCP. Surrey is supporting schools through this process by providing training in provision management tools which will enable the school to evaluate and describe the effectiveness of a range of SEND interventions. This will lead to provision which is more effective and better targeted at needs. Training will also be provided to SEN Coordinators to ensure they are able to support pupils' SEND needs appropriately.

The changes brought about by the Children and Families Bill will not result in an overall funding reduction for the Surrey pupils who are currently covered by School Action and School Action plus, although funding will be allocated differently in the future. This new model of distribution will place a greater emphasis on the relationship between funding and attainment, with those schools where pupil attainment is lowest receiving a higher proportion of funding than they do currently.

This will mean that there will be some changes in the funding allocated to individual schools. Officers and the DfE recognise that some schools with large numbers of high cost SEND pupils, but few low attaining pupils, may find it difficult to secure funding from the delegated sources. In response to these concerns, and where this is a particular issue for schools, we are proposing to allocate a proportion of the additional high needs funding outside the delegated formula.

While these changes are taking place, Services for Young People will continue to commission work to support participation after age 16 and ensure that young people with SEND can make successful transitions from Year 11 onwards. The Pathways Team's work with SEND young people, to support their transition to college or employment, will continue for students from Year 9 to Year 11 and beyond, up to the age of 25. Additionally, Year 11/12 provision will continue to identify and support 'at risk' young people who will fall into the ASENS category following the changes.

The service also commissions a range of local interventions, such as Centre Based Youth Work and the Local Prevention Framework. These commissions are focused on young people aged 14 to 19 and will continue to support participation in Education, Training and Employment post 16. As with Year 11/12 provision, a significant proportion of this work supports those young people who will fall into the ASENS category.

In order to ensure that this provision continues to meet the needs of young people following these changes, Officers are carrying out research to establish why SEND young people have a higher propensity to become NEET. The findings from this research will feed directly into the Services for Young People commissioning process, to ensure that these groups receive support into education, training or employment which is closely matched to their needs.

Mrs Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
24 September 2013

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

**Adult Social Care Budget 2013/14
(considered by Select Committee on 5 September 2013)**

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That -- in light of the Committee's serious concerns about the possibility of budget overspend -- the Adult Social Care budget for this year be reviewed again to reflect increased demand on the services.

RESPONSE

The Select Committee expressed doubts about the realism of outturn forecasts, and requests that the adult social care budget be reviewed to reflect a more realistic financial position.

1. 2013/14 Budget background

- a. It is acknowledged that this budget does carry risks.
- b. In addition to the savings made over the last three years of £86m, a further savings target of £46m (of £64m for the total County) was passed down to the service for the current financial year.
- c. The Select Committee at the budget setting stage did express its concerns at the level of savings required, and the budget was increased by £11m compared with the previous MTFP assumption.

2. Budget Objectives

- a. To achieve the savings targets the budget had the following main saving initiatives:
 - i. successful negotiation with suppliers
 - ii. no increases in demand beyond those built into the budget (as did occur in 2012/13)
 - iii. minimal slippage in the established savings programs
 - iv. £15 million of savings through the new initiative making better use of social capital

3. Current Status

- a. It is expected that objectives i-iii above will be achieved assuming no new pressures or increase in demand arise.
- b. Objective iv, above is the main item at risk. It must be emphasised that this objective represents a radical change in the way that the service has approached assessment and is the main focus of the service.
- c. It is still believed that £8m of this target can be achieved by the year end. That would leave a gap in achievement of £7m which it is proposed be met this year from unused Whole Systems Funds but will also need to be funded going forward.

4. Ongoing Actions

- a. The service believes that the current management of the budget performance is adequate and in completing the outturn for the year, the full list of objectives in the comprehensive savings list is constantly monitored

- b. By the October reporting date to Adult Social Care select committee and Cabinet will provide the first viable indications of the extent to which that £8 million is likely to be delivered this year, and also some initial indication of the long-term deliverability of the program.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
24 September 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

Committee Assistant

Victoria Lower - x132733

victoria.lower@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Andy Spragg - x132673

andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Huma Younis - x132725

huma.younis@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

Damian Markland - x132703

damian.markland@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Tom Pooley - x419902

Thomas.Pooley@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Jisa Prasannan – x132694

jisa.prasannan@surreycc.gov.uk