

## CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 17 December 2013 and will take effect on Tuesday 31 December 2013 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 30/12/13.**

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, 17 December 2013 considered the following matters and resolved:

### **Members' Questions** (Item 4a)

Twelve questions had been received from Members. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 1**.

### **Petitions** (Item 4c)

Two petitions were received from residents. The petitions were considered as part of the discussion on the Surrey Cycling Strategy and Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 & Classic items. A response was tabled and agreed. A copy is attached as **Appendix 2**.

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

Recommendations had been received from the Communities Select Committee on the Surrey Cycling Strategy and Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 & Classic items and were considered as part of the discussion of those items. A response was tabled and agreed. A copy is attached as **Appendix 3**.

### **Surrey Cycling Strategy** (Item 6a)

- The Surrey Cycling Strategy be approved as set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted.
- The role of Local Committees in developing affordable Local Cycling Plans be approved.
- The continued engagement with central government to press for further funding for investment in cycling provision be approved.
- Active engagement with the police and other local authorities in a similar position to Surrey on key aspects of cycling safety and regulations, as the basis for dialogue with central government, be approved.
- The Framework for Coordinating and Approving Events on Surrey's Highway be approved as set out in Annex 3 to the report submitted.

- The comments and recommendations of the Communities Select Committee be noted and the response agreed as attached at Appendix 3 to this decision sheet.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The 2012 Olympic Games positioned Surrey as a centre for cycling and presented a once in a lifetime opportunity to realise the economic, health and environmental benefits from this. Through a partnership approach, the Strategy seeks to ensure that the benefits of this legacy result in more Surrey residents cycling for transport and leisure and that all Surrey children have the opportunity to learn to ride a bike safely.

The issues and challenges in relation to cycling differ considerably in different parts of the county. For that reason, the Strategy proposes the development of Local Cycling Plans, overseen by the Local Committees, which can properly reflect local circumstances.

A successful legacy also requires that steps be taken to tackle the rising levels of cyclist casualties, to encourage respect and consideration amongst all road users and to ensure that cyclists who come to the Surrey countryside show respect and consideration for local communities. It also requires that major events that showcase our beautiful county and bring benefits to Surrey continue to be supported, whilst also ensuring that they are properly managed so as to minimise disruption and ensure no individual communities are affected by multiple events.

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

**Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 & Classic (Item 6b)**

- The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic events for the period to 2017 be approved as the County's legacy cycling events.
- That, in order to achieve the above, the Council will continue to collaborate with the Greater London Authority, Transport for London and other delivery partners to deliver the events
- The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic routes for 2014 be approved in principle and the final detail of the route be determined by either the Assistant Chief Executive or Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Leader of the Council, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and the Environment.
- That a further decision will be taken regarding the proposed route for future events.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The 2012 Olympic Games positioned Surrey as a centre for cycling and presented a once in a lifetime opportunity to realise the economic, health and environmental benefits from this. The Surrey Cycling Strategy sets out how these benefits will be realised.

An important aspect of this is the tourism and inspirational benefit derived from the profile of the Olympic road races. To that end, following the successful operation of the 2013 PRLS events and the consultation feedback indicating widespread support for major cycling events, the PRLS events will be established

as the county's 2012 Olympic legacy cycling events.

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

• **BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR NOVEMBER 2013** (Item 7)

- That the following be noted:
  - Forecast revenue budget for 2013/14 is balanced on services, adding the unused £13m risk contingency brings this to £13m overall underspend (paragraph 1 of Annex 1 to the report submitted).
  - Forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end is £61m (paragraph 67 of Annex 1 to the report submitted).
  - Forecast capital budget position for 2013/14 is -£2.7m on services and +£26.6m overall (paragraphs 71 to 75 of Annex 1 to the report submitted).
  - The management actions to mitigate overspends throughout the report submitted.
- The request to drawdown the 2012/13 winter pressures funding (£1.7m) to cover slippage on Family, Friends & Community Support saving (paragraph 14 of Annex 1 to the report submitted). be agreed.
- The re-profiling of the capital expenditure on road and highway repairs from £20m each year of the five year 2013-18 capital programme to £31m in 2013/14, with the remainder spread over the four years 2014/15 to 2017/18 (paragraph 75 of Annex 1 to the report submitted). be agreed.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To progress the actions identified as part of the agreed strategy of monthly budget monitoring reporting, noting the particular focus on the year end revenue and capital budgets forecasts and the achievement of efficiency targets.

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

• **SCHOOLS EXPANSION PROGRAMME FROM SEPTEMBER 2014** (Item 8)

- The expansion of the following schools be agreed in principle subject to the consideration and approval of the detailed financial information for each school (as set out in agenda items 17, 18 and 19 in Part 2 of the agenda) in Part 2 of the meeting:
  - (i) Queen Eleanor's Junior School (Increase by 120 places to 420 places)
  - (ii) Womersley and Shamley Green Primary School (Increase by 120 places to 210 places)
  - (iii) Grayswood Infant School (Increase by 120 places to 210 places)
  - (iv) St Bartholomew's Primary (Increase by 60 places to 420 places)
  - (v) Holmesdale Infant School (Increase by 90 places to 360)

(vi) Brookwood Primary School (Increase by 210 places to 420)

**Reasons for Decision:**

The schemes deliver a value for money expansion to the schools, which supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide additional school places for local children in Surrey. The individual projects and building works are in accordance with the planned timetables required for delivery of the new accommodation at each school.

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

• **CONTRACT EXTENSION - MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT FOR DRUG AND ALCOHOL** (Item 9)

- Following consideration of the results of the discussions undertaken with the service provider outlined in Annex 1 to the report submitted in Part 2 of the meeting, the award of the extension of the contract be agreed.
- That a contract extension for the period of one year be awarded to Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation Trust for the provision of Medical and Psychological Treatment for Drugs and Alcohol to commence on 1 April 2014 and expires on 31 March 2015.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contract will expire on 31 March 2014. Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation Trust has performed well over the duration of the contract against the performance measures in place. This has contributed to the success of Surrey's Drug and Alcohol Treatment System as the most successful in a cluster group of other partnerships with a similar socio/demographic basis. No concerns were raised in the recent Care Quality Commission report.

The extension of the current contract will ensure stability and continuity of the largest component of the Drug and Alcohol Treatment System in Surrey (detailed in Annex 2).

The extension period will provide the opportunity to develop collaborative working relationships with the supplier and regular contract management meetings.]

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

• **SHORT BREAKS FRAMEWORK FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES** (Item 10)

- The following providers be awarded a place on a four-year framework as they have been successful in the Invitation To Tender evaluation process:

Action for Blind People, Action for Children, Animated Youth, Avenues, Barnardo's, Cherry Trees, Children's Trust, Core Assets Children's Services, Crossroads Care Surrey, Cycling Projects, Disability Challengers, Family Resource Centre UK, Freewheelers Theatre and Media Ltd, KIDS, Link Leisure, Live & Learn, Prospect Housing, Rainbow Trust Children's Charity, Reigate and Redhill YMCA, Rhythmix, Shooting Star Chase, Stopgap Dance Company, The National Autistic Society, Voyage Care, White Lodge Centre.

- That it be noted that the council reserves the right within the terms and

conditions of the framework agreement to add additional providers onto the framework through a further competitive tendering process during the four-year period of the framework agreement.

- That the authority to award contracts with individual contract value of over £500k under this Framework Agreement be delegated to the Strategic Director for Children Schools and Families in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The council has a statutory duty, under the Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011, to commission short breaks services for children and young people with disabilities and their families across the county of Surrey.

The existing contracts will expire on 31 March 2014. 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.

Awarding the named providers a place on the framework agreement and subsequent contracts allows the council to continue to deliver short break services for children and young people with disabilities and their families/carers within Surrey.

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

- **SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE** (Item 11)

- That the following providers be awarded a place on the four-year Framework as they had passed the Invitation To Tender evaluation process:

A2 Dominion Group, Above Beyond Care, Barnados, Care Tech, Cherchefelle, East to West, Guildford YMCA, Holmdene, Home Group LTD, Keychange Charity, Life, Morgan Brown, Moving on Care Management, Pathway to Independence, Prospect Housing, Reigate and Redhill YMCA, Sanctuary Housing, Step Ahead, Step by Step, Transform Housing and Watershed Care Services.

- That the authority to award contracts under this Framework Agreement, with individual contract value of over £500k, be delegated to the Strategic Director for Children Schools and Families in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Families.
- That the authority to award contracts with individual contract value of over £500k under this Framework Agreement be delegated to the Strategic Director for Children Schools and Families in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The re-commissioning process and subsequent award of a number of contracts under this Framework Agreement will ensure safe and appropriate supported accommodation is available and delivered countywide for vulnerable young people.

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed. The thorough

evaluation process resulted in a selection of the most suitable providers able to deliver supported accommodation services.

The Framework will be for a maximum of four years and will include multiple providers. This will allow for further mini-competitions to ensure value for money. The Framework Agreement will govern the overall commercial arrangements between the Council and providers, providing a clear structure for service delivery, quality and price.

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

• **MERSTHAM REGENERATION PROJECT (Item 12)**

- That the entering into of a Memorandum of Understanding with Raven Housing Trust and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council to progress the Merstham Regeneration Project be approved in principle as outlined in the report submitted.
- That the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be delegated authority to sign the final Memorandum of Understanding.
- That the estimated total capital expenditure of no more than £2.3m be approved and delegated authority be given to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to approve expenditure in relation to this project, subject to full business case approval.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The Merstham estate is one of the most deprived areas in Surrey with comparatively high levels of poverty, some poor housing and significant health needs. It remains an area with a high concentration of young people not in education, employment or training. The inclusion of youth services and library services within an integrated community hub in Merstham will significantly enhance the facilities available to young people and the local community.]

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

• **PROVISIONAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES 2013 (Item 13)**

- That the 2013 Provisional Education Outcomes (as set out in the report and annexes), which will be confirmed following publication of the final key stage 4 data in January 2014, be noted.
- That a further report be brought to Cabinet in February 2014 with an update on more recently published Ofsted inspection results and performance headlines.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To ensure that Cabinet is fully informed of the latest education outcomes.]

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

• **ADULT SOCIAL CARE LOCAL AUTHORITY TRADING COMPANY BUSINESS CASE (Item 14)**

- That the creation of a Local Authority Trading Company (LATC) limited by shares and

owned wholly by the Council to deliver the services within the scope of the report submitted be approved.

- That authority be delegated to the Shareholder Board to approve the relevant steps set out in the report submitted to form the LATC, appoint its Directors and put in place appropriate governance arrangements to commence trading activities in April 2014.
- That the award of a contract to the LATC for an initial five year period with a break point after three years to deliver the services in scope on behalf of the Council be approved.
- That debt financing to the LATC be approved to enable it to purchase operational assets from the Council, pay for start-up costs and provide working capital, as set out in paragraph 42 of the report submitted.
- That officers commence consultation with staff, Trade Unions, partner organisations and stakeholders.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

A LATC will deliver benefits to Surrey residents by ensuring the sustainability and continued improvement of existing services. It will also deliver financial benefits to the Council over the five year contract term, including those benefits which could not be obtained without setting up the LATC such as price reductions and surpluses derived from trading activity.

There is also potential to develop additional and alternative business opportunities - both within the services in scope, and by expanding into other areas - in the longer term, which could lead to substantial profits beyond the five year period covered by this proposal. These longer term gains would not be available if services remained in-house.

Trading on something close to an “as is” basis will ensure the continued stability and viability of existing services. This LATC provides a relatively low-risk environment in which to establish and take forward the principles and practice of running a trading company, which could feed positively into the broader trading developments which are an integral part of the Council’s longer term financial strategy.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adult Social Care Select Committee]*

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 15)**

That the decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted be noted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To note the decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.]

- **PROPOSED EXPANSION OF 4 GUILDFORD DIOCESE SCHOOLS TO PROVIDE 420 NEW PLACES IN GUILDFORD AND HASLEMERE FROM SEPTEMBER 2014 (Item 17)**

- That the business case for the projects to expand the following schools at the total cost set out in the report submitted be approved.

(i) Queen Eleanor’s Junior School (Increase by 120 places to 420 places)

- (ii) Wonersh and Shamley Green Primary School (Increase by 120 places to 210 places)
- (iii) Grayswood Infant School (Increase by 120 places to 210 places)
- (iv) St Bartholomew's Primary (Increase by 60 places to 420 places)
- That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and the Leader of the Council, to agree a variation of up to 10% of the total value as set out in the report submitted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To support the authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Guildford and Haslemere area.

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

- **PROPOSED EXPANSION OF BROOKWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL (Item 18)**

- That the business case for the project to expand Brookwood Farm Primary School at the total cost set out in the report submitted be approved
- That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and the Leader of the Council, to agree a variation of up to 10% of the total value as set out in the report submitted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To support Surrey County Council'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 & Scrutiny Committee]*

- **HOLMESDALE INFANT SCHOOL, REIGATE (Item 19)**

- That the business case for the project to permanently expand Holmesdale Community Infant School at the total cost set out in the report submitted be approved
- That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and the Leader of the Council, to agree a variation of up to 10% of the total value as set out in the report submitted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To support Surrey County Council's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Reigate area.

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

- **INNOVATION PARTNER PROPOSAL (Item 21)**

- That an investment be agreed on the basis set out in the report submitted.



- That the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to agree appropriate contractual arrangements on behalf of the Council, following completion of appropriate due diligence.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

An innovation partnership will bring to the Council expertise, intellectual knowledge and a wide network that is essential to its journey of innovation. This partnership will introduce skills and competencies which would be difficult for a local authority to attract in isolation and might otherwise be sought from more expensive consultancy arrangements.

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

- **CONTRACT EXTENSION - MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT FOR DRUG AND ALCOHOL (Item 22)**

- That a contract extension for the period of one year be awarded to Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation Trust for the provision of Medical and Psychological Treatment for Drugs and Alcohol to commence on 1 April 2014 and expires on 31 March 2015.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contract will expire on 31 March 2014. The contract extension provides best value for money for the Council following negotiations in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders.

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

- **SHORT BREAKS FRAMEWORK FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES (Item 23)**

- That the following providers be added to the framework agreement as they have successfully passed the evaluation process outlined in the Invitation to Tender:

Action for Blind People, Action for Children, Animated Youth, Avenues, Barnardo's, Cherry Trees, The Children's Trust, Core Assets Children's Services, Crossroads Care Surrey, Cycling Projects, Disability Challengers, Family Resource Centre UK, Freewheelers Theatre and Media Ltd, KIDS, Link Leisure, Live & Learn, Prospect Housing, Rainbow Trust Children's Charity, Reigate and Redhill YMCA, Rhythmix, Shooting Star Chase, Stopgap Dance Company, The National Autistic Society, Voyage Care, White Lodge Centre, for the provision of Short Breaks for Children and Young People With Disabilities to commence on 1 April 2014.

- That, as part of the mini competition process, no tenderer is awarded a contract unless their quality score in that mini competition achieves a minimum of 40% of the 60% allocated to quality.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contracts will expire on 31 March 2014. 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 & Scrutiny Committee]*

- **SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE** (Item 24)

- That the following providers be added to the Framework Agreement as they had successfully passed the evaluation process as outlined in the Invitation to Tender:

A2 Dominion Group, Above Beyond Care, Barnados, Care Tech, Cherchefelle, East to West, Guildford YMCA, Holmdene, Home Group LTD, Keychange Charity, Life, Morgan Brown, Moving on Care Management, Pathway to Independence, Prospect Housing, Reigate and Redhill YMCA, Sanctuary Housing, Step Ahead, Step by Step, Transform Housing and Watershed Care Services.

- That total spend under this Framework be up to the value specified in Annex 1 to the report submitted and will commence on 1 April 2014.
- That, as part of the mini competition process, no tenderer is awarded a contract unless their quality score in that mini competition achieves a minimum of 40% of the 60% allocated to quality

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing supported accommodation contracts will expire on 31 March 2014. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed. Thorough evaluation process should guarantee best value for money for the Council and best outcomes for young people needing support.

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

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS** (Item 25)

- **ACQUISITION OF AN OFFICE PROPERTY IN WOKING** (Item )

That Surrey County Council acquire the freehold interest in this property for the purchase price, ancillary costs and on the basis set out in the report submitted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To secure the long term need for office accommodation.

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

- **REFURBISHMENT OF VACANT HOUSES** (Item )

- That a capital investment of the amount set out in the report submitted be approved for the refurbishment of eight vacant houses which will protect and enhance the capital value and generate an ongoing income stream for the Council.
- That the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the

Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, be authorised to agree a variation of up to 10% of the total value on the basis set out in the report submitted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To meet Surrey County Council's objective to increase revenue to the authority and enhance capital value in its assets.

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

**Disposal of Perry Hill Lodge, Worplesdon (Item )**

- The disposal of Perry Hill Lodge, Worplesdon be approved on the basis set out in paragraph 1 of the report submitted, subject to exchange of papers taking place by 31 December 2013, with completion taking place on 31 March 2014 or earlier on not less than 10 working days notice from the buyer.
- Should completion not take place within the required timeframe, the Chief Property Officer, be authorised to take the actions set out in paragraph 19 of the report submitted in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and S151 Officer.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To ensure best value is obtained for the disposal of a property no longer required for service reasons, to reduce the cost of managing an empty property and to maximise potential receipts without additional risk.

*[The decisions on this item were taken under Special Urgency procedures as they could not be reasonable deferred and therefore come into immediate effect]*

• **PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS (Item 26)**

- That no publicity on the details discussed in Part 2 of the meeting be agreed at this time.

## CABINET – 17 DECEMBER 2013

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

**Members' Questions****Question (1) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:**

What action is being taken to improve the reliability of the webcasting of meetings including of full Council and Cabinet meetings, following a number of failures in the webcasting of meetings?

**Reply:**

I share your frustration when the webcasting fails as I would like our decision making to be as open and transparent as possible. In order to improve the reliability of the webcasts, tests are carried out on the equipment beforehand to make sure that it is fully operational and that any faults can be rectified before the meeting. In addition, officers from IMT are on standby during the meetings and can be called upon to investigate if problems arise with the internal connections during the webcast. The webcasting service provider, Public-i, is also on call remotely to fix issues that occur with connections external to the meeting venue during the webcast.

Despite these measures there are occasions where unanticipated difficulties have arisen. The failure of the webcasting equipment at the Council meeting on 10 December, for example, is thought to have been caused by a power spike in the electricity supply in the Council Chamber, which disabled the computer that is used for the webcast. Nothing could be done to rectify this at the time. The provider will check the equipment to supply an analysis of the reason for the failure of the equipment and action will be taken dependent on this diagnosis, involving the appropriate county council services.

**Mr David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**17 December 2013**

**Question (2) from Mrs Nikki Barton (Haslemere) to ask:**

I am writing to request that the Cabinet consider a separation of the current cycling strategy into 2 parts: a cycling events strategy and a separate cycling strategy, which specifically excludes this. This would mean the work to date could lead to two effective strategies, better able to focus on their aims, have separate action plans, targets and budgets, as set out below.

Currently two strategies have been co-presented. Firstly, the cycling events strategy is important as this is an emerging event/series of events which Surrey CC wish to have clearer control of. This would logically be owned by the Communities Committee.

Secondly, the Cycling (promotion and infrastructure) strategy should be about promoting and facilitating cycling; including continuing with external funding successes like the LSTF in Woking, Guildford and Reigate/Redhill; with the aim of increasing commuter and leisure cycling. This logically should be coordinated with other transport strategies such as for rail, congestion, bus travel and pedestrian access (which we understand will follow in 2014) and it would therefore make sense to be managed by the Transport and Environment Committee.

The consultation on the cycling strategy was dominated by a focus on cycling events. This has resulted in a cycling strategy that does not clearly signpost external funding opportunities (such as LSTF), or provide a guide/leadership to local committees drawing up plans for LTP3. It could have a target for overall cycling levels (by journey for example) and also proposed budget to achieve this, including from partner bodies (who could be co-signatories) and government.

To achieve the best cycling events and cycling strategies it would be good to separate these two from each other, and have clear measurable targets and budgets for both. This would enable both to be effective and link to other strategies: eg for other types of event management and with other transport modes as noted above, to give a coherent and well supported overall sustainable transport strategy for Surrey.

Therefore, I request that the Cabinet consider that the two strategies be separated such that action plans and targets might be developed for both - and the twin aims - one to limit the impact of cycling and the other to promote cycling - are achieved better on their own rather than overshadowed by each other.

**Reply:**

In redrafting the strategy, we did consider this issue carefully. Our view, however, is that the issues are too closely interlinked to be meaningfully separated without resulting in two very repetitive strategies. For example, tackling casualty levels and sharing the roads safely are issues that need to be addressed and cut across cycling as a means of transport and sports cycling and events.

The establishment of a Cycling Board to oversee the delivery of the strategy will provide crucial leadership. We would see the two select committees both having an important role to play in scrutinising achievement of the different objectives of the strategy and reporting the results of that scrutiny to the Board.

It should be noted that the events Framework is a standalone document which covers all events on the highway, not just cycling events.

**Mrs Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services**  
**17 December 2013**

<b>Question (3) from Mr Alan Young (Cranleigh &amp; Ewhurst) to ask:</b>
--

- (1) Can the Leader explain why the county council's draft *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway* does not recognise the clearly documented wish of Parish Councils in the Surrey Hills (including Brockham, Shere, West Horsley, Headley, Ewhurst, Capel, Newdigate, Abinger, Buckland, Ockley, Wooton, Mickleham) to only allow races conducted under a rolling road block (see Surrey County Council's minutes of the meeting of Parish Councils held on 12 August 2013)?
- (2) Can the Leader please explain why the Cabinet is being asked to take a decision on 17 December to hold further Ride-London races in Surrey, before these events have been subject to the council's own procedures for approving such events, as set out in the *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway*?
- (3) Does the leader see any risk in the council abrogating all responsibility for consultation with local stakeholders on major events to event organisers, as set out in the *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway*, not least as that document contains no guidance on what form that consultation should take?

- (4) Can the Leader confirm that the Ride-London organisers have **individually** consulted all Members and Parish and Borough Councils affected by the proposed race in 2014? I am aware that they organised a single information event in the Dorking Halls, but it is widely agreed that this does not amount to consultation.
- (5) If the Ride-London organisers have not consulted all affected parties and sought their feedback, can the Leader explain why the Cabinet is being asked to make a decision on approving the Ride-London race for the next four years in the absence of consultation and feedback from the people of Surrey, as required in the *Framework for coordinating and approving events on the Highway*?

**Reply:**

- (1) In drafting the Framework, we considered the issue of rolling road closures versus closed roads events. Our view is that each event must be considered on its own merit, against a range of factors including the health, economic and tourism benefits as well as local impacts. Our preference will always be to use rolling road blocks, but only where it can be made safe to do so.
- (2) The Prudential London- Surrey 100 and Classic is part of the legacy to the Olympic Games and is a large high profile event delivered in partnership. The Framework states that for strategic events of this type, a timetable and process for delivery will be developed on a case by case basis.
- (3) We do not see this as a risk. Details on the requirements are set out in Appendix 3 to the Framework, the Events Organiser's Guidance for Events on the Highway. Where the Council is approached by an event organiser road closures will not be allowed unless the event organiser can show that there is local support for the event. Decisions will be taken based on advice regarding safety from the Safety Advisory Group and advice regarding due process and proper consultation from the Surrey Events Coordination Group.
- (4) Officers from all of the affected borough and district councils were sent the proposals for the 2014 route on the 30<sup>th</sup> August 2013 to share with their elected members for feedback and comment. This was in turn cascaded to parishes on the route. The organisers then met with representatives to discuss the feedback in more detail, which was incorporated wherever possible and presented back to members at a seminar on the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2013. All of the members on the route were invited to that seminar. The event organiser is continuing to meet with local groups to take forward planning for the 2014 event.
- (5) See question 4 above.

**Mr David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**17 December 2013**

**Question (4) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:**

- (1) Does the Cabinet Member now have the figures for the economic costs to the Surrey Economy from the Ride London Surrey Prudential Classic in 2014. This must include the losses as well as the gains by District or Borough?
- (2) What consultation does the Cabinet Member expect Ride London Surrey Partnership to undertake with communities in my Division and others that do not have Parish Councils in 2014 as there was none in 2013 before this Cabinet when the route is being agreed.

- (3) How does the Cabinet Member intend to measure the risk that the problems with the 2013 Ride London Surrey Prudential Classic have seriously damaged community support particularly in Mole Valley and Elmbridge? As listed in the risk register.
- (4) What steps is the Cabinet Member taking to make sure the lessons for the trials race in 2011 are communicated and acted on by the Ride London Surrey Partnership? As they seem to have been oblivious in 2013.
- (5) What information does the Cabinet Member have on visitor and spectator numbers in Surrey for the 2013 Ride London Surrey Prudential Classic. Who provided this information and how was it audited? How does that compare with the previous two years cycle races?

**Reply:**

- (1) London and Partners has produced an economic impact assessment from the 2013 event, which indicates a total economic benefit of £13m from the Prudential Ride London weekend of activities. We only have anecdotal information on local impacts – positive and negative – to Surrey businesses. We are working with the event organisers and other stakeholders to improve economic intelligence for future years.
- (2) In areas that do not have a parish or town council, we look to the borough and county members to represent the views of their communities. We would welcome input from members on other representative organisations in these areas.
- (3) We will continue to monitor local views on the event. To date, we have had both positive and negative feedback and continue to work to address the concerns expressed.
- (4) This is a continuously evolving process and the lessons from each event feed into planning for the following year. The Technical Event Director for PRLS was also Technical Event Director for the Olympic road race and test events and is ensuring that lessons are learned and applied on an ongoing basis.
- (5) We do not consider it meaningful to compare Olympic events with the PRLS Classic. The priority for the first year of the PRLS was to deliver a safe and successful event. From next year, the focus will also include attracting greater spectator numbers, including by establishing the PRLS Classic as a significant event on the international cycling calendar and attracting high profile competitors.

**Mrs Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services**  
**17 December 2013**

## **CABINET RESPONSE TO CYCLING PETITIONS**

### **“Surrey County Council: Stop Surrey being turned into a cycle track”**

Presented by Mr Ian Huggins, Esher

### **“Surrey County Council: Interact and give knowledge to those you represent.”**

Presented by Mr Michael Blann, Walton on Thames

## **RESPONSE**

We welcome the helpful and constructive views that have been expressed from the two petitions and the cycling strategy consultation. Collectively, these give us incredibly useful information from which to build.

We recognise and appreciate the concerns about increased levels of cycling in Surrey and our proposed Cycling Strategy outlines a number of ways we will address this. This includes improved education and awareness on sharing the road safely, engagement with cycling clubs and event organisers and a consistent approach to enforcement. It also includes lobbying central government to amend current regulations to require notification of sportive events. Our new Framework for Coordinating and Approving Events on Surrey’s Highway will include a presumption against more than one closure of any road per year and an onus on event organisers to engage locally at the earliest stages.

We recognise that major events such as the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic, have been unpopular with some people because of inconvenience on the day and lost trade to businesses on the route. But we have also heard from many people who felt that the PRLS was a wonderful event that brought people together and inspired people to cycle and get fit. In 2013 2,000 Surrey residents took part in the 100 and 10,000 have applied for a place in 2014.

I will be recommending to Cabinet today that we approve the PRLS events for a further four years as they are nationally and internationally significant and give us the opportunity to showcase Surrey as a beautiful place to visit. We will work proactively to ensure that Surrey businesses benefit from this.

I thought it would be useful to clarify the work carried out to date to engage locally to ensure that local residents and businesses are informed and supported in a timely manner.

In 2013 this included leaflets delivered to homes on and within 100 metres of the route, drop in sessions where residents could ask questions and a county wide advertising campaign on radio, bus backs, press and poster sites to make sure people were full aware of the events and their impact.

For the 2014 events the proposed route has been shared with elected representatives of the communities affected, providing them the opportunity to comment and make suggestions. Wherever possible the organisers have taken these into account and as you will hear when the report is considered by Cabinet later in this meeting, many positive changes are being proposed that will help to reduce the disruption and ensure communities and businesses benefit from the events.

**Mrs Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services**  
**17 December 2013**



**CABINET RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE****SURREY CYCLING STRATEGY****Recommendations:**

- a) That the impact on, and potential benefits for, businesses in Surrey as a result of cycling events be a key element of the Strategy. In particular, staff access to businesses when events are taking place.
- b) That consideration be given to including cycling infrastructure schemes on future programmes in Operation Horizon.
- c) That the County Council be encouraged to lobby central government for a change in primary legislation so that unregulated 'sportive' events become regulated.
- d) That Parish Councils and Local Committees be involved with Surrey County Council and Surrey Boroughs and Districts when working together to develop cycling plans that reflect local priorities and issues.
- e) That paragraph 7.4 of the Cycling Strategy be amended to read 'Any additional major events would involve a road closure only when there is clear evidence that there is strong local resident and business support to do so.'

**RESPONSE**

I welcome the valuable discussion at the Select Committee meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> November, and the recommendations that resulted.

I will take each of them in turn:

- a) We recognise the economic significance of cycling and have identified economic impact as an overarching objective of the strategy. We will focus on the role of cycling in tackling congestion and the potential tourism benefits from Surrey's profile as a destination for cycling. With regard to the Prudential RideLondon Surrey events, we are working with the event organisers to ensure that more is done to support businesses to manage impacts and capitalise on the day.
- b) The County Council is investing £100million over the next five years in roads maintenance. As part of this investment we will be identifying opportunities to improve cycling provision and building our internal expertise in designing provision for cycling.
- c) Whilst we welcome the increase in cycling in Surrey, we are concerned with the levels of unregulated events taking place in parts of rural Surrey. We are aware that these events can cause disruption and potentially lead to safety issues. We have committed in the Strategy to lobby central government for a change in the current regulations to require sportive organisers to notify the police and the highways authority of planned events.
- d) The strategy proposes development of local cycling plans, to reflect local needs and issues. The development of these strategies will be overseen by the local committee and we would anticipate that parish and town councils will be key stakeholders in developing the plans.
- e) This change has been made in the strategy.

**Mrs Helyn Clack  
Cabinet Member for Community Services  
17 December 2013**

## DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

### Democratic Services Lead Manager

Rachel Crossley - x419993  
[rachel.crossley@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.crossley@surreycc.gov.uk)

#### Cabinet and Regulation

Senior Manager  
Katie Booth - x417197  
[katieb@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:katieb@surreycc.gov.uk)

Cabinet Business Manager  
James Stanton - x419068  
[james.stanton@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:james.stanton@surreycc.gov.uk)

Cabinet Committee Manager  
Anne Gowing - x419938  
[anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk)

Regulatory Committee Manager  
Cheryl Hardman - x419075  
[cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk)

Committee Assistant  
Victoria Lower - x132733  
[victoria.lower@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.lower@surreycc.gov.uk)

Committee Assistant  
Andy Spragg - x132673  
[andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk)

Committee Assistant  
Huma Younis - x132725  
[huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk)

#### Scrutiny

Senior Manager  
Bryan Searle - x419019  
[bryans@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:bryans@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Manager  
Helen Rankin – x419126  
[helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer  
Damian Markland - x132703  
[damian.markland@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:damian.markland@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer  
Ross Pike - x417368  
[ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer  
Tom Pooley - x419902  
[Thomas.Pooley@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Thomas.Pooley@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer  
Jisa Prasannan – x132694  
[jisa.prasannan@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:jisa.prasannan@surreycc.gov.uk)