

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 4 FEBRUARY 2014 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr John Furey
*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)	*Mr Michael Gosling
Mrs Mary Angell	Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr Mel Few	Mr Tony Samuels

Cabinet Associates:

*Mr Steve Cosser	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Clare Curran	*Mr Mike Goodman

* = Present

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

1/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mrs Mary Angell, Mrs Linda Kemeny and Mr Tony Samuels.

2/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 17 DECEMBER 2013 [Item 2]

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2013 be agreed and the Chairman be authorised to sign them.

3/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

4/14 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Nine questions had been received from Members. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 1 to these Minutes**.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment provided a response to question 5 at the meeting. It was noted that it was not possible to give figures for the damage caused by the recent storms at that time as the situation was ongoing. Flooding was still present in the county and this prevented the examination of damage to those bridges and carriageways which were still underwater. Forecasts were that the poor weather conditions would continue. A full review would take place however, for now, it was right that the priority remained focused on the emergency response. The council and the emergency services would continue to act swiftly in response to the extreme conditions.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment, with the support of the Cabinet, thanked all highways officers, voluntary services, the police, ambulance and fire and rescue services for the manner in which they had worked together to come to the aid of the residents of Surrey. The response of the emergency services and all groups had created considerable goodwill and provided an effective response.

Mr Tim Hall asked a supplementary question relating to the Prudential Ride London-Surrey event and the economic benefits in the county. The Cabinet Member for Community Services advised that a detailed breakdown of the economic figures was not available for the past year but was something that had been requested for future events. The Deputy Leader noted that, though there were the difficulties involved in producing detailed breakdowns of the economic impact per event or rider, the economic benefits experienced by the county in the years in which previous events had been held had been considerable. The measure of growth used by the National Audit Office had shown that Surrey's economy had grown by 8% in 2012 (an additional £2.5billion pounds). Surrey's economy had been growing faster than the rest of the UK and the Olympic events held in the county had been one of the factors involved.

(b) PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Three questions had been received from residents. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 2 to these Minutes**.

(c) PETITIONS [Item 4c]

A petition was received in relation to agenda item 10 – Changes to Fire Deployment in the Borough of Spelthorne. A response was tabled and is attached as **Appendix 3**.

The petition was presented by Mr Richard Jones, Secretary of Surrey Fire Brigades Union (FBU) and member of Save Our Services in Surrey (SOSiS). Mr Jones addressed the Cabinet on the proposed changes to fire and rescue service deployment in Spelthorne. He raised concerns about the consultation process and, in particular, that a question relating to no change in services had not been an option. He noted that the outcome of the consultation had been that 92% rejected the original option for a change in service. Mr Jones advised that he believed that the development of a new option in response to the consultation, without its own consultation, could be subject to challenge. He also advised that he felt that the risk assessment was incomplete and subject to challenge due to the increased risk of fire in Spelthorne and issues with congestion locally. Mr Jones asked that, instead of the proposals before them, the Cabinet consider ending the contract with Specialist Group International which he suggested would save the council money and improve industrial relations.

It was noted that the points raised would be included as part of the consideration of the agenda item on this matter (Minute Ref 6/14).

(d) REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

5/14 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

Recommendations were received from the Adult Social Care Select Committee, Communities Select Committee and Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Responses to the Adult Social Care Select Committee and Communities Select Committee were tabled and are attached as **Appendices 4 and 5 to these Minutes** respectively.

The Chairman of the Communities Select Committee, Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos, presented the Committee's recommendation to Cabinet on fire service deployment in Spelthorne. Mrs Saliagopoulos noted that the development of an option which included two engines in Spelthorne showed that residents' concerns had been listened to and it was on this basis that Members of the Communities Select Committee had been able to support option 5. The importance of ensuring the same professional high standard of response in Spelthorne, whether provided by full time or retained crews, was stressed. Mrs Saliagopoulos asked that her thanks to the fire and rescue service for their work in Spelthorne with the recent flooding be recorded.

The report of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee was considered as part of agenda item 7 - Revenue and Capital Budget 2014/15 to 2018/2019. In response to the recommendations, the Chairman welcomed the focus of the Scrutiny Committee on the challenges within the Medium Term Financial Plan and the recognition of the enormous achievement to date in terms of the Council's budget. The budget was complex and required very careful attention to the relevant details. The Chairman advised that he believed some of the comments to be based on inaccuracies and misunderstandings. The Cabinet had been clear on the considerable challenges facing all councils. Whilst the Medium Term Financial Plan was dependant on the delivery of identified and agreed savings, it was crucial to note that at this stage, services had not been asked to find additional savings.

In terms of inaccuracies, £20 million of the £26million cited had come from the Budget Equalisation Reserve. This reserve had been specifically built up over the previous few years in order to smooth council spend across the medium term. Accordingly, only £6million was being applied this year from other reserves. Savings anticipated from Families, Friends and Communities are significant and considerable work was underway to identify the scale and timing of how these would be delivered. It was crucial to recognise that this was the correct strategy and therefore the discussion was entirely about the execution of the approach.

The Chairman advised that the Committee had missed the point about risk contingency. This was created by adding additional savings targets to savings and to date it hadn't been required. It would be illogical at this point to add further pressures to services such as Adult Social Care in order to create a contingency in case they didn't meet their existing targets.

It was clear that the future of Adult Social Care services was fundamentally entwined with how health and social care was integrated. Detailed conversations had taken place with CCG colleagues in the health service to confirm both how whole system funding with work in 2014/15 and how we will work together with Better Care Funding proposals from 2015 onwards. There

was no lack in the clarity of this process or the shared objectives with health colleagues.

With regard to the Committee's recommendations, the Chairman advised that it would be a tough year and that no secret had been made about this fact. This is why the Council had been adamant about the need for a council tax strategy for Surrey. It would be simply wrong to say that there was no contingency or reserves to manage slippages. Reserves were in a healthy position than they were in 2008 and the Council had reasonable levels although it was careful not to build up unnecessarily large reserves in a period where householders were facing severe challenges. The strategy of working with Members of Parliament to secure a fairer share of national funding, not least when Surrey contributed so much to the Exchequer (Surrey was the second most contributor to the Exchequer in the country), was already working. The Council was also working very well with health colleagues on Better Care Funding.

6/14 CHANGES TO FIRE DEPLOYMENT IN THE BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE [Item 10]

The Cabinet considered options relating to the closure of Staines and Sunbury Fire Stations and the provision of an alternative service model in Spelthorne. A public consultation had been held on proposed changes in fire deployment. This included the boroughs of Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Runnymede. As a direct result of the feedback received from the consultation, an amended proposal had been developed which consisted of a new fire station at an appropriate location with two fire engines. One of these engines would be whole-time and one "On-call", with both providing 24/7 response cover and a waterborne rescue capability. This option had been developed by working collaboratively with the local community and borough leaders and recognised the comments and concerns raised by stakeholders. The optimised location of the new fire station would support Phase 2 of Surrey Fire and Rescue Services transformation programme, the Public Safety Plan (PSP) 2011-2020.

In addition to the contributions of the petitioner and the Chairman of the Communities Select Committee made under previous agenda items, the Cabinet heard representations from Mr Robert Evans (Stanwell and Stanwell Moor). Mr Evans thanked the Cabinet Associate Responsible for Fire and Police Services for her attendance at consultation events. He drew attention to the results of the public consultation and the opposition of the MP for the area and local councillors of different parties, in response to the original proposals. He noted the willingness of residents, when asked, to consider paying more to keep both existing fire stations open and expressed concern about the potential for access difficulties in operating from a potential new site. Mr Evans stated that there was no budget for the proposed changes, that they could put lives at risk and questioned the practicalities of the proposed 'on-call' arrangements. He asked that the Cabinet vote not to approve the proposal or to send the amended proposal out for further public consultation.

The Cabinet Associate Responsible for Fire and Police Services expressed her thanks to the members of the Fire and Rescue Service for their hard work and commitment, noting that they had suspended their strike action in order to respond to the recent emergency conditions and help the residents of Surrey.

The proposals being considered were noted to form part of Phase 2 of the Public Service Plan previously agreed by Cabinet. Consultation had taken place and the Council had listened to the residents. Residents and the local borough council had raised concerns about the original proposal to reduce the number of fire engines based 24/7 in the area to one and this had been directly addressed in the amended proposal. Spelthorne residents would now benefit from a new fire station with two engines based on site 24/7. The provision of the service from one optimised base had been assessed and would enable the service to meet response standards within Spelthorne whilst also providing new equipment and facilities for the use of the service. On-call fire fighters already performed a valuable role in Surrey and consideration of their use had been encouraged by Sir Ken Knight in his recent national report on fire services.

The points raised in the petition and by the Local Member were considered. It was noted that the contract with an outside partner had enabled services to be provided to residents during the recent fire strike and had given access to specialist equipment during the recent flooding. This would not have been the case had the partnership contract not been agreed. The Council was required by the Government under the Fire Services Act to make ensure such business contingency arrangements were in place.

Cabinet Members noted the work that had taken place to ensure that risks had been properly assessed and that equalities implications had been addressed. The changing shape of response patterns was noted. Responding to fire incidents had increasingly formed a reduced part of the Fire and Rescue Service's work in comparison to its broader rescue work over the past twenty years. The evidence in support of the proposals provided by response time mapping was noted as was the commitment towards a new fire station in the Council's budgeting.

The Cabinet heard from the Chief Fire Officer who advised that risk assessments had taken place and that, given the reduction in incident numbers and the fact that the fire service was not excluded from the need for efficiencies in the current financial climate, the service was prepared to professionally subscribe to and recommend the proposal.

The Chairman advised that the amended proposal, Option 5, was good for Spelthorne. The Council had listened to the residents of Spelthorne and had responded with a proposal that addressed the concerns which had been raised. The proposal before Cabinet would continue to keep the people of Spelthorne safe. Though the Council faced huge financial pressures, these changes would enable it to make an investment in a new fire station and new facilities for Spelthorne, just as it had agreed previously for Guildford and Woking. By focusing the right fire service cover in the right places across the whole county, both in preventing incidents and responding to them, the Council would continue to protect Surrey residents.

RESOLVED:

1. That the amended proposal Option 5 and the commissioning of a new fire station in an appropriate location be agreed subject to a further business case setting out the delivery costs of a new station returning to Cabinet in due course. The new fire station will have two fire engines, one 24 hour whole time and one 24 hour "On-call" and a

waterborne rescue capability. This will retain the same number of fire engines in that part of Surrey and supports improvements in the response standard across Surrey.

2. That the subsequent closure of Staines and Sunbury fire stations be agreed.
3. That the implementation of Option 4 be agreed should the provision of Option 5 and the “On-call” unit not be secured.

Reasons for Decisions

Option 5 supports improvements in the provision of a more equitable level of fire service response in support of the Surrey Response Standard and the Public Safety Plan.

The amended proposal has given due consideration to the concerns of local communities and leaders and surrounding boroughs by listening to their ideas and by involving residents in the decision making process. Their local knowledge combined with the revised response modelling had influenced the design and delivery of future services in Spelthorne.

7/14 CORPORATE STRATEGY 2014 - 2019 [Item 6]

The Cabinet was asked to endorse a refreshed version of *Confident in our future*, the Council’s Corporate Strategy. The Strategy will then be presented to the County Council meeting on 11 February 2014 for approval alongside the Revenue and Capital Budget. Continued delivery of the Strategy will ensure that Surrey residents remain healthy, safe and confident about their future.

The Chairman stated the Council’s commitment to continue to provide value for money for residents and noted the “50 ways Surrey County Council adds value” document circulated with the agenda. Discussions with MPs had all been positive and had highlighted the Council’s position as the only one to produce an account of its unit costs. The Council would continue to focus on improving Surrey’s road network, supporting economic growth, building its schools and strengthening partnerships.

The Deputy Leader noted that Surrey had been recognised as having the strongest economy in the country, ahead of any other county or city (ONS figures 2012). Key achievements had included improving the condition of Surrey’s roads through Project Horizon, improving performance in schools, increasing the recycling rate, working together to find better ways of helping to keep families healthy, and the increased amount of investment in young people through apprenticeships. 1,000 young people would benefit from apprenticeships following the investment of £750k by the Leader. Surrey County Council would continue to make a difference.

Cabinet Members noted the commitment to address recent flooding in the county and the £10million investment which had been made. The Leader drew attention to the good work previously carried out in this area by Mr Nick Skellet when he was leader of the council.

RESOLVED that the refreshed version of *Confident in our future*, Corporate Strategy 2014-2019 be endorsed and that it be recommended to the County

Council for approval alongside the Revenue and Capital Budget 2014-2019 at its meeting on 11 February 2014.

Reason for decision

By reconfirming a long term vision for the county and setting priorities for the next financial year the refreshed Corporate Strategy provides a clear sense of direction for Council staff and signposts the Council's approach for residents, businesses and partner organisations. As part of the Council's Policy Framework (as set out in the Constitution) the Corporate Strategy must be approved by the County Council.

8/14 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2014/15 TO 2018/19 [Item 7]

The Cabinet considered the draft revenue and capital budget for the five years 2014-19 and the level of the council tax precept for 2014/15 with a view to recommending them for consideration at the budget meeting of the County Council. This included consideration of the revised treasury management strategy, including the borrowing and operation limits (prudential indicators) for 2014-19, the policy for the provision of the repayment of debt (minimum revenue provision (MRP)), and the treasury management policy.

The Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Mr Nick Skellett, addressed the Cabinet on the budget proposals and the Chairman's response to the Committee's recommendations. Mr Skellett advised that the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee recognised the position with regards to the ongoing need to make savings and the pressures placed in terms of funding. Committee Members had wanted to bring concerns and uncertainties to the attention of Cabinet to ensure that the budget works. These concerns included a belief that more comprehensive, deeper processes for savings and efficiencies needed to be embedded in order prevent any potential for drastic changes in year.

The Chairman addressed the points raised and agreed that efficiencies would get harder and harder to achieve. Robust systems were in place to regularly monitor and check efficiencies across the whole of the Medium Term Financial Plan. The Better Care Fund presented a unique opportunity for the County Council and the Clinical Commissioning Groups to look at their services and address any potential for waste. The work that had been taking place with partners had proved to be very helpful and would benefit the residents of Surrey. The Audit Commission did not wish local authorities to hold high balances in reserves and the Council's budgeting reflected this by maintaining them at an appropriate level.

The recommendation to Council would be for an increase in the council tax precept of 1.99%. It was noted that a proposed increase of 2.49% had initially been planned to enable further investment in roads and other resident priorities. The Chairman advised that the cost of £2m for a referendum to ask residents about this level of rise would be a waste of money and so the level had instead been recommended at 1.99%. He noted that the right decision had been made not to accept the government offer of a freeze for the coming financial year and that no guarantee had been provided that this funding would remain in the base after 2015/16. The decision to reject the freeze in the current year had proven to be correct and had enabled the Council to do the right thing for Surrey residents.

Members of the Cabinet noted the success of the public service reviews and processes for driving efficiency programmes against a backdrop of increasing levels of demand and continuing reductions in the government contribution to services locally. The decisions taken by the Council to reject the Government's freeze proposal and drive efficiencies locally had enabled investment in schools and highways, addressed residents' priorities such as social care and driven apprenticeship programmes for young people. Members noted that these decisions had been backed by the residents of Surrey at the County Council Elections in 2013.

The Chairman advised that Surrey received the lowest proportion of government grant contribution in the country. The services that residents expected and needed were funded from council tax. Sensible planning had taken place in preparing the budget. This had included consultation based on proper assumptions about the level of council tax. The Chairman had been pleased that the Government had listened and had given a clear indication in June 2013 of the level at which a referendum would be required. This had allowed the Council to carry out consultation with residents on an informed basis. He expressed surprise that others had circulated rumours that the Government might consider changing this agreement and advised that the Chancellor's word on this should be taken and trusted. Should any change be made, a further Cabinet meeting would be held prior to the budget meeting of Council.

RESOLVED:

1. That recommendations be made to the Full County Council on 11 February 2014 as follows:

On the revenue and capital budget:

1. Note the Chief Finance Officer's statutory report on the robustness and sustainability of the budget and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves (Annex 1 of the report submitted).
2. Set the County Council precept for band D council tax at £1,195.83, which represents a 1.99% up-lift.
3. Agree to maintain the council tax rate set above and delegate powers to the Leader and the Chief Finance Officer to finalise detailed budget proposals following receipt of the Final Local Government Financial Settlement.
4. Approve the County Council budget for 2014/15 as £1,644.2m.
5. Agree the capital programme proposals specifically to:
 - fund essential schemes over the five year period (schools and non-schools) to the value of £760m including ring-fenced grants; and
 - make adequate provision in the revenue budget to fund the revenue costs of the capital programme.

6. Require the Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer to establish a mechanism to regularly track and monitor progress on the further development and implementation of robust plans for achieving the efficiencies across the whole MTFP period.
7. Require Strategic Directors and Senior Officers to maintain robust in year (i.e. 2014/15) budget monitoring procedures that enable Cabinet to monitor the achievement of efficiencies and service reductions through the monthly budget monitoring Cabinet reports, the quarterly Cabinet Member accountability meetings and the monthly scrutiny at the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee.
8. Require a robust business case to be prepared for all revenue invest to save proposals and capital schemes before committing expenditure.

On treasury management and borrowing:

9. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy for 2014/15 and approve that their provisions have immediate effect. This strategy includes:
 - the investment strategy for short term cash balances;
 - the treasury management policy (Appendix B1);
 - the prudential indicators (Appendix B2)
 - the schedule of delegation (Appendix B4);
 - the minimum revenue provision policy (Appendix B7).
2. That the medium term financial plan (MTFP) for the financial years 2014-19, be approved including:
 - approval of the Total Schools Budget of £563.1m;
 - reduction of the revenue budget risk contingency for 2014/15 to £5m to mitigate against the risk of non-delivery of service reductions & efficiencies;
 - applying £20.1m from the Budget Equalisation Reserve (including £13.0m contributed by the unused risk contingency from 2013/14) and £5.8m from other reserves to support the 2014/15 budget;
 - provision of £0.75m to support the apprenticeship programme;
 - setting aside £1.25m in a reserve for Business Rates Appeals as mitigation against potential business rates valuation appeals.
3. That it be noted that the Cabinet will receive the final detailed MTFP (2014-19) on 25 March 2014 for approval following scrutiny by Select Committees.

Reason for Decisions

Full County Council will meet on 11 February 2014 to agree the summary budget and set the council tax precept for 2014/15. The Cabinet advises the

Full County Council how best to meet the challenges the Council faces. The reasons underpinning the recommendations agreed by Cabinet include:

- to ensure the Council continues to maintain its financial resilience and protect its long term financial position;
- to enable the Council to meet the expectations of Surrey's residents as confirmed in their responses to the in depth consultation exercise undertaken in 2012; and
- to provide adequate finances for key services such as school places, highways, adults social care and protecting vulnerable people.

9/14 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 8]

The Cabinet considered the council's financial position at the end of period 9 – December of the 2013/14 financial year, with particular focus on the year end revenue and capital budgets forecasts and the achievement of efficiency targets.

The Chairman noted that the corporate strategy had ensured a prudent level of balances by applying reserves. There had been a £0.9 million improvement on the revised forecast since November and it was noted that this would have been even greater but for the additional work necessary to address the recent flooding. Demand for services was continuing to increase, offset by underspends in other areas, however there were no plans to use the contingency to achieve the year end target of a £13.9 million underspend. The risk contingency would be used to support the 2014/15 budget and keep any calls on the taxpayer to a minimum. The Council was also working to ensure that it was less reliant on government grants in the longer term.

The Deputy Leader commended the performance and achievements towards the £13.9 million saving on top of previous savings. It was noted that this represented the finances being managed to come in below budget each year since the appointment of the Leader of the Council. This represented a remarkable level of performance in difficult circumstances.

RESOLVED that the following be noted:

- (i) Forecast revenue budget for 2013/14 is to underspend (£0.9m) on services, adding the unused £13m risk contingency brings this to £13.9m overall underspend (paragraph 1 of the report submitted).
- (ii) Forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end is £60.3m (paragraph 74 of the report submitted).
- (iii) Forecast capital budget position for 2013/14 is -£22.3m on services and +£7.0m overall (paragraphs 79 to 84 of the report submitted).
- (iv) Management actions to mitigate overspends appear throughout the report submitted.
- (v) Quarter three balance sheet, reserves, debt and treasury report (paragraphs 85-93 of the report submitted)
- (vi) debt written off during quarter three totals £583,828 (paragraph 92 of the report submitted)

Reasons for decision

To monitor the budget in compliance with the agreed monitoring strategy.

10/14 PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFORMATION [Item 9]

Partners in Surrey have a shared ambition to transform services and outcomes for Surrey residents. The vision is that by working together more effectively across the public sector, partners will shift services away from an emphasis on high cost responses towards prevention and earlier intervention. The intention is for services to deliver better value for money and improved outcomes for Surrey residents.

This ambition had been strongly endorsed by central Government. Surrey was one of only nine areas in the country to be included in the Public Service Transformation Network which was providing active support to the work underway.

The Cabinet considered an update on the progress made since it agreed five outline business cases as part of the public service transformation programme in October 2013. Officers had continued to develop business cases for each area. Due to the markedly different nature of each strand, the business cases were noted to be at different stages of development, however each represented significant progress towards the ambition agreed with partners and endorsed by the Cabinet.

The work to date had identified additional resource requirements for limited specialist support to the public service transformation programme over the coming two years. This investment would enable further development and implementation of the proposals and the delivery of improved outcomes and savings.

The Chairman advised that Surrey was taking a lead in work to transform services and that this had been recognised by Government. Cabinet Members agreed that the benefits of this approach were being seen with organisational boundaries being crossed. The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board provided an update on the potential of team building across organisations in Surrey, exemplified by the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board, and the conversations now taking place with partners which couldn't have happened previously. Prevention was noted to be the next area to address across organisations. This work should result in a better health and social care system for residents.

RESOLVED:

1. That the next steps for each of the public service transformation strands, as outlined within the report and Annex 1 submitted, be agreed and the final partnership endorsed business cases for each of the individual projects be brought back to Cabinet as they are ready.
2. That the broad approach and methodology taken for the cost benefit analyses and the business cases based on this methodology be agreed.
3. That it be noted that £10m of efficiencies relating to Surrey County Council services' element of the public service transformation programme is included in the council's Medium Term Financial Plan(2014-19) from 2015/16 onwards and that progress towards

delivery of these efficiencies will be monitored using the same mechanism agreed for all MTFP(2014-19) efficiencies.

4. That the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board as co-chairman, be authorised to sign-off the 'draft' Surrey Better Care Fund plan for submission to NHS England.
5. That Surrey County Council commit an 'invest to save' funding of £300,000 for additional resources as outlined in paragraph 29 of the report submitted, covering the period to March 2016.
6. That the Chief Executive be asked to work with partners to bring forward proposals for effective and appropriate governance arrangements.

Reasons for decisions

Partners in Surrey believe that working together more effectively will enable services to be transformed so as to give better value to Surrey residents.

The council is working closely with partners to develop its plans for public service transformation in Surrey, which forms a key part of its overall strategy to improve services and outcomes as well as delivery of its medium term financial strategy. Significant progress has been made towards the ambitions of the County Council and its partners, providing a strong basis for further development of both the business cases and implementation plans.

11/14 JOINT STRATEGIC REVIEW OF SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES [Item 11]

The Joint Strategic Review of Short Breaks is a joint project between Surrey County Council and NHS Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group on behalf of Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups. The scope of the Review was to look at the provision of short breaks for children and young people with disabilities in Surrey, including;

- Funding and provision of short breaks for Children and young people with disabilities in Surrey;
- Residential services at the Beeches and Applewood;
- Other residential services in Surrey and out of county;
- Community based services;
- Value for money from services commissioned in all settings.

The Review had focused on options for the future use and funding of Applewood (Surrey County Council) and Beeches (NHS) as other areas of residential short break services had been found to be working well. The Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families drew attention to the Equalities Impact Assessment which had been completed and set out those groups that might be affected and what this impact might be. Surrey County Council's Children's Services spent over £8million every year on short breaks in fulfilment of its statutory duty and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups spent £1.3million a year. Surrey invests significantly more in short break provision than many other local authorities and was committed to its priority in this area. Stakeholders had been in touch, including the Chair of

Surrey Mencap, and the points raised would be addressed as part of the consultation and responded to.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Joint Strategic Review of Short Breaks for children and young people with disabilities be endorsed.
2. That the options for consultation be approved.

Reason for decisions

To enable recommendations to be considered by Cabinet on 27 May 2014 based on a comprehensive consultation process in February and March 2014.

12/14 PROVISION OF EMOTIONAL WELLBEING AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS IN SURREY [Items 12 and 19]

Surrey County Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups have a statutory responsibility to provide, ensure the residents of Surrey have access to and receive the safest needs based Emotional Wellbeing & Mental Health Services.

The Cabinet was asked to approve the award of one year contracts from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, to four existing providers for the provision of Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) & HOPE (Integrated service including Education, Social Care & Health, working with children and young people with complex mental health needs). The Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families drew Cabinet Members' attention to the contents of the Equalities Impact Assessment and the contract details circulated in Part 2 of the agenda.

RESOLVED:

1. That contracts be awarded for a period of one year, from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, for the continued safe provision of CAMHS & HOPE.
2. That these contracts be awarded to the four existing Providers:
 - Surrey & Borders Partnership (SaBP) NHS Foundation Trust
 - Virgin Care Limited
 - CSH Surrey (formerly Central Surrey Health)
 - First Community Health

Reasons for decision

Awarding one year contracts to the four existing providers ensures that the Council:

- Adheres to statutory requirements regarding the safeguarding of children by securing the provision of Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Services by contractually bound providers.
- Facilitates the implementation of changes in legislation and recommendations from authorised bodies whilst maintaining continuity of service and minimising risk to service delivery.

- Enables the joint re-commissioning of a co-designed, outcomes focused, streamlined service model that engages service users in order to deliver improved service quality and a service that is fit for purpose.
- Promotes internal collaboration and builds synergy with partners and providers which will yield efficiency savings and value added benefits.

13/14 APPROVAL TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO AWARD FUTURE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS PROCURED THROUGH BUILDSURREY [Item 13]

In response to an increasing demand for school places across Surrey, the Council had established in its Medium Term Financial Plan 2013-2018 a Capital Programme to fund the provision of additional places in a number of schools.

As part of this programme 30 school capital construction projects would be procured over the next few years, along with a variety of non-school capital works. Procurement and Property Services had developed a strategy to engage local building contractors to tender for schools and other projects through the BuildSurrey portal.

The Cabinet considered a request for delegated authority to be granted to the Chief Property Officer, with Member and financial oversight, in order to engage with local building contractors outside of the Framework Agreement. Cabinet Members noted the aim that 60% of the expenditure would go to businesses in Surrey. The Council spent around £1million a day with Surrey businesses. It was noted that this policy could really enhance the local economy and help small businesses in Surrey.

RESOLVED

1. That authority to award future construction contracts above £500,000 in value, where a competitive tender procedure has been followed through the BuildSurrey portal, be delegated to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Head of Procurement, Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, Cabinet Member for Business Services, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, the Leader of the Council and Section 151 Officer.
2. That authorisation obtained under the above delegation be formally minuted with the Section 151 Officer retaining the paperwork.

Reason for decisions

The agreed delegation ensures that the limited delivery timescales of 30 School Basic Needs projects are met. The school projects totalling approximately £50m over the next two years, and other non-schools capital works up to £10m in aggregate will be tendered through the BuildSurrey portal. This will ensure that as much of the over £60m of construction works as possible will be delivered directly through Surrey based contractors.

The delegation is in line with the principles established under previous arrangements. The consultation and decision recording requirements of the delegation will provide an appropriate governance structure.

14/14 HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES FOR SERVICE USERS (SUPPORTING PEOPLE) [Items 14 and 20]

The Cabinet considered the award of new contracts for Housing Related Support Services from 1 April 2014.

Supporting People services provide housing-related support services to a range of people who require support to live independently within Surrey. This includes older people, those with learning disabilities, those with mental health issues, vulnerable young people, those with an offending history, those experiencing domestic abuse and those who are at risk of homelessness.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care complemented the work carried out by the service on the Equalities Impact Assessment and advised that a continuous link was in place with the district and boroughs, including three meetings each year, to ensure their perspective was fully captured.

RESOLVED:

1. That the new contracts for Housing Related Support Services be awarded to run on a continuous contract basis with on-going service reviews and fixed annual reviews effective from 1 April 2014 as detailed in Annex 2 to the report submitted.
2. That the information relating to the contract process be noted.

Reasons for decisions

To meet the need for localised provision that enables individuals to stay in their communities and continue to be supported by friends, family and the community thus reducing costs to the wider social care system.

The approach of this contracting strategy aligns to the wider commissioning intentions of Adult Social Care and recognises the needs of individuals who want continuity of providers and the support they receive. It also recognises the on-going partnership arrangements with, and objectives of, the District and Borough Councils. In some cases there is also the opportunity for service remodelling to enable more focussed service and value for money delivery.

15/14 CONTRACT AWARD FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL ASBESTOS CONSULTANCY SERVICES [Items 15 and 21]

It is estimated that asbestos related diseases are responsible for over 4000 deaths a year in the UK. Surrey County Council must discharge its duties under the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012 by managing the way it deals with asbestos containing materials (ACMs) in the workplace.

The risks posed by asbestos are managed in a number of ways and require the use of a UKAS accredited consultant to carry out inspections on known or suspected ACMs, manage any remedial works where damage has occurred and manage its removal when required.

The Cabinet considered the award of a contract to the recommended supplier following the completion of a comprehensive procurement exercise.

RESOLVED:

1. That the background information set out in the report submitted be noted.
2. That, having considered the results of the procurement process (as set out in the Part 2 annex submitted as agenda item 21), the award of the contract to the supplier detailed in the Part 2 annex submitted be agreed.

Reasons for decisions

To support the council's duty to protect its workers, visitors to its buildings, pupils etc., from the effects of asbestos and this is only possible through a risk management approach.

A full tender process, in compliance with the EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council. In addition to delivering savings compared to existing rates, the contract will also deliver an improved service with strengthened performance measures and robust contract management.

16/14 TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS - PROCUREMENT OF INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE [Items 16 and 22]

The County Council is required to manage its road network to ensure safety and to minimise congestion. Traffic Control Systems are an essential tool in achieving this. They include: traffic signals at junctions, pelican, puffin, toucan, and equestrian crossings, variable message signs, fire station "wig wags", car park counting equipment, bridge height warning (secret) signs and rising bollards.

The Cabinet considered details of the procurement process to award two separate contracts for the Inspection and Maintenance of Traffic Control Systems. These included the results of the evaluation process and how this demonstrated that the recommended contracts offered the best value for money.

The contract procurement did not relate in any way to the deployment of temporary traffic signals to safely manage traffic through road works activities. The deployment of such temporary signals was approved and coordinated by the Street Works team using powers under Surrey's New Permit Scheme

RESOLVED that contracts be awarded to the preferred bidders on the basis set out in the report submitted under agenda item 22 in Part 2 of the agenda.

Reasons for decision

To support Surrey County Council's duty to inspect and maintain traffic control systems on its highway network across the county.

A full tender process for the inspection and maintenance of Traffic Control Systems, 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.

17/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 17]

The Cabinet received the list of delegated decisions taken by Cabinet Members since its previous meeting for information.

RESOLVED 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 decision

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

18/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 18]

RESOLVED that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

19/14 PROVISION OF EMOTIONAL WELLBEING AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES - CONTRACT ANNEX [Item 19]

The Cabinet noted and agreed the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 12.

20/14 HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES FOR SERVICE USERS [Item 20]

The Cabinet noted and agreed the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 14.

21/14 CONTRACT AWARD FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL ASBESTOS CONSULTANCY SERVICES [Item 21]

The Cabinet noted and agreed the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 15.

22/14 TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS - PROCUREMENT OF INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE [Item 22]

The Cabinet noted the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 15.

23/14 PROPERTY ACQUISITION [Item 23]

The Cabinet considered the acquisition of a property to facilitate opportunities for public service integration with partners, regeneration and the provision of a site suitable for an identified service need.

RESOLVED:

1. That the freehold interest in the property be acquired on the basis set out in the report submitted.

2. That the changes to the overage provisions which had been negotiated be noted and authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration to agree any further changes to the detail of the Heads of Terms.
3. That the Chief Property Officer be instructed to develop a full business case in relation to the future use of the site on the basis set out in the report submitted.

Reason for decisions

To facilitate opportunities for public service integration with partners, regeneration and the provision of a site suitable for an identified service need

24/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 24]

No publicity was agreed in relation to the information circulated in Part 2.

Meeting closed at 4.20 pm

Chairman

CABINET – 4 FEBRUARY 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

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

In December 2013 and January 2014 parts of Surrey, including parts of my own Division, suffered severe flooding involving properties being flooded, in some cases people being rescued by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service by boat, and some roads including major A roads being impassable as a result of flooding.

What action is the County Council taking to work with the Environment Agency to reduce the risk of flooding in the future by improving flood defences in flood affected parts of Surrey? What action is being taken to improve the advance warning to residents so that they can take appropriate action to safeguard themselves, their properties and belongings?

Can the County Council provide progress reports to County Councillors, including myself, whose Divisions have suffered flooding so that we can reassure local residents that action is being taken to tackle flooding in Surrey?

Reply:

The Flood and Water Management Act, introduced in 2010, made the County a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) responsible for managing the flood risk associated with surface water runoff, ordinary water courses and groundwater. These responsibilities are in addition to the duties also imposed on the council as Highway Authority.

The LLFA has a duty under the Act to:

1. Produce a local flood risk management strategy
2. Create an asset register
3. Carry out an investigation where significant flooding occurs
4. Create a Sustainable Drainage Approval Body (not yet enacted)

In these circumstances Surrey has and will continue to respond to flooding issues throughout the county providing practical support and assistance with partner organisations where possible. The council is also ensuring that flood information is obtained, maintained, shared and communicated widely with other flood risk management authorities, and internal and external stakeholders, for future reference and action where appropriate.

Following the flood events over Christmas and in the interim the council has been evaluating the data to confirm whether official 'investigations' are required at approximately 20 sites across the county where significant flooding occurred. Any individual investigation of this nature will require the involvement of all the relevant flood risk management authorities concerned in order to provide appropriate conclusions.

Planning for the response to flooding incidents is undertaken through the Surrey Local Resilience Forum, chaired by the Surrey Chief Fire Officer. Flooding is assessed as one of the three very high risks for the County and plans to support residents affected by flooding are in place and reviewed on a regular basis. Based on risk assessments provided by the Environment Agency work is currently underway to plan for the response to a 1%-5% flooding event in the Lower Thames area that could impact on approximately 15000 properties in Surrey. Planning for the response to other flood risk in the County continues.

The council's operational response to the severe weather events and emergency situation over Christmas and the New Year included officers from a variety of services, together with staff from our service provider partners who successfully delivered on the ground. Many of the individuals concerned worked throughout the holiday period and over subsequent weekends to ensure services to Surrey residents were generally maintained. I would like to acknowledge the work done by all parties and thank the individuals and services concerned.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (2) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

At the Cabinet on 17th December 2013, the Cabinet Member for Communities promised to produce the Economic Impact Figures for Surrey and by District of the Ride London Surrey 2013 Race. Could she please supply them. Also how those figures were calculated?

Reply:

Independent research carried out during the event demonstrated that it generated £13m in direct economic benefit. The research used the "eventIMPACT" methodology, the UK government-endorsed standard approach to calculating the impact of events, which takes into account expenditure by organisers and visitors. The £13m direct economic benefit is made up of the proportion of the expenditure by participants, spectators and organisers during, and in the lead up to the Prudential RideLondon FreeCycle, Prudential RideLondon Grand Prix and Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic that would not have been spent without the event.

In addition, independent research was carried out to assess the value of the national and international TV broadcast. This demonstrated that London and Surrey benefited from £21m worth of media coverage from Prudential RideLondon-Surrey Classic which would not have occurred without the event.

Unfortunately we are not able to break down this data in order to provide Surrey specific figures, however, we have asked for this to be made available for this year's event. Event organisers are also working closely with businesses along the race route to help them prepare for this year's event, to

ensure that local communities in Surrey reap the maximum economic benefit going forward.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (3) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Mole Valley District Council has agreed to "waive" their proportion of the Council Tax on those properties that were flooded in the recent storms, while the properties are empty.

Will the County Council do the same?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been working in partnership with district and borough councils to support residents throughout the recent flooding, which is still on-going in many parts of the county. On 19 February 2014 I will be meeting with all district and borough leaders to assess our response, and to discuss how we will support residents who have been affected by flooding going forward. This matter should be properly considered there.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

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

Could the Cabinet Member for Communities tell us how much Prudential PLC is sponsoring the Prudential Ride London Surrey in both 2013 and 2014?

Reply:

Surrey County Council does not have access to this information as it is commercial and confidential to the event organisers.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (5) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Highways and the Environment give the latest updated figures for storm damage to Bridges and Other Structures from the recent Storms and Floods?

Reply:

An update on the flooding situation was provided at the meeting.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (6) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

At both the Cabinet on 17th December, and the Meeting with Councillors on 20th November. The Cabinet Member for Communities stated erroneously that in the Cabinet in December 2011, had agreed the 2013 Ride London Surrey Race. Would she re-publish the Minute and admit that she was as was pointed out at both meetings to her wrong.

Reply:

Mr Hall will be aware that the Leader and I have already answered numerous questions regarding the process for agreeing the Ride London Surrey event. In December 2013 this Cabinet agreed to host the event for the next four years, as well as approving the Surrey Cycling Strategy, after a thorough public consultation. The Cabinet has learnt lessons from the 2013 event and we are now working with event organisers and local communities along the race route to deliver an improved event for 2014.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (7) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Sir Paul Beresford MP has stated publicly that he is working with the Leader of the County Council on the issues of Flooding. Could I ask how many meetings Sir Paul has had with the Leader on this subject if any?

Reply:

The flooding experienced in Surrey since late December has been some of the worst in recent memory. In order to support residents effectively through this time it has been vital that the Council works closely with emergency services, district and boroughs and the NHS, as well as communicating regularly with local stakeholders such as MPs. As we now begin to assess our response we will continue to work with MPs, including as Sir Paul with whom I have been in contact with, to ensure that lessons are taken forward for the future.

Perhaps Mr Hall is unaware that Sir Paul has recently raised the specific issues of Mole Valley flooding on the floor of the House of Commons when addressing the DEFRA Minister. This direct action by Sir Paul demonstrates that he is actively working with SCC, Mole Valley District Council and other agencies for the benefit of the residents in his constituency.

Mr David Hodge

Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

Question (8) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Communities explain why the Route of the Ride London Surrey 2013 was not consulted on at all? And why the Route for 2014 was published before Consultations even started in certain communities such as Leatherhead?

Reply:

As with my response to Mr Hall's previous question, the Leader and I have already answered numerous questions regarding the process for agreeing the Ride London Surrey 2013 event. My focus is now working with event organisers and local communities along the race route to deliver an improved event for 2014.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (9) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:

Mole Valley District Council has established a hardship fund for flood victims whose insurance does not cover double council tax. Will the County Council establish a similar hardship fund to refund the County Council's part of the Council Tax for flood victims who are forced to vacate their flooded homes and to live elsewhere to avoid them having to pay Council Tax on two properties?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been working in partnership with district and borough councils to support residents throughout the recent flooding, which is still on-going in many parts of the county. On 19 February 2014 I will be meeting with all district and borough leaders to assess our response, and to discuss how we will support residents who have been affected by flooding going forward. This matter should be properly considered there.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

CABINET – 4 FEBRUARY 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions**Question (1) from Mr Michael Connolly to ask:**

With regard to the new lamp posts in Surrey Villages, especially Parsonage Lane, Westcott RH4 3NL:

- i). Why do you consider all lamp posts in Surrey (towns and villages) should be urban in style?
- ii). Why were we not consulted about the style?
- iii). Why would different lamp posts (i.e. suitable for a village) cost any more? This is a village - not Sutton or Kingston or Surbiton!
- iv). Was there an environmental impact report? For instance, why were LED lights not used (90% cheaper to run)?
- v). Why do the lights pollute the houses and the streets (more power wasted)?
- vi). Why were they replaced (they seemed to work)?
- vii). After filling Dorking with unnecessary traffic lights, are you planning to urbanise all of rural Surrey?

Reply:

- i). The style of lanterns was chosen to reflect the type of road and its use. Principally there is a lantern used for residential roads and one for traffic routes and these were selected to ensure the correct levels of lighting were achieved within each type of road. This is no different to the lights which were previously being used to replace faulty or damaged lights although it is fair to say that prior to the replacement programme, lights were often replaced on an individual basis which resulted in a variety of styles of lantern, bracket and even light colour along many of the county's roads.

There were exceptions to this, namely in conservation areas and town centres. Within these areas, if the lights being replaced were already of a "special" design, they were (or will be) replaced with a similar design – discussions have taken place with officers within the relevant district or borough council's planning, heritage, or conservation department to agree what styles would be installed.

Given that nearly 90,000 lights will have been replaced by the end of the programme it would have been impractical to have a wider variety of styles and would also have seen a significantly increased cost to the council to install a wider variety.

- ii). Discussion and consultation took place covering a number of factors within a number of groups prior to the award of the PFI contract which included councillors (individually, in select committees and sub-

committees), planning and conservation officers and representatives from the Campaign for Rural England among others.

It would not have been practical to consult all residents prior to awarding a new contract of this size.

- iii). I am not clear on the correspondent's definition of lights that would be suitable for a village. I can however advise that the special design columns used in conservation areas are considerably more expensive (ranging from £450 to over £1000 per column) compared the standard equipment installed in the majority of roads. The details of these additional costs are published on the council's website since the replacement programme started and in some cases, residents groups, parish councils and other interested parties have contributed to the cost of installing special design columns instead of the standard replacements. This option remains open to replace lights, however the council cannot bear the cost of installing additional special design lights out of its maintenance budgets.
- iv). The impact to the environment was considered and was included in the business case for replacing the lights. At the time of contract award, LED technology in street lighting was not fully proven and was in many cases not cost effective with the initial cost of the units being higher than the savings it would have generated. The council did however adopt another energy saving technology through the installation of a Central Management System. This, amongst other things, allows us to control the on/off times remotely and dim the lights in the very late evening and early morning. By dimming the new lights by 25-50% between 23.00 and 05.30 each day, the council expects to save in the region of £12m in lower energy bills and approximately 60,000 tonnes of CO2.
- v). The new lights actually reduce "light spill" compared to many of the previous lights. This is because, rather than being housed in an open glass/plastic cover, the lamp is recessed into the luminaire with a series of angled mirrors redirecting this light back downwards to the road and footpath it is intending to light. On occasion some residents do experience a unwanted light into their property – should this be the case, the residents can make a request through the council's contact centre to have a shield fitted and provided it doesn't reduce the light to the footpath or road, will be fitted free of charge.
- vi). Although individual lights worked, the volume of lights requiring replacement or expensive repairs was increasing year on year. Added to this, a significant majority of the council's street lighting columns were over 40 years old (their expected life), some being in excess of 60 years old; the result being an increased risk of structural failure. By entering into the PFI credit, the county council received support from the Department of Transport in the form of £74m funding to carry out the replacements. It also enabled the council to freeze the budget for street lighting, preventing the continuing increase.

Full details of the rationale for the new Street Lighting Service and contract can be found on the Council's website.

- vii). Traffic signals for road junctions and pedestrian crossing facilities are needed in Dorking for pedestrian safety and to enable traffic to flow around the town. We monitor the functionality and reliability of these signals regularly to ensure they operate to maximum efficiency. Any new proposed signals in more rural areas of Surrey will only be commissioned where a specific need is identified, usually by locally elected representatives.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (2) from Mr Tim Jones to ask:

Following Kay Hammonds statement at the Communities Select Committee meeting in January, where she said that "she had listened to the concerns of the Spelthorne residents, about the NEED for two appliances stationed in Spelthorne and that Option 5 was a result of her listening to those concerns," will she (and the Senior Management of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service) state, categorically, that they GUARANTEE, that they WILL provide a RELIABLE, COMPETENT, On-call crew 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, albeit with the understanding that this is unlikely to be achieved 100% of the time, but they will GUARANTEE that if the availability drops below 90% (the stated success rate of Cranleigh's first appliance), they will recognise that Option 5 is NOT a feasible option and WILL reinstate 2 full time, wholetime appliances?

Reply:

On a daily basis Surrey Fire and Rescue Service seeks to ensure that it delivers the right balance of services to people and communities across Surrey. This includes community fire prevention work, community fire protection advice to businesses with enforcement where necessary and responding to incidents, some of which are emergencies. Today's Fire and Rescue Service does much more work to prevent fires and other emergencies from arising through a variety of initiatives and important work with other partners and agencies whilst at the same time ensuring that it has the right people with the right skills and the right equipment to respond to incidents wherever and whenever they arise. In support of that the Fire and Rescue Service already has an agreed competency based framework and assurance regime for all uniformed staff (full-time and On-call) which is well established and effective.

The establishment of the On-call unit at the new fire station will require the community and other stakeholders to work closely and diligently with the Fire and Rescue Service to achieve the right people who are consistently capable of delivering the variety of community emergency prevention work which is central to the community risk reduction activity of today's Fire and Rescue Service, as well as responding to incidents. By recruiting the right people and employing them on a part-time basis using the new On-Call contracts – ostensibly an orthodox part-time job with time-slots that must be fulfilled - the

Service seeks, so far as is reasonably practicable, to achieve a reliable service 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. There will of course always be factors that mean that fire appliances are not available 100% of the time due to operational commitments, training commitments or vehicle maintenance schedules, for example. Nevertheless, by attracting people from the local community who are willing to play their part in delivering a wide range of fire and rescue services in Spelthorne and Surrey we will maximise the availability of the On-call appliance which will have a initial target for operational availability of 90% - the Service decides on a constant basis how to continue to achieve its target attendance standard in all areas of the County which can be achieved by a variety of means e.g. moving fire engines and crews to different locations informed by operational intelligence

Should an On-call unit not be secured in the way described we have made it clear that the alternative option is to locate one whole-time fire engine at one location, which was the original proposal.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (3) from Mr Jeremey Spencer to ask:

Would the fire authority please advise what the annual spend on fire crews based in Spelthorne would be if option 5 is approved (ie one wholetime fire appliance and one on-call fire appliance) and advise how that compares with the total annual fire budget for 2013/14. This can then be compared with the number of rate payers in Spelthorne compared with the rest of Surrey to determine how heavily Spelthorne will be subsidising fire cover for the rest of Surrey?

Reply:

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service provide a county wide response to the communities of Surrey. If 10 fire appliances are required for a fire in or outside of Spelthorne, costs are not apportioned and money does not move either way. We have 35 frontline fire appliances, 2 of which are located in Spelthorne. Under Option 5, 2 fire appliances will continue to be located in Spelthorne and will continue to meet the agreed attendance standard all things being equal, whilst securing £880,000 as a part contribution to the revenue savings target allocated to fire and rescue under the Medium Term Financial Plan.

This is being taken as part of a rationalisation of fire and emergency cover to achieve the agreed attendance standard and providing a balanced level of county wide service provision within a given total budget. Therefore the network of fire stations is being configured to provide the requisite assurance of achieving the response standard, acknowledging that incident numbers and types have reduced by a significant degree, that the risk profile still exists and that the prevention and protection work will remain a high priority to support the management of that risk. This will be supported by appropriate response resources in neighbouring boroughs and districts and will provide a suitable

and sufficient presence to assure local, sub-regional, regional and national responsibilities when the Service is looked at as a whole.

The majority of the “annual spend” in Spelthorne comprises revenue costs (staff wages). To staff one whole-time 24/7 fire engine at one fire station costs £1.05million per annum. The current costs for Spelthorne with Sunbury and Staines fire stations amount to £2.1million per annum. By contrast the cost per annum of staffing one 24/7 On-call fire appliance is in the order of £170,000. Therefore the total “annual spend” under option 5 will be £1,220,000 per annum on staff in Spelthorne. The total annual budget for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service for the year 2013/14 was set at £45,752,000.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO FIRE SERVICE PETITION

“Keep both of our fire stations open in Spelthorne”

Presented on behalf of ‘Save our Services in Surrey’

RESPONSE

The consultation undertaken by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service provided valuable information with regard to the views of the people who responded to the surveys or who attended the meetings. Having considered the comments Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has considered and put forward another option in order to address the concerns expressed by Spelthorne residents and local leaders and which is now referred to as option 5 in the paper placed before the Communities Select Committee.

Option 5 suggests a new centrally located fire station with two fire engines, one 24/7 whole-time crewed fire engine and one 24/7 fire engine staffed by people who are on-call (part-time staff who are available on a pager system from their home, a place of work or from within a certain time of the fire station) from the local community and who are trained to the same standards as whole-time staff. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service already operate this type of duty system in other parts of the county, for example, at Walton and Guildford. Under this option 18 new, local jobs would be created and would be recruited from within a 4-5 minute response footprint of the new location. As part time workers they would then commit to being available at least 54 hours each week.

This option provides the community with two fire engines which will support the provision of fire cover across the county not just the borough of Spelthorne. It will also provide the communities of Spelthorne with an opportunity to work with the Fire Service to continue to reduce the risk from fire and other incidents through community fire prevention work which is a key role of today’s Fire Service.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS TRAINING

That the Cabinet Member for Business Services consider the need for internal training for Surrey County Council employees, in order to prevent discrimination against staff and residents with mental health difficulties.

I welcome the recommendation to promote mental and emotional well-being in the workplace and put an end to the stigma and discrimination that people with mental health problems can face. I consider our internal training adequate for our employers, in order to prevent discrimination against staff and residents with mental health difficulties. As well as supporting [Time to change Surrey](#)¹ we have in place a number of programmes and are developing new ones. These are:

1. **Manager Masterclasses “ Supporting mental and emotional Well-being“**

A 90 minute Manager Masterclass called ‘supporting mental and emotional well-being’ was launched on 8 Jan 2014. There are four 90 minute masterclasses per day, over 6 days, from February to March 2014 in multiple locations. They are delivered by Santia (our occupational health provider) and Workplace Options (our employee assistance programme provider). Up to 20 managers can attend each workshop, so in total up to 480 can attend. We can roll this out further from April 2014. There will be a strong emphasis on spotting early signs, early support and creating workplace environments that support mental well-being. As of 29 January 2014, 180 managers and supervisors have pre-booked.

2. **E-Learning**

We are putting together a mental health awareness e-learning package. We are using embedded video from Time To Change, MIND, Mindful Employers² and Re-Think³, using actual clips of people with mental health problems, to make the offer more powerful.

3. **Equality and inclusion matters training**

This is mandatory one day training for all new staff. Also, refresher sessions are available. On average 4-6 sessions are delivered per month and there is coverage of mental health awareness. These sessions have been delivered since 2010 and are regularly refreshed.

¹ **Time to Change Surrey** – Campaign to tackle discrimination, stigma and inequalities in mental health services

² **Mindful Employer** – National Campaign for employers to sign up to action that supports a healthy workforce

³ **Re-think** - Rethink Mental Illness helps millions of people affected by mental illness by challenging attitudes and changing lives.

4. **Reasonable adjustments and flexible working training for managers (Institute of Leadership and Management accredited)**

Covers mental health conditions and supporting staff with various challenges. Has been delivered since 2010.

5. **Time To Change – Employer Health Checks – Engagement Study**

The council has been successful in becoming part of a national study, with 49 other organisations in a comprehensive study and review of their performance, in relation to mental health in the workplace. A Time To Change consultant will work with the Council for 3 months, using a survey, interviews and desktop research, to produce a comprehensive report, identifying current and future improvements.

6. **‘Flashpoint’: Interactive drama training**

It is intended to roll out a programme of drama workshops which illustrate the impact of stigma and discrimination. The forum theatre style enables participants to re-direct the script to enable more positive outcomes for the characters. Rollout, delivery and funding options are currently being discussed.

7. **Mental Health Awareness (multi-agency training)**

Aimed at anybody who works with people who may be at risk of developing symptoms of depression, anxiety or any other mental illness, or anyone interested in learning about mental health and emotional well-being.

8. **Mental Health Awareness and Improving Wellbeing at Work (multi-agency training)**

A further mental health awareness programme has been developed as a joint training venture by Surrey CC as part of their Time to Change campaign in collaboration with the First Steps⁴ team and Employment Support Retraining Agency.

9. **SADAS Substance Misuse and Mental Health Programme (multi-agency training)**

An exciting programme of modules in the Guildford area facilitated by the Southern Addictions Advisory Service (SADAS)⁵ and their partners aimed at health and social care staff, mental health staff, emergency services personnel, volunteers and all those whose work brings them into contact with people who may have mental health or substance

⁴ **First Steps** – Universal primary care access to mental health services

⁵ **Southern Addictions Advisory Service (SADAS)** - Southern Addictions Advisory Service are an organisation dedicated to improving the lives of drug and alcohol users and people with mental health problems by providing different services to meet needs

abuse issues in Surrey.

I believe we have an excellent workforce whose values are consistent with the aims of the County Council but we need to ensure that all directorates are aware of, and avail themselves of the training that tackles inequalities discrimination and stigma within the council.

Ms Denise Le Gal
Cabinet Member for Business Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

**CHANGES TO FIRE ENGINE DEPLOYMENT IN THE BOROUGH OF
SPELTHORNE**

Communities Select Committee recommends the inclusion of option 5 for the Cabinet report for 4th February 2014.

Response

I would like to thank the Communities Select Committee for the scrutiny that they applied to this paper. I also note the key points that were discussed which demonstrates the diligence that was applied by the Committee in allowing the inclusion of option 5 for the Cabinet report. I will ensure that this option is now presented to Cabinet on 4th February 2014 for their decision.

**Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014**