



Agenda and Reports
for the meeting of
THE COUNTY COUNCIL
to be held on
18 MARCH 2014

County Hall
Kingston upon Thames
Surrey

7 March 2014

TO THE MEMBERS OF SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

SUMMONS TO MEETING

You are hereby summoned to attend the meeting of the Council to be held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, on Tuesday, 18 March 2014, beginning at 10.30 am, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda set out overleaf.

DAVID McNULTY
Chief Executive

Note 1: *For those Members wishing to participate, Prayers will be said at 10:25am. The Dean of Guildford, The Very Revd Dianna Gwilliams has kindly consented to officiate.*

If any Members wish to take time for reflection, meditation, alternative worship or other such practice prior to the start of the meeting, alternative space can be arranged on request by contacting Democratic Services.

There will be a very short interval between the conclusion of Prayers and the start of the meeting to enable those Members and Officers who do not wish to take part in Prayers to enter the Council Chamber and join the meeting.

Note 2: *This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.*

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the representative of Legal and Democratic Services at the meeting.

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print or braille, or another language please either call Democratic Services on 020 8541 9122, or write to Democratic Services, Surrey County Council at Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 9698, fax 020 8541 9009, or email anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Anne Gowing on 020 8541 9938

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chairman to report apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 11 February 2014.

(Note: the Minutes, including the appendices, will be laid on the table half an hour before the start of the meeting).

(Pages 1
- 14)

3 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman to report.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

NOTES:

- Each Member must declare any interest that is disclosable under the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, unless it is already listed for that Member in the Council's Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner).
- If the interest has not yet been disclosed in that Register, the Member must, as well as disclosing it at the meeting, notify the Monitoring Officer of it within 28 days.
- If a Member has a disclosable interest, the Member must not vote or speak on the agenda item in which it arises, or do anything to influence other Members in regard to that item.

5 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader to make a statement.

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions.

6 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

The Leader of the Council or the appropriate Member of the Cabinet or the Chairman of a Committee to answer any questions on any matter relating to the powers and duties of the County Council, or which affects the county.

(Note: Notice of questions in respect of the above item on the agenda must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Anne

(iii)

Gowing in Democratic Services by 12 noon on Wednesday 12 March 2014).

7 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Any Member may make a statement at the meeting on a local issue of current or future concern.

(Note: Notice of statements must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Anne Gowing in Democratic Services by 12 noon on Monday 17 March 2014).

8 ORIGINAL MOTIONS

Item 8(i)

Mr Stephen Cooksey (Dorking South and the Holmwoods) to move under Standing Order 11 as follows:

'This council wishes to place on formal record its thanks to all staff and its contractors, who working tirelessly in partnership with other councils, agencies and the emergency services to respond to the recent and current flooding to do as much as possible to protect residents' homes and businesses.

While recognising this weather has been exceptional by past standards, the County now has a statutory duty to investigate flooding and the need to understand better the impacts of the recent events. The Council must now plan for similar occurrences and learn from any omissions or failures which may have contributed to the scale of the flooding-related problems in Surrey. Particular attention should be paid to how the resilience of the county's infrastructure against recurrence of such events can be strengthened, especially on gully maintenance, and whether any improvements can be made in cross authority and cross agency working.

Council notes:

1. That Government has a Severe Weather Recovery scheme and that the European Union has a Solidarity Fund to which the UK has contributed and is designed to provide emergency aid after such natural disasters. In addition European Union Regional Development Funds can be used towards flood prevention infrastructure in the future.
2. The date of the most recent published wetspots list, where past flooding incidents have been reported, on the County Council website is February 2012 even though an update was promised to members to be completed by February 2013.
3. That the statutory Flooding Asset Register which includes key assets (structures and features such as a wall, ditch or bridge) that are known to cause or allow the major flooding of properties, critical infrastructure or block major roads when the asset is not functioning to an adequate level was last updated in December 2011 and only contains 65 items for the whole county.

Council calls for:

- i. The Flooding Asset Register and the wetspots list to both be completed and updated urgently, and at most within six months.
- ii. A review of the maintenance of highway drainage assets such as gullies, soakaways, ditches, channels, drains, grills and outlets. In particular, a review of the adequacy of the policy of gully cleaning at least once per year and put together a ditching programme in rural areas.
- iii. A programme of tree planting on higher ground, in particular to replace trees that have been lost, to help trap and slow down the movement of water.
- iv. The County Council to work with boroughs and districts to develop planning policies not to build on flood plains.
- v. Flood damaged roads and bridges to be repaired.
- vi. The Leader to apply for any additional funding the County Council requires from the Severe Weather Recovery scheme, the European Union Solidarity Fund and the Regional Development Fund.'

Item 8(ii)

Mr Peter Martin (Godalming South, Milford and Witley) to move under Standing Order 11 as follows:

'This Council:

1. Notes and recognises the seriousness of the recent severe weather and flooding in the County and the impact it is having on residents' homes and businesses, with many thousands damaged, in some instances severely, as well as much of the County's infrastructure, for which the estimated repair bill currently stands at over £10m
2. Expresses sympathy and concern for the residents, businesses and livelihoods affected
3. Commends the County's Fire & Rescue Service, Surrey Police, our District and Borough Council colleagues, HM Armed Forces, SCC staff, and the large number of individuals and community and voluntary organisations on their response to this major incident
4. Acknowledges and welcomes the Government's commitment to support local authorities in helping those residents and businesses affected by providing Council Tax relief
5. Recognises that Surrey's economy, at £32.7 billion GVA, is substantial and creates a very significant net contribution to the Exchequer

This Council therefore resolves:

- a) To continue working alongside our partners to help Surrey's residents and businesses with advice and assistance and to ensure any future incidents are met with a rapid, comprehensive multi-agency approach.
- b) To assess the viability of longer term engineering and environmental solutions for Surrey in conjunction with utility companies, the Environment Agency, other Local Authorities and appropriate Government departments.
- c) To call on Government to help protect, and demonstrate the government's commitment to, this key part of the UK economy by fully funding the Environment Agency's Lower Thames Flood Alleviation Scheme.'

9 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Pages
15 - 54)

To receive the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 25 February 2014 and to agree two recommendations in respect of:

- (i) Admission Arrangements for September 2015 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Schemes
- (ii) Formation of Woking Joint Committee

10 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2014 - 2015

(Pages
55 - 64)

To approve a pay policy statement for publication on the Council's external website.

11 AMENDMENTS TO FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

(Pages
65 - 86)

To seek the Council's approval to the proposed changes to the Financial Regulations.

12 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET

(Pages
87 - 144)

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 17 March 2014.

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings with the Chairman's consent. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can grant permission and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNTY COUNCILCOUNCIL MEETING - 11 FEBRUARY 2014

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 11 February 2014 commencing at 10.30 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

David Munro (Chairman)
Sally Marks (Vice-Chairman)

*	Mary Angell	David Ivison
	W D Barker OBE	Daniel Jenkins
	Nikki Barton	George Johnson
*	Ian Beardsmore	Linda Kemeny
	John Beckett	Colin Kemp
	Mike Bennison	* Eber Kington
	Liz Bowes	Rachael I Lake
	Natalie Bramhall	Stella Lallement
	Mark Brett-Warburton	* Yvonna Lay
	Ben Carasco	Denise Le Gal
	Bill Chapman	Mary Lewis
	Helyn Clack	Christian Mahne
*	Carol Coleman	Ernest Mallett MBE
	Stephen Cooksey	Peter Martin
	Steve Cossier	Jan Mason
	Clare Curran	Marsha Moseley
	Graham Ellwood	Tina Mountain
	Jonathan Essex	Christopher Norman
	Robert Evans	John Orrick
	Tim Evans	Adrian Page
	Mel Few	Chris Pitt
	Will Forster	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
*	Pat Frost	Denise Saliagopoulos
	Denis Fuller	Tony Samuels
	John Furey	Pauline Searle
	Bob Gardner	Stuart Selleck
	Mike Goodman	Nick Skellett CBE
	David Goodwin	Michael Sydney
	Michael Gosling	Keith Taylor
	Zully Grant-Duff	Barbara Thomson
	Ken Gulati	Chris Townsend
	Tim Hall	Richard Walsh
	Kay Hammond	Hazel Watson
	David Harmer	Fiona White
	Nick Harrison	Richard Wilson
*	Marisa Heath	Helena Windsor
	Peter Hickman	Keith Witham
	Margaret Hicks	* Alan Young
	David Hodge	Victoria Young
	Saj Hussain	

*absent

1/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mr Beardsmore, Mrs Coleman, Mrs Frost, Ms Heath, Mr Kington, Mrs Lay and Mr Young.

2/14 MINUTES [Item 2]

One amendment to the minutes was requested:

Item No. 84/13 – re. Adjournment: Rachael I Lake requested that her name was removed because she was present for the afternoon session of the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 10 December 2013, as amended, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

3/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) He invited the Leader of the Council to make an urgent statement in relation to the flooding issues affecting the county (Appendix A). Members were invited to make comments and ask questions.
- (ii) Her Majesty the Queen's New Year Honours List.
A list was included within the agenda. He informed Members that he had written letters of congratulations to those who had receive awards for services to Surrey communities.
- (iii) Related Party Disclosures – he reminded Members, that it was a legal requirement to complete their forms, and return them to Finance by the deadline in March.
- (iv) Members Survey – he drew Members' attention to the online survey sent to them last Friday.
- (v) He had attended a short service, held in the Great Hall on 27 January 2014, to commemorate Holocaust Day.
- (vi) That he had attended the funeral of Frederick Alistair Stone CBE, DL – Surrey County Council's Chief Executive from 1974 – 1988.
- (vii) He had also attended Sarah Mitchell's, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care leaving party at Dorking Halls.
- (viii) The Lord Lieutenant had presented Surrey County Council with a Commonwealth Flag. There would be a special flag raising ceremony in approximately one month's time.

4/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There was none.

5/14 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2014/15 TO 2018/19 / COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENT FOR 2014/15 / TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY [Item 5]

The Chairman said that the papers for this item were included in the agenda and the supplementary report of the Cabinet circulated last week. He asked Members to note that the recommendations before them today, numbered (1) to (15) were set out in the supplementary report.

He said that the debate on the Budget would be conducted in accordance with the County Council's Standing Orders, with the exception that he would allow the minority group leaders five minutes each for speeches on the Budget proposals.

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet on the Revenue and Capital Budget 2014/15 to 2018/19, the Council Tax Requirement for 2014/15 and the Treasury Management Strategy and made a statement in support of the proposed budget. A copy of the Leader's statement is attached as Appendix B.

The Chief Finance Officer presented her report to Council. A copy of her statement is attached as Appendix C.

Each of the Minority Group Leaders (Mrs Watson, Mr Johnson and Mr Harrison) spoke on the budget proposals.

Key points made by Mrs Watson were:

- Support for the level of council tax proposed but opposition to the budget as a whole
- The budget needed to be radically reshaped and more needed to be done to raise funding from the European Union
- Pleased the Administration was spending money to resurface roads and provide more school places but other areas needed additional funding
- The majority of Surrey residents did not think that the County Council provided Value for Money
- A request for a separate vote on recommendations (10) and (11)

Key points made by Mr Johnson were:

- Disappointment that the Council Tax was being increased and that the budget report indicated that further increases would be inevitable
- The aim of all Members was to obtain the best possible result for their electorate
- There was no mention of cutting costs and he hoped that next year's budget would address this (However, front line services should be excluded)

Mr Harrison moved an amendment, to the Budget recommendations, which was formally seconded by Mr Townsend. This was:

A new recommendation (15):

15. acknowledges the challenging and ambitious savings targets for the Friends, Family and Community Programme within the Adult Social Care Directorate and requires the Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and the Chief Finance Officer

to develop contingency plans to make savings in other budget areas to ensure the overall County Council budget envelope for 2014/15 is maintained.

And amend the original recommendation 15, to become a new recommendation (16)

(additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)

45 16. Requires these contingency plans to be assessed as part of the final detailed MTFP (2014/19) which the Council notes that the Cabinet will consider and approve the final detailed MTFP (2014/19) on 25 March 2014, following scrutiny by Select Committees.

So that the Budget recommendations now read:

The County Council:

(1) – (14) As per the supplementary report of the Cabinet

(15) acknowledges the challenging and ambitious savings targets for the Friends, Family and Community Programme within the Adult Social Care Directorate and requires the Chief Executive, Strategic Directors and the Chief Finance Officer to develop contingency plans to make savings in other budget areas to ensure the overall County Council budget envelope for 2014/15 is maintained.

(16) requires these contingency plans to be assessed as part of the final detailed MTFP (2014/19) which the Council notes the Cabinet will consider and approve on 25 March 2014, following scrutiny by Select Committees.

In support of his amendment, Mr Harrison made the following points:

- Concern re. the level of savings to be achieved within the Adult Social Care Budget, in particular, within the Friends, Family and Community Programme – he did not consider the savings targets to be realistic
- Other demands for funding i.e. highways repairs following the flooding, Better Care Funding and School Places
- Only the overall Budget figure was being agreed by Council at this meeting
- The Chief Finance Officer had confirmed that there were significant risks associated with this Budget
- Council tax would increase again in 2015 or there would be further cuts to services
- Other areas of concern included: (i) that the overall headcount for the County council had increased over the last two years, (ii) Information Technology costs continued to rise, (iii) Central Infrastructure costs needed to be re-examined, and (iv) the level of senior officer salaries

Seven Members spoke on the amendment, making the following points:

- That the amendment was a direct result of the Adult Social Care (ASC) discussion at the Council Overview and Scrutiny (COSC) meeting. However, following that meeting, discussions had taken place on how to deal with the pressures

- Referring to recommendation (15), the onus was on select committees / COSC to ensure that the detailed budgets were financially viable before Cabinet approved the MTFP on 25 March 2014
- Acknowledgement that the budget was tough and there would be challenges
- Government lobbying had resulted in some success i.e. the funding for the New Homes Bonus was being returned to Councils
- The number of extra responsibilities passed to County Councils since this Government had been in power
- Concern re. the detail of the budget and that the ASC budget should be realistic. There was also no contingency plan in place – should the need arise.
- Concern re. the reduction to the ASC care package budget
- Lack of understanding as to how the County Council would 'do things differently'
- The overall budget needed to be approved at this meeting and subsequently the detailed budget proposals would be scrutinised

The amendment was put to the vote, with 21 Members voting for and 52 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, 9 Members spoke on it.

Key points made in the debate were:

- The success of the apprenticeship scheme - it looks to the future and provides young people with opportunities
- Confirmation that the County Council was working hard to try and obtain European Union funding
- A reference to the Leaflet: 'More than 50 ways Surrey County Council adds Value', which was annexed to the Budget report
- The Public Value Review programme resulted in savings in excess of £30m. Also, unit costs were being reduced
- Support for Project Horizon.
- A reduction in the Adult Social Care budget would result in fewer people being employed to help those in need
- Any cuts should be shared across all budgets
- Funding for road repairs / flooding issues continued to be inadequate
- Residents would find it difficult to understand that their council tax was being increased
- Cutting the Surrey Fire and Rescue budget in Spelthorne was indefensible at this time, when large areas of the county were flooded and their services were urgently required
- An explanation as to why the County Council received a low Government grant and had to rely on raising a large part of its funding through council tax – could Surrey's Conservative MPs be lobbied to address this issue
- Due to forthcoming elections in 2015, Government promises about including council tax freeze grant in the base budget were worthless
- Increasing the council tax uplift by 1.99% was at the right level for the County Council

After the debate, the Chairman said that he would not be agreeing to Mrs Watson's request to take a separate vote on recommendations (10) and (11) and that he would be taking the Budget, including Treasury Management, as one recommendation.

52 Members voted for the Budget proposals and 21 Members voted against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That 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 to the submitted report) be noted.
- (2) That the council tax requirement for 2014/15 be set at £564.0m (Annex 3, paragraph 3.5 in the submitted report).
- (3) That the 2014/15 council tax up-lift be fixed at 1.99%.
- (4) That the basic amount for 2014/15 council tax at Band D be set at £1,195.83 (Annex 3, paragraph 3.7 in the submitted report).
- (5) That the council tax for each category of dwelling in its area will be as follows:

Valuation band	£
A	797.22
B	930.09
C	1,062.96
D	1,195.83
E	1,461.57
F	1,727.31
G	1,993.05
H	2,391.66

- (6) That the payment for each billing authority, including any balances on the collection fund will be as follows:

Billing authority	£
Elmbridge	74,230,222.44
Epsom & Ewell	37,557,254.18

Guildford	64,630,646.62
Mole Valley	46,631,182.73
Reigate & Banstead	68,767,330.83
Runnymede	37,289,117.17
Spelthorne	45,013,925.65
Surrey Heath	44,379,315.63
Tandridge	43,429,951.44
Waverley	63,113,040.71
Woking	46,301,177.37
TOTAL	571,343,164.77

- (7) That the payment for each billing authority, including any balances on the collection fund to be made in ten equal instalments on the dates, already agreed with billing authorities as follows:

17 April 2014	17 October 2014
23 May 2014	21 November 2014
27 June 2014	5 January 2015
1 August 2014	12 February 2015
8 September 2014	16 March 2015

- (8) That the council tax rate set above be maintained and powers be delegated to the Leader and the Chief Finance Officer to finalise detailed budget proposals following receipt of the Final Local Government Financial Settlement.
- (9) That the £2.5m additional council tax surplus on the Collection Fund be transferred to the Economic Downturn Reserve (paragraph 68 of the submitted report).
- (10) That the County Council budget, of £1,646.7m, for 2014/15, be approved.
- (11) That the following capital programme proposals be agreed:
- to fund essential schemes over the five year period (schools and non-schools) to the value of £760m including ring-fenced grants and
 - to make adequate provision in the revenue budget to fund the revenue costs of the capital programme.

- (12) That the Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer be required 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 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) period.
- (13) That Strategic Directors and Senior Officers be required to maintain robust in year (i.e. 2014/15) budget monitoring procedures to 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.
- (14) That a robust business case be required to be prepared for all revenue invest to save proposals and capital schemes before committing expenditure.
- (15) That the final detailed MTFP (2014-19) be considered and approved by Cabinet on 25 March 2014, following scrutiny by Select Committees.

Treasury management and borrowing:

That the Treasury Management Strategy for 2014/15 be approved and that the provisions have immediate effect (Annex 2 to the submitted report).

This strategy includes:

- the investment strategy for short term cash balances
- the treasury management policy (Annex 2, Appendix B1 to the submitted report)
- the prudential indicators (Annex 2, Appendix B2 to the submitted report)
- the scheme of delegation (Annex 2, Appendix B4 to the submitted report)
- the minimum revenue provision policy (Annex 2, Appendix B7 to the submitted report).

6/14 ORIGINAL MOTION [Item 6]

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Hazel Watson moved the motion which was:

'This Council notes the Government announcements restricting Surrey County Council's Council Tax increase, without incurring the cost of holding a referendum, to a level which will severely impact on Surrey's services to the public.

This Council believes in local government as one of the cornerstones of democracy in the UK, championing the needs and ambitions of the people it represents and that decisions made on behalf of a community are best made by those in the community.

This Council notes the Prime Minister's acknowledgement that local government is the most efficient part of the public sector.

Council further notes the General Power of Competence introduced in the Localism Act 2011 giving local authorities power to do anything that individuals of full legal capacity may do giving authorities the power to take reasonable action they need 'for the benefit of the authority, its area or persons resident or present in its area'.

This Council supports the Local Government Association in its campaign for independence for local government based on the following principles:

- i) Councils should retain in full the proceeds of Council Tax and business rates, subject to retaining mechanisms for fairness and redistribution and that both these taxes should be determined by councils alone without central government interference;
- ii) Councils should be granted greater freedoms and flexibilities to drive economic growth;
- iii) Councils should be accountable to their electorates and not to ministers of the Crown;
- iv) The burden of statutory duties and central compliance regimes should be lifted further; and

This Council therefore resolves to work with Surrey's Members of Parliament, the LGA and other Councils to campaign for a far greater devolution of powers from central to local government.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey.

Mr Martin moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

The amendment was as follows (with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through:

'This Council notes the Government announcement on the council tax referendum threshold. This council asserts that it should be for councils and their residents to decide how local services are paid for, not Whitehall. The ballot box on local election-day allows for people to pass judgement on their councils.

~~This Council believes in local government as one of the cornerstones of democracy in the UK, championing the needs and ambitions of the people it represents and that decisions made on behalf of a community are best made by those in the community.~~

This Council notes the Prime Minister's acknowledgement that local government is the most efficient part of the public sector.

Council further notes the General Power of Competence introduced in the Localism Act 2011 giving local authorities power to do anything that individuals of full legal capacity may do giving authorities the power to take reasonable action they need 'for the benefit of the authority, its area or persons resident or present in its area'.

This Council supports the Local Government Association and the County Council Network (CCN) in ~~its~~ their campaigns for independence for local government based on the following principles:

- (i) Councils should retain in full the proceeds of Council Tax and business rates, subject to retaining mechanisms for fairness and redistribution and that both these taxes should be determined by councils alone without central government interference;
- ii) Councils should be granted greater freedoms and flexibilities to drive economic growth;
- iii) Councils should be accountable to their electorates and not to ministers of the Crown;

- iv) The burden of statutory duties and central compliance regimes should be lifted further; and

This Council therefore resolves to work with Surrey's Members of Parliament, the LGA, CCN and other Councils to campaign for a far greater devolution of powers from central to local government.

Both Mrs Watson and Mr Cooksey agreed to accept the amendment to the motion and therefore it became the substantive motion.

Three Members spoke on the substantive motion, with the following points being made:

- The amendment had strengthened the original motion
- Surrey County Council needed more control over its own destiny
- Slight caution was expressed re: (iv) – the burden of statutory duties and central compliance regimes should be lifted further

After the debate, the substantive motion was put to the vote and it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes the Government announcement on the council tax referendum threshold. This council asserts that it should be for councils and their residents to decide how local services are paid for, not Whitehall. The ballot box on local election-day allows for people to pass judgement on their councils.

This Council notes the Prime Minister's acknowledgement that local government is the most efficient part of the public sector.

Council further notes the General Power of Competence introduced in the Localism Act 2011 giving local authorities power to do anything that individuals of full legal capacity may do giving authorities the power to take reasonable action they need 'for the benefit of the authority, its area or persons resident or present in its area'.

This Council supports the Local Government Association and the County Council Network (CCN) in their campaigns for independence for local government based on the following principles:

- (i) Councils should retain in full the proceeds of Council Tax and business rates, subject to retaining mechanisms for fairness and redistribution and that both these taxes should be determined by councils alone without central government interference;
- ii) Councils should be granted greater freedoms and flexibilities to drive economic growth;
- iii) Councils should be accountable to their electorates and not to ministers of the Crown;
- iv) The burden of statutory duties and central compliance regimes should be lifted further; and

This Council therefore resolves to work with Surrey's Members of Parliament, the LGA, CCN and other Councils to campaign for a far greater devolution of powers from central to local government.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45pm and resumed at 2.00pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mr Bennison, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Goodwin, Mrs Hammond, Mr Hickman, Mrs Hicks, Mrs Moseley, Mr Norman, Mr Pitt, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Selleck, Mr Skellett, Mr Townsend and Mrs Young.

7/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 5 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix D.

A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below:

(Q1) Mr Ellwood suggested that another provider may come forward to run Redwood and asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care for the service's viewpoint. He also urged the Cabinet Member to relocate existing residents as soon as possible to nearby homes in Guildford. The Cabinet Member considered that it was unlikely that an alternative provider would come forward because the building did not meet the standards of a modern quality care home in relation to assisted bathrooms. He also confirmed that the service was working closely with residents and their families to discuss their options and support them in looking for alternative provision.

(Q3) Mrs Mason referred to the Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) in a previous Administration, when the Authority had been advised to reduce their number and considered that this had not happened. **Mr Essex** asked for details on how the County Council benchmarked against other Councils. The Leader of the Council stated that Surrey County Council was open and transparent and confirmed that it benchmarked well against other Councils. He also said that the SRAs were approved by Members at County Council meetings.

(Q4) Mr Robert Evans considered that the response to his question had not answered it. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and the Environment responded and said that he had given a full answer, which set out the many improvements that had been made since 1968 and in particular, the last 10 years. He said that officers had been extremely busy dealing with the current flooding issues and thanked all staff involved in this current emergency. Finally, he said that Surrey County Council was the lead authority on flood risk and that a report on Surrey's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy would be presented to a forthcoming Cabinet meeting.

(Q5) Mr Jenkins asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services what measures the County Council would take if the proposals for Surrey Fire and Rescue (SF&R) in Spelthorne were unacceptable. **Mrs Mason** expressed concern about the second team and requested that these were addressed. The Cabinet Member for Community Services said that the decision relating to changes to the deployment of fire engines in the Spelthorne area had already been made by Cabinet at its meeting on 4 February 2014 and that a business case would now be developed and considered by the Communities Select Committee. She also stressed the importance of a strategic vision across the county for SF&R and confirmed that risks would be included in the strategy.

8/14 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were no local Member statements.

9/14 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 17 December 2013 and 4 February 2014.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Cabinet Member for Community Services referred to her statement relating to the Tower Awards, which had been included in the agenda papers.

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A *Confident in our Future*, Corporate Strategy 2014 – 2019

The Leader of the Council said that the Corporate Strategy clearly set out the Council's priorities for 2014/15 and was intertwined with the Budget recommendations.

RESOLVED:

That *Confident in our Future*, the Corporate Strategy 2014 - 2019, as set out in Annex1 to the submitted report, be agreed.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Surrey Cycling Strategy
- Quarterly Report on Decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 October – 31 December 2013

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 17 December 2013 and 4 February 2014 be adopted.

10/14 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance presented his committee's Annual Report 2012/13.

RESOLVED:

That the Audit and Governance Committee's Annual Report 2012/13 to Council be noted.

11/14 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET [Item 11]

No notification had been received from Members wishing to raise a question or make a statement on any of the matters in the minutes, by the deadline.

[Meeting ended at: 2.25pm]

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

County Council Meeting –18 March 2014

REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Cabinet met on 4 and 25 February 2014.

In accordance with the Constitution, Members can ask questions of the appropriate Cabinet Member, seek clarification or make a statement on any of these issues without giving notice.

The minutes containing the individual decisions for 4 and 25 February meetings are included within the agenda at item 12. Cabinet responses to Committee reports are included in or appended to the minutes. If any Member wishes to raise a question or make a statement on any of the matters in the minutes, notice must be given to Democratic Services by 12 noon on the last working day before the County Council meeting (Monday 17 March 2014).

For members of the public all non-confidential reports are available on the web site (www.surreycc.gov.uk) or on request from Democratic Services.

1. STATEMENTS/UPDATES FROM CABINET MEMBERS

None.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

25 February 2014

A ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES

1. The Cabinet at its meeting on 25 February 2014 considered the report on the admission arrangements for September 2015 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Schemes. The recommendations and reasons for recommendations considered by Cabinet are attached at Appendix 1.
2. However, Esher CofE High School became an academy on 1 March 2014. As an academy, the school's governing body and not Surrey County Council is responsible for determining the school's admission arrangements. As it is no longer within the remit of Surrey's Full Council to determine the admission arrangements of Esher CofE High School, Recommendation 7 has been withdrawn and has been deferred to the school for a decision.

The full report is available as part of the 25 February 2014 Cabinet agenda on the County Council's website.

3. The report covered the following areas in relation to school admissions:

- Auriol Junior School (Stoneleigh, Ewell) - Recommendation 1
- Reigate Priory School (Reigate) – Recommendation 2
- St Ann’s Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 3
- Meadowcroft Infant School (Chertsey) and St Ann’s Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 4
- Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools (Thames Ditton) – Recommendation 5
- Admission criteria for two year olds applying for nursery - Recommendation 6
- Esher CofE High School (Esher) – Recommendation 7 **(NOW WITHDRAWN)**
- St Andrew’s CofE (Controlled) Infant School (Farnham) – Recommendation 8
- Published Admission Number for Year 3 at The Dawnay School (Great Bookham) – Recommendation 9
- Published Admission Number for Reception at North Downs Primary School (Brockham) – Recommendation 10
- Own admission authority schools to be used in the assessment of ‘nearest school’ – Recommendation 11
- Out of County schools not to be used in the assessment of ‘nearest school’ – Recommendation 12
- Published Admission Numbers for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 13
- Admission arrangements for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 14
- Coordinated Admissions Schemes – Recommendation 15

4. **The Cabinet RECOMMENDS that the County Council agrees the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2015 for Surrey’s Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Schemes:**

- (1) A feeder link is introduced for Auriol Junior School for children attending The Mead Infant School for September 2015, as follows:
 - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Children attending The Mead Infant School
 - d) Siblings not admitted under c) above
 - e) Any other children

- (2) That tiered sibling criteria are introduced for Reigate Priory for September 2015, as follows:
 - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
 - f) Any other children

- (3) That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children attending Meadowcroft Infant School for September 2015, in addition to the existing feeder link with Trumps Green Infant School, as follows:
- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings
 - d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School or Meadowcroft Infant School
 - e) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
 - f) Any other children
- (4) That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School for September 2015 so that these schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.
- (5) That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools for September 2015 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.
- (6) That criteria for admission to nursery for two year olds who are eligible for the free extended provision are introduced for September 2015, as follows:
- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Children who will have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
 - d) Any other children
- (7) That, subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to admission arrangements as they have proposed, the catchment area for Esher CofE High School is extended for September 2015 to include the whole of Claygate village.
(NOW WITHDRAWN)
- (8) That admission priority based on a catchment is introduced for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School for September 2015 so that, after siblings, children who live within the published catchment area for the school would receive priority for a place ahead of those who do not, as follows:
- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings
 - d) Children living within the catchment area of St Andrew's CofE Infant School
 - e) Any other children
- (9) That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay is decreased from 30 to 15 for September 2015.
- (10) That the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School is decreased from 64 to 60 for September 2015.

- (11) That Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic School and St Andrew's Catholic School are added to the list of own admission authority schools which will be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.
- (12) That Camelsdale Primary School in West Sussex is discounted for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.
- (13) That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2015 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report, which include the following changes:
- i. Bell Farm Primary School – removal of Junior PAN
 - ii. Bishop David Brown – increase in PAN from 120 to 150
 - iii. Esher High School – increase in PAN from 210 to 240
 - iv. Holmesdale Community Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 90 to 120
 - v. The Hythe Community Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
 - vi. Manorcroft Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 58 to 60
 - vii. Meath Green Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 70 to 90
 - viii. Onslow Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
 - ix. St Ann's Heath Junior - increase in Junior PAN from 64 to 90
 - x. St Mary's C of E (VC) Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 25 to 30
 - xi. Stamford Green Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- (14) That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2015, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Appendix 1 and its Annexes of the Cabinet report.
- (15) That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2015/16 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report.

B FORMATION OF WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

1. The Cabinet at its meeting on 25 February 2014 considered the report on the formation of Woking Joint Committee, which will be the first of its kind to be established in Surrey. The full report is available as part of 25 February 2014 Cabinet agenda on the County Council's website. The objectives of the Joint Committee are to improve outcomes and value for money for residents and businesses in Woking by strengthening local democracy and improving partnership working through joint decision making.
2. The development of the Joint Committee builds on the strong track record of joint and collaborative working to date between both authorities in a number of areas of corporate activity planning and service delivery. As the Woking Joint Committee will be a Joint Committee of both Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council, functions from both authorities can be delegated to it and affords full voting rights to

all members. The Joint Committee will also be able to oversee projects jointly funded by both authorities.

- 3 The Joint Committee will operate under its own standing orders, although it will be bound by approved policies, budgets and financial regulations of the council delegating the functions. Although decision making in relation to delegated matters will be dealt with by the joint committee, the day-to-day operational arrangements relating to those functions will be continue to be managed within the respective authority responsible for the function.

4. The Cabinet agreed:

(1) To recommend that the Council agrees to establish Woking Joint Committee to deal with both executive and non-executive functions from 1 June 2014 in place of the current Local Committee in Woking which will cease to function from that date.

(2) As set out in Appendix 2, to:

- delegate the current Local Committee executive functions to the Woking Joint Committee
- delegate the Surrey County Council element of the new joint SCC/WBC executive functions to the Joint Committee
- recommend to Council to delegate the current non-executive functions delegated to the Local Committee to the Woking Joint Committee
- agree the advisory functions that will come under the remit of the Woking Joint Committee.

(3) To note the functions that Woking Borough Council have delegated to the Woking Joint Committee as set out in Appendix 2.

(4) To agree the Woking Joint Committee Constitution, including the Standing Orders under which it will operate, as set out in Appendix 2, and delegate authority to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to agree to any minor amendments to the Constitution which may be required.

5. The Cabinet RECOMMENDS that the County Council agrees:

- a. To establish Woking Joint Committee to deal with both executive and non-executive functions from 1 June 2014 in place of the current Local Committee in Woking which will cease to function from that date.
- b. To delegate the current non-executive functions delegated to the Local Committee to the Woking Joint Committee
- c. To the relevant changes to the County Council's Constitution to enable the Joint Committee to be established and become operational, as set out in Appendix 3, and notes that the Constitution of the Woking Joint Committee (Appendix 2) will be annexed to the County Council's constitution.

CABINET IS ASKED TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL:

A. CONSULTATION ON SURREY'S ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND CO-ORDINATED SCHEMES

It is recommended that Cabinet make the following recommendations to the County Council:

Recommendation 1

A feeder link is introduced for Auriol Junior School for children attending The Mead Infant School for September 2015, as follows:

- f) Looked after and previously looked after children
- g) Exceptional social/medical need
- h) Children attending The Mead Infant School
- i) Siblings not admitted under c) above
- j) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other schools which have a feeder link and reciprocal sibling links
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within close proximity
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There was overall support for this proposal
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at The Mead Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Auriol Junior School

Recommendation 2

That tiered sibling criteria are introduced for Reigate Priory for September 2015, as follows:

- g) Looked after and previously looked after children
- h) Exceptional social/medical need
- i) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- j) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- k) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- l) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings in to the same school, this would only apply if it is not their

nearest school

- The pressure on places means that on balance a greater disadvantage might be caused to local families than to future siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- There was overall support for this proposal
- It reduces the likelihood of local families having to travel to schools that are further away

Recommendation 3

That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children attending Meadowcroft Infant School for September 2015, in addition to the existing feeder link with Trumps Green Infant School, as follows:

- g) Looked after and previously looked after children
- h) Exceptional social/medical need
- i) Siblings
- j) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School or Meadowcroft Infant School
- k) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
- l) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Meadowcroft Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to St Ann's Heath Junior School

Recommendation 4

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School for September 2015 so that these schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 5

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools for September 2015 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 6

That criteria for admission to nursery for two year olds who are eligible for the free extended provision are introduced for September 2015, as follows:

- e) Looked after and previously looked after children
- f) Exceptional social/medical need
- g) Children who will have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
- h) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for clear, fair and transparent criteria
- The criteria are consistent to those used for other years of entry
- They are lawful and comply with the School Admissions Code
- They will enable parents to understand how places will be allocated at nurseries which choose to admit children at two years old
- It supports the Government's agenda of extending free nursery provision to families on low income

Recommendation 7 (now withdrawn)

That, subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to admission arrangements as they have proposed, the catchment area for Esher CofE High School is extended for September 2015 to include the whole of Claygate village.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for families in Claygate to have a greater opportunity of being offered a local Surrey school
- It coincides with an increase in PAN at Esher High thereby minimising the impact on other families applying for Esher High
- There was overwhelming support for this proposal
- This proposal is linked to a separate proposal by Hinchley Wood School to extend its catchment area and to introduce feeder links which, if not introduced in line with this proposal, would lead to an untenable increase in applications for Esher High. This recommendation is therefore conditional on the changes at Hinchley Wood being agreed before this recommendation is ratified by Full Council
- If Esher High School becomes an Academy on 1 March 2014, before ratification of the recommendation by Full Council, the school's Governing Body will need to ratify the recommendation of Cabinet in order to ensure the admission arrangements have been lawfully determined

Recommendation 8

That admission priority based on a catchment is introduced for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School for September 2015 for children who are siblings, children who

live within the published catchment area for the school would receive priority for a place ahead of those who do not, as follows:

- f) Looked after and previously looked after children
- g) Exceptional social/medical need
- h) Siblings
- i) Children living within the catchment area of St Andrew's CofE Infant School
- j) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It helps to support the future viability of this school
- It provides for a joined up approach to admissions in the area of Farnham
- It helps to protect the existing feeder link from St Andrew's to South Farnham School
- It is supported by the Governing Body of St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School as it is recognised that this is a step towards formalising the links between these schools

Recommendation 9

That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay is decreased from 30 to 15 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will provide for a better use of resources within the school
- It will reduce the impact of in year admissions on the school
- It will not lead to a pressure on school places because the number will better reflect numbers on roll
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 10

That the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School is decreased from 64 to 60 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will enable the school to meet its duty with regard to infant class size legislation
- It will enable the school to optimise the most efficient use of its sites
- It will reflect the number that the school is working to maintain after the initial offers are made
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 11

That Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic School and St Andrew's Catholic School are added to the list of own admission authority schools which will be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that there will be a consistent approach in selecting schools which will be taken in to account when assessing 'nearest school' when applying the admission arrangements of community and voluntary controlled schools
- It ensures that there is equity in the application of admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools County wide

Recommendation 12

That Camelsdale Primary School in West Sussex is discounted for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that families who live nearer to Camelsdale Primary School but who are unlikely to be offered a place there will not be disadvantaged in their applications for their nearest community Surrey school
- It is consistent with the approach taken with other out of County schools for which Surrey parents are generally unsuccessful based on catchment

Recommendation 13

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2015 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report, which include the following changes:

- xii. Bell Farm Primary School – removal of Junior PAN
- xiii. Bishop David Brown – increase in PAN from 120 to 150
- xiv. Esher High School – increase in PAN from 210 to 240
- xv. Holmesdale Community Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- xvi. The Hythe Community Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- xvii. Manorcroft Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 58 to 60
- xviii. Meath Green Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 70 to 90
- xix. Onslow Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xx. St Ann's Heath Junior - increase in Junior PAN from 64 to 90
- xxi. St Mary's C of E (VC) Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 25 to 30
- xxii. Stamford Green Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where a decrease in PAN is proposed the decrease has already been agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school
- Where increases in PAN are proposed the schools are increasing their intake to respond to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2014 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 14

That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2015, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Appendix 1 and its Annexes of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The existing arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey's sustainability policies

Recommendation 15

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2015/16 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2015 are similar to 2014
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

**Woking Joint Committee
Constitution**

Section 1 Context and Purpose

Section 2 Functions and Funding

(A) General Remit

(B) Delegated Powers

(C) Funding

(D) Withdrawal from the Joint Committee

Section 3 Standing Orders

Section 1 – Context and Purpose

Woking Joint Committee is a Joint Committee of Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council and is set up under the provisions of Section 102 of the Local Government Act 1972. The Joint Committee aims to improve outcomes and value for money for residents in Woking by strengthening local democracy and improving partnership working within the borough of Woking.

The Joint Committee will carry out Surrey County Council functions previously performed by the Local Committee (Woking) (which ceased to exist on 01/06/2014) plus some additional new advisory County Council functions, and functions delegated to it by Woking Borough Council. These functions are set out within Section 2 of this document.

By working together, the Joint Committee will provide the opportunity to identify local solutions and seek to jointly deliver local government service improvements for the residents, businesses and visitors to Woking. Both councils will be proactive in bringing issues to the Joint Committee and seeking to deliver local priorities together.

Meetings of the Woking Joint Committee are held in public, and local people are able to participate during parts of the meeting as set out in Section 3 of this document.

This Constitution includes the standing orders that will apply to the Joint Committee. These need also to be read in the light of the individual Constitutions of each of the two Councils which will continue to apply as appropriate to decisions delegated by each relevant authority.

Whilst the Joint Committee will be responsible for making decisions relating to the delegated functions as set out below, the day-to-day operational arrangements relating to any particular function will continue to be managed by the local authority having responsibility for that function.

Section 2 – Functions and Funding

The scope and overall purpose of the Woking Joint Committee is as set out in Section 1. The general remit of the Joint Committee is set out below and the more specific delegated functions are outlined in later sections.

(A) General Remit

The general remit of the Woking Joint Committee is:-

1. To make decisions on local services and budgets delegated to it by either Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council.
2. To make comments on policy, strategy, services, priority community work, or other matters specifically referred to it by the County Council or the Borough Council
3. To provide political oversight of key County and Borough partnership initiatives and strategies.
4. To discuss opportunities for a closer alignment of County and Borough services in Woking.
5. To seek solutions to local concerns relating to Council services under the remit of the Joint Committee.
6. To identify and set local priorities through an annual priority setting meeting.
7. To build community leadership and local engagement, and encourage local community resilience plans.
8. To ensure that local authority services within Woking borough are carried out in accordance with both Surrey County Council's and Woking Borough Council's core values, policies, strategies and within approved budgets.

(B) Delegated Powers

The services identified below are delegated by Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council as indicated, for decision making or consideration by the Woking Joint Committee, in accordance with the relevant legislation.

In discharging the delegated powers, the Woking Joint Committee must have due regard at all times to the approved policies, budgets and financial regulations of the Council delegating the functions, and act in accordance with Standing Orders at Section 3 of this Constitution.

Set out below is a list of the functions that are currently delegated to the Woking Joint Committee. Additional functions and matters for determination may be delegated to the Committee in the future by Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council, which will form part of this Constitution. The Community Partnership and Committee Officer will maintain a record of all additional delegated functions and will ensure that any such additions are reported to the Joint Committee at the next meeting after the delegation takes place.

Executive Functions (delegated by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council)

The Joint Committee will be responsible for the following decisions on local services and budgets:

In relation to the Borough of Woking the Joint Committee will take decisions delegated to it by the SCC Leader and/or Cabinet and/or the WBC Leader and/or Executive on the following local services and budgets, to be taken in accordance with the financial framework and policies of the respective Councils within a framework of agreed performance and resources:

- (i) Changes which amount to more than 15% in the hours of opening for local libraries (whether managed directly by Surrey County Council or under a community partnership agreement.) (SCC)
- (ii) Community safety funding that is delegated to the Joint Committee (SCC/WBC).
- (iii) Decisions in relation to highways and infrastructure:
 - a. The allocation of the Surrey County Council highway capital budget and highway revenue budget which are devolved to the Joint Committee for minor highway improvements, and highway maintenance, within the committee's area including the scope to use a proportion of either budget to facilitate local highways initiatives (SCC).
 - b. To allocate funds to review on-street parking management, including local parking charges where appropriate and to

- approve the statutory advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) relating to on-street parking controls (SCC).
- c. To agree local speed limits on county council roads within their area, and to approve the statutory advertisement of speed limit orders, taking into account the advice of the Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team and with regard to the County Council Speed Limit Policy (SCC).
 - d. To approve the statutory advertisement of all legal orders or appropriate notifications relating to highway schemes within the delegated powers of the Joint Committee (SCC).
 - e. Where, under delegated powers, the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager or Area Team Manager has chosen to refer the decision on whether a TRO should be made to the Joint Committee, the committee will make that decision (SCC).
 - f. Oversee and determine priorities for the Woking Town Centre Management Agreement. (WBC)
- (iv) Consider how Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts will be expended in Woking, taking into account the approved Infrastructure Capacity Study and Delivery Plan (IDP) for Woking. (WBC)
 - (v) In relation to services for young people, with the aim of achieving an integrated approach from Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council (SCC/WBC):
 - a) To agree joint priorities for commissioning by the County Council and the Borough Council in Woking for provision of:
 - i) youth work and
 - ii) other preventative work with young people who are at risk of becoming not in education, training or employment (NEET).
 - b) To apportion delegated funding for young people, specifically the distribution between Local Prevention Framework Grants and Individual Prevention Grants categories of funding, in accordance with the allocated budget and small grants (youth) as allocated by the Borough Council.
 - c) Approve the award of the Local Prevention Framework for the provision of local prevention services for Woking Borough in accordance with the allocated budget and to qualified providers. This power to be exercised by the County Council Portfolio Holder in the event that the Joint Committee is unable to award grant(s) (due to the presence of conflicts of interest which result in the body being inquorate).

- d) Approve the award of youth service related commission(s) as delegated to the Joint Committee by Woking Borough Council.
- e) Oversee and determine priorities for the Full Participation Programme and make appropriate linkages into the work of Services for Young People and Woking Borough Council
- (vi) Oversee and influence priorities for the Family Support Programme in Woking and monitor its performance. (SCC/WBC)
- (vii) Determine priorities for collaborative work undertaken within the committee's area by the Councils and other partners. (SCC/WBC).

Non-Executive Functions (delegated by Surrey County Council)

The Joint Committee will deal with all those non-executive functions relating to public rights of way set out in the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, as amended, except for those separately referred to in the County Council's Scheme of Delegation (or within the terms of reference of other Committees).

Non-Executive Functions (delegated by Woking Borough Council)

- (i) Oversee and determine priorities for the Borough based community strategy and related local plans within Woking.
- (ii) Oversee and determine priorities for the implementation of the Infrastructure Capacity Study and Delivery Plan (IDP).

In addition, the Joint Committee will deal with those relevant non-executive functions, relating to joint working that may be delegated to it by the Borough Council from time to time.

Service Monitoring, Scrutiny & Issues of Local Concern- advisory functions

The Joint Committee may:

- (i) In relation to the exercise of County Council Executive functions relating to Members allocations, receive a report on all projects approved under delegated authority of the Community Partnership Manager or Team Leader. (SCC)
- (ii) In relation to Community Highway Enhancement allocations, receive a report on all projects approved by Individual Members of the County Council under delegated authority, or by the Area Team Manager where Members have requested that their

- allocations be combined to be spent in one or more divisions. (SCC)
- (iii) Monitor formal decisions taken by officers under delegated powers and provide feedback to improve service standards. (SCC/WBC)
 - (iv) Engage in issues of concern to local people and seek to influence the respective Councils in the light of local needs. (SCC/WBC)
 - (v) Monitor the quality of services provided locally, and recommend action as appropriate. (SCC)
 - (vi) Support Surrey Schools, strengthening links with Headteachers and Governing Bodies to promote the outcomes of increased investment for safer, better schools focussed on raising the standards of education for all children.
 - (vii) Be informed in relation to the prioritisation of proposed and planned infrastructure schemes, or developer funded highway improvements within Woking. (SCC)
 - (viii) Be informed of and receive appropriate reports on highway initiatives and/or improvements either wholly or partly in Woking. (SCC)
 - (ix) Oversee local initiatives agreed and funded by the Joint Committee. (SCC/WBC)
 - (x) Oversee on-street parking enforcement including financials in its area subject to terms of reference, agreed by the committee, which best suit its particular local circumstances. (SCC)
 - (xi) Oversee and scrutinise the impact of the Local Prevention Framework in accordance with prevention priorities for young people not in education, employment or training (NEET), in the local area. (SCC)
 - (xii) Be advised of the Joint Youth Estates Strategy for Woking Borough. (SCC/WBC)
 - (xiii) To provide political oversight and advice on the Community Safety functions of the Borough. (SCC/WBC)
 - (xiv) To act as the local Health and Wellbeing Board for Woking and oversee and set priorities for general health and wellbeing matters within the framework of Surrey's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. (SCC/WBC)
 - (xv) Be consulted on any issues referred to it by either Council and produce responses as appropriate. (SCC/WBC)

(Note: A joint committee may not make any decision which will have an adverse effect on a part of the county for which it does not have functions).

(C) Funding

- (i) With regards to budget setting and planning, the County Council and Woking Borough Council will agree each year the amount of funding available to the Joint Committee to carry out its delegated decisions. All funds will be held and administered by the originating authorities and

spent in accordance with their respective financial regulations and policies.

- (ii) Provision of venue:
The meeting's venue and associated costs will normally be provided by Woking Borough Council, unless alternative arrangements are agreed by Surrey County Council.
- (iii) Committee management:
Committee management and associated costs (as set out in paragraph 3.1) for the Joint Committee will be provided by Surrey County Council.
- (iv) Any resulting Joint Committee members' costs and expenses will be funded and administered by their respective authorities.

(D) Withdrawal from the Joint Committee

At any time either Council may give 6 months' notice in writing to the other Council of its intention to withdraw from the Joint Committee. Once the Joint Committee ceases to exist the functions delegated to it would each revert back to the relevant delegating authority.

SECTION 3 - STANDING ORDERS

1. MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS AT MEETINGS

- 1.1. Membership of the Woking Joint Committee shall be all county councillors with electoral divisions in Woking, one Surrey County Council Cabinet Member (who may also be a county councillor with an electoral division in Woking), and an equivalent number of borough councillors who should be politically proportionate to the borough council. At least one borough councillor shall be a member of that council's Executive. No substitutes will be permitted for the members on the Joint Committee. Members will be appointed to the committee at the first business meeting of the respective Council, at the start of each municipal year. All borough and county councillors on the Joint Committee will have equal voting rights on all issues being considered.
- 1.2. A person shall cease to be a member if he/she ceases to be a member of the County Council, a member representing an electoral division in Woking or the relevant Cabinet Member, or in the case of a member of the Borough Council, ceases to be a member of that Council, or the relevant Executive Member or resigns from the Woking Joint Committee.
- 1.3. Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council may, through their respective Councils, co-opt representatives from the voluntary sector, public authorities or businesses in Woking onto the Joint Committee. These representatives will be able to take part in discussions on agenda items, but will not be able to vote on any item for decision.
- 1.4. The Leader of either Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council, or appropriate Surrey County Council Cabinet Member or Woking Borough Council Executive Member with portfolio responsibilities for a matter on the agenda of the joint committee meeting may attend the meeting of the committee and, with the chairman's consent, speak on the matter or provide written representation.

2. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

- 2.1. The Chairman (who will be a County Councillor) and Vice-Chairman (who shall be a member of the Borough Council's Executive) shall be elected at the first business meeting of the County Council or the Borough Council as appropriate, of each municipal year.
- 2.2. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall, unless he or she resigns the office or ceases to be a member of the Woking Joint Committee, continue in office until a successor is appointed.
- 2.3. In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman at a meeting, the members of the Committee shall elect a chairman for that meeting.

3. MANAGEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE

- 3.1. The County Council's Community Partnership's Team shall act as the Committee Manager for the Woking Joint Committee and shall be responsible for preparing and circulating agendas for meetings, advising on constitutional matters and for producing the decisions and minutes.

4. FORMAL MEETINGS

- 4.1. There shall be between 4 and 8 formal meetings of the Woking Joint Committee each year as determined by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and as set out in the calendar of meetings published on the council's website.
- 4.2. The Chairman or in his/her absence the Vice-Chairman, may call a special meeting of the Woking Joint Committee to consider a matter that falls within its remit but cannot await the next scheduled meeting, provided at least seven clear working days notice in writing is given to the Committee Manager.
- 4.3. Formal meetings of the Joint Committee and its sub-committees shall be held in public except when exempt or confidential information is being considered and the press and public can be excluded in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
- 4.4. Meetings of any working groups or task groups established by the Joint Committee shall, unless otherwise agreed, be held in private.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

- 5.1. The delegated powers mean those powers to be discharged by the Woking Joint Committee as set out in Section 2(B) of this Constitution.
- 5.2. The Woking Joint Committee shall discharge the delegated powers, within the budgetary and policy framework set by Surrey County Council in the case of County functions or by Woking Borough Council in the case of borough functions.
- 5.3. When discharging the delegated powers the Woking Joint Committee shall take decisions only after taking into account advice given in writing or orally from relevant Officers of Surrey County Council or of Woking Borough Council as appropriate, including legal, financial and policy advice.
- 5.4. If the Joint Committee is to make a Key Executive decision delegated to it by either Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council, then the Joint Committee must follow the constitution of the authority delegating the decision, including publishing it in the monthly forward plan of that authority.

6. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

- 6.1. Executive decisions made by the Woking Joint Committee are subject to scrutiny by Surrey County Council's or Woking Borough Council's relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee (depending on which authority delegated the particular function), including an Overview and Scrutiny Committee's right under the Local Government Act 2000 to request that an Executive Decision made but not implemented be reconsidered by the decision-taker (often referred to as 'call-in').
- 6.2. The processes and procedures for the exercise by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee of their 'call-in' function shall be in accordance with the Constitutions of Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council depending on which authority delegated the executive decision in question.
- 6.3. Referral of Joint Committee Executive decisions by either Surrey County Council Cabinet or Woking Borough Council Executive (dependant on who delegated the function)
 - 6.3.1. The SCC Cabinet/WBC Executive may require referral, for review and final determination, any executive decision taken by the Joint Committee which has significant policy or budgetary implications or is outside of the authority delegated to the Joint Committee, subject to notice of requirement for referral being given within 5 working days of publication of the decision.
 - 6.3.2. Notice of referral may be given by the Leader or Deputy Leader of the relevant authority, or any three or more members of the SCC Cabinet/WBC Executive as appropriate.
 - 6.3.3. All members of the Joint Committee will be notified that an executive decision taken by the Committee has been required for referral by SCC Cabinet/WBC Executive.
 - 6.3.4. The decision will be considered by the SCC Cabinet/WBC Executive at its next appropriate meeting in discussion with the Joint Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman and no action will be taken to implement it in the meantime.
 - 6.3.5. The Joint Committee Chairman or Vice-Chairman may attend the SCC Cabinet/WBC Executive meeting, as appropriate, for the consideration of the matter and speak on the item.
 - 6.3.6. The SCC Cabinet/WBC Executive may accept, reject or amend the decision taken by the Joint Committee. A report on the decision taken by the Cabinet/ Executive will be made to the next appropriate meeting of the Joint Committee, and to all the Members of either Surrey or Woking Council, as appropriate, for information.

The following general provisions apply to the consideration of all matters within Woking Joint Committee's remit.

7. NOTICE OF MEETING

- 7.1. The date, time and place of the fixed meetings of the Woking Joint Committee will be accessed through both the Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council websites. The notice, agenda, reports and other documents prepared for the Woking Joint Committee will be posted on the Surrey County Council website (with links from the Woking Borough Council website) and sent to Members of the Committee not less than seven clear working days before the date of the meeting.
- 7.2. Only the business on the agenda will be discussed at a meeting of the Woking Joint Committee except for urgent matters raised in accordance with the provisions in the Constitution or Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

8. SPECIAL MEETINGS

- 8.1. A special meeting of the Woking Joint Committee will be convened to consider specific matters within its terms of reference at the discretion of the Chairman, or the Vice-Chairman in his/her absence. At least seven clear working days notice of a special meeting must be given.

9. AGENDAS

- 9.1. Woking Joint Committee will comply with the Access to Information rules in Part VA of the Local Government Act 1972.
- 9.2. Agendas for meetings of the Woking Joint Committee shall be dispatched by the Committee Manager seven clear working days in advance of a meeting, and copies will be made available for public inspection at the designated County and Borough Council offices, libraries and via the County Council and Woking Borough Council websites.
- 9.3. Members of the Woking Joint Committee may suggest items for inclusion in the agenda within its remit. These will be added to the forward programme in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Woking Joint Committee.

10. DECISIONS AND MINUTES

- 10.1. The decisions from the meeting shall be published on the County Council's website, with links from the Woking Borough website, within three clear working days of the Committee.

- 10.2. The minutes of a meeting shall be published on the County Council's website, with relevant links, as soon as is reasonably practicable.
- 10.3. At the meeting, the Chairman will move the formal motion "That the minutes of the last meeting be confirmed and signed by the chairman" and there may only be discussion if there is disagreement about their accuracy which will be resolved by a vote in the normal way.
- 10.4. Where in relation to any meeting, the next meeting for the purpose of signing the minutes is a meeting called under paragraph 3 of schedule 12 to the Local Government Act 1972 (an Extraordinary Meeting), then the next following meeting (being a meeting called otherwise than under that paragraph) will be treated as a suitable meeting for the purposes of signing of minutes.

11. CONFIDENTIALITY OF PAPERS

- 11.1. All Members must respect the confidentiality of any papers made available to them for the purpose of meetings of the Woking Joint Committee or otherwise for so long as those papers remain confidential.

Failure to observe

- 11.2. Any or all of the rights conferred on a Member of the Council under the Constitution may be withdrawn by the Council if it is satisfied that he/she has not observed the requirements of Standing Order 11.1 in relation to any of its papers.

12. QUORUM

- 12.1. The Chairman will adjourn the meeting if there is not a quorum present.
- 12.2. The quorum will be one quarter of the total number of voting members of the Committee. A quorum may not be fewer than three voting members.

13. MEMBER QUESTIONS TO THE WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

- 13.1. Any Member of either Council may, with the Chairman's consent, ask one or more questions on matters within the terms of reference of the committee.
- 13.2. Notice of questions must be given in writing to the Community Partnerships Team by 12 noon four working days before the meeting. If the day in question is a Bank Holiday then notice of questions should be received by 12 noon on the previous working day.

- 13.3. Questions may be asked without notice if the Chairman decides that the matter is urgent.
- 13.4. Where a Member has given notice of a question and is absent from the meeting another Member may ask it on his/her behalf.
- 13.5. Every question will be put and answered.
- 13.6. Copies of all questions will be circulated to Members before the start of the meeting.
- 13.7. Questions may be answered orally or in writing.
- 13.8. If the Chairman is unable to answer any question at the meeting he/she may send a written answer to the Member asking the question.
- 13.9. At the discretion of the Chairman, a Member who has given notice of a question may ask one supplementary question relevant to the subject of the original.
- 13.10. A record of all questions and answers will be included in the minutes of the meeting.

14. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

14.1. PETITIONS

- 14.1.1. Any member of the public who lives, works or studies in the Woking Borough area may present a petition, containing 30 or more signatures or at the Chairman's discretion, relating to a matter within the terms of reference of the Committee. The presentation of a petition on the following business will not be allowed:
 - 14.1.1.1. matters which are "confidential" or "exempt" under the Local Government Access to Information Act 1985;
 - 14.1.1.2. planning applications; and
 - 14.1.1.3. matters in relation to a public rights of way under consideration by the Joint Committee.
- 14.1.2. A spokesperson for the petitioners may address the committee on the petition for up to 3 minutes or longer if agreed by the Chairman. Discussion on a petition at the meeting is at the Chairman's discretion. The petition may be referred to the next appropriate meeting of the committee or to the SCC Cabinet, Cabinet Member, WBC Executive or relevant committee of either SCC or WBC at the discretion of the Chairman.

- 14.1.3. Notice must be given in writing to the Community Partnerships Team at least 14 days before the meeting. Alternatively, the petition can be submitted on-line through Surrey County Council's or Woking Borough Council's e-petitions website as long as the minimum number of signatures has been reached 14 days before the meeting.
- 14.1.4. No more than three petitions may be presented at any one meeting of the committee unless agreed otherwise by the Chairman.
- 14.1.5. The Community Partnerships Team may amalgamate within the first received petition other petitions of like effect on the same subject.
- 14.1.6. The presentation of a petition on the same or similar topic as one presented in the last six months may only be permitted at the Chairman's discretion.

14.2. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

- 14.2.1. At the start of any ordinary meeting of the Committee, any member of the public who lives, works or studies in the Woking borough area may ask one question or make a statement relating to a matter within the Committee's terms of reference. The Chairman may alternatively permit the question to be asked or the statement to be made at the start of an item on the agenda if it relates to that item.
- 14.2.2. Questions or statements will not be allowed on matters which are "confidential" or "exempt" under the Local Government Access to Information Act 1985 or on planning applications or on rights of way matters under consideration.
- 14.2.3. Notice of questions or statements must be given in writing or by e-mail to the Community Partnerships Team with details of the question or statement, by 12 noon four working days before the meeting. If the day in question is a Bank Holiday then notice of questions should be received by 12 noon on the previous working day.
- 14.2.4. Written questions or statements must be submitted by the deadline set out in section 14.2.3. The Chairman may alternatively permit questions or statements to be made under relevant agenda items as they consider appropriate during the formal meeting.
- 14.2.5. The Community Partnerships Team may, having consulted a questioner, reword any question or statement received to bring it into proper form and to secure reasonable brevity. Copies will be tabled and made available in the meeting room for members of the Joint Committee and any member of the public in attendance.
- 14.2.6. Questions and statements will be taken in the order in which they are received by the Community Partnerships Team. The provision of answers to questions being asked, any response to statements, and any

discussion of the question or statement will be at the discretion of the Chairman.

14.2.7. Following any initial reply to a question, one or more supplementary question/s in relation to the response provided may be asked by the questioner at the discretion of the Chairman. The provision of answers to supplementary questions being asked and any discussion of these questions will be at the discretion of the Chairman.

14.2.8. The total number of questions which may be asked or statements made at any one meeting will be at the discretion of the Chairman. The Chairman may decide that questions or statements can be held over to the following meeting, or dealt with in writing and may disallow questions or statements which are repetitious.

14.2.9. When dealing with any item in which public participation has occurred, the Chairman shall clarify the point at which such public participation has concluded and the Committee's formal discussion and decision making of the item is taking place.

14.3. PUBLIC SPEAKING IN RELATION TO RIGHTS OF WAY

Rights of Way application decisions are quasi-judicial decisions. They are therefore subject to specific rules. The reason for the rules about public speaking reflect the right of all individuals to a fair hearing.

14.3.1. Members of the public and their representatives may address the Working Joint Committee on any applications relating to public Rights of Way being considered by the committee.

14.3.2. Speakers must first register their wish to speak by telephone or in writing to the Community Partnerships Team by 12 noon one working day before a meeting stating on which item(s) they wish to speak.

14.3.3. Only those people who have previously made written representations in response to a Rights of Way application will be entitled to speak.

14.3.4. Speakers must declare any financial or personal interest they may have in the application.

14.3.5. Registration of speakers will be on a first come first served basis and speakers will be taken in the order in which they are registered, with the first five registered being entitled to speak. Where more than one person has registered an interest to speak, the subsequent speakers will be entitled to speak first if the first named speaker is not in attendance five minutes before the start of the meeting. Representations can be combined if necessary. A reserve list will also be maintained if necessary.

- 14.3.6. The time allowed for public speaking will be limited to 15 minutes for objectors and 15 minutes for supporters per item, and to 3 minutes per speaker.
- 14.3.7. Only if a member of the public or their representative speaks objecting will the applicant/agent be allowed to speak and then only to respond to the points raised by the objectors, and will be limited to 3 minutes for each objector who has spoken.
- 14.3.8. No additional information may be circulated by speakers at the meeting and they will have no right to speak or question Members or officers once they have made their submission.
- 14.3.9. Speeches will precede the committee's formal discussion on each application requiring the committee's attention.
- 14.3.10. The right to speak will only be exercised at the first meeting at which the application is considered and will not normally be the subject of further presentations at any subsequent meeting unless significant changes have taken place after a deferral by the committee.

15. RIGHT TO SPEAK AT COMMITTEE

A Member may only speak once on a motion and amendment except:

- 15.1.1. the mover may reply to the debate but, in doing so, may only answer statements and arguments made in the course of the debate. He/she may not introduce any new matter;
- 15.1.2. the mover of a motion may speak during the debate on any amendment to the motion;
- 15.1.3. a Member who has already spoken may speak on a point of order or may, at the chairman's discretion, explain any statement made by him/her which he/she believes has been misunderstood;
- 15.1.4. the Chairman may speak before the mover of the motion or amendment replies to the debate.
- 15.1.5. A Member seconding any motion or amendment will be deemed to have spoken on it unless he/she speaks immediately and reserves his/her right to speak later.

16. RELEVANCE

Every Member who speaks must direct his/her speech strictly to the motion or matter under discussion, or to a motion or amendment which he/she moves, or to a point of order.

17. POINTS OF ORDER

Any Member wishing to raise a point of order must say at the outset the Standing Order or rule of debate which he/she believes has been infringed. Every point of order will be decided immediately by the chairman whose decision will be final.

18. LENGTH OF SPEECHES

Except with the consent of the chairman, the following time limits will apply to speeches:

(a) The mover of a motion or an amendment. (5 minutes)

(A Member may not speak for more than five minutes unless he/she has a seconder).

(b) The mover of a motion either speaking to an amendment or replying to the debate. (3 minutes)

(c) The mover of an amendment replying to the debate on the amendment. (3 minutes)

(d) The seconder of a motion or an amendment. (3 minutes)

(e) A Member speaking on a report or in a debate. (3 minutes)

19. AFTER REPLY DEBATE IS CLOSED

After the reply is made, the motion or amendment under discussion will be put from the Chair.

20. PROCEDURE FOR MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

Every motion or amendment must be moved and seconded and, if the Chairman requires, must be submitted in writing to the Community Partnerships Team and read aloud before it is put to the meeting.

A Member may not move or second more than one amendment on any motion.

Once moved and seconded, a motion or amendment may not be withdrawn without the consent of the Committee.

With the consent of the Committee a Member may:

- 20.1.1. alter a motion of which he/she has given notice; or
- 20.1.2. with the consent of his/her seconder, alter a motion which he/she has moved.

(In either case, the alteration must be one which could be made as an amendment under the following Standing Order).

21. AMENDMENTS

21.1. Every amendment must be relevant to the motion under discussion and will either:

- 21.1.1. move the reference back
- 21.1.2. leave out words
- 21.1.3. add words, or
- 21.1.4. leave out words and add others.

An amendment which forms the negative of the motion will not be allowed.

Whenever an amendment has been moved and seconded, no subsequent amendment may be moved until the first has been dealt with, unless the Chairman decides otherwise.

If an amendment is lost, other amendments may be moved on the motion.

If an amendment is carried, the motion as amended will become the substantive motion on which further amendments may be moved.

22. PROCEDURAL MOTION

“That the question be now put”

Any Member may, at the close of the speech of another Member, move “That the question be now put”.

If he/she considers that there has been adequate debate, the Chairman may put the motion “That the question be now put” without debate. If the motion is carried:

(a) the Chairman may speak to the motion or amendment under debate, if he/she has not already spoken; and

(b) the mover of the motion or amendment may reply.

The motion or amendment will then be put.

23. INTERRUPTIONS AND DISORDERLY CONDUCT

23.1. If a member of the public interrupts the proceedings at a meeting the Chairman may ask him/her not to interrupt.

23.2. If the interruption continues the Chairman may order his/her removal from the room.

23.3. If there is general disturbance in all or part of the public gallery the Chairman may order that part to be cleared.

23.4. If a Member behaves in a disorderly or disruptive manner, any Member may move, with the consent of the Chairman, “That the named Member be not further heard”. If this motion is seconded it will be put to the vote and determined without discussion.

23.5. If the motion is carried and the misconduct continues the Chairman may adjourn or suspend the sitting of the Committee for as long as he/she considers appropriate.

24. VOTING

24.1. Voting will be by show of hands unless a Member demands a recorded vote. Where a recorded vote is called, the names of those voting for or against the motion or amendment will be recorded and entered in the minutes.

24.2. Where a demand for a recorded vote is not supported, any Member may require his/her vote for or against the motion to be recorded in the minutes.

- 24.3. On a formal motion put from the Chairman (e.g. "That the report be received"), the question may be decided by the voice of the Members, unless any Member demands a show of hands.
- 24.4. If immediately after a vote is taken any Member so requires, the way in which he/she voted (or abstained) will be recorded in the minutes of that meeting.
- 24.5. The person presiding at the meeting, having already voted, may in the event of a tie exercise a second or casting vote.

25. MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT

- 25.1. Members are bound by the Code of Conduct of the authority which appointed them to the Woking Joint Committee and should particularly observe the provisions of their respective Codes concerning the declaration of pecuniary interests when attending meetings of the Woking Joint Committee.

26. INTERESTS OF MEMBERS

- 26.1. At any meeting where a Member becomes aware that a matter under consideration relates to:
- 26.1.1. one of their interests that they must disclose in accordance with their respective council's Codes not already entered on the relevant Council's register and/or
- 26.1.2. the donor of any gift and/or hospitality they have accepted and not yet entered on the relevant Council's register

The Member must disclose the interest to the meeting and, within 28 days, notify this to either the County Council's Monitoring Officer in the case of County Councillors or the Borough Council's Monitoring Officer in the case of Borough Councillors for inclusion in the register.

27. PARTICIPATION IN RELATION TO DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

- 27.1. A Member with a disclosable pecuniary interest in any matter must:
- 27.1.1. not participate in any discussion or vote relating to the matter;
- 27.1.2. withdraw from the room or chamber when it becomes apparent that the matter is being considered at that meeting;
- 27.1.3. not exercise functions in relation to that matter; and

- 27.1.4. not take any steps in relation to the matter (except for the purposes of enabling the matter to be dealt with otherwise than by them) unless he/she has obtained a dispensation from the County Council's Audit and Governance Committee for County Councillors or the Borough Council's Monitoring Officer for Borough Councillors.

28. ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS

- 28.1. Members will sign a register of attendance.

29. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

- 29.1. The Woking Joint Committee may, by resolution, exclude the press and public from a meeting during an item of business wherever it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during that item there would be disclosure of Exempt or Confidential information as defined by the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.

30. SUB-COMMITTEES AND TASK GROUPS

- 30.1. The Woking Joint Committee may appoint:
- 30.1.1. Sub-Committees with power to act to discharge any of its functions as agreed by the Joint Committee.
 - 30.1.2. Task Groups which cannot make decisions but may consider specific matters and report back to a future meeting of the Woking Joint Committee.

31. CONDUCT AT MEETINGS

- 31.1. The conduct of meetings and the interpretation of these Standing Orders are at all times a matter for the Chairman of the meeting whose ruling is final.

32. STANDING ORDERS OF SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL TO APPLY

- Save to the extent that a matter is dealt with in these governance arrangements, the Woking Joint Committee shall be subject to the County Council's Rules of Procedure contained in its Constitution (in so far as they are relevant, and with the necessary changes being made).

If there is any conflict between these governance arrangements and those Rules of Procedure, these governance arrangements shall have precedence.

Changes to the County Council's Constitution

1. ARTICLE 9 – LOCAL COMMITTEES

9.01 Local Committees

The Council will appoint local committees as it sees fit, if it is satisfied that to do so will ensure improved service delivery in the context of best value and more efficient, transparent and accountable decision making. **These may include joint committees appointed by the Council and the relevant District or Borough.**

The Council will consult with relevant parish and town councils and the chairmen of relevant parish meetings when considering whether and how to establish local committees.

The Leader/Cabinet will undertake a review of local committees annually, and make recommendations to the Council on their Constitution, Terms of Reference and Scheme of Delegation. The delegation of executive functions shall be determined by the Leader/Cabinet.

9.02 Form, composition and function

- (a) **Local committees.** The Council has appointed local committees to discharge functions in the Surrey district/borough areas of the county, with the membership of each committee comprising the county councillors representing the electoral divisions which fall within the respective district/borough areas.

The membership of the committees may also include an equal number of co-opted district/borough councillors with voting rights in relation to those matters set out in Section 2 of the Scheme of Delegation.

Where the local committee is a joint committee the membership will comprise the county councillors representing the electoral divisions which fall within the respective district/borough areas, together with a member of the Council's cabinet if not already included, and an equal number of councillors from the relevant district or borough, together with any representation from its Executive as required by the regulations.

- (b) **Delegations.** The Council and the Leader have included details of the delegations to local committees in Part 3 of this Constitution, including the functions delegated (showing which are the responsibility of the Leader/Cabinet and which are not), the composition and membership of the committees, budgets and any limitations on delegation.

9.03 Local committees – access to information

Local committees will comply with the Access to Information rules in Part VA of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agendas and notices for local committee meetings which deal with both functions of the Leader/Cabinet and functions which are not the responsibility of the Leader/Cabinet will state clearly which items are which.

9.04 Cabinet Members on local committees

A Member of the Cabinet may serve on a local committee if otherwise eligible to do so as a Councillor. Where a local committee is a joint committee discharging executive functions a cabinet member will need to be appointed to that committee.

2. SCHEME OF DELEGATION – WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

Membership

All County Councillors with an electoral division in Woking, one Surrey County Council Cabinet Member (who can also be a county councillor with an electoral division in Woking), and an equivalent number of borough councillors who should be politically proportionate to the borough council. At least one borough councillor should be a member of that council's executive. All borough and county councillors on the Joint Committee will have equal voting rights on all issues being considered.

Executive Functions of Woking Joint Committee (delegated by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council)

The Joint Committee will be responsible for the following decisions on local services and budgets:

In relation to the Borough of Woking the Joint Committee will take decisions delegated to it by the SCC Leader and/or Cabinet and/or the WBC Leader and/or Executive on the following local services and budgets, to be taken in accordance with the financial framework and policies of the respective Councils within a framework of agreed performance and resources:

- (i) Changes which amount to more than 15% in the hours of opening for local libraries (whether managed directly by Surrey County Council or under a community partnership agreement.) (SCC)
- (ii) Community safety funding that is delegated to the Joint Committee (SCC/WBC).
- (iii) Decisions in relation to highways and infrastructure:
 - a. The allocation of the Surrey County Council highway capital budget and highway revenue budget which are devolved to the Joint Committee for minor highway improvements, and highway maintenance, within the committee's area including the scope to use a proportion of either budget to facilitate local highways initiatives (SCC).
 - b. To allocate funds to review on-street parking management, including local parking charges where appropriate and to approve the statutory advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) relating to on-street parking controls (SCC).
 - c. To agree local speed limits on county council roads within their area, and to approve the statutory advertisement of speed limit orders, taking into account the advice of the Surrey Police Road Safety and

- Traffic Management Team and with regard to the County Council Speed Limit Policy (SCC).
- d. To approve the statutory advertisement of all legal orders or appropriate notifications relating to highway schemes within the delegated powers of the Joint Committee (SCC).
 - e. Where, under delegated powers, the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager or Area Team Manager has chosen to refer the decision on whether a TRO should be made to the Joint Committee, the committee will make that decision (SCC).
 - f. Oversee and determine priorities for the Woking Town Centre Management Agreement. (WBC)
- (iv) Consider how Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts will be expended in Woking, taking into account the approved Infrastructure Capacity Study and Delivery Plan (IDP) for Woking. (WBC)
 - (v) In relation to services for young people, with the aim of achieving an integrated approach from Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council (SCC/WBC):
 - a) To agree joint priorities for commissioning by the County Council and the Borough Council in Woking for provision of:
 - i) youth work and
 - ii) other preventative work with young people who are at risk of becoming not in education, training or employment (NEET).
 - b) To apportion delegated funding for young people, specifically the distribution between Local Prevention Framework Grants and Individual Prevention Grants categories of funding, in accordance with the allocated budget and small grants (youth) as allocated by the Borough Council.
 - c) Approve the award of the Local Prevention Framework for the provision of local prevention services for Woking Borough in accordance with the allocated budget and to qualified providers. This power to be exercised by the County Council Portfolio Holder in the event that the Joint Committee is unable to award grant(s) (due to the presence of conflicts of interest which result in the body being inquorate).
 - d) Approve the award of youth service related commission(s) as delegated to the Joint Committee by Woking Borough Council.
 - e) Oversee and determine priorities for the Full Participation Programme and make appropriate linkages into the work of Services for Young People and Woking Borough Council
 - (vi) Oversee and influence priorities for the Family Support Programme in Woking and monitor its performance. (SCC/WBC)
 - (vii) Determine priorities for collaborative work undertaken within the committee's area by the Councils and other partners. (SCC/WBC).

Non-Executive Functions

The Joint Committee will deal with all those non-executive functions relating to public rights of way set out in the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, as amended, except for those separately referred to in the County Council's Scheme of Delegation (or within the terms of reference of other Committees).

Service Monitoring, Scrutiny and Issues of Local Concern

The Joint Committee may:

- (i) In relation to the exercise of County Council Executive functions relating to Members allocations, receive a report on all projects approved under delegated authority of the Community Partnership Manager or Team Leader. *(SCC)*
- (ii) In relation to Community Highway Enhancement allocations, receive a report on all projects approved by Individual Members of the County Council under delegated authority, or by the Area Team Manager where Members have requested that their allocations be combined to be spent in one or more divisions. *(SCC)*
- (iii) Monitor formal decisions taken by officers under delegated powers and provide feedback to improve service standards. *(SCC/WBC)*
- (iv) Engage in issues of concern to local people and seek to influence the respective Councils in the light of local needs. *(SCC/WBC)*
- (v) Monitor the quality of services provided locally, and recommend action as appropriate. *(SCC)*
- (vi) Support Surrey Schools, strengthening links with Headteachers and Governing Bodies to promote the outcomes of increased investment for safer, better schools focussed on raising the standards of education for all children.
- (vii) Be informed in relation to the prioritisation of proposed and planned infrastructure schemes, or developer funded highway improvements within Woking. *(SCC)*
- (viii) Be informed of and receive appropriate reports on highway initiatives and/or improvements either wholly or partly in Woking. *(SCC)*
- (ix) Oversee local initiatives agreed and funded by the Joint Committee. *(SCC/WBC)*
- (x) Oversee on-street parking enforcement including financials in its area subject to terms of reference, agreed by the committee, which best suit its particular local circumstances. *(SCC)*
- (xi) Oversee and scrutinise the impact of the Local Prevention Framework in accordance with prevention priorities for young people not in education, employment or training (NEET), in the local area. *(SCC)*
- (xii) Be advised of the Joint Youth Estates Strategy for Woking Borough. *(SCC/WBC)*
- (xiii) To provide political oversight and advice on the Community Safety functions of the Borough. *(SCC/WBC)*
- (xiv) To act as the local Health and Wellbeing Board for Woking and oversee and set priorities for general health and wellbeing matters within the framework of Surrey's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. *(SCC/WBC)*
- (xv) Be consulted on any issues referred to it by either Council and produce responses as appropriate. *(SCC/WBC)*

(Note: A joint committee may not make any decision which will have an adverse effect on a part of the county for which it does not have functions).

3. PART 3 – SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS

Highways and Transportation

T23	Assistant Director Highways Local Highway Services Group Manager Area Team Manager Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager	<p>Where significant objections are received to an advertised Traffic Regulation Order to decide, in consultation with the divisional member, appropriate¹ borough councillor on the joint committee where the local committee is a joint committee and the Local Committee Chairman/ Vice Chairman whether the Traffic Regulation Order may be made.</p> <p>The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager or Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Divisional Member, appropriate borough councillor on the joint committee where the local committee is a joint committee and the relevant Local Committee Chairman or Vice-Chairman, will decide whether or not to accede to any unresolved objections received in relation to an advertised TRO, and whether the TRO may be made, either with or without modifications, with due regard to the provisions of regulation 14 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.</p> <p>Where a TRO has been advertised and a substantial number of objections have been received or significant modifications are proposed to be made, the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager or Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Divisional Member, appropriate borough councillor on the joint committee where the local committee is a joint committee and the relevant Local Committee Chairman or Vice-Chairman, may refer the decision on whether the TRO may be made to the Local Committee.</p>
-----	--	---

¹ Each Borough Councillor on the Joint Committee will be aligned to a County Council Electoral Divisio

This page is intentionally left blank



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2014 – 2015

KEY ISSUE / DECISION :

To approve a Pay Policy Statement for publication on the Council's external website.

BACKGROUND :

1. To comply with Section 40 of the Localism Act 2011 all local Authorities are required to publish a Pay Policy Statement, approved by a meeting of the full Council, with effect from 1 April each year. The Act requires that the Statement should then be updated and approved by the full Council on an annual basis.
2. The main points that must be covered include:-
 - The remuneration of Chief Officers.
 - The responsibilities of the Council's Remuneration Committee (the People, Performance and Development Committee) for determining the terms on which Chief Officers are employed.
 - The Council's current policies on Equal Pay, Redundancy and Severance, and Reward.
 - The ratio between the remuneration of the highest and lowest paid employees, together with an explanation as to how job evaluation is used to determine appropriate levels of reward.

A copy of the proposed Statement is appended (Annex A) for reference.

3. The Statement has been drafted to reflect the requirements of the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency 2011 and the guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government on Openness and Accountability in Local Pay 2012, to comply with Section 40 of the Localism Act 2011.

Account has also been taken of the final report and the recommendations made in the Hutton Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector 2011.

4. Publication of Statement and Supporting Documentation

It is proposed that the Statement will include “clickable links” to:-

- (i) Documents already published on the website:-
 - Councillors and Committees (which sets out the role of the PPDC as the Council’s Remuneration Committee).
 - Statement of Accounts.
 - Working for Surrey (which summaries the Council’s Employment Policies).

- (ii) Additional documents to be reviewed and updated via the external website with effect from 1 April 2014:-
 - Equal Pay Statement
 - Early Retirement and Severance Policy
 - Reward Policy

Note:

To achieve greater transparency increasing use will be made of the external website to improve access to the Council’s Employment Policies that are currently only accessible via the S-net.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that approval is sought to continue to implement the following recommendations:-

- (i) the attached Pay Policy Statement to be published on Surrey County Council’s external website, as detailed above, with effect from 1 April 2014; and

Lead / Contact Officer:

Carmel Millar, Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development.
Tel: 020 8541 9824

Sources / Background Papers:

Attached draft Pay Policy Statement and extract from the current “Council tax and finance” web pages.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2014 - 2015

This Pay Policy Statement, which was approved by a meeting of the full County Council on 18 March 2014, is published to comply with the requirements of Section 40 of the Localism Act, 2011.

Governance [[Link to Councillors and Committees](#)]

The People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) acts as the County Council's Remuneration Committee under delegated powers, in accordance with the constitution of the County Council. All Surrey Pay and terms and conditions are determined by the PPDC, including the remuneration of Chief Officers and specific appointments to posts with salaries of £100,000 or more.

Salary Transparency [[Links to Salary Transparency](#)]

The County Council is committed to being at the forefront of openness and transparency to demonstrate to its residents and local taxpayers that it delivers value for money. As part of the national and local government transparency agenda, it already publishes information on its external website detailing Surrey Pay ranges, all expenditure items over £500 and contracts with a value of £50,000 or more.

To continue that progress and in line with the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency 2011, the Council has published details of salaries paid to senior staff on-line, with effect from 30 March 2012. This information is updated on a regular basis and covers all positions with annual salaries of £58,200 and above.

Chief Officers' Remuneration [[Link to Statement of Accounts](#)]

Chief Officers are on all-inclusive single status Surrey Pay contracts i.e. there are no variable pay salaries or bonuses paid. The council has not provided any grade related benefits in kind, such as Annual Leave, Private Medical Insurance or Lease Cars since 2007. Chief Officers receive the same allowances as other members of staff and access to the same voluntary benefits scheme, while any expenditure on business travel is reimbursed at the same rates for all grades.

The Chief Executive is on a contract which is no different than Chief Officers i.e. he is on an all-inclusive single status Surrey Pay contract and there is no variable pay or bonuses made. He is paid a specific additional allowance for duties carried out in support of the Lord Lieutenant of the County.

For details of the remuneration paid to the officers of the Council Leadership Team, in a particular financial year, please refer to the council's annual Statement of Accounts. In the case of the report for 2012/2013 this can be found under Note 34, between pages 67 and 69.

Surrey Pay Salary Ratios

The minimum Surrey Pay rate paid on grade S1/2 is currently set at £7.85 per hour as at 1 April 2014, this compares with the statutory National Minimum Wage of £6.31 per hour and the “UK Living Wage”, of £7.65 per hour, which is advocated by the Living Wage Foundation.

Based on existing salaries as at April 2014 it is estimated that the council will have the following ratios, between the lowest and highest paid staff on Surrey Pay, for the 2014 / 2015 financial year.

Surrey Pay Salary Ratios 2014 – 2015		
Salary	Amount per annum £'s	Ratio to the highest salary
Highest Basic Salary	211,600	n/a
Median Basic Salary	23,434	10 : 1
Lowest Basic Salary	14,739	15 : 1

Notes:

- (i) The ratios have been calculated in accordance with guidance published in The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency 2011 and in light of recommendations contained in the Hutton Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector 2011.
- (ii) The median is defined as the mid-point of the total number of staff employed.

[Surrey Pay](#) [[Link to Reward Policy](#)]

The council's reward strategy is based on the local negotiation of “single status” Surrey Pay terms and conditions of service. This means that the majority of staff are on consistent terms and conditions of service, except for teachers and fire fighters part of national terms and conditions. Pay including terms and conditions are reviewed annually, with any changes agreed by the PPDC normally made with effect from 1 April. The council recognises two trades unions, the GMB and UNISON, for the purposes of negotiating Surrey Pay.

- (i) [Equal Pay](#) [[Link to Equal Pay Statement](#)]

The council is committed to ensuring that its employment policies and practices comply with the requirements of the Equal Pay Act 1970. This includes the application of a robust job evaluation process to ensure that all staff will receive equal pay for work of equal value.

(ii) Grading Structure

The allocation of Surrey Pay grades to jobs is determined by (HAY) job evaluation, or in accordance with a career guide scheme related to (HAY) job evaluation. The Surrey Pay grading structure covers all jobs from Cleaners and Catering Assistants on the lowest grade to Chief Officers, including the Chief Executive, on the highest grades. Please see appended table that shows the salary ranges agreed by PPDC for the 2014 / 2015 financial year.

The differentials between these grades and jobs have been established objectively by application of a HAY based job evaluation scheme. For example the job of a cleaner is evaluated at the bottom because the level of skill, knowledge, problem solving and accountability are low compared with jobs at the top level. Conversely, Chief Officers are at the top of the pay scales because the level of skills, knowledge, problem solving, responsibility and accountability are considerably greater than those at the bottom of the pay scales.

Newly appointed, or promoted, staff are normally appointed to the minimum salary on a grade unless a robust business case has been approved to start them at a higher salary within the grade range.

(iii) Market Supplements

Managers may make a business case for a market supplement to be paid above the maximum for the particular grade if it proves exceptionally difficult to recruit at the rate advertised. Such supplements must be approved and reviewed on a regular basis by either the PPDC, in the case of Chief Officers, or by the Head of HR&OD under delegated powers.

(iv) Pay Progression Arrangements

Before April 2010 the majority of staff were on “incremental” Surrey Pay grades, S1/2 – S7, or their equivalent. Personal pay progression within grade is normally dependent upon “added value” in terms of duties, responsibilities and job performance following an annual appraisal.

Middle Pay Grades and Senior Pay Zones (S8 – CEX) contracts currently provide for an annual review of contribution. These reviews normally determine any subsequent personal progression through these pay zones subject to personal headroom being available.

Note: The “normal” arrangements for determining pay progression were suspended with effect from 1st April 2010. The suspension is part of the council’s current pay restraint package that will be reviewed by the end of the 2015 / 2016 financial year.

(v) Recognition Awards

There are **no** provisions under standard Surrey Pay contracts for council employees to be awarded performance related bonuses. However the Recognition Award Scheme provides a mechanism through which managers can recognise exceptional achievement by an individual or team, subject to approval by the appropriate Head of Service in conjunction with the Head of HR&OD for all grades up to S12. For officers on Senior Pay grades and above PPDC approval is required.

[Early Retirement and Severance Terms](#) [Link to Early Retirement & Severance Policy]

The council’s terms for granting redundancy or severance, including access to benefits under the Local Government and Teachers’ Pension Schemes, are the same for all staff on Surrey Pay contracts including Chief Officers and also for Teachers working in maintained schools across

Last updated: 18 March 2014

Surrey. The approval process to be followed when payments are to be funded by the Council is explained in the Policy, see link above.

In cases of redundancy, an employee will not be entitled to a redundancy payment or a severance payment if, before leaving the council, they accept an offer of employment with another local authority or associated employer contained in the Redundancy Payments (Modification) Order 1999 and commence the new employment within four weeks of their last day of service as the employment would be deemed to be continuous.

Further Details

Specific details may be accessed via the links indicated above, or by clicking on the buttons that are included on the landing page.

Surrey Pay Main Grades & Pay Ranges: 2014 / 2015 with affect from 1 April 2014

Job Evaluation Scores		Grades	Salary Ranges	
			Minimum £	Maximum £
0	119	S 1/2	14,739	15,399
120	142	S 3	14,856	16,845
143	165	S 4	16,107	18,894
166	194	S 5	17,928	20,961
195	231	S 6	20,124	23,135
232	313	S 7	23,040	27,239
314	437	S 8	26,498	31,556
438	477	S 9	33,269	38,012
478	518	S 10	37,715	42,692
519	611	S 11	42,203	47,315
612	660	S 12	46,973	54,998

Senior Managers & Directors' Grades and Pay Ranges: 2014 / 2015

Job Evaluation Scores		Grades	Salary Ranges	
			Minimum £	Maximum £
661	734	13	55,185	66,344
735	880	14 A	61,292	76,997
881	1055	14 B & 15 B	76,083	90,169
1056	1260	15 C	87,691	103,967
1261	1312	15 D	101,421	120,278
1358	1450	16 E	116,434	140,851
1451	1688	16 F	127,418	151,943
1689	2000	16 G	149,386	178,561
2001	2328	CEX	209,684	232,383

This page is intentionally left blank



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

Amendments to Financial Regulations

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

This report seeks Council's approval to the proposed changes to the Financial Regulations.

DETAILS:

The Financial Regulations (Annex 1) have been reviewed to ensure that they remain current and reflect changes in the Council's processes and procedures.

Key changes are outlined below:

- Financial planning and management sections (Regulations 2 and 3) updated to ensure clarity on the process and specific elements such as mid year changes.
- Investment Panel paragraphs updated (3.4 – 3.8) following recent changes to the terms of reference and membership.
- Pension Fund section (7.1 – 7.4) updated to reflect changes in the Pension Fund governance arrangements.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council approve the Financial Regulations in Annex 1 for inclusion into the Constitution of the Council.

Contact: Kevin Kilburn
Deputy Chief Finance Officer

Tel no: 020 8541 9207

Background papers: None

This page is intentionally left blank

Financial Regulations

February 2014

Financial Regulations

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Governance	3
1. Officer roles and responsibilities	4
Chief Finance Officer	4
Strategic Directors	4
Heads of service / budget holders	5
2. Revenue financial planning and management	6
Revenue budget and medium term financial plan preparation	6
Fees and charges	6
Mid year changes	7
Monitoring	8
Reporting	8
Revenue budget – schools budget	8
Debt write offs	9
Stock write offs	9
Consultancy services	9
3. Capital planning and management	10
Budget setting	10
Investment Panel	10
Procurement Review Group	11
Mid-year changes	11
Reporting and monitoring	13
Acquisition and disposal of assets	13
Key decision – other than above	13
4. Risk Management	14
Internal Audit	14
Fraud and corruption	14
Business continuity	15
Money laundering	15
Security and insurance of assets	15
System controls	15
5. Reserves, balances and closure of accounts	16
Reserves and balances – reporting	16
Accountancy arrangements	16
6. Contracting arrangements	17
7. The pension fund and treasury management	18
The pension fund	18
Treasury management	18
8. Glossary	19

Introduction

- 1 Financial Regulations govern the manner in which the council's financial activity is conducted and its financial interests are safeguarded. All councillors, officers and contractors must comply with the Financial Regulations ('the regulations'). Locally managed schools have their own financial governance and regulations, as set out in the Surrey Scheme of Financing Schools and the Schools' Finance Manual.
- 2 An officer of the council with the appropriate qualifications must ensure proper management of the council's financial affairs under Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972. The Chief Finance Officer and Deputy Director of Business Services is the Section 151 Officer for Surrey County Council.
- 3 All strategic directors and the Assistant Chief Executive are accountable to the Section 151 Officer for compliance with these regulations. The Section 151 Officer is, in turn, accountable to Council. All officers with delegated responsibility for undertaking financial duties are accountable to their Strategic Director for compliance with these regulations.
- 4 The regulations outline the financial responsibilities of the Chief Finance Officer, strategic directors, heads of service and budget holders, defining what the council does financially, and why it does it. The Section 151 Officer is also required to define more detailed requirements in respect of financial activity (Financial Management toolkit) that facilitate compliance with the regulations and ensure there are clear operational practices.

Governance

- 5 The regulations are part of the council's Constitution. The relevant parts of the Constitution are Article 6 (Budget and Policy Framework) and Article 13 (Contracts and Legal matters and Scheme of Delegation).
- 6 The Leader of the Council determines the Scheme of Delegation that sets out the level of authority for officers and members. The regulations are aligned to the Scheme of Delegation and amended accordingly.
- 7 The Chief Finance Officer reviews the regulations annually and proposes any amendments to the Leader.

Regulation 1: Officer roles and responsibilities

Chief Finance Officer

- 1.1. The Chief Finance Officer's responsibilities to administer and steward the financial affairs of the council are decreed by statute:
 - Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972
 - Section 114 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988
 - Local Government and Housing Act 1989
 - Local Government Act 2003
 - Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011.
- 1.2. The Chief Finance Officer's key responsibilities are to:
 - a) provide strategic financial planning and advice to the Council Leadership Team, the Cabinet, other committees and member task groups
 - b) ensure proper administration arrangements are in place for the council's financial affairs
 - c) report to members on the overall budget performance and recommend corrective action
 - d) ensure that the council or any officer of the council does not make any unlawful financial transaction or action
 - e) comply with the relevant accounting and financial procedures and standards in accordance with best accounting practices, and that all transactions are conducted in the spirit of the council's values (listen, responsible, trust and respect)
 - f) agree and ensure those locally managed schools and other local financial management arrangements are aligned to these regulations
 - g) nominate an appropriate council officer to perform these responsibilities in the absence of the Chief Finance Officer.
- 1.3. The Chief Finance Officer must be given access to any necessary information to comply with these statutory duties.

Strategic Directors

- 1.4. Strategic directors shall (jointly with the Chief Finance Officer) propose a revenue and capital budget to Cabinet for each service, within their budget guidelines set by the Cabinet.
- 1.5. Each Strategic Director must produce a monitoring report every month on the progress and projected spend of their approved revenue and capital budgets within agreed timescales.
- 1.6. Each Strategic Director is responsible for ensuring that there is a nominated budget holder responsible for controlling each part of their total budget. Strategic directors will align budgetary accountability with managerial responsibility when nominating budget holders for the use of resources as closely as possible.
- 1.7. Each Strategic Director is responsible for the effective operation of the relevant financial systems to the extent that they are operated or controlled within their directorate, taking into account the advice of the Chief Finance Officer.

Heads of service / budget holders

- 1.8. Heads of service may delegate local/ detailed budgetary responsibility to nominated budget holders. Heads of service will align budgetary accountability with managerial responsibility when nominating budget holders for the use of resources as closely as possible.
- 1.9. Budget holders should make all relevant staff aware of these regulations (and associated documents) and highlight the relevance and compliance of the regulations to their team members. Finance officers can assist budget holders in this.
- 1.10. Budget holders shall make arrangements to ensure that the actual revenue expenditure does not exceed the approved budget in accordance with paragraph 2.21 below.
- 1.11. Risk criteria (size, complexity, volatility and political sensitivity) are applied to each budget as part of the budget setting process, which then determines how a budget will be monitored during the financial year (the risk based approach).
 - a) High risk – the budget is monitored monthly and a budget narrative reported to Cabinet every month.
 - b) Medium risk – the budget is monitored monthly and a budget narrative reported to Cabinet every quarter.
 - c) Low risk – the budget is reviewed every quarter and reported by exception.

Any variances more than £50,000 and over 10% of the actual spend to date and budget spend to date position; and the full year forecasted spend and the full year budget, must be monitored monthly until the variance is stable.
- 1.12. Budget holders are responsible for providing the budget narrative as part of monthly budget monitoring reports to Cabinet. Combining more than one budget holder report into a service report is the responsibility of the Head of Service. Combining more than one service report into a directorate report is the responsibility of the Strategic Director. The Finance Service can support heads of service and strategic directors in producing budget narratives.
- 1.13. The Chief Finance Officer and relevant Strategic Director should approve all arrangements, guidelines and procedures for the proper administration of the service's financial affairs.

Regulation 2: Revenue financial planning and management

Revenue budget and medium term financial plan preparation

- 2.1. In late January or early February, the Leader and Cabinet propose the level of council tax precept for the coming financial year for Council to set. In proposing the council tax precept, the Leader and Cabinet propose the following year's overall revenue budget, capital programme (see Regulation 3) and five year medium term financial plan (MTFP) for Council's approval. In setting council tax and approving the budget and MTFP, Council is responsible for ensuring it aligns with the corporate strategy.
- 2.2. The Section 151 Officer submits a report to the Cabinet and Council on the robustness of the budget proposals submitted for Council approval in compliance with the requirements of Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003.
- 2.3. In developing the council's overall high level revenue budget, Cabinet, Corporate Leadership Team and the Chief Finance Officer agree budget guidelines for each year of the MTFP. Budget holders must propose revenue budgets for the MTFP period that are sustainable for their directorate and the council. The Finance service collates the proposed budgets and present them to Directorate Leadership Teams. Strategic directors and the Chief Finance Officer are responsible for producing a budget and MTFP that are within the agreed guidelines.
- 2.4. Directorates must present their budgets for the MTFP period to Council Leadership Team. These must include the key budgetary assumptions and risks. The Leader presents the budgets for the five year MTFP to Cabinet in January or February and to Council in February.
- 2.5. Any revenue budget changes must follow virement regulations (see paragraph 2.16).

Fees and charges

- 2.6. Every year, Cabinet must review and agree a schedule of fees and charges when it approves the MTFP in March. The Chief Finance Officer may provide guidance to Cabinet on the schedule.
- 2.7. All income properly due to the council must be collected promptly and recorded to the council's benefit, unless specific authority to waive, discount or write-off such income is approved through Cabinet, Cabinet Members or under delegated powers to officers. Heads of service have authority to waive fees and charges for reasons outlined in Financial Management toolkit, up to a cumulative value of £100,000 in any one case. Any value greater than this requires Cabinet approval. Waivers granted in year must be reported in year end financial outturn reports to Cabinet.
- 2.8. Cabinet must agree proposals to start charging for or trading in goods or services not previously subject to charging or trading with third parties.
- 2.9. Heads of service must comply with any grant conditions where they budget to meet expenditure from grant income to ensure the service receives the maximum relevant grant income.

Mid-year changes

- 2.10. Cabinet has discretion to use and allocate resources within the budget approved by Council. Any decision of Cabinet, a committee, individual Cabinet Members, officers, local committees or a joint body discharging executive functions which would incur expenditure beyond the approved budget requires Council's agreement.
- 2.11. Occasionally, new projects will arise in year that were not included in the MTFP and require specific funding. Cabinet may approve such new projects, provided their funding is within the overall limits of the budget.
- 2.12. Revenue Invest to Save scheme proposals must follow the Investment Panel process set out in paragraph 3.4. Budget holders must not commit or incur expenditure on projects arising in year until Cabinet has granted approval. This includes projects services develop to access external funding.
- 2.13. Budget holders may request to carry forward a budget to the next financial year. Cabinet can approve carry forwards in the context of the total outturn position, or forecast outturn position, taking the Chief Finance Officer's advice into account.
- 2.14. At the beginning of the financial year, it can be difficult for services to estimate revenue government grants accurately and grant adjustments will be required. These grant changes will amend the revenue expenditure levels for the relevant directorates. Budget holders must seek approval through the virement process outlined in paragraph 2.16 for such amendments. Cabinet notes all grant virements reported within the Leader's budget monitoring reports.
- 2.15. Approval of all previous year carry forwards, grant changes and other budget virements amend the MTFP budget, which becomes the updated budget.
- 2.16. The approval requirements depend on the virement.

Virement type	Approval required
Technical e.g. incorrect coding, capital transfers, redistributing funding	Relevant finance manager
Administrative i.e. already approved by Cabinet	Within a service - head of service Within a directorate – strategic director Across directorates – Chief Finance Officer
Without existing Cabinet approval	Under £250,000 (full year effect) - Chief Finance Officer Over £250,000 (full year effect) and within a directorate - relevant Cabinet Member Over £250,000 (full year effect) and across directorates - the Leader in conjunction with the relevant Cabinet Member

Monitoring

2.17. Budget holders are required to monitor and report on their revenue and projects budgets in accordance with risk ratings determined using the criteria in paragraph 1.11.

2.18. Budget holders must forecast the income and expenditure position for their budget throughout the year. Using the council's forecasting tool, budget holders submit year-end forecasts and commentary to their line manager, Strategic Director and Finance according to the budget monitoring timetable.

The budget commentary should include:

- a) the extent of any under or overspend
- b) the reasons for any under or overspend, such as information on activity or volume levels, contract or price variations; and
- c) what the service is doing to address any under or overspend.

2.19. Line managers, strategic directors and Finance reviews and validates completed budget monitoring forecasts and commentaries.

2.20. Budget holders can only commit to spend against budgets within their delegated responsibility. Changes to delegated responsibility require a virement to effect the change to the budget (paragraph 2.16).

2.21. If a budget holder forecasts to over-spend or under-recover (for income) then in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member they can:

- a) reduce expenditure or take action to increase income with Cabinet approval
- b) re-direct resources by making a virement between budgets (paragraph 2.16)
- c) in very exceptional circumstances, request Cabinet to approve a supplementary budget allocation.

2.22. The budget holder must include comments about such actions taken in their budget monitoring commentary.

Reporting

2.23. The Chief Finance Officer uses strategic directors' budget monitoring commentaries to prepare the overall budget monitoring report to Continual Improvement Board and Cabinet each month.

2.24. At the financial year end, the Chief Finance Officer reports to Cabinet on the outturn of expenditure and income and the performance of each directorate compared with the updated budget.

Revenue budget – schools budget

2.25. If an individual school overspends, it carries that overspend forward and it becomes the first call on the school's budget in the following year. In highly exceptional circumstances, the Council may approve additional funding for a school in financial difficulties. If schools as a whole overspend collectively, the overspends would still be carried forward and they would each be required to recover the funds from their following year's budgets. Again, in highly exceptional circumstances, the Council may approve additional funding for a school in financial difficulties.

2.26. The Department for Education restricts use of Dedicated Schools Grant to spending on schools and centrally held schools expenditure only. Statute limits the proportion of centrally held schools expenditure, so only the Schools Forum or Secretary of State can increase the proportion of centrally held expenditure. If the centrally held budgets overspend and the council chooses to carry forward the overspend, the carry forward will count as part of the statutory limit. If this means that the statutory limit is exceeded, the Schools Forum or Secretary of State may need to approve the carry forward.

Debt write offs

2.27. The Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, has authority to write off individual debts of up to £100,000 they consider to be irrecoverable, where:

- a) the debtor has gone into liquidation;
- b) the debtor is deceased and there are no funds and the debt has been registered as a liability to the executor;
- c) the evidence against a debtor is inconclusive, and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services recommends write-off;
- d) the debtor has absconded and all enquiries have failed; or
- e) the debtor is in prison and has no means to pay.

2.28. The Chief Finance Officer can approve the write off of irrecoverable debts under £10,000 not covered by the criteria above. For debts between £10,000 to £100,000 not covered by the criteria above, the relevant Cabinet Member in consultation with the Leader can approve the write off of irrecoverable debts in their portfolio, having taken into consideration the advice of the Chief Finance Officer and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services. All other write offs require Cabinet approval.

2.29. The year end financial outturn reports to Cabinet set out debt write offs granted in the year.

Stock write offs

2.30. The relevant strategic director and head of service and the Chief Finance Officer's nominee can agree to write off individual categories of stock items to a maximum value £10,000. All other write offs require Cabinet approval. The year end financial outturn reports to Cabinet set out stock write offs granted in the year.

Consultancy services

2.31. Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) set out the thresholds for appointing consultants and contractors.

2.32. The Leader and the Chief Executive must approve consultant or contractor appointments where the fee exceeds £50,000 a year (or in proportion where the engagement is for less than one year) before the contract starts.

2.33. Procurement must subject all consultant or contractor engagements with an aggregate value of £100,000 or over to competitive tender and review by the Procurement Review Group before approval by the Leader and Chief Executive. Under no circumstances will the Leader and Chief Executive approve such engagements retrospectively.

Regulation 3: Capital planning and management

Budget setting

- 3.1. In late January or early February, the Leader and Cabinet propose the overall five year capital programme for Council's approval. The Chief Finance Officer supports this with: aggregate and detailed capital budgets, capital programme financing and assurances about the council's compliance with the Prudential Code's requirements.
- 3.2. Strategic directors and heads of service must ensure any planned capital spend included within the MTFP does not exceed the capital resources allocated to that programme or scheme. In particular, they must ensure:
 - a) capital programme proposals are consistent with the council's corporate strategy, capital strategy, asset management plan and directorate strategies;
 - b) each capital scheme or project is assessed for both financial and service risk;
 - c) the proposed timetable for the programme is realistic;
 - d) the available revenue resources (or planned revenue resources likely to be made available) can contain all consequential revenue costs in current and future years; and
 - e) Investment Panel has reviewed the business case for each scheme or project for robustness.
- 3.3. The approved capital programme gives 'in principle' approval for expenditure on land acquisitions, building works, professional fees, furniture and equipment (including IT equipment) on any project it includes for:
 - a) new starts, in the year for which the project first appears in the capital programme and in any subsequent years;
 - b) minor works allocations or other block sums, in the year for which the allocation is approved and specific carry forwards approved by Cabinet;
 - c) any government allocation that depends on expenditure being incurred within a specified year, only for that year.

Investment Panel

- 3.4. Each year Council approves a list of capital schemes, plus allocations for recurring programmes such as minor works and maintenance. For all schemes not previously included in the approved capital programme, budget holders must present a business rationale to Capital Working Group (CWG). CWG conducts the initial review of proposals to determine whether they should be presented to Cabinet for decision to identify schemes in the MTFP capital programme.
- 3.5. Investment Panel considers the robustness of business cases identified as part of the council's main capital programme approved by Cabinet. Sufficiently robust business cases proceed for approval to procure and start work to:
 - a) Cabinet for schemes valued at greater than £1m;
 - b) Cabinet Member in conjunction with the Leader for schemes valued between £100,000 and £1m; and
 - c) Chief Finance Officer for schemes valued at less than £100,000.
- 3.6. Investment Panel applies the following policy to exempt schemes from business case review:

- a) capital schemes where the council carries out work funded by, and on behalf of a third party e.g. extending a Diocese run school;
 - b) capital schemes determined by local committees;
 - c) grant funded schemes awarded on a bid basis where CWG had considered the business rationale and Finance had agreed the council's business case included in its funding bid; and
 - d) highways and property maintenance programmes where prioritisation criteria exist within the services to manage the budgets for this work.
- 3.7. To allow exemption from business case review based on prioritisation criteria, CWG considers and approves the prioritisation criteria for the service before the start of each financial year and agrees a schedule for the service to report to Investment Panel on how it has applied the criteria for that year. This gives Investment Panel oversight of the programmes and enables it to monitor progress.
- 3.8. The rules on virements (paragraph 3.18) apply for approval of additional allocations, advances or deferrals of approved scheme. The same approval process applies to projects receiving additional government capital grant funding in year.

Procurement Review Group

- 3.9. Prior to seeking tenders for approved capital projects, heads of service must present a strategic procurement plan proposing the preferred route to market for the project to Procurement Review Group (PRG). PRG reviews the proposal for: overall effectiveness of the proposed route to market, legality, affordability and value for money. Following PRG review, heads of service present proposals to the appropriate Cabinet Member, in conjunction with the Leader for proposals estimated to cost between £100,000 and £1m, or Cabinet for proposals estimated to cost over £1m.
- 3.10. Following return of tenders, heads of service must submit proposals for contract award to PRG. PRG reviews the proposal for: overall effectiveness, legality, affordability and value for money. Following PRG review, heads of service present the proposals for contract award to the appropriate Cabinet Member, in conjunction with the Leader for proposals estimated to cost between £100,000 and £1m, or Cabinet for proposals estimated to cost over £1m.
- 3.11. If the final tendered cost exceeds the last estimate reported formally to either Cabinet or Cabinet Member by 5% or £200,000, whichever is the lower, the head of service, after consultation with the strategic director and appropriate Cabinet Member, determines whether to meet the additional cost from savings already identified on other projects within the existing capital programme or whether to make further savings on other approved capital projects to offset the increased costs. If the head of service cannot absorb the increased costs they must submit a report to the Cabinet Member in conjunction with the Leader or Cabinet proposing other action to take.

Mid-year changes

- 3.12. Deletion of a scheme that has been individually approved as part of the capital programme must be approved by the Cabinet Member, in consultation with the Leader if its value is below £1m and Cabinet if its value is over £1m.

- 3.13. Where it is likely the total cost of a project already in progress will exceed its latest approved budget allocation, the relevant head of service must report this with advice on how the head of service proposes to fund the overspend:
- a) to the appropriate strategic director and Cabinet Member; and
 - b) in the budget monitoring report to Cabinet.
- 3.14. The head of service must explain the reasons for any overspend in each scheme's post implementation review.
- 3.15. Heads of service must refer all proposals to enter into leasing arrangements, including those by schools, to the Chief Finance Officer for agreement prior to finalisation.
- 3.16. Heads of service must conduct a post-completion review for capital projects, in line with requirements specified in the Financial Management toolkit. The head of service must advise Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Investment Panel, appropriate select committee and the relevant strategic director and Cabinet Member on a timely basis of all such reviews conducted.
- 3.17. In respect of additional capital grant funding awarded in-year, spending proposals should follow the Investment Panel process.
- 3.18. Virements are permissible subject to the following limitations:
- a) service heads can approve virements between budgets within the same team (thresholds do not apply);
 - b) strategic directors can approve virements between team budgets within the same service (thresholds do not apply);
 - c) the Chief Finance Officer can approve virements below £250,000 between portfolios or services;
 - d) the Cabinet Member can approve virements above £250,000, between services within the same portfolio area;
 - e) the Leader (with agreement from both relevant Cabinet Members) can approve virements above £250,000, between portfolios or services;
 - f) strategic directors and service heads can approve virements to resolve scheme overspendings of up to 10% (to a maximum of £200,000) of the approved budget for the scheme, any overspend above this level will be permissible only with the approval of the Cabinet Member and Leader; and
 - g) in urgent cases a virement decision as set out in (d) to (f) above may be taken by the Cabinet Member or Leader in accordance with Article 6.05(f) of the Constitution.
- 3.19. The only type of capital virement exempt from the above rules is one between the Members' Allocation budget to another capital budget, as local committees have already approved them.
- 3.20. Cabinet approval is required to reprofile a capital scheme's budget across years, or to carry forward capital budgets at the end of the financial year.
- 3.21. The relevant head of service can approve virements from revenue to capital below £100,000 and the Cabinet Member can approve if the amount is above £100,000. Virements are not permissible from capital to revenue budgets.

Reporting and monitoring

- 3.22. The Chief Finance Officer collates the overall capital budget monitoring report and presents it to Continual Improvement Board and Cabinet each month.
- 3.23. At the end of the financial year, the Chief Finance Officer reports to Cabinet on the income and expenditure outturn and the performance of each directorate, as set out in the MTFP, compared with the updated budget.

Acquisition and disposal of assets

- 3.24. The acquisition of land or buildings for an approved scheme or for a specifically authorised acquisition, with value of more than £1m in any one case requires Cabinet approval. This value relates to freehold and leasehold interests. Acquisitions authorised under the Scheme of Delegation must use a relevant professional valuation in line with the purchase price. These should be agreed in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer.
- 3.25. The sale of land or buildings declared surplus to the council's requirements and valued at £1m or more in any one case requires Cabinet approval. This value relates to freehold and leasehold interests and includes setting a reserve figure for auction sales.
- 3.26. Acquisitions or disposals below £1m require approval of Cabinet Member in conjunction with the Leader.

Key decisions – other than above

- 3.27. The Constitution determines that the financial threshold for key decisions is £500,000. This is for any items that are not already highlighted in the above paragraphs.
- 3.28. Delegated authority to take decisions in respect of matters outlined in this document must not contradict the general provisions on key decisions in the Constitution.

Regulation 4: Risk management

- 4.1. The council's approach to risk management is a continuous and evolving process that runs through the council's strategies and service delivery. It ensures key risks are managed and resilience is strengthened in order to support the delivery of the council's priorities and goals.
- 4.2. The Risk Management Policy Statement and Strategy outline the arrangements in place to ensure the council identifies and deals with the key risks it faces. The Risk Management Framework complements the statement and strategy and ensures a consistent approach to risk management across the organisation by detailing the council's approach to risk identification, assessment, control and reporting.

Internal Audit

- 4.3. As a key part of internal control, on behalf of the council, an adequate and effective system of internal audit of the accounting records and systems of internal control must be maintained, to the satisfaction of the Chief Finance Officer and the Audit and Governance Committee. To facilitate independence and objectivity in reporting, the reporting lines of this function should be unfettered by line management structures so that direct access to any officer, Member or external regulating authority (eg External Audit) will be available.
- 4.4. Internal audit staff will have access to all such documents, books, computer records, property, assets and explanations as considered necessary for the purposes of the audit from any Member, officer, agents or contractors of the council. Any material unresolved issues emerging from audit work undertaken will be referred to the Audit & Governance Committee and/or the Cabinet, as appropriate.
- 4.5. Members, heads of service, other senior officers and any other employees must notify the Chief Internal Auditor of any matter that involves or is thought to involve any instance of suspicion of corruption or financial irregularity in the exercise of the functions of the council. An internal audit investigation of such allegations will be undertaken in line with the council's Strategy Against Fraud and Corruption.

Fraud and corruption

- 4.6. The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that measures to counter fraud and corruption and to facilitate such disclosures are defined, documented, widely distributed and reviewed at appropriate intervals, in consultation with the Chief Internal Auditor, as appropriate. Any investigations of this type undertaken by internal audit will be under the direction of the Chief Internal Auditor, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, with a report to the Audit and Governance Committee, the Leader and Chief Executive as appropriate. The Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development will ensure that 'whistle-blowing' procedures are defined, documented, widely communicated and reviewed at appropriate intervals, in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Chief Internal Auditor.

Business Continuity

- 4.7. The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that procedures are documented and made available to users for those systems identified as business-critical. Systems so identified will be specified in the Financial Management toolkit, together with the location of the relevant documentation.

Money Laundering

- 4.8. The Chief Internal Auditor acts as the council's Money Laundering Reporting Officer (MLRO). The MLRO will ensure that there is an Anti Money Laundering Policy published on the council's external website which sets out the procedures which must be followed to enable the council to comply with its legal obligations. This policy states that no payment to the council will be accepted in cash if it exceeds £5,000.

Security and insurance of assets

- 4.9. All Members and staff have a general responsibility for taking reasonable action to provide for the security of the assets under their control and for ensuring that the use of these resources is legal, is properly authorised, benefits the council and represents value for money.
- 4.10. The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that there are sufficient arrangements in place to protect the County Council against insurable risks.

System controls

- 4.11. The corporate financial systems documented procedures will be updated and amended as necessary to ensure their continued accuracy and applicability.
- 4.12. The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that appropriate systems of internal financial control are maintained across the council and will ensure that any finance-related issues raised by Internal Audit, the External Auditor or by the Annual Governance Statement are appropriately addressed.
- 4.13. The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that key financial systems are regularly tested to ensure that they are secure and reliable.

Regulation 5: Reserves, balances and closure of accounts

Reserves and balances - reporting

- 5.1. The Chief Finance Officer must annually advise the Cabinet and Council on the prudent level of reserves and general balances for the authority, taking into account prevailing and anticipated levels of risk and uncertainty. In year, the Chief Finance Officer should report on any financial forecast or anticipated event that could threaten the council's ability to maintain reserves of at least the stated level, drawing attention to any material financial implications.
- 5.2. Planned spending from reserves, provisions and funds must be approved as a part of the budget or budget monitoring processes. The use of reserves, provisions and funds for purposes other than those planned must be reported to and agreed by the Cabinet.
- 5.3. The Chief Finance Officer will report to the Cabinet for its approval to use reserves, provisions and funds held by the council.

Accountancy arrangements

- 5.4. The Chief Finance Officer must ensure that all the financial transactions of the council are accurately reflected in the council's accounting records.
- 5.5. The accounting policies, practices and procedures adopted by the council will be determined by the Chief Finance Officer and will reflect professional standards and recommended good practice. All services are required to adhere to these policies, practices and procedures in recording the financial transactions of the council.
- 5.6. Any proposed changes to accounting policies, practices or procedures or material departures from professional standards or recommended good practice must be declared and must be acceptable to the Chief Finance Officer and to the council's external auditors before implementation.
- 5.7. Services must use corporate financial systems, unless the prior agreement of the Chief Finance Officer has been obtained and he / she is satisfied that the local system proposed contains adequate financial controls and is capable of feeding required data into corporate systems.
- 5.8. The Chief Finance Officer will make appropriate arrangements for and advise officers and Members of the council on, all taxation issues that affect the authority.
- 5.9. The Chief Finance Officer will sign off the annual statement of accounts once satisfied that the statement represents a true and fair view of the financial position of the council. The accounts of the Council and associated opinions and reports of the external auditor will be presented to the Audit and Governance Committee.
- 5.10. Strategic directors, assistant directors and heads of service must sign a manager's assurance statement each year as prescribed by the Chief Finance Officer.

Regulation 6: Contracting arrangements

- 6.1. All procurement and purchasing undertaken must adhere to corporately specified processes as agreed by the Council Leadership Team and follow the requirements of PSO's and the PRG (see paragraph 3.9). The Financial Management toolkit sets out the requirements for the use of purchasing cards in emergencies.
- 6.2. All material assumptions and risks inherent in evaluations of proposed contracts must be fully disclosed, (before the contract award) to those officers and Members making decisions on the award of contracts.
- 6.3. Long-term strategic contracts must include provisions to secure continuous improvement, improved efficiency and value for money.
- 6.4. All work undertaken for third parties should follow the contract procedures in the PSO's.
- 6.5. Goods and services commissioned from the voluntary or community sectors must assure value for money for the council. Financial relationships must be in the form of grants or contracts made under the relevant corporate guidance within the Financial Management toolkit.
- 6.6. In this context, partnerships are deemed to be joint arrangements involving the council pooling financial and/or other resources with other bodies in the pursuit of agreed joint objectives.
- 6.7. All partnership arrangements and pooled budgets must be under written terms appropriate to the extent of the financial risk to the council and may be entered into only following appropriate advice from the Chief Financial Officer and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services. Where the council's contribution to or financial risk from such an arrangement exceeds £100,000, the Cabinet's agreement to the pooled arrangement is required.
- 6.8. Prior to the council entering into any proposed partnerships requiring an annual contribution (financial or otherwise) to the value of £100,000 or more, the approval of the Cabinet will be required.
- 6.9. The thresholds for the appointment of consultants and contractors are set out in the PSO's.

Regulation 7: The pension fund and treasury management

The pension fund

- 7.1 The Chief Finance Officer has delegated authority to take any urgent action as required between Pension Fund Board meetings but such action only to be taken in consultation with and by agreement with the Chairman and/or Vice Chairman of the Pension Fund Board and any relevant Consultant and/or Independent Advisor.
- 7.2 The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that monitoring reports on the Pension Fund's investment performance and activities, and any other business are considered by the Pension Fund Board at least quarterly.
- 7.3 The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that a report on the triennial actuarial valuation of the pension fund is taken to the Audit and Governance Committee.
- 7.4 The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that a report on the annual accounts and associated external audit of the pension fund is taken to the Audit and Governance Committee.

Treasury management

- 7.5 The Chief Finance Officer will propose for adoption by the Council the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management, which governs treasury management activity, and will ensure that its provisions are implemented.
- 7.6 The Chief Finance Officer will define and propose for agreement by Council, a treasury management policy statement, stating the policies, objectives and approach to risk management in keeping with the code's recommendations and will monitor these throughout the year.
- 7.7 The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that Council receives an annual investment strategy as part of the Prudential Code report.
- 7.8 The Audit and Governance Committee is responsible for ensuring effective scrutiny of the treasury management strategy and activity. The Chief Finance Officer will submit a mid-year review and an annual outturn report on treasury management activity to the Audit and Governance Committee.
- 7.9 The Chief Finance Officer will ensure that treasury management activities are administered within the parameters defined and agreed by Council and those defined by statutory requirements and professional best practice.

Glossary

Asset management plan	A strategic overview of the property portfolio that sets a broad direction for asset management over the medium term.
Balances	See <i>Revenue Reserves</i> .
Budget	A document stating the council's policy for using resources for the first year of the MTFP period. May also include information on non-financial resources such as manpower.
Business case	Prepared and submitted to Investment Panel for approval to spend capital and Invest to Save revenue schemes.
Cabinet	Comprises a Leader (an elected councillor) and up to nine other elected councillors, one of which must be the statutory portfolio holder for Children's Services. It is responsible for key decisions and policy.
Capital budget	Statement of approved capital expenditure for present and future years.
Capital grants	Money received towards capital spending for a particular service or scheme.
Capital strategy	Outlines the council's approach to capital investment, summarising the principles, policies, priorities and practices that will underpin investment planning over the medium to long term (ten years), ensuring that value for money is secured.
Capital Working Group (CWG)	Conducts initial reviews of proposed capital schemes.
Carry-forwards	Unspent revenue or capital budgets that services can use in future years.
CIPFA	The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy. The leading accountancy body for local government.
Corporate Leadership Team	The council's strategic leadership team led by the Chief Executive and includes the Assistant Chief Executive and Strategic Directors.
Council Investment Panel	Provides assurance that robust business cases support capital and invest to save project proposals, ensuring value for money.
Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)	The Dedicated Schools Grant provides 100% ring-fenced funding for schools from the Department for Education. Local authorities are responsibility for distributing this funding to schools according to local needs and priorities.
Estimate	Expected expenditure in a given year by committee, service and expenditure description.
Fees and charges	Income arising from the provision of services such as school meals, further education and meals on wheels.
Financial control	Good financial practice, including budgetary control, audit and financial regulations.
Financial Management toolkit	Guidance, instructions and support relating to the council's financial activity.
Financial year	1 April to 31 March - the year of accounts for Surrey County Council.
Government grants	Central Government contributions towards the cost of local services.
Income	The amount received, or expected to receive, from any source. Service revenue income includes grants, sales, rents, fees and charges.
Invest to Save	Schemes that are funded from the council's invest to save fund as the initial investment is paid back through savings over the life of the scheme.
Medium term financial plan	Sets out the council's spending and funding plans for the following five years including detailed plans by Directorate for both capital and revenue budgets.
Outturn	The actual income and expenditure for a particular year of account.

Pension Fund Board	A member committee responsible for the governance and administration of the council's pension fund.
Precept	A charge levied by one local authority on another.
Procurement	The process of gaining the use of supplies, services and construction work.
Procurement Review Group (PRG)	Considers the robustness of business cases identified as part of the council's main capital programme approved by Cabinet.
Procurement Standing Orders (PSO)	Set out how the council authorises spending, including all types of goods, works and services, as well as non-permanent workforce such as temporary and agency staff and consultants.
Projection	An estimate of expenditure in future years.
Provisions	Money set aside to pay for known, future costs.
Prudential Code	Sets out the principles that local authorities must follow when borrowing.
Revenue budget	An estimate of annual income and expenditure that sets out the financial implications of the council's policy for the budgeted year.
Revenue expenditure	The day-to-day spending on employment costs, other operating costs and capital charges less any income from fees, and charges.
Risk Based Approach (RBA)	Risk criteria applied to each budget as part of the budget setting process. Determines how a budget is monitored during the financial year.
Statement of Accounts	The council's accounts for the financial year.
Surplus	When income is higher than expenditure.
Virement	The authorised transfer of a budget from one expenditure head to another.
Whistle blowing	Raising concerns about wrongdoing.
Write off	Reduces the value of an asset to zero in a set of accounts.

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 17 March 2014.

**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 Skellett 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 decisions:

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 businesses 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 decisions:

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 decisions:

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 Surrey¹ 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

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.

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.

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

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

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 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 4 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 4 February 2014 for their decision.

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

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 25 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

[Prior to the start of the meeting, the Leader of the Council made an urgent statement in relation to the flooding in Surrey – Appendix 1]

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

25/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Denise Le Gal and Mike Goodman.

26/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 4 FEBRUARY 2014 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

27/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

28/14 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

The Leader of the Council said that the report re. the Schools Expansion Programme from September 2014 (item 11) had been amended to remove references to St John the Baptist School because the decisions on this school have been withdrawn from this meeting and therefore item 22 has also been withdrawn.

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were none.

29/14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

One question has been received from Mr Sawyer, Vice-Chairman of Banstead Village Residents Association. The question and the response was tabled and is attached as Appendix 2.

30/14 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

No petitions were received.

31/14 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

No representations were received.

32/14 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There were none.

33/14 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES [Item 6]

Following the statutory consultation on proposed changes to Surrey's admission arrangements for September 2015, Cabinet was asked to consider the responses and make recommendations to the County Council on admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and Surrey's coordinated schemes for September 2015.

The report covered the following areas in relation to school admissions:

- Auriol Junior School (Stoneleigh, Ewell) - Recommendation 1
- Reigate Priory School (Reigate) – Recommendation 2
- St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 3
- Meadowcroft Infant School (Chertsey) and St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 4
- Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools (Thames Ditton) – Recommendation 5
- Admission criteria for two year olds applying for nursery - Recommendation 6
- Esher CofE High School (Esher) – Recommendation 7
- St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School (Farnham) – Recommendation 8
- Published Admission Number for Year 3 at The Dawnay School (Great Bookham) – Recommendation 9
- Published Admission Number for Reception at North Downs Primary School (Brockham) – Recommendation 10
- Own admission authority schools to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 11
- Out of County schools not to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 12

- Published Admission Numbers for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 13
- Admission arrangements for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 14
- Coordinated Admissions Schemes – Recommendation 15

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning presented the report and said it was a complex and lengthy report. She highlighted the proposed arrangements for Reigate Priory School (recommendation 2) and the proposals for Esher High School, which would be subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to their admission arrangements (recommendation 7).

Cabinet Members were given an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

The Leader of the Council asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, who confirmed that the Equalities Impact Assessment was comprehensive.

He also reminded Members that these recommendations would be considered by the County Council at its meeting on 18 March 2014.

Finally, he thanks the Principal Manager Admissions and Transport (Strategy) and her team for an excellent report.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

Recommendation 1

That a feeder link is introduced for Auriol Junior School for children attending The Mead Infant School for September 2015, as follows:

- | | |
|----|---|
| a) | Looked after and previously looked after children |
| b) | Exceptional social/medical need |
| c) | Children attending The Mead Infant School |
| d) | Siblings not admitted under c) above |
| e) | Any other children |

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other schools which have a feeder link and reciprocal sibling links
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within close proximity
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There was overall support for this proposal
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at The Mead Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Auriol Junior School

Recommendation 2

That tiered sibling criteria are introduced for Reigate Priory for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings in to the same school, this would only apply if it is not their nearest school
- The pressure on places means that on balance a greater disadvantage might be caused to local families than to future siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- There was overall support for this proposal
- It reduces the likelihood of local families having to travel to schools that are further away

Recommendation 3

That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children attending Meadowcroft Infant School for September 2015, in addition to the existing feeder link with Trumps Green Infant School, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School or Meadowcroft Infant School
- e) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Meadowcroft Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to St Ann's Heath Junior School

Recommendation 4

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School for September 2015 so that these schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 5

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools for September 2015 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 6

That criteria for admission to nursery for two year olds who are eligible for the free extended provision are introduced for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children who will have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
- d) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for clear, fair and transparent criteria
- The criteria are consistent to those used for other years of entry
- They are lawful and comply with the School Admissions Code

- They will enable parents to understand how places will be allocated at nurseries which choose to admit children at two years old
- It supports the Government's agenda of extending free nursery provision to families on low income

Recommendation 7

That, subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to admission arrangements as they have proposed, the catchment area for Esher CofE High School is extended for September 2015 to include the whole of Claygate village.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for families in Claygate to have a greater opportunity of being offered a local Surrey school
- It coincides with an increase in PAN at Esher High thereby minimising the impact on other families applying for Esher High
- There was overwhelming support for this proposal
- This proposal is linked to a separate proposal by Hinchley Wood School to extend its catchment area and to introduce feeder links which, if not introduced in line with this proposal, would lead to an untenable increase in applications for Esher High. This recommendation is therefore conditional on the changes at Hinchley Wood being agreed before this recommendation is ratified by Full Council
- If Esher High School becomes an Academy on 1 March 2014, before ratification of the recommendation by Full Council, the school's Governing Body will need to ratify the recommendation of Cabinet in order to ensure the admission arrangements have been lawfully determined

Recommendation 8

That admission priority based on a catchment is introduced for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School for September 2015 so that, after siblings, children who live within the published catchment area for the school would receive priority for a place ahead of those who do not, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children living within the catchment area of St Andrew's CofE Infant School
- e) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It helps to support the future viability of this school
- It provides for a joined up approach to admissions in the area of Farnham
- It helps to protect the existing feeder link from St Andrew's to South Farnham School
- It is supported by the Governing Body of St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School as it is recognised that this is a step towards formalising the links between these schools

Recommendation 9

That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay is decreased from 30 to 15 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will provide for a better use of resources within the school
- It will reduce the impact of in year admissions on the school
- It will not lead to a pressure on school places because the number will better reflect numbers on roll
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 10

That the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School is decreased from 64 to 60 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will enable the school to meet its duty with regard to infant class size legislation
- It will enable the school to optimise the most efficient use of its sites
- It will reflect the number that the school is working to maintain after the initial offers are made
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 11

That Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic School and St Andrew's Catholic School are added to the list of own admission authority schools which will be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that there will be a consistent approach in selecting schools which will be taken in to account when assessing 'nearest school' when applying the admission arrangements of community and voluntary controlled schools
- It ensures that there is equity in the application of admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools County wide

Recommendation 12

That Camelsdale Primary School in West Sussex is discounted for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that families who live nearer to Camelsdale Primary School but who are unlikely to be offered a place there will not be disadvantaged in their applications for their nearest community Surrey school
- It is consistent with the approach taken with other out of County schools for which Surrey parents are generally unsuccessful based on catchment

Recommendation 13

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2015 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1, of the submitted report, which include the following changes:

- i. Bell Farm Primary School – removal of Junior PAN
- ii. Bishop David Brown – increase in PAN from 120 to 150
- iii. Esher High School – increase in PAN from 210 to 240
- iv. Holmesdale Community Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- v. The Hythe Community Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- vi. Manorcroft Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 58 to 60
- vii. Meath Green Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 70 to 90
- viii. Onslow Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix. St Ann’s Heath Junior - increase in Junior PAN from 64 to 90
- x. St Mary’s C of E (VC) Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 25 to 30
- xi. Stamford Green Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where a decrease in PAN is proposed the decrease has already been agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school
- Where increases in PAN are proposed the schools are increasing their intake to respond to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2014 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 14

That the remaining aspects of Surrey’s admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2015, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Appendix 1 and its Annexes, of the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey’s parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The existing arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey’s sustainability policies

Recommendation 15

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2015/16 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2015 are similar to 2014
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

34/14 CHANGES TO FIRE ENGINE DEPLOYMENT IN THE NORTH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for Community Services invited the Cabinet Associate for Fire and Rescue Services to introduce the report. She began by saying that the changes to fire deployment in Reigate and Banstead would have some impact on Epsom and Ewell.

She reminded Cabinet that, in March 2013, they had approved Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's (SFRS) proposal to operate a chain of single fire engine stations running through the boroughs of Epsom and Ewell (E&E) and Reigate and Banstead (R&B).

Part of the plan was to create a new fire station within the Burgh Heath area. However, no site has been found in this area and therefore Cabinet was being asked to approve the provision of a new fire station within a wider area (a three mile radius) around Burgh Heath. Until a permanent site is identified SFRS intend to relocate to a temporary location within the same area, which would still deliver an improvement in the response standard. This is in order to enable SFRS to meet its response targets, which have become an operational imperative due to a reduction in the reliability of the fire cover in that part of the County due in part to London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority closing Purley Fire Station for a period of 18-24 months from summer 2014.

She also drew attention to paragraph 34 of the report, which stated that there would be continued engagement with the relevant committee in Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead. Referring to the Equalities Impact Assessment and the impact of the proposals on people with protected characteristics, she confirmed that modelling had predicted slightly longer response times but they were still within the Surrey Response Standard.

Finally, she tabled a small amendment to recommendation (3), inserting 'interim' before Strategic Director Adult Social Care and adding in, 'in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services'.

RESOLVED (as amended):

That the following proposals be proposed:

Officers should identify and deliver a permanent site for a single fire engine station within a three miles radius of Burgh Heath, to serve the north of Reigate and Banstead.

Until such time as a permanent site is available, to relocate the second fire engine from Epsom to a temporary fire station within the same geographical area, to deliver improvements against the Surrey Response Standard.

Authority be delegated to the Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to assess the options to relocate the second fire engine from Epsom and to identify an available location which meets the requirements identified in this report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The relocation of a fire engine into the proposed area will secure improvements against the county wide Surrey response standard. Whilst it may not be the optimal location this still delivers improvements against the response standard to meet the operational imperative that is compounded by the reduction in the provision of fire cover due to the temporary removal by London Fire Brigade of Purley's fire appliance. The fire station is being refurbished from summer 2014 and the fire engine is being moved further away to Mitcham which will have a detrimental impact on response times when requests are made by SFRS under section 13 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004.

It provides an opportunity to work with Blue light partners and other agencies to collocate to further integrate service provision and share information to generate efficiencies through shared spaces and networking.

35/14 SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH [Item 8]

The Deputy Leader said that the Cabinet had agreed in February 2013 the importance of promoting Economic Growth in Surrey and he was proud of the role of the County Council in it. He highlighted some of the measures that would help businesses to grow and succeed:

- The apprenticeship scheme for Surrey businesses, which had resulted in the creation of more than 500 apprenticeship places
- The rollout of a county wide high speed broadband network
- 60% of county council spend with local small and medium sized enterprises that had resulted in almost £1m per day being spent with local companies
- A major programme of road schemes

He also referred to the Surrey Employment and Skills Board which was established in April 2013 and the Local Transport Bodies.

He said that Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) were expected to take a lead role in the day to day management of the European Structural and Investment Fund for 2014 – 2020 programme and he referred to the funding opportunities through the Local Growth Deals.

A summary of draft Strategic Economic Plans for Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3 were attached as Annexes to the report.

Finally, he tabled an amendment to recommendation (3), adding in 'either the Leader or' before the Deputy Leader.

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. That Surrey businesses be congratulated on their success in achieving significant economic growth in recent years, which means that the gross value added of the Surrey economy is now in excess of £32 billion a year.
2. That the progress made with both of the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), of which Surrey is a member, in making the case for additional investment in the county be noted and that the Deputy Leader, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment, should agree the final Strategic Economic Plans for both LEPs in accordance with the approach set out in this report.
3. That the county council be represented by either the Leader or the Deputy Leader in the proposed new local authority governance arrangements for Enterprise M3 (EM3) and Coast to Capital (C2C) Local Enterprise Partnerships.
4. That the financial implications of the ongoing work with Local Enterprise Partnerships, including the potential to secure additional funding for transport and infrastructure schemes and for skills development given that the LEPs are intending to bid for £850-£950 million for the period 2015-2021 be noted.
5. That it be noted the Surrey Connects Board are currently considering a range of options for their future operation and that decisions on any financial and organisational changes that are needed in the county council, once that consideration is concluded, should be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure in discussion with the Deputy Leader
6. That the arrangements for enhancing collaboration with district and borough councils, including potential areas for joint working to secure additional benefits across the whole of Surrey be noted.
7. That an all member workshop on economic growth and the Local Enterprise Partnerships be held in March 2014.

Reasons for Decisions:

The approach set out in this report will assist the Council in achieving the 'Confident in our Future' Corporate Strategy 2014-19 (as agreed by Cabinet on 4 February 2014 and by full Council on 11 February 2014), which includes a specific priority to make Surrey's economy strong and competitive. In particular, it will support the council in its efforts to secure additional investment in Surrey, more flexibility to meet the distinct needs of the county and more joint working with boroughs and districts to promote economic growth. Additional investment in strategic and local infrastructure, in skills and in employment and business support will help to promote economic growth across the county, maintain the quality of life for residents and develop Surrey's already very strong offer as a place to do business.

36/14 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 9]

The Leader of the Council presented the Council's financial position at the end of period 10 (January) of the 2013/14 financial year and said that the Council's financial strategy had four key drivers to ensure sound governance in managing finances and providing value for money:

(1) Keep any additional call on the council taxpayer to a minimum

- That there had been a £1.1m improvement on the revenue forecast since December and the forecast was for a £2.1m underspending. The improvement would have been greater but for the additional costs faced in tackling the flooding
- This was the fourth consecutive year that the council had a small underspending.

(2) Continuously drive the efficiency agenda

- At the end of January, services were making good progress in delivering efficiencies and forecast achieving over £61m on-going savings for the full year against a stretch target of £68m savings
- Underspends had been identified and delivered by services to cover the shortfall this year.

(3) Develop a funding strategy to reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and government grant income.

- Reducing reliance on government grants and council tax was key to the Council's ability to balance budgets in the longer term. Significant in the Council's ability to achieve this was the Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund. By year end it was forecast that over £59m would have been invested, and net income of £700,000 generated by the end of this year. Rental savings could also total over £1m over the next 10 years.

(4) Continue to maximise our investment in Surrey

- The council's capital programme not only improved and maintained service delivery, it was also a way of investing in Surrey and of generating income for the council. This year the budget was £224m.
- Finally, he said that, in addition to the £59m capital investment in assets, it was estimated that £193m would be invested in service delivery, from improving roads to the creation of more school places. However, with any large capital project there would be some delays with planning issues and archaeological finds.

Other Cabinet Members were invited to highlight the key points and issues from their portfolios, as set out in the annex to the report.

Cabinet Members also thanked all staff who had worked tirelessly, and often outside normal working hours, during the recent flooding emergency.

RESOLVED:

1. That the forecast revenue budget for 2013/14 to underspend by £2.1m on services, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 1) of the submitted report, be noted.
2. That the forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end were £61.3m, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 79) of the submitted report, be noted.
3. That the forecast capital expenditure and investment of £232.6m against a budget of £224.7m, as set out in the Appendix (paragraphs 83 to 89) of the submitted report be noted.
4. That the transfer of £2m from increased business rates and government grants to the Budget Equalisation Reserve for supporting future years' budgets, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 62 and 67) of the submitted report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

37/14 FORMATION OF WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Community Services said that she was delighted to present the report for the proposal of a Joint Committee of Surrey County Council (SCC) and Woking Borough Council (WBC) which would be the first of its kind to be established in Surrey.

Both Surrey County Council's Cabinet and County Council approval was needed to establish the Joint Committee, to agree to delegate recommended functions to the committee and to agree the Constitution and Standing Orders under which this committee would operate. Woking Borough Council had sought approval from its own Executive and Full Council earlier in February.

She highlighted the possibility of deciding that representatives from the voluntary sector may be co-opted onto the joint committee. She also said that the Chairmanship of the committee would be a County Council appointment but the Vice-Chairmanship would be a Borough appointment.

Functions jointly delegated by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council were also set out within the report.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- It was a good example of partnership in practice and a good template to take forward
- Other Districts and Boroughs should be encouraged to follow and establish joint committees
- The joint committee would enable greater local accountability and residents would be more involved in decision making

- Encourage Woking to act as its local Health and Well Being Board and oversee and set priorities for general health and wellbeing matters within the framework of Surrey's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- The joint committee had the full support of Woking Borough Council
- No substitutes would be permitted for both County and Borough Members
- A belief that this could be a template that could be used throughout two-tier Government

Cabinet Members publically thanked the Programme Manager and Lead Manager for Community Safety and Partnership and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and their teams for their hard work in formulating the arrangements for the Woking Joint Committee. They also acknowledged the role that the Leader of Woking Borough Council had played in supporting the proposals.

In putting the recommendations to the vote, the Leader of the Council said that he hoped for all-party support for these proposals when the item was considered at County Council on 18 March 2014.

RESOLVED:

1. To recommend to County Council the establishment of a Woking Joint Committee to deal with both executive and non-executive functions from 1 June 2014 in place of the current Local Committee in Woking which will cease to function from that date.
2. To agree (as set out in Annex A of the submitted report):
 - that the current Local Committee executive functions be delegated to the Woking Joint Committee
 - that the Surrey County Council element of the new joint SCC/WBC executive functions be delegated to the Joint Committee
 - to recommend to Council that the current non-executive functions delegated to the Local Committee be delegated to the Woking Joint Committee
 - that the advisory functions that will come under the remit of the Woking Joint Committee be agreed.
3. That the functions that Woking Borough Council has delegated to the Woking Joint Committee, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report, be noted.
4. That the Woking Joint Committee Constitution, including the Standing Orders under which it will operate, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report be agreed, and authority be delegated to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to agree to any minor amendments to the Constitution which may be required.
5. To recommend that Council agrees to the relevant changes to the County Council's Constitution to enable the Joint Committee to be established and become operational, as set out in Annex B of the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions:

Cabinet and Full Council agreement is required to establish a Working Joint Committee in place of the current Local Committee arrangements; to delegate recommended executive functions to the newly formed Working Joint Committee; and to agree the new Constitution and Standing Orders under which the newly formed committee will operate.

The new Joint Committee will simplify and speed-up local decision making processes, enabling for the first time, all functions and budgets delegated to it by both authorities to be jointly decided upon.

38/14 SCHOOLS EXPANSION PROGRAMME FROM SEPTEMBER 2014 [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that there was significant demand for new school places within Runnymede and there was an opportunity to increase provision at Lyne and Longcross Infant School to meet demand for primary school places in this area.

This expansion was also supported by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning and the Headteacher, Governors and parents of this school.

RESOLVED:

That the expansion of Lyne and Longcross Infant School, as detailed in the submitted report, and subject to the consideration and approval of the detailed financial information for the school as set out in Part 2 of this agenda (item 21) be approved and that Lyne and Longcross Infant School (increase by 120 places to 210 places) and the school change from an infant to a primary school.

Reasons for Decisions:

The scheme is essential to meeting basic need in Surrey. The scheme delivers a value for money expansion to the school, which supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide additional school places for local children in Surrey. The individual project and building works are in accordance with the planned timetables required for delivery of the new accommodation at the school.

39/14 EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that this report sought approval to extend the Grant Agreement for Welfare Benefits Advice, Information and Support for two years from 1 April 2014.

A one year grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support was awarded in April 2013 after a competitive bidding process. The agreement included the option of extending for a further two years, which he was recommending to Cabinet.

He also referred to the case studies, attached as Annex 1 and which illustrated the benefits of this advice and support.

Finally, he proposed a small amendment to recommendation (2) – deleting 'should' and adding 's' to remain.

The Leader of the Council said that the provision of this service was important and referred to the Equality and Diversity and the Corporate Parent / Looked After Children implications set out in the report.

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. That the grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support be extended for two additional years from 1 April 2014.
2. That the service remains with the current lead provider Surrey Disabled People's Partnership (SDPP) on behalf of the "getWIS£" consortium.

Reason for Decisions:

There is a continuing demand from residents of Surrey for advice, information and support about welfare benefits especially with regard to changes as a result of the Welfare Reform Act (2012). From 1 April 2013, the providers have seen 1,448 people and helped them claim £940,416 of benefits they were entitled to.

40/14 BLOCK CONTRACT WITH HILLCREST CARE FOR 20 INDEPENDENT FOSTERING PLACEMENTS [Item 13]

In presenting this report, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families said that the County Council had a statutory duty to provide suitable alternative accommodation for children that become Looked After either under Section 20 or 31 of the Children Act 1989 and as part of this provision Surrey County Council (SCC) had a block contract for 20 placements with Hillcrest Care Services Ltd (Hillcrest).

In 2013 Procurement and Commissioning reviewed the contract with Hillcrest and assessed the options regarding future delivery (beyond March 2014). Thorough review of the contract as well as future commissioning intentions resulted in a recommendation that a new 3-year contract was awarded to Hillcrest because this was the best option and there would be no disruption to children receiving this care.

Finally, she drew attention to the comprehensive Equalities Impact Assessment attached to the report.

RESOLVED:

That a new contract be awarded to Hillcrest for three years from 1 April 2014 until 31 March 2017.

Reasons for Decisions:

Surrey County Council commissions its other IFA requirements through a Regional Framework Contract with 11 South East Local Authorities. This requirement was tendered in 2011/12. The Framework Contract started on 1 April 2012 and is due to end on 31 March 2017.

Under the Block Contract with Hillcrest, SCC pays one of the lowest rates for IFA placements in the South East of England. The Council is seeking to continue this best value arrangement until the Regional IFA Framework contract comes to an end. An award of a 3-year contract to Hillcrest will mean that both contractual arrangements for IFA placements will be aligned. This will allow a full option analysis to be carried out with Children's Services and Children's Commissioning and development of the placement strategy for the entire area of Looked After Children services.

41/14 ICELANDIC BANK DEPOSIT [Item 14]

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Business Services, the Leader of the Council presented the report which concerned the outcome of the sale of the priority claim of the Council as a Landsbanki depositor/creditor.

He made the following amendments to the report:

- (i) Paragraph (9) of the report: **Delete** consultation with the Chairman of the County Council and **replace with** the Chairman of Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (ii) What Happens Next: Add in: 'Landsbanki' so it now reads:

Officers to close the **Landsbanki** accounts with regard to the sale transaction and write off irrecoverable balance to the Financial Investments Reserve.

Members were confident that the £1.6m relating to Glitnir would be paid in full at a future date and agreed that this was a successful outcome. They complimented finance officers, and in particular the Strategic Finance Officer, for their efforts in pursuing this claim.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the overall position be noted.
- (2) That the successful outcome with regard to the sale of the £10m Landsbanki investment be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

Given recent developments within Iceland and the LGA collective negotiation offer, as well as the underlying uncertainty that existed with regard to full repayment of its claim, the Council needed to fully consider the available offers by interested third parties to buy out its claim in Landsbanki. To enable

this, the Council authorised the LGA to negotiate on its behalf and concluded a successful outcome.

42/14 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS [Item 15]

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that currently, both Surrey County Council (SCC) and the National Health Service (NHS) in Surrey entered into contracts with providers of paediatric therapy services in Surrey to provide services to Surrey children with special educational needs and disabilities who attended Surrey schools.

The provider organisations were Virgin Care Services Limited (VCSL) and Central Surrey Health Limited (CSHL). The County Council and the NHS in Surrey had agreed to move as soon as possible to a joint commissioning arrangement.

As the SCC contracts terminate on 31 March 2014 and the NHS contracts terminate on 31 March 2017, April 2017 is the agreed date to commence joint commissioning.

She also proposed an amendment to Recommendation (2), adding after April 2016:

‘taking advantage of a break clause in both contracts which enables early termination.’

In his capacity as Local Authority Governor of the Abbey School, the Chairman of the Council was invited to address Cabinet. He said that the provision of speech and language therapy for special schools was critical and this report was welcomed. He hoped that the joint commissioning would come to fruition and asked that during the negotiation of the contracts that the pay and conditions for staff be addressed to ensure consistency.

Finally, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment and said that in Surrey there were over 5000 children and young people with Special Educational Needs statements.

[The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board abstained from this item]

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. That new contracts be awarded until 2017 under newly agreed terms from 2014 with Virgin Care Services Limited (VCSL) and Central Surrey Health Limited (CSHL) a Surrey-based social enterprise, whilst joint commissioning arrangements are agreed with the NHS.
2. Milestones be agreed to enable early action to be taken before 2017 if a joint commissioning framework cannot be agreed with the NHS. These milestones will be measured and will inform the decision on whether this service should be re-tendered earlier than 2017. If a joint commissioning framework cannot be agreed with the NHS by April 2015, the service will be re-tendered and new contracts will be awarded

from April 2016, taking advantage of a break clause in both contracts which enables early termination.

Reasons for Decisions:

Although commissioned by two organisations (Surrey County Council and the NHS), as far as the child or young person at Surrey's maintained Special Schools is concerned, they are accessing one service. If Surrey County Council (SCC) were to re-tender this service alone, it could potentially mean that two different providers would be going into the same school. This could cause disruption and dissatisfaction to our vulnerable service users.

Significant progress has been made with the NHS over the last six months, with agreement from the Health and Wellbeing Board to establish joint commissioning arrangements in Surrey for the delivery of paediatric therapies.

For joint commissioning to take place our contract arrangements with providers need to be aligned, therefore the recommendation is that new contracts should be awarded until 2017 in line with termination of NHS block contracts with the same providers.

This will enable SCC and the NHS to jointly commission the delivery of paediatric therapy services in Surrey providing single and equitable outcomes focused services for children and young people.

Tendering at this stage would not support the local authority's aim to agree joint commissioning arrangements with the NHS to deliver the paediatric therapy service in Surrey. The current shared commissioning arrangements for this service means that contracting with new providers may only add confusion and further dissatisfaction to our service users. By using the same providers as the NHS, SCC has been able to secure competitive rates for these services. Running a competitive process would not necessarily remove the existing contractors from the service delivery as it is likely that they would win the tenders or parts of the tenders.

Improving the management of the contract will still go ahead with the existing providers and it avoids the variable performance in services that is sometimes experienced by end-users when a new contractor mobilises at the start of a new contract.

43/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 16]

RESOLVED:

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

Reasons for Decisions:

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

44/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]

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.

PART TWO – IN PRIVATE

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BUSINESS WERE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE BY THE CABINET. SET OUT BELOW IS A PUBLIC SUMMARY OF THE DECISIONS TAKEN.

45/14 EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care drew Cabinet's attention to the competitive tendering process and the scoring results of this confidential annex to item 12.

RESOLVED:

That the grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support, with Surrey Disabled Partnership (SDPP) be extended for an additional two years from 1 April 2014.

Reasons for Decisions:

The existing grant agreement will expire on 31 March 2014.

46/14 BLOCK CONTRACT HILLCREST CARE FOR 20 INDEPENDENT FOSTERING PLACEMENTS [Item 19]

This item was the confidential annex for the Block Contract with Hillcrest Care, which detailed the Financial and Value for Money implications and the recommendation and reasons for decision were set out within item 13.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families also informed Members that the recent negotiations had resulted in a commitment from Hillcrest Care to offer additional bespoke services.

47/14 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS [Item 20]

This item was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning and was the confidential annex for the award of contracts for the delivery of therapy services to Surrey Schools, which detailed the Financial and Value for Money Implications. She said that the proposal was to extend the existing contracts at current prices to enable longer term service redesign.

[The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board abstained from this item]

RESOLVED:

That new Surrey County Council contracts be approved to cover the period 2014 – 2017, as set out in the recommendations for item 15, as amended.

Reasons for Decisions:

Set out within item 15.

48/14 LYNE AND LONGCROSS COFE INFANT SCHOOL: EXPANSION [Item 21]

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that there was strong support from the parents of this school and other local schools for this expansion and commended the recommendations to Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

1. That the business case for the project to expand Lyne and Longcross Infant School at a total cost, as set out in the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and the Leader of the Council be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

49/14 ST JOHN THE BAPTIST CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL [Item 22]

This item was withdrawn.

50/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 23]

That non-exempt information relating to items considered in part 2 of the meeting may be made available to the press and the public, as appropriate.

[Meeting closed at 3.30pm]

Chairman

Flooding Statement

As everyone in the county will know, many of our residents and business have suffered some of the worst flooding in living memory.

More than 3,600 families have been affected and nearly 1,300 people have been rescued by Surrey firefighters. But these numbers don't begin to convey the full impact on our residents, who are now counting the personal, emotional and financial cost.

Our staff and Members have been working round the clock with the police, Environment Agency, the military and local councils to support our communities to get through a situation that has, for many people, literally turned their lives upside down.

While Surrey fire crews have rescued families from the floods, our social care teams have made sure vulnerable people remain safe and well. In addition, our teams have been working hard to keep as many roads and schools open as possible. Not to mention supplying and distributing more than 50,000 sandbags.

With the flood waters now going down the work has not stopped and our focus has turned to helping affected communities to recover. We have worked with our borough and district colleagues to set up recovery centres to provide people with advice and support. A concerted effort has started on the clean up operation.

I am sure I speak, not only for my Cabinet colleagues, but also for all county council Members when I say how grateful I am to all those who have helped and volunteered to assist the county and local communities to get through this.

The work to help families to get back on their feet is not yet done and the cost to the county is only just emerging. The cost alone of putting our roads back in shape currently stands at £12.5 million and is set to rise. So, we must look to the future and that is why we are now in discussion with central government about what measures can be taken to limit the chances of this happening again. It is vital we leave no stone unturned to ensure our communities are properly protected in the years to come.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
25 February 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question (1) from Mr Mike Sawyer, Vice-Chairman of Banstead Village Residents Association to ask:

In the context of the current PSP review and impending closure of the London Fire Brigades Purley Station, we recognise the need for, and benefits of, siting a fire appliance in the Burgh Heath/Banstead area with direct access to the A240 or A217. With regard to the change of “preferred location” from Burgh Heath to the busy Banstead High Street as a site for a fire appliance we deplore the inadequate “consultation” in our immediate area and ask that we be told:-

1. Why, given the length of time that it has been known that the LFB’s station at Purley will close for at least 18 months from this summer without short term replacement cover, has it not been possible to secure a site that meets the fire service’s requirement (as stated at the public consultation meeting in January 2013) of direct, or virtually direct, access onto the A217 or A240?
2. Why was the only public meeting to discuss this proposal held in Ewell Village when siting only affects Banstead Village and its surrounding area, when Banstead has many meeting rooms that could have been made available for a vastly greater public response?
3. Why has the former Ambulance station adjacent to the A217 not been secured as the long term, or even interim, site, when it has existing garaging and the potential for re-opening the access onto, and across, the A217, and shared messing with the retained Ambulance HQ buildings? This is especially hard to understand as the site owners are known to be moving the main headquarters establishment from this location.
4. What practical research has been carried out on the delays inherent in siting the new station in the High Street – other than theoretical computer based modelling? We were told that this modelling does not have information specific to the congestion in Banstead High Street. Whilst it is practical to expect a fire tender to gain access to an emergency in the High Street, it is an entirely different practical problem to make all calls from the High Street – with its’ and the surrounding roads’ congestion as the starting point for each journey.

Reply:

- (1) Property Services working with Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) have found it difficult to secure a permanent site and this is why SFRS intend to locate to a temporary location. This will ensure that the Service can meet its response targets. This includes the reduction in the reliability of fire cover in that part of the county due in part the closing of Purley Fire Station for a period of at least 12 months

from summer 2014. We will continue to search for a suitable site that is closer to our optimal location in the wider identified area in the consultation. Once a suitable site/premises has been found, securing it will be subject to a separate Business Case and Cabinet decision.

- (2) This was also discussed at the public meeting. We explored around 20 venues between Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead and Bourne Hall was the only available venue for this date, with the suitable capacity and accessibility criteria. A comprehensive consultation and communications plan was established to target those who are likely to be most affected by the proposals. We used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as a range of communication channels to gather the views of our stakeholders and Item 7, Annex 3 – Consultation report highlights in more detail the methodology, analysis, key findings and next steps from the consultation process. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service organised a public meeting on 9 January 2014 that was publicised through the consultation website and also in 200 outlets, including libraries, community centres, churches, schools and post offices. The event was also publicised to 200 groups and individuals invited to complete an online survey and through social media sites, Twitter and Facebook. County and local Members were also briefed on the event so they could raise it with their constituents.
- (3) SCC Property Services and the Service continue to investigate available sites/premises in search for a permanent site. This work will continue and should a suitable long term site become available then this will be worked through accordingly.
- (4) The modelling commissioned by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service to identify the optimal location for a fire station is modelled on our incidents to examine historical trends and incident locations, along with appliance utilisation, demand (temporal and geographical) and time spent at incident. Due to the fact that it looks at historical data it will indirectly take into account local variations, as it will consider the time taken to respond to an incident in that area.

Our ambition for the future is to operate not from fixed fire stations but use fire engines for community work and dispatch them when they're out and about, so they can be mobilised from anywhere.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
25 February 2014

-