

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 24 February 2015 and will take effect on 05/03/2015 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 04/03/15.**

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

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

The Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday, 24 February 2015 considered the following matters and resolved:

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

Three questions have been received from members of the public. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 1.

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

Children and Education Select Committee:

- (i) Recommendations relating to Surrey County Council Safeguarding Unit Report – the response from the Cabinet Member for Children and Families is attached as Appendix 2.
- (ii) Recommendations relating to the School Governance Task Group report – the response from the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning is attached as Appendix 3.

- **SURREY WASTE STRATEGY** (Item 6)

1. That the Surrey Waste Partnership's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Revision 2 (2015) be endorsed and recommended to County Council for adoption.
2. That a further report on the Eco Park be brought back to the Cabinet in April 2015 with an updated value for money and affordability assessment.
3. That the consultation process for potential changes at Community Recycling Centres be approved and that the proposals for consultation be finalised and agreed by the Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning.
4. That a report outlining the results of the consultation and recommendations for implementation of cost saving measures at Community Recycling Centres be brought back to Cabinet by July 2015.

Reasons for Decisions:

Adopting the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy will enable Surrey County Council (SCC) to work closely with Surrey districts and boroughs to improve performance and manage waste in a way that offers best value to the Surrey taxpayer.

Revisions to pricing for the Eco Park have arisen due to delays, associated with planning beyond the control of the Council. This has led to further time being required to complete the assessment process. To allow this to happen it is proposed that a further report including an updated value for money analysis should be brought to the Cabinet in April 2015.

Given the current financial climate, it has been necessary to investigate opportunities for making savings through optimising and rationalising the way in which Community Recycling Centres are managed. This will help address a funding gap that arises from increasing costs and reducing funding, in addition to contributing to other savings that will be required across SCC in the coming years.

- **ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2016 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS, COORDINATED SCHEMES AND RELEVANT AREA (Item 7)**

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

Recommendation 1

That, subject to Connaught Junior School also agreeing to introduce a reciprocal sibling link with Bagshot Infant School, a reciprocal sibling link for Bagshot Infant School is introduced with Connaught Junior School so that Bagshot Infant School would be described as operating shared sibling priority with Connaught Junior School for 2016 admission.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at Connaught Junior School would benefit from sibling priority at Bagshot Infant School
- This proposal is in line with a separate proposal by Connaught Junior School to introduce a reciprocal sibling link with Bagshot Infant School. This recommendation is therefore conditional on Connaught Junior School implementing this change before this recommendation is ratified by Full Council
- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- If Connaught also introduce a feeder link from Bagshot as they have proposed, 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 Connaught Junior School and by the Headteacher and Chair of Governors of Bagshot Infant School

Recommendation 2

That a new criterion for Hammond Community Junior School is introduced for September 2016 to provide priority for children attending either Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Children attending Lightwater Village School
- d. Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e. Children attending either Valley End CofE Infant School or Windlesham Village Infant School
- f. Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would introduce a feeder link for infant schools where currently none exists and in doing so would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children at schools with agreed links
- It would support viability of Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of Hammond Community Junior School and by Valley End and Windlesham Village infant schools
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools would not confer an automatic right to transport to Hammond Community Junior School

Recommendation 3

That a feeder link from Meath Green Infant to Meath Green Junior School is introduced for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Children attending Meath Green 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 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 would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other community and voluntary controlled schools which have feeder and reciprocal sibling links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Body of the school
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Meath Green Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Meath Green Junior School

Recommendation 4

That, in line with the tiered arrangements that currently exist at both schools, a tiered feeder link is introduced from Wallace Fields Infant School to Wallace Fields Junior School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need

- c. Siblings for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- d. Children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- e. Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- f. Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- g. Other children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- h. 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 would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Chair of Governors of both schools
- 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 Wallace Fields Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Wallace Fields Junior School

Recommendation 5

That admission criteria are introduced for Year 3 entry to Worplesdon Primary School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings
- d. Children attending Wood Street Infant School
- e. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- f. Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- As this school now has a Year 3 Published Admission Number (PAN) the local authority has a duty to determine criteria which confirm how children will be admitted
- Other than the feeder link for children attending Wood Street Infant School, it would introduce criteria that are in line with those that exist for the reception intake to the school
- It would provide continuity and reduce anxiety for parents and children of Wood Street Infant School
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children at schools with agreed links
- 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 Wood Street Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Worplesdon Primary School

Recommendation 6

That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for Cranleigh Primary School is removed for September 2016.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There will still be sufficient junior places for local children if the PAN is removed
- It will help support other local schools in maintaining pupil numbers
- It will alleviate funding, accommodation and staffing issues in the school
- It will have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

Recommendation 7

That the own admission authority schools to be included in the assessment of nearest school are decided each year according to the policy set out in Section 12 of Enclosure 1, to the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that there will be a consistent approach in selecting schools to 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
- It ensures a transparent and open policy that parents can understand
- It does not deliver a significant difference to current practice
- It ensures historical pattern of admission is taken in to account
- It prevents schools from being included due to the admission of a bulge class or a non-standard admission year
- It allows for exceptions to apply where admission authorities change their admission arrangements

Recommendation 8

That following consultation, the start date to the primary admissions round remains as 1 September for 2016 admission rather than 1 November as proposed.

Reasons for Recommendation

- Response rate from schools was insufficient to gauge whether or not there would be general support for this proposal
- This proposal will be deferred until 2017 when a more targeted consultation will be carried out with schools

Recommendation 9

That Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Enclosure 2, to the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The local authority is required by law to define the Relevant Area for admissions
- The Relevant Area must be consulted upon and agreed every two years even if no changes are proposed
- Setting a Relevant Area ensures that any schools who might be affected by changes to the admission arrangements for other local schools will be made aware of those changes
- No significant change has been made to Surrey's Relevant Area but clarity has been provided for faith schools that they should consider the advice issued by their Diocese when considering which other deanery schools to

consult with

Recommendation 10

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2016 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1, of the submitted report, which include the following changes:

- i. Ashford Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ii. Bishop David Brown Secondary – increase in Year 7 PAN from 150 to 180
- iii. Cranmere Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- iv. Farncombe CofE Infant School - increase in Reception PAN from 40 to 50
- v. The Greville Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- vi. Hinchley Wood Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- vii. Hurst Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- viii. Manby Lodge Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix. Milford School – increase Reception PAN from 50 to 60
- x. North Downs Primary School – introduction of Year 3 PAN of 4
- xi. South Camberley Primary – increase in PAN from 110 to 120
- xii. Stoughton Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiii. West Byfleet Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiv. Worplesdon Primary – introduction of a junior PAN of 30

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where an increase in PAN is 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 2015 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 11

That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2016, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Enclosure 1 and its Appendices, to 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
- Changes highlighted in bold in sections 10, 13, 14, 19 and 20 of Enclosure 1 have been made to add clarity to the admission arrangements but do not constitute a policy change
- Changes highlighted in bold in sections 17 and 18 of Enclosure 1 have been made to comply with statutory requirements of the School Admissions Code 2014
- The change highlighted in bold in section 21 of Enclosure 1 has been made to reflect a change to Surrey's Home to School Transport policy
- Changes to PAN that are highlighted in bold in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 are referenced in Recommendation 10

Recommendation 12

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2016/17 are agreed as set out in Appendix 4 of Enclosure 1, to the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2016 are the same as 2015
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

- **SURREY BETTER CARE FUND IMPLEMENTATION - SECTION 75 AGREEMENTS WITH CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUPS** (Item 8)

That it be agreed to enter into section 75 agreements with seven Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), in accordance with the principles set out in the submitted report, to enable pooled funds to be established and to govern the delivery of the Surrey Better Care Fund Plan 2015/16 and for an agreed period thereafter (by the Cabinet and relevant CCG Governing Body).

Reasons for Decisions:

The Care Act 2014 requires that funds allocated to local areas for the Better Care Fund must be put into pooled budgets established under section 75 agreements. Authority is required from the County Council's Cabinet and each CCG Governing Body to enable each organisation to enter into the section 75 agreements.

These agreements need to be in place by 1 April 2015 to allow the funds to be pooled and invested in line with the Surrey Better Care Fund plan – this will support the joint working with the Surrey CCGs and other partners to achieve better outcomes and high quality coordinated care for Surrey residents through greater integration and alignment of health and social care services.

There are six CCGs in Surrey: East Surrey CCG; Guildford & Waverley CCG; North West Surrey CCG; North East Hampshire & Farnham CCG; Surrey Downs CCG; and Surrey Heath CCG. The seventh, Windsor and Maidenhead CCG, is also included because its population crosses Surrey in a small area of North West Surrey. Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead CCG is consequently making a small contribution to the Surrey Better Care Fund but does not form part of the Surrey planning area.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by either the Adult Social Care Select Committee or Health Scrutiny Committee]

- **IMPLEMENTING THE CARE ACT - CHARGING POLICY** (Item 9)

1. That the new charging policy for Adult Social Care, set out at Annex 2 of the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the Deferred Payment Policy and schedule of charges, set out at Annex 4 of the submitted report, be approved

Reasons for Decisions:

The Council must revise its current Charging and Deferred Payment Policies to meet the requirements of the Care Act 2014. The proposed policies provide an open and transparent framework which will enable people to make informed decisions about how their care and support needs may be met.

The proposals do not significantly change charging for the majority of people currently receiving care and support.

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

- **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL PARTNERSHIP** (Item 10)
 1. That the proposal to create a new business services partnership arrangement with East Sussex County Council, with effect from 15 April 2015, be approved and pursuant to that arrangement to place those of its staff employed in the delivery of those functions at the disposal of East Sussex County Council.
 2. That the functions of the Council, which are within the remit of the services in scope be discharged by a newly constituted Joint Committee, to be established with East Sussex County Council with effect from 15 April 2015.
 3. That the Joint Committee will comprise up to three Cabinet Members from Surrey County Council and up to three Members from East Sussex County Council.
 4. That the responsibility for agreeing the detail of an Inter Authority Agreement with East Sussex County Council, and other related issues including establishing the Standing Orders of the Joint Committee, be delegated to the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Business Services, in consultation with the Chief Executive, the Strategic Director for Business Services, the Director of Finance and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services.
 5. That the Director of Legal and Democratic Services be requested to prepare amendments to the Scheme of Delegation and to the Constitution to reflect the changes arising from this report and the Inter-Authority Agreement, once it is concluded, and submits them for approval by the Leader of the Council.

Reasons for Decisions:

The proposed transformative public service partnership will build upon the strength of the existing arrangements, delivering resilient and affordable services to both Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council. The partnership will deliver significant savings by taking advantage of economies of scale, streamlining processes and reducing duplication. Investment required for transformative change and continuous improvement will become a more affordable proposition than if undertaken by one council alone. In the longer term, the partnership will benefit from growth, delivering further economies of scale for the benefit of each council and their residents.

The recommendations satisfy the legal requirements to enable the formation of a Joint Committee, appoint Members to it and to enable staff to be shared with East Sussex County Council. East Sussex County Council will pass similar resolutions and taken together these form the foundations of the governance arrangements for the partnership.

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

- **FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR JANUARY 2015** (Item 11)

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. The council forecasts an improved revenue position for 2014/15 of £7.9m underspend, up from £3.5m at 31 December 2014, as set out in Annex1, paragraph 3 of the submitted report. (This position includes the need to fund planned commitments that will continue beyond 2014/15)
2. Services forecast achieving an improved position on efficiencies and service reductions by year end of £72.7m, as set out in Annex1, paragraph 70 of the submitted report.
3. The council forecasts investing £202.3m through its capital programme in 2014/15, as set out in Annex1, paragraphs 74 and 75 of the submitted report.
4. Services' management actions to mitigate overspends, as set out throughout Annex1 of the submitted report, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

This report is presented to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

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

- **LEADERSHIP RISK REGISTER** (Item 12)

That the content of the Leadership risk register, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report be noted and the control actions put in place by the Statutory Responsibilities Network be endorsed.

Reasons for Decisions:

To enable the Cabinet to keep the Council's strategic risks under review and to ensure that appropriate action is being taken to mitigate risks to a tolerable level in the most effective way.

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

- **AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF INSURANCE SERVICES - EXCLUDING BROKER SERVICES** (Item 13)

1. That the contracts be awarded to the suppliers in the following lots:

Lot 1 Property – Zurich Municipal,
Lot 2 Fidelity Guarantee – QBE Insurance (via Risk Management Partners),
Lot 3 Commercial Properties – Zurich Municipal,
Lot 4 Casualty – QBE Insurance (via Risk Management Partners),
Lot 5 Motor Fleet – Travelers,
Lot 6 Group Personal Accident and Travel – AIG (via Risk Management Partners),

Lot 7 Terrorism - Pool Reinsurance

2. That the contracts be awarded for three years, with an option to extend for two further years for all lots.

Reasons for Decisions:

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirements of Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders has been completed. The recommendations provide best value for money for insurance cover in association with the lots as listed for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

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

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Item 14)

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.

- **AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF INSURANCE SERVICES - EXCLUDING BROKER SERVICES** (Item 16)

1. That contracts be awarded to the suppliers by lot with an estimated total annual value and contract term, as set out in the submitted report, with an option to extend for two further years for the provision of Insurance Services excluding Broker Services for the benefit of the Council to commence on 1 April 2015:

Lot 1 Property – Zurich Municipal

Lot 2 Fidelity Guarantee – QBE (via Risk Management Partners)

Lot 3 Commercial Properties – Zurich Municipal

Lot 4 Casualty – QBE (via Risk Management Partners)

Lot 5 Motor Fleet – Travelers

Lot 6 Group Personal Accident and Travel – AIG (via Risk Management Partners)

2. That for Lot 7 Terrorism, a quotation be obtained from Pool Reinsurance and agreed with the Leader of the Council for cover to take effect from 1 April 2015 as the proposal put forward by a sole bidder for the lot does not meet the requirements of the Council.

Reasons for Decisions:

The existing agreements will expire on 31 March 2015. A full tendering process, in compliance with the requirements of Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

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

Public Questions

Question (1) from Peter Crews to ask:

The original value for money assessment for Charlton Lane was reported to Cabinet in July 2013. The assessment considered four options. These were:

Option 1: Amend the existing waste contract to deliver Waste Solutions

Option 2: Terminate existing waste contract and re-procure to build and operate Waste Solutions

Option 3: Terminate waste contract and achieve recycling and landfill diversion improvements without new infrastructure (i.e. secure alternative technology contracts)

Option 4: Terminate waste contract and achieve recycling and landfill diversion improvements without new infrastructure (i.e. continue to landfill)

My question is to Mr Goodman and relates to the value for money assessment for Charlton Lane that will be reported to Cabinet on 24 February 2015.

1. Will the assessment for February 2015 consider the same four options?
2. Will the assessment for February 2015 consider additional options and, if so, please could I have a description for each additional option?
3. Am I correct in assuming the costs of each option will represent the whole life cost of running Charlton Lane (construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning) calculated for the 25-year design life period of the Charlton Lane incinerator and, if not, what will the costs represent?
4. Will the base date for the costs be the same as for the July 2013 assessment and what is the base date?
5. Have prices gone up since the July 2013 assessment and, if so, by how much?
6. How will the costs be expressed; cash or net present value?
7. Will the costs include a contingency and, if so, what will be the level of confidence associated with the contingency, e.g. 50% or 95%?

Reply:

1. The value for money assessment will include options 1 & 3 which were the same two options that were considered in the October 2013 Cabinet report.
2. No other options are being considered.
3. The cost of each option will include the whole life cost of construction, operation and maintenance of any relevant infrastructure. Decommissioning costs have not been included in either option as these depend on the future use of the sites which are currently unknown. However, as these costs would be incurred after 25 years then they will have little effect on the costs in net present value terms.
4. All costs will be updated to current prices
5. The costs for all options may have risen. The quantum of costs will be the subject of the value for money analysis in April.
6. Costs will be expressed both as cash and as net present value.

7. The costs will include optimism bias adjustments in accordance with HM Treasury guidance.

**Mr John Furey on behalf of:
Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
24 February 2015**

Question (2) from Malcolm Robertson to ask:

"The World Class Waste Solution was proposed by Surrey Waste Partnership and became the current Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. It was to achieve a recycling rate of 70% by 2013. It also endorsed a 60,000 tonne gasifier (incinerator) at Charlton Lane, Shepperton.

On 2 February 2010, Surrey officers told Cabinet that the Surrey reference plant gasifier, sited at Dargavel in Scotland was "successfully in operation", when, in reality, after just a few months trial, and a sample of Surrey waste, its boiler had terminally broken, and the plant was not working. It was not therefore "successfully in operation" as the Cabinet had been told. It was completely out of action.

When it eventually restarted it suffered 88 emergencies, each allowing extremely hot unfiltered gases to be emitted across the Scottish countryside, a steam line explosion, massive breaches of UK Dioxin limits, and was temporarily shut down by its Regulators, before suffering a total loss fire.

Several million pounds of Surrey Taxpayers money have been spent chasing that nightmare, and all that has resulted is a severe dent in Surrey's reputation. This has been compounded by Surrey's dismal failure to achieve, even now, its avowed rate of 70% recycling.

Surrey Waste Partnership is now promoting a new lower target 'Waste Strategy', but before it does so, it must explain this last fiasco, and both now, and in the future, it must publish its Reports and Minutes, which are so far secret, and demonstrate only the lack of transparency of this Surrey quango. Will you undertake to ensure that this action is taken immediately, a full explanation is provided for these monumental failures and deceit, and all reports are made public, before any new 'strategy' is agreed?"

Reply:

The Surrey Waste Partnership includes representatives from all of Surrey's authorities and is the main forum through which waste management matters are discussed. Decision making and reporting on progress towards achieving our shared objectives is done by individual councils, and was last reported to Surrey County Council's Cabinet in November. In that report, we set out the significant progress that had been made to reduce the amount of waste produced by householders and increase recycling. We also set out a range of challenges that we currently face and believe that the revised joint strategy being considered by Cabinet today will facilitate and support performance improvement across all Surrey authorities.

**Mr John Furey on behalf of:
Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
24 February 2015**

Question (3) from Brian Catt to ask:

Background Information to his question concerning the delayed Eco Park Value Assessment.

PROXIMITY: Best value can be realised anywhere in the EC per DEFRA, EC and SCC waste policies. Proximal disposal of dry waste is not a requirement.

DEFRA PFI Support: DEFRA's c.£200M waste PFI support is not dependent upon the Eco Park, **and will not be lost** because it is varied. DEFRA only requires significant "eco" waste infra structure projects to be created in County.

ROCs: It is unlikely OFGEM will award the proposed incinerator double ROCs as a gasifier at 2 x c.£40/MWh by OFGEM. Its physical design does not comply with OFGEM's fundamental definition of a gasifier - that will output an energetic fuel gas for combustion in a subsequent process.

RISK: Most municipal waste gasifiers globally and at Dargavel have failed, unless repurposed as direct EfW combustion - which can be better delivered elsewhere as recovery in cheaper more efficient full sized plants ten times the capacity. Failure to work as advertised is a very high probability for this experiment. For independent research - Ref: Google: "global WTERT council history of Gasification"

PRICE: At the core of the logic for all three waste policies is the lowest price consistent with the adequate R1 compliant energy recovery from our waste fuel, to raise waste affordably up the hierarchy. UK prices are well documented by the "WRAP Gate Fees Report" at down to £60/tonne for modern EfW. They are as low as £8/tonne plus freight for R1 EfW in Sweden. Google "1-3_Prognos_Tolvik" for ref. data, see slide 6.

We are not told the gate fee proposed for the Charlton Lane "gasifier", so cannot begin to compare. We do know it will be CHP-less disposal of our waste in an inadequately sized, hence inherently inefficient and overpriced, facility.

QUESTION: Will the Eco Park value for money determination, now delayed to April cabinet, transparently apply all the crucial considerations listed above to compare the full range of options, in particular the lower gate fees for better R1 qualifying energy recovery widely available elsewhere, and fully justify its results to Councillors, exclusive of any contract cancellation penalties TBD?

Reply:

I note that you have made a number of statements which reflect your personal opinion. However, I would not agree with the conclusions that you have drawn. I am not aware, for example, that any communication has been received from Defra along the lines that you have indicated or that OFGEM have stated that the gasifier will not satisfy their technical requirements for the payment of Renewables Obligation Certificates (ROCS).

Yes, I confirm that the proposed Value for Money analysis will deal with the points that you have raised.

**Mr John Furey on behalf of:
Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
24 February 2015**

CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

SURREY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2013-2014

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL SAFEGUARDING UNIT REPORT

(considered by C&ESC on 26 January 2015)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That Surrey County Council actively engages with District and Borough Councils and Surrey Police to consider how the risk of Child Sexual Exploitation can be reduced through regulatory licensing, in particular taxi licensing and in respect of activities described as "Licensable Activities" by the Licensing Act 2003.
2. That, given the crucial work of the Youth Support Service and Children's Services in supporting young people and children at risk of CSE and in reducing the risk of CSE, any future strategy and financial planning by Cabinet ensures that both services are suitably resourced to address CSE and safeguarding in Surrey.

RESPONSE:

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 1:

In line with the National CSE Work Plan and Strategy: Surrey's CSE sub-group will be reviewing its own Action Plan. As part of that, it will ensure that there is Borough and District representation on the CSE Strategic Group. That it will agree a set of standards with the Boroughs and Districts on the vetting and assessment procedures for granting licences to a range of activities - including Licensed Premises, Taxi firms, Voluntary organisations offering leisure activities to children and young people, entertainment groups - both professional and amateur.

It will work with them to develop local leadership within each Borough and District on CSE, which will ensure awareness and appropriate skills amongst all staff. This is so that CSE becomes integrated into all the work they carry out.

Through the Section 11 audit processes, the Council will work with the Boroughs and Districts to identify if there are areas of weakness and help each them to develop an action plan to combat these.

The Council will also provide training and development for all staff that need it through the SSCB's and SCC's programmes on CSE and integrate this into the Learning and Development Framework for staff.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION 2:

As public sector funding for local authorities reduces, it is necessary for the County Council to reduce costs and make savings on its budget. The CSF Directorate has therefore had to make savings and will probably need to make further savings in the short to medium term. In deciding where these savings are planned to be realised, consideration is given to key priority services. Supporting young people and children at risk of CSE and reducing the risk of CSE is seen as

one of the most important priorities for the CSF Directorate and savings are carefully considered to ensure there will not be an impact. Investment of funding has been made into child protection and Children in Need, with £3.1m being invested in 2013/14 and a further £2m being invested over the next two years.

Mary Angell
Cabinet Member for Children and Families
24 February 2015

CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

SCHOOL GOVERNANCE TASK GROUP – FINAL REPORT

(considered by C&ESC on 26 January 2015)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning engages with local economic and enterprise partners, Phase Council representatives and SGOSS to consider how the Council can best encourage individuals in the business sector to serve as school governors.
2. That the Cabinet Member and Assistant Director for Schools and Learning use the Council's internal communication network to actively promote the school governor role to all local government staff.
3. That the Directorate for Children, Schools and Families work with its professional governance partners to develop and strengthen peer to peer support between school governing bodies, and relevant professional associations.
4. That the Internal Audit Team update the Committee on any themes emerging from the financial audits in schools following the conclusion of the 2015/16 audit plan.
5. That the Council's Education Finance Team and Internal Audit Team are invited to attend a future meeting of all Surrey governors in order to highlight the skills and expertise of the Internal Audit Team and discuss the role of governing bodies in financial and risk management.
6. That the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning considers how to involve the Internal Audit Team in future governor training on financial and risk management.

RESPONSE:

1. I am happy to engage as widely as possible to promote and encourage serving as a school governor in Surrey. Our Education partner, Babcock 4S, already works with SGOSS (a Department for Education funded charity) recruiting school governors from FTSE 100 companies and has some links with large Surrey employers, including BP and Proctor & Gamble, which it is continuing to develop as far as funding allows. Babcock 4S also engages on behalf of Surrey County Council with the Voluntary Service organisations across the 11 Surrey boroughs and districts and gets a steady flow of potential governors in this way who are matched to schools.
2. I am happy to agree to this proposal although it should be noted that LA "association" rules apply in that only 1 LA governor per school is permitted who can work for Surrey County Council. However if it could be explored as a strategy for nominating hard-to-fill LA governor roles in certain schools, it could be really helpful.
3. Babcock 4S does this extensively already through the National College for

Teaching and Leadership Chairs; Governors programme, using National Leaders of Governance to conduct Reviews of Governance, mentoring of Chairs, mentoring of Clerks, etc. We are continually looking at opportunities to extend good practice. All training and development events also provide opportunities for networking and peer-to-peer support.

4. Refer to (5) below.
5. The Internal Audit Team is happy to remind governing bodies of the role of Internal Audit in schools and where any issues should be directed, although to date this has not been identified as an area of concern. Babcock 4S routinely works with Education Finance/Audit teams to address concerns where they have arisen, and additional training is arranged if necessary. The Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) is an annual return completed by every governing body which requires governors to discuss annually with their Headteacher and senior staff 23 specific areas of financial responsibility. These returns are collated by Education Finance and, where expertise is perceived to be weak, additional training or briefings are arranged. Governors are also obliged to monitor the progress of any remedial actions. I am therefore confident that governors are aware of their responsibilities in this area, but if the Select Committee has identified specific weaknesses, I would be willing to ask Education Finance and Internal Audit to review their advice. I will also be happy to ask Education Finance/Internal Audit to update the Select Committee on their findings following collation of the 2015/16 SFVS annual returns, as referred to in 4 above.
6. Babcock 4S already runs several courses on this subject, one of which is sponsored by the National College for Teaching and Leadership.

Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
24 February 2015

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

Cabinet, Committees and Appeals

Bryan Searle x419019

Bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Business Manager

Vicky Hibbert – x419229

Vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Committee Manager

Anne Gowing - x419938

anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

Regulatory Committee Manager

Cheryl Hardman - x419075

cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Rianna Hanford - x132662

rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Andy Baird – x417609

Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

George Foster – x132732

George.foster@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Manager

Helen Rankin – x419126

helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Ross Pike - x417368

ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Huma Younis - x132725

huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Andy Spragg – x132673

Andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Victoria White – x132583

victoria.white@surreycc.gov.uk