

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 23 June 2015 and will take effect on 02/07/2015 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 01/07/15.**

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, 23 June 2015 considered the following matters and resolved:

Members' Questions (Item 4a)

Questions from Mr Essex were received. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 1.

• **PETITIONS** (Item 4c)

- (i) Lingfield Library: The response is attached as Appendix 2.
- (ii) Surrey Wildlife Trust: The response is attached as Appendix 3.

• **THE AGREEMENT WITH SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE** (Item 6)

1. That variations to the Agreement, and associated leases, relating to revised financial formula, governance arrangements, Asset Management Plan, performance management and woodland management, as described in paragraph 3-7 of the submitted report, and subject to the same variations being agreed by Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) Trustees in July 2015 be approved.
2. That the net contribution of Surrey County Council to the SWT Agreement be reduced to zero by 2020/2021; that the distribution of funds thereafter will be determined; and that a robust business plan be required to achieve this and be reported to Cabinet by November 2015; and that failure to implement recommendation 1 or 2 will lead to an immediate review of alternative methods of achieving value for money in the management of the Council's Countryside Estate.
3. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience, the Director for Legal and Democratic Services and the Head of Property Services, to enter into final negotiations with SWT to vary the Agreement.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approval of the recommendations will implement changes to the Agreement with SWT which improve its effectiveness, deliver improvements for visitors, aim to reduce the Council's contribution to zero by 2020/2021, and agree the distribution of funds thereafter.

[The decision on this item can be called in by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board]

• **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL TRANSPORT REVIEW (Item 7)**

Following the Local Transport Review report to Cabinet on 23 September 2014,

1. That the proposed changes to local bus services in Surrey, as detailed in Annex E of the submitted report be approved, and authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning and the Strategic Director for Environment & Infrastructure, to agree any minor adjustments before these changes take effect from 29 August 2015.
2. That Surrey County Council retains its policy in relation to concessionary fares as described in paragraph 3 of the submitted report.
3. That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning and the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure report back to Cabinet on the consideration of further proposals for change to local bus services in Surrey in the financial years 2016/17 and 2017/18.

Reasons for Decisions:

These recommendations will enable SCC to achieve the required savings needed from the Local Transport Review, as outlined in the MTFP. It will also ensure that Cabinet is kept fully informed throughout, and can take decisions on changes based on best practice and best value in subsequent years of the review.

Recommendations for change are based on:

- Responses to two public consultations.
- Full understanding of the impact on the changes to the public (including those with protected characteristics) and the environment.
- Maintaining services that residents rely on the most such as services that get people to employment, healthcare, school and essential shopping.
- A funding arrangement with partners that is financially sustainable in the long term.

[The decision on this item can be called in by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board]

• **ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2014/15 (Item 8)**

1. That the 2014/15 Annual Governance Statement, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved and signed by the Leader and the Chief Executive for inclusion in the Statement of Accounts and Annual Report.
2. That the Audit and Governance Committee continue to monitor the

governance environment and report to Cabinet as appropriate.

Reasons for Decisions:

There is a statutory duty to annually review and report on governance. The identification of issues in governance and a responsive approach to addressing those issues is viewed as best practice.

[The decision on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board]

• **FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR MAY 2015 (Item 9)**

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. the council's forecast revenue position for 2015/16 is to overspend by £1.8m, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 1 of the submitted report.
2. the council's forecast achievement of efficiencies for 2015/16 is £66.5m, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 25 of the submitted report.
3. the council's forecast capital expenditure for 2015/16, including long term investments, is £189.1m, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 33 and 34 of the submitted report.
4. services' management actions to mitigate any significant overspends, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report be noted.

That the following virements be approved:

- £1.0m revenue virement from the Economic Prosperity budget to budgets across Environment & Infrastructure Directorate to enable preparatory work on Local Growth Deal schemes to continue, as detailed in Annex 1, paragraph 14 of the submitted report.
- £0.7m revenue virement from the Central HR Training Budget to most services to allocate service specific training budgets for 2015/16, as detailed in Annex 1, paragraph 15 of the submitted report.
- £0.75m capital virement from highway maintenance to additional flooding and drainage and embankment works, as detailed in Annex 1, paragraph 35 of the submitted report.
- £22.3m capital virement to reprofile of 2015/16 capital spending into future years, while maintaining the council's overall investment over the five year programme, as detailed in Annex 1, paragraph 36 of the submitted report.

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 decision on this can be called in by the Council Overview Board]

- **CONFIDENT IN SURREY'S FUTURE: EQUALITY, FAIRNESS AND RESPECT STRATEGY 2015 - 2020** (Item 10)

That the Confident in Surrey's Future: Equality, Fairness and Respect Strategy 2015-2020 be approved and that progress towards its priorities be reported on an annual basis through the Council's corporate performance reporting arrangements.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approving *Confident in Surrey's Future: Equality, Fairness and Respect Strategy 2015-2020* will support the delivery of the Council's commitment to ensure best practice in equality, fairness and respect, in the services it provides and in its workforce. It will also ensure that statutory requirements for the publication of equality objectives continue to be met.

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

- **NEW BUILD SPELTHORNE FIRE STATION** (Item 11)

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the project, as set out in agenda item 14 in Part 2 of the agenda, the business case for the provision of a new fire station in Spelthorne be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

A new build fire station in Spelthorne will achieve the outcomes desired in the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority's Public Safety Plan 2011 – 2020 by providing modern, efficient, low cost premises that are Disability Discrimination Act compliant and meeting equality and diversity needs with suitable operational training facilities to meet modern fire service duties. In addition, it will enable the Service to achieve the associated efficiency savings built into the MTFP resulting from the consolidation of the two fire stations into one.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resident Experience Board]

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Item 12)

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.

- **NEW BUILD SPELTHORNE FIRE STATION** (Item 14)

That the release of up to a maximum figure, as set out in the submitted report, for the overall budget for delivery of the project be authorised.

Reasons for Decisions:

A decision was taken by Cabinet on 4 February 2014 to close Sunbury and Staines fire stations and to build a new fire station at a suitable location in Spelthorne. A new build fire station in Spelthorne will achieve the outcomes desired in the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority's Public Safety Plan 2011 – 2020 by providing modern, efficient, low cost premises that are Disability Discrimination Act compliant, meeting equality and diversity needs with suitable operational training facilities to meet modern fire service duties. In addition, it will enable the Service to achieve the associated efficiency savings built into the MTFP resulting from the consolidation of the two fire stations into one.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resident Experience Board]

Member's Question

Question from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East) to ask:

1. The first Local Transport Review resulted in a host of measures being proposed by bus users in Surrey to improve Surrey's bus travel, which are clearly prioritised and set out in the Cabinet report. Please can you confirm how these set of positive suggestions will be taken forward with 'invest to save' proposals across Surrey (or similar) as opposed to being limited to specific capital funding bids such as the excellent news of an improved bus corridor between Redhill, Reigate and Horley announced recently. What will the time scale for considering these positive opportunities to make savings through improving the service level be considered.
Could you please confirm when the consultation for the further bus budget savings is expected to focus on these elements to avoid the need to impact even more bus routes in the two subsequent parts of this Local Transport Review are proposed in 2016 and 2017.
2. The number of passengers affected of 234 appears to assume that the average user uses a bus 5 times a week. Please can you confirm the total number of people that are likely to be affected by the changes.
3. Surrey's Local Transport Plan (published July 2014 – see Executive Summary at http://new.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/29898/STP-Executive-Summary-2014.pdf) includes an objective for Sustainable Transport (to provide an integrated transport system that protects the environment, keeps people healthy and provides for lower carbon transport choices) alongside objectives to improve the effectiveness, reliability and safety of transport in Surrey. This implies a greater role for sustainable travel options, including bus travel in the future, with this taking a greater share of transport on Surrey roads, thereby reducing congestion. Please can you confirm if this understanding is correct and also whether the impact of the Local Transport Review has as its baseline an increase in annual use of bus travel or maintaining bus travel as the same percentage of total transport on Surrey's roads, and how the chosen baseline sits with the Surrey Local Transport Plan commitments.
4. Some of the bus changes will require passengers to change journeys and use separate buses to complete their journey. With the current ticketing arrangements this will be more expensive. Please can you confirm that through-ticketing is being considered by Surrey to ensure that impact of the proposed changes are minimised, as well as to encourage increased bus use in Surrey.

Reply:

The responses are in the same order as the questions:

1. Surrey County Council will work in partnership with our bus operators and other stakeholders, including large businesses, Boroughs/Districts, hospitals, the rail industry and others, to deliver improvements to bus services in Surrey. The focus of this work will be to increase attractiveness

of bus services, enhance reliability, encourage greater usage and support a sustainable and realistic alternative to the private car, delivered through Quality Partnership Agreements and Joint Investment Plans. The impact of these schemes will be monitored and will assist the shaping of Local Transport Review proposals in 2016 and 2017.

2. Based on current usage pattern data supplied by bus operators, the figure of 234 relates to the estimated number of people on average on a weekday that could be impacted by the changes as currently tabled in the report, some of which are to be amended. The majority of this number would result from a requirement to change buses to reach certain destinations, rather than having no bus service at all. If a required journey can still be accomplished within the new timetables, there may be no impact, thus it is not straightforward to suggest a figure for the people actually individually affected, rather than perceived to be.
- 3) Surrey's Local Transport Plan contains a broad range of objectives (which still remain valid) and to support them, the Local Transport Review has sought to maintain where possible the primary bus network and to enhance frequencies in certain cases, whilst being mindful of the affordability of securing those services not deemed commercially viable by the bus industry. The Review seeks to focus available investment to obtain the best value and maximum benefit for Surrey residents. Prioritising and working to enhance the main commercial bus network will contribute to these objectives, alongside the delivery of capital funding for infrastructure and information improvements. The outcome of the current Bus Review is expected to be similar to the one undertaken in 2010-2012, whereby overall patronage loss and environmental impact was minimal.
- 4) Ticketing arrangements are matters for the bus operators. Already, some offer multi-journey products that give a discount over purchasing two separate fares. Surrey County Council is encouraging consideration of through ticketing in those cases where significant demand manifests itself for a through fare with a change of bus, where a current direct link may be severed. The Council welcomes the availability of multi-journey and flexible ticketing offers, to encourage increased bus patronage.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
23 June 2015

The Petition concerning ‘Lingfield Library’

It states: ‘We the undersigned, would like to register our dismay at the proposed changes to the staffing of Lingfield Library, and ask the Library service to re-consider its decision to remove them.’

Details of petition:

We believe Surrey County Council (SCC) misled us with their statement at the public meeting last June that Lingfield Library, with its current staff, would stay as it is for one year after the new trust is set up, to enable the trust to pursue ways of paying staff from funds.

We understand that Lingfield will have no continuity of staff as we are single manned and both staff will be relocated.

No one from the library service would surely opt for Lingfield as their base for one year unless they have a guarantee of a placement elsewhere at the end of that year. They would also be taking on extra responsibilities as our library assistant does now, as a lower grade.

The security of the building and its contents will be a major concern.

Has SCC considered borrowers with special needs? We have borrowers who rely on the staff to help them choose or obtain the reading material they prefer. Some are afraid to deal with ‘new’ people, preferring to wait until either of the staff they recognise is on duty if relief staff are in. Familiarity and continuity are vital for such people.

Do the senior library service staff have any first hand knowledge of our library? The relationship between staff and users, the ambience and social atmosphere. Do they even care?

Submitted by Mrs Rita Russell

Signatures: 294

Response

Surrey County Council has not misled residents. A meeting of Cabinet 24 July 2012 decided that Lingfield Library was one of ten libraries that would become a Community Partnered Library. At the public meeting last June, the Leader committed SCC to retaining the status of Lingfield as an SCC managed library until one year after the establishment of arrangements for the new Trust to take over responsibility for the building. The decision regarding this arrangement was taken by the Leader on 9 June 2015. The Leader was happy to take this decision because of the success of the already established Community Partnered Libraries in Surrey. That commitment included continuing to provide staff from the library service to run the library. In the meantime (and this position was discussed by SCC in the negotiations with the prospective trustees) Lingfield Library remains managed by the Surrey County Council library service as part of the directly managed library network and therefore included in the operational review of the library service.

One of the aims of the Library Review is to improve training and development opportunities for staff so that libraries can continue to improve the service offered to residents and can deliver on SCC's priorities, particularly to help people live and age well, to promote volunteering in building community resilience and to expand the range of services available locally. The Review is county-wide and will give all staff the broader experience of other libraries serving other communities so that all libraries can progressively improve - to the benefit of all residents

Across the library service as a whole there is recognition that members of the community with special characteristics require additional support and care to get the most from their library. This was recognised both in the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for community partnered libraries in 2012 and in the EIA for the library review in 2014 and is reflected in training and customer care guidance for staff across the service as a whole. Feedback on library staff is very positive across the whole service.

The library service operates from a wide range of premises (including a number of listed buildings) and within the everyday role of library managers, there is always responsibility for the security of the building and on site property and valuables. New staff will be properly inducted and be under the same guidance and supervision as current staff.

The library service will continue to provide appropriately trained staff for Lingfield Library. Library staff throughout the service have the training, skills, sensitivity and customer service skills to deal with people with a variety of needs and characteristics, and knowledge of the wider library service and its range of over 100 services will help library users at Lingfield. Staff will be provided who will work regularly at Lingfield - but working in rotation as required rather than permanently based there - and will soon build appropriate relationships with library users. Developing good relationships with library users and the community is part of the job of every member of the library staff.

Mr Richard Walsh
Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing
23 June 2015

The Petition

To ensure the independence of Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) and its ability to protect the County's Wildlife and its habitats by continuing to provide adequate funding for SWT's activities in managing social assets on behalf of the Community such as Special Protection Areas.

Details of petition:

The Surrey Advertiser has reported that the County Council has plans to withdraw all County funding from Surrey Wildlife Trust over the period to 2021. This may require SWT to work with commercial sponsors and supporters to find new sources of funding which has the potential to compromise its independence and conflict with its role as manager of Special Protection Areas within the Thames Basin Heaths. Surrey Wildlife Trust's website states, 'SWT is the only organisation concerned solely with the conservation of all forms of wildlife in Surrey.' The Wildlife Trusts website states, 'The Wildlife Trusts want to help nature to recover from the decline that for decades has been the staple diet of scientific studies and news stories. We believe passionately that wildlife and natural processes need to have space to thrive, beyond designated nature reserves and other protected sites.' Wildlife habitats across the County face the constant threat of encroachment by new development. Surrey needs an organisation which can champion the interests of Nature. Withdrawal of funding from SWT is inconsistent with SCC's pledge to protect the Green Belt.

Submitted by Mr Ben Paton

Signatures: 420

Response

I understand the well intended motivation of Mr Paton and those who subscribed to the petition. However, I do not agree that the county council's proposals are in any way inconsistent with our enduring pledge to protect the Green Belt; on the contrary they are aimed at enhancing the contribution that our countryside makes to this valuable asset.

The County Council is well aware of the value of the Countryside Estate as it relates to the immediate benefits of wildlife and habitat protection, and the wider benefits to public health and Surrey's unique and vital economy and enshrined this in the Agreement with SWT.

The proposed changes to the long term Agreement with Surrey Wildlife Trust have been jointly developed based on sound principles which recognise the wider aims and objectives of both organisations.

Our work with the Wildlife Trust has shown the Agreement can work effectively, with reducing levels of financial support from the County Council, provided that we work collaboratively, have strong governance arrangements in place and develop clear plans.

SCC has statutory responsibilities towards the Countryside Estate including rights of way and nature conservation. (The Estate is protected by a range of designations including SPA (Special Protection Area), SAC (Special Area for Conservation), SSSI (Sites of Special Scientific Interest) and the AONB (Surrey

Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). These designations attract a modest amount of grant but in order to conserve them at the level these designations require, further sources of funding need to be attracted, including working with other organisations to bid for funding.

SWT as a charity is protected under the agreement if it is not able to generate the income needed to manage the Estate.

I will present detailed plans describing how the Agreement will be revised to achieve these objectives to the Cabinet later in the meeting, similarly the Wildlife Trust will present the changes to their Council in July.

I trust that the signatories to the petition are reassured by this response.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
23 June 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