

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Wednesday, 29 July 2015 and will take effect on 07/082015 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 06/08/15.**

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 Wednesday, 29 July 2015 considered the following matters and resolved:

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

Two questions were received from members of the public. The responses are attached as **Appendix 1**.

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

Reports were received from the Council Overview Board concerning Welfare Reform and the Chief Executive's 6 month report. The responses are attached as **Appendix 2** and **Appendix 3**.

- **FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR JUNE 2015** (Item 6)

Cabinet is asked to note the following.

1. Services forecast the 2015/16 revenue budget to overspend by +£1.7m (Annex1, paragraph 1).
2. Services forecast efficiencies and service reductions for 2015/16 at £67.4m (Annex1, paragraph 24).
3. Total forecast capital expenditure, including long term investments is £196.2m (Annex1, paragraph 31).
4. The quarter end positions for: balance sheet, earmarked reserves, debt and treasury management (Annex1, paragraphs 10 to 26).

Cabinet is asked to approve the following.

5. A new proposal to charge third parties for the use of the council's intellectual property which runs the on-line Careers Education Information and Guidance, a web based advice and guidance service for young people (Annex1, paragraph 14).

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 Board]

- **REFRESH OF 2015 - 20 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN** (Item 7)
 1. That £1.9m per year funding for the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service pooled budget, as set out in paragraph 29 of the submitted report, be approved.
 2. That the increased demand and complexity of pressures faced by the Council in the next five years be noted.
 3. That the revised and updated revenue budget assumptions for the years 2016 to 2020 be noted.
 4. That the revised capital programme for 2015-20 be approved, including:
 - a. removal of three schemes totalling £7.0m, as detailed in paragraphs 42 to 44 of the submitted report.
 - b. addition of up to a total of £1m per year to match funding for district and borough councils for improving secondary local shopping areas, as detailed in paragraph 45 of the submitted report.
 5. That officers be required to develop business cases for capital investment in SEND and Looked After Children provision, as set out in paragraphs 47 to 48 of the submitted report.
 6. That officers be required to develop further, for approval by Cabinet in November 2015, service transformational strategies necessary for the Council to meet its financial challenges, as set out in paragraph 54 of the submitted report.
 7. That officers be required to prepare a draft Medium Term Financial Plan 2016 to 2021 for the Cabinet Meeting in November 2015 as set out in paragraph **Error! Reference source not found.**55 of the submitted report.
 8. That the revised financial strategy to meet the challenges of the next five years as set out in paragraphs 56 to 59, and Appendix 4 of the submitted report be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

To ensure the Council has a plan to develop a balanced and sustainable budget.

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

- **LEADERSHIP RISK REGISTER** (Item 8)

That the content of the Surrey County Council Leadership Risk Register, Annex 1 to 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 Surrey County 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 Board]

- **ST JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL, REDHILL (Item 9)**

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion set out in agenda item 15 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional 1 Form of Entry (210 places) primary places at St Joseph's Catholic Primary School in Redhill be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places, relative to demand.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and / or the Education and Skills Board]

- **AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FROZEN AND GROCERY PRODUCE AND VIENNOISERIE AND PIZZA PRODUCTS (Item 10)**

1. That a framework agreement with a start date of 1 October 2015 be awarded for three years to each supplier in the following lots:
 - Lot 1 - Frozen and Grocery Produce – BFS Group Ltd trading as Bidfest 3663
 - Lot 2 - Viennoiserie Products – Delice de France Ltd and BFS Group Ltd trading as Bidfest 3663
 - Lot 3 - Pizza Supplies – South Coast Restaurants Ltd trading as Express Foodservice and BFS Group Ltd trading as Bidfest 3663.
2. In year three of the framework agreement, a decision be made to either extend the agreement in accordance with the single 12 month extension available or to terminate it.
3. Immediate call-off contracts for each lot under the framework agreement be placed with each of the suppliers named in (1) above, up to the annual sum set out in the part 2 report (item 17).

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, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council.

These suppliers will provide a good mix between local enterprises for nominated lines and national providers, all of which have demonstrated the ability to deliver the required produce and products through a competitive procurement and thorough evaluation process.

The framework agreement as awarded sets out the general terms and conditions under which specific purchases known as call-off contracts can be made on behalf of the Council during the term of the framework agreement.

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

- **APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF A STOP SMOKING SERVICE** (Item 11)

That the contract be awarded for the provision of the Stop Smoking Service as described in the Part 2 report (item 18) for a period of three years with an option to extend on one or more occasions for up to two years commencing from the 1 February 2016. In any event the contract shall be for no more than five years in total and any such extension be notified to the Service Provider at least 3 months prior to the contract end date.

Reasons for Decisions:

The recommended contract award will deliver an evidence based Stop Smoking Service that meets national guidance and will be responsive to the needs of key priority groups including deprived communities, pregnant women and young people. Priority groups have been identified in the Tobacco needs assessment as being particularly at risk of smoking related morbidity and mortality, or in the case of pregnant women, their smoking can cause harm to others.

An independent review commissioned by the Council found that the existing provision, which is delivered in-house, does not fully meet the current evidence base, national guidance or the needs of priority groups. Following consultation, and an appraisal of the options with key stakeholders, a decision was taken to commission an external specialist stop smoking service.

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirements of EU Procurement Legislation and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendation provides best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

The service will be delivered in Surrey from local office bases and will provide apprenticeship opportunities to Surrey Young People whilst delivering efficiencies for Public Health Services.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board]

- **ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SHAREHOLDER BOARD** (Item 12)

1. That the first Annual Report of the Shareholder Board, Annex A to the submitted report, be endorsed and that the report be presented to Council at its meeting in October.
2. That the Council's strategic approach to innovation and evaluating new models of delivery, ensuring that this innovation is supported by best practice governance arrangements, be continued to be supported.

Reasons for Decisions:

To inform the Council about the activities of the Shareholder Board. Continued innovation will enable the Council to continue to respond to the challenges it faces and will contribute to enhancing its financial resilience in the longer term. The Shareholder Board has been established in accordance with best practice governance to ensure effective oversight and alignment with the strategic objectives and values of the Council.

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

- **JOINT STRATEGIC REVIEW OF SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES** (Item 13)

Following the negotiations with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABP), the earlier consultation be reopened / concluded with the options that Surrey County Council:

- negotiates an acceptable block contract with SABP for overnight short breaks or;
- funds alternative services, which may result in Beeches being closed.

Reasons for Decisions:

Overnight short breaks are a positive experience for children and young people with disabilities to spend time away from their parents, relax and have fun with their peers. They are also a lifeline for many families giving parents a break from the day and night care for their child. They give siblings an opportunity to spend some quality family time with their parents. SCC is committed to ensuring that this type of support continues to be available.

Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust continue to own and run Beeches and have confirmed again that they will not lease the building to the Council or a Private or a Voluntary organisation. Their block contract with Guildford & Waverley CCG (G&WCCG) ends on 4 November 2015.

Completing the consultation is recommended so that there is clarity that the choice is a council block contract with SABP or that Beeches closes.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Social Care Services Board]

- **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.

- **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC** (Item 15)

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.

- **ST JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL, REDHILL (Item 16)**

1. That the business case for the project to expand St Joseph's Catholic Primary School by 210 places, at a total estimated 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 Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience and the Leader of the Council.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board and / or the Education and Skills Board]

- **AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FROZEN AND GROCERY PRODUCE AND VIENNOISERIE AND PIZZA PRODUCTS (Item 17)**

1. That a framework agreement with a start date of 1 October 2015 be awarded for three years to each supplier in the following lots:
 - Lot 1 - Frozen and Grocery Produce – BFS Group Ltd trading as Bidfest 3663
 - Lot 2 - Viennoiserie Products – Delice de France Ltd and BFS Group Ltd trading as Bidfest 3663
 - Lot 3 - Pizza Supplies – South Coast Restaurants Ltd trading as Express Foodservice and BFS Group Ltd trading as Bidfest 3663.
2. In year three of the framework agreement a decision be made to either extend the agreement in accordance with the single 12 month extension available or to terminate it.
3. Immediate call-off contracts for each lot under the framework agreement be placed with each of the suppliers named in (1) above for the Council to the total value for the three lots for four years, which includes the option to extend for a further period of one year in accordance with the framework agreement.

Reasons for Decisions:

The existing agreement will expire on 30 September 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 Board]

- **APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF A STOP SMOKING SERVICE (Item 18)**

That a contract be awarded to North 51, at a value, as set out in the submitted report, for the provision of a Stop Smoking Service to commence on 1 February 2016 targeting priority groups including deprived communities, pregnant women and young people. The price is fixed for the duration of the contract term of three years.

Reasons for Decisions:

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board]

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION UPDATE (Item 19)**

1. That the County Council participates in the regeneration scheme by the contractual mechanisms and financial considerations outlined in the updated report.
2. That the Strategic Director of Business Services is authorised to agree the appropriate contractual and financial arrangements, following the completion of all necessary due diligence, in consultation with the Leader, Director of Finance, Director of Legal & Democratic Services and the Chief Property Officer.

Reasons for Decisions

Participation in the scheme is in accordance with the council's Investment Strategy; to invest in schemes that have the potential to support economic growth in the county. The council's participation in this regeneration scheme will ensure that the proposed development proceeds and delivers a significant enhancement to the economic outcomes of the area.

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

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - ACQUISITION OF PREMISES IN ALFORD, CRANLEIGH (Item 20)**

1. That the acquisition of the freehold interest of Lindon Farm, Rosemary Lane, Alford, Cranleigh, for potential future service needs, be approved.
2. That the freehold interest of the property be purchased for a maximum acquisition cost not exceeding the sum set out in the submitted report, including ancillary costs of purchase (stamp duty legal and surveyors costs).

Reasons for Decisions:

A time-limited opportunity has arisen for Surrey County Council (SCC) to purchase the freehold interest in Lindon Farm in Alford, near Cranleigh. The purchase provides a site for a comprehensive refurbishment and development opportunity, providing an expected ten bed autism supported living service with in-

house live in provision for care workers.

The creation of this service would address an urgent need for a provision within Surrey for individuals with complex autism who need accommodation with significant outdoor space. The acquisition of the site therefore aligns with the Council's strategy to support individuals with disabilities by maximising their independence and enabling them to be part of the local community.

The building is being disposed of by a private individual in three separate lots, comprising the main farm house with gardens and two piggeries. The vendor has secured a planning consent for residential use for all three plots. The Purchaser report prepared, and attached as Annex 2 to the submitted report, concludes that there are no reasons why the site would not be suitable for a supported living service.

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

**CABINET – 29 JULY 2015
PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

Public Questions

Question (1) from David Beaman:

Stagecoach have announced their intention to withdraw the section of bus route between Farnham and Alton from 30 August 2015 which will end the long established inter urban service that has operated for many years between Guildford, Farnham, Alton and Winchester.

To date this service has been operated commercially with the only financial support from local authorities being reimbursement for provision of free concessionary travel. The withdrawal of this section of route will affect the following 3 main groups of existing passengers viz:

- It will end the ability of passengers to make through trips from Guildford and Farnham to Alton and Winchester. A significant number of such long distance trips are made by the elderly for shopping and social purposes which helps them to remain active members of the community;
- Although the morning and afternoon college buses will continue to be operated to and from Alton College, there are a significant number of part time students living in Farnham who use the college buses in one direction only and use service 65 buses to make either their outward or return journey. These students will now face being stranded in Alton for several hours;
- In Farnham the withdrawal of service 65 will, associated with the proposed withdrawal of the 565 service between Coxbridge Business Park and Farnham which is being implemented from the same date, result in no public transport service being provided along West Street which will effect local residents living along this road and particularly the Chantrys Estate which already has a number of social problems.

In addition, Waverley Borough Council are currently considering a planning application as part of the proposed redevelopment of East Street to relocate the day facilities that are currently provided for the elderly at the Gostrey Centre in the centre of Farnham to the Memorial Hall which is located nearly 1 km from the town centre and in the Access and Design Statement the provision of the bus service is stated to be one of the reasons that allows this planning application to comply with NPFF guidelines for edge of centre locations for community use of buildings to be required to be accessible and well connected to the town centre.

It is also likely that there will be substantial new residential development at Coxbridge and this would fail to meet NPFF guidelines that all new residential developments should be sustainable if there is no public transport service.

The recent Surrey Rail Study identified the corridor between Alton, Farnham and Guildford as being one of strategic importance and proposed the introduction of a direct rail service.

The existing bus service already provides this direct link with journey times that are comparable with any proposed rail service since between Farnham and Alton the bus service uses the direct route via A31 whilst any rail service would operate

via Aldershot. Since this corridor is already identified as having such strategic importance the continued operation of the existing level of bus service be regarded as a strategic bus route that should not only be continued but improved rather than withdrawn.

Whilst appreciating that there are restrictions on local government expenditure with savings currently being sought in the level of subsidy paid for bus services will Surrey County Council working in partnership with Hampshire County Council provide the financial support necessary to ensure the continued operation of the existing bus service along a corridor that has already been identified as being of strategic importance?

Reply:

Surrey County Council is disappointed that Stagecoach intends to withdraw the section of route between Farnham and Alton on their bus service 65, for commercial reasons. The company considers that the number of people travelling on the Farnham to Alton section is insufficient to sustain the service from a revenue perspective. They consider that the train service between those towns caters for much of the overall travel demand.

For a service run without a contractual obligation to a local authority, national legislation gives the company the prerogative to make such a decision. The reduction in public transport travel choice now and in the future is recognised, as well as the potential impact on those residents located along West Street in Farnham.

However, both Hampshire and Surrey County Councils are currently assessing whether a replacement service of some kind could be obtained that would be sustainable in the future against current budgetary pressures. Discussions with operators are ongoing and cost option information is at this time still awaited, to allow any decision to be reached

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
29 July 2015

Question (2) from Fran Morgan:

The question is as follows:

- We do not understand why the only proposed question in the public consultation is whether the council should agree a block contract with Surrey and Borders Partnership Trust to run the service. Parents do not care whether the service is paid for on a block contract or spot purchase basis only that they are able to continue to access the service at the Beeches. Can you specify how the potential answers to this question would influence the council's decision – how many people would need to agree that they wanted a block contract before the council would commission it?
- How does the council reconcile discontinuing local respite provision with their stated aim of helping children with disabilities to remain living at home and within their local community?
- What risk assessment has the council carried out to compare the current annual cost of keeping Beeches open (£565K pa on the current block

contract) with the potential costs of having to take one or more disabled children into care (over £300k each pa)? To give an indication of the likely costs: with the current level of provision, 8 children from one of the local schools were taken into care during the last year. Parents of 2 of the current Beeches users have indicated that they will not be able to continue caring for their child at home, if they lose their current respite provision.

- What regard has Surrey given to NHS Surrey's impact assessment 2012 that stated: "The original reasons for closure did not take into account the full health impact on families, their overall wellbeing and the preventative role played by Beeches." Why was this advice disregarded in Surrey's own joint strategic review passed by cabinet in 2014?
- There are 800 severely disabled children who currently meet the criteria for respite at Beeches and 161 at the 2 local SLD schools. Is it credible to cabinet that promises made by Caroline Budden and Ian Banner, that social workers would actively promote the Beeches as an option for all eligible families, should result in only 15 families being assessed for the Beeches?
- Using Surrey's own data, the spend on children with disabilities in East Surrey (in the parent panel meeting in 2014) was £47,856 less than in West Surrey, yet there are more disabled children in East Surrey. There are also less respite centres in East Surrey, with one of only two now planned for closure. How does the Local Authority justify this discrepancy between East and West?

Reply:

We thank Family Voice for their questions and comments, which raise a number of important issues. As you will see from the Agenda, Cabinet is considering a report this afternoon which recommends a further period of consultation on the provision of short breaks, and the questions raised will be referred to the officers responsible so that those issues can be taken into account in the consultation.

Mrs Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement
29 July 2015

CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD

WELFARE REFORM TASK GROUP

(considered by Council Overview Board on 3 June 2015)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

For the Cabinet to endorse the recommendations made by the Council Overview Board regarding Welfare reform as listed below:

1. The case for continuing funding for the Local Assistance Scheme in Surrey is reconfirmed as part of the budget and service planning cycle, having due regard to usage, need, benefits and cost of delivery.
2. That the getWiS£ or a similar service, be extended for a further 3 years, with a built-in review of usage and need on an annual basis.
3. That careful consideration be given to the role of Libraries as a 'gateway to County services' when developing a vision for the future of the Surrey Library Service and that the Resident Experience Board (previously Communities Select Committee) continues to monitor the progress.
4. A Member representative of the Welfare Reform Task Group be invited to be briefed on the Universal Credit pilot in Elmbridge, and agree a protocol for keeping the Task Group informed.
5. That a structured project plan for the Universal Credit roll Pilot in Elmbridge be shared with Members of the Task Group.
6. A robust monitoring scheme needs to be introduced to measure update of staff accessing training but also measuring the numbers starting the programme and the number of staff completing the training.
7. The Task Group to explore further the length of time it can take claimants to reach tribunal when they have launched an appeal against a benefits decision and request further information about how the assessment process has improved since moving to the Maximus contract.
8. Surrey's District & Boroughs and Housing Associations ensure that all options are explored for alternative payment arrangements for vulnerable claimants.
9. The Welfare Reform Coordination Group continues to work with partners to ensure that the reforms, including the introduction of Universal Credit, are communicated widely with residents and services across the County.
10. The Surrey County Council Contact Centre is adequately trained to deal with, and signpost, callers to the correct services, particularly during the initial period of Universal Credit.
11. The Welfare Reform Task Group should continue for a further year, meeting quarterly to monitor the impact of the reforms. The Chairman of the Task Group to engage with the Resident Experience Board to carry out future work.
12. The Welfare Reform Task Group to investigate the disparity between hardship fund spending in different districts and boroughs in Surrey.

RESPONSE:

I am pleased that the Task Group is satisfied that the Council is prepared for the welfare reforms and I am happy to endorse the Task Group's recommendations. Some of the recommendations and issues raised by the Task Group relate to national policy - in particular, the ongoing issue of delays in benefit appeals reaching tribunals. I endorse the continued work of the Task Group in monitoring this issue and should the Chairman of the Board wish to write to the Secretary of State to raise any concerns, I would be happy to endorse the letter.

A number of the Task Group's recommendations refer to Universal Credit. Officers are working very closely with Elmbridge Borough Council to support the introduction of Universal Credit and how this affects our residents and services. As part of this, the Council will be organising an information sharing session in the autumn and I have asked that Officers ensure the Task Group is kept informed.

The Task Group also makes recommendations regarding the future of the getWIS£ and Local Assistance Scheme. Officers are currently evaluating the existing arrangements before developing a business case to see how best to deliver these schemes in the future. Again, I have asked Officers to ensure that the Task Group is kept up to date with this work.

Finally, I would like to thank the Task Group for its continued hard work in scrutinising the impact of welfare reform on Surrey residents. This is a complex and ever changing issue, which makes the careful and considered scrutiny that the Task Group offers even more important.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
29 July 2015

CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S 6 MONTH REPORT
(considered by Council Overview Board on 1 July 2015)**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Chief Executive and Staff are congratulated on their hard work contributing to the report.
2. That the Chief Executive's 6 month report continue to be presented to Full Council in future years.
3. That future reports include key milestones and targets in relation to the Council's priorities.
4. That the Four Priorities for the next 6 months, as set out in the Chief Executive's report, are endorsed by the Scrutiny Board.

RESPONSE:

I would like to join the Council Overview Board in congratulating the Chief Executive and Staff for their hard work contributing to the 6 month report. Despite the challenges we face, there are some great examples within the report of how this Council continues to make a positive difference to Surrey residents.

I am glad that Members find the report useful and support the request for it to be presented to Full Council in future years.

The report is part of a suite of documents which provide Members with information on the Council's priorities and performance. Reports such as our Corporate Strategy and Annual Report include further detail on our key milestones and targets, and the Chief Executive's 6 month report should be read alongside these other documents. Members can also keep up to date on progress against our corporate priorities on our new performance web pages (<https://performance.surreycc.gov.uk>). However, I have asked the Chief Executive to be mindful of the feedback from Members regarding milestones and targets when drafting future reports.

I am pleased that the Council Overview Board approves the four priorities as set out in the report. We will need a strong focus on these priorities if we are to meet our corporate responsibilities in 2016 and beyond. I hope that the Overview and Scrutiny function can support the organisation in achieving these goals through continuing to offer robust challenge.

On behalf of the Cabinet, I endorse these recommendations.

**David Hodge
Leader of the Council
29 July 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 Managers:

Cheryl Hardman - x419075

cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk

Andy Baird – x417609

Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Rianna Hanford - x132662

rianna.hanford@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