

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 27 OCTOBER 2015 AT 2.00 PM  
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,  
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr John Furey
*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)	* Mr Mike Goodman
* Mrs Helyn Clack	* Mrs Linda Kemeny
Mrs Clare Curran	* Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr Mel Few	*Mr Richard Walsh

Cabinet Associates:

*Mrs Mary Angell	*Mrs Kay Hammond
Mr Tim Evans	Mr Tony Samuels
*Mrs Mary Lewis	

\* = Present

**PART ONE**  
**IN PUBLIC**

**186/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Curran, Mr Evans and Mr Samuels.

**187/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 22 SEPTEMBER 2015 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**188/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

A declaration of interest was received from Mrs Clack for items 12 and 22.

**189/15 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

**a MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

A question was received from Mrs Carol Coleman in relation to Schools Funding Formula. A response is attached as Appendix 1.

**190/15 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were none.

**191/15 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

No petitions were received.

**192/15 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

No representations were received.

**193/15 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY BOARDS, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

(a) Council Overview Board in relation to Surrey Airports Policy. The response from the Deputy Leader of the Council is attached as Appendix 2.

(b) Council Overview Board and East Sussex County Council in relation to joint scrutiny of the Orbis programme. The response from the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience is attached as Appendix 3.

(c) Education and Skills Board in relation to Funding Schools for Deprivation. The response from the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement is attached as Appendix 4.

**194/15 OPTIONS FOR OVERNIGHT SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES IN EAST SURREY [Item 6]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement introduced the item by reminding Members of a Cabinet report they received in September 2014 when it was recommended that the County Council and Guildford & Waverley CCG work with Surrey and Borders Partnership (SABP) to transfer commissioning at the Beeches in Reigate for children and young people with complex special needs and disabilities to individual spot purchase arrangements.

She informed Members that this recommendation had been accepted but it had not been possible to move to a spot purchasing arrangement and in May this year SABP informed the Council, the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and Family Voice Surrey on behalf of affected families that it proposed to discontinue short breaks at the Beeches from November. In light of this, Cabinet agreed in July that the County Council would negotiate an acceptable block contract with SABP for overnight short breaks at the Beeches or fund alternative services if the Beeches were to be closed.

She told Members that the County Council had a statutory duty to provide short break services which were a lifeline for individuals and families who care for disabled children, providing them with breaks from caring and overnight respite. She also said that it was an opportunity for children and young people to spend time away from their parents, relax and have fun with their peers, which they were often unable to do whilst at home.

Mrs Kemeny referred to the formal online public consultation that the County Council had run from 4 August to 2 October 2015 and sign posted Members to a full consultation report that included all feedback contained within the part 2 section of the report. She informed the Cabinet that she had visited both Beeches and Applewood with the Cabinet Associates to see the provision being offered.

She reflected that whilst it might be that some of the feedback was duplicated, there was no doubt that concern had been expressed that the east of the county was lacking in overnight respite provision and since there had been a question mark over the Beeches for some time, it might not have been offered to all families who could have been using the facility.

She explained that responses to the Consultation had been grouped into 8 themes which were set out with a response to each. She said that it was clear that families who used the Beeches and their children were very attached to it. It was also relevant that the County Council spent a significant amount more than comparable authorities on short breaks.

Mrs Kemeny said that Family Voice had provided a summary of the 13 impact statements and that a comment that appeared many times was that 'There was no comparable alternative provision in Surrey providing a homely environment.' She stated that Beeches did have a small and cosy feel, but that it only had 1 bathroom between the 5 bedrooms which was not well equipped and this was a problem if more than 1 or 2 children or young people were in residence.

She said that Applewood was larger but much better equipped for young people with physical disabilities, with an en suite bathroom for every 2 of the 6 bedrooms. She said that whilst a smaller facility might be preferred by some families and might be better suited to children and young people with different needs, the staff at both were facilities were kind and caring and definitely equally as well trained to cope with the demands which they face with the children in their care.

She sign posted Members to the completed Equality Impact Assessment which set out journey times if the young people using the Beeches were required to transfer to Applewood for short breaks, which differentiated between an additional 15 minutes and a reduction of 11 minutes. She also said that Applewood was also only 2.5 miles further from Clifton Hill School in Caterham, which was attended by a number of children using the Beeches.

She referred Members to the recommendations and said that it was clear that a full and comprehensive assessment of future demand for short breaks provision in East Surrey was needed and would be undertaken. She stated that the recommendation from officers was that a block contract was agreed with SABP for overnight short breaks at the Beeches for up to 12 months from 1 December 2015 which would form part of the programme of work which the SEND Governance Board was developing to support the County Council's emerging SEND strategy.

She summarised by stating that the Cabinet was being asked to consider whether or not Surrey County Council should commission short breaks for disabled children from Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABP) at Beeches Bungalow and that there were two key issues that Cabinet were asked to weigh up and balance in making the decision which were as follows:

- 1) the impact of closing Beeches on those families currently using the service and on those in the community that may otherwise have been able to access the service.

- 2) the value for money provided by Beeches to residents. In considering this second issue volumes of current and future demand would be important.

The Cabinet Associate for Children and Families Wellbeing referred to the visits that she had been on to both sites and commented on how much the families value the service. She said that this was not a service available to all families and required a very detailed assessment to be undertaken and that short breaks were only offered if the threshold had been met.

Mrs Lewis stated that she supported the recommendations and that a thorough analysis of needs provided an opportunity to support parents. She said that the recommendations were good on an interim basis but that this must be revisited in order to find the right answer for the east of the county in the next 12 months.

**RESOLVED:**

1. Surrey County Council contracts with Surrey and Borders Partnership (SABP) for overnight short breaks at Beeches for up to 12 months commencing on 1 December 2015 as an interim arrangement.
2. The interim arrangement is reviewed by Cabinet as part of a revised special educational needs and disability (SEND) strategy be brought back to Cabinet that includes recommendations from the SEND Governance Board regarding future provision for short breaks.
3. A report is presented to Cabinet within the 12 month interim period based on an assessment of the needs of children with disabilities in the east of the county, and an assessment of capacity available in order to meet demand in relation to short break provision.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Surrey County Council would benefit from a more comprehensive assessment of future demand to determine whether or not additional short breaks provision for children is required. Any recommendations in relation to short breaks provision should be considered in the round, alongside all arrangements for disabled children. This approach will enable Surrey County Council to be confident in its commissioning decision. In order to allow time for this review it is recommended that a block contract is agreed with SABP for overnight short breaks at Beeches for up to 12 months.

The SEND Governance Board have developed a programme of work to review the provision of all SEND services for children and young people that supports Surrey County Council's emerging SEND strategy.

**195/15 SURREY SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORMULA 2016/17 [Item 7]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement began by saying that in each of the past 4 years when she had presented the schools funding formula report, it had been a process that involved the complex figures that make up schools funding being understood, and with the

combined support of Schools Forum and Surrey Officers, the recommendations had been approved after a brief discussion.

She went on to state that this year's report on proposals for the Schools' Formula Funding for 2016/17 was quite different and had been arrived at after a great deal of debate and consideration by both the schools community and officers and there had been and still was a large measure of disagreement between schools on 2 key areas of the funding formula which were covered in the report, the level of Deprivation funding and the extra special educational needs funding allocated from the Dedicated Schools Grant which the Department for Education (DfE) made to Surrey schools.

She referred Members to the pack of consolidated responses from schools to the Funding Consultation in September reminded them that they had also been copied or had sight of correspondence from many schools, which included those on both sides of the Deprivation Funding debate.

She provided the following information:

- The Dedicated Schools Grant for general schools funding, totalled £583 million with £49 million for Early Years.
- The High Needs Block of £127 million funded pupils with special educational needs and disabilities and other SEND support services.
- That Surrey spent quite highly on special educational needs for a variety of largely historic reasons, and accepted that the Council had been slow to implement programmes to bring down this spending.
- That the £127 million High Needs Block was frozen by the DfE last year and Schools Forum agreed to transfer £10 million to it from the general Schools funding for 2015/16.

She went on to say that whilst it had been expected that this additional £10 million of funding could be reduced for 2016/17, the consultation document circulated to all schools last month requested a transfer of £13.3 million next year to the High Needs block, net of £2.2 million of planning savings that would be made, as a result of demographic growth, inflation, and changes in the entitlement of young people aged 16-25 with special educational needs. She said that the consultation document had also suggested cuts which would need to be made to SEN support services if Schools Forum did not agree to the additional transfer for 2016/17 and also asked schools to suggest services which they would be prepared to see cut back although no such proposals were in fact received.

She referred Members to the proposed savings needed to maintain the additional level of funding from schools at £10 million which were set out in the submitted report and said that these covered a range of important special needs support services, particularly the special schools outreach service which was accessed by around 200 Surrey schools.

She asked Members to note that, of the 219 responses received from schools around 60% of those, both primary and secondary schools, had voted to maintain the additional High Needs Block funding to £10 million, but from the

stream of correspondence received from schools over the past few days, the actual cuts needed seemed to have caught them unawares.

Mrs Kemeny asked Members to consider the detailed Equality Impact Assessment prepared to cover the possible cuts in SEN funding in Annex 5 of the submitted report. She said that it was of great concern to see that nurture groups, learning support units, Pupil Referral Units, Learning & Language staff, and Outreach Services, particularly for Speech & Language and Autism, could all be lost if schools could not afford to buy them back, and these services support some of the most needy and vulnerable children in the county including Looked After Children.

She then moved onto the subject of Deprivation funding and said that Surrey currently allocates £61 million for additional Deprivation funding (10.8% of total formula funding). She asked Members to note the difference between the total sum of £583 million the total of £564.3 million in the table. The difference of £19 million includes the additional £10 million transferred to the High Needs Block, plus the admissions service, funding for growing schools and service costs totalling around £9 million. She informed Members that it was a fact, that the national median is 7.79% and Surrey ranked 42<sup>nd</sup> highest of 142 local authorities, however many local authorities had significantly higher basic funding to support their deprivation. She stated that Surrey's basic funding was much lower, and the comparison was stark particularly compared with adjacent London boroughs.

She informed Members that prior to the DfE's introduction of a new funding formula in 2013, Surrey had operated a tiered funding method which targeted deprivation funding where it was most needed. She explained that both she and the Leader had written to the Secretary of State for Education seeking to return to tiered deprivation funding and officers have met with DfE officials to discuss this. She said that the DfE were unwilling to consider this at present but Surrey was continuing to press for a fairer approach where there are significant pockets of deprivation alongside more affluent areas.

She explained that Deprivation funding supported the Council's aim to close the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and all other pupils. She referred to the fact that at the moment Surrey does not appear to be collecting all of the pupil premium it could – for pupils entitled to free school meals and that Surrey collected around £27 million which officers estimated was about half the amount the county is entitled to and more should be to be done to persuade more parents to apply for free school meals whenever they met the criteria.

She highlighted the following points:

- The suggested reduction in deprivation funding from 10.8% to 7.79% amounted to a reduction of £9.8 million for primary schools and £7.2 million for secondary schools.
- From the Summary of Schools' Responses, it could be seen that 33.3% of primaries and 55.6% of secondaries had voted for a reduction to 7.79% in line with the national median.
- That due to the minimum funding guarantee set by the DfE and in place for 2016/17, schools could only lose up to 1.5% of their total

funding next year. There was no certainty that this cap would remain in place after April 2017, so any additional reductions above 1.5% could effectively be rolled over and applied in future years.

Mrs Kemeny signposted the Equality Impact Assessment that covered the effect of such a reduction in deprivation and stated that schools already faced a real terms reduction in funding in 2016/17 meaning that schools in deprived areas would inevitably feel this more.

She summarised by saying that she somewhat reluctantly agree with the proposal to reduce schools' deprivation funding to 7.79% of the total schools formula funding for 2016/17 on the basis that the loss of funding is capped at 1.5% for the year and that the County Council would continue to lobby government hard on a fairer deprivation funding criteria. She said that schools must work harder to ensure that as much pupil premium as possible is collected, and the County Council would help with this campaign.

The Leader of the Council confirmed his support to lobby government on the issues with deprivation funding and stated that he would urge government to look at this again on behalf of Surrey schools.

The Deputy Leader said that it was a sensitive issue with a difficult decision to be made. He agreed that a tiered funding formula would be the best option for deprivation funding and that the Schools Forum had worked to try and reach a consensus. He stated that he took comfort in the fact that no school would lose more than 1.5% and that the county must look to increase the amount of pupil premium.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience said that it had never been more complex and difficult and that although she was happy to support the proposals she didn't understand why the Council was involving itself at all. The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement replied that the Council had a legal duty in this situation.

The Cabinet Associate for Children and Families Wellbeing queried why the costs of Special Educational Needs seemed to keep rising to which Mrs Kemeny replied that the Council had fallen into a pattern of non-maintained provision for SEN and that this was very costly. She referred to the increased pressure from the 16 to 25 year old group and that it would take time to recognise the additional responsibility with no additional funding provided.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding commented on the effect of Surrey being close to London and the comparative levels of funding received by other neighbouring authorities.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care asked if the decisions being taken applied to academies or only to Surrey maintained schools and was informed that the basic funding per pupil was no different.

Mrs Lewis reflected on the pupil premium available to schools and suggested that the Council should make a concerted effort to encourage more people to sign up to free school meals.

The Deputy Leader referred to the 2 Equality Impact Assessments and how these had been read very carefully and it was very important to take note of these.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the 2016/17 funding formula for Surrey schools be prepared on the basis of:
  - (i) continuing the £10 million transfer of Dedicated Schools Grant from the notional Schools block to the High Needs block first introduced in 2015/16
  - (ii) transferring an additional £1.65 million from the Schools block to the High Needs Block and
  - iii) transferring £1.65 million from the County Council to the DSG High Needs Block.”
2. That the Cabinet approves the recommendation of the Schools Forum to reduce schools’ deprivation funding to 7.79% of total schools’ formula funding in 2016/17
3. That the proposed Surrey formula factors for 2016/17 as set out in Annex 4 (appendix 5) are approved for submission to the DfE by the 30 October deadline
4. That authority is delegated to the Assistant Director, Schools & Learning, in conjunction with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement to update and amend the formula as appropriate following receipt of the DSG settlement and updated DfE pupil data in December 2015. This is to ensure that total allocations to schools under this formula remain affordable within the council’s DSG settlement to be announced during December 2015.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To ensure that spending on crucial Special Educational Needs services is maintained despite the vote of the majority of schools responding to the County Council’s September 2015 funding consultation, and the subsequent decision of Schools Forum only to recommend a transfer of £10m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block. Decisions on the proposed Surrey schools funding formula are required in order to comply with DfE regulations requiring notification of the council’s funding formula by 30 October 2015.

**196/15 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 2015  
[Item 8]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the budget monitoring report for the second quarter of the 2015/16 financial year and stated that it continued to see the Council face intense pressure and hard choices as service demand increased and funding declines.



He highlighted that table 1 of the submitted report set out the current budget and all approved adjustments and that the impact was that the Council still needed to draw £3.7m from the Budget Equalisation Reserve to balance 2015/16. He went on to say that the majority of services forecast a balanced outturn or a small underspend.

He said the Council's four key drivers to ensure sound governance in managing finances and providing value for money which include:

**1. Keep any additional call on the council taxpayer to a minimum**

That the current forecast end of year revenue position was for an underspend of £1.1m and that he was confident Cabinet's support for managers' actions would make this the sixth consecutive year the Council had a small underspend or balanced outturn across the Council.

**2. Continuously drive the efficiency agenda**

That at the end of September, services forecast delivering £63.8m efficiencies and of this, £31m had either already been implemented or was on track, £10m had some issues, £19m was additional in year or one off savings and £4m was considered to be at risk.

**3. Reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and government grant income.**

That reducing reliance on government grants and council tax was key to balancing the Council's budgets over the longer term. The Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund was part of that strategy and forecasted investing another £19m by the year end.

**4. Continue to maximise our investment in Surrey**

That the Council's £696m capital programme for 2015-20, not only improved and maintained services, it was also a way of investing in Surrey and generating income for the Council. The forecast capital programme was for £183m investment in 2015/16.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. That services forecast a £1.1m revenue budget variance at year end, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 1 of the submitted report.
2. That services forecast to achieve £63.8m efficiencies and service reductions by year end, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 28 of the submitted report.

3. That the total forecast capital expenditure for 2015/16, including long term investments, be £183.2m, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 38 of the submitted report.
4. The quarter end positions for: balance sheet, earmarked reserves, debt and treasury management, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs App 7 to App 22 of the submitted report.
5. That a virement of £7.1m to reflect direct schools grant funding in relation to delays in academy conversions and updates on other direct school grants estimates, as set out in Annex 1 paragraphs 3 to 5 of the submitted report, be approved.
6. That the use of Central Government Care Act new burdens funding by Adult Social Care to manage increased demand and new Care Act responsibilities that are causing pressure on the budget, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 10 and 11 of the submitted report be approved.

**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.

**197/15 REVISION OF PROCUREMENT STANDING ORDERS [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience informed Members that the Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) set out how the Council governs spending by Officers on goods, works and services and form part of the Council's constitution.

She said that the revision to the PSOs was to take account of recent changes in the law, and to update them to ensure that they reflected best practice, Council priorities and partnership working with East Sussex.

She also signposted Members to the Equality Impact Assessment that had been undertaken.

The Leader of the Council stated that the PSO's would go to County Council for approval in December.

**RESOLVED:**

That proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) be noted and commended to full Council for final approval at their next meeting on 8 December 2015.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To provide support for adoption of the revised Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) by full Council.

The PSOs have been updated to take account of:

- The new Public Contract Regulations 2015 (as described in more detail in paragraph 3, part viii)

- best practice updates for lower value contracts from Lord Young recommendations aiming to making it easier for small and local businesses to tender for contracts
- the Local Government Transparency Code on publication of data
- closer alignment of procurement practices to support effective collaboration and partnership working, including extension of the existing partnership with East Sussex County Council whilst still respecting the sovereignty of individual Council requirements
- improvements to purchasing processes intended to speed up transactions and ensure proper compliance
- improvements to strengthen contract management and management of contract variations and extensions
- updates to reflect best practice around electronic invoicing

### **198/15 LEADERSHIP RISK REGISTER [Item 10]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience explained that the Leadership risk register was presented to the Cabinet each quarter and this report presented the Leadership risk register as at 30 September 2015.

She highlighted two new risks and informed Members that there have been some wording changes.

The Leader drew attention to the risks around the Medium Term Financial Plan, safeguarding for Adult Social Care and Children's Services, national policy development and the spending review.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the content of the Surrey County Council Leadership risk register, as set out in 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.

### **199/15 ORBIS INITIAL BUSINESS PLAN [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience introduced the item and explained that on 15 April 2015, East Sussex and Surrey County Councils established a transformative public sector partnership, 'Orbis', with the vision to deliver a fully integrated business services offer to the public sector.

She highlighted that it could present opportunities to bring in other partners in the future alongside new ways of working and that a great deal of work had taken place.

She explained that the business plan set of how the vision would be achieved and the story so far.

The Deputy Leader of the Council stated that he thought it was a terrific project and paper and it was great that two councils had come together and made savings and that he fully supported it.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Orbis business plan, approved by the Orbis Joint Committee on 28 September, and the roadmap for the integration of services, as described in the plan be noted.
2. That the one off investment (SCC share £4.7m) required to deliver the benefits (SCC share £5.6m recurring) through off-setting of investments against benefits in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) (2016-21) be approved in principle.
3. That the SCC share of the initial investment in the programme team up to 2017/18 be approved and IT costs for 2015/16 which is £862,000, be funded from the 'Invest to Save' fund initially, where investment precedes benefits, otherwise to be off-set against benefits.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The development of Orbis to date demonstrates the strength of the partnership between the two Councils, and the ability to become a 'Compelling Alternative'. The Orbis programme must continue to drive momentum through scale and pace, to deliver the ambition which is predicated on the expertise and passion of staff, and to remain focussed on Customers in order to realise better outcomes for residents.

Any form of innovation carries a level of inherent risk, and by identifying these early, keeping stakeholders informed, and taking the required action to mitigate accordingly, the projected benefits outlined can be achieved.

In order to complete the Orbis story, and achieve full projected benefits, Cabinet's endorsement and sign-off of the next level of investment is required.

This investment is necessary to realise the full benefits of Orbis, including better business services for customers, and therefore residents. In addition, by creating a dynamic and innovative environment for staff, they will be enabled to contribute to realising confidence in Surrey's future.

***[The Chairman moved to item 14 after this item concluded.]***

**200/15 THE HORLEY MASTER PLAN [Item 12]**

Mrs Clack declared a pecuniary interest in this item and left the room for the duration of the debate.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning introduced the report and informed Members that the Horley Master Plan was a good example of partnership working with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council. He said that the report set out additional arrangements to manage the financial risks of

delivering infrastructure and service improvements over the lifetime of the Horley Master Plan.

He informed Members that the master plan included two developments to the north of the town and included a new primary school and a youth centre and bus service access as well as the expansion of secondary schools.

The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services said that this had been part of a 1994 structure plan and that it was essential to do long term planning. She highlighted some of the difficulties that had occurred along the way along with the long term benefits that were materialising.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement referred to the new primary school that had been built and how long it had taken to develop. She informed Members that this was a 1 form of entry school and now the Council would not consider this. She commented that the report referred to another school and that this would need to be 2 form of entry.

The Deputy Leader said that he strongly supported the report and that it took a long time to put in place at the infrastructure for a large development and that it was a very exciting to see.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the background information, as set out in the submitted Part 1 and Part 2 reports be noted.
2. Subject to the financial information contained in the submitted Part 2 report, that the Horley Master Plan Delivery Fund be approved.
3. Subject to the financial information contained in the submitted Part 2 report, that works to Langshott/The Acres development be approved
4. That the Strategic Director of Environment and Infrastructure and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, approve any requests to the Horley Master Plan Delivery Fund within their delegated authority.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To improve the Council's arrangements for the management of financial risk over the life time of the Horley Master Plan and to provide infrastructure and service improvements that will benefit local residents.

**201/15 INVESTMENT IN IMPROVEMENTS TO THE VISITOR FACILITIES AT NEWLANDS CORNER [Item 13]**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning introduced the report by informing Members that the aim was to make improvements to Newlands Corner to allow people to enjoy the Surrey countryside that everyone valued.

He said that the site received 550,000 visitors per annum and that developments included toilet facilities and play structures.

He referred Members to the annex within the submitted report that set out the timetable and master plan for the improvements and said that work was due to commence in January 2015 and the improved site would open in Spring.

He stated that due to the heavy strain on budget the aim was to have a self financing countryside estate in the future.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the proposed investment of £0.4m to improve facilities at Newlands Corner, including a Family Play Trail be approved.
2. That the re-commencement of car park charging at Newlands Corner, as set out at paragraph 16 of the submitted report, to help finance the improvements, as set out in paragraph 7 be approved.
3. That the agreement of the necessary changes to agreements with the Albury Estate and Surrey Wildlife Trust be delegated to the Director of Legal and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Assistant Director for Environment and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Two of the three Strategic Goals in the Corporate Strategy can be addressed through the proposals in this report: improving Residents' Experience and improving their Wellbeing.

In order to achieve this, decisions are needed about the investment required, the re-commencement of parking charges and changes to the agreements that exist with Albury Estate and Surrey Wildlife Trust.

**202/15 SURREY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2014 - 2015 [Item 14]**

***[This item was taken after item 11].***

Simon Turpitt the independent chair of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board (SSAB) introduced the Annual Report 2014-2015 and reminded Members that the Board was a voluntary, multi agency board at the time covered by the report and that it was a reflection on the year before the Care Act 2014 became law. He explained that the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board (SSAB) became a statutory board from 1 April 2015 and that it will be a statutory requirement for the Board to publish an Annual Report next year.

He highlighted that there had been improvements in the engagement of member agencies and that there an accountability framework was now in place. He informed Members that there had been increase public awareness and that the results of a recent campaign had been really good.

He said that work was being undertaken try and improve data and that there was a programme in place that would be reflected in next year's report.

He informed Members that there had been two serious case reviews published and that action tracking was in place.

He stated that the Care Act meant that the structure was more robust and that key areas of focus were self neglect and hoarding and that a structure would be put in place to support this.

The Leader commented that the Council contribute 45% of towards the cost of the SSAB.

The Deputy Leader stated that he felt it was a good comprehensive report and queried how many people are involved in the management group and how often did they meet.

The Cabinet Associate for Children and Families Wellbeing queried the narrative around some of the data and was informed that the information came from Adult Social Care and had been interrogated however it did not have an outcome with it.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement referred to the Terms of Reference and action plan and queried that as partnership working was quite low down the list how was the SSAB working with partners. The Chairman of the SSAB stated that the board was not as well advanced as the Children's Safeguarding Board but it was working hard to meet statutory requirements.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report be considered and noted, prior to it being published.
2. That the next steps for the publication of the Annual report be agreed.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

These recommendations demonstrate that the Council is well placed to fulfil its obligations under the Care Act to have an established Safeguarding Adults Board in its area.

It will support the SSAB to be transparent by providing information to the public on the performance of the Board in the delivery of its strategic plan.

**203/15 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE - YEAR 11/12  
TRANSITION CONTRACT AWARD [Item 15]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement explained to Members that the report proposed a new contract for young people. She stated that this was a great success story as Surrey had the second lowest levels of NEET young people in the country.

She proposed that a new contract would be awarded in place from 1 January 2016 to U-Explore and that is provided value for money. She said that U-Explore had been delivering services for Surrey since 2012 and that the delivery staff were all based in Surrey. She stated that there was a 91% success story and that Surrey's strong performance at NEET prevention had attracted a lot of attention from other local authorities and the Local Government Association.

**RESOLVED:**

Following consideration of the results of the procurement process noted in the submitted Part 2 report, a fixed-price contract be awarded to the highest scoring tenderer (U-Explore Ltd.) for the provision of Year 11/12 Transition Services to Young People (age 16-17) at risk of becoming NEET, at a value of £1.578m over four years (£394,387 per year), to commence 1 January 2016 for a period of three years, with the option to extend for a further year.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contracts with the two current providers will expire on 31 December 2015. 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.

Building on the previous success of this commission and aligned to the strategy outlined within 'Creating Opportunities for Young People: Re-Commissioning for 2015-2020' it is intended to award a fixed-price contract to U-Explore Ltd. for the provision of support services to young people, age 16-17, at risk of becoming NEET, to commence on 1 January 2016 for a period of three years, with the option to extend for a further year.

This report provides details of the procurement process, including the results of the evaluation process, user / customer engagement and consultation and, in conjunction with the Part 2 report, demonstrates why the recommended contract award delivers best value for money.

**204/15 CONTRACT AWARD FOR TARGETED CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH AND NEURO DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS PATHWAY SERVICES [Item 16]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement who explained that it was a contract award for the provision of Targeted Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and Neuro Developmental Disorder Behaviour Pathway Services.

She informed Members that this was a good news story as there had been very low levels of funding and this had caused concern. The contract had been developed with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to commence on 1 April 2016 for 3 years with an option to extend. She referred to paragraph 9 of the submitted report that set out the £1.9m additional funding that the County Council would be contributing to Targeted CAMHS.



The Cabinet Associate for Children and Families Wellbeing said that it was an excellent procurement exercise working in conjunction with CCGs. She referred to the service being co-designed and a seamless pathway where every child could get advice and information on where to access services. She said that there was an early intervention focus and that the contact demonstrates value for money and promotes social enterprise. She referred to it covering the following elements:

- Services for Looked After Children
- Children and Young People pre and post adoption
- Adopters and carers
- Extended Hope (out of hours)
- Sexual trauma and recovery
- Infant mental health
- Care leavers CAMHS service.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement requested that Members consider the detailed Equalities Impact Assessment.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience said that as the Chairman of the Surrey Equalities Group this was very welcome news to assist with mental health provision across the county.

The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety drew attention to the Equality Impact Assessment and in particular thanked the 26 children and young people that had helped to shape this.

#### **RESOLVED:**

Following consideration of the results of the procurement process the award of a contract for Targeted Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services and the Neuro Developmental Disorder Behaviour Pathway Service be agreed, subject to the S75 agreement, which secures the funding being completed and signed by all Clinical Commissioning Groups before the 12 November 2015. The contract is for an initial period of three years with an option for the Council to extend for up to two years. Any such extension will be notified in writing to the Service Provider at least 6 months prior to the end of the initial period of the contract.

#### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contract with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SaBP) for Targeted Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) will expire on 31 March 2016. A restricted tender process (pre-qualification questionnaire, PQQ followed by Invitation to Tender, ITT), in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation, Public Contract Regulations 2015 and Surrey County Council Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendation provides best value for money for the Council after undertaking a thorough evaluation process.

**205/15 APPROVAL TO AWARD A FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND PEOPLE LIVING WITH DEMENTIA [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care informed Members that this report was to award a contract and that this was a new way of looking at delivering these services as it was previously a block contract and would now be a framework.

He stated that the agenda would be tailor made to each individual and outcomes would be based around that individual. He informed Members that Locality Teams would have information to access services in their areas and that these are promoted via Surrey Information Point. He also referred Members to the Equality Impact Assessment that had been undertaken.

**RESOLVED:**

That a Framework Agreement for the provision of Community Opportunities for Older People and People Living with Dementia be awarded to the following providers for a period of three years with an option to extend for one year commencing from 1 December 2015.

<p>Lot 1 – Low Level Needs For older people who are socially isolated or need a little bit of support to get out and about. It could also include people in the early stages of dementia.</p>	<p>Bright Shadow Limited Cameo Spelthorne Borough Council Surrey Choices Surrey Crossroads</p>
<p>Lot 2 – Moderate Needs For individuals in the middle stages of dementia. Individuals accessing this service should be able to continue with activities of daily living but will need help and support.</p>	<p>Alzheimer's Society Bright Shadow Limited Cameo Spelthorne Borough Council Surrey Crossroads</p>
<p>Lot 3 – High Needs For individuals with high needs or end stage dementia likely to have significant memory loss. They may be prone to wandering and will need to be supported in a safe and secure environment.</p>	<p>Alzheimer's Society Avenues Group South East Spelthorne Borough Council</p>

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The recommended framework agreement providers will deliver older people's community opportunity services, including those living with dementia, which will keep people active and involved in the local community and cared for in a safe environment. It also provides support for carers, giving them an opportunity to have time away from their caring duties.

The recommendation to replace the current block contracts and grants with a new framework will help deliver better quality services and more choice within the same budget and will also enable the transition to the new model of services. For many of these providers it is the beginning of a shift to working

in more flexible ways. There will also be ongoing work with the market to develop a fuller range of flexible services.

The existing block arrangements expired on 30 September 2015. Contract extensions based on existing arrangements were put in place until 1 December 2015. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

#### **206/15 APPOINTMENT OF A NUMBER OF CONTRACTORS TO THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF RESPONSIVE AND PLANNED MAINTENANCE TO TRAVELLERS' CARAVAN SITES [Item 18]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience informed Members that this was a straightforward report to award a contract to the recommended suppliers for the provision of responsive and planned maintenance to Traveller caravan sites. She explained that it was a framework agreement and would allow partners to procure services through the agreement.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. The Framework Agreement be awarded for three years plus the option to extend for one year to:
  - Millane Contract Services Ltd
  - Kier Facilities Services Limited
  - MD Building Services Ltd
2. Immediate call-off maintenance contracts under the Framework Agreement are placed with Millane Contract Services Ltd, Kier Facilities Services Limited and MD Building Services Ltd for the Council commencing in November 2015 for an initial term of three years, with the option to extend by a further one year.

#### **Reasons for Decisions:**

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirements of Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders has been completed. The recommendations provide best value for money for responsive and planned maintenance to Traveller caravan sites for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

The Framework Agreement, as awarded, sets out the terms and conditions under which a specific purchase, known as a direct call-off can be made under the resulting Framework Agreement for an area based Term Maintenance Contract.

**207/15 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 19]**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reasons for Decisions:**

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

**208/15 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 20]**

**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.

**209/15 OPTIONS FOR OVERNIGHT SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES IN EAST SURREY [Item 21]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 6.

Resolution and Reasons for Decisions as per Part 1 report (item 6)

**210/15 THE HORLEY MASTER PLAN [Item 22]**

Mrs Clack declared a pecuniary interest in this item.

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 12.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the background information set out in the submitted Part 1 and Part 2 reports be noted.
2. Subject to the financial information contained in the Part 2 report, a Horley Master Plan Delivery Fund be approved.

3. Approval be given for capital expenditure, to provide improvements to the Fastway bus service at Langshott/The Acres development, as outlined in this report and the Part 1 report.
4. That the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, approve any requests to the Horley Master Plan Delivery Fund within delegated authority.
5. That s106 income relating to works already delivered and funded from the Council's capital and revenue budgets, be held in a specific reserve to further mitigate risks against the Horley Master Plan, until such time that it can be released to support wider Council expenditure.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To inform Cabinet about how the Horley Master Plan Delivery would be funded, to approve budget allocations and to highlight the financial risks.

**211/15 INVESTMENT IN IMPROVEMENTS TO THE VISITOR FACILITIES AT NEWLANDS CORNER [Item 23]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 13.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the proposed investment, as detailed in the submitted report, to improve facilities at Newlands Corner, including a Family Play Trail be approved.
2. That the re-commencement of car park charging at Newlands Corner as set out at paragraph 16 of the submitted report, to help finance the improvements as set out in paragraph 7 be approved.
3. That the agreement of the necessary changes to agreements with the Albury Estate and Surrey Wildlife Trust be delegated to the Director of Legal and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Assistant Director for Environment and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Two of the three Strategic Goals in the Corporate Strategy can be addressed through the proposals in this report: improving Residents' Experience and improving their Wellbeing.

In order to achieve this, decisions are needed about the investment required, the re-commencement of parking charges and changes to the agreements that exist with Albury Estate and Surrey Wildlife Trust.

## **212/15 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE - YEAR 11/12 TRANSITION CONTRACT AWARD [Item 24]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 15.

### **RESOLVED:**

Following consideration of the results of the procurement process, that a fixed-price contract be awarded to the highest scoring bidder, U-Explore Ltd., at a value of £1.578m over four years (£394,387 per year), for the provision of Year 11/12 Transition Services to Young People (age 16-17) at risk of becoming NEET, to commence on 1 January 2016 for a period of three years with the option to extend for a further year.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contracts with the two current providers will expire on 31 December 2015. 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.

Building on the previous success of this commission and aligned to the strategy outlined within 'Creating Opportunities for Young People: Re-Commissioning for 2015-2020' it is intended to continue with the commission and award a fixed-price contract to the recommended tenderer for the provision of support services to young people at risk of becoming NEET, to commence on 1 January 2016 for a period of three years, with the option to extend for a further year.

This report provides details of the procurement process, including the results of the evaluation process, user / customer engagement and consultation and demonstrates why the recommended contract award delivers best value for money.

## **213/15 CONTRACT AWARD FOR TARGETED CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH AND NEURO DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS PATHWAY SERVICES [Item 25]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 16. A discussion was held regarding how scores are assessed in relative and absolute terms and it was agreed that further information would be provided to Members on this for use with future contract reports.

### **RESOLVED:**

That a three year contract be awarded to Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust at a capped annual contract price of, as set out in the submitted report, for the provision of Targeted Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services and Neuro Developmental Disorders Behaviour Pathway Services to commence on 1 April 2016. This is subject to the Section75

agreement being finalised and signed by the six Clinical Commissioning Groups by 12 November 2015.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contract with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust for Targeted Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) will expire on 31 March 2016. A restricted tender process (pre-qualification questionnaire, PQQ followed by Invitation to Tender, ITT), in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation, Public Contract Regulations 2015 and Surrey County Council Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendation provides best value for money for the Council after undertaking a thorough evaluation process.

**214/15 APPROVAL TO AWARD FRAMEWORK AGREEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER PEOPLE AND PEOPLE LIVING WITH DEMENTIA [Item 26]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 17. The Leader stated that this was an extremely important paper due to rising numbers of older people and people living with dementia.

**RESOLVED:**

That a Framework Agreement for the provision of Community Opportunities for Older People and People Living with Dementia be awarded to the providers, identified in the main report, for a period of three years with an option to extend for one year commencing from 1 December 2015.

**Reasons to 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. Replacing the current block contracts and grants with a new framework will deliver better quality services and more choice within the same financial envelope in a developing market. The development of the market for day services for older people with dementia has been limited by block arrangements and traditional provision. The new framework agreement will enable the required shift in the market to provide a more flexible range of services.

**215/15 APPOINTMENT OF A NUMBER OF CONTRACTORS TO THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF RESPONSIVE AND PLANNED MAINTENANCE TO TRAVELLERS' CARAVAN SITES [Item 27]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 18.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Framework Agreement be awarded for three years plus the option to extend for one year to:

- Millane Contract Services Ltd
  - Kier Facilities Services Limited
  - MD Building Services Ltd
2. Immediate call-off maintenance contracts under the Framework Agreement are placed with Millane Contract Services Ltd, Kier Facilities Services Limited and MD Building Services Ltd for the Council, with an estimated total annual value as set out in the submitted report, commencing in November 2015 for an initial term of three years, with the option to extend by a further one year.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contracts will expire in November 2015. 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.

**216/15 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - INVESTMENT PROPERTY ACQUISITION [Item 28]**

The Investment Strategy was agreed by Cabinet in July 2013 and was developed in response to the requirement for the Council to maintain its financial resilience in the longer term. In facilitation of the strategy, Cabinet approved the business case for the creation of a Property Company and associated subsidiaries in May 2014 in order to achieve a balanced property portfolio to generate an income to the council.

This acquisition was in accordance with the Investment Strategy and contributed to the creation of a diversified investment portfolio.

**RESOLVED:**

That Surrey County Council agree to provide equity and debt funding to Halsey Garton Property Ltd, a wholly owned company of the council, in order to enable the company to purchase a property investment asset.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The provision of financing to the council's property company to facilitate the proposed investment acquisition is in accordance with the council's Investment Strategy. The investment will deliver an ongoing income to the council, enhancing financial resilience in the longer term.

**217/15 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 29]**

It was agreed that non-exempt information relating to items 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 22, 23 and 24 of the meeting may be made available to the press and public, where appropriate.



Meeting closed at 4.20pm

---

**Chairman**

**Question from Carol Coleman (Ashford):**

I have been contacted by Headteachers of schools that are very concerned about the proposals on item 7 of the agenda.

Have the Cabinet fully considered all the possible ramifications of agreeing to the proposal in item 7 on the Cabinet agenda to effectively cut deprivation funding to those schools in Surrey that are inclusive and accept the pupils who are in the most need?

Could they please explain what the scenarios are that they have considered, including the effect on the educational support for the gypsy and traveller communities, SEND and FSM pupils?

Could they please explain what Surrey County Council will do to support those children living in deprivation if schools lose the funding that is needed to support them?

What plan has Surrey County Council should all schools become exclusive, as approving the recommendation would show that schools are being rewarded for being exclusive?

What sort of place will Surrey be in the future if the policy of Surrey County Council is to be to help those that are better off, and not those that are most deprived, what sort of future is that for them?

**Reply:**

The Cabinet will consider most carefully the report and recommendations concerning the Schools Formula Funding for 2016/17 in item 7 of today's Cabinet Agenda. The decisions of the Cabinet must comply with the DfE requirements and legislation following consultation with schools and the Schools Forum. The Schools Forum is a statutory body which must be consulted on the allocation of the Dedicated Schools Grant. It comprises head teachers, governors, academy representatives and "non-school" representatives from early years providers, diocesan bodies, teaching unions, post 16 providers and Family Voice (SEND). The Cabinet must also have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for people with protected characteristics, foster good relations between such groups and eliminate any unlawful discrimination. These matters are dealt with in the equalities paragraphs of the report and in the attached equalities impact assessment.

**Mrs Linda Kemeny**  
**Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement**  
**27 October 2015**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD**

**SURREY AIRPORTS POLICY  
(considered by Council Overview Board on 10 September 2015)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Surrey County Council should urge government to make a quick and final decision on airport capacity in the South East.
2. The Council should be fully involved in the considerable work involved to refine any proposals after an 'in principle' decision on extra capacity is made. However, the council's financial exposure should be minimised as far as possible.
3. The Council should reiterate its regret (as expressed in their submission to the Airports Commission) that the commission did not explore the issues of surface access to any expanded airport in nearly enough detail, and recommends this should be given high priority.
4. The majority of Council Overview Board members agree that an extra runway, at one of the shortlisted locations recommended in the Airport Commission's report, should be provided as soon as practicable, not withstanding the reservations expressed above.

**RESPONSE:**

I am pleased that the Overview Board is satisfied with the Council's current policy position on airports and I am happy to endorse the Board's recommendations.

The Council is about to agree a non-binding memorandum of understanding with Heathrow Airport Limited. This recognises surface access as a key area on which they will work together, especially on proposals for strategic and local transport network improvements. Additionally, we have recently written to Network Rail to highlight the importance of Southern Rail Access to Heathrow and the need for it to feature as a high priority within the current review of its rail investment programme.

I shall also write to the Secretary of State for Transport urging a quick and final decision on airport capacity and to emphasise that it is critical for any new runway proposal to fully address surface access issues.

In preparation for the work that will be needed to secure the best possible deal for Surrey once the Government's response to the Airports Commission is known, officers will continue to liaise with our boroughs and districts and other local authorities around Heathrow Airport and with Surrey and West Sussex local authorities around Gatwick Airport.

**Peter Martin  
Deputy Leader of the Council  
27 October 2015**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND EAST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL  
JOINT SCRUTINY OF THE ORBIS PROGRAMME  
(considered by Council Overview Board on 5 October 2015)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Most importantly, the Boards supported the Business Plan in principle and wished all concerned in its implementation the best of luck in surmounting the challenges ahead.
2. However, there was general agreement that the plan could have been improved by the inclusion of more specific proposals to achieve the benefits, financial and otherwise, that were outlined. The Boards look forward to more detailed measures being specified in the near future, especially in the area of costs vis-a-vis benefits. At their next meeting in the New Year, the Boards will be paying particular attention to:
  - Details of the efficiencies and tangible benefits proposed
  - The procurement and cost of a common Business Support Platform and its effect on the Orbis Business Case
  - Property, productivity measures and pay harmonisation pressures
  - Case studies from other authorities
  - Evidence that cost-shunting was not occurring when extensive delegation to service managers occurs
3. It was recognised that, the achievement of the plan's ambitions would require firm, sustained Member support.
4. The Boards urged that the health community, especially the Clinical Commissioning Groups, should be involved as soon as practicable.
5. Individual achievements arising out of the Orbis programme should be highlighted as soon as they occurred.

**RESPONSE:**

I would like to thank all Members for your support together with your commitment to participate in the joint scrutiny session.

The challenges raised by the joint scrutiny committee have been noted. As agreed, a further joint scrutiny session will be arranged in the New Year to provide a further update on Orbis development.

A separate business case will be required for the Business Solutions Platform which will detail the required investment and outline benefits specific to that project.

**Ms Denise Le Gal  
Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience  
27 October 2015**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO EDUCATION AND SKILLS BOARD**

**FUNDING SCHOOLS FOR DEPRIVATION**

**(considered by Education and Skills on 17 September 2015)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

Recommendations for Cabinet

1. That the Leader seeks to lobby national government for greater flexibility around the funding for deprivation and early help in order to improve linked pupil-centred support between schools and social care.
2. That the Cabinet seek to link the early help strategy in Children's Services to the issues identified through the school deprivation funding.
3. That the Cabinet are given the opportunity to review the full range of responses to the School Forum consultation - including evidence of the impact of each of the three options proposed and any other options considered- prior to any decision being made.

Recommendations for officers:

- a) That officers proactively explore options with schools about how to best develop a collaborative alternative mechanism for targeting deprivation.

Officers' Response:

The targeting of deprivation to schools is subject to regulation by the DfE. This requires that funding for deprivation must be allocated to individual schools and on the basis of specific indicators only - either free school meals or IDACI (Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index). Specifically deprivation may not be allocated to groups of schools. Prior to 2013, the council operated a popular tiered deprivation mechanism for allocating deprivation funding but the DfE now requires a standardised approach to be used by all LAs.

- b) That officers develop a strategy with schools to encourage families to register children for Free School Meals where eligible, in order to ensure schools are receiving the appropriate level of Pupil Premium funding.

Officers' Response:

Schools are particularly active in encouraging families to register for free school meals (FSM), as there are considerable financial benefits to the school. The council sends bulletins to schools twice a year reminding them of the need for accurate recording. Additionally, the LA sought and gained the approval of Schools Forum to withhold funding from all maintained schools from April 2015 onwards in order to fund a central FSM entitlement checking service, provided by Babcock 4S.

- c) That officers support the Primary Phase Council in understanding the low response rate to the consultation, in order to develop a wider evidence base of how funding is used.

Officers' Response:

The response of primary schools to the Call for Evidence from the Headteacher / Governor Working Group was relatively low (11%).

However the response from primary schools to the larger Consultation on Schools Funding which included the Deprivation funding proposals was 57.8% (174 schools) – a significant increase on the response rate in the previous year (43.4%). This follows a series of presentations by the Chair of the Primary Phase Council and officers to raise the profile of funding at area headteacher meetings.

**RESPONSE:**

Decisions from central Government in 2013 reduced the discretion local authorities and schools forums enjoyed as to how school funding could be calculated. In Surrey, a "tiered deprivation funding" element had proved helpful in directing funding to where it was most needed, and this is now prohibited. We will continue to lobby Government to give greater capacity for local discretion as we think this is helpful in directing appropriate funding to where social needs are greatest, area-by-area.

As the Member with the overall lead for Children's Services I am very concerned to ensure that we run a coherent, coordinated strategy. The Children's Services Directorate has established a Programme Board to bring together work on different priority areas, and the Board plays a central part in coordinating work on early help, special educational needs and schools funding among other areas.

Although the time available is short, I am ensuring that all Cabinet Members have access to all the response to the funding consultation and to all the lobbying materials received in the run up to the decision-making meeting. I am satisfied that the original consultation document gave a fair overall view of the services which have been under consideration for reduction. It is important that we make fully-informed decisions and I know that Cabinet has approached these very difficult choices with high concern and a very close focus on the issues at stake.

**Mrs Linda Kemeny**  
**Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement**  
**27 October 2015**

**Appendix 5**  
**Item 7 – Revised Annex 4**

**Proposed Surrey formula factors for 2016/17**

The table below lists the provisional values of the proposed Surrey formula factors for 2016/17.

The table indicates the decrease in targeted deprivation funding as sums are transferred to basic entitlement for all pupils.

	2016 / 17 Provisional values		% change	2015/16 values	
	Primary £	Secondary £		Primary £	Secondary £
<b>Basic entitlement per pupil</b>	2,742.04	-	4.1%	2,632.99	-
• Key stages 1 & 2	-	3,638.93	3.1%	-	3,527.94
• Key stage 3	-	4,493.64	3.1%	-	4,356.58
• Key stage 4					
<b>Deprivation:</b>					
Per pupil on free school meals	3,662.66	2,580.08	-28.1%	5,093.57	3,588.05
Per pupil in IDACI* band 1		637.52	-28.1%		886.59
Per pupil in IDACI* band 2-6		1,149.81	-28.1%		1,599.02
<b>Lump sum per school</b>	135,000	175,000	0	135,000	175,000
<b>Low prior attainment:</b>					
Per low attainer based on Foundation Stage Profile	857.89		0	857.89	
Per secondary pupil scoring below level 4 in either maths or English at key stage 2		1,080.12	0		1,080.12
<b>Per Looked After Child</b>	796.17	796.17	0	796.17	796.17
<b>English as an Additional Language:</b>					
Per pupil with EAL in school system for fewer than 3 years	275.95	672.95	0	275.95	672.95
<b>Pupil mobility:</b>					
Per mobile child above		774.00			774.00

10% of roll	629.00		0	629.00	
<b>Sixth Form Support:</b> Per post 16 learner		181.43	0		181.43

\* IDACI Income deprivation affecting children index

In addition, schools will also receive funding for rates at actual costs. A small minority of schools will also receive funding for split sites or exceptional rents. These are calculated individually for each school, based on actual costs.

The provisional amounts above may be amended once the outcome of the 2015 pupil census is known, to ensure they are still affordable within the available funding.