

## CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 24 November 2015 and will take effect on 03/12/2015 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 02/12/15.**

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

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

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

- **PETITIONS** (Item 4c)

One petition was received, from Karena Marchant. A response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence was tabled at the meeting, and is attached as Appendix 1.

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

Resident Experience Board – two recommendations were received, relating to:

- (i) Annual Scrutiny of Community Safety Partnerships
- (ii) Discussion of 'Enabling closer working between the Emergency Services consultation'

The responses from the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing are attached as Appendix 2 and 3 respectively.

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

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. That the council forecasts a £3.0m overall revenue budget underspend at year end, which includes use of £6.9m central government grant plus temporary use of a £0.8m unplanned underspend against Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards budget to offset pressures in Adult Social Care, as set out in the Annex, paragraph 1 of the submitted report.
2. That services are forecast to achieve £63.1m efficiencies and service reductions by year end, as set out in the Annex, paragraph 41 of the submitted report.
3. That the total forecast capital expenditure for 2015/16, including long term investments, is £196.8m, as set out in the Annex, paragraph 54 of the submitted report.
4. That services' management actions to mitigate overspends, were set out

throughout the submitted report.

5. That £0.9m increase to the existing B4S school improvement programme over the next two years, specifically to focus on creating a leadership development package for schools and to increase the number of high quality mainstream places for students with Special Education Needs and Disabilities, as set out in the Annex, paragraphs 3 to 6 of the submitted report, be approved.
6. That £2.2m spending reductions Public Health, which have been identified to meet the cut in the Public Health ring fenced grant, announced by the Chancellor in June 2015 and recently confirmed by the Department of Health, as set out in Annex, paragraphs 7 to 8 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.

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

- **FINANCIAL PROSPECTS FOR THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2016-2020** (Item 7)

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. That the Chancellor of the Exchequer will publish his Spending Review on 25 November 2015 and that financial planning assumptions may alter subsequently, meaning development of a formal draft budget is not sensible at this stage, as set out in paragraph 7 of the submitted report.
2. The strategic financial challenge that the council faces, specifically:
  - the significant, growing and non-controllable demand for services delivered by county councils (in particular adult and children's social care), as set out in paragraph 9 of the submitted report.
  - that the failure to fund, and therefore protect these services, will lead to very significant cost consequences on the health sector finance pressures, as set out in paragraph 10 of the submitted report.
  - that while County Councils in two-tier areas have the responsibility for delivering high demographic non-controllable demand services, they do not have the full range of options that are available to unitary local authorities to raise funding through other services (e.g. parking charges), as set out in paragraph 11 of the submitted report.
  - that County Councils are further disadvantaged by the Government's apportionment ratios for allocating funds within the local government sector, as set out in paragraph 12 of the submitted report.
  - that County Councils have to, therefore, put greater reliance on Council Tax to fund services, as set out in paragraph 12 of the submitted report.
  - that Surrey County Council has one of the lowest government funding per head of all upper tier local authorities, as set out in paragraph 16 of the submitted report.
  - That Surrey County Council is particularly dependent on Council Tax to fund services, as a consequence of their low level of Government

funding, as set out in paragraph 16 of the submitted report.

3. The effectiveness of the strategic actions the Council has taken over recent years to manage the financial challenge be noted, in particular:
  - that the loss of Government grants since 2010/11 (£93m) is greater than the increase in Council Tax (£80m) over the same period, as set out in paragraph 17 of the submitted report.
  - the successful delivery of £329m of efficiencies since 2010/11 (forecast to rise to £396m by the end of 2015/16) through continual improvement in processes and significant transformational change, as set out in paragraph 19 of the submitted report.
  - that the level of efficiencies gained since 2010 effectively off-sets the increased service pressures over the same period (efficiencies total £396m and pressures total £382m between 2010/11 and 2015/16), as set out in paragraph 20 of the submitted report.
  - the improved efficiency across many key services, resulting in reduced unit costs, as set out in paragraph 20 of the submitted report.
4. The consequences of the strategic actions taken:
  - that the current level of efficiencies is not sustainable and that, without additional funding, services will have to be cut , as set out in paragraph 21 of the submitted report.
  - that the combination of high level demand pressures and Government grant loss has led the council to, reluctantly, adopt the strategy of increasing Council Tax at just below referendum levels for the last four years in order to sustain services to residents of Surrey, as set out in paragraph 23 of the submitted report.
5. The council's overall preliminary financial position, in particular:
  - the high level of forecast revenue savings (£28.5m) still to be identified in order to set a balanced and sustainable budget for 2016/17, as set out in paragraph 31 of the submitted report.
  - that the capital programme exceeds that which is affordable in view of the revenue costs of the additional long term borrowing requirement, as set out in paragraph 36 of the submitted report.
  - the work that senior officers are progressing to identify further savings to enable a total package of savings can be brought forward for consideration by Scrutiny Boards, as set out in paragraph 32 of the submitted report.
6. That, at this point, the council is not clear how it will meet its duty to set a balanced budget and maintain an adequate level of reserves, as set out in paragraph 44 of the submitted report.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

In setting the MTFP (2015-20) in February 2015, the Council recommended this was reviewed and refreshed in July 2015. Following the refresh, the Cabinet requested a report be submitted to its November 2015 meeting which provided an update on financial prospects for the Council for the next MTFP (2016-21). This will ensure early transparency ahead of the Cabinet meeting on 2 February 2016 that will formally recommend the budget for 2016/17 to full County Council on 9 February 2016, and enable the Cabinet to:

- give full consideration of strategic financial challenge faced by the Council and the potential consequences, and;
- consider the views of Scrutiny Boards in relation to the budget changes required to deliver the savings the county council will need to make over the period 2016-21.

Cabinet advises the full County Council how best to meet the challenges the Council faces and these proposals will aim to ensure the Council continues to maintain its financial resilience and protect its long term financial position.

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

- **SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN** (Item 8)

That the School Organisation Plan 2015/16 - 2024/25 be approved for recommendation to Council to determine its publication.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The School Organisation Plan is a key document used by schools and education stakeholders in considering long term plans. It is necessary to review the Plan to ensure that the best and most up to date information is published for use in this planning process.

- **FUTURE OPTIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF GYPSY TRAVELLER CARAVAN SITES** (Item 9)

1. That a review of future arrangements for the management of its caravan sites be approved.
2. That final recommendations will be made to Cabinet for full consideration in 2016.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Whilst historically a statutory duty was placed on County Councils to provide and manage caravan sites, this has not been the case for over 20 years, with relevant responsibilities now being placed upon the local housing and local planning authorities to ensure sufficient sites are provided in their area.

Different approaches have been taken over the years to optimise the management of Surrey County Council's existing sites, however such direct provision is not the Council's core business and a review of alternatives could deliver this service more effectively, produce savings and provide an improved experience for site residents.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by either the Council Overview Board or the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board]*

- **SHAPING SURREY'S COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES** (Item 10)

That changes, as set out below, are implemented as soon as is operationally possible:

1. Officers continue to work with SITA Surrey to pursue operational efficiencies

and cost reduction measures.

2. Officers continue to work with SITA to enforce the Council's existing trade waste and resident scheme policies.
3. Weekday opening hours at the Community Recycling Centres be reduced at the least busy times in order to ensure the sites run as efficiently as possible.
4. Opening days be reduced in order to fit with demand for the service, but to ensure that a number of sites are always made available to residents on a daily basis.
5. Charging to cover costs for non-household items, comprising large gas bottles and car tyres, should be implemented across the service.
6. Charging to cover costs for asbestos should not be implemented.
7. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director, Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to devise how to implement a charging scheme which allows residents to deposit small amounts of inert building material and plasterboard free of charge.
8. Reuse shops will be opened at suitable sites across the network to reduce waste sent for disposal and generate additional income.
9. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director, Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to lead a new initiative to co-ordinate and enhance the fly-tipping investigation, prevention and enforcement activities of district and borough councils, the Police and the Environment Agency.

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

All council services are required to consider options for cost reduction. Any savings must be recommended with due regard to the customer and stakeholder views expressed through consultation. As Annex 2 of the submitted report shows, there are times and days when it is not value for money to operate the sites.

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

#### • **PROGRESSING THE INTEGRATION OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE** (Item 11)

1. That the progress made towards the integration of health and social care, particularly in North East Hampshire and Farnham and Surrey Heath CCG areas be noted.
2. That the development of frameworks to support integration, such as pooled budgets or the development of separate integrated care organisations, be approved.
3. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director of Adult Social Care Wellbeing and Independence, the Director of Public Health and the Director of Finance, in consultation with Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care Wellbeing and Independence, to approve pooled budget agreements for the

integration of health and social care.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The approach to integration proposed will support the provision of better outcomes to Surrey residents at less cost and enable the council to better influence and control the source of demand for social care services.

The proposals further work towards expanding pooled budgets beyond those currently within the remit of the Better Care Fund under Section 75 agreements. Including more Adult Social Care and NHS funding, with agreement on shared risks, will ensure we are jointly focusing on reducing the increasing demands on our services.

'Fast-tracking' two areas will provide learning for the rest of the County and support the local approach of the right pace and form for each area dependent on needs and context.

The models and degrees of integration available are varied and range between, for example, co-location, joint commissioning arrangements, one accountable organisation as a lead commissioner, pooled budgets and the creation of a separate integrated care organisation. All key decisions required in the progress to integration will follow the County Council's due process, and where required will be reported back or brought to the Cabinet for decision.

Pursuing opportunities for further integration will help to ensure the County Council meets its statutory duties, set out in both the Care Act 2014 and the Health and Social Care Act 2012, for encouraging and promoting the integration of health and social care.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by the Social Care Services Scrutiny Board or the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board]*

- **PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES** (Item 12)
  1. That a procurement process with the NHS for Health Visiting, School Nursing, Parent Infant Mental Health and CAHMS Community Nurses be approved and include these within the Associate Commissioner arrangement between Surrey County Council and the six Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in Surrey, as set out in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the submitted report. The process will be led by North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group with the Council as a key partner.
  2. That approval be granted to council officers to negotiate contract extensions with East Surrey CCG and First Community Health and Care for the provision of Health Visiting and School Nursing services.
  3. That the award of new contracts with each of the Community Health Service providers for the provision of CAMHS Community Nursing and Parent Infant Mental Health Services, from 1 April 2015 to the earliest date possible that can be agreed with health partners, be approved.
  4. That delegation of the decision making authority to the Strategic Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health and the Head of Procurement to sit on the Committee in Common, to be involved in the determination of the procurement and tendering process, including

timeframes, and to award the contracts for the above services be approved.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

Commissioning and procuring NHS and public health services jointly will help to provide a seamless service for users and carers and reflects the synergies that exist between the services commissioned by the Clinical Commissioning Groups and the Council. Whilst North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group will lead the process the Council is a key partner due to the services included in the procurement.

Delegating decision making authority to the Strategic Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health and Head of Procurement, as part of a Committee in Common will allow for decisions on the procurement of Community Health Services in Surrey, to be made collectively with Clinical Commissioning Groups in line with the procurement time frames. All key decisions in the procurement process will follow the County Council's due process, and where required will be reported back or brought to the Cabinet for decision.

Aligning the timeframes for the commissioning and procurement of these services will address the issue of current contract expiry for the CAMHS Community Nurse Services and Parent Infant Mental Health Services delivered by the three Community Health Providers. It will also reduce the need to go out to market on multiple occasions.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by the Social Care Services Scrutiny Board or the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board]*

- **EAST SURREY INTEGRATED REABLEMENT UNIT** (Item 13)

1. That Surrey County Council's initial investment of £1.7m in an Integrated Reablement Unit on the East Surrey Hospital site in Redhill operated by Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust be approved.
2. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Adult Social Care Wellbeing and Independence, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health, to approve legal arrangements to develop and bring the Integrated Reablement Unit into operation.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The provision of an Integrated Reablement Unit in East Surrey will provide an improved process for discharge from hospital and enable Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust (SaSH), East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group (ES CCG) and Surrey County Council (SCC) to make better use of their available resources. It will be the first step in system transformation in East Surrey to provide a better service to Surrey residents. The creation of the unit will release immediate financial savings for the health system and is anticipated to achieve cost avoidance for the County Council.

The Integrated Reablement Unit will allow people to receive an intense rehabilitation service which will enable greater independence on discharge. This will in turn ensure that more can be delivered for less cost but with improved outcomes, helping to maximise efficiency across both Health and Social Care.

Developing the unit at pace will mean that it will be 'up and running' in time to help support the health and social care system with 'winter pressures'. During the

winter months there is increasing demand on services, especially bed capacity at East Surrey Hospital. This Unit will ensure people receive a timely assessment which will provide an individual support plan detailing need and how this will be met.

All people transferred to the Integrated Reablement Unit will be medically fit for discharge from the acute wards. Transferring to the Integrated Reablement Unit will reduce the risk of further infections, consequently reducing the risk of increased length of stay for people in a hospital environment. Discharge processes will be more streamlined, which would provide better outcomes for people.

The Integrated Reablement Unit will enable Health and Social Care to work collaboratively together to provide the best possible outcomes for East Surrey residents.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by the Social Care Services Scrutiny Board or the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board]*

- **APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF COMBINED SENSORY SERVICES AND THE PROVISION OF MOBILITY AND INDEPENDENT LIVING SKILLS (Item 14)**

That a contract for the provision of combined sensory services and for the provision of mobility and independent living skills be awarded to Sight for Surrey starting from 1 February 2016 for a period of three years with an option to extend on an annual basis for two more years.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The current separate contracts listed below are due to expire on 31 January 2016.

- A. Contract for the provision of services for people with visual impairments delivered by Sight for Surrey
- B. Contract for the provision of services for people with hearing impairments delivered by First Point

The contract listed below expired on 31 October 2015 with temporary arrangements currently in place to ensure continued service delivery.

- C. Contract for provision of mobility and independent living skills delivered by Sight for Surrey

A joint contract for adults and children's demonstrates best practice and has the biggest potential to deliver improved outcomes for Surrey residents and will provide value for money.

This joint contract will ensure that Surrey residents continue to receive a timely provision of service, and enable Surrey County Council to continue to meet its statutory duties to provide appropriate services to people with a visual impairment, hearing impairment, dual sensory loss, people who are Deaf, people who use British Sign Language, and to children for provision of mobility and independent living skills.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by the Social Care Services Scrutiny Board or the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board]*

- **SFRS: TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF BUSINESS CONTINUITY CREWING AND SPECIAL RESCUE CAPABILITIES** (Item 15)
  1. The contract for Business Continuity and Specialist Rescue Capabilities be awarded to Specialist Group International (SGI).
  2. The contract be awarded, from 31 December 2015, for an initial period of two years with an option to extend for up to two further years.

**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 offers received as part of the tender have been rigorously evaluated and the best overall solution has been identified.

The proposed contract will enable SFRA to meet its statutory obligation to provide contingency cover during industrial action; provide access to specialist rescue services; and will support the long term strategy to realise benefits from collaborative working.

The recommended supplier is based in Surrey. This helps support the County Council's wider objectives of contributing to the economic prosperity of Surrey and supporting local businesses.

Furthermore, in awarding the contract to SGI, it will enable Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) to continue to benefit from external expertise in developing new models of delivery.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by the Resident Experience Board]*

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Item 16)

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.

- **APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF COMBINED SENSORY SERVICES AND THE PROVISION OF MOBILITY AND INDEPENDENT LIVING SKILLS** (Item 18)

That a contract for the provision of combined sensory services and for the provision of mobility and independent living skills is awarded to Sight for Surrey to deliver range of services commencing from 1 February 2016. The annual value of this contract is set out in the submitted report. This contract will be for a period of three years, with an option to extend on an annual basis for two more years.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The current separate Adults' contracts with Sight for Surrey and First Point will expire on 31 January 2016. The Schools and Learning contract expired on 31 October 2015 and temporary arrangements are in place to ensure continuity of service provision.

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.

A joint contract for adults and children's demonstrates best practice and has the biggest potential to deliver improved outcomes for Surrey residents and will provide value for money.

This joint contract will ensure that Surrey residents continue to receive a timely provision of service, and enable Surrey County Council to continue to meet its statutory duties to provide appropriate services to people with a visual impairment, hearing impairment, dual sensory loss, people who are Deaf, and people who use British Sign Language, and for children for the provision of mobility and independent living skills.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by the Social Care Services Scrutiny Board or the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board]*

- **SFRS: TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF BUSINESS CONTINUITY CREWING AND SPECIAL RESCUE CAPABILITIES** (Item 19)
  1. That the contract be awarded to Specialist Group International (SGI) for a period of two years to commence on 31 December 2015.
  2. The contract will cover the provision of Business Continuity and Special Rescue Capabilities. The annual value of the contract is set out in the submitted report and will also have the option to extend for a further two years.

### **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 offers received as part of the tender have been rigorously evaluated and the best overall solution has been identified.

The proposed contract will enable Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority (SFRA) to meet their statutory obligation to provide contingency cover during industrial action; provide access to specialist rescue services; and, it will support the long term strategy to realise benefits from collaborative working.

The recommended supplier is based in Surrey. This helps support the County Council's wider objectives of contributing to the economic prosperity of Surrey and supporting local businesses.

The contract terms allow the Council to terminate the contract with three months notice in the event of: legislative changes; service priorities change; or supplier

performance is not to the required standard.

During the period covered by the existing contract 50 periods of strike action were called as part of a national dispute which remains unresolved, since the last of these strikes additional strikes have occurred in Essex, the financial constraints that face all public sector organisations and proposed changes to trade union legislation may further increase the likelihood of industrial action in the future. Furthermore, in awarding the contract to SGI, it will enable SFRS to continue to benefit from external expertise in developing new models of delivery.

*[The decision on this item may be called in by the Resident Experience Scrutiny Board]*

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - ACQUISITION (Item 20)**

1. That Surrey County Council seek to acquire the freehold interest in the combined property for a consideration of up to figure as stated in the submitted report, including the ancillary purchase costs of 5.8% and that the level of an appropriate bid be delegated to the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council.
2. That Surrey County Council notes that a public sector partner is interested in taking up to a 25% share of the purchase. If the partner confirm their participation, authority to put in place appropriate arrangements for the joint ownership of the property, including a joint venture company if this is the most appropriate mechanism be delegated to the Chief Property Officer, supported by the Director of Finance and the Director of Legal & Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

**Reason for Decisions:**

The acquisition will provide the opportunity for the Council to actively participate in a wider town centre regeneration and in the meantime, the property will provide an investment opportunity to produce a significant annual income for the County Council and their public sector partner.

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

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - ACQUISITION OF A PROPERTY FOR ECONOMIC AND REGENERATION PURPOSES (Item 21)**

That Surrey County Council seek to acquire the freehold interest in three units within a business park in Crawley for a purchase price, together with ancillary costs, as set out in the submitted report.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The acquisition will provide the opportunity for Surrey County Council to secure premises that are adjacent to the former Thales site which the council acquired in March 2014 and where Phase 1 of the development of the site is underway. The property is an established industrial estate in a commercially active south M25 town. The purchase of the industrial units will provide suitable accommodation appropriate for Surrey County Council and partners in the longer term.

A further report and recommendation will be presented to Cabinet for consideration at the appropriate time when this option becomes available. In the

interim, the investment purchase provides an opportunity to secure a strategically located property with a substantial income for the council in the short to medium term.

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

**The Petition**

It states: **Revoke the decision to tender a single provider for sensory services and to tender for Deaf and VI services separately**

'Surrey has made the decision to put out a single tender for sensory services - no consultation with user groups. This means that Deaf people will not have the social services expertise and language access that they previously had, which has become more and more eroded since the dissolution of the DST in 2011. A specialist VI service is not a Deaf specialist service.'

**Submitted by Karena Marchant**  
**Signatures: 188**

**Response**

The Council's response aims to address the two key issues raised in the petition:

1. No consultation with service users
2. No services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing residents of Surrey when new contract will go live and lack of expertise to deliver Deaf specialist services

**1) Surrey has made the decision to put out a single tender for sensory services - no consultation with user groups**

Surrey County Council (SCC) carried out an extensive consultation with different service user group over the last 12 months.

Initial discussions started in September 2014. The Surrey County Council Commissioner attended a meeting with representatives from Deaf Forum to discuss the upcoming contracts, outlining SCC's intention to tender for a multi-sensory contract.

Surrey Vision Action Group and Hard of Hearing Forum were also consulted on combining sensory services at separate meetings.

In December 2014, Commissioning and Procurement held a joint meeting with representatives of the three Forums (Surrey Deaf Forum, Surrey Hard of Hearing Forum and Surrey Vision Action Group) and the two current providers to consult on the service specification and retendering timescales for the new multi-sensory contract. The purpose of this meeting was to start the co-design of the new services and prepare for a Concept Day (service user and market engagement event), that would be held in the New Year.

In January 2015, that Concept Day was hosted by Commissioning and Procurement. A large number of members of the three Forums, as well as other visual and hearing impaired service users attended. The draft specification for a multi-sensory contract was circulated in advance and was also available on the day. The Commissioner did a presentation explaining the commissioning intentions and encouraged feedback from the attendees. The event was dominated by table discussions regarding the content of the specification to ensure that input from Forums' representatives and service users was accommodated.

Updated specification was then sent to the three Forums to give further opportunity to provide feedback.

As a result, Surrey Hard of Hearing Forum added further contributions to the specification in February 2015 and Surrey Vision Action Group provided additional feedback in March 2015.

Final tender documentation, including the service specification for Combined Sensory Services, was published in April 2015.

Representatives of all three Forums were involved in drafting tender questions.

Representatives of Surrey Hard of Hearing Forum, Surrey Deaf and Surrey Vision Action Group agreed take part in the service user evaluation panel to assess quality of the bids.

Regrettably the appointed representative from Surrey Deaf Forum had to withdraw from the process at a very short notice and no replacement was found despite being offered a one-to-one session to go through submitted bid and questions.

We remain confident that all the points mentioned above demonstrate that wide spread consultation with all three Forums and service users was carried out, with several opportunities to fully contribute and feedback into the process.

**2) No services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing residents of Surrey when new contract will go live and lack of expertise to deliver Deaf specialist services**

The new service specification is clear that the award of the contract is based on providing combined sensory services to Surrey residents. We believe that integrated services will ensure that people with sight or hearing impairments receive the best support in the most efficient way. There will be no reduction in the services for Deaf or Hard of Hearing residents and the expertise will remain as the existing frontline staff will still be providing the support.

There is recognition and understanding that the Deaf and Visual Impairment services are different and the new service specification makes clear that both will be offered under the contract. Back-office procedures will be consolidated to ensure that more money is available to be spent on service delivery for both specialisms and this is set out as a requirement in the new Terms and Conditions.

From the start of the new contract the different specialisms needed in each area will be maintained. The new contractor must employ and deploy suitably qualified staff in both service areas. The wording in the specification is in line with Care Act, and the awarded provider will work to that requirement for Social Work and Interpreting (e.g. Social Workers for the Deaf).

In the event that any of the existing staff chose not to continue with First Point or transfer to Sight for Surrey, contingency arrangements will be implemented. This will ensure that the quality of specialist services delivered to Deaf and Hard of Hearing residents is not compromised. The Council reviewed the contingency plans that Sight for Surrey have in place.

Sight for Surrey are pro-actively engaging with the Deaf Forum and Hard of Hearing Forum to provide reassurance that regardless of whether contract is delivered in a sub-contracting agreement or by the prime contractor the services from 1 February will not be affected.

The Council will work to ensure that the new contract delivers to the standards as described in the service specification, and will have in place the necessary

contract management protocols to identify, and should they occur, rectify, any performance issues.

**Mr Mel Few**  
**Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence**  
**24 November 2015**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD**

**ANNUAL SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS  
(considered by Resident Experience Board on 16 October 2015)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Cabinet Member:

- leads a discussion with County Members who sit on Community Safety Partnerships on how the work of the Community Safety Partnerships reflects local concerns and priorities of residents.
- requests that the Cabinet Associate leads a discussion with the Lead Members Group to explore how the work of Community Safety Partnerships reflects local concerns and priorities of residents.
- requests that the Community Partnership Team gathers evidence of how local concerns and priorities of residents are reflected by Community Safety Partnerships and feeds this information back to a future Resident Experience Board meeting within six months.

**RESPONSE:**

I will be arranging to attend a meeting of the Local Committee Chairs and the Chairman of each Community Partnership in order to establish how the Partnership reflects local concerns and priorities of the residents to progress this discussion.

In response to the second point, this will be included on the agenda for the next Community Safety Lead Members meeting, Chaired by Kay Hammond, and I will be attending the next meeting of this group on 10 December, 2.00pm, at County Hall. (SCC Officer contact for this is: Gordon Falconer).

In line with the final point, this request will be incorporated into the annual refresh of the Surrey Single Strategic Assessment, which will take place by the Community Safety Team. I will be organising a meeting with each of the officers engaged in all these aspects of Community Safety Partnerships.

**Richard Walsh  
Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing  
24 November 2015**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD**

**DISCUSSION OF 'ENABLING CLOSER WORKING BETWEEN THE  
EMERGENCY SERVICES' CONSULTATION**

**(considered by Resident Experience Board on 16 October 2015)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Board agrees with and supports collaboration between the emergency services, but has reservations about the possible governance structure proposed in the consultation.

**RESPONSE:**

I would like to thank the Resident Experience Board for their observations and can confirm that Surrey County Council's response was submitted to the Home Office on 23 October 2015. This document encompasses the Board's recommendations and a full copy is available upon request.

**Richard Walsh**  
**Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing**  
**24 November 2015**

## DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

### Cabinet, Committees and Appeals

Bryan Searle x419019

[Bryans@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Bryans@surreycc.gov.uk)

Cabinet Business Manager

Vicky Hibbert – x419229

[Vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk)

Cabinet Committee Manager

Anne Gowing - x419938

[anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk)

Regulatory Committee Manager

Cheryl Hardman - x419075

[cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:cherylH@surreycc.gov.uk)

Regulatory Committee Manager

Andy Baird – x417609

[Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk)

Committee Assistant

Rianna Hanford - x132662

[rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk)

Committee Assistant

Joseph Jones– x418987

[Joseph.jones@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Joseph.jones@surreycc.gov.uk)

Committee Assistant

Dominic Mackie – x132814

[Dominic.mackie@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Dominic.mackie@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Manager

Helen Rankin – x419126

[helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:helen.rankin@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer

Ross Pike - x417368

[ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer

Huma Younis - x132725

[huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer

Andy Spragg – x132673

[Andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.spragg@surreycc.gov.uk)

Scrutiny Officer

Victoria White – x132583

[victoria.white@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.white@surreycc.gov.uk)