

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 24 NOVEMBER 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**

**218/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Angell, Mrs Curran, Mrs Hammond and Mr Samuels.

**219/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 27 OCTOBER 2015 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**220/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**221/15 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

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

**b**

There were no questions from Members.

**222/15 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were no questions from Members of the public.

**223/15 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

One petition was received, from Kerena 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, together with the petitioner's statement, attached as Appendix 1A.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence thanked the petitioner for attending the meeting to present her petition and addressed the two issues raised by the petitioner. He gave an assurance that the new contract would be closely monitored to ensure it delivered the standards as described in the service specification.

#### **224/15 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

No representations were received.

**[Note: This item was moved up the agenda and taken next]**

#### **225/15 APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF COMBINED SENSORY SERVICES AND THE PROVISION OF MOBILITY AND INDEPENDENT LIVING SKILLS [Item 14]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence said that this report sought approval to award a three year contract with an option to extend for up to two additional one year periods to Sight for Surrey for the provision of combined sensory services and mobility and independent living skills, to commence on 1 February 2016.

He stated that the Council believed that combining visual and hearing impairment services across the County would improve outcomes for Surrey residents and also provide value for money. He also said that two commissioning strategies had informed the re-commissioning process: (i) the Adults Joint Commissioning Strategy, and (ii) the Children's Commissioning Strategy.

He referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment, attached as an Annex to the report and confirmed that a range of positive impacts had been identified for all groups, including increased flexibility of provision for individuals and carers.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement said that she was fully aware of the importance of the service provision which enabled these children and young people to have full access to the academic, mobility and independence skills to help them achieve their potential. She was confident that the new contract would deliver the right provision for 0-25 year olds. Finally, she confirmed that the contract would be closely monitored.

Other Cabinet Members made the following points:

- The procurement strategy – that the tenders received had been evaluated against a number of 'quality' questions, including 'added value'.
- The Equality Impact Assessment had included evidence which would ensure its compliance with the statutory and legal requirements, as set out in the Care Act 2014.

- The aim of this contract was 'outcome based commissioning' rather than just providing a service.
- The specification of this contract was jointly drafted and had incorporated both Adults' and Schools and Learning's requirements.
- Assurance was requested that hearing was equally important to the proposed contract provider - Sight for Surrey.
- The Monitoring Officer had confirmed that the Council was complying with the general responsibilities under the Care Act 2014.
- Finally, attention was drawn to paragraph 30 of the report which said that the contract would include a termination clause.

### **RESOLVED:**

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 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.

## **226/15 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.

## **227/15 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR OCTOBER 2015 [Item 6]**

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report for the seventh month of the 2015/16 financial year, covering the period up to 31 October 2015. He said that the County Council faced ever more intense pressures and hard choices as service demand grew and funding declined and drew attention to recommendation 6, the approval of a £2.2m in-year spending reduction because the Department of Health had confirmed that would be taken from the Council’s Public Health grant.

He confirmed, as stated at previous Cabinet meetings, that the Council’s financial strategy had four key drivers to ensure sound governance in managing finances and providing value for money.

These were:

### **1. To keep any additional call on the council taxpayer to a minimum**

The current forecast for the end of year revenue position was for an underspend of £3.0m and he was confident that Cabinet’s support for managers’ actions would make this the sixth consecutive year that the Council had a small underspend or balanced outturn across the Council. He said that the Council’s multi-year approach to financial management aimed to smooth resource fluctuations over five years and managing budgets and overall resources to achieve a small underspend was important for giving some headroom and flexibility for managing spending plans for future years.

He stressed the importance of understanding the Council’s underlying demand and savings pressures and drew attention to the Adult Social Care forecast which include £7.7m one off support, which if left unchecked, would add to future years’ pressures.

### **2. To continuously drive the efficiency agenda**

That, at the end of October, services forecast delivering £63.1m efficiencies. Of this, £33m had either already been implemented or were on track, £8m had some issues, £19m were additional in-year or one off savings and £3m were considered to be at risk.

**3. To 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 and that the Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund was forecast to invest another £31m this year.

**4. To continue to maximise our investment in Surrey**

Finally, he said that the Council's £696m capital programme for 2015-20, not only improved and maintained Council services, it was also a way of investing in Surrey and generating income for the Council, with the forecast capital programme of £197m 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 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.

## **228/15 FINANCIAL PROSPECTS FOR THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2016-2021 [Item 7]**

The Leader of the Council said that he was pleased to share a report setting out the financial prospects for the County Council for the next five years. He said that previously the budget proposals had been considered by Cabinet in February. However, for this year, he wanted to update Cabinet on the latest financial position earlier, in order to help with transparency and to assist the Scrutiny Boards.

He also wanted to put on record the strategic financial challenges facing the Council, which were significant and reflected the high demographic demand pressures the Council faced plus the specific implications of how County Councils were funded. He said that the report set out the preliminary financial position and stated that more work was required to ensure a balance budget for 2016/17 was set in February 2016. This further work would be undertaken after the Chancellor's Autumn Statement and the Local Government's Financial Settlement, due in December.

Other Members of the Cabinet Team made the following points:

- That Table 1 in the report illustrated that Surrey residents received the lowest Formula Grant Support per head of any county area and the third lowest of all English upper tier areas.
- That for the last two years, the County Council had used reserves to deliver a balanced budget and that much of the reserves held in general balances were earmarked for particular expenditure.
- Figure 7 clearly set out the budget efficiencies already achieved and future required savings.
- Figure 5 forecast Adult Social Care Unit Costs, which had significantly reduces over the past few years and also the Client Volumes, forecast to continue upwards.
- That the capital programme for school places had increased from £54m to £75m per year and that a key element for meeting the increased demand was working with Government and other parties to create more free schools.
- The funding allocation for Surrey's road network.

In summing up, the Leader of the Council drew attention to an additional bullet point proposed within recommendation (2), namely:

'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.'

### **RESOLVED (as amended):**

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. That 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.

#### **229/15 SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN [Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement said that the School Organisation Plan set out the policies and principles underpinning school organisation in Surrey and highlighted the likely demand for school places projected over a 10 year period. It set out any potential changes in school organisation that may be required in order to meet the Authority's statutory duty to provide sufficient places.

She said that the current position in Surrey remained one of a rising permanent school population across the county, despite a plateau in the birth rate in 2013. The sharp increase in primary cohorts was also now starting to impact on the secondary sector. She also confirmed that the County Council worked closely with Boroughs and Districts to ensure that appropriate contributions from developers were received to meet future educational infrastructure and that the Council would continue to work with the Department for Education for a fairer funding settlement.

Other key points highlighted by the Cabinet Member were that Elmbridge was the fastest growing borough in terms of overall population and that 197 languages other than English were spoken by children and young people in Surrey schools.

Points made by other Cabinet Members included: (i) that the County Council had maintained its statutory duty and had offered all Surrey children a school place, (ii) School expansion in their areas and the number of bulge classes throughout the county, and (iii) the importance of accurate forecasting.

Finally, the Cabinet Member thanked officers from the School Commissioning Team for the compilation of the School Organisation Plan and commended it to Cabinet for recommendation at the next meeting of the County Council on 8 December 2015.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**230/15 FUTURE OPTIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF GYPSY TRAVELLER CARAVAN SITES [Item 9]**

Introducing this report, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience said that the statutory duty to ensure that there was sufficient provision of pitches for gypsies and travellers was the responsibility of Boroughs and Districts.

She said that Surrey County Council owned a portfolio of Gypsy Traveller Caravan sites and this report provided options as to how these sites might be managed in the future, developing a medium term strategy that would deliver financial savings to Surrey County Council whilst protecting their existing use. Three options were set out in the report but that did not preclude other options being considered by Property Services.

At this early stage, Cabinet was being asked to approve the principle of looking at alternative ways in which sites can be managed.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**231/15 SHAPING SURREY'S COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES [Item 10]**

Prior to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning introducing the report, the Chairman of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board was invited to speak.

He informed Members that his Scrutiny Board had considered the proposals for shaping Surrey's Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) and that his overall position was to support the proposals, in principle. However, he made two suggestions for consideration: they should have an environmental benefit and also that any recycling should be viable.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning began his introduction by recognising the high regard that residents had for the community recycling centres and said that this Council had recognised this by investing over £9m in upgrading them in recent years.

However, he said that, with the financial pressures the Council faced, particularly in adult social care and education, CRCs could not remain immune from cost saving scrutiny.

He explained the consultation process undertaken and said that over 4500 members of the public and other organisations had responded and that the proposals set out in the report took the feedback into account. Also, that officers were engaging with the contractor SUEZ to identify further opportunities for efficiencies and cost savings.

He highlighted the key proposals from the report and commended them to Cabinet.

Finally, he said that he recognised the concerns that of some of those responding to the consultation had, with regard to the potential for an increase in fly tipping and said that the Council was working with the relevant partners

to develop a Surrey fly tipping strategy. He also informed Cabinet that he was meeting Rory Stewart, the Government Minister regarding Surrey's approach to waste and would be seeking Government support.

Other Members of the Cabinet considered that this was a good report and made the following points:

- Making use of Social Media, including Twitter and Facebook
- An assurance that residents would be made aware of any changes to the opening times at their recycling centres
- The importance of balancing this provision alongside other County Council services, whilst still providing Value for Money.

### **RESOLVED:**

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.

## **232/15 PROGRESSING THE INTEGRATION OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE**

### **[Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health said that this report provided a synopsis of the move towards integrated services which had been accelerated in health and social care by the introduction of the Better Care Fund. This was a key strategy for Surrey's Adult Social Care service to manage increasing demand.

She said that, due to differing contexts and local needs across the six Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) areas in Surrey, the speed and form of integration was not identical in each area and this report provided the Cabinet with an updated position and requested approval for the direction of travel including the 'fast-track' approach in two of the CCG areas.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence agreed that this was an important report which set out the future strategy for integration going forward. He drew attention to the Financial and Value for Money implications, as set out in the report, and said that it was important that funds were only pooled for services that would be directly impacted by integration plans and also that it was equally important that there was a clear agreement on how financial risks were shared.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement was pleased to report that the Woking Community Hub would be opening on 16 December 2015 and that she hoped that it would alleviate pressure for services at St Peter's hospital.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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.

## **233/15 PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES**

### **[Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health said that this report outlined the commissioning and procurement process for Community Health Services that was taking place across Surrey. The final contract award was anticipated to take place in August 2016 and would include services that were commissioned by the Council. There were a number of recommendations for Cabinet to approve to progress with the procurement of these services.

She drew attention to proposed revised recommendations (3) and (4):

Recommendation 3 – deleting ' 31 March 2017' and replacing it with 'the earliest date possible that can be agreed with health partners'

Recommendation 4 – adding in 'including timeframes' after 'procurement tendering process...'

Finally, she asked Cabinet to note that a 'Committee in Common' would be established – this would allow for procurement timeframes to be met whilst each organisation involved in the Community Health Services procurement retained its own decision making authority.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement confirmed that she support the recommendations and drew attention to Annex A of the report which listed the services currently being considered within the Community Health Services procurement process.

### **RESOLVED:**

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.

#### **234/15 EAST SURREY INTEGRATED REABLEMENT UNIT [Item 13]**

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health said that the integration of health and social care was a key strategic priority for Surrey County Council and its partners, and to improve outcomes for residents. The proposal to develop the Integrated Reablement Unit highlighted the partnership working that was taking place between Surrey County Council and the NHS.

She said that Cabinet were being asked to approve an initial investment of £1.7m and that the timing of this provision was very important to being able to manage the increase in demand associated with winter and the additional pressure this created on health and social care services.

The Integrated Reablement Unit would contribute to the Council's corporate Wellbeing objective by supporting older people to be discharged from hospital more quickly and to live independently in the community.

It was hoped that the creation of the integrated Reablement Unit would help reduce pressures on services at East Surrey hospital and reflected the new ways of working in partnership with the NHS.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**235/15 SFRS: TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF BUSINESS CONTINUITY CREWING AND SPECIAL RESCUE CAPABILITIES [Item 15]**

The Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing provided Cabinet with the background to this contract and said that Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority (SFRA) had a statutory obligation to provide contingency cover, in accordance with the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 and the National Framework and Civil Contingencies Act 2004.

He said that this report sought approval to award a contract for the provision of Business Continuity and Specialist Rescue Capabilities to commence on 31 December 2015, when the current contract expired and that the annual contract value would be £680,000.

The report provided details of the competitive tendering process. The tender had been divided into three lots and, in conjunction with the Part 2 report, demonstrated why the recommended contract award delivered best value for money.

Finally, he drew Members attention to the S151 officer commentary and explained the reason for the inclusion of a termination clause in this contract.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**236/15 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 16]**

**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.

**237/15 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]**

**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.

**238/15 APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF COMBINED SENSORY SERVICES AND THE PROVISION OF MOBILITY AND INDEPENDENT LIVING SKILLS [Item 18]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 14 and was presented by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**239/15 SFRS: TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF BUSINESS CONTINUITY CREWING AND SPECIAL RESCUE CAPABILITIES [Item 19]**

This part 2 report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 15 and was presented by the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

## **240/15 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - ACQUISITION [Item 20]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience confirmed that the County Council was seeking to acquire a freehold interest in this property but that there was no guarantee of its success.

She also confirmed that the Local Member had been consulted on this proposed acquisition.

### **RESOLVED:**

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.

**241/15 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - ACQUISITION OF A PROPERTY FOR ECONOMIC AND REGENERATION PURPOSES [Item 21]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience introduced the report and commended the recommendations to the Cabinet.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**242/15 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 22]**

It was agreed that non-exempt information relating to items 18 and 19 of the meeting may be made available to the press and public, where appropriate.

[Meeting closed at 4.20pm]

---

**Chairman**

**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**

**Presentation of petition by Kerena Marchant**

The Deaf Community of Surrey asks the Council to revoke the decision for a single tender for VI and DEAF Services and to commission them separately.

The proposals that the Cabinet is about to table are:

- Unconstitutional – for example, it doesn't meet The Social Value Legislation of 2013
- Don't meet the principals and provision of the Children and Families Act of 2014 which covers children and young adults up to 25
- The consultation process failed to give the Deaf community full access

Consequentially the Equality Impact Assessment is flawed and fails to raise the high risk of this cash saving strategy.

If, in the light of this, the council go ahead and single tender, they will have failed legally and morally with a high risk strategy that will result in disengagement and tragedy.

You will note that I have used the word **Deaf and** not hearing impaired. That is deliberate! Deafness is not a medical/health need it is a cultural identity. The Deaf community are a cultural, linguistic minority with quite specific and specialised needs. Our language is BSL with its own distinct grammar syntax which is different to English and it has no written or spoken form. It underpins our cultural identity and the way we do things – we need visual references not words.

We are a community that needs a range of specialised professionals working with us in the local community if we are to engage in services. We (Deaf) find it impossible to access services and consultations conducted in English. This goes beyond the provision of equipment and an interpreter. Specialist social workers train for 3 years in complex Deaf issues. Fluency on BSL qualifications are at least 6 years. Other staff working with the Deaf need specialist training and skills.

Joint funding (health/social care) has started nationally and it is and will be a disaster for this community resulting in no access to services and serves to increase disengagement and risk. Only last Saturday, the Deaf community in Bristol were campaigning in the streets about this...

National and local Social services provision to our community must be:

- accessible,
- specialist
- culturally appropriate

or the Deaf community will be cut off from all support and services with dire consequences.

For example, it is known from research that Deaf children and adults are substantially at risk from mental health, more than non deaf people, and with a national shortage of deaf specialist in patient facilities access to specialised Deaf mental health support and services in the local community is critical.

Recently a young deaf man I know committed suicide due to lack of specialised support in the community. He is not alone.

- Single service tendering has led to deaf people not being able to access services like housing, employment, support with benefits in a form that is accessible to them. We need specialised SWs trained in the needs of the Deaf community fluent in BSL who can engage direct.
- There are needless S47 investigations against deaf parents due simple communication/cultural breakdowns between these families hearing SW and professionals with no awareness of Deaf culture.
- Deaf children and young people up to 25 are facing increased mental health issues in mainstream provision and their EHCPs don't include local offers of specialised Deaf support. I know a young Deaf adult in Surrey who can't access the EHCP process due to no BSL access and skilled professionals contrary to the principals of the 2014 Children and Families Act.

This service must provide skilled Deaf signing staff and hearing staff with full BSL, trained in meeting the specific needs of this community, and full BSL access to all services provided from first contact via skype, face time, to engagement with signing professionals SWs equipment accessors and technicians etc. This is not a generic provision it is highly specialised.

Historically, the Surrey County Council flagship Deaf Services team effectively met the needs of the Deaf community until it transferred to a new social enterprise in 2011 as First Point. However, this move saw a decline in effectiveness of the service as Social Services department found co-working with First Point too costly in terms of buying in specialist social workers and interpreters, leaving this high risk community at the hands of non specialists with disastrous consequences. I can give you examples of Deaf people who have had to endure generic hearing SWs due to this and have disengaged from SS and other support services.

It has also led to highly specialist staff resigning and going to work elsewhere with an escalation of this with the move to single tendering and Sight for Surrey, non specialist provider, taking over the tender. Deaf signing professionals don't want to work in joint services – how can a deaf person like me communicate effectively with a blind person? And we would like to know if the commissioning brief included specialised professionals including social workers. Did the successful bid include this provision? No it is minor issues like equipment and lip reading classes and some interpreting.

The whole move to single tender was flawed from conception day in January 2015 to the awarding of the tender to Sight for Surrey.

The Deaf community were **NOT** appropriately consulted throughout the process. Their language communication and cultural needs were ignored through the process. And now we have a provider with no expertise in Deafness. And expert professionals are leaving.

Talking to Deaf people who attended “conception” day in Woking in January 2015 and reading the minutes we were referred to as hard of hearing. Interpreters were there but the day was presented through English making it hard for the interpreters to fully translate and explain concepts and jargon. At

the conclusion of the day Deaf representatives were left asking what is happening? Why single tender? What does this mean? We didn't understand the jargon. This is not how you consult with a minority group with specific access requirements. Nowhere in this process have the commissioning team met with the Deaf community direct nor explained the agenda behind this joint commissioning in a form that is accessible to them.

An invitation to a September meeting to discuss the tender by Sight for Surrey – insensitively called a listening meeting!! - was advertised in sign by a very basic signers, a volunteer, not registered or listed as a qualified interpreter. Even I struggled to understand the signing.

At the meeting non registered signers/volunteers of basic level were used i.e. not interpreters and the standard of interpretation was low leading to more confusion and frustration.

Now Sight for Surrey have taken over the tender Deaf people have been forgotten. Look at the Sight for Surrey Web page The Sight for Surrey current web page describes the service as “committed towering with the blind and partially sighted people in Surrey”. Since they took over the tender in October, Deaf people report they can't even contact them. There are no video phones with signing staff on the other end. The web site and face book pages are not accessible to Deaf people nor or promote Deaf services. The result is confusion, anger and disengagement. A recent school holiday club mixed Deaf and blind children – this is not appropriate not what deaf children need ie communication stress of non deaf children.

I therefore invite this meeting to reconsider and ask does this tragedy fulfil the commissioning aims. (Behind the decision to single tender?)

It is not **effective** – is leading and has led to the disengagement of the Deaf community.

**People don't get lost across the services** - deaf can't even contact Sight for Surrey, information is not accessible and the community is disengaging with tragic consequences

**Combining leads to a better continuity for individuals and carers** – can't access services, specialist professionals have left

**Is it better value for money when a whole community are cast adrift from social services and their support given to a non specialist provider and depleted. Social value and value for Money are now a statutory requirement by law and this tender does not achieve that.**

Please reconsider and at least keep the contract for First Point going past 1 February while we reconsider. Adhere to social practice legislation and don't make cuts that fall short.

Don't cast the vulnerable Deaf community adrift deprived of access to vital services and support. They have a right to these services and please respect the democratic process of this petition.

**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**