

CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 22 March 2016 and will take effect on 1/04/16 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 31/3/16.**

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, 22 March 2016 considered the following matters and resolved:

Members' Questions (Item 4a)

Four questions were received from Mr Essex. The responses are tabled as Appendix 1.

• **PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 4b)**

Questions were received from five members of the public. The responses are attached as Appendix 2.

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

(i) A response to the report from the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board in relation to the agreement between Surrey County council and Surrey Wildlife Trust to manage the countryside estate is attached as Appendix 3.

(ii) A response to the report from the Council Overview Board in relation to their review of Service Budgets 2016/17 is attached as Appendix 4.

• **MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2016 - 2021 (Item 6)**

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. The 2016/17 service strategies that will deliver the Corporate Strategy 2016-21, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved.
2. The detailed service revenue and capital budgets for the year 2016/17 and indicative budgets for the years 2017-21, including amendments resulting from the final Local Government Financial Settlement and other Government funding changes announced since 9 February 2016, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved.
3. The use of a further £7.5m of earmarked reserves to support the 2016/17 revenue budget, as detailed in paragraph 25 of the submitted report, be approved.

4. The proactive and systematic engagement of the County Council in responding to proposed changes in local government funding to ensure these changes do not further disadvantage Surrey, and the recognition of the costs of delivering services in Surrey be approved.
5. The highway maintenance capital budget for 2016/17 be increased by £5m, offset by a £5m reduction to the 2017/18 highway maintenance budget, as set out in paragraphs 55 to 56 of the submitted report.
6. The publication of the service revenue and capital budgets as the Medium Term Financial Plan 2016-21 be approved.
7. A £400 charge for arranging a funeral for an individual who has received Adult social Care services commissioned by the Council, where there is no one else to make these arrangements be noted.
8. The Director of Finance's letter to the Department for Communities and Local Government confirming that the adult social care precept will be spent entirely on adult social care functions, as detailed in paragraph 11 of the submitted report be noted.
9. That a programme has been established in line with previous recommendations to deliver on Public Value Transformation that will identify base budget reductions to deliver up to £50m through additional continuing savings or funding, beyond those already in MTFP (2016-21), over the next two years to make the Council's finances sustainable, as set out in paragraphs 29 to 38 of the submitted report.
10. The fees & charges approved under delegated powers, as set out in Annex 2 to the submitted report, be noted.
11. The Equality Impact Assessment of the savings proposals within the Directorate and Service Budgets, as set out in Annex 3 to the submitted report, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Corporate Strategy 2016-21 sets out the Council's key strategic goals of wellbeing, economic prosperity and residents' experience. The underpinning service strategies provide detail on the objectives and actions to achieve these corporate goals.

The Medium Term Financial Plan 2016-21 is a five year budget aligned to the corporate strategy. It reflects assumptions about the current local and national financial, economic and political environment. Setting a five year budget is a key element of the council's multi-year approach to financial management. Regular reporting through the year will enable effective tracking and management of progress with the strategy and the budget.

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

- **FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR FEBRUARY 2016**
(Item 7)

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. That Services forecast a £8.7m revenue budget variance at year end which includes use of £7.4m central government grant, as set out in the Annex, paragraph 1 to the submitted report
2. That Services forecast to achieve £65.1m efficiencies and service reductions by year end, as set out in the Annex, paragraph 39 of the submitted report.
3. That total forecast capital expenditure for 2015/16, including long term investments, is £224.1m, as set out in the Annex, paragraph 47 of the submitted report.
4. That Services' management actions to mitigate overspends were set out throughout the report.
5. That £0.5m virement to reduce the budget in 2015/16 for the SEND Reform Grant intended to support implementation of the new Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) system, as detailed in the Annex, paragraph 3 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 decisions on this item can be called in by the Council Overview Board]

- **HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE INTEGRATION** (Item 8)

1. That the update on health and social care integration planning in Surrey and the emerging Sustainability and Transformation Plans be noted.
2. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Adults Social Care and Public Health, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence and the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health, to finalise and approve the 2016/17 Surrey Better Care Fund plan from the Council's point of view in line with the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.
3. That the finalised 2016/17 Better Care Fund Plan should be presented to the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board for final approval on 7 April 2016.

Reasons for Decisions:

Integration of health and social care will support the provision of better outcomes to Surrey residents and enable the council to better influence and control the source of demand for social care services.

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.

A specific requirement of the Better Care Fund Planning process is to secure approval of plans from the Council, the relevant CCGs and the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The deadlines and tight timescales for submission necessitate the recommendation included in this report to delegate authority to the Strategic Director for Adults Social Care and Public Health (in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence and the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health) to finalise and approve the 2016/17 Surrey Better Care Fund plan on behalf of the Council before it is presented to the Health and Wellbeing Board on 7 April 2016.

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

- **CONSULTATION ON A REVISED CHARGING POLICY FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE** (Item 9)

That the following recommendations be approved:

1. To consult on the following proposals as part of a revised charging policy for Adult Social Care services, that:
 - The Council will charge an administration fee in any case where the person is able to pay the full cost of their care and support at home but nevertheless asks the Council to commission care on their behalf.
 - The Council will increase the amount of available income contributed in charges for non-residential services from 90% to 100%.
 - The Council will include the full rate of Higher Rate Attendance Allowance/ Disability Living Allowance/Personal Independence Payment (excluding mobility elements) in the calculation of income.
 - The Council will no longer give a discretionary allowance of £20 per week when calculating the available income for respite services.
2. That subject to consultation, any changes will take effect from 2 October 2016.
3. That Cabinet receives a further report at its meeting on 14 July 2016, detailing the response to the consultation and the proposed Charging Policy.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Council has previously consulted on the policy of charging for care and support. The recommendations made in this report do not change charging for those people in residential and nursing care but may impact on people currently receiving care and support in their own homes and it is right that we consult people who may be adversely affected by the revised proposals. People who can afford to contribute towards their care and support should do so in a fair and equitable way.

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

• **THE AGREEMENT WITH SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE (Item 10)**

1. That the Surrey Wildlife Trust decision and recommendation be noted and endorsed.
2. That the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning and the Director of Legal, Democratic and Cultural Services be required to work with Surrey Wildlife Trust to ensure the business plan is delivered.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approval of the recommendations will put in place a mechanism to make the management of the Countryside Estate more efficient whilst improving and maintaining the countryside, delivering improvements for visitors, reducing the Council's financial contribution to nil by December 2021, and agreeing the distribution of any surplus income thereafter.

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

• **GUILDFORD COUNTY SCHOOL (Item 11)**

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion set out in item 15 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case be approved for the expansion of Guildford County School to provide an additional 20 places per year (100 places in total).

Reasons for Decisions:

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

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

- **DANETREE JUNIOR SCHOOL, EWELL (Item 12)**

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion set out in item 16 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional 360 primary places plus 52 nursery places in Ewell be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

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

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING (Item 13)**

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

Reasons for Decisions:

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

- **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (Item 14)**

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.

- **GUILDFORD COUNTY SCHOOL (Item 15)**

1. That the business case for the project to expand Guildford County School by 100 places, at a total cost as set out in the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience and the Leader of the Council be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

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

- **DANETREE JUNIOR SCHOOL, EWELL (Item 16)**

1. That the business case for the project to expand Danetree Junior School by 360 places plus 52 new nursery places at a total cost as set out in the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience and the Leader of the Council be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

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

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTION (Item 17)**

1. That Surrey County Council provides equity investment and a long-term loan its wholly owned property company, the Halsey Garton Property (HGP) Group, as outlined in paragraphs 9 -11 of the submitted report.
2. That Legal Services be authorised to agree appropriate contractual arrangements for the provision of financing on behalf of the Council, with funds to be released upon the completion of appropriate due-diligence in relation to the property acquisition.
3. That HGP be authorised to acquire the freehold interest in the property detailed in the submitted report for a purchase cost including associated costs, also detailed in the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The provision of financing to the Council's property company to facilitate the proposed investment acquisition is in accordance with the Council's Investment Strategy and provides an asset that will contribute to the creation of a diversified portfolio over time to spread risk.

The investment will deliver an ongoing income to the Council, enhancing financial resilience in the longer term.

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

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTION** (Item 18)
 1. That Surrey County Council provides equity investment and a long-term loan to its wholly owned property company, Halsey Garton Property Group (HGP), as outlined in paragraphs 9 to 12 of the submitted report.
 2. That Legal Services be authorised to agree appropriate contractual arrangements for the provision of financing on behalf of the Council, with funds to be released upon the completion of appropriate due-diligence in relation to the property acquisition.
 3. That HGP be authorised to acquire the freehold interest in the property detailed in the submitted report for a purchase cost, including associated costs of purchase, also detailed in the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The provision of financing to the Council's property company to facilitate the proposed investment acquisition is in accordance with the Council's Investment Strategy and provides an asset that will contribute to the creation of a diversified portfolio over time to spread risk.

The investment will deliver an ongoing income to the Council, enhancing financial resilience in the longer term.

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

Member Questions

Question (1) from Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

The Leader announced that an extra £20m will be made available for pavements and paths in the Council Meeting on 15 March 2016. The Medium Term Financial Plan report (recommendation 5) confirms that there will be an increase of £5m in next year's highway maintenance (capital) budget while the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding confirmed £6m spending for pavements in the next financial year. Please can the Leader or Cabinet Member confirm where the £6m of funding for pavements and paths will be funded from this year and where the £20m funding total will be funded from, including confirming what proportion of this is from within the existing highways maintenance budget or not.

Reply:

The £20m footway restoration programme will span 5 to 6 years, commencing with £6m in 2016/17. The programme will be funded from the existing highway maintenance capital budget, including bringing forward £5m of spend from 2017/18 to 2016/17. This focus on footways is in response to the developing Asset Management Strategy, which will be considered by Cabinet in the summer, and which will ensure optimum allocation of resources between different parts of the highway such as roads, footways and bridges, taking account of residents and service users priorities as well as asset condition.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding
22 March 2016

Question (2) from Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

The Medium Term Financial Plan Cabinet report states that, "if central government is unable, or unwilling, to fund adult social care adequately then it should allow local government to link the precept to the rise in demographic demand." In Surrey this would amount to a 4% annual precept for Adult Social Care. Please confirm if the Leader of the council has, or if not will now write to the government requesting that central government funds this gap between the current 2% precept and the higher cost of increased in demand due to demographic change, or whether he has requested or intends to request that the government allow Surrey County Council to set a higher precept for Adult Social Care.

Reply:

The Council welcomed the decision by the government to allow local authorities to add a 2% precept for Adult Social Care to Council Tax charges. This is anticipated to provide £12m of additional funding annually to help alleviate growing pressures in Adult Social Care. It is true that the 2% ASC precept will not cover all of the £24m of ASC demand pressures included in the Medium Term Financial Plan for 2016/17. As Leader of the Council I will continue to work for the best deal for Surrey residents and reviewing the scale of the ASC precept for future years will be an important aspect of this.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence
22 March 2016

Question (3) from Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

The Public Health budget for 2016-17 is understood to be increasing due to additional commissioning responsibilities, but also reflects a 7.5% reduction in the government grant for public health from 2015/16 to 2016/17 (including in year cuts). The equalities impact analysis states that the impact on contracts for (at least) 0-19 public health services, sexual health, substance misuse and public mental health may have an impact on front line services. Please can you quantify the impact of budget changes on public health services over this current year and current estimates for the coming year based on the budget proposed here envisaged over this coming year and what is planned to mitigated against these possible negative impacts.

Reply:

The Public Health grant in 2016/17 was expected to be £41.5m, which was a £6m increase on 2015/16, reflecting the increase in services to be provided by Surrey's Public Health service (Health Visiting for children aged 0-5 which transferred half-way through the year).

An ongoing grant reduction of £2.2 million in 2015/16 and a further reduction of £0.87 million in 2016/17 leaves the 2016/17 grant allocation 7.2% lower than commitments. In order to meet this pressure, and the pressures from expected reductions from alignment of service provision with other Surrey County Council departments (shadow funding), the service have identified a number of plans to reduce spend in the coming year.

Three of these savings plans (£3.33m) are expected to have an effect on services.

NHS Health Checks – it is mandatory for Public Health to fund Health Checks for its eligible population, but by ensuring more focussed delivery of this service to the population groups most at risk of cardiovascular disease the programme will become more effective for a smaller amount of funding.

Contract Negotiation – The Director of Public Health has written to providers of our services to begin discussions about how they can help us to meet our savings targets. We expect this co-operation to consist mostly of recouping one-off underspends or slippage in order to share reductions across the system rather than place the burden on front-line service provision. Where this is not possible, commissioners are entering into negotiations about where service re-design can meet the savings targets with the least impact on the front line. At this stage negotiations are ongoing, but as an illustration, the £1.8m equates to a 6% reduction in spend on Substance Misuse, Children's Community Services and Sexual Health Services. As these meetings are yet to be concluded, it would be inaccurate at the moment to comment on whether it would come from all, or just one of the areas above.

Pausing non-contractual spend – will have a short term effect on training and early intervention schemes around substance misuse advocacy and recovery, breast-feeding support, oral health and child and adult nutrition and physical activity programmes, but reduces the impact on service provision.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health
22 March 2016

Question (4) from Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

The Council meeting questions confirmed that there will be a reduction of adult social care grants to voluntary organisations of around 25% this coming year and 50% in 2017/18 (£5.8 million and £11.6 million from a budget of £22-24 million to 116 organisations). Please can a schedule of the current contracts be provided with details of the outcomes required under the current contracts. Please indicate what alternatives for this service provision are being considered and what the current estimated loss of front line services to residents and service users will be as a result of this budget change.

Reply:

The Adult Social Care Directorate is currently reviewing its grants and contracts in order to ensure maximum value. The Directorate holds grants and contracts with a range of organisations across the private and public sectors, as well as the voluntary sector. The decision to reduce grant or contract funding to particular organisations, including voluntary organisations, will be made on a case by case basis, in consultation with CCG partners where appropriate. Details on the financial impact of any changes can only be provided once the review programme has been completed.

The review process will consider what local alternatives are available to current local service provision, and what the impact of changing funding would be on Surrey residents and the current provider organisation. This will include exploration of more creative responses which meet local priorities, which could include family, friends and community support networks where appropriate. This impact assessment will be carried out on a case by case basis, and will inform the final decision regarding future funding to a particular organisation. Until this work has been carried out at a local level, it is not possible to calculate the overall impact on service provision.

The review process will comply with the Surrey Compact agreement, so that voluntary, community and faith sector organisations have the opportunity to be engaged in the process where appropriate, and have sufficient opportunity to respond to reductions in grant and contract funding. The Directorate will honour all current agreed contract notice periods.

Over 100 organisations delivering almost 300 schemes are in scope of the above review. A list of the individual organisations and how these schemes help to meet residents' health and social care outcomes is available by emailing 'tristram.gardner@surreycc.gov.uk' from the Adult Social Care Directorate's Commissioning Support Unit.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence
22 March 2016

Public Questions

Question (1) from John Powell:

Have any improvements to the road layout on the A25 at Newlands Corner been considered, related to your proposals there?

If so, how much approximately will they cost, and which part of the Surrey County Council budget will they be allocated to?

Reply:

The highways authority is considering possible improvements to the A25. This is unlikely to change the layout of the road, but rather look to reduce speeds along the stretch of road from before the junction with Trodds Lane and past the entrance and exit to Newlands Corner. Designers are also looking at potential options to improve the crossing points. This work has involved the Council's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police. Once an option is developed it will be need to be agreed by the Local Committee, who would approve funding for a scheme, before it can go ahead.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
22 March 2016

Question (2) from Sally Blake:

With regard to your proposals at Newlands Corner, how many responses (written and on-line) have been received to date on the designs by Davies White to put in a 'play trail' and what percentage of these have been against the proposal to put in a 'play trail' at all?

Reply:

The proposal is of interest to a very broad range of stakeholders including all users and potential users. The population of Surrey is over 1 million so the number of people that could be considered stakeholders is very large.

There were 147 posts on line by 14 March and of those 25 were in favour of a trail suitable for all ages. Of the 147, the majority have also written direct to the County Council and registered the same views.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
22 March 2016

Question (3) from Shirley Dawe:

At the last Cabinet meeting I asked if you would have a prominent display of the proposed changes at the Newlands Corner Visitor Centre, you replied that it would be emailed to stakeholders and displayed on site. I have not noticed any

details of 9 March meeting or the proposed developments in a prominent position at Newlands Corner. It was left to groups such as Save Newlands Corner to advertise the event for the Council. Nothing is mentioned in Surrey Matters. You are not reaching a democratic audience by these methods. Please can you tell me:

- Who do you class as stakeholders?
- How can non-IT users see the plans if they are not on display at prominent sites around the county especially at Newlands Corner?
- Will SCC and SWT arrange for a prominent display of the proposals at the Newlands Corner Visitor Centre, with facilities for public feedback?

Reply:

Stakeholders in this context are a very broad and inclusive group and will include all those within Surrey and beyond who use the site and who could use it.

Posters were put on site for the meetings and online. There has been wide consultation and publicity about the proposals through a range of ways including a very active social media interest.

The plans were on display at the two drop in sessions and the amended plans will be on display at Newlands Corner with further facilities for public feedback. Paper forms are available for feedback at the visitor centre

A meeting is being set up with members of the campaign group, as mentioned at the public meeting on 9 March to review the project.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
22 March 2016

Question (4) from Pamela Keale:

I am interested in the planned developments at Newlands Corner, and am concerned that there is no evidence of any inclusive or systematic survey of the public's views on this considerable investment by Surrey County Council. What groups, and how many people have Davies White consulted? How are people's opinions of planned developments being gathered – other than through the Davies White website? Sole use of this website unfairly eliminates a high proportion of interested people.

How well do the groups of people identified by Surrey County Council (disabled people, sensory impaired, the elderly and those with dementia) feel that the proposed development of phase 1, will meet their needs and enhance their experience when visiting Newlands Corner?

How many people are Surrey County Council engaging in this process, by what methods and how are results being compiled?

When and where will the results be made available to Surrey residents?

Reply:

There has been wide consultation and publicity about the proposals through a range of ways including a very active social media interest.

Davies White is undertaking an engagement process with two local schools, attended the Woodfair last October and have taken part in the Drop in sessions and the public Question and Answer session. All the open meetings covered the whole project and not just the play trail. In addition the designers set up a webpage for comments on their design and the County Council have been receiving views through a dedicated e-mail address, and via written comments from meetings.

SCC have undertaken further consultation with the Disabilities Alliance Network in South West Surrey and are following up with other specific groups to get their views on how the facilities could be improved. This is being carried out in a number of ways to suit the groups, some are submitting their views and others are being engaged through presentations at meetings.

The results of the consultation will be collated and put on our website.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
22 March 2016

Question (5) from Julie Brown:

Mr Goodman has stated that the maintenance costs for Newlands Corner currently are £156,000 per year. Mr Davenport of SWT has stated that the audited accounts for SWT can be seen online, however it is difficult to see the costs for Newlands Corner alone.

Could Mr Goodman let me have the breakdown of the **current actual maintenance costs** for Newlands Corner, not just the headings, which were used as part of the proposal to Cabinet, and the **actual projected maintenance cost** should phase I of the proposal go ahead?

Davies White have now proposed two further options to the original proposal; five play structures instead of ten or the refurbishment of the existing play area with one play structure. Can you confirm if either of these two options were to go ahead that the car parking charges would remain as per the original proposal to Cabinet?

Reply:

The figure already quoted is the full cost recovery figure for managing Newlands Corner including Surrey Wildlife Trust management costs associated with running the site.

A summary of the business plan that formed part of the case to Cabinet will not be released until we have finalised an agreement with the Albury Estate and can be more precise about the figures. This also applies to the breakdown of the current figures.

The car parking charges form an important part of the overall business case for Newlands Corner. The County Council is working with the Surrey Wildlife Trust to

make the County Countryside Estate self-funding due to increasing pressure on public sector finance and the desire to maintain the Countryside Estate for the public. In order to do that, we need to find an alternative source of funding and income generation is one way of doing that.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
22 March 2016

CABINET RESPONSE TO ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD

THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST TO MANAGE THE COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE (considered by Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board on 26 January 2016)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Cabinet notes the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Boards concerns around the agreement between Surrey County Council and Surrey Wildlife Trust to manage the Countryside Estate.

RESPONSE:

The response from EPEH Board and their reservations are noted and I have set out below a more detailed reply to the points raised.

The Business Plan is built around a large number of business cases that have been produced or are in development. Cases are being developed with SCC support to establish feasibility. Where investment is required the Team at SWT are looking at external investors to take projects forward.

The Business Plan will be monitored quarterly by SCC with an annual report to the County Council.

The aim of the five year business plan is to reach financial self sufficiency by 2021 and to determine the allocations of funds thereafter. The profit share for each project will have clear rules to ensure the investors receive a return and then to share further returns based on the merits of each project.

SWT have worked consistently with SCC over the last few months to produce the Business Plan. This has included staff reduction and restructure and employing a Commercial and Visitor Services Team, assessing outgoings to find efficiencies and ensuring sustainable and commercial management of the built property. A new Property Asset Management Plan has been signed off by SCC Property Services.

The existing termination clause in the Agreement for Services has not been changed and allows the County Council to terminate in a number of circumstances, including in the event of a breach of the terms of the Agreement. The Memorandum of Understanding and the revised plans attached to the Agreement clarify the way the agreement will be implemented.

Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
22 March 2016

CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD

REVIEW OF SERVICE BUDGETS 2016/17 (considered by the Council Overview Board on 2 March 2016)

Introduction:

- 1 As part of the Council's annual Business Planning process, each of the Scrutiny Boards has undertaken a review of the budgets and priorities for the services within its remit in order to understand the pressures and challenges faced and to identify possible savings which would contribute to the meeting its overall budget shortfall in 2016/2017 and beyond. They have worked closely with officers from the services and Finance through private workshops and performance & finance sub-groups, and the Council Overview Board has drawn together the key themes and recommendations from this process. These are set out below for consideration by the Cabinet.
- 2 The Scrutiny Boards recognise the particular difficulty there has been this year in setting the Council's overall budget as a result of the significant reduction in the grant funding from Central Government, and the delay and uncertainty this caused in determining the budgets at directorate and service level. The knock-on impact of this has been that scrutiny by the Boards has taken place much later than usual in the budget cycle, and it has been difficult for Boards to get timely and detailed information to enable them to make informed comments and recommendations on the spending plans of services. This has inevitably impacted on the value of the Scrutiny Boards' contribution to the overall process.
- 3 As a result of the difficulty faced by Boards in contributing fully to the budget-setting process, the Council Overview Board has agreed to review the arrangements for the scrutiny of budgets at its meeting in June 2016. The Board recognises that the delays and uncertainty faced this year may be an issue again in the future, and would therefore like to identify ways in which the scrutiny process can more rigorously support the budget-setting process.
- 4 The Scrutiny Boards would like to thank officers from Finance and other services for their support in the process, and the Boards will continue to work closely with them as part of their on-going monitoring and challenge of the budgets in the year ahead.

General Issues:

- 5 As already mentioned, one of the challenges faced by Boards was in obtaining sufficiently timely and detailed budget information. Whilst acknowledging the reasons which contributed to this, the availability of detailed budget break-down makes it easier for the Boards to scrutinise the spending and make informed decisions about the scope for savings. This was reflected in the work of the Economic Prosperity, Environment & Highways Board, which received a detailed cost analysis breakdown of the Highways and Transport Service. This provided reassurance to the Board about the management of the budget pressures by the service and enabled it to understand fully the decisions which had been made in determining the

spending in each area of work and that all reasonable steps had been taken to minimise costs. The Board's Performance & Finance Sub-Group has therefore asked to be provided with a cost analysis breakdown for the Environment and Planning service along the same lines as that provided by Highways and Transport.

- 6 As part of its budget review, the Council Overview Board identified a number of posts in the Business Services Directorate where agency staff appeared to be employed for significant periods of time. Many of these posts appeared to be non-specialist roles, and the Board believes that there is scope for making further savings in this area. It will therefore be carrying out a review of agency staffing later this year, but asks the Cabinet to review the evidence gathered so far, which it will pass to the Cabinet Member for Business Services. The Board will also, as part of this review, consider further a suggestion made by one of its members for the Council to establish its own agency to manage the appointment of temporary staff as a way of reducing overall costs and developing a pool of temporary staff with knowledge and experience of the Council
- 7 The Council Overview Board considered proposed savings to the training budget for Business Services. The organisation has previously sought to maintain the training budget despite the budget pressures it has faced in order to ensure that staff are equipped to deal with difficult challenges. The Board expressed concerns about the impacts on staff effectiveness and morale of the proposals to reduce the training budget for 2016/17, subject to consideration of further information about the extent to which the proposed reductions to the budget reflect efficiencies in the way training is delivered (eg e-learning) rather than a simple cut to the budget.

Recommendations:

The Council Overview Board has agreed the following specific recommendations to the Cabinet:

- a) That the Environment and Planning Service make an additional £50k saving from the Countryside budget specifically from the £800k budget allocated to the management of rights of way.
- b) That the Environment and Planning Service seek out potential savings in the Passenger Transport Initiatives budget (Travel and Transport budget).
- c) That the Environment and Planning Service seek out potential savings in the Community Transport budget (Travel and Transport budget), alongside current transport providers in preparation for 2017/18. It was suggested a reduction of £150k could be made cumulatively starting in 2017/18.
- d) That the Cabinet monitors whether savings planned through delays in the implementation of some IMT schemes result in increased costs of service delivery in other parts of the organisation.
- e) That, subject to confirmation about whether the proposed reductions to the training budget reflect efficiencies in the way training is delivered rather than a simple cut to the budget, the training budget be maintained at its current level.

Steve Cosser, Chairman of the Council Overview Board

Cabinet response to recommendations:

The Cabinet thanks the Council Overview Board and the Scrutiny Boards for their work in contributing to the budget process, in what has been a most difficult year. The Cabinet also welcomes the recommendations from the Council Overview Board.

The Environment and Planning Service are planning savings of £0.2m for the Countryside Service in 2016/17, and £1.25m for the Local Transport Review by 2017/18. The Cabinet will ask officers to investigate further savings proposals and to reflect them in both the 2016/17 monthly budget monitoring and in developing the 2017/18 budget.

The Modern Worker is a long term programme crossing financial years which supports the delivery of the Council's IT Strategy. The 2016/17 budget for the Modern Worker programme is key to delivering SCC's strategy and service savings but we must look at all areas to find savings and efficiencies in these times. The savings for the Modern Worker programme are therefore based on reviewing the scope of the new and future projects so that they will still deliver the MTFP savings. The Modern Worker budget will be regularly reviewed throughout the year to ensure that the impact of savings is managed and funding is invested in areas which have the highest priority in terms of strategic delivery and providing benefits to Services.

The Cabinet sees the training of its staff as key to the success of the County Council. The Council has invested significantly in leadership training over the last few years, which will have an impact for years to come. The efficiency savings are being delivered by ensuring increased attendance on courses, reducing cancellations, reducing costs and changing delivery methods, such as e-learning.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
22 March 2016

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST

Cabinet, Committees and Appeals

Bryan Searle x419019

Bryans@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Business Manager

Vicky Hibbert – x419229

Vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Committee Manager

Anne Gowing - x419938

anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

Regulatory Committee Manager

Andy Baird – x417609

Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Rianna Hanford - x132662

rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk

Committee Assistant

Lucy Collier – x418051

Lucy.collier@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Manager

Ross Pike - x417368

ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Dominic Mackie – x132814

Dominic.mackie@surreycc.gov.uk

Scrutiny Officer

Huma Younis - x132725

huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk