

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 22 MARCH 2016 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:

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

\* = Present

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

**42/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mr Few.

**43/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 23 FEBRUARY 2016 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**44/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**45/16 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

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

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

Mr Essex asked supplementary questions to question (2) and (4).

**Question 2:**

As the 2% Adult Social Care (ASC) precept would not cover all ASC demand pressures, he asked the Leader of the Council whether he would continue to lobby the Government to ascertain whether the 2% ASC precept could be increased above 2%? The Leader confirmed that he would continue to lobby for fair funding for Surrey. He also said that ASC provision was a major issue for our society.

**Question 4:**

He asked for clarity on the review process and the Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs), whether they would be carried out for individual organisations and for confirmation of when the information would be published. The Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence confirmed that there would be an EIA for each voluntary organisation.

**46/16 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

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

**Mrs Blake** referred to the public meeting held last week, where most of the people attending disagreed with the proposals for Newlands Corner and she asked whether the Cabinet would vote in favour of the recommendations before them today before considering any other options.

**Mrs Brown** made reference to the Leader's Statement made at the County Council meeting on 15 March 2016, in which he said that residents were at the heart of every decision that the County Council made. She also referred to the press article concerning the proposed play trail at Newlands Corner, which had suggested that the County Council was already working with designers and therefore she asked if the Administration would be listening to concerns from residents?

The Leader of the Council responded to both supplementary questions. He said that over one million people lived in Surrey and that it was important to remember that when trying to improve facilities for all residents. He recognised that not everyone agreed with decisions made by the Cabinet and cited decisions made in the past, in particular the decisions relating to keeping Surrey libraries open. He said that he was proud to be a Surrey resident and that it was important to ensure that Surrey facilities were the best that the Council could make them.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning confirmed that the Council had involved a wide number of groups, including schools and disability groups in its consultation on the play trail.

**47/16 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were no petitions.

**48/16 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were no representations.

**49/16 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.

[Note: The Leader of the Council agreed to re-order the agenda and take item 10: The Agreement with Surrey Wildlife Trust for the management of the County Council's Countryside Estate next]

**50/16 THE AGREEMENT WITH SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE [Item 10]**

Both the Chairman, Chris Wilkinson and the Finance Director, Roger Wild from Surrey Wildlife Trust were in attendance for this item and were invited to speak.

Mr Wilkinson made the following points:

- This was an important paper, which provide the direction of travel for Surrey's Countryside Estate
- It recognised the severe budgetary constraints that the County Council was under
- He supported the proposals and had worked hard with Council officers to get to this stage
- The five year rolling business plan had been produced by Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT), as part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between SWT and Surrey County Council (SCC)
- SWT was a conservation organisation
- The proposals set out in the report provided an opportunity to generate income to help the estate, SCC and wildlife.

Mr Wild made the following points:

- That SWT had been working closely with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
- In relation to the strategic goals of SCC, these proposals 'ticked all the boxes'
- Budget demands for other services meant that it was vital to make SWT self financing
- He stressed the importance of protecting the environment and thanked SWT officers for the work that they had achieved during the last two years
- Referred to the partnership meeting which had taken place the day before and provided confirmation that the trustees were supportive of this approach

- That paragraphs 6 and 7 in the report set out the governance arrangements and those that had endorsed this approach, following detailed consideration of other options
- The MoU formalised the commitment of SCC /SWT to work together and that the five year rolling business plan had taken considerable time to put together
- Drew attention to the report from Knight Frank, commissioned by SCC Property Services, in relation to the Property Asset Management Plan
- Confirmed that there would be closer joint working between SCC and SWT, which will be robust and accountable, using agreed key performance indicators
- Finally, he said that there would be an annual review of the business plan by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board, plus an annual report to Cabinet.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- That many residents would welcome the proposals
- Norbury Park and the work that SWT had undertaken there had offered many opportunities for residents' leisure time, including those for young people
- The report set out the relationship between SCC and SWT
- That the county of Surrey had large areas of green space. It was important to increase the number of residents who could enjoy access to it, as detailed in paragraph 23 of the report – public health implications
- The SWT Finance Director was asked about the risk management and implications of the annual business cases. He responded by stating that future business plans would set out a number of different routes, including some trading opportunities and that there would be a number of different opportunities being considered to increase footfall. He also confirmed that SWT had recruited an income generation team. In relation to governance processes, SWT had worked with council officers to obtain a clear vision, project boards were in place for certain key initiatives and the SWT management team were committed to making it work.
- The key point was to ensure that Surrey residents continued to enjoy Surrey's countryside and that SWT delivered value for money for Surrey's taxpayers
- That Surrey countryside was also enjoyed by those living in a more urban environment
- That Equality Impact Assessments would be carried out as improvements arising from the application of new processes were proposed.

The Leader of the Council thanked the Chief Executive and Finance Director from SWT for attending the meeting and for their contribution to the debate. He said that he believed that SWT now had a good management team in place.

He also said that he hoped SWT would consider recruiting apprentices for some areas of their work.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**51/16 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2016 - 2021 [Item 6]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and said that last month, the Council's refreshed five year corporate strategy *Confident in Surrey's Future* and overall budget and council tax precept for 2016/17 and indicative budgets for the following four financial years were approved by the County Council.

He said that the Council strategy focused on Surrey's long-term interests and making sure:

- everyone in Surrey had a great start to life and could live and age well;
- Surrey's economy remained strong and sustainable; and
- Residents experience services that are easy to use, responsive and value for money.

He reported the following details for Cabinet approval.

- Service strategies to deliver the overall corporate strategy for 2016-21
- Revenue and capital budgets for 2016/17 and indicative budgets for 2017/18 to 2020/21, which included:
  - grant changes in the Final Local Government Financial Settlement;
  - fees and charges; and
  - Equality Impact Assessments for our savings proposals.

He said that the Financial Settlement had partly mitigated Surrey's shock grant reductions in the Provisional Settlement. However, the Council still needed to draw £7.5m more from its reserves in 2016/17 than had been

anticipated last month and over £30m reserves in total to balance 2016/17 and 2017/18.

He informed Cabinet that savings of over £330m had been made in the past five years, including £64m in 2015/16. However, falling Government funding and rising demand for Council services, especially social care, meant that the Council needed to achieve over £360m of new base budget savings or additional income over the next five years to continue to maintain a lawful, balanced and sustainable budget.

To help achieve this unprecedented level of base budget reductions, the Public Value Transformation Programme had been set up, to identify and deliver an extra £50m lasting savings over the next two years.

He said that, inevitably, delivering over £360m savings on top of what had already achieved will involve difficult and uncomfortable choices. However, a robust Medium Term Financial Plan was critical to delivering the ambitions and goals and ensuring value for money for Surrey's residents. The clear aim from this MTFP was to maintain a robust and sustainable financial base from which to transform and deliver the services that matter most to the people of Surrey.

Finally, he drew attention to additional information plus an extra recommendation 7 (subsequent recommendations were re-numbered), which was tabled at the meeting.

This was, the inclusion of the following paragraph after paragraph 74 in the main report:

'Adult Social Care seeks approval of a £400 charge for arranging the 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. The Council is already involved in arranging funerals, but the process is currently finished by the relevant District or Borough Council who then applies the charge. This change will streamline the process and allow the Council to make the charge. The potential volume of these charges is unknown, so the budgeted income yield is nil.'

**With recommendation 7 now stating:**

'That £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.'

Other Members of the Cabinet Team were invited to comment on their respective portfolios and made the following key points:

- The most significant pressures for the Council's revenue budget were within Adult Social Care. £24m of these pressures were due to an increase in demographic demand for services. The EIA for 2016/17 Budget savings, annexed to this report, set out proposals for how next year's savings target of £55m could be achieved. It included a range of mitigating actions that had been developed to help minimise any negative impact of the proposals. The Adult Social Care Service

Strategy set out the key actions for the service in 2016/17 which included 'Whole Systems Demand Management'.

- That the success of the Public Value Transformation Programme was crucial to deliver required savings.
- Provision of school places continued to be a budget strain because the schools basic needs programme needed to provide 11,500 additional places in the next five years and there was a significant shortfall in Government funding for this provision.
- The Children, Schools and Families Strategy set out the challenges and opportunities, which included addressing the findings of the Ofsted report of June 2015 for Children's Services. Additional investment would also be required to meet the legislative changes surrounding SEND provision.
- Other demand led pressures included having sufficient qualified staff for safeguarding children, Looked After Children, Fostering, Asylum Seekers, CAMHS and Hope.
- Highways – Surrey's roads were the busiest in the country. The county had a planned highway maintenance programme – Project Horizon. However, it was dependent on Government funding which was not sufficient to meet its needs.
- Concern about the methodology for distributing the £1.5billion improved Better Care Funding and the need for the Leader to continue to lobby Government to obtain a fairer deal for Surrey.
- That the county was facing massive gap in funding for the provision of Adult Social Care Services.
- The Local Transport Bus Review would be reporting to Cabinet on 24 May 2016 – the Cabinet Member gave assurance that the EIAs would be updated and any mitigating action would be explored.
- That the kerbside waste improvement programme could have a negative impact for disability, age and race due to differing communication needs. However, these would be mitigated using accessible communication needs for residents.
- One of Surrey's strengths was its vibrant economy and the importance of working with the business community was stressed so that the economy could grow and apprenticeships, tourism, exports and small businesses were promoted and supported.

A summary of Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) for all services was annexed to the report. (Full details of each EIA is available on the SCC website) These EIAs set out the impact of any budget savings on Surrey residents. It was acknowledged that mitigating actions would have to take place.

Before putting the recommendations to Cabinet, the Leader of the Council summed up, stating that the Medium Term Financial Plan was a large

document that included financial information, narrative for each service and their key actions plus the roles and responsibilities of the Cabinet team.

Finally, he said that the four big issues facing the Council were:

- Adult Social Services
- Children's Services, including SEND, early prevention, school places
- Better Care Fund
- Overall Budget savings

**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 28 of the submitted report.
10. The fees & charges approved under delegated powers, as set out in Annex 2 to the submitted report, be noted.



10. 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.

#### **52/16 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR FEBRUARY 2016 [Item 7]**

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report for the eleventh month of the 2015/16 financial year, covering the period up to 29 February 2016. He said that, since the Council set its budget for 2016/17 demographic demand pressures continued to grow, which reinforced the need and resolve to find new ways of delivering Council services and that was why the Public Value Transformation programme was so important to ensure that the Council's finances would be sustainable in the future.

As he has stated at each Cabinet meeting, 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
2. To continuously drive the efficiency agenda
3. To reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and government grant income
4. To continue to maximise the Council's investment in Surrey.

Other Cabinet Members were given the opportunity to highlight key points and issues from their portfolios, as detailed in the annex to this report.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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.

## **53/16 HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE INTEGRATION [Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health said that one of her responsibilities, together with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence, was to promote social care and health. She said that the move towards integrated services had become a fundamental part of the way the Council and its partners developed and delivered services for adults and children across Surrey. This has been accelerated in health and social care by the introduction of the Better Care Fund, the publication of the NHS Five Year Forward View and was a key strategy for Surrey's Adult Social Care service to manage increasing demand.

She said that the NHS planning guidance introduced Sustainability and Transformation Plans as the overarching strategy plan for local health and care systems covering the period October 2016 – March 2021 and referred to the geographic 'footprint', as set out in the report.

She considered that the first year of the Better Care Fund had been quite successful with the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board helping to improve relationships between NHS England and the County Council. She also highlighted the joint working relationships to date and hoped that the next stage of integration of health and social care services would be as successful, although she acknowledged that there were a number of risks associated with integration, including financial implications and governance arrangements.

The Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence also endorsed the views of the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement said that whilst this report had focussed on Adult Social Care she would also like to endorse a similar integration for Children's Services because she

considered that health colleagues were a key partner in the work of this service and that she supported the direction of travel of this initiative.

[Note: the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience left the meeting at 3.30pm, before these recommendations were resolved]

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**54/16 CONSULTATION ON A REVISED CHARGING POLICY FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE [Item 9]**

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence, the Cabinet Associate for this portfolio introduced the report. He said that the report provided details of proposed changes to the charging policy to increase income to help bridge the funding gap for Adult Social Care services and that it also made recommendations for a full consultation on the proposals with people who received chargeable services.

He said that the report explained the rationale behind the proposals, as detailed within it under the following headings:

- The Council will charge an administration fee to full cost payers
- The increase in the percentage of available income taken in charges
- The full rate of Attendance Allowance / Disability Living Allowance / Personal Independence Payment (excluding mobility elements) should be included in the calculation of income
- The removal of the £20 per week disregard when charging for respite care

He said that the consultation of the proposals would take place between 7 April – 16 June 2016 and that the recommendation today was to go out to consultation on these proposals, with a report being brought back to Cabinet on 14 July 2016 for determination.

Finally, he said that it was important to stress that those residents who currently qualified for free support would continue to receive the necessary care and support to help maintain their independence and wellbeing.

The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services drew Cabinet's attention to the Equality Impact Assessment, attached as Annex 2, and said that this was an initial assessment which would be updated as the consultation progressed.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**55/16 GUILDFORD COUNTY SCHOOL [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement introduced the first of two reports for school expansions on the agenda today. She requested that Cabinet approve the business case for the expansion of Guildford County School, which is an Academy, so that it could expand from a 160 place per year 5 Form of Entry secondary (800 places) to a 180 place per year 6 Form of Entry secondary (900 places) to meet the demand for 100 additional secondary places in Guildford from September 2017.

She informed Members that a number of primary school expansions had taken place in the area and plans now need to be put in place to ensure that there would be adequate secondary places in the area. She said that the project would create a three-storey extension and also would provide a multi-use games area to help mitigate the limited recreation space at this school.

Finally, she confirmed that following the consultation process, the School's Governing Body had unanimously agreed to a Published Admission Number (PAN) increase to 180 from September 2017, subject to approval of the business case for the school's expansion.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**56/16 DANETREE JUNIOR SCHOOL, EWELL [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement said that this business case for the approval of expansion of Danetree Junior School from a 4 Form of Entry junior (480 places) to a 4 Form of Entry primary (840 places) creating an additional 360 primary places, plus those places at Guildford County School meant that the County Council was creating a total of 460 additional school places today.

The project would include a new two-storey building that would provide a new nursery and six new infant classrooms. She said that this expansion formed

part of an area re-organisation of primary schools within Ewell that sought to deliver 630 additional primary places across three schools and would help meet the basic need requirements in the Ewell and NW Epsom primary planning areas from September 2017. She also said that there would be a maintained 52 place nursery for children aged 2 to 4 years on the Danetree school site.

As the school was an Academy, part of the Glyn Learning Foundation, it conducted the consultation for the expansion which subsequently the Governing Body approved in principle. This decision had now been ratified by the Secretary of State via the Regional Schools' Commissioner and therefore, the Cabinet Member commended its expansion to Cabinet.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**57/16 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 13]**

An updated Annex 1 was tabled at the meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reasons for Decisions:**

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

**58/16 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.**

## **59/16 GUILDFORD COUNTY SCHOOL [Item 15]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement said that this report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 11 and drew attention to the average programme target cost set out within the report.

The Cabinet Associate responsible for Community Safety Services asked whether sprinklers would be fitted as part of the building work for both this and Danetree Schools. The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement agreed to check with officers after the meeting and provide both the Cabinet Associate and the Leader with a response.

### **RESOLVED:**

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.

## **60/16 DANETREE JUNIOR SCHOOL, EWELL [Item 16]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement said that this report contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 12.

### **RESOLVED:**

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.

**61/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTION [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Associate Member for the Built Environment introduced the next two items, both property acquisitions, to Cabinet.

Due to the impact of stamp duty charges, announced on 16 March 2016, revised recommendations for both items were tabled at the meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**62/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTION [Item 18]**

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**63/16 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 19]**

It was agreed that non-exempt information may be made available to the press and public, where appropriate.

[Meeting closed at 4.05pm]

---

**Chairman**

**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.

<b>Recommendations:</b>
-------------------------

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**