

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 18 OCTOBER 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

Members in attendance:

Mr David Harmer, Chairman of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

189/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mr Peter Martin.

190/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 20 SEPTEMBER 2016 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 September were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

191/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

192/16 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

193/16 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

A question was received from Mrs Watson and a response can be found at **Appendix 1**.

Mrs Watson stated that reference to a recent office occupancy survey undertaken by the Council had been made at a meeting of the Council Overview Board on 6 October 2016. In light of the response, Mrs Watson asked to receive the results from the most recent office occupancy survey completed by the Council. The Cabinet Member for Business Services

informed Mrs Watson that the Council had undertaken a utilisation survey and that this may have been what was discussed at the Council Overview Board. The Cabinet Member confirmed that a copy of the results from the most recent office occupancy survey would be circulated to Mrs Watson.

194/16 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

A question was received from Dominick Lemanski, a response can be found at **Appendix 2**.

195/16 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

No petitions were received.

196/16 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

No representations were received.

197/16 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY BOARDS, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

A report was received from the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board regarding Winter Maintenance and a response to this can be found as **Appendix 3**.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding indicated that the response to recommendations from the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board tabled at the meeting outlined the manner in which the Council would seek to identify savings within its winter maintenance budget and that officers were working with Kier Group, the company contracted by the Council to provide winter maintenance services, to reduce the annual lump sum that the Council pays for these services.

198/16 SURREY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2015-2016 [Item 6]

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care introduced the report and stated that the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board has a statutory duty to publish an annual report. Attention was drawn to page 17 of the report which highlighted some of the headline figures around safeguarding in Surrey. The Cabinet Member highlighted that there had been a reduction in the number of new safeguarding enquiries from the previous year but stated that the introduction of a cap on household benefits at £20,000 per annum may lead to this figure rising next year.

The Cabinet Member for Localities and Communities Wellbeing referenced the percentage of safeguarding enquiries which related to financial abuse and highlighted the work of Trading Standards in protecting vulnerable residents from being financially exploited by prosecuting unscrupulous traders that operated in the County.

Concerns were raised by the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health in regard to the potential impact that the benefits cap could have on vulnerable residents in the County informing the Cabinet that there are a significant

number of residents in Surrey who suffer from mental health problems or drug abuse issues who would be adversely impacted by the reduction in the amount of benefits that households can claim. She highlighted that Surrey County Council (SCC) would work closely with district and borough councils to mitigate the impact of the benefits cap on vulnerable residents.

Other Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- Attention was drawn to the contribution of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) to safeguarding in the County through newly implemented Safe and Well Visits. Fire officers visited elderly and vulnerable residents signposting them to relevant services
- 18 October was Modern Slavery Awareness day and it was fitting that Cabinet was considering the Surrey Safeguarding Board Annual Report given that human trafficking was a reality throughout the UK including in Surrey.
- Surrey is often viewed as an affluent county but this masks the fact that there are a significant number of vulnerable residents who require protection for a variety of reasons.
- The Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board was congratulated for the great work it does in protecting elderly, disabled and otherwise vulnerable individuals in the County.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet considered and noted the attached Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report prior to it being published.

Reasons for Decisions

This annual report highlights the achievements of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board during the year and provides the Cabinet with an opportunity to understand the issues within the Adult Social Care directorate in respect of safeguarding over the past year.

199/16 SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSFORMATION PLANS [Item 7]

An introduction to the report was provided by the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health who outlined that Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STP) represent a bid by NHS England to create place-based systems of health and social care delivery. The rationale for STPs was to tackle financial challenges by utilising available resources more effectively while simultaneously introducing local accountability into the delivery of healthcare services which was vital to the establishment of successful STPs. The Cabinet Member stated that there would be three STPs which would operate in Surrey, East Surrey and Sussex STP, Frimley Health and Care STP and Surrey Heartlands STP with the latter covering roughly 80% of Surrey residents. It was highlighted that the Chief Executive of SCC was Chairman of the Surrey Heartlands STP Transformation Board, one of only three local authority Chairmen for Transformation Boards across the 44 STP footprints. The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health further stated that Surrey Heartlands STP had introduced a Committee in Common to facilitate open

and transparent decision-making as well as providing the opportunity for residents to challenge decision-makers.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement drew attention to the Ofsted Inspection of SCC's Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) service and stated that she had been impressed by the close partnership working between the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG), healthcare providers and the County Council. The Cabinet Member stressed that co-commissioning and close collaboration between health and social care commissioners and providers are at the heart of STPs and this would deliver better outcomes for residents.

The Leader of the Council noted his thanks to the Chief Executive for the work that he had done in supporting CCGs to put STP packages together, particularly Surrey Heartlands STP which had been recognised nationally as a robust plan.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet:

1. noted the update on the emerging NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plans;
2. approved the terms of reference for, and the County Council's participation in, the Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Plan Committees in Common;
3. appointed the Chief Executive, the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health and the Strategic Director Adult Social Care and Public Health to Surrey County Council's Sustainability and Transformation Committee (as part of the Surrey Heartlands STP Committees in Common arrangement) and delegates authority for them to sign off the final Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Plan submission and delivery plan; and
4. delegated authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health, to sign off the Frimley Health and Care and Sussex and East Surrey Sustainability and Transformation Plan submissions and associated delivery plans on behalf of the Council through its membership of the relevant Sustainability and Transformation Plan Transformation / Programme Boards.

Reasons for Decisions

The deadlines and tight timescales for the preparation and submission of NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plans necessitate the recommendation included in this report to delegate authority to sign off the STPs on behalf of the Council ahead of the deadline for submission to NHS England.

200/16 DELIVERY OF NEW SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY SERVICE AND JOINT COMMISSIONING ARRANGEMENTS FOR SPECIALIST SCHOOL NURSING SERVICE [Item 8]

An introduction to the report was provided by the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement who highlighted that the delivery of Speech and Language Therapy services in Surrey had been patchy over the past few years. The recommendations outlined in the report were designed to improve how these services were delivered. Members were informed that the recommendations within the previous report considered by Cabinet at its meeting in May 2015 could not be agreed with schools and so it had been concluded that the best way to deliver an effective Speech and Language Therapy Service would be for SCC to manage it centrally. The Cabinet Member stressed that this would enable the development of a more consistent, streamlined and cost efficient service and that responsibility for funding would continue to be split between the Council in the sum of £2.8m which is provided from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and the CCG's with an estimated current spend of £1.7m. She further advised that the Council would not incur additional costs for the provision of pensions for speech and language therapists TUPEd over to the Council as a result of the proposed changes to the delivery of this service.

The Cabinet Associate for Children and Families Wellbeing stated that moving to a centralised model for the delivery of Speech and Language Therapy services supported the strategic goals of the SEND 2020 programme by focusing delivery around customers and service users. The aim was to enable children who require speech and language therapy to access these services at an early age and would therefore support inclusive education by giving them the best possible chance of attending a mainstream school.

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health said that the report demonstrated how joint commissioning with healthcare partners can create better services for residents not only in relation to Speech and Language Therapy but also specialist school nurses who help to ensure that children with an Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP) can attend mainstream schools.

RESOLVED

It is recommended that the Cabinet agree that:

1. Surrey County Council will continue to jointly commission the Specialist School Nursing service with Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups.
2. the speech and language therapy service for special schools and specialist settings will be transferred to Surrey County Council alongside the mainstream school service from April 2017
3. That approximately 64 staff will transfer across to Surrey County Council from April 2017.

Reasons for Decisions

Speech and Language Therapy

In February 2014, Cabinet agreed to issue new contracts to Virgin Care Services Ltd and CSH Surrey Ltd for an additional three years whilst joint

commissioning arrangements were agreed with Health. These contracts expire in March 2017; therefore there is a requirement for new service arrangements to be in place from April 2017.

In May, 2015, Cabinet agreed the following decisions regarding the future joint commissioning and delivery of a Speech and Language Therapy Service in Surrey:

1. that the Cabinet approves the draft commissioning strategy and the five joint commissioning principles within the strategy;
2. that the Cabinet agrees in principle to the realignment of commissioning responsibilities for the Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups;
3. that the Cabinet agrees for work to continue in developing a detailed costing model for a new speech and language therapy service. At this stage it is estimated to mean an increase of £377,000 in the Council's budget, to be made available from the Schools' High Need Block and will be subject to Schools Forum approval in June; and
4. that the Cabinet agrees that the new speech and language therapy service should be procured through devolving funding directly to special schools and specialist centres and bringing the mainstream service in-house to the Council. This service will be fully in place from September 2016.

The joint commissioning strategy agreed between Surrey County Council (SCC) and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) means the realignment of commissioning responsibilities for each organisation. SCC will become responsible for commissioning the school aged services and Surrey CCGs will re-direct resource into Early Years.

This Cabinet paper sets out further changes to the proposals detailed in the May 2015 Cabinet paper. These changes are:

- postponing the implementation date from September 2016 to April 2017. This date was put back whilst discussions took place with current providers of the service. Following further dialogue, both providers were satisfied that their concerns were being addressed and implementation could progress; and
- bringing the service for specialist settings (Surrey special schools and specialist centres) into SCC to sit alongside the mainstream service.

A jointly commissioned service that brings the school-aged service into SCC will offer the following benefits. These include:

- a service that achieves value for money – where the therapy service will be educationally focused and child-centred;
- reducing the gap in accessing speech and language therapy input between children and young people who have an Education, Health and Care plan and those that do not;
- offering a school-based delivery model rather than a health-focused one, will enable therapists to focus their time on supporting the child and school;

- removing barriers in accessing the service, for example, restrictions relating to where a child might live or which GP the child is registered with will no longer apply;
- investment into the early years service which reduces waiting times from referral and intervention, building trust and confidence in the system for families and reducing the number of children entering school with speech, language and communication needs;
- jointly commissioned speech and language therapy services across Surrey for children and young people aged 0-25 years;
- a service model which has been evidenced to work in other local authority areas and that has an impact on achieving positive outcomes for children and young people;
- clear commissioning principles and arrangements in place with Education and Health, including funding responsibilities; and
- improving the school offer in state funded provision, therefore instilling trust and confidence for families in the local school provision and reducing Surrey's reliance on the non-maintained and independent sector.

The Children and Families Act 2014 is clear that most speech, language and communication needs form part of a child's overall education needs and are not health related. On-going contract management of the current speech and language therapy services in Surrey has not been able to reshape a Health managed service into one that can provide schools with what they need to embed this service into their education offer for children and young people. In the new service, working days and leave will be organised around the school day and entitlement to the service will no longer be based on where a child lives or which GP a child is registered with. Recruitment, selection and training of therapy staff that is managed by an education service will ensure that staff are equipped with the skills and understanding to support schools and children and young people in the classroom. In addition, aspects of record keeping and training mandated by the Health service will no longer apply, freeing up therapists' time to provide direct therapy support.

A jointly commissioned service between SCC and Surrey CCGs across Surrey will provide an equitable and consistent offer for children and young people aged 0-25 years. This means that children and young people will access the service based on need regardless of whether they have a statutory plan in place or not.

Approximately 64 staff will be transferring across to SCC from April 2017 and Cabinet should be reassured that a key set of principles with regards to TUPE are being applied to the process.

Special School Nursing Service

There was reference in the May 2015 Cabinet paper that the Council would cease funding of this service and resources would be re-directed into the new speech and language therapy service. This was ultimately not possible as the service would be effectively decommissioned. Instead, SCC negotiated a 50:50 funding arrangement with CCGs, improving the SCC position from the current funding of 66%.

The SEND 2020 programme focuses on the importance of developing local provision for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) through joint partnership with Health. Jointly commissioning the Special School Nursing Service supports the new SEND joint inspection framework and SEND Performance scorecard.

201/16 LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT - TECHNICAL CONSULTATION [Item 9]

The Leader of the Council opened the item by welcoming the introduction of a technical consultation by Government. He drew attention to the challenging financial position that SCC was in as a result of the four year funding settlement proposed by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). He highlighted that the four year funding settlement offered by DCLG would mean that SCC would not only lose its Revenue Services Grant from the Government but would be required to pay £17 million back to the Exchequer annually. This was compounded by a reduction in funding provided to Surrey through the Better Care Fund (BCF) which would fall to £1.5 million by 2019/2020. Furthermore, the 2% increase in the Social Care Precept allowed by Central Government would not be enough to cover the cost of the rising demand for Adult Social Care services in the County. The Leader of the Council also expressed concern about the local government funding formula used to determine the allocation of grant funding to local authorities which is based on deprivation and the ability to raise council tax rather than the numbers of older people, those with learning disabilities and children with special education needs. In order to address the funding gap faced by SCC, the Leader of the Council advised that he has proposed the following solutions to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government:

- a) Enable an additional ASC precept – to allow SCC to increase the precept to meet need – and not impose an arbitrary 2% cap.
- b) Review Improved Better Care Fund allocations so SCC receives the £25m it is entitled to
- c) Agreement that SCC's Revenue Services Grant will not go negative in 2019/20

Other Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- reducing Surrey's share of the Better Care Fund allocation would have an adverse impact on acute hospital trusts whose costs would rise as a result of increased delays in discharging elderly and vulnerable patients from hospital. The CCGs should use their voice to put pressure on the Government not to reduce Surrey's share of the Better Care Fund.
- There would be serious implications for SCC if it did not secure a fairer funding settlement from DCLG and may require the Council to reset its

budget. It is vital to continue talking to the Secretary of State as well as Surrey's MPs to ensure that the County Council receives fair funding from the Government.

- It was unfair for residents to be funding services in other local authority areas to the tune of £17 million a year.
- Decreased funding for SCC would lead to reductions in frontline services for residents
- Surrey suffers from the preconception that it is affluent which masks the fact that poor people and communities still exist in the County and this is exacerbated by the high cost of living.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council's response to the consultation paper (Annex 1 of the submitted report), be approved.
2. That the Leader's covering letter to the Department for Communities and Local Government (Annex 2 of the submitted report) be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

Surrey County Council (SCC) is facing a significant financial challenge in creating a balanced and sustainable budget for 2017/18 and beyond. The methodologies to distribute resources within the Local Government Finance Settlement will have a material impact on the council's funding.

202/16 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2016 [Item 10]

The Budget Monitoring report was introduced by the Leader of the Council who reiterated the significant challenges which existed to SCC's long term financial sustainability which included a forecast overspend of £22.4 million for 2016/17. He highlighted that urgent action would be required to tackle this overspend and to present a balanced budget to Full Council at its meeting in February 2017.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence indicated that increased demand for services presented significant budget challenges for the Adult Social Care Directorate. ASC had successfully reduced the average cost of social care packages which had achieved savings for the Directorate but advised that these had been offset by the increase in volume of those requiring social care packages from the Council. The Cabinet Member stated that forecast spend for ASC in the financial year would be around £389 million but this would be contingent on winter demand as well as the financial resilience of residential and home-based care providers.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing advised that the Children's Services had a projected overspend of £4.3 million for the 2016/17 financial year. She highlighted that it was vital to maintain strong child protection and social work services despite demand for these service growing faster than anticipated. This was compounded by the fact that Children's Services was also providing for young people with increasingly complex needs some of whom required care packages that could cost the Council up

to £300,000 annually. Child asylum seekers also represented an additional financial burden on SCC as the funding that the Government provided for asylum seeking children placed in Surrey did not fully cover the costs that the Council incurred by looking after them.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement detailed the financial challenges that were being faced by schools in the County. Surrey receives the lowest funding per pupil of any local authority in England which meant that many schools were struggling to present balanced budgets. The Cabinet was informed that Schools were also finding it challenging to recruit and retain teaching staff as a result of the high cost of living in Surrey and the fact that schools in London could afford to pay teachers much more competitive salaries. The Cabinet Member did, however, advise that savings were being made through the implementation of the SEND 2020 strategy which would create an improved and more cost-effective service.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience drew attention to significant underspends in a number of service areas that had been delivered by the Council and which demonstrated the extent of the action that would be required in order for SCC to achieve a balanced budget. This could include considering the possibility of SCC only delivering on its basic statutory duties. The Cabinet Member further highlighted the impact of quantitative easing which was having an adverse impact on the Council's ability to accrue savings.

Other members of the Cabinet made the following comments:

- Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) was in the process of re-profiling a capital funding grant which it had received from Central Government to facilitate widespread service transformation. Utilising this grant effectively would enable SFRS to deliver significant savings.
- The Environment and Infrastructure Directorate was also facing significant cost pressures and was projected to have a very small budget overspend for 2016/17. Services provided were being looked at to consider how the Directorate could achieve further savings in the future.
- The Highways and Transport Service was on target to meet its budget for 2016/17 although there was a risk of overspending as a result of adverse weather conditions.

RESOLVED:

1. That the forecast revenue budget outturn for 2016/17 is a +£22.4m overspend (Annex, paragraph 1 of the submitted report) be noted.
2. That the forecast efficiencies and service reductions for 2016/17 is £60.3m (Annex, paragraph 32 of the submitted report) be noted.
3. That the quarter end positions for: balance sheet, earmarked reserves, debt and treasury management (Appendix, paragraphs App 8 to App 32 of the submitted report) be noted.
4. That the Section 151 Officer's commentary, Financial and Value for Money Implications and the Monitoring Officer's Legal Implications commentary (main report, paragraphs 14 to 18 of the submitted report) be noted.

5. That Members and officers should act urgently to identify, agree and implement actions to reduce the 2016/17 overspend (Annex, paragraph 4 of the submitted report)
6. That the Cabinet and other leading members to bring the council's budget issues to the attention of Surrey's MPs (Annex, paragraph 5 of the submitted report)
7. That a request to reprofile Surrey Fire & Rescue Service's capital budget (Annex, paragraph 42 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.

203/16 LEADERSHIP RISK REGISTER [Item 11]

Attention was drawn to L1 on the Leadership Risk Register by the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience who indicated that a lack of funding leading to significant constraints on the delivery of Council Services was no longer simply a risk but rather a reality. All mitigation measures had been exhausted to secure fair funding and SCC was now facing a watershed moment in terms of funding services.

The Leader stressed that the challenges in the midst of which SCC now found itself was not as a result of incompetence or poor financial management on the part of the Council but rather changes to allocation of the Revenue Services Grant which would result in SCC owing the Exchequer £17 million annually.

Other Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- The involvement of scrutiny boards in considering risks to the Council was welcomed as it is vital that all Members are aware of potential challenges that have been identified.
- Consideration should be given to reviewing L1 on the Leadership Risk Register to indicate that this was no longer a risk but rather an actual issue that the Council was required to tackle.

RESOLVED:

That the content of the Surrey County Council Leadership risk register (Annex 1 of the submitted report) be noted and the control actions put in place by the Statutory Responsibilities Network be endorsed.

Reasons for Decisions

To enable the Cabinet to keep Surrey County Council's strategic risks under review and to ensure that appropriate action is being taken to mitigate risks to a tolerable level in the most effective way.

204/16 STREET LIGHTING - INTRODUCTION OF A PART NIGHT LIGHTING PROGRAMME [Item 12]

An introduction to the report was provided by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding who advised that the Cabinet was being asked to take a decision on whether to reduce street-lighting further in certain areas of the County where it is deemed appropriate to do so following consultation with highways officers and police officers. Reducing the number of street-lights turned on would generate savings for SCC while also reducing the Council's carbon footprint. The Council was aware that residents would have concerns about a lack of street lighting at particular locations, such as at train stations, and members of the public would therefore be able to request that the Council turn on street-lights in certain areas.

The Chairman of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board asked to contribute to this item. He expressed his support for the policy and advised the Cabinet that the significant savings identified through the introduction of part-night lighting would be achieved at relatively low risk to residents and the Council. He welcomed the Cabinet Member's comments that residents would be able to make the case for street-lights being turned on in certain areas. The Chairman suggested that an amendment be made to the recommendations to state that requests from residents to change patterns of street-lighting would be given consideration by the Council. The Cabinet agreed the suggested amendments to the recommendations contained within the report.

Other Members of the Cabinet made the following comments:

- Important that residents will be able to request that lights remain on in certain locations as vital to ensure that shift workers and those returning home after a night out feel safe.
- LED lights have the potential to deliver further savings for the Council and consideration was being given to developing an iterative process for introducing these across the County.

RESOLVED:

1. That the implementation of a part-night lighting policy across Surrey commencing with residential roads where assessed safe to do so be approved resulting in lights in selected roads being turned off from midnight to 0500 hours each night.
2. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director for Highways and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding to determine the final programme of roads included and in future to vary the road categories to be included and future timings of part-night lighting in response to local circumstance where assessed to be safe to do so.

Reasons for Decisions

The introduction of the Central Management System for controlling street lights initially allowed the Council to introduce a dimming regime in 2010 but also provided the future flexibility to adapt lighting profiles including turning lights off. The expected £210,000 annual saving represents a 7% saving on the Council's electricity budget. The reduction in CO2 output by 1250 tonnes

per annum as a result not only contributes to the Council's objective to reduce its CO2 impact but achieves a further £22,500 saving in avoided Carbon Tax.

The recommendations follow a review of the increasing number of local authorities implementing part-night lighting and the outcome of the research by the LANTERNS project as described in point 8. Whilst the Council's public consultation identified concerns around personal safety and road safety with implementing part-night lighting, over 75% of respondents were in favour of switching off at least some street lights.

Building on good practice in other local authorities, the introduction of part-night lighting will only be implemented in locations where it is deemed safe to do so based on a combination of factors including a site visit and risk assessment and, consultation with the Council's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police to mitigate against the concerns highlighted.

205/16 INVESTMENT IN TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE - ADDITIONAL SCHEMES IN THE THIRD TRANCHE OF THE LOCAL GROWTH FUND [Item 13]

This item was deferred.

206/16 RIVER THAMES SCHEME FUNDING CONTRIBUTION [Item 14]

This item was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding who advised that the decision of whether to commit £2.5m in funding to the River Thames Scheme would be a difficult one for the Council. He did, however, stress that the scheme would significantly reduce the risk of flooding to thousands of homes and businesses in Surrey. The scheme also constituted a great return on investment as SCC would receive a significant return on investment arising from the amount of money committed by other organisations to developing flood defences in Surrey. The Cabinet Member further stated that the River Thames Funding Scheme was the culmination of significant collaboration between a number of organisations including district and borough councils, other local authority areas, the Environment Agency and Local Enterprise Partnerships. Given the number of partners involved, any delay by SCC in deciding whether to commit funding to the project could create a domino effect which would collapse the scheme. Cabinet was further informed that discussions were ongoing with local businesses, other public sector organisations and utility companies in regard to making a contribution towards the River Thames Scheme and make up some of the existing shortfall in funding for the project.

The Chairman of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board was invited to speak on this item. He stressed the significant risk that Surrey faced as a result of flooding and asked Cabinet to agree the recommendations in the interests of residents and the economic prosperity of the County.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement inquired as to whether there were any similar schemes being developed to improve flood defences on rivers and tributaries in Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding responded by stating this scheme was a one-off in terms of the scope of the project but highlighted that

there were a number of initiatives ongoing to bolster flood defences across the County.

The Leader of the Council announced that until SCC's financial sustainability had been addressed, it would not be possible to commit funding to other flood defences of this nature as they fell outside of the Council's statutory responsibilities.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet approved a total funding contribution of £2.5m from 2016-20 towards capital activities in the development phase of the River Thames Scheme.

Reasons for Decisions

Cabinet has previously indicated its support for the scheme by approving provision of £2.5m in the Medium Term Financial Plan in March 2016. A decision is now required for the contributions to be enacted.

Although there is no specific statutory responsibility for the County Council to contribute to flood alleviation schemes, in its capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority SCC has a duty to develop a strategy for flood risk management and to adopt a co-ordinated and co-operative approach with other Risk Management Authorities under sections 9 and 13 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 respectively. Delivery of the RTS is both part of SCC's strategy for flood risk management and a key element of its co-ordinated approach with partners; therefore a contribution towards delivery of the RTS will enable the Council to fulfil these particular statutory responsibilities.

Flooding is a significant concern to the residents of Surrey. The River Thames Scheme would significantly reduce the risk and impact of flooding to a number of communities in the County and provision of this funding would assist with the development of the scheme and will show a strong commitment to supporting the EA and other partners in successfully delivering the scheme.

207/16 APPROVAL FOR THE SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE TO TRIAL THE USE OF INITIAL RESPONSE VEHICLES AND AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION [Item 15]

This item was deferred.

208/16 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 16]

RESOLVED:

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

Reasons for Decisions

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

209/16 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

210/16 AWARD A CONTRACT FOR SFRS INITIAL RESPONSE VEHICLE CONCEPT FROM 4 NOVEMBER 2016. [Item 18]

This item was deferred.

211/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTION 1 [Item 19]

The Cabinet agreed that Recommendation 3 in the report should be amended so that it refers to the 'total cost' rather than the 'purchase cost'.

RESOLVED:

1. That Surrey County Council agrees to provide equity investment and a long-term loan to its wholly owned property company, Halsey Garton Property Ltd (HGP), as detailed in paragraphs 11 to 13 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 as detailed in the submitted part 2 report for a total purchase cost, including associated costs of purchase, as set out 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.

212/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTION 2 [Item 20]

The Cabinet was informed that Recommendation 3 in the report should be amended so that it refers to the 'total cost' rather than the 'purchase cost'.

RESOLVED:

1. That Surrey County Council agrees provide equity investment and a long-term loan to its wholly owned property company, Halsey Garton Property Ltd (HGP) as outlined in paragraphs 10 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 as detailed in the submitted part 2 report for a total purchase cost, including associated costs of purchase, as set out 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.

213/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTION 3 [Item 21]

RESOLVED:

1. That Property Services be instructed to progress and submit a detailed planning application to enable the construction and development of a headquarter training and production facility as set out in paragraph 20 of the submitted report.
2. That Property Services commence the contractor selection programme, with pre-construction contracts to be awarded at SCC's risk and full contract award pending receipt of a Resolution to Grant of a planning approval.
3. That Property Services conclude the negotiation of commercial terms with the proposed tenant and enter into an Agreement for Lease on a 'subject to planning' basis upon confirmation from the Chief Property Officer that the terms agreed with the tenant comply with S123 of the Local Government Act 1972.
4. That approval be delegated to proceed to the two stage construction process for Phase 2 of the project to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Business Services & Residence Experience, subject to the following pre-conditions:
 - receipt of a resolution to grant of a detailed planning consent;
 - completion of the Agreement for Lease with the tenant in line with the heads of terms; and
 - confirmation that agreed contracts do not exceed a gross capital cost as detailed in the submitted report, or where this is exceeded, it relates solely to Tenant works which are to be recovered in full.

Reasons for Decisions

To allow Surrey County Council to secure a significant, pre-committed and long term revenue stream in line with the Council's stated Investment Strategy from the development of a bespoke and advanced headquarter training and production facility on a pre-let basis.

This development means that there continues to be the opportunity to make available the remaining land area and offices within the Phase 1 construction just completed for emergency service use. Such accommodation may be required, subject to any necessary revised planning consent, in any future joint strategic partnership for a combined dispatch and control centre or shared operational office/training accommodation as part of the Public Service Transformation Network (PSTN).

214/16 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 22]

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

Meeting closed at 16:10

Chairman

Member Questions

Question (1) from: Cllr Hazel Watson

Surrey County Council recently carried out an office occupancy survey. What was the occupancy rate of the county council's offices? Which offices are wholly or partially underoccupied, and by what percentage?

Reply:

The Council has not carried out an Occupancy Survey at this time.

**Ms Denise Le Gal
Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience
18 October 2016**

Public Questions

Question (1) from: Dominick Lemanski

Why is nothing being done to address the dire state of the road network in Tandridge?

The roads are deteriorating every year across the borough and little is done to address the problem.

Reply:

Roads in Tandridge make up 11% of the total road network in Surrey. Since the Operation Horizon programme began in 2012 schemes in Tandridge have made up 23% of the countywide programme which recognises the poor condition of some roads in the area. Over 110km of roads in Tandridge have been treated since the programme began. Further schemes for future years will depend on achieving certainty of adequate Government funding.

**Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding
18 October 2016**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO ECONOMIC PROSPERITY,
ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD**

**WINTER MAINTENANCE SAVING COST RECOMMENDATION
(Considered by Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways
Board on 8 September 2016.)**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways board recommends;

- a. That Officers continue to develop a financial plan for the Thermal Mapping proposal, to ensure a significant saving is returned against the initial revenue expenditure, albeit in future financial years.
- b. That Cabinet considers more acceptable means for generating savings from the Environment and Infrastructure budget in order to obtain the £340,000 target for this financial year.

RESPONSE:

- a. Officers are continuing to develop a robust business case for the Thermal Mapping proposal and anticipate that they will have enough information by December 2016 to make the decision on whether to proceed with the process. This should allow sufficient time to see the financial benefits of the process for Winter 2017.
- b. Officers are continuing to develop compensating savings proposals for this financial year and will report to Cabinet in Spring next year on the saving proposals for Winter 2017.