

# Cabinet

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 30 May  
2017 at 2.00 pm

**Place**

Ashcombe Suite,  
County Hall, Kingston  
upon Thames, Surrey  
KT1 2DN

**Contact**

Vicky Hibbert or Anne  
Gowing  
Room 122, County Hall  
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020  
8541 9938

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk c  
anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk

**Chief Executive**

David McNulty

**We're on Twitter:**

@SCCdemocracy

Membership: Mr David Hodge CBE (Leader), Mr John Furey (Deputy Leader), Mrs Helyn Clack, Mrs Clare Curran, Mr Mel Few, Mr Mike Goodman, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mr Tim Oliver, Mrs Denise Turner Stewart.

**If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 9698, fax 020 8541 9009, or email vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or anne.gowing@surreycc.gov.uk.**

**This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Vicky Hibbert or Anne Gowing on 020 8541 9229 or 020 8541 9938.**

***Note:** This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.*

*Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.*

*If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the representative of Legal and Democratic Services at the meeting*

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 27 APRIL 2017**

The minutes will be available in the meeting room half an hour before the start of the meeting.

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

**NOTES:**

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

**4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**a Members' Questions**

The deadline for Member's questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (*23 May 2017*).

**b Public Questions**

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (*23 May 2017*).

**c Petitions**

The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

**d Representations received on reports to be considered in private**

To consider any representations received in relation why part of the meeting relating to a report circulated in Part 2 of the agenda should be open to the public.

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

None

## **CORPORATE PRIORITIES: WELLBEING**

### **6 PROPOSED DE-COMMISSIONING OF EXTERNALLY COMMISSIONED YOUNG PEOPLE'S EARLY HELP SERVICES** (Pages 1 - 26)

Surrey County Council and its partners are delivering an Early Help Transformation Programme, to radically reshape the early help offer for children, young people and families. We will develop and implement a cohesive, collaborative approach with partners to provide a continuum of help and support to respond to the different levels of need and risk for children and families, whilst securing the best possible value for money for residents. We will do this to achieve better outcomes for children, young people and families, and this is also a key part of the County Council's Children's Services improvement journey, following the Ofsted inspection in 2015.

As well as transforming the offer, the Council also needs to achieve savings in early help of £2.9 million in 2017-18, rising to a cumulative total of £7.5 million in 2018/19. The proposals in this paper are the first stage in addressing the savings and seek to realise £0.25 million during 2017/18, rising to a cumulative total of £0.45 million in 2018/19. A subsequent report on Early Help will set out the approach for the remaining savings.

On 28 February 2017, Cabinet approved an eight-week public consultation, from 9 March to 3 May 2017, about proposals to change some of the Council's externally commissioned young people's early help services to deliver these first stage savings. The services in scope for this consultation were: Neighbourhood Local Prevention; 1-to-1 Local Prevention; and Year 11/12 Transition. This report sets out a final recommendation in relation to these proposals for a Cabinet decision, informed by the findings of the consultation period.

*[The decision on this item may be called in]*

## **CORPORATE PRIORITIES: RESIDENT EXPERIENCE**

### **7 PART NIGHT STREET LIGHTING - ALTERNATIVE FUNDING MODEL** (Pages 27 - 34)

In October 2016, to generate an estimated £210k of annual savings, Cabinet approved the implementation of Part Night Street Lighting with approximately 44,000 lights estimated to be turned off between midnight and 0500 each night. The lights selected focussed on non-traffic routes and were risk assessed against a number of "Avoidance Criteria" which if present would mean the lights would be left on. The Avoidance Criteria include:

- a. Traffic Routes – this will predominantly be A, B and C classified roads. However, some lower trafficked roads in this group may be included and equally some higher trafficked unclassified roads may be excluded by this criteria.
- b. Town centres where this is a night time economy.

- c. Where traffic calming measures (speed cushions or humps, chicanes etc) or formal pedestrian crossings such as zebra crossings are present and they require illumination.
- d. Locations where Council or Police CCTV is in operation to reduce crime.
- e. Locations where the Council's Road Safety Team or Surrey Police believe that implementing part-night lighting could have an adverse effect on either crime or road safety.
- f. In cases where buses or trains run beyond the proposed switch off time, roads will be assessed and may either be excluded from part-night lighting or have a later switch off time.

In addition as described in (e) above, where Part Night Lighting has been proposed and implemented, all locations were assessed in conjunction with colleagues in the Council's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police and any road where there were concerns that switching off lights could have an adverse effect on either road safety or crime were excluded. This amounted to approximately 4,000 lights across the County.

Using the above avoidance criteria, the County Council has implemented Part Night lighting where it is considered safe to do so. Since the implementation of Part Night Lighting, some partner councils have expressed an interest in covering the cost of keeping the lights on that are currently included in Part Night Lighting thereby enhancing the level of service due to differing local priorities.

There have also been a number of comments made by residents (often via social media) who are in support of having the lights turned off. Reasons include being able to see the night sky, improved sleep as the streetlight near a bedroom window and the environmental effect of the CO2 savings made.

It is proposed to implement a mechanism that will allow District or Borough Councils to request an enhanced level of service by excluding the street lighting in their area from Part Night lighting subject to their agreement to reimburse the County Council all costs that would have otherwise been saved.

*[The decision on this item may be called in]*

## **8 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER AND INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING**

(Pages  
35 - 38)

To note any delegated decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader, Cabinet Members and the Investment Board since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

## QUESTIONS, PETITIONS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

The Cabinet will consider questions submitted by Members of the Council, members of the public who are electors of the Surrey County Council area and petitions containing 100 or more signatures relating to a matter within its terms of reference, in line with the procedures set out in Surrey County Council's Constitution.

### **Please note:**

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to the meeting. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and so cannot relate to "confidential" or "exempt" matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual – for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of this agenda).
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman's discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

## MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

*Thank you for your co-operation*

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 30 MAY 2017****REPORT OF: MRS CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN****LEAD OFFICER: GARATH SYMONDS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR COMMISSIONING AND PREVENTION****SUBJECT: PROPOSED DE-COMMISSIONING OF EXTERNALLY COMMISSIONED YOUNG PEOPLE'S EARLY HELP SERVICES****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council and its partners are delivering an Early Help Transformation Programme, to radically reshape the early help offer for children, young people and families. We will develop and implement a cohesive, collaborative approach with partners to provide a continuum of help and support to respond to the different levels of need and risk for children and families, whilst securing the best possible value for money for residents. We will do this to achieve better outcomes for children, young people and families, and this is also a key part of the County Council's Children's Services improvement journey, following the Ofsted inspection in 2015.

As well as transforming the offer, the Council also needs to achieve savings in early help of £2.9 million in 2017-18, rising to a cumulative total of £7.5 million in 2018/19. The proposals in this paper are the first stage in addressing the savings and seek to realise £0.25 million during 2017/18, rising to a cumulative total of £0.45 million in 2018/19. A subsequent report on Early Help will set out the approach for the remaining savings.

On 28 February 2017, Cabinet approved an eight-week public consultation, from 9 March to 3 May 2017, about proposals to change some of the Council's externally commissioned young people's early help services to deliver these first stage savings. The services in scope for this consultation were: Neighbourhood Local Prevention; 1-to-1 Local Prevention; and Year 11/12 Transition. This report sets out a final recommendation in relation to these proposals for a Cabinet decision, informed by the findings of the consultation period.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Cabinet agrees to de-commission Neighbourhood Local Prevention Grants so funding ceases on 31 August 2017.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

This is recommended so that the Council delivers the change to grants necessary for the required savings in the Medium Term Financial plan for 2017/18 and 2018/19, whilst protecting investment in the most strategically critical services, and preparing for the wider transformation of early help.

## DETAILS:

### BACKGROUND

1. On 23 September 2014, Surrey County Council's Cabinet approved a new commissioning model for Services for Young People to deliver the goal of employability, as set out in the Surrey Young People's Outcomes Framework. This included approval to procure up to £8.1 million of externally commissioned early help services spread across the five-year period from 2015 to 2020, in the form of commissions for 1-to-1 Local Prevention, Neighbourhood Local Prevention and Year 11/12 Transition.
2. Since implementation in September 2015, these services have worked in a targeted and preventative way to realise improved outcomes for many vulnerable young people in Surrey. In particular they have helped Surrey to continue to have some of the lowest rates of youth offending and young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) in the country.
3. However, the Council now needs to transform its early help offer for children, young people and families, so that services are even more integrated, targeted and efficient, with the aim of an even greater impact on outcomes for the whole family.
4. An initial stage in this integration and transformation process has involved reviewing and publically consulting on proposals to change externally commissioned early help services for young people, in preparation for a wider re-design and commissioning of a more sustainable future offer. As a result of this review, required savings of £0.25 million during 2017/18 and at least a further £0.2 million in 2018/19 need to be realised from the Council's external spend of £1.54 million per annum on early help commissions for young people.

### GRANTS AND CONTRACTS THAT WERE COVERED BY THIS CONSULTATION

5. The purpose of this section is to provide a short overview of the three current external commissions that were in scope for this consultation: Neighbourhood Local Prevention; 1-to-1 Local Prevention; and Year 11/12 Transition.

Commission	Annual budget	Current end date
Neighbourhood Local Prevention	£448,000	31 August 2018
1-to-1 Local Prevention	£700,000	31 August 2018
Year 11/12 Transition	£395,000	28 February 2019
Total external spend	£1,543,000	

6. The following list provides a summary of the key features of **Neighbourhood Local Prevention**:
  - i. Projects are funded through grants to local voluntary, community and faith sector organisations, with funding allocated to boroughs and districts in proportion to the identified level of need.
  - ii. Grants are awarded locally through Surrey's Local Committees and funded projects target delivery in priority communities identified through Youth Task Groups.



- iii. Organisations delivering these projects are: The Beat Project; The Eikon Charity; Leatherhead Youth Project; The Lifetrain Trust; and YMCA East Surrey.
  - iv. The commission responds to locally identified needs and priorities, working alongside Surrey's Community Youth Work offer to ensure provision is complementary and that the needs of young people in priority communities are well met.
  - v. Typical activities include: flexible youth work in the community; mobile bus projects; and targeted group programmes. Some young people identified as in need of early help will be referred to these activities by schools or via Surrey's Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH).
  - vi. The commission engaged over 2,000 young people in this range of group-based activities in priority communities in 2015/16.
7. The following list provides a summary of the key features of the **1-to-1 Local Prevention** commission:
- i. Services are delivered by contracts with local voluntary, community and faith sector providers, with funding allocated to boroughs and districts in proportion to the identified level of need.
  - ii. Providers are commissioned locally through Surrey's Local Committees and Youth Task Groups.
  - iii. Organisations delivering these services are: The Eikon Charity; Learning Space; Leatherhead Youth Project; The Lifetrain Trust; Step by Step; Surrey Care Trust; and YMCA East Surrey.
  - iv. Providers offer 1-to-1 support to particular young people who are referred through Surrey's MASH and identified as in need of early help.
  - v. In July 2016, contracts were varied to increase capacity of the services by 25% to extend the age range, improve consistency of outcomes measurement and strengthen work with families, to prepare for increased demand following the launch of the MASH.
  - vi. Typical approaches to delivery include: mentoring; 1-to-1 youth work; talent coaching; and counselling.
  - vii. The commission has the capacity to provide 1,600 hours of targeted 1-to-1 early help work to young people each month.
8. The following list provides a summary of the key features of the **Year 11/12 Transition** commission:
- i. Services are delivered through outcomes-based, area contracts, awarded to the specialist information, advice and guidance provider U-Explore.
  - ii. Services are offered to targeted young people in Year 11 who have been identified as at greatest risk of becoming NEET, through Surrey's Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) – a process delivered in partnership with Surrey's secondary schools to ensure the right young people are supported.

- iii. Young people are supported from the spring term of Year 11, over the summer and during the first months of their transition into post-16 education, training or employment.
- iv. The contracts' success is judged by the proportion of young people who are participating in the January of Year 12, and it achieved a success rate of over 90% in 2015/16.
- v. The commission provided a year of targeted 1-to-1 support 451 young people who were identified as at risk of becoming NEET in 2016.

## OPTIONS THAT WERE CONSULTED UPON

9. Whilst all the early help services above have performed well and had a positive impact on outcomes for young people, the Council needs to make difficult decisions to secure its financial position and prepare the way for its integrated 0-19 early help offer from 2018. A range of options that realise the required level of saving have been developed and were set out for consultation as follows, including a preferred option (Option 1):
  - i. **Option 1** – Bring to an end funding for Neighbourhood Local Prevention Grants at the end of the second year of the three-year programme on 31 August 2017 (**this was identified as the preferred option**).
  - ii. **Option 2** - Reduce funding to 1-to-1 Local Prevention contracts by 64% across all districts and boroughs (£450,000) for year three of the commission from 1 September 2017.
  - iii. **Option 3** – De-commission the Year 11/12 Transition Commission at the end of December 2017, alongside reducing the level of funding for Neighbourhood Local Prevention grants and 1-to-1 Local Prevention contracts by 23% for the year beginning 1 September 2017. This approach realises the required saving of £250,000 in 2017/18, but in so doing reduces funding for early help services in 2018/19 by over £400,000, double the required level of £200,000.
  - iv. **Option 4** – Apply a 39% funding reduction to both Neighbourhood and 1-to-1 Local Prevention from 1 September 2017 and run both grants and contracts until August 2018.
  - v. **Option 5** – Maintain funding for all grants and contracts at current levels, leading to an overspend of the identified available budget.

## REASON FOR PREFERRED OPTION

10. It should be noted that the Equality Impact Assessment completed, which was informed by consultation feedback, has highlighted adverse impacts on young people in Surrey in the short-term. In the medium-term the Council will aim to mitigate these impacts through the programme to transform and integrate its early help services. These impacts are summarised later in the report.
11. Option 1 was identified as the preferred option as the course of action that has the least degree of detrimental impact on both outcomes for the most vulnerable young people and the Council's approach to transforming early help in Surrey. It

also fits best with the timeline for the wider review and realises the required level of savings. This judgement was based on the following key considerations:

- i. Although Neighbourhood Local Prevention is targeted to Surrey communities with the greatest need, analysis shows that a lower proportion of young people from key vulnerable groups access these services (including those who: are currently or have been open to Children's Services; have SEND; have been involved in offending in the last 24 months; or are at risk of becoming NEET) when compared to other commissions, where young people are specifically identified as in need and referred to services. As an example, 55% of young people who received support through 1-to-1 Local Prevention were or had been previously involved with Children's Services, compared to 15% for Neighbourhood Local Prevention. By making savings against the grants programme (Option 1), other services that provide more targeted support to the most vulnerable young people are protected.
- ii. Both the 1-to-1 Local Prevention and Year 11/12 Transition models directly support the priority need for referral routes for young people who are referred into Surrey's Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) as at risk and in need of early help. This is a key part of SCC's journey of improvement in Children's Services, following the challenging Ofsted judgement in 2015. As a direct response to this, additional capacity for 1-to-1 early help was secured through contract variations in July 2016. Removing or reducing this capacity (Options 2, 3 and 4) would have a significant detrimental effect on the Council's ability to realise the required improvements.
- iii. The evidence of achievement of lasting impact on outcomes for young people accessing services is stronger in the case of 1-to-1 Local Prevention than Neighbourhood Local Prevention, based on assessments of quality of practice and performance monitoring undertaken during 2016, hence Option 1 is preferred to Options 2, 3 and 4.
- iv. The Year 11/12 Transition Commission demonstrates most clearly a direct impact on the Council's strategic priority of "creating opportunities for young people" of the three commissions. It delivered the positive outcome of a successful transition to participation in post-16 education, training and employment for over 90% of young people supported, all of whom were previously identified as at risk of becoming NEET. De-commissioning this service (Option 3) would mean this is not achieved.
- v. Year 11/12 Transition works with young people from January to December, so it is not possible to end contracts prior to January 2018, without a disproportionate impact on young people currently accessing services. This means Option 3, which sets out de-commissioning of this service, will not realise adequate budget savings in 2017/18 without also reducing funding for 1-to-1 and/or Neighbourhood Local Prevention by 39% from 1 September 2017. This runs the risk of making all three commissions unviable for current providers.
- vi. The resources for Neighbourhood and 1-to-1 Local Prevention are already allocated to boroughs and districts through a needs-led resource allocation system. The level of savings required by Option 4 will mean close to a 39% reduction in funding across boroughs and districts. This

level of reduction may well mean both 1-to-1 and Neighbourhood Local Prevention become unviable for providers and will not offer sufficient capacity to meet Surrey's key early help challenges.

- vii. Option 5 is not a viable option as it does not fit with the service intention of the Early Help review, which aims to transform and integrate existing disparate services in order to provide a holistic service for families that will deliver better outcomes and be more efficient. It would also not fit the requirement for a balanced budget to be set.
- viii. Taking account of the balance of considerations related to these options, Option 1 was presented as the preferred option.

## KEY FINDINGS FROM THE CONSULTATION

12. Throughout the period of public consultation, 56 responses to the online survey as well as six specific emails from partners and members of the public were received. We also held four drop-in sessions, one in each area of the County, to give the public an opportunity to feedback to Council officers directly. We met with all current providers of the affected services. A wide range of views were expressed through this process, with some supporting the preferred option and others strongly opposing this and proposing alternatives.
13. Looking overall, many of the responses acknowledged the Council's challenging financial position, whilst also agreeing that all young people's early help commissions were valuable and having an impact and the need to reduce funding at this time was regrettable.
14. The online survey asked members of the public to tell us the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the different options available to us. This is summarised in the following table. In terms of option 1 (de-commission Neighbourhood Local Prevention - the preferred option) 48% of respondents (27 of 56) either strongly agreed or tended to agree with this option, taking account of the current context. The same proportion of respondents strongly agreed or tended to agree with option 5 (maintain funding at current levels). These compared to only 7% for option 2, 16% for option 3 and 16% for option 4. Please note that respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed with each of the five options in turn, therefore the total percentage shown here does not add up to 100%.

Option	% strongly agree or tend to agree	% strongly disagree or tend to disagree	% neither agree nor disagree
Option 1	48.2%	50.0%	1.8%
Option 2	7.1%	89.3%	3.6%
Option 3	16.1%	75.0%	8.9%
Option 4	16.1%	73.2%	10.7%
Option 5	48.2%	37.5%	14.3%

15. Whilst all current services are obviously valued, the balance of public feedback supports the view that, should the savings need to be made from externally commissioned young people's early help, de-commissioning Neighbourhood Local Prevention is the least detrimental from the options available. It should be noted that Option 5 has received the same level of agreement as Option 1, whilst a lower proportion of respondents disagreed with the option. Option 5 however will not enable the Council to deliver a balanced budget, which it is

legally required to do, without the required savings being made against other Council services. Through the Medium Term Financial Plan process, the level of savings required from each service area have already been set and agreed, therefore option 5 is not a realistic option at this stage.

16. A summary of further findings from the consultation have been attached to the end of the report in Annex 1.

### **SHOULD THE PREFERRED OPTION BE CHANGED?**

17. Neighbourhood Local Prevention Grants are clearly valued by many people in Surrey and a range of responses have highlighted how Surrey should consider maintaining current levels of funding for all young people's early help services (as set out in option 5). In spite of this, however, the balance of feedback received has not demonstrated that the alternative options available to realise the proposed level of savings should be pursued in preference, with much of the rationale for the original identification of the preferred option still standing. In summary, this assessment was based on option 1:
  - i. having the least detrimental impact on outcomes for the most vulnerable young people in Surrey from the options available, with less strong evidence of engagement with young people from vulnerable groups and lasting impact on outcomes for young people, whilst still realising the level of saving agreed in the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan; and
  - ii. having the least detrimental impact on the Council's approach to transforming early help, including the need for referral routes for young people coming to the attention of Surrey's Multi-agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and the Council's improvement journey following the challenging Ofsted judgement of our Children's Services in 2015.
18. An Equality Impact Assessment, attached as Annex 2, has been undertaken in relation to the proposal, which has also set out mitigation, as far as possible, to the negative impacts identified. Whilst the reduction in funding will have a negative impact on young people, we will work to mitigate these through the overall transformation of early help during 2017 and 2018.
19. There is also a risk that organisations from the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector who currently provide Neighbourhood Local Prevention services will face financial challenges as a result of the withdrawal of funding. This could also result in the loss of wider community benefit and added social value they deliver.
20. Taking account of the balance of these considerations, informed by consultation feedback, Option 1 should remain the preferred option.

## **CONSULTATION:**

21. This report has been informed by an eight-week period of public consultation that ran from 8 March to 3 May 2017.
22. During the consultation, the following approaches were undertaken to engage with key groups affected by the proposals:
  - i. Online survey issued through Surrey Says;
  - ii. Focus groups help with young people currently attending provision;
  - iii. Four drop-in public consultation sessions held across the county
  - iv. Meetings with all current providers to discuss the proposals and explore the options presented;
  - v. Engagement with staff in the Early Help Service; and
  - vi. Engagement with Youth Task Group Chairmen.
23. In preparing for the public consultation, a briefing was provided to Local Committee Chairmen's Meeting on 31 January 2017, given their key current role in local prevention services. Whilst they understood the need for savings in 2017/18 they did highlight concerns about the potential impact of changes on the voluntary sector in Surrey. These have been reflected in this report.
24. Surrey's Youth Collective were also engaged on 1 February 2017. They provided feedback on the consultation approach and offered to help young people to take part in the consultation process. They raised concerns about the impact that the changes might have on young people.

## **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

The key risks associated with this proposal are:

- i. Neighbourhood Local Prevention Services are preventative in nature, engaging young people early to stop negative experiences in their lives. There is therefore a risk that a ceasing of Neighbourhood Local Prevention services may lead to an increase in demand in the future for higher-cost late intervention services provided by the Council and its partners, for example Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and Children's Services.
- Risk management – The Council will work with providers to ensure that wherever possible young people are supported to access alternative provision, as part of a structured approach to exit planning from the current grants.
- ii. There is a risk that organisations from the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector who currently provide Neighbourhood Local Prevention services will face financial challenges as a result of the withdrawal of funding. This which could also result in the loss of wider community benefit and added social value they deliver.



- Risk management – The Council has spoken to all providers currently receiving Neighbourhood Prevention grants to understand the likely impact of the proposals. Whilst the loss of funding will have an impact on the offer provided by organisations, none have indicated that this change in isolation will make them unviable. Alongside this, we have been working with the voluntary, community and faith sector to develop the early help market and shape their future role. A focussed early help event for the sector is planned for July 2017.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

25. This paper recommends an approach to realise savings of £250,000 in 2017/18 and at least a further £200,000 in 2018/19 (£450,000 in total).
26. The efficiency savings planned for Early Help transformation are in the 2017-22 Medium Term Financial Plan. Overall, the Early Help Programme is targeted to deliver more integrated services and savings of £2.9 million in 2017-18, rising to a cumulative total of £7.5 million in 2018/19. The 2016-21 MTFP included significant investment (£2.5m) in the transformation of Early Help, so that planned savings could be realised in later years including significant efficiencies through integration. The intention is to ensure that the Children, Schools and Families Directorate (CSF) delivers an Early Help service that demonstrates value for money and improves the outcomes of vulnerable groups.
27. A key strategy for CSF is the review of all its services around early intervention, prevention and early help with the strategic intention to transform, integrate and coordinate the delivery of early help services to the most vulnerable children, young people and their families. Evidence of an integrated early help offer from elsewhere has shown improved outcomes for these vulnerable groups. By coordinating resources and targeting preventative services early in the care pathway for individuals and families, efficiencies are able to be realised and demand for services better managed.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

28. This review of and consultation about some of the externally commissioned services providing early help to young people is a step in the process of the wider early help review and integration. This specific change will realise savings of £450,000 by 2018/19.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

29. Whilst there is no express or implied duty to consult, there is an expectation that a local authority making decisions affecting the public will act fairly. Therefore, if a Local Authority withdraws a benefit previously afforded to the public, it will be under an obligation to consult with the beneficiaries of that service before withdrawing it. That obligation requires there to be a proposal, consultation on the proposal before the decision is reached and that the responses to the consultation are conscientiously considered in the decision making process. Failure to do so will risk the decision being overturned following Judicial Review.
30. The Local Authority is also required to comply with the public sector equality duty as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

## Equalities and Diversity

31. An Equality Impact Assessment (Annex 2) has been completed in relation to the recommendation to de-commission Neighbourhood Local Prevention, updated with feedback gathered through the public consultation process. We know that over 2,000 young people in some of Surrey's communities with the greatest need are supported through Neighbourhood Local Prevention projects each year and the Equality Impact Assessment has identified that this recommendation will have a short-term adverse impact on some of these young people, as explained below.
32. The two key adverse impacts identified through this Equality Impact Assessment (Annex 2) include:
  - Young people aged 11-18, some of whom have protected characteristics, would have less access to early help provision in particular communities, possibly resulting in increased negative outcomes, social isolation, anti-social behaviour and poorer mental health and emotional wellbeing. Young people who have special educational needs and disabilities, who have poor emotional wellbeing, who are members of the Gypsy Roma Traveller community and young carers may be particularly affected.
  - There will be fewer opportunities in the short-term for young people to participate in positive activities, access help and develop relationships with supportive adults, as well as fewer opportunities to spend time with peers in a safe environment. This is especially true for young people who live in rural communities.
33. The mitigation identified for these negative impacts is set out in Annexe 2 and key points are set out below:
  - i. Young people who are currently accessing Neighbourhood Local Prevention projects who are the most vulnerable, in particular those with protected characteristics, would be signposted to other local services where these are available or, where appropriate, referred directly to 1-to-1 Local Prevention services. This would be a key focus of exit planning with the current providers.
  - ii. In the medium-term, the Council would aim to mitigate these adverse impacts through the wider review, transformation and integration of all early help services, to deliver more holistic support to families. This will be achieved through the Early Help Transformation Programme which will be implemented from 1/1/18. This would include ensuring the young people who are most vulnerable, some of whom have protected characteristics and are prioritised for support through effective early identification, using both the available data and local knowledge. Surrey's Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) and its application in targeting support, has been an effective tool for the last four years in Surrey to identify young people who are most at risk of not engaging with education, training or employment when they reach 16, is an example of this approach in action. The Early Help Transformation Programme will build on the success by targeting support through a Risk of Vulnerability Indicator (RONI).
  - iii. By protecting funding for 1-to-1 Local Prevention and Year 11/12 Transition, the services that are most directly targeted at the young people



who are most vulnerable, including many of those with protected characteristics, would be maintained with ongoing benefit for these groups.

#### **Other Implications:**

34. The potential implications for the following council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	Neighbourhood Local Prevention Services play a role in preventing young people becoming Looked After. Reductions to Neighbourhood Local Prevention services may increase the risk of more young people becoming Looked After
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	Neighbourhood Local Prevention services play a role in safeguarding vulnerable young people in Surrey as part of the Early Help offer.
Public Health	Neighbourhood Local Prevention services play a role in a range of public health issues for young people, including preventing substance misuse, improving sexual health, and promoting healthy lifestyles, in response to young people's needs and local priorities set by Youth Task Groups. Reduction to these services will reduce preventative work with young people in these areas.
Climate change	No significant implications arising from this report
Carbon emissions	No significant implications arising from this report

#### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

35. Should Cabinet agree the recommendation set out in this report, the following next steps will be undertaken:

Date	Activity
1 June 17	Indicative notifications of end of Neighbourhood Local Prevention Grants on 31 August 2017 sent to current grant recipients
8 June 17	Cabinet call-in period ends and final position confirmed to current grant recipients
During June 17	Meetings held with all current providers to plan for end of grants and exit plans

	completed and agreed.
July and August 17	Exit plans implemented in partnership with providers
31 August 17	Neighbourhood Local Prevention Grants end
May – December 2017	Development of Surrey's wider early help model

---

**Contact Officer:**

Frank Offer, Head of Market Strategy, CSF Commissioning  
[frank.offer@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:frank.offer@surreycc.gov.uk), Tel: 020 8541 9507

Chris Tisdall, Senior Commissioning Manager, CSF Commissioning  
[chris.tisdall@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:chris.tisdall@surreycc.gov.uk), Tel: 020 8541 7567

**Consulted:**

Local Committee Chairmen's Meeting  
 Surrey Youth Collective

**Background papers:**

- Cabinet Report, Creating Opportunities for Young People: Re-commissioning for 2015-2020, 23 September 2014
-

**Additional key findings from the public consultation and our response**

The consultation feedback highlighted a range of potential negative impacts that could arise as a result of reductions in funding for early help services that have been picked up through the Equality Impact Assessment (Annex 2). These included:

- i. Increase in risk taking behaviours by young people, such as anti-social behaviour, crime, substance misuse and not engaging in education or training, as well as a reduced emotional wellbeing and mental health;
- ii. A lack of safe spaces and positive activities for young people to participate in within local communities;
- iii. Increased costs to the Council and society as a whole in the longer-term due to more young people requiring more intensive support in the future, as issues that were previously addressed early are allowed to escalate over time;
- iv. Reduced range of access points to more intensive support services in local communities for young people; and
- v. Negative impact on community cohesion in particular areas.

As well as these, many people took the opportunity to highlight potential alternatives that the Council could consider in how to respond now or make better use of resources in the future. These are included, below along with the Council's response in brackets:

- Reducing “backroom” functions and layers of management and increasing organisational efficiency

**Response:** Surrey County Council has undertaken a restructure of its commissioning and performance teams in Children's Schools and Families during the first part of 2017, including some management, support and back office functions, reducing the number of full-time equivalent staff that will be employed by the Council by 40% and saving £2.1 million from annual budget.

- Lobbying central government to secure more funding for Surrey

**Response:** Surrey County Council has been actively lobbying central government to increase funding to Surrey in a range of areas.

- Saving money from other Council services that have less of a direct impact on young people and families

**Response:** Surrey County Council is planning and implementing savings across a range of different services in 2017/18 in response to funding reductions from central government.

- Developing more sustainable models of services, through volunteering and other forms of social capital, and commissioning contracts for other services in a way that rewards providers for offering opportunities to children, young people and families

**Response:** Surrey County Council is committed to developing more sustainable models of early help as part of the planned transformation taking place during 2017 and into 2018. Development of more sustainable models will however take time, so will not provide a viable short term solution to realise the level of savings required during 2017 and 2018.

- Providing more parenting support to families of young people aged 11-16

**Response:** Parenting for young people has been identified as a gap and we are planning to address this through the transformation of the early help offer. This will include a review of the current parenting offer, to make best use of the opportunities that are already available in Surrey, alongside exploring the commissioning of additional services as part of the new model.

- Seek funding from other sources, such as bidding for external grants

**Response:** We are actively seeking opportunities to bid for additional funding to supplement delivery funded through existing budgets.

- Improve information sharing between agencies and with families to make better use of the services that are out there in communities

**Response:** Surrey County Council acknowledges the importance of effective information sharing and is working to develop and implement new approaches to draw together and share data to support effective planning, commissioning and delivery of early help in Surrey.

# Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

## 1. Topic of assessment

<b>EIA title</b>	Proposed changes to externally commissioned early help services for young people
<b>EIA author</b>	Nikki Parkhill

## 2. Approval

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date approved</b>
<b>Approved by</b>	Frank Offer, Head of Market Strategy	17/05/2017

## 3. Quality control

<b>Version number</b>	v.5	<b>EIA completed</b>	18/05/2017
	17/05/2017	<b>EIA published</b>	

## 4. EIA team

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Team role</b>
Chris Tisdall	Principal Commissioning Manager	Surrey County Council	

## 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<b>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</b>	<p>Surrey County Council is transforming its early help offer for children, young people and families, to provide holistic support to the whole family that enables them to achieve positive outcomes and to make sure that services are good value for money. This change is being delivered at a time when unprecedented financial pressures are being faced, stemming from decreasing funding from central government and increasing demand for Council services. It is therefore vital to continue investing in early help services that realise the best outcomes and offer best value for money.</p> <p>In order to achieve savings during 2017/18, the Commissioning and Prevention Service in the Children, Schools and Families Directorate are reviewing the services we run ourselves (in-house) and those that other organisations are commissioned to deliver (through grants or contracts). This EIA focuses on the first phase of savings, which are required to deliver £0.25 million savings in 2017-18, rising to £0.45 million in 2018/19.</p> <p>This equality impact assessment is seeking to understand the impact of the proposed reductions to early help services currently delivered for young people across Surrey by external organisations.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>What proposals are you assessing?</b>	Following an 8 week public consultation, this document assesses the potential positive and negative impacts of the proposal to bring to an end funding for Neighbourhood Local Prevention Grants at the end of the second year of the three year commission, from 31 August 2017.
<b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b>	<p>Young people, families, communities and staff from the provider organisations are affected by the proposals. The Neighbourhood Local Prevention service has been locally designed, commissioned and targeted to meet specific needs in specific communities. The commission delivers community based projects, targeted in response to local need, to build the resilience of young people and address barriers to employability.</p> <p>During 2015-16, a total of 31,612 hours of activities were delivered for young people across Surrey through services funded by the Neighbourhood Local Prevention Grants. The provision was accessed by 2058 young people, with each young person attending for an average of 15.4 hours. Of these young people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15% are currently or have previously been open to Children's Services</li> <li>• 5% have been open to Youth Justice System in last 24 months</li> <li>• 26% currently have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) or receive SEN Support</li> </ul>

## 6. Sources of information

### Engagement carried out

A number of engagement activities occurred during the consultation period which ran from 9<sup>th</sup> March to 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2017. These included an online survey hosted on Surrey Says and four area based face to face drop in sessions. The team also facilitated a focus group that was organised by one provider and included representatives from schools, a parent and a young person. In addition, we visited a group of young people who access one of the mobile youth work services in one of our more isolated communities. We also engaged with representatives from each of the providers through our scheduled contract, performance and quality review meetings during March and April. Colleagues from partner organisations and other stakeholders were asked specifically to share equality issues/ concerns about any impacts that may be experienced by young people who have protected characteristics. We received 56 responses to the online survey from young people, parents, providers, schools, elected members, borough and district councils and other stakeholders. In addition, we spoke with 12 young people during one of the drop in sessions and received 7 emails containing detailed feedback about the proposed changes and concerns about the potential negative impacts of reducing funding for young people's early help services on young people, families and communities.

Prior to this, young people, providers, elected members and other stakeholders were engaged throughout the commissioning processes that shaped the current format of Early Help services for young people which started delivery in September 2015.

### Data used

This EIA draws on performance data provided by the One to One Local Prevention, Neighbourhood Local Prevention and the Year 11-12 Transition Commission; case studies; reports from the quality assurance activities undertaken for of both strands of the Local Prevention service; SCC

Commissioning and Prevention Weekly Report (26<sup>th</sup> January 2017); and the following JSNA chapters (reference has been made to the EIA undertaken in 2014 when the current model was being developed and commissioned. Feedback gathered during the consultation period will be included):

- Surrey County Council (2016) 'The SEND challenge: growing levels of need: Needs analysis summary'
- Surrey County Council (2016) SEND Needs Analysis Section 2.1.3, SFR31/2014
- SCC Child Sexual Exploitation Needs Assessment, 2016
- Report: Demographic Growth 2015-2025. School Organisation Plan 2013/14 – 2022/23 and updated information from the Edge-ucate system (appendix 1)
- Council of Europe (2008) Child and teenage suicide in Europe: A serious public-health issue: Report Document 11547  
<http://assembly.coe.int/main.asp?Link=/documents/workingdocs/doc08/edoc11547.htm>
- Families in Poverty Needs Assessment 2010
- Needs Analysis for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Children and Young People in Surrey (2013)
- Surrey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) chapters, including: Domestic Abuse (2011); Ethnicity (2011); Family Stability (2011); Mental Health (2011); Religion (2011); Sexual Orientation (2011); Children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) (2017); Parenting (2011); Teenage Pregnancy (2011); Unaccompanied (and former unaccompanied) Asylum Seeking Children (2011); and Young Carers and Young Adult Carers (2014).
- ONS population estimates (2010)
- Parkhill, N. (2016) The Youth Work Commission Final Report  
<http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/Resource.aspx?GroupID=27&ResourceID=1710>
- Reed, B., Rhodes, S., Schofield, P. & Wylie, K. (2009) *Gender Variance in the UK: Prevalence, Incidence, Growth and Geographic Distribution*. GIRES. Available at [www.gires.org.uk](http://www.gires.org.uk)
- Surrey County Council (SCC) reports including: Services for Young People (SYP) performance reports (2015-2017); SYP Cabinet Paper 'Re-commissioning for 2015 – 2020' (April 2014); SYP: Analysis of the Engagement Paper Feedback: DRAFT V2 (2014); Young people's perspectives (2014); Young people's feedback through the Surge Survey (2014); SYP Needs Assessment 2013; Evaluation of Commissions (2013); and One in Ten: A needs assessment of young people aged thirteen to nineteen in Surrey (2010).
- Whittle, S., Turner, L. & Al-Alami, M. (2007) *Engendered Penalties: Transgender and Transsexual People's Experiences of Inequality and Discrimination*. Press for Change. Available at <http://www.pfc.org.uk/pdf/EngenderedPenalties.pdf>

## 7. Impact of the new/amended policy, service or function proposals

### 7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	Young people who access other early help provision will continue to receive a service. The de-commissioning / transition plan will ensure that young people are supported to access alternative provision where possible.	<p>There will be less opportunities for young people to access early help. This may lead to experiencing greater disadvantage and/ or negative outcomes which result in them needing to access more specialist services. Feedback from stakeholders has indicated that there is likely to be a negative impact on other residents and local communities due to increased anti-social behaviour resulting from less positive activities for young people.</p> <p>Young people who live in more rural areas/ have a lack of public transport will miss out on activities the most.</p> <p>Loss of funding available to the Voluntary, Community &amp; Faith Sector (VCFS) through this approach may also lead to a reduced provision for young people outside of that commissioned by SCC, as it will reduce the resources available and may means some aspects of services provided become unsustainable. Further to this, it is possible that wider community benefits and social capital generated through the current delivery model are lost.</p>	<p>According to the most recent data available, 53% of referrals received for early help across Surrey are aged 10-18.</p> <p>In 2015-16, 2058 young people participated in Neighbourhood Local Prevention activities.</p> <p>As of 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017, 56% of the young people within the target aged range of 11-18 (who have correct dates of birth uploaded onto the Attendance App) are aged 14-16.</p> <p>There is projected growth in total numbers of 16 to 18 year olds in Surrey of 3,990 between September 2015 and 2025, which represents an increase of just under 10%. The expectation is that the growth in year 12 learners will be 2,631 across the county, with the largest growth being in Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Elmbridge and Woking.</p> <p>Mobile youth projects delivered as part of the Neighbourhood Local Prevention activity tend to be located in areas where there is no other provision and increases access to services for young people who, in particular, live in rural communities.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	None identified	Young disabled people and those who have special educational needs will lose opportunities for group activities that enable them to achieve positive	In 2015-16, 26% young people who accessed neighbourhood local prevention services had an Educational, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) or received additional support within their



<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 19</p>		<p>outcomes.</p> <p>The removal of neighbourhood local prevention activities is likely to have an adverse impact on the mental health and emotional wellbeing of the young people who access provision. This is particularly so for those who live in rural locations or are otherwise socially isolated.</p> <p>Loss of funding available to the VCFS may lead to a reduced provision for young people who access provision outside of that commissioned by SCC as it will reduce the resources available.</p> <p>Mental health was listed as a key concern by Youth Task Groups in Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Tandridge, Reigate &amp; Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne and Woking</p> <p>Provision for young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) was identified as a priority in Guildford and Spelthorne.</p>	<p>educational setting (SEN Support).</p> <p>In 2016 Surrey County Council identified that there was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing population and growing need</li> <li>• A need to reduce the gap in key outcomes achieved by children and young people with SEND compared to their peers</li> </ul> <p>The categories of SEN children that are most likely to not be in education, training or employment (NEET) are those with Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) and Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD). (JSNA: Children and Young People who have SEND, 2017)</p> <p>Young people have said one of their key concerns is mental health and emotional wellbeing and that they would like to have people to talk who they can have a long-term, trusting, relationship with. They said it can impact on their ability to engage in learning or work. (Young People's Perspectives, 2014; Young people's feedback through the early help consultation, 2017).</p>
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b></p>	<p>None identified</p>	<p>Loss of funding available to early help services will lead to a reduction in provision and access points for young people into services that they may find beneficial.</p> <p>Trans young people and those who have a non-binary identity and access the provision will lose safe spaces to be with their peers and supportive adults.</p>	<p>Current prevalence of people experiencing gender variance in the UK is estimated at 600 per 100,000 people, with those with gender dysphoria presenting for treatment estimated at 20 per 100,000 people. There is a currently a rapid growth rate of 15% per annum. These figures do not take account of those who are questioning their gender identity or who have not made their gender dysphoria known. (GIRES, 2009: 4).</p> <p>This largely hidden group are highly likely to experience transphobic bullying, harassment and discrimination in public places, schools, in the workplace and within their families which can have a negative impact on mental health. There is a higher incidence of suicidality amongst lesbian, gay, bisexual and</p>

			<p>transgender young people than the wider youth population (Council of Europe). Access to medical treatment and safe accommodation are also key issues for these children and young people (Whittle et al, 2007).</p> <p>As a result of concerns about their own safety, young trans people need to be able to choose which provision they access.</p>
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	None identified	Sexual health, pregnancy and relationships were identified as key concerns by Youth Task Groups in Elmbridge, Epsom & Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne and Waverley. Less activities relating to relationships and sex will take place should funding be reduced. There will also be less points of access for young people to appropriate help, including the CCard condom distribution scheme should they need it.	'The recent child sexual exploitation (CSE) cases in Rotherham highlighted that the position of youth workers in the system, and how they worked, ensured that young people had relationships with adults who were able to recognise the issues and advocate on their behalf' (Parkhill, 2016: 20).
<b>Race</b>	None identified	<p>Young people from Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities will be particularly disadvantaged in some localities as there will be less provision accessible to them. Community cohesion may be affected within some areas as this has been a key focus of the work. Support for this cohort was identified as a priority in Guildford and Epsom &amp; Ewell.</p> <p>Reduced provision will also have an impact on other BAME groups. During the consultation, one young person who accesses a football project delivered by the LP neighbourhood provider in Woking said: <i>"before I trained here I was not confident, I used to be bullied by how I played football and my race by teens. But now as I play here I feel more protected, this has been a great experience for me and wish this happened more</i></p>	<p>White British people make up 83% of the resident population in Surrey. Other White is the second largest ethnic group with the largest ethnic minority group in Surrey being Indian, at 2.3% of the population (JSNA Chapter: Ethnicity). The 2011 Census shows that Surrey has become more ethnically diverse with rising numbers of people identifying with minority ethnic groups in 2011. Across the districts in Surrey, Woking was the most ethnically diverse area and Waverley the least.</p> <p>The percentage of statements of SEN has increased amongst mixed and Asian ethnic groups in the past three years.(SCC Education Performance 2011)</p> <p>All ethnic minority groups in the UK have a higher proportion of poverty compared to the majority white population (Families in Poverty Needs Assessment). Research suggests that a higher proportion of people from BME communities in the UK experience mental health problems compared to White British</p>

		<i>often! thank you.”</i>	people. (JSNA Chapter: Mental Health)  It is difficult to determine the exact size of Surrey’s GRT population. 59% of children in the Surrey GRT community have special needs compared with 19% in the whole population. Children and young people in GRT communities are often expected to assume caring responsibilities for siblings or relatives (Needs Analysis for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Children and Young People in Surrey 2011).	
Page 21	<b>Religion and belief</b>	None identified	It is our assumption, in the absence of data, that the religion and beliefs of young people who access Neighbourhood Local Prevention activities will follow similar trends as the wider population. Particular faith groups may experience a negative impact through the withdrawal of services in particular areas.	According to the 2011 Census, 62.7% of Surrey is Christian, 0.5% Buddhist, 1.3% Hindu, 0.3% Jewish, 2.2% Muslim, 0.3% Sikh and 24.7% no religion. There is a 4% difference between the percentages of people who identify as Christian in rural areas (66.2%) versus the percentage who identify in urban areas (62.3%).
	<b>Sex</b>	None identified	One provider has identified that young men may be particularly affected as they will have reduced access to positive male role models.	In 2011 the difference in educational attainment between boys and girls ranges from 18 percentage points at the EYFS to 6.4% at GCSE. (SCC Education Performance 2011) Boys were nearly three times more likely than girls to have educational statements in Surrey. (JSNA Chapter: SEN)  Young women aged between 14 and 17 are the most vulnerable to CSE (Child Sexual Exploitation Needs Assessment, 2016)
	<b>Sexual orientation</b>	None	Loss of funding available to early help services will lead to a reduced provision and access points for young people into services that they may find beneficial.	JSNA Chapter: Sexual Orientation:  Using mid-2009 population estimates, there are an estimated 5,700 young people aged 11-16 that are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or questioning (LGBTQ).  Identity-related stigma contributes to in increased risk of bullying and social exclusion – 34% of LGBTQ young people are estimated to have experienced homophobia whilst in school and domestic abuse – a third of LGBTQ young people are estimated

			<p>to have experienced bullying at home by a parent.</p> <p>It is recognised that these experiences can have a negative impact on mental health and that there is a higher incidence of self harm and suicidality amongst lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender young people than the wider youth population (Council of Europe).</p> <p>A fear of homophobia and the issues listed above can impact on a young person's ability to participate freely in education, training, employment and other youth activities.</p>
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	N/A	N/A	
<b>Carers (protected by association)</b>	None identified	<p>A reduction of services will limit choices and accessibility for young carers, and access routes into other provision.</p> <p>Loss of funding available to the VCFS may lead to a reduced provision for young people who access provision outside of that commissioned by SCC as it will reduce the resources available in addition to the reduction of early help provision directly funded.</p> <p>Young people who have caring responsibilities were identified as a priority group in Elmbridge, Runnymede and Woking.</p>	<p>Young carers are more at risk of possible mental-health disorders including stress, anxiety, low self-esteem, depression, eating disorders, difficulty in sleeping, and self-harm. (JSNA Chapter: Young Carers)</p> <p>It is estimated that there are 14,030 children and young people aged 0 – 18 years old who are young carers in Surrey (JSNA Chapter: Young Carers and Adult Young Carers)</p> <p>Surrey Young Carers give support to 1650 young carers a year. The average age of a Surrey young carer is 12. (JSNA Chapter: Young Carers and Young Adult Carers)</p>

## 7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Disability</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Race</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Religion and belief</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Sex</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	
<b>Carers (protected by association)</b>	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	N/A The proposals relate to externally commissioned Services	

## 8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
None	

## 9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
Young people aged 11-18 will have less access to early help provision, some of whom will have protected characteristics, possibly resulting in increased negative outcomes, social isolation, anti-social behaviour and poorer mental health and emotional wellbeing.	Ensure that young people, especially those who have protected characteristics, are supported to access alternative provision, where possible, as part of the exit planning.	August 2017	Nikki Parkhill
	<p>Work with colleagues to ensure that other early help provision delivered by the Family Service and the remaining externally commissioned early help service is accessible to, and inclusive of, those who have protected characteristics.</p> <p>Ensure that future early help commissioning and the Early Help Transformation address the needs of this cohort. This will include ensuring that young people who are the most vulnerable, including those with protected characteristics are prioritised for support through effective early identification, using both available data and local knowledge.</p>	December 2017	Frank Offer and Ben Byrne

## 10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
There will be less opportunities in the short-term for young people, some of whom will have protected characteristics, to participate in positive activities, access help and develop relationships with supportive adults, as well as opportunities to spend time with peers in a safe environment. This is especially true for young people who live in rural communities. In the short-term and as part of de-commissioning, young people will be sign-posted to other local services when these are available or, where appropriate, referred directly to 1-1 Local Prevention Services. In the medium-term, the Council will aim to mitigate these impacts through the wider review and integration of all early help services to be in place from 1 January 2018.	Age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, carers

## 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

<b>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</b>	JSNA Chapters, data from the Attendance App, census data, needs assessments, responses to the consultation (Surrey Says Survey, direct feedback from young people, parents and other stakeholders, and a focus group), and case studies written by providers.
<b>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</b>	Young people aged 11-18, some of whom will have protected characteristics, will have less access to early help provision, possibly resulting in increased negative outcomes, social isolation, anti-social behaviour and poorer mental health and emotional wellbeing. Young people who have special education needs and disabilities, young people who have poor emotional wellbeing, GRT young people, those who live in rural communities and young carers are likely to be particularly affected.
<b>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</b>	The EIA has helped to inform the proposal by exploring the impact of 4 potential approaches to securing the required financial savings. It was identified that bringing funding for Neighbourhood Local Prevention to an end one year early would have less negative impact on individual young people, including those who have protected characteristics, than the other options considered.
<b>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts</b>	<p>Ensure that young people, especially those who have protected characteristics, are supported to access alternative provision, where possible, as part of the exit planning. This may include referring particular young people for early help provided by the 1-to-1 Local Prevention service if appropriate.</p> <p>Work with colleagues to ensure that other early help provision delivered by the Family Service and the remaining externally commissioned early help services is accessible to, and inclusive of, those who have protected characteristics.</p> <p>Ensure that the Early Help Transformation programme and future early help commissioning addresses the needs of this cohort.</p>
<b>Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated</b>	There will be fewer opportunities in the short-term for young people to participate in positive activities, access help and develop relationships with supportive adults, as well as opportunities to spend time with peers in a safe environment. This is especially true for young people who live in rural communities. In the short-term and as part of de-commissioning, young people will be sign-posted to other local services when these are available or, where appropriate, referred directly to 1-1 Local Prevention Services. In the medium-term, the Council will aim to mitigate these impacts through the wider review and integration of all early help services, to be in place from 1 January 2018.

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 30 MAY 2017****REPORT OF: MR COLIN KEMP, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS****LEAD OFFICER: TREVOR PUGH, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR – ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE****SUBJECT: PART NIGHT STREET LIGHTING – ALTERNATIVE FUNDING MODEL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

In October 2016, to generate an estimated £210k of annual savings, Cabinet approved the implementation of Part Night Street Lighting with approximately 44,000 lights estimated to be turned off between midnight and 0500 each night. The lights selected focussed on non-traffic routes and were risk assessed against a number of “Avoidance Criteria” which if present would mean the lights would be left on. The Avoidance Criteria include:

- a. Traffic Routes – this will predominantly be A, B and C classified roads. However, some lower trafficked roads in this group may be included and equally some higher trafficked unclassified roads may be excluded by this criteria.
- b. Town centres where this is a night time economy.
- c. Where traffic calming measures (speed cushions or humps, chicanes etc) or formal pedestrian crossings such as zebra crossings are present and they require illumination.
- d. Locations where Council or Police CCTV is in operation to reduce crime.
- e. Locations where the Council’s Road Safety Team or Surrey Police believe that implementing part-night lighting could have an adverse effect on either crime or road safety.
- f. In cases where buses or trains run beyond the proposed switch off time, roads will be assessed and may either be excluded from part- night lighting or have a later switch off time.

In addition as described in (e) above, where Part Night Lighting has been proposed and implemented, all locations were assessed in conjunction with colleagues in the Council’s Road Safety Team and Surrey Police and any road where there were concerns that switching off lights could have an adverse effect on either road safety or crime were excluded. This amounted to approximately 4,000 lights across the County.

Using the above avoidance criteria, the County Council has implemented Part Night lighting where it is considered safe to do so. Since the implementation of Part Night Lighting, some partner councils have expressed an interest in covering the cost of keeping the lights on that are currently included in Part Night Lighting thereby enhancing the level of service due to differing local priorities.

There have also been a number of comments made by residents (often via social media) who are in support of having the lights turned off. Reasons include being able to see the night sky, improved sleep as the streetlight near a bedroom window and the environmental effect of the CO2 savings made.

It is proposed to implement a mechanism that will allow District or Borough Councils to request an enhanced level of service by excluding the street lighting in their area from Part Night lighting subject to their agreement to reimburse the County Council all costs that would have otherwise been saved.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Approves the implementation of a mechanism (as detailed in paragraphs 16-19) to allow District/Borough Councils to enhance the level of service and request all lights in their area be excluded from Part Night Lighting and to reimburse the County Council the full value of savings that would be realised by switching them off.
2. Delegates authority to the Head of Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways, to enter into specific agreements with requesting District or Borough Councils.

#### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

District and Borough Councils have their own budgets and across the County will have differing local priorities. Enabling them to request lights be excluded from Part Night lighting allows them to respond to those differing priorities by enhancing the level of service provided over and above that delivered by the County Council.

#### **DETAILS:**

##### **Background**

1. Surrey Council operates approximately 89,000 street lights across the County with an annual energy cost in excess of £3 million. The installation of a Central Management System (CMS) enables two distinct functions:
  - a. Control of street lights including the on and off times; the ability to reduce power consumption by dimming the lights.
  - b. Monitoring the performance of the lights to identify faults.
2. The CMS can be used to monitor and control lights to an individual level with each light having a different regime if desired.
3. As lights were replaced during the investment programme which took place between 2010 and 2014, each light was connected to the CMS and were dimmed. Lights on traffic routes are dimmed by 25% and in residential areas by 50%. Dimming was initially carried out from 2300-0530 each night but was extended to commence at 2200 in October 2015 to generate savings.
4. In October 2016, Cabinet approved the implementation of a Part Night lighting programme. It was estimated that upon completion of site visits and risk

assessments, application of the avoidance criteria and review by the Road Safety Team and Surrey Police, approximately 44,000 lights in residential roads would be suitable to be switched off from midnight to 0500 each night across the County. This was expected to save in excess of £210,000 in energy costs each year. In addition a further £22,500 of savings was expected through a reduction in CO2 and the associated carbon tax the Council is subject to.

5. A public consultation was carried out during August 2016 to gather the view of residents on the proposal to implement Part Night lighting. Of 842 responses, nearly half of all respondents were in favour of switching off many lights and overall 76% were in favour of switching off at least some lights.
6. The programme has been implemented over the past six months and is nearing completion and as at 31 March 2017, 45,327 lights have been moved to being switched off between midnight and 0500 each night. Of these 788 lights are either switched off later than midnight (up to 0200) and/or switched on before 0430 in roads close to train stations or bus stops where the first or last bus arrives or departs between midnight and 0500.
7. As part of the risk assessment process described in the October 2016 Cabinet Report, all roads were visited to assess them against the published Avoidance Criteria:
  - a. Traffic Routes – this will predominantly be A, B and C classified roads, however some lower trafficked roads in this group may be included and equally some higher trafficked unclassified roads may be excluded by this criteria.
  - b. Town centres where this is a night time economy.
  - c. Where traffic calming measures (speed cushions or humps, chicanes etc) or formal pedestrian crossings such as zebra crossings are present and they require illumination.
  - d. Locations where Council or Police CCTV is in operation to reduce crime.
  - e. Locations where the Council's Road Safety Team or Surrey Police believe that implementing part-night lighting could have an adverse effect on either crime or road safety.
  - f. In cases where buses or trains run beyond the proposed switch off time, roads will be assessed and may either be excluded from part- night lighting or have a later switch off time.
8. As described in paragraph 7(e) they were then reviewed in conjunction with the Council's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police to identify any locations where it was felt that turning off lights might have an adverse effect on either road safety or crime.
9. 10,311 lights which were assessed were deemed not to be suitable for Part Night lighting of which more than 4,000 were excluded following the discussions with the Road Safety and Police teams.
10. There are a further 9,250 lights across the County which are still under review and it is expected that the majority of these will be suitable to be moved to Part Night lighting in the next month or so this would mean an estimated total of around 53,000 lights operating on a part night basis.
11. There will be seasonal variations as during the middle of the year when sunrise occurs before 0500 (British Summer Time), lights will not switch back on in the

morning. For the remainder of the year, the lights will be switched back on and go off when the required ambient light levels are reached alongside other street lights which are not included in Part Night lighting.

12. During the implementation of Part Night lighting, several Parish Councils and a Borough Council have expressed an interest in being able to fund the cost of keeping the street lights in their respective areas on and so exclude them from Part Night lighting.

### **Options Analysis**

13. During the analysis carried out prior to implementing Part Night lighting, whilst there were many examples of Highway Authorities implementing similar programmes across their respective areas there were no examples identified where another tier of local government was funding keeping the lights on in a specific area. As a result, this was not considered as part of the original implementation.
14. The County Council has identified reduced street lighting as an area which can contribute to its overall savings programme and so by switching off some lights for some of the night where it is considered safe to do so in accordance with the published avoidance criteria, ensures limited funds are allocated where they are most needed.
15. There are 2 options available to the County Council in response to the requests made so far:
  - a. Implement a mechanism whereby District or Borough Councils can request an enhanced level of service whereby lights in their respective areas be excluded from Part Night lighting should they wish to fund the cost of keeping them on during the night.

Any agreement made between the County Council and a District or Borough Council would be for an agreed, fixed period of 5 years and the requesting District or Borough Council would reimburse the County Council its costs in full resulting from excluding those groups of lights from Part Night Lighting. Those costs will include the cost of energy consumed, any carbon tax associated with the consumption and any administrative costs incurred in processing and managing the request.

District and Borough Councils have their own budgets and across the County will have differing local priorities. Enabling them to request lights be excluded from Part Night lighting allows them to respond to those differing priorities by enhancing the level of service provided over and above that delivered by the County Council.

- b. Do nothing – the provision of street lighting on the Highway is the responsibility of the County Council and in implementing Part Night lighting, it has considered the impact on residents both in diverting limited resources to where it is needed most and in respect of the safety of the travelling public.

### **Proposal: Part Night lighting – enable external funding**

16. To implement a mechanism whereby District or Borough Councils can request an enhanced level of service by requesting lights in their respective area be excluded from Part Night lighting.
17. The requesting District or Borough will enter into an agreement for a fixed period of 5 years to maintain this enhanced level of service and will reimburse the County Council in full for the additional costs of delivering it including energy, carbon tax and any administrative costs.
18. This is similar in practice to other service areas such as environmental highway services where some District and Borough Councils enter into contracts with Service Providers on the County Council's behalf to deliver activities such as grass cutting, weed control and arboriculture services. The County Council reimburses the District or Borough for delivery of the agreed level of service and in some (but not all cases), the District or Borough Council contributes to the cost of an enhanced service, for example, a more frequent grass cutting schedule.
19. As the energy costs vary from summer to winter, costs will be calculated and invoiced twice per year – April to September invoiced in May and; October to March invoiced in November. The costs will vary from area to area depending on the number of street lights excluded from Part Night lighting. This process will allow for increases or decreases in energy prices and carbon tax to be passed directly to the requesting District or Borough Council with no direct financial implication on the County Council's budget or savings plans.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

20. The proposal results from feedback from partner Councils who themselves are acting on feedback from residents. Any decision to contribute to an enhanced level of service will be made by the relevant District or Borough Council with the County Council administering it and so consultation by the County Council will not be required.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications:**

21. The County Council has identified savings from implementing Part Night lighting and these have been built into the Medium Term Financial Plan.
22. Following the agreed process and reviewing suitability in line with the Avoidance Criteria, the County Council has achieved its expected target and will exceed it with the final phase as described in paragraph 7. Any additional savings will result in an underspend this year and will be reflected in future year's MTFPs.
23. Any costs incurred by the County Council by excluding lights from Part Night lighting including administrative costs will be reimbursed by the District or Borough requesting the increased level of service and so there is no direct financial implication to the County Council. Any increase or decreases in energy prices or carbon tax will be passed through to the requesting District or Borough Council.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

24. The recommended changes will not expose the County Council to additional cost or risk. Any agreement with District or Borough Councils to enhance street lighting levels will be on the basis that they fully reimburse the County Council for any additional costs incurred, including the cost of electricity, carbon tax and the council's own administrative costs.

#### **Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

25. As Highway Authority, Surrey County Council has a discretionary power but no duty to provide Highway Lighting under section 97 of the Highways Act 1980.
26. Lighting Authorities (District, Parish and Community Councils) have a power to light streets, markets and public buildings in their districts pursuant to section 161 of the Public Health Act 1875. They may therefore fund the provision of the lighting in their districts where the Highway Authority does not do so.
27. The public sector equality duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) applies to the decision to be made by Cabinet in this report. There is a requirement when deciding upon the recommendations to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for people with protected characteristics, foster good relations between such groups and eliminate any unlawful discrimination. These matters are dealt with in the equalities and diversity paragraph of the report.

#### **Equalities and Diversity**

28. An equalities impact assessment was completed on Part Night lighting and the outcome reported in the October 2016 Cabinet report.
29. Any decision to exclude lights from Part Night lighting will of course reverse the impacts highlighted. Any decision to enhance the level of service in a specific location will not be made by the County Council but by the requesting District or Borough Council.

### **Climate change/carbon emissions implications**

30. In the October 2016 Cabinet report, it was estimated that switching off 44,000 lights in residential roads would result in a reduction in CO2 of approximately 1250 tonnes each year equivalent to just over a 2% reduction in the Council's total consumption. Furthermore, the Council would see a reduction in Carbon Tax payments of £22,500<sup>1</sup>.
31. Although the County Council can pass on any costs associated with CO2 output such as Carbon Tax, the CO2 itself will still be produced. Depending on the number of lights in the requested areas to enhance the service level, there will be a corresponding reduction in the County Council's CO2 savings against those expected.

### **WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

32. Subject to Cabinet Approval, District and Borough Councils will be able to request an enhanced level of service by excluding all lights in their District or Borough from Part Night lighting subject to agreement to reimburse the County Council in full for any costs associated with delivering the enhanced level of service.

---

#### **Contact Officer:**

Paul Wheadon, Business and Strategic Programme Manager Tel: 020 8541 9346

**Consulted:** Not required

**Annexes:** None

**Background Papers:** Cabinet report October 2016

---



---

<sup>1</sup> Carbon Tax is currently £18 per tonne of CO2

This page is intentionally left blank



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 30 MAY 2017****REPORT OF: N/A****LEAD OFFICER: ANN CHARLTON, DIRECTOR OF LEGAL, DEMOCRATIC AND CULTURAL SERVICES****SUBJECT: LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/ INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To note the delegated decisions taken since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that the Cabinet note the decisions taken by Cabinet Members / Investment Board since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

**DETAILS:**

1. The Leader has delegated responsibility for certain executive functions to the Deputy Leader and individual Cabinet Members, and reserved some functions to himself. These are set out in Table 2 in the Council's Scheme of Delegation.
2. The Leader has also delegated authority to the Investment Board to approve property investment acquisitions, property investment management expenditure, property investment disposals and the provision of finance to its wholly owned property company, Halsey Garton Property Ltd.
3. Delegated decisions are scheduled to be taken on a monthly basis and will be reported to the next available Cabinet meeting for information.
4. **Annex 1** lists the details of decisions taken by Cabinet Members / Investment Board since the last Cabinet meeting.

**Contact Officer:**

Andrew Baird, Regulatory Committee Manager, Tel: 020 8541 7609

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 – List of Cabinet Member Decisions

**Sources/background papers:** Agenda and decision sheets from the Cabinet Member meetings (available on the Council's website)

---

**CABINET MEMBER/ INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS****April 2017****INVESTMENT BOARD****(I) PROPERTY ACQUISITION****Details of Decision:**

The Board approved the proposed acquisition, and specifically-

1. the provision of equity investment of a set amount as set out in the submitted report by Surrey County Council to its wholly owned property company, Halsey Garton Property Ltd (HGP).
2. that Legal Services agree the 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. authorised HGP to acquire the freehold interest in the acquisition, 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.

*(Decision taken by the Investment Board – 27 April 2017)*

This page is intentionally left blank