

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 31 OCTOBER 2017 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Cabinet at its next meeting.

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr Mike Goodman
*Mr John Furey (Vice-Chairman)	*Mrs Mary Lewis
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Mr Colin Kemp
*Mrs Clare Curran	*Mr Tim Oliver
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr Will Forster, Member for Woking South
Mrs Hazel Watson, Member for Dorking Hills
Mr Jonathan Essex, Member for Redhill East

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

163/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were none.

164/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2017 were agreed and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendment:

That Minute 148/17 (last two sentences of 6th paragraph) should read:

It was highlighted that following the responses to the detailed consultation, it had been decided to retain 30% of grants for older adults and disabled people. For socially excluded groups 80% of the grant would be retained and the service would be reconfigured accordingly.

165/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Colin Kemp declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 14 and question 4 of Members' Questions as he was an Executive Member at Woking Borough Council.

166/17 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

1 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Six questions in total were received from Mrs Hazel Watson, Mr Will Forster and Mr Jonathan Essex. Responses to these can be found at Appendix 1.

Supplementary questions

Q1: Mrs Watson asked what the council's strategy was in order to provide housing that residents could actually afford. The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services responded that the council were looking at all forms of housing and that provision was dependent on a number of factors including local planning, transport links and others. However, the council wished to see a significant number of homes built.

Q3: Mr Forster requested further information breakdown to his question. The Leader stated that what Mr Forster wanted was operational information which was not the Cabinet's jurisdiction but an issue for the Chief Fire Officer who was responsible for ensuring that operations ran correctly.

Q4: Mr Forster sought clarification that the response given was a 'no'. The Cabinet Member for Communities explained that there was no duty on the fire service to ensure that buildings were built according to building regulations.

Q5: Mr Essex asked if the information on the Joint Venture would be made available when a decision had been made. The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services explained that first a business case had to go to the Investment Board which would then consider on a site by site basis.

Q6: Mr Essex asked if the high level report on housing unit figures could be provided and when. The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services stated that it was dependent on Cabinet agreeing a partner but that a considerable amount of work was being undertaken to move development along and that more would be known in a few weeks' time.

Mr Colin Kemp declared a non pecuniary interest in question 4 as he was an Executive Member of Woking Borough Council.

167/17 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were none.

168/17 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

169/17 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

170/17 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY BOARDS, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There were none.

171/17 SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSFORMATION PARTNERSHIPS [Item 6]

Mrs Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Health introduced the report that explained how Surrey County Council was playing an important role in the three Sustainability and Transformation Partnerships across Surrey.

On 28 March 2017 the Cabinet considered a report regarding the Surrey Heartlands Partnership and the emerging health and care devolution proposals. The Cabinet endorsed a set of associated 'devolution governance principles' and asked the Chief Executive to take the necessary steps to finalise and implement the new devolution arrangements – this report focussed on the implementation of this work and provided a brief update on the progress in the Frimley Health and Care, and Sussex and East Surrey Partnerships. Since March a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed and Surrey Heartlands had been chosen as one of ten areas nominated to be involved with the Accountable Care Systems development programme. A joint committee had been set up and would be the primary decision making committee for Surrey Heartlands. The Cabinet Member explained further the governance and funding arrangements.

The Cabinet Member for Adults spoke about the number of Clinical Commissioning Groups working across services of health and social care and spoke of the problems with delayed transfer of care, the penalties of bed blocking and finding appropriate accommodation.

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services stated that now was a good opportunity to look at closer integration of services and co-location of services.

The Leader of the Council thanked NHS staff involved for their work on this. He stated that the Government should be bolder in their ambition for devolution and explained that the council's new Chief Executive, when in place, would drive forward ambitions of devolution.

RESOLVED:

1. That the progress made in implementing the Surrey Heartlands health and care devolution agreement, and progress in both Frimley Health and Care, and Sussex and East Surrey Partnership areas was noted.
2. That the approach being taken with Surrey Heartlands partners towards establishing a devolved health and care system was approved.

Reason for Decisions

Sustainability and Transformation Partnerships will play a pivotal role in shaping the future health and care priorities and landscape. In the seven months since the last Surrey Heartlands update to the Cabinet, significant

progress has been made in the development of the devolution arrangements for Surrey Heartlands. Devolution is a key mechanism for enabling the Surrey Heartlands Partnership to achieve its aims and ambitions, and the integration of health and social care.

172/17 INDEPENDENT TRAVEL TRAINING FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SEND [Item 7]

Mrs Mary Lewis, Cabinet Member for Education explained how Surrey County Council (SCC) was introducing a new travel assistance offer for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), designed to better meet the diverse needs of the county's pupils through a broader, more flexible range of assistance options. The first in a wide-ranging package of improvements, independent travel training would equip children and young people with the skills and confidence to travel independently to school, college or placement, where appropriate, building their resilience and preparing them for adulthood. This was a positive move that had been welcomed by parents and young people.

The Council's existing travel assistance offer is limited to mainly taxi and minibus transport, resulting in an annual cost of nearly £27m that is no longer sustainable. There is a need for the Council to work together with families, young people, schools, colleges and transport providers to develop a change in culture and approach to home to school travel assistance. Independent travel training is the first step in this direction, and provides an invaluable opportunity to provide more lasting support to children and young people with SEND, whilst delivering savings to the public purse in the longer term. Therefore, this is the first in a series of reports due to come to Cabinet concerning SEND transport.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the results of the procurement process, in Part 2 of the meeting, a five year contract supported by a Social Impact Bond be awarded to CT Plus Community to deliver independent travel training.

Reason for decision

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of Public Contract Regulations and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendation provides best value for money for the Council, and aims to deliver better outcomes for children and young people with SEND.

173/17 CHILDREN SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES COMMISSIONING PLAN 2017-22 [Item 8]

This report was introduced by Mrs Clare Curran, Cabinet Member for Children and it was reported that the Child First Commissioning Intentions had been developed at a time when unprecedented financial pressures were being faced by Surrey County Council, stemming from decreasing funding from central government and increasing demand for Council services. The Council had already saved over £450m with a further saving required of £103m for 2017/18 and £75m for the next two years. This was being felt especially in children, schools and families.

The statement set out 10 commissioning intentions that provided an overall strategic framework for Children, Schools and Families for 2017-2022, with an emphasis on the importance of Early Help. The commissioning intentions will drive the Council's commissioning to achieve value for money and, as part of the overall service, to ensure children get the right help, care and protection at the right time so they are safe and can thrive. She also explained that this was the first time a plan like this had been formulated and thanked staff for their work in producing it.

Additionally, further work was underway alongside planning for 2018-23; this focused on more rigorous modelling of future demand on services and developing a robust approach to local decision making and market development. This will mean more needs met locally and delivery managed sustainably within planned budgets.

The Cabinet Member for Education explained how the Select Committee had scrutinised the plan and were happy with the data-informed approach. They also wanted to ensure that this plan merged with others and made suggestions that had been incorporated into the plan.

The Cabinet Member for Health stated that it was a good plan and emphasised the tagline that children should be seen, be heard and kept safe.

RESOLVED:

1. The Commissioning Intentions set out in Child First 2017-2022 was agreed.
2. To delegate authority to Cabinet Member for Children, Cabinet Member for Education, and Director for Children's Services, to make changes to the commissioning intentions, including those necessary to meet requirements of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2018-22.

Reason for decision

The commissioning intentions are the response to the Surrey Children & Young People's Partnership Strategy 2017-22 and provide a clear framework of strategic action for children, schools and families in Surrey, which addresses MTFP challenges for 2017-21 and provides a basis for the approach for 2018-22.

174/17 FUNDING OPTIONS FOR FUTURE FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORK IN SURREY [Item 9]

The Cabinet Member for Highways introduced this report that explained how in April 2017 when Cabinet approved Surrey's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy it recommended that officers identify additional sources of funding to increase the current level of flood alleviation work across the county. This was because limited council budgets were struggling to resource the amount of schemes required to protect the 30,000 properties that were at risk of flooding in Surrey. The Met Office was predicting more frequent severe rainfall in coming years and if this was the case, it was likely that more areas beyond those already identified would become at risk of flooding in the future. Therefore if a funding solution to this issue was not found then future flood

events were likely to cause significant social and economic harm to residents in Surrey.

A further contributing factor to this situation is that the Government's funding formula for capital flood alleviation schemes was such that "local contributions" were required to pay a significant proportion of the costs. This was sometimes possible in the case of smaller scale schemes and the council had a programme with some capital support for such schemes across Surrey. It was not practical however to raise sufficient local contributions with very large scale projects such as the River Thames Scheme (RTS), a project of national significance, which, under the current formula, presents a funding gap of at least £257 million.

The RTS is a "main river" scheme which means that the Environment Agency (EA) is responsible for the project's management. However the Agency has asked whether the county council and the other local authorities affected can together make up the funding gap that remains after all other possible and likely local contributions have been accounted for. Although yet to be confirmed, it is estimated that the county council's share of this would be in the order £100m. This is not a reasonable request to make, particularly in the context of the council's financial position.

If there is no prospect of the funding gap for the RTS and the demand for flood alleviation schemes elsewhere in the county being met, unless Government provides additional funding, alternative options must be considered. These could include raising finance locally through a levy or a council tax precept. These options have inherent risks and impacts as set out in the report.

The council could not ignore the increasing risk of flooding to its residents. Given the lack of funding available from Government at the current time for both the nationally significant RTS and smaller local schemes, Cabinet was asked to consider how best to respond.

He emphasised that flooding was a risk to all residents whether they lived near a river or not explaining that flash floods could happen anywhere and drew attention to the maps provided with the submitted report.

The Deputy Leader explained how this was a national issue and the funding gap had been broken down proportionately between the five councils involved but even so, was an impossible amount for local government to find in today's financial climate. There would also be future maintenance costs to consider.

The Leader referred to recent flooding experience in Germany and said that Surrey could not contain a similar 10 feet flood. The RTS was needed and he felt that Government should take responsibility. He stated that he had a meeting arranged with the Treasury and he would fight for Government to take responsibility for this.

RESOLVED:

That the Leader of the council writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary of State for Department of Communities & Local Government and Secretary of State for Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, stating that:

- a) Because of the scale of the River Thames Scheme and the potential economic impacts at risk if it does not proceed, this is a nationally significant scheme and it is not appropriate to apply Defra's FDGiA Partnership Funding model to it.
- b) Surrey County Council has no capital reserves to meet Surrey's local contribution for the River Thames Scheme as requested by the Environment Agency, and requests that Central Government provide the capital required for the scheme.
- c) Should Central Government not provide the capital required for the scheme up-front, then Surrey County Council would be willing to take out a loan to pay Surrey's local contribution for the River Thames Scheme (at a cost of approximately £4.5m per year for 40 years) subject to Central Government funding the annual costs of borrowing.

Reason for decision:

Surrey County Council's current budget for flood alleviation work is very limited. There is not enough funding to develop schemes for all of the areas at significant risk of flooding in the county. The 2013/14 floods highlighted a number of risks across Surrey and if a flood event of a similar magnitude were to take place again in the coming years, the council's inability to carry out work in the relevant areas owing to resource and budget constraints means that many locations would continue to suffer the same or worse economic and social damage to their communities.

It is also essential that greater protection from River Thames flooding in particular is provided for the many Surrey residents and businesses currently affected. The funding arrangements of the proposed RTS scheme present a high risk that it is unaffordable and will not be delivered.

175/17 FARNHAM ROAD RAIL BRIDGE - FUNDING FOR BRIDGE STRENGTHENING [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Highways introduced this report that explained how the Farnham Road Bridge owned by Network Rail has B4 liability, which meant that Network Rail were responsible for providing a load capacity of 24T.

As the bridge is on a principal road network, Surrey CC requires the bridge to have a load bearing capacity of 40/44T in line with EU Directive EU/2015/71. As agreed in works agreements with the railway undertaker where the County is required to provide for load-bearing capacity higher than the railway undertaker is required by law to provide, the County will meet the cost.

The structure has been identified as critically deficient for unrestricted traffic loading meaning that if work is not carried out to strengthen the bridge the weight limit will have to be reduced to 7.5T. This would result in a scenario where heavy goods vehicles and buses will not be able to use the bridge which would have a devastating impact on residents and businesses.

Surrey Highways officers and Network Rail had identified a preferred scheme option which would restore the bridge to 40/44T capacity and therefore enable the bridge to remain open to traffic into the future. The preferred scheme would provide a 60 year design life for the bridge. The cost of the preferred scheme option has been estimated at £4,461,000.

Past experience of these type of schemes both within Surrey and in other local authority areas has identified that the cost of increasing the load bearing capacity to 24T (Network Rail's responsibility) generally equates to approximately 20% of the total scheme cost and the additional work to increase capacity to 40/44T (Surrey CC's responsibility) generally equates to approximately 80% of the scheme costs.

Surrey CC and Network Rail officers were reviewing the costings and funding allocations with a view to ensure equitable apportionment of funding which accounts for the fact that a lower cost scheme could increase the capacity to 40/44T, but that the chosen scheme has additional benefits for Network Rail.

Funding for this scheme was not accounted for within the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). Surrey's CC's contribution could be up to £3.5m. Approximately £650,000 had been identified within existing Highways budgets and therefore up to £2.9m still needed to be identified.

The Deputy Leader explained how important this bridge was for Guildford and if it was reduced to 7.5T this would mean a 4km diversion for buses, cars and lorries. Boroughs and districts, and partners, had been asked if they could help with costs but financial cuts were affecting everyone.

RESOLVED:

1. That support for the delivery of the Farnham Road Bridge Project was confirmed.
2. That an agreement with Network Rail for payment towards improvements to Farnham Road Bridge would be entered into.
3. That officers will work with Network Rail to confirm the Surrey CC contribution to the scheme.
4. That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Deputy Director will engage with stakeholders to identify alternate funding sources in order to limit or remove the need to reduce the existing capital programme or borrow to fund this scheme.

Reason for decision:

To enable the Farnham Road Bridge scheme to take place to ensure the ongoing safety of the travelling public and economic prosperity of Guildford Town Centre.

176/17 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 11]

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report for the sixth month of the 2017/18 financial year, covering the period up to 30 September 2017.

He explained that in February this council set its budget for 2017/18 in the face of: significant rising demand pressures (particularly in social care); falling Government funding and continuing restraint on our ability to raise funds locally. To balance 2017/18's budget the council had to make plans to deliver an unprecedented £104m of savings. This significant challenge for the council comes on top of already making over £450m savings since 2010.

He explained that within the £104m savings target, the council has agreed plans for £95m savings, with £9m savings to be identified. After six months of the financial year, services had already achieved £47m of savings with another £26m on track for delivery, and £6m facing potential barriers. £16m savings were now thought to be unachievable in this year.

He also explained that the council's 2017/18 budget included significant demand and cost pressures, mostly in social care. In the first six months of the year, demand had increased above that forecast even a short time ago. For example, in Children's Services, demand continued to increase and was expected to add a £9m pressure by the end of the financial year. Partially offsetting these pressures, there were forecast underspends elsewhere, including in Children Schools & Families and Adult Social Care, Orbis, Highways & Transport and Waste.

He went on to explain that services had already taken action as part of the recovery plan to reduce costs by £4m. There was a need to continue to take all reasonable action to manage our spending within available resources by keeping costs down, managing vacancies and maximising income wherever possible. The combined impact of delivering lower savings than planned and demand rising faster than anticipated was a forecast overspend of £17m for 2017/18. Whilst this was a £4m improvement on last month's forecast position, considerable risks remain in some key budgets that were outside the council's control and the forecast year end position could potentially worsen.

He explained that, this month, he and the leaders of the eleven district and borough councils in Surrey gave full agreement to a bid to form a Surrey business rates pilot in 2018/19. He was pleased to report that the bid was submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government and that it had the support of both of Surrey's Local Enterprise Partnerships.'

The Cabinet Member for Adults spoke of the overspend in Adult Social Care and shortfall in budget due to increased demand and increasing costs. He paid compliments to the Finance and Benefits Team that had done an outstanding job looking at all service user costs. He also stated that staff were aware costs needing to be reduced.

The Cabinet Member for Children spoke of the overspend for Children's Services which had deteriorated since the last report which was due to staffing budget and the extra social workers needed. There was also a

significant increase in the cost of placements for Looked After Children and asylum seekers, especially those with multiple complex needs. She explained the gap in funding in the Government grant received versus the costs for asylum seekers.

The Cabinet Member for Education spoke of an estimated underspend due one-off underspends, some of which were temporary such as unfilled vacancies that needed to be filled. She also reiterated the challenge to find £13m savings this year but to find a further £12m to £14m savings next year may also affect council budgets as well as Dedicated Schools Grant.

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport spoke about the shortfall due to savings not being realised in waste however a balanced budget was expected by end of year. He also stressed caution in that some of the costs of completing the Community Recycling Centres would now go to 2018 which would put pressure on the budget next year. He also explained that in relation to recommendation 7 of the report, this was not a cost to the council.

The Cabinet Member for Highways stated that highways budget was target for this year and further savings had been made. He also spoke of the risks of winter and flooding. Savings made and challenges going forward will be noticed by residents as cuts were made to front line services.

The Cabinet Member for Communities spoke of the various savings to be made and the projected overspend.

The Cabinet Member for Health reported on the overspend due to sexual health services but that mitigation was in place to reduce the overspend by the end of the year.

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services reassured Cabinet that Orbis continue to drive forward cost savings.

The Deputy Leader explained that for every £1 the council gets 70p is spend on demand services. Cuts were being forced on councils by Government and the economic viability was at risk in Surrey.

The Leader stated that in 14 weeks' time he would have to propose a budget to the council. He had deep reservations that cuts to services were now having an effect on residents. The business rate retention project was not the answer to the council's problems just a small piece of a large picture and would only be run for a year. Reality needed to be faced and there would be more cuts to services going forward. It was an extremely difficult time for councils.

RESOLVED:

That the following be noted.

1. Forecast revenue budget outturn for 2017/18, is £17m overspend (paragraphs 1 and 8 to 39 of the submitted report). This includes:
£9m savings to be identified,
£16m savings considered unachievable in 2017/18,
£11m service demand pressures
less
£19m underspends and additional income.
2. Significant risks to the revenue budget (paragraphs 40 to 44 of the submitted report) could add £13m to the forecast overspend, including: £8m in Children, Schools & Families and £3m in Adult Social Care.
3. Forecast planned savings for 2017/18 total £79m against £95m agreed savings and £104m target (paragraph 46).
4. All services continue to take all reasonable action to keep costs down and maximise income (e.g. minimising spending, managing vacancies wherever possible etc).
5. The Section 151 Officer's commentary and the Monitoring Officer's Legal Implications commentary in paragraphs 15 to 18 of the main budget monitoring report to Cabinet state that the council has a duty to ensure its expenditure does not exceed resources available and move towards a sustainable budget for future years.
6. The council and all eleven district and borough councils in Surrey have submitted an application to form a business rates retention pilot in 2018/19 (paragraph 45 of the submitted report).

That the followed be approved.

7. Transfer £8m from the Budget Equalisation Reserve to Central Income & Expenditure to negate the deferral of the increase in Waste PFI credits (paragraph 36 of the submitted report).

Reason for decision:

This report is presented to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

177/17 LEADERSHIP RISK REGISTER [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services introduced the Leadership risk register stating that both L2 and L3 of the register had been reviewed and updated. The Surrey County Council Leadership risk register is presented to Cabinet each quarter and this report presents the Leadership risk register as at 19 October 2017.

RESOLVED:

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

Reason for decision:

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

178/17 APPROVAL TO AWARD A FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL HIGHWAY SERVICES [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Highways presented this report which described how Surrey County Council had a statutory duty under the Highways Act 1980 to ensure that highways for which it was responsible remain safe for public use.

The Highway Service was responsible for the delivery of an ambitious multimillion Works Programme over the next 3 years. In order to deliver the Programme within required time scales, the Service needed access to specialist services and expertise to supplement the in-house capacity as and when required. The current Professional Highways Services Framework has recently expired, therefore, the decision was made that a new arrangement needed to be put in place to ensure continuous successful delivery of the Programme.

Following an open tender exercise, Procurement and Highways Services Cabinet approval was sought to appoint Atkins Ltd to a Professional Highway Services Framework Agreement.

The report provided details of the procurement process, including the results of the tender evaluation of the only bid received. In conjunction with the confidential Part 2 report, it demonstrated why the recommended contract award delivered best value for money.

RESOLVED:

1. That the background information set out in this report be noted; and
2. following consideration of the results of the procurement process in Part 2 of the meeting, the award of the Framework Agreement to Atkins Ltd, be approved.

Reason for decision:

The award of this Framework will enable Surrey County Council to ensure that highways for which it is responsible remain safe for public use.

179/17 PILOT FOR CAMERA ENFORCEMENT OF BUS LANE, HIGH STREET WOKING [Item 14]

The Cabinet Member for Highways explained that powers designated to Surrey County Council (SCC) in the Road Traffic Order 2005 that would enable it to enforce against moving traffic offences in bus lanes were proposed to be enacted. This report proposed that these powers be enacted for a pilot of bus lane enforcement by means of an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) system at the High Street in Woking, and that these powers be delegated to Woking Borough Council to carry out camera enforcement.

An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) had been made that prohibits the use of the Woking High Street between 7am and 9pm, 7 days a week for all vehicular traffic apart from local buses and specified classes of vehicles, which were registered with Woking Borough Council (WBC), and takes the form of a bus lane. The intent was to remove much of the traffic passing along High Street to provide a safer, more pleasant environment for pedestrians between the busy railway station and the town centre.

The High Street would become a bus priority route allowing bus journey times through the town centre to be as reliable as possible. A Bus Lane Enforcement Agency Agreement is being prepared between SCC and WBC which would delegate these powers.

Officers would prepare and consult on a county-wide policy for the enforcement of moving traffic offences which would be presented to Cabinet in 2018. Findings from this pilot site and experience elsewhere would be considered as part of policy formation.

RESOLVED:

1. That Surrey County Council exercise existing moving traffic enforcement powers for the first time, in relation to a bus lane in the High Street, Woking;
2. That Surrey County Council delegates that enforcement function to Woking Borough Council through an agency agreement;
3. That officers prepare a comprehensive county-wide policy for moving traffic offences.

Reason for decision:

The main reason for this is to provide enforcement for High Street, Woking town centre, which has been subject to vehicle restrictions which have been difficult to enforce. The aspiration is to remove much of the traffic passing along High Street to provide a safer, more pleasant environment for pedestrians between the busy railway station and the town centre, assisting in delivery of the Woking town centre extensive public realm works. The High Street will then become a bus priority route allowing bus journey times through the town centre to be as reliable as possible.

To date there has been no camera enforcement of bus lanes within Surrey. By developing a comprehensive policy, enforcement can be introduced where there is a recognised need.

Mr Colin Kemp declared a non pecuniary interest as he was an Executive Member of Woking Borough Council.

Mr Colin Kemp left the meeting at 3.40pm at the end of this item.

180/17 REVISION OF PROCUREMENT STANDING ORDERS [Item 15]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services introduced this report and explained that as part of the transformation programme for Orbis, the Procurement Service has been through significant change over the past year in order to deliver a broader commercial role for the Council.

Revising the Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs), which set out how the Council governs spending by Officers on goods, works and services, will help to support these changes.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) were noted and RECOMMENDED to full Council for final approval on 5 December 2017.

Reason for decision:

To provide support for the adoption of the revised Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) by full Council.

The updated PSOs will help drive the following developments within procurement:

- Delivery of broader value through procurement, particularly regarding social value and local suppliers
- An increased focus on supporting contract management activities

Improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the procurement process

181/17 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN REPORT OF AN INVESTIGATION INTO A COMPLAINT [Item 16]

This report was introduced by the Legal Services Manager and concerned the Local Government Ombudsman's findings in response to a complaint concerning the service provided to a Surrey family.

The production of this Monitoring Officer report was a statutory requirement under Section 5A of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. The Council's Monitoring Officer has to report to the Council's executive body (Cabinet) when the Local Government Ombudsman has conducted an investigation into a complaint against the Council and has found that maladministration causing injustice has occurred.

Children's Services have apologised unreservedly to the family, who experienced drift and delay in receiving the right help and support for their son. Systems and processes were reviewed and improved to ensure children with special educational needs are identified better and earlier and supported well for as long as is needed. This has been overseen by the Improvement Board with a focus to improve outcomes for children in Surrey.

Mrs Watson stated that there were multiple failures in this case and sought assurance that processes had been improved and that this would not happen again.

The Leader made a statement that as Leader of the Council he accepted responsibility on behalf of the Council and wholeheartedly apologised to the child and the family. He hoped that it would never happen again but Members were not personally responsible for operational matters but would drive improvements needed.

Acknowledgement was also given to the work of the Improvement Board for their concerted effort in driving through the improvements necessary for Children's and SEND services.

RESOLVED:

1. Following consideration of the Ombudsman's report and the response from Children's Services, Cabinet:
 - Was satisfied that that steps have been taken to address the findings and consider whether any other action should be taken, and
 - noted that the Monitoring Officer will be bringing her report to the attention of all councillors.

Reason for decision:

There is a statutory requirement for the Monitoring Office to bring to Members' attention any Ombudsman report on the Council that identifies it is at fault and has caused injustice as a result.

**182/17 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/
INVESTMENT BOARD TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING
[Item 17]**

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by Cabinet Members / Investment Board since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, was noted.

Reason for decision:

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

183/17 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 18]

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

184/17 INDEPENDENT TRAVEL TRAINING FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SEND [Item 19]

The Cabinet Member for Education explained that this report contained the commercial and financial details relating to item 7.

RESOLVED:

1. That following consideration of the results of the procurement process, a contract be awarded to deliver independent travel training for children and young people with SEND, supported through a Social Impact Bond;
2. That the contract would start on 1 December 2017 for a duration of five years with an estimated contract value as set out in the report, based on the successful training of 70 children was noted.

Reason for decision:

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of Public Contract Regulations and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process, and support the successful delivery of outcomes for children and young people with SEND.

185/17 APPROVAL TO AWARD A FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL HIGHWAY SERVICES [Item 20]

The Cabinet Member for Highways explained that this report contained details of the evaluation process and tender results pertaining to item 13.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the results of the procurement process the award of the framework agreement as set out in the report, be approved.

Reason for decisions:

The recommendations provide the best value for money for the Council.

186/17 TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION – OCTOBER 2017 UPDATE [Item 21]

The Leader explained that unless the right financial information arrangements were forthcoming this acquisition would not go ahead.

RESOLVED:

1. Cabinet's approval for Surrey County Council's acquisition of a long leasehold interest as highlighted in the submitted report in accordance with the details outlined in that report be reaffirmed;
2. Cabinet's approval for the funding and reimbursement arrangements for Surrey County Council in relation to the acquisition of the leasehold be reaffirmed; and
3. approval is delegated to agree appropriate contractual and financial arrangements to the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Leader, Director of Finance and the Director of Legal & Democratic Services, following the completion of all necessary due diligence and upon exchange of agreements to lease, subject to a minimum rental value threshold being exceeded.

Reasons for Decisions

The proposed acquisition of the leasehold supports economic prosperity, one of Surrey County Council's corporate priorities.

187/17 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 22]

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

Meeting closed at 4.00 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 31 October 2017

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members Questions

Question (1) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

It is well known that there is a need for genuinely affordable housing in Surrey as a result of high property costs. Given that there is a shortage of affordable housing and that the proposed Joint Venture with a private partner involves the use of county council owned public land and buildings, why does OJEU concession notice 2017/S 032-058452 not mention:

- affordable housing
- housing associations
- shared ownership
- social housing
- key worker housing?

Please could the Cabinet Member set out whether these types of housing will be included as part of the JV?

Reply:

The council is looking to optimise the opportunity for the best outcome for Surrey Residents whilst recognising the need for additional housing across the County. Any proposed residential development will need to comply with both national and local planning policies and as part of the consideration of any application by the planning authority, they will undoubtedly take into account the local housing needs of the area.

Mr Tim Oliver
Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services
31 October 2017

Question (2) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

What were the County Council's energy costs last year and what is the current energy efficiency rating for each of the following buildings:

- County Hall
- Quadrant Court
- Consort House
- Fairmount House?

Reply:

For the financial year 2016/2017 the council's buildings energy costs were £3,066,093 for electricity, water and gas utilities. In addition, a further £4,123,815 was paid in electricity for un-metered supplies, this includes streetlamps, illuminated signs, bollards and traffic signals.

The Display Energy Certificate (DEC) rating of the four buildings mentioned are County Hall C (58), Quadrant Court G (163), Consort House D (95) and Fairmount House D (94).

DEC Operating Ratings range from A to G. The DEC for a typical building is 100 – the high end of D bordering on E.

Mr Mike Goodman

Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport, and

Tim Oliver

Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services

31 October 2017

Question (3) Will Forster (Woking South):

The Cabinet Member will have seen recent news reports on the number of pumps available at fire stations including the one in Woking. Can she confirm how frequently these staffing and pump shortages occur, the effect it has on operational capacity and what steps she has taken to ensure that pump shortages do not occur in the future?

Reply:

The reallocation of staff and appliances is an established practice within Surrey Fire and Rescue. It is an important part of business as usual activity to ensure that the availability of resources are aligned to achieve the appropriate level of fire cover across Surrey. This is even more important in times of increased demand, for example, the flooding in 2013/2014. In the event of a station being understaffed, or a fire engine not being available, a tactical decision is made to reallocate staff and appliances to ensure that fire cover continues to be met across the county.

The ability to align resources in this way enables the Service to respond appropriately to demands on the Service, this is not a new way of working and Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has a number of measures in place to ensure that the right resources are in the right place at the right time. The Service uses sophisticated technology which shows the location of fire engines and other vehicles and allows the Service to monitor response cover across Surrey. Understanding risks and the location of assets across the county allows the Service to allocate available resources in a way that addresses risk whilst maximising value for money.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Cabinet Member for Communities

31 October 2017

Question (4) Will Forster (Woking South):

Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether, given the construction of many tall buildings in Woking, developers will be required to fund specialist firefighting equipment (e.g. new ladder equipment) to tackle any potential fires in this new buildings?

Reply:

The Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 places a duty on the Fire and Rescue Authority to extinguish fires in its area, and to protect life and property. The obligation for firefighting and rescue lies with the Fire and Rescue Authority and developers will not be required to fund any specialist equipment.

Buildings within Surrey are designed and built to comply with the Building Act 1984. Before any construction process can begin, developers must submit an application for approval. During the application process the fire service are invited to comment on the design and construction of the building, including access, for firefighting purposes.

During the construction phase, developers and other responsible parties have a duty to comply with the Construction, Design and Management Regulations 2015. These regulations make provision for fire safety, including prevention of risk from fire, emergency procedures, emergency routes and exits, and fire detection and fire-fighting.

The finished building will have a number of features to ensure that occupants are able to escape safely in the event of fire, and that the fire service is able to effectively deal with a fire within the building. These include:

- suitable means of escape for the occupants
- fire warning and detection systems (where required)
- adequate fire separation to prevent fire spread
- adequate access for the fire service; and
- the provision of fire mains for firefighting (where required).

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Communities
31 October 2017

Question (5) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

Please can you confirm when the business plan for the Joint Venture (OJEU notice 2017/S 032-058452) will be released? Please provide a copy of the technical specification setting out the minimum social and environmental criteria which will direct the development of these publically owned sites.

Reply:

At present Cabinet have not taken any decision around the appointment of a Joint Venture partner. Until they have, there is no additional information that I can provide.

Mr Tim Oliver
Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services
31 October 2017

Question (6) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

This website (<https://www.investinsurrey.co.uk/assets/documents/surrey-county-council-property>) refers to 36 "seed sites" for the Joint Venture and a "Tranche 1" and "Tranche 2" programme which could deliver "circa 2000 homes".

- i) Please set out the breakdown of the 2000 homes over the 36 sites and how this figure was calculated and what other (e.g. community uses, commercial use for these sites is also being considered).
- ii) The website also states: "*For each site we will consider the specific needs of areas and communities and in line with those decide on the right solution(s) for each site*" - how and at what stage will the public be involved in this process?

Reply:

The council commissioned external advisors to provide an indicative high level view of the number of housing units that might be achievable on a number of sites. However, the detailed configuration of each site (including the mix of use) will be assessed against national and local planning policies by the local planning authority. As these will be public applications residents will be able to fully contribute through the planning consultation process.

Mr Tim Oliver
Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services
31 October 2017