

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 14 DECEMBER 2017 AT 2.00 PM  
AT COUNCIL CHAMBER, 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:

Mrs Hazel Watson  
Mr Jonathan Essex  
Mr Keith Witham

**210/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

An apology was received from Mr John Furey.

**211/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**212/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Mr Tim Oliver declared a non-pecuniary interest for item 5b in that he was on the Surrey and Borders Partnership.

**213/17 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

There were four questions received from Members. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 1.

**214/17 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were four questions received from the public. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 2.

Q1. Sally Blake asked when she would receive an answer to her question.

Q2. Sally Blake stated that she believed that no allowance had been made for the increase to adult social care and health costs if free parking for Surrey residents to have regular exercise in the Countryside Estate was taken away. This was despite considerable evidence that it would increase these costs.

The increase could dwarf the income from parking charges and it was even more important with the financial issues faced by the council. She asked if Cabinet would be approving the pay and conserve proposal before these costs had been valued, independently confirmed and taken into account? The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport would send a written response.

Q3. Mr John Oliver stated that, legally, the car parks are part of common land. This meant that a charge for parking was a charge for access to the common. Given that, for many, the only way to get to the commons is by car, charges would effectively prevent access to the common for those who cannot afford it. He asked the Chairman what could be done to improve the presentation of the law by policy makers to Cabinet Members and to the public? The Chairman would ensure a written response to this question.

Q4. Mr John Oliver stated that the Planning Inspectorate has just advised the Save Newlands Corner Campaign Group that, although the psychological effect of the introduction of parking charge equipment and charges was not specifically mentioned in law, the Inspector could have regard to 'any other matter' when considering an application and said it has done so in the past. The council's own consultation showed that there would be a psychological and cost barrier to 57% of users, either preventing them using the common at all or as often as usual. This was a huge significant effect which prevented and impeded the public from accessing the commons. He asked if the proposals should now be placed before the Planning Inspectorate for a decision, given the very significant effect that they would have to access and that the public should be given the opportunity to make representations about the proposals and if not, why not? The Chairman would ensure a written response to this question.

Mr Keith Witham, Member for Worplesdon, was granted time to make a statement on Item 11 (Car Parking Charging on the Countryside Estate), which was to be deferred until January, as he would not be available to attend the Cabinet meeting in January. He made the following points:

- Common land was not free and maintenance costs were huge,
- He supported the work of the Surrey Wildlife Trust,
- Parking charges would lead to displacement parking and he urged Cabinet to consider ways to combat this at the same time as agreeing any charges. He supported the request of Worplesdon Parish Council for consideration to be given to double yellow lines being installed around the two sites affected by parking charges, at the same time as the charges take effect to deal with displacement parking.
- Despite 75% of those that responded to the consultation were against the introduction of charging they had not made any suggestions where costs were to come from if not charging.

## **215/17 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were none.

#### **216/17 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

Representation was received from Mrs Watson that information in item 15 (contract award for joint venture development partner) be considered in public. The Chairman stated that the information asked for was contained in a report that was in part 2 of the agenda because it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of the Council. This was exempt information and to release a single sentence from the report would be to take the information out of context and could be misleading.

#### **217/17 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY BOARDS, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

Responses to reports from the Environment & Infrastructure and the Children & Education Select Committees are attached as Appendices 3 and 4.

*Mr Tim Oliver declared a non-pecuniary interest to the report from the Children & Education Select Committee in that he was on the Surrey Borders Partnership Board.*

#### **218/17 APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF ONLINE LESSONS VIA SURREY ONLINE SCHOOL FOR SURREYS ALTERNATIVE LEARNING SERVICES [Item 6]**

The Cabinet Member for Education introduced the report which explained how the Surrey Online School (SOS) had been providing live online lessons to a range of pupils who required alternative education provision across the county since 2015. The service provided an alternative to more expensive face to face tutoring and was enabling the local authority to cope with increasing demands without incurring additional cost.

The Surrey Online School replaced a previous system that Surrey had used (Lift Off) as it was more cost effective and more secure. This was a unique system that no other local authority had in place, thus there was no 'off the shelf' provision that could be purchased.

Many schools bought into the service for pupils from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 (10-16 year olds). It was generally used as provision for fixed term and permanently excluded pupils, pupils who could not attend school due to medical conditions, school refusers and catch up. It was also used for children not on roll or awaiting placement.

The curriculum was based on three core subjects (Mathematics, English and Science) plus spiritual, moral, social and cultural development lessons. Each pupil could participate in up to 14 lessons a week and, on average there were 60-70 pupils participating per half term. All lessons were monitored for quality assurance and attendance alerts for pupil involvement were created for the schools and other agencies. User feedback was collated from schools, pupils and parents/carers and this was significantly positive towards the provision. If there were any negative responses, these were further investigated.

Schools found it more cost effective to buy back from Surrey Online School and due to number of places purchased a slight profit was made. To date the services had been contracted via 'ad hoc' spot purchases but the continued growth in demand meant it now made sense to implement a longer term contract that would ensure continuity of service and legal compliance, as well as delivering additional savings and supporting the opportunity to generate income.

In response to a query the Cabinet Member explained that virtual schools were set up by each authority whereas the online school was unique to Surrey. Online lessons were differentiated and could be offered to small groups of up to 12 pupils in a range of buildings.

**RESOLVED:**

That a contract for the provision of online lesson packages to Surrey Online School be awarded to Tute Education Ltd. starting from 1 January 2018 for a period of two years with an option to extend on an annual basis for two more years.

**Reasons for Decision:**

- i. Surrey Online School currently spot purchases places on online courses, in advance from an existing supplier, and then recoups the money directly from the schools or services. In order to continue current levels of provision and cope with increasing demand we are seeking a longer term solution to procurement of courses and places for students.
- ii. This new provision provides a more cost effective means of commissioning these services.
- iii. Due to the rapid growth of demand for the services offered by Surrey Online School we are now seeking to formalise a contract with a supplier to maintain continuity for the schools and services that purchase online education for students in alternative provision.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Education Select Committee]*

**219/17 SURREY SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORMULA 2018/19 [Item 7]**

The Cabinet Member for Education introduced this report that set out the recommended funding formula for Surrey schools in 2018/19. All Surrey schools, including academies, were funded from the council's Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation. Each local authority was required to maintain a local funding formula to allocate DSG funding to individual schools. This funding formula was determined annually, ahead of the council's main budget decisions, in order to meet the Department for Education (DfE) deadline of 19 January 2018. It followed the annual funding consultation with all Surrey schools during October and the recommendations of the Schools Forum on 10 November 2017.

She went on to explain that the DfE was to introduce a National Funding Formula (NFF) from 2020/21. During 2018/19 local authorities were expected

to manage a smooth transition for schools by amending their local formula in the direction of the NFF. This report recommended transitional arrangements for 2018/19.

The transition to the NFF provided an extra £14m (2.4%) in 2018/19 and once fully implemented in 2020/21, a net increase of approximately £28.5m (4.8%) to Surrey schools. However, after two years with no inflation increases, schools were facing increasing pressures, including rising pay, national insurance and pension costs and funding the impact of the withdrawal of education service grants. Furthermore, the distribution of that funding was not consistent across all Surrey schools. In general, Surrey schools with higher levels of deprivation gain rather less from the NFF as Surrey's local formula currently allocates a higher proportion of funding to schools serving deprived communities.

A few Members made the point that this was not fair funding but the council would continue to call on the Government for fairer funding. Two Members made funding comparisons with schools along the London borders. Also that grant received for pupils with high needs did not cover the spend in this area.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Schools Forum's recommendations for the formula funding of Surrey schools in 2018/19, as set out in Annex 2 to the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the proposed Surrey formula factors for 2018/19, as set out in Annex 3 to the submitted report, be approved.
3. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Schools & Learning, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Education to approve amendments to the schools funding formula as appropriate following receipt of the DSG settlement and DfE pupil data in December 2017.

**Reason for Decision:**

To comply with DfE regulations requiring formal council approval of the local funding formula for Surrey's primary and secondary schools, including academies.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Education Select Committee]*

**220/17 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 8]**

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report for period eight of 2017/18, up to 30 November 2017.

He explained that in February the 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 the 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 also explained that within the £104m savings target, the council had agreed plans for £95m savings, with £9m savings to be identified. After eight months of the financial year, services have already achieved £55m of savings with another £19m on track for delivery, and £5m facing potential barriers. At this stage, £16m savings are now thought to be unachievable in this year.

The council's 2017/18 budget included significant demand and cost pressures, mostly in social care. In the first eight 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 an £8m pressure by the end of the financial year. Partially offsetting these pressures, there were forecast underspends elsewhere, including in Children Schools & Families, Adult Social Care, Orbis, Highways & Transport, Waste and Central Income & Expenditure.

The combined impact of delivering lower savings than planned and demand rising faster than anticipated was a forecast year end overspend of £19m for 2017/18. This was a £1m increase on last month's forecast position due to further market related cost pressures in Adult Social Care partly offset by savings and cost reductions in Orbis, Children's services and Fire. Additional risks that were outside the council's control may yet crystallise in some key budget areas and the forecast year end position could potentially worsen.

He concluded that services had already taken action as part of the recovery plan to reduce costs by £4m. However, he also stressed the need to continue to take all reasonable action to manage spending within available resources by keeping costs down, managing vacancies, optimising income and being aware of the current financial position before committing additional future expenditure.

Cabinet Members spoke of the financial and demand pressures as well as work being undertaken in their portfolio areas.

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport updated Cabinet on the Eco Park which was due to be operational by May/June 2018. He stated that this was a good achievement, despite much opposition, and that it had been achieved by working together with partners.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted including the following:

1. Forecast revenue budget outturn for 2017/18 were £19m overspend (Annex 1, paragraphs 1 and 8 to 38). This included:  
£9m savings to be identified,  
£16m savings considered unachievable in 2017/18,  
£14m service demand and cost pressures  
less  
£20m underspends, additional savings and income.
2. Significant risks to the revenue budget (Annex 1, paragraphs 39 to 44 of the submitted report) could add £11m to the forecast overspend, included: £8m in Children, Schools & Families and £2m in Adult Social Care.

3. Forecast planned savings for 2017/18 totalled £79m against £95m agreed savings and £104m target (Annex 1, paragraph 45 of the submitted report).
4. All services continued to take all reasonable action to keep costs down and optimise 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 16 to 19 of the submitted report stated that the council had a duty to ensure its expenditure did not exceed resources available and move towards a sustainable budget for future years.

That the following be approved:

6. Draw down £23,000 from Community Buildings grant scheme for planned spend on school kitchen schemes in 2017/18 (Annex 1, paragraph 61 of the submitted report).
7. £0.5m of the current £0.8m Adult Social Care Major Adaptations capital budget be spent on items purchased from the community equipment store capitalised under the accounting policy for community equipment from 1 April 2017 (Annex 1, paragraph 62 of the submitted report).

**Reason for Decisions:**

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

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee]*

**221/17 CONTRACT AWARD FOR JOINT VENTURE DEVELOPMENT PARTNER  
[Item 9]**

Mrs Hazel Watson spoke to this item and put the following statements and questions:

- Whilst it was good that this was an opportunity for the council to bring empty properties into use the report failed to meet needs of residents and safeguards and sought assurances
- It was shrouded in secrecy and requested a list of land and properties, and their value, in the joint venture
- What methodology was used to say a building was surplus to requirements and would there be consultation with local councillors and residents?
- The key performance indicators were not contained in the report
- What were the termination options and costs?
- She was upset that there was no commitment to provide more than the minimum affordable housing. The venture has missed an

opportunity to provide affordable housing and home for those adults and children with SEND.

- Also, would the council be seeking exemption under S123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to substantially boost the level of affordable homes built?

Mr Jonathan Essex then spoke to the item and put the following comments and questions:

- This venture could provide unique opportunities depending on the detail of individual projects
- That when considering the sustainability and equality outcomes for project that environmental and social sustainability also be considered as well as economic sustainability
- He asked for clarification on the 50% of benefits mentioned in the report being shared with a partner. Does this include the sustainability requirements as to take a lower cut for these may be a disincentive?
- There was a need for this council to show leadership and insist on higher standards than other developers.

The Cabinet Member for Property & Business Services introduced the report and responded to some of the issues raised. The report provided an update on activities undertaken in response to Central Government's proposals to tackle the nationwide housing crisis, by unlocking sites for the construction of mixed use development schemes. Through utilising its own land and buildings, Surrey County Council (SCC) had the opportunity to unlock public land for redevelopment use, whilst also creating assets with income generating potential. In order to deliver this opportunity at scale and pace the Council has completed a procurement process for an external partner to deliver these benefits through a Joint Venture (JV). Due to the commercial sensitivity of the contract award, the financial and commercial details were covered in a Part 2 report.

The Cabinet Member explained that a policy would be drawn up to cover environmental issues and that work was taking place with boroughs and districts to provide affordable housing. Cabinet would receive a report in the New Year detailing the establishment of a Board which would include boroughs and districts and looking at properties. Full engagement would take place with Members and the select committee would report back on its findings.

He also explained the governance arrangements and how there would be six layers of oversight and how they would work and be interconnected. The JV was one part of the delivery mechanism and a report to Cabinet in March 2018 would also look at resource for the growth of Halsey Garton which would be equally important in progressing projects at pace. With regard to sites they could not be given as no agreement had been reached. Before sites were announced the divisional Member would be asked for their input. The proposed joint strategy board would include Member engagement and use their expertise as well as feed into the place agenda.

Cabinet Members described this project as a game changer and that boroughs and districts were glad of the assistance this would bring to helping them with their housing targets. Praise was given to the Cabinet Member for

Property & Business Services for his hard work in getting thus far in a relative short period of time.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services; Acting Chief Executive and Chief Property Officer to approve:
  - a. the JV contract documentation, as set out in the submitted Part 2 report, with Places for People Group (PfP);
  - b. conclude contract requirements for the provision of an operating lease within the parameters set out within the submitted Part 2 report;
  
2. That the Investment Board:
  - a. commission the Joint Venture to undertake development opportunities and option analysis for the initial prioritised sites to be agreed by the Shareholder Board when setting the business plan, with future development opportunities following the same process;
  - b. formulate and present recommendations back to Cabinet for final approval of any development proposal or alternative future uses for the sites; and
  - c. review additional potential sites and commission feasibility proposals or options analysis for development proposals or alternative future uses of the sites;
  
3. That it be noted that authority was delegated to the Shareholder Board (SB) to:
  - a. appoint nominated representatives to the Joint Venture Strategy Board;
  - b. appoint two nominated Council officers to be representatives of the Council on the Joint Venture Board to oversee and deliver the day to day activities of the joint venture vehicle;
  - c. approve the Annual Business Plan, Annual Accounts and other applicable control and management member matters of the Joint Venture entity; and its terms of reference have been amended accordingly.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

- i. These recommendations enable SCC to assist in enhancing economic prosperity within the County, through the delivery of mixed use development schemes, and potentially securing a long term revenue stream to the Council.
  
- ii. Entering into the proposed Joint Venture will provide SCC with an ability to secure the following objectives:
  - (a) establish a delivery model, which can act as an agent for economic growth and social activity, delivering housing and mixed use developments;

- (b) create a focus for skills & training development and local employment opportunities;
- (c) utilise its assets, ensuring efficiencies, site optimisation and achieving best value and allowing a pipeline of sites to be made available to the JV partner to ensure economies of scale and scope to the programme of activities;
- (d) support delivery of key components of the Investment Strategy;
- (e) secure a significant, pre-committed and long term partner able to bring capital and expertise to the region;
- (f) support and benefit from wider collaborative opportunities through offering the vehicle to those public sector partners seeking a development delivery vehicle that satisfies their own corporate asset related objectives.

*[The decisions on this item are subject to call in by the Corporate Services Select Committee]*

## **222/17 AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF ADVERTISING SERVICES FOR STATUTORY NOTICES [Item 10]**

The Cabinet Member for Property & Business Services introduced a report that sought approval for the Council to award a framework agreement to TMP Worldwide for the provision of Advertising Services for Statutory Notices to commence on 1 March 2018. He explained that there was a legislative requirement and no alternative. The Council had a statutory duty as the Traffic Authority to publish notices in the press for both permanent and temporary Traffic Orders. It was a costly service especially when very few people get information from newspapers. The report outlined the procurement process undertaken, including the results of the tender evaluation. Due to the commercial sensitivity involved in the framework award process, the names of the bidders and their financial details have been circulated as a Part 2 report.

Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- a) That there was an increasing use of social media for information.
- b) That a white paper had been put forward some time ago to get this legislation changed, but it did not go anywhere.
- c) That one parking review had cost £10k in advertising and that this money should be used on the service.
- d) One Member asked if the advert could be reduced to one line which directed the reader to the full information on a social media site but was informed that this was not possible.

The Leader proposed an additional recommendation which was accepted.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the framework agreement be awarded to TMP Worldwide for three years from 1 March 2018 with an option to extend for one period of one year. Over the full term of the framework, the anticipated value is £1.4m (approximately £368,000 per annum).
2. That the Leader of the Council write to the Secretary of State for Department of Communities & Local Government requesting that the legislation regarding statutory notices be reviewed in light of the

significant financial cost of producing such notices and to modernise the way that the public access this information.

**Reasons for Decision:**

- i. The Council has a contract for Advertising of Statutory Notices, which is due to expire on 28 February 2018 and needs to be replaced.
- ii. The Council conducted an Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) tender process, in compliance with the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders.
- iii. A thorough evaluation process has identified awarding the framework to TMP Worldwide will provide the Council with the best value for money.

*[The decisions on this item are subject to call in by the Corporate Services Select Committee]*

**223/17 PAY AND CONSERVE, CAR PARK CHARGING ON THE COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE [Item 11]**

This item was deferred until January 2018.

**224/17 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/ INVESTMENT BOARD TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 12]**

**RESOLVED:**

The decision taken by a Cabinet Member 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.

**225/17 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 13]**

**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.

**226/17 APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF ONLINE LESSONS VIA SURREY ONLINE SCHOOL FOR SURREYS ALTERNATIVE LEARNING SERVICES [Item 14]**

**RESOLVED:**

That the information within the Part 2 report be noted, in conjunction with the recommendations made in the Part 1 report (item 6).

**Reasons for Decision:**

See Minute 218/17.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children and Education Select Committee]*

**227/17 CONTRACT AWARD FOR JOINT VENTURE DEVELOPMENT PARTNER  
[Item 15]**

Mrs Hazel Watson spoke to this item and asked when the various agreement would be available. She also stated that this was a complicated arrangement which would cause confusion and a lack of transparency.

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services replied that advice would be sought from the Monitoring Officer regarding the release of agreements. He also denied that the operation process with its various checks and balance was complicated and stated that the agreement could be terminated with six months' notice.

**RESOLVED:**

That the information within the Part 2 report be noted, in conjunction with the recommendations made in the Part 1 report (item 9).

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 221/17.

*[The decisions on this item are subject to call in by the Corporate Services Select Committee]*

**228/17 AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF  
ADVERTISING SERVICES FOR STATUTORY NOTICES [Item 16]**

**RESOLVED:**

That the information within the Part 2 report be noted, in conjunction with the recommendations made in the Part 1 report (item 10).

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 222/17.

*[The decisions on this item are subject to call in by the Corporate Services Select Committee]*

**229/17 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 17]**

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

Meeting closed at 3.58 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET – 14 December 2017**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Members Questions**

**Question (1) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

Four Seasons Health Care, which has 360 homes including one in Guildford, is reportedly on the brink of going into administration. Please could the Cabinet Member confirm whether Surrey County Council places residents in care homes run by Four Seasons either inside or outside of the county and if so, what preparations are in place should Four Seasons go into administration?

**Reply:**

We have confirmed with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) that the care home in Guildford is owned by a separate company unrelated to Four Seasons Health Care Limited.

We have 30 individuals placed in different care homes that are subsidiaries of Four Seasons Health Care. There are three subsidiaries so it is a complex situation. Two of the homes are in Surrey, we have 24 individuals within these two homes. Six individuals are placed in homes outside of Surrey.

Our Quality Assurance team are liaising with CQC, once we have a clearer picture from their market oversight team we will be in a position to make a decision regarding using our Provider Failure Protocol which sets out the actions we will need to follow.

In the meantime the QA team will liaise with the two homes in Surrey and we will continue to monitor the situation closely.

**Mr Mel Few**  
**Cabinet Member for Adults**  
**14 December 2017**

**Question (2) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

Were DCLG's guidance on Investment & Minimum Revenue Provisions to be implemented in full, what effect would this have on the County Council's projected revenue income from a) Halsey Garton and b) the proposed Joint Venture to dispose of and redevelop surplus SCC properties and land?

**Reply:**

The DCLG published a consultation on potential changes to its guidance on Local Government Investments and Statutory Guidance on Minimum Revenue Provision on 7<sup>th</sup> November. Responses are required by 22<sup>nd</sup> December. As there are inconsistencies in the consultation and a number of areas which require further clarification we are not able to state with any confidence the possible impact upon the council's finances – indeed the impact may be much wider than investments undertaken by Halsey Garton Property Ltd or potentially in future in a joint venture arrangement in respect of the council's vacant sites.

The council is preparing its response to the consultation and will be able to better quantify the impact once further clarification and the final guidance has been received.

**Mr Tim Oliver**  
**Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services**  
**14 December 2017**

**Question (3) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

Page 77 of the Cabinet Agenda for 14.12.17 refers to a joint letter sent to third party organisations, including the Districts & Boroughs, from the Leader of the Council and the then Chief Executive in October 2016 outlining the proposed Joint Venture to dispose of and redevelop surplus SCC properties and land, its programme of work and benefits. Could the Leader of the Council please provide a copy of this letter and copies of any replies received?

**Reply:**

With regards to the first question, please find attached a copy of the letter (Annex A) sent out to a range of other local authorities and public sector organisations. With regards to the second part of the question concerning the responses received that information is not available as it was provided in commercial confidence by those who responded and Surrey County Council is unable to share that information.

**Mr David Hodge CBE**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**14 December 2017**

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

What consultation has taken place, with either residents or elected members, as to the 5 proposed Extra Care facilities at the following sites:

- Pinehurst Resource Centre, Camberley
- Bagshot Depot and Archaeology Centre, Bagshot
- Former Pond Meadow School, Guildford
- Land at Ten Acre Walk, Farnham
- Colebrook site, Redhill

**Reply:**

We have engaged with each Local Member where a site falls in their division, particularly on the impact for the local area and opportunities that can be realised through Extra Care schemes as thriving community hubs offering a range of services to the local community.

Engagement with the relevant District & Boroughs has contributed to determining the level of need in each area for this type of accommodation and how it fits with Local Plans. The Social Care Services Board scrutinised the direction of travel of the whole Accommodation with care and Support programme in December 2016, and will do so again in April 2018 following the council's engagement with the market.

This strategy is in line with Cabinet approval.

**Mr Mel Few**  
**Cabinet Member for Adults**  
**14 December 2017**

This page is intentionally left blank



Leadership Office  
Room 121, County Hall  
Penrhyn Road  
Kingston upon Thames  
KT1 2DN

24<sup>th</sup> October 2016

Dear [NAME]

## **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL: PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME AND JOINT VENTURE PROCUREMENT**

Surrey County Council is undertaking a procurement to select a long term strategic partner to deliver our residential development investment programme from our identified current surplus estate. Through the use of existing land and buildings we have the opportunity to develop both housing and mixed uses on a variety of sites for revenue income and/or capital receipt. The Council intends to create a joint venture to deliver this work at scale.

The joint venture will deliver a range of services including: options appraisals, market analysis, land promotion services (including planning), development management services, arranging development finance, design and construction services and asset management. More detail on the plans can be found in the briefing attached to this letter.

It is intended that this joint venture will be capable of delivering similar services to other public sector organisations. I am writing to you to ask if you would like to join the procurement and to be named in the forthcoming OJEU Contract Notice as a potential user of the joint venture. At this stage being named on the notice would not oblige you to use the joint venture, but would give you the option to do so in the future.

By signing up, you would not be responsible for any upfront costs or need to have any direct involvement in the procurement process and evaluation. We would keep all named organisations informed on progress and be happy to provide you with relevant information when requested.

If you would like to be named on the Contract notice; I would ask that you complete the attached statement and return it to me at the above address by 11 November 2016. For administration needs it would be useful if you are able to provide a total estimate of the likely range of values and/or land holdings that could be put through the joint venture by yourselves in the event you find it meets your needs. We would be happy for colleagues to discuss the metrics we are developing for ourselves, being a simple calculation providing details of number of sites, total acreage and indicative number of units.

For clarity identifying sites will provide you as an organisation the ability to use the joint venture in the future but not tie you to doing so. For more information please contact the project team by emailing [property.developmentprogramme@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:property.developmentprogramme@surreycc.gov.uk) who would be happy to discuss this further.

Yours sincerely

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET – 14 December 2017**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Public Questions**

**Question 1: Ms Sally Blake**

Surrey County Council (SCC) is considering the adoption of a policy which would introduce parking charges of £1.30 an hour (up to £5) at 15 car parks at the busiest sites in its Countryside Estate (Chobham Common, Norbury Park, Rodborough Common, Whitmoor Common, and Wisley and Ockham Commons), with payment by card or phone only. This followed its public consultation, 'Pay and Conserve', in which 75% of people said they did not want any parking charges at all, and 59% said if there were charges they would prefer to pay by cash. There are currently 446,000 cars visiting these car parks each year, indicating people visits of about 1 million a year.

An article in the British Medical Journal in October confirmed the huge financial benefits of regular exercise, by keeping people physically active and mentally healthy, in particular by keeping older people out of care homes. A report 'Natural capital accounts for public green space in London' in October has put a value on this. It says £950 million is avoided in health costs in London by providing free access to public green space.

Of the people that completed the SCC consultation and gave their age, 74% were over age 46, including 23% over age 65, and 50% of people said they would stop coming or come less often if charges were brought in. SCC pays £385 million for adult social care a year. The people who cannot afford to pay for parking and will stop coming will be those who are most reliant on public social care services. Also, older people will be less likely to come if they have to pay by card or phone.

Has the Council included a figure for increased social care and health costs to SCC in the financial model for charging in these Surrey car parks and:

- If so, how much is it? or
- If not, what are the reasons for this?

**Question 2: Mr John Oliver**

Mr Chairman, the Cabinet will consider, at Item 11, the proposal to adopt a policy of charging at 15 car parks across the Countryside Estate. In the paper, the response to the "Concern that the income from charging will be used for other SCC services" is that "The income will be ring fenced for the countryside and information will be put in the car parks to explain where the money is being spent". Similar proposals for the use of parking charge surpluses have been agreed, but not yet implemented concerning Newlands Corner, an Access Agreement site.

Given that car park charges are meant to cover only the cost and maintenance of the car parks and any associated buildings (e.g. public toilets) and are required to be "reasonable":

- How does the Council justify, legally, a policy which sets out to produce fiscal surpluses to otherwise spend on the Countryside Estate (e.g. conservation, Surrey Wildlife oncosts) or give landowners a share of the profits (up to a rumoured 50% at Newlands Corner); and
- Given that Councillor Goodman has not set out his legal authority for this policy at the Pay and Conserve sites, and the Countryside Group has been unable to provide me with the legal basis for its proposals at Newlands Corner, and has had to refer to its legal advisers, do you agree (and if not, why not) that:
  - No further consideration of this matter should take place, particularly at Cabinet level, before the legal basis for the policy is fully explained and clarified to everyone's satisfaction; and
  - That it is irresponsible that such policies are being proposed where the legal basis appears to be unknown to the policy team and the legislative position is not being explained to decision-makers?

**Question 3: Mr John Oliver**

Mr Chairman, at the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee on 29 November 2017, the Committee was presented with the results of the 'Pay and Conserve' consultation and the policy proposals concerning the introduction of parking charges at the 15 car parks which were the subject of the consultation.

Councillor Furniss asked if, as part of the policy implementation, it would be necessary to seek 'commons consent' from the Planning Inspectorate for the introduction of parking charges. Councillor Goodman responded, quite rightly, "No". What he failed to go on to explain is that such consent should be sought for the placing of "structures" (machines and signage) on, and, if concrete plinths are involved, the "resurfacing" of, the commons under section 38 of the Commons Act 2006.

There was also no mention by the Countryside Group Manager as to whether, as part of the charging policy, there will be an initial free 20 minutes of parking, before charges apply, as has been promised at Newlands Corner.

Could you please confirm that the Council's policy for the Pay and Conserve car parks, if agreed at Cabinet, will include:

- applications to the Planning Inspectorate for commons consent; and
- an initial free period of 20 minutes at each of the car parks involved"

**Question 4: Mr James Osbourn, on behalf of The Chobham Society**

Relating to the Pay and Conserve proposal:

- What was the point of the consultation if it is intended to press ahead anyway in the face of the 75% of responders who were not in favour of parking charges?

- We question the right of Surrey County Council to make these charges as in doing so it is placing a fetter on the right of the public to freedom for air and exercise?
- We note that the County has decided not to proceed with some of the works it proposed at Newlands Corner on the grounds of risking Circa £30,000 on a public inquiry. What are the estimated costs of a public inquiry, or inquiries, for the erection of the charging equipment in the event that some or all of the 75 % who are against the proposal object?

**Combined Response:**

Thank you very much for your questions. The Cabinet is waiting for further details from Surrey Wildlife Trust and officers and will not be taking a decision on this item today.

**Mr Mike Goodman**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**  
**14 December 2017**

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
SELECT COMMITTEE**

**PAY AND CONSERVE – CAR PARK CHARGING ON THE COUNTRYSIDE  
ESTATE [ITEM 11]**

**(Considered by the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee on 29  
November 2017)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Cabinet agree option 5 with further consideration given to

- Options for people to pay online, or in advance or after parking 24 hours
- How machines and phone payment are options made accessible and easy to use
- How enforcement is implemented with minimum of disruption
- A review of the scheme, displacement and lessons learnt within six months
- What additional resources are provided to promote cycling and cycle parking

**RESPONSE:**

We are grateful to the E&I Select Committee for a very constructive and useful discussion which raised a number of points which can improve the final scheme implementation.

Responding to the recommendations in turn:

**Payment options**

In designing the scheme, we have had to be mindful that the scheme operation needs to be proportionate to the projected level of visitors to the sites in question. As such, we have had to design a scheme which balances ease of use with financial viability. The current costs for implementing the scheme similar to the London congestion charge i.e. with options to pay online in advance or to pay up to 24 hours after parking are understood to be significant and therefore such a scheme is unlikely to be viable at this time. However, we will carry out further investigations as part of the procurement process and we will continue to review developments in the technology, with a view to moving towards such a scheme in the future if prices came down sufficiently or if use patterns make such a scheme more viable.

With regard to access and ease of use, we will review meter options and ensure that ease of use is part of the consideration for determining the preferred meters. In addition, a warden will be in attendance across the sites and will provide support and advice to visitors when the scheme is introduced in order to ease the transition.

**Enforcement**

Enforcement is clearly an important issue with a scheme of this type. We will undertake enforcement in two ways: firstly, soft enforcement will be carried out by on site wardens who will seek to engage with people including explaining to them how the scheme works and where the income is going; secondly, we will look to build on existing county enforcement arrangements, in discussion with the districts and boroughs. We will ensure that the company deployed will operate in a way that is both fair and sensitive to the fact that this is a new scheme and may take time to bed down.

**Displacement**

In addition to on-site enforcement, the issue of displacement parking is another key issue for this project. The project is being supported by Highways colleagues who are advising on the appropriate mitigation measures. We will undertake site visits of

all car parks before the scheme is implemented to review displacement issues and finalise our plans for mitigation measures. We will work with local members to ensure that solutions are appropriate to the local areas. One of the concerns is that mitigation measures should as far as possible be sympathetic to the local environment, which we will seek to achieve drawing on experience in other rural areas.

We will also seek to respond quickly to any unforeseen displacement issues that arise after the scheme has been implemented.

### **Scheme review**

We welcome the opportunity to share with the select committee the outcome of the first 6 months of the scheme and to discuss lessons learned and any amendments to the scheme which are felt to be necessary.

### **Cyclist Provision**

The select committee raised the important point of supporting access to the sites by other modes than private car, in particular the potential to cycle to the sites. We will seek to deliver cycle parking stands as part of the scheme implementation at a number of the car parks. In the medium term, as resources allow, we will seek to improve access to the sites via bicycle and on foot, for example through improvements to the rights of way network.

**Mr Mike Goodman**

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**

**14 December 2017**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE**

**CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (CAMHS) IN SURREY  
(Considered by the Children and Education Select Committee on 17 November  
2017)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- That Cabinet note the Committee's dissatisfaction with the performance of the CAMHS contract, and seek meaningful assurances from commissioner and provider as to the commitment to improve.
- That the Committee receives an update on the action plan in place to reduce waiting times, including key timescales and milestones for improvement, for circulation and given formal consideration at the next meeting.
- That the commissioners and providers seek to incorporate the Family Voice proposals into service design and delivery (attached), and report back on how they have taken these proposals forward.
- That child and family experience is embedded into the contract monitoring and processes, and that evidence is provided about how this has guided service design and delivery to the next committee meeting.

**RESPONSE:**

We are assured that there is a clear commitment and action to improve CAMHS services in Surrey, both from Surrey and Borders Partnership and other partners delivering this key service. The commissioners (Surrey County Council and the Clinical Commissioning Groups) are driving improvement and have found it necessary to issue a Performance Improvement Notice to increase momentum on progress and impact. An action plan is in place to drive improvement and this is being sent to Select Committee members.

An update on the action plan will be provided to the next Select Committee. In advance of this, we can report some initial progress, both in the quality of reported data and in reduction of average waiting times on the BEN (Behaviours, Emotional and Neurological) pathway in particular. This is encouraging but waiting times are still too long, even given increases in demand which are being experienced nationally, and we will be taking a keen interest in seeing further improvements before the next report to Select Committee.

Surrey and Borders Partnership have already taken action to respond to the Family Voice proposals and concerns as raised with Select Committee. They have supplied an initial overview on their response as attached. This response will be further developed for the report to the next Select Committee.

Further, work is underway to embed child and family voice within the contract monitoring process, building on Family Voice's and CAMHS youth/advisors' membership of the Contract Quality Review meeting.

Whilst commitment to improvement is positive, we would stress that current waiting times are unacceptably long in some cases and look forward to further progress being reported, both in reduced waiting times and improved outcomes for children.

This is essential given the importance of this service to children and families in Surrey.

**Mrs Clare Curran**  
**Cabinet Member for Children**  
**14 December 2017**

| <b>Concern raised by Family Voice</b>  | <b>Remedial activities from SABP Programme Plan</b>  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>1. Referral</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify/Communicate/Train</li> <li>• Who can refer</li> <li>• Consider move to self-referral</li> <li>• Ensure support for families is available and known</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice and Partnership Approach Workshop 12 Dec</li> <li>• Regular meetings with One Stop and locality managers to review referrals</li> <li>• Optimising System Capacity and Clinical Pathway Workshop addressing unallocated cases and waiting lists</li> <li>• Meetings held with National Autistic Society and Barnardo's</li> <li>• Move to self-referral discussed at November Contract Quality and Review Meeting</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>2. Assessment and Treatment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce waiting times – assessment and treatment – with support and treatment while waiting</li> <li>• Make sure service 'child and family centred'</li> <li>• Timely information and informed decision making</li> <li>• Continues to improve locations/facilities/times/in consultation with users</li> <li>• Involve children and families – in Care Plan, settings outcomes, agreeing processes, agreeing discharge</li> <li>• Value and measure family and young people experience/use to drive change</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop 12 December</li> <li>• Patient Experience Survey with Health watch</li> <li>• BEN pathway workshop</li> <li>• Regular meetings with One Stop</li> <li>• Standard Clinical Operating Practice Policy to be developed to cover waiting list management</li> <li>• Operational Plan to be developed to change the service pathway to the Children and Young People on a central waiting list</li> <li>• Run evening clinics</li> <li>• Introduce duty rota that is non-locality specific to standardized approach to managing incoming calls</li> <li>• Review the number of Children and Young People held on a case load</li> <li>• Training on care plans and how to communicate it to the family and manage expectations</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>3. Discharge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve transfers to other services on discharge</li> <li>• Ensure Health and Wellbeing Plan in place and 'owned' by child and family</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standardised discharge letter template to be re-written and cascaded to localities</li> <li>• Discharge Forum implemented</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>4. Re-referral</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make process straightforward and with timely response</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Optimising System Capacity and Clinical Pathway Workshop addressing re-referral route to ensure consistency</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   |  |
| <p><b>5. Crisis</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve pathways for crisis – child and family awareness/services prepared</li> <li>• Use cases to Identify how crisis can be reduced, especially admissions</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pathway redesign to discuss and agree on BEN pathway entry criteria, assessment strategy and standard treatment process</li> <li>• ASD training in wider CAMHS teams to enable adequate screening and advice before going onto BEN pathway</li> <li>• Guidance given to partner agencies on referral criteria for BEN pathway and assessment/treatment approach of BEN team</li> <li>• Create shared care prescribing with GPs</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>6. General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve information/knowledge sharing from CAMHS staff</li> <li>• Improve support/advice/training for parent carers</li> <li>• Improve communication to children, young people and families and wider stakeholders</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training to be undertaken of what makes a good assessment appointment, including how families are communicated to throughout the session and then after the assessment.</li> <li>• Patient Experience Survey with Health watch</li> <li>• Working closely in association with CAMHS Youth Advisors (CYA)</li> </ul>   |

This page is intentionally left blank