

Notice of Meeting

Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee

**Date & time**

Wednesday, 12 July
2017 at 10.00 am

Place

Committee Room C,
County Hall, Kingston
upon Thames, Surrey
KT1 2DN

Contact

Ross Pike or Emma
O'Donnell
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 7368 or 020
8541 8987

Chief Executive

David McNulty



We're on Twitter:
@SCCdemocracy

ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 8914, fax 020 8541 9009, or email ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Ross Pike or Emma O'Donnell on 020 8541 7368 or 020 8541 8987.

Elected Members

Ms Ayesha Azad, Mr Jonathan Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Tim Evans, Mr Tim Hall, Mrs Kay Hammond (Chairman), Mr David Harmer, Mr Nick Harrison (Vice-Chairman), Ms Charlotte Morley and Mrs Hazel Watson

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Committee is responsible for the following areas:

Co-ordinates the Council's policy development and scrutiny work by agreeing work programmes for Select Committees, ensuring that reviews are focused on the Council's priorities and value for money, that reviews are cross-cutting where appropriate, and that work is not duplicated.

Performance, finance and risk monitoring for all Council services.

Policy development and scrutiny for Cross-cutting/whole-Council issues, including:

- Budget Strategy/Financial Management
- Improvement Programme, Productivity and Efficiency
- Equalities and Diversity
- Corporate Performance Management
- Corporate and Community Planning
- Transformation
- New models of delivery
- Digital strategy

AGENDA

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 27 MARCH 2017

(Pages 1
- 8)

To agree the minutes as a true record of the meeting.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

NOTES:

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

4 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

To receive any questions or petitions.

Notes:

1. The deadline for Member's questions is 12.00pm four working days before the meeting (Thursday 6 July 2017).
2. The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (Wednesday 5 July 2017).
3. The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

5 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE

(Pages 9
- 10)

The Committee is asked to note the Cabinet response to recommendations made by the Council Overview Board on 1 March 2017.

6 REVIEW OF SELECT COMMITTEE PROPOSED FORWARD WORK PROGRAMMES

(Pages
11 - 22)

The Committee is asked to review and agree the Forward Work Programmes for each of the Select Committees.

7 BUDGET SUB-GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

(Pages
23 - 26)

The Committee is asked to review and agree the Budget Sub-Group's Terms of Reference, making any amendments as necessary.

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Committee will be held at 10:00am on Thursday 14 September 2017.

9 PRIVATE MEMBER INDUCTION SESSION

David McNulty
Chief Executive

Published: Tuesday 4 July 2017

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD** held at 10.00 am on 27 March 2017 at Committee Room C, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 28 June 2017.

Elected Members:

* present

- * Mr Steve Cosser (Chairman)
- * Mr Eber A Kington (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- Mr Bill Chapman
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mr Bob Gardner
- * Mr Michael Gosling
- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- Mr David Harmer
- Mr Nick Harrison
- Mr David Ivison
- * Mr Colin Kemp
- * Ms Hazel Watson
- * Mr Keith Witham

Members in attendance

Ms Denise Le Gal, Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience

Mr Tim Evans, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

Mrs Mary Lewis, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families Wellbeing

31/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from David Ivison, Mark Brett-Warburton, Bill Chapman, Nick Harrison and David Harmer.

32/17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 1 MARCH 2017 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

33/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declaration of interest made.

34/17 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions submitted to the Board.

35/17 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]

It was noted the Scrutiny in a New Environment Task Group's recommendations would be considered by Cabinet on Tuesday 28 March 2017.

36/17 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 6]

The Board noted and agreed with the Recommendations Tracker.

37/17 PROGRESS OF THE SUSTAINABILITY REVIEW BOARD & THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2017-22 [Item 7]

Declarations of interest:

None

Witnesses:

Tim Evans, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing & Independence, Sustainability Review Board Member
Mary Lewis, Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families, Sustainability Review Board Member

Kevin Kilburn, Deputy Director of Finance

Key points raised during the discussions:

1. The Board were informed that the following report on the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) would be considered by Cabinet on Tuesday 28 March and also incorporated the progress report of the Sustainability Review Board (SRB).
2. The Chairman showed gratitude to the Cabinet Associates in attendance, however expressed disappointment in the absence of senior Cabinet representation which was necessary for the meeting as

it involved views on Council leadership and advised Members that this would be reflected in the report to Cabinet from this Board.

3. It was noted that the SRB was formed to identify £30m permanent service reductions and up to a further £22m one-off reductions required to achieve a balanced budget in 2017/18. SRB Members explained that it had not been possible to identify these savings in the short period of time the SRB has been working.
4. Members were concerned with proposals to abolish Members allocations and Local Highways funds and argued this would reduce Members ability to resolve issues and respond to resident concerns in their own division effectively diminishing their role as Councillors. It was suggested that the proposals to stop these functions be amended to reduce the amount rather than stop it in its entirety. SRB Members noted these concerns and assured the Board they would be communicated to Cabinet.
5. SRB Members further responded that a narrative of the Council's situation needed to be endorsed by all Members to make sure residents understand why some local matters could not be responded to. It was further advised that a place-based approach would need to be established and developed at a local level in order to start delivering savings and mitigate the concerns to stop Members Allocations and Local Highways funds.
6. The SRB report indicated that £3-5m in savings were achievable, SRB Members were asked where this saving was recognised in the MTFP and whether it was an immediate saving. Members were advised that the £3-5m in savings was identified in a number of themes and service areas and these proposals were subject to approval by Cabinet. The Board were informed that the unsuccessful delivery of these proposals from the start of the financial year would mean falling back on reserves to achieve a sustainable target.
7. Members raised concern with inconsistencies in the MTFP report in relation to the identified savings and when these savings would be delivered. The Deputy Director of Finance advised the Board that the identified savings of £170m in the MTFP were subject to approval and would be delivered from 2017/18, over three years. The MTFP was developed in parallel with the SRB therefore there are some differences in where savings had been identified.
8. The Chairman commended SRB Members and officers for putting the report together in a short period and under such circumstances, however shared the view that proposals should be applied where appropriate and at pace to commence some real progress against considerable savings targets
9. Reference was made to the table in Annex 1 of the SRB report and SRB Members were questioned what the value was in identifying these potential savings in particularly with the Heritage, Arts and Music functions when it is noted further in the report that these figures would not be achievable. SRB Members explained that although these figures were considered not to be achievable to balance the budget for

2017/18, it was necessary to make a note of the potential savings these services could provide in the future.

10. Members sought more clarification on the staffing budget as the report did not address the particulars around the reduction of 101 full time equivalents (FTEs). The Deputy Director of Finance explained that agency staff was employed to cover gaps particularly in care services, however FTE's had not reduced due to new local government responsibilities.
11. The Chairman requested whether a list of capital schemes that would not progress as per the MTFP could be provided to members as the report did not incorporate this information.
12. There was a discussion around Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) and officers assured the Board that the saving proposals were assessed to ensure that any proposals that would have negative impacts would be tracked and to make sure remedial action would be taken..
13. The Deputy Director of Finance was asked whether the monthly monitoring reports tracking the implications of the savings were available to scrutiny boards and the officer advised that the monthly cabinet report included a summary of this tracking and that further analysis of these reports could be made available to scrutiny boards upon request.
14. Members made reference to the fact that delivery of only statutory responsibilities was missing from the SRB report and suggested the Council considered meeting its legal and statutory duties only to minimise costs. SRB Members acknowledged this and explained that the services should not to be judged on this criteria alone when considering how the Council delivers savings as removing non-statutory services could increase the demand on statutory ones.
15. Members raised concerns with that the COB recommendation to reduce council buildings and review the Policy and Performance and Communications Team had not been addressed by the Cabinet. The Board were assured that work was underway within the Council to develop a Surrey-wide view of assets and to develop options for how the council uses it assets most effectively. In relation to the Policy & Performance and Communications teams, the SRB have proposed a more streamlined, matrix management approach to prevent duplication of roles within the directorates.
16. It was noted that the Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund (Annex 1, Appendix 1) was forecasted to remain the same despite the time between the investment starting to produce returns and the funding costs the council incurs. Members further noted that the £1.8m of funds produced by investments were allocated into the budget to reduce budget overspends.
17. In an effort to draw recommendations from the discussions the Chairman expressed the view that the pace and intent of the exercise before the Council needs to change significantly to deliver good

services to Surrey residents within budget. The Chairman acknowledged Members reluctance with the proposals on local Members allocations and local Highways funds and agreed the proposals would have a detriment effect on communities.

18. It was also highlighted that budget scrutiny processes would need to be improved, suggesting that early discussions need to take place with the new council to support fundamental change.
19. The Vice-Chairman expressed the view that the recommendation should also reflect the need to re-affirm the fundamental review of back office functions of what the council does and whether it needs to be carried out within the totality of buildings the council currently holds.
20. Members showed disagreement with some of the proposals put forward on the MTFP and did not support the report in its entirety especially with the proposals in cutting frontline services.
21. Members could not reach a consensus on the inclusion of specific requests in its recommendations therefore a vote was cast to resolve the debate on what the report to Cabinet should read. Five Members voted in favour of the Chairman's proposed comments which urged the Cabinet to increase the scale and pace of change. Four Members of the Board voted against this.
22. The Council Overview Board recognises and shares the desire of the Cabinet to provide the best services possible for Surrey residents and understands the difficulties that there have had in reducing this offer. However, all the evidence the Board has considered confirms that the pace of change must accelerate significantly in the new Council and that there must be a fundamental review of how frontline and support services are provided and the use and retention of council owned assets.

Recommendations:

The Board recommends that:

1. Cabinet notes the very strong resistance of the Council Overview Board to the notion that local member allocation and local committee highways schemes should be completely removed because of its disproportionate and detrimental impact on local communities and asks the Cabinet to not to proceed with this proposal.
2. That the Cabinet provide a commitment to early discussions in the new Council to improve the scrutiny process so as to afford all members a role and sense of ownership in the savings process required to achieve a sustainable budget.
3. Cabinet provides assurance that the enhanced tracking of savings, consultations and equality impact assessments in budget monitoring reports will be available to scrutiny boards.

Further information requested:

A list of capital projects that will not progress now as per the MTFP (Kevin Kilburn)

38/17 INVESTMENT STRATEGY REVIEW [Item 8]

Declarations of interest:

None

Witnesses:

Denise Le Gal, Cabinet Member for Business Services & Resident Experience

Susan Smyth, Strategic Finance Manager and Secretary to the Investment Advisory Board

Peter Hall, Asset Investment and Disposal Manager

Key points raised during the discussions:

Keith Witham and Michael Gosling briefly left the meeting during this item

1. The Chairman began discussions by informing Members that he was pleased the report included the annual report proposal previously put forward by the Council Overview Board as a recommendation to Cabinet.
2. It was noted that the new Investment Board (IB) would provide an update of decisions made to Cabinet each month, as a confidential agenda item and a summary investment position would continue to be reported as part of the monthly budget monitoring report considered by Cabinet.
3. Members questioned whether these monthly reports and summaries would be available to the Scrutiny Board, as the Council Overview Board had the responsibility to hold the Cabinet to account for progress in relation to achieving the stated aims of the Investment Strategy. The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience explained that arrangements on this matter were unclear and assured the Members a review on the scrutiny process was in place to resolve this. It was further advised due to the competitive nature, proposed investments were time sensitive and until they were secure and complete, disclosure will need to be restricted to prevent leaks that could jeopardize the investment opportunity.
4. The Board noted that one of the justifications in delegating to the IB with the authority to take decisions was to allow investments to progress quickly and secure the opportunity against competition in the market. The Chairman requested that Officers inform the Board about one example where under the existing arrangements, an investment opportunity was lost. Officers provided the example of, a warehouse in Banbury which had interest from 6 other institutions and SCC was

unsuccessful as heads of terms could not be agreed with the vendor due to Cabinet's timetable in approving the acquisition.

5. Officers noted that the Evaluation Criteria at paragraph 14 in the Investment Board terms of reference would be better served under Scrutiny, paragraph 11, to clearly identify the criteria the Council Overview Board would need to take into consideration when scrutinising the IB on the aims of the Investment Strategy.

Bob Gardner left the meeting at 11:44am

6. The Chairman expressed the view that the rates of return should be included in paragraph 1, page 2 of the Investment Board terms of reference as part of the advice on how each investment proposal could be taken forward. It was explained that the rates of return were not specified as there was a broad list of criteria of which rate of return was one but the Strategic Finance Manager would include this.
7. The Cabinet Member stated that the growth of the portfolio was dependent on the opportunities available and had the potential to reach £2bn going forward. Officers further advised the Board that that the portfolio was a mix of low and high risk investments, ensuring the portfolio was balanced by taking a diversified approach.
8. Members acknowledged the current achievable returns in the market with the table provided in the report and asked whether return of investments were tracked. Officers advised that returns were recorded and were shared in part 2 in the reports provided to Cabinet.
9. There was a discussion around approving finance for property investments via the council's property company and the Board noted that this authority was also proposed to be delegated to the IB. Members expressed the view that COB's capacity to scrutinise the IB as per the Investment Strategy was dependent on the information available and raised concern for review in this area to ensure public money was being managed efficiently.
10. Officers clarified that the procurement of a property investment advisor would be funded by the income generated by the Investment Strategy and assured the burden would not fall on tax payers.
11. , The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience was asked about the results of investing to support economic growth. The Cabinet Member informed the Board of the recent agreement to invest in the Brightwells regeneration scheme in Farnham. It was highlighted that this investment would produce 400 jobs and would also bring major community benefits to residents, visitors and local businesses.
12. Officers explained that once the IB took a decision regarding an acquisition, it is reported as part of a monthly, confidential paper to Cabinet. COB could then scrutinise the details of the report to Cabinet. The Cabinet Members added that the Scrutiny Board would have to demonstrate a need to know as these matter could become political.

13. Members suggested that the proposed membership of the Investment Board should reflect a broader make up of members with the right skills and expertise which is not always reflected by the Member in the specific position referenced in the Terms of Reference. The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience noted the suggestion to have the IB membership include non-cabinet members and assured the Board that this would be expressed to Cabinet for consideration.
14. The Chairman felt that the key issue was with the governance in the proposal to delegate authority solely to the IB to take decisions in relation to property acquisitions. The Board voted in favour of a recommendation to allow COB to retain the ability to scrutinise these decisions before they are made.

Recommendations:

1. The Council Overview Board welcomes the proposal to produce an annual report on the investment portfolio as previously suggested to the Cabinet by the Board.
2. Recommends that COB retains the right to scrutinise individual investment proposals on property acquisitions before decisions are taken.
3. Cabinet review the proposed membership of the Investment Board to:
 - a) replace the two specified Cabinet posts with two members of the Cabinet with appropriate knowledge
 - b) include a Members of the Council who is not a member of the Cabinet

39/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 9]

The Board noted that its next meeting would be held on 28 June 2017.

Meeting ended at: 12.28 pm

Chairman

CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD

SCRUTINY IN A NEW ENVIRONMENT TASK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS (Considered by the Council Overview Board on 1 March 2017)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Cabinet review:

- a) the terms of reference for the Shareholder Board and consider the inclusion of a mechanism for tracking the performance of individual investments, and specifically the Property Investment Portfolio.
- b) the terms of reference for the Shareholder Board and consider the requirement that it report regularly, at least annually, to Cabinet on the performance of individual investments - and specifically the Property Investment Portfolio held by the Council - including with reference to each original business case and the Investment Strategy stated aims.

Future scrutiny role and Constitution changes:

- c) Annual reviews of the Shareholder Board (including a review of each LATC's performance) in the context of the Investment Strategy should be undertaken by the Council Overview Board in line with the constitution.
- d) Following this report the Constitution of Surrey County Council should be explicit in permitting the Council Overview Board to require Directors and Chief Executives of wholly owned LATCs (or trading companies where the Council has a controlling interest) to attend as witnesses to programmed agenda items to allow COB to fulfil its existing constitutional role to "review the performance of and hold to account any trading companies established by the Council."
- e) The Council Overview Board recommends that Scrutiny Boards consider conducting enquiries on proposals to commission services from wholly owned LATCs, at the initial stage when the business case is formulated. Long-term, once contracts are awarded, the boards should consider incorporating in their programme of work regular overview and scrutiny of service delivery.
- f) To carry out this work Scrutiny Boards should also be given the role to review the performance of trading companies that deliver relevant services under their remit. As above, the Constitution should be explicit in permitting Scrutiny Boards to access company financial information as part of their enquiries and to require Directors and Chief Executives of wholly owned LATCs (or trading companies where the Council has a controlling interest) to attend as witnesses to programmed agenda items.

RESPONSE:

The Cabinet would like to thank COB for their recommendations and for their work in reviewing the role of scrutiny in new models of delivery.

The council's investment portfolio is managed by the Investment Advisory Board rather than the Shareholder Board since the portfolio is the combination of assets held by the council and assets held by the council's wholly owned Property Company.

The investment performance is reported each month to Cabinet as part of the financial monitoring report. The Cabinet are considering a paper at their meeting today which includes an update to the terms of reference for the Investment Advisory Board, which will become known as the Investment Board. If approved the Investment Board will produce an annual performance report for the consideration of Cabinet and for the purposes of scrutiny.

The Committee will be aware that the Shareholder Board have produced two annual reports, in 2015 and 2016, which have been considered by Cabinet and scrutinised by COB. A further annual report will be provided in June 2017 which will provide comment about performance compared to expectations.

The Shareholder Board will continue to make information and its members available for attendance at COB meetings in order to aid its scrutiny role and will support reasonable requests from COB for the attendance of appropriate company officers to provide information to COB, however a change to COB's terms of reference would be a matter for Council rather than Cabinet.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
28 March 2017



Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee

12 JULY 2017

SELECT COMMITTEE PROPOSED FORWARD PLANS

Purpose of report: Scrutiny of Services and Budgets, Performance Management and Policy Development and Review

Introduction:

1. Under the new scrutiny arrangements agreed by Council at the Annual General Meeting of 23 May 2017, the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee has been given the role of coordinating the scrutiny function and agreeing individual Select Committee forward plans.
2. Further to agreeing the topics outlined in Select Committees' forward plan proposals the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee will review the methods considered for scrutiny, the potential for collaboration with other Select Committees and the resource requirements of each topic.

Select Committee Proposals:

3. Throughout June 2017 each of the Select Committees has held at least one induction session with Cabinet Members and Senior Officers in attendance. These sessions have helped to capture service priorities and challenges and shape Select Committee thinking on the areas for scrutiny in 2017/18. The current proposals of the Select Committees are attached to this document as Annexe 1.
4. The Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee recognises that Select Committees will, at times, need to respond quickly to emerging issues and therefore they will not always be in a position to wait for the next meeting of this Committee to have the item agreed.
5. To facilitate an agile scrutiny function, Select Committees will be able to notify the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee of the need to add an item to its forward plan at short notice as per the Constitution. Similarly, the 'Councillor Call for Action' provision is available to Members.

Recommendations:

- a) That the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee reviews each Select Committee's proposed forward plan in the light of the Council's Corporate Strategy, Cabinet Forward Plan and Medium Term Financial Plan, to ensure that Select Committees are targeting issues of strategic and financial importance and that their work adds value for Surrey

residents.

- b) That, following this review, the Committee agrees forward work programmes for each of the Select Committees.

| |
|--------------------|
| Next steps: |
|--------------------|

- Select Committee forward plans to be reviewed at each Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee meeting.

Report contact: Ross Pike, Scrutiny Manager, Democratic Services

Contact details: 0208 541 7368 / ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers: Council Agenda, Surrey County Council, 23 May 2017, available at: <https://members.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=121&MIId=5097>

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

Adults and Health Select Committee

| Select Committee | Topic | Scrutiny method | Involvement of other committees | Expected outcome |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Adult and Health Select Committee (AHSC) | Housing Related Support | Formal meeting - 14 July 2017 | None | Consulted on proposals, and understanding how these link to service saving plans Recommendations to Cabinet to support pre-decision scrutiny. |
| AHSC | Acute Mental Health Ward Relocation | Formal meeting - 22 September 2017 | None | Assess the impact of the ward relocation in improving patient experience and safety |
| AHSC | Suicide Prevention Framework | Formal meeting - 22 September 2017 | None | Review the suicide prevention framework, following a request from the House of Commons Health Select Committee. Explore what is being done to reduce suicides in the county (leading cause of death in 20-34 year olds in the UK). |
| AHSC | Home-based Care | Formal meeting - 9 November 2017 | None | Adult Social Care will be recommissioning home based care services in the autumn. The committee will review the plans to recommission, and investigate how the council is responding to the current pressures on providers created by market conditions. |
| AHSC | Accommodation with Care and Support | Formal meeting - January 2018 | None. | The Committee will review the next phase of the ASC accommodation with care and support project, following a Cabinet decision on the next phase in January 2017. |
| AHSC | Surrey Heartland Devolution | TBC | None | The committee will need to consider how it reviews the Surrey Heartlands devolution proposal. As this is an area of considerable strategic change, it may wish to consider a plan of ongoing engagement with the topic. |
| AHSC | Demand management | TBC | None | The committee will review the plans to manage demand in ASC, which accounts for approximately £4 million of ASC |

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

| | | | | |
|------|---|-----|-------|---|
| | | | | savings in the MTFP and has been identified as a red risk. |
| AHSC | Sustainability and Transformation Plan Progress | TBC | None | The committee will need to maintain track on progress around the three STP footprints, and how this is impacting on the delivery and long term planning for social care and health. The committee will also need to consider how the three plans work together to mitigate risks of regional variation in health outcomes, and represent the best interests for Surrey residents. |
| AHSC | Access to primary care and GP services | TBC | None. | This has been identified an area of interest by committee members. The committee will need to consider how it approaches scrutinising the item, and will use the summer to scope it and report back to the Council Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee |

Committee groups

Given the diverse range of organisations involved in the delivery of Surrey’s health services, some consideration will be given to how the committee can best organise itself to ensure adequate representation across local and regional networks. A summary of groups the committee’s predecessor had representation on is attached for reference.

The SECamb regional sub-group is formally constituted and its terms of reference are attached. The committee recommends that involvement in this group continues for the duration for 2017, as the CQC has recently re-inspected the Trust and expect to publish the results in September.

Regional

Regional Chairman’s Group –

This is the informal network of scrutiny officers and chairmen in West and East Sussex, Kent, Medway, Brighton & Hove and Surrey. It meets twice a year.

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

A good opportunity to share common experiences, challenges and opportunities. NHS England meet with this group regularly, and there is scope to invite other key partners. CQC have attended in the past and given comprehensive briefings on the regional picture.

SECamb Regional Sub-group –

- Established following the CQC inspection of SECamb in 2016.
- Has a formalised terms of reference, with two representatives from each local authority (West and East Sussex, Kent, Medway, Brighton & Hove and Surrey).
- Meets once every two months, with discussions reported back to the committee.

Sussex and East Surrey STP Health Scrutiny Group –

- Informal group, comprised of Chairmen from Brighton & Hove, Surrey, and West and East Sussex. It meets with Geraldine Hobarn, who is one of the leads in preparing the STP.
- Surrey's role in this STP is that of a minority partner, though there are concerns about the impact of proposals on Surrey residents. The engagement of the STP has also been piecemeal and uncoordinated, and this is a good opportunity to maintain a vital link to the STP proposals.
- The work of this group will also gain greater significance if a substantial change in service delivery is planned and Surrey is required to establish a joint committee to review these.

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

Local

CCG Member Reference Groups

Each of the 6 CCGs were supported by a Member reference group comprised of two committee members. These groups were established to exchange information, identify scrutiny topics and generally build up relations between the committee and the CCGs. Impact was variable, and committee engagement has declined over the last few years.

Provider Quality Account Groups

Previously Quality Account groups have been established to support local acute providers in reviewing quality data through the year.

The view was that these groups would feed into the committee's response to each provider Quality Account at the end of the year, though this has not largely been the case in practice.

These tended to meet on a quarterly basis and would have two committee representatives. Overall impact could be considered to be variable, though it improved the committee profile and was a good opportunity for Members to engage in discussions around local services.

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

Children and Education Select Committee

| Select Committee | Topic | Scrutiny method | Involvement of other committees | Expected outcome |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Children and Education Select Committee (C&E SC) | Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) | Site visit(s) and committee workshop | Site visit(s) could be open to all Members by prior appointment with MASH staff. | <p>The Committee expressed that a site visit (either as a Committee or as individual Members), followed by a workshop would help develop an understanding of the MASH and the part it plays for Family Services.</p> <p>The Committee highlighted child sexual exploitation and missing children as initial areas of concern and focus.</p> |
| C&E SC | Surrey Education in Partnership Programme | Workshop/ formal report | N/a | <p>An overview of the progress made within the Surrey Education in Partnership Programme. Previous work by the Education and Skills Board highlighted areas of concern and risk. September 2017 was a milestone for implementing new initiatives with schools and stakeholders. The Committee would like to assess this implantation, the impacts made and how the programme intends to develop further.</p> |
| C&E SC | Performance Monitoring – School Improvement & Children Services | Member Reference Group | N/a | <p>The Committee recognised performance monitoring as a key objective for the year and would like to establish a Member Reference Group could support regular scrutiny of performance from across the remit, and feedback to the main Committee at regular intervals.</p> <p>In discussion, areas of initial focus could be school improvement, Children Services, school governance arrangements in the new education landscape, and restraint records – record keeping and guidance.</p> |

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

| | | | | |
|--------|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| C&E SC | Ofsted | TBC | TBC | <p>The Committee notes that the Council expects a full Ofsted inspection of Children Services, and that outcomes from the inspection could shape a future scrutiny item.</p> <p>The proposed Performance Member Reference Group may also begin to recognise key areas of interest within Children Services ahead of the inspection.</p> |
| C&E SC | Financial Scrutiny | Task group | Possibly the Overview and Budget Select Committee | Having identified financial planning as major risk to the Council, the Committee would like to establish a finance task group to provide scrutiny and an input into school and directorate financial planning. |
| C&E SC | Social Services Data Protection & Risks | Formal report | Adults & Health Select Committee | The Committee identifies data protection of case files as a risk. The Committee would like to assess the Council's record keeping processes and procedures, and the steps taken to ensure the longevity and security of the records for the future. |
| C&E SC | School place planning | Workshop | N/a | The Committee would like to receive a workshop on the current school place planning and forecasts; and explore with Officers the potential impacts on education provisions with regard to Local Plans in Surrey. |
| C&E SC | Surrey's Pupil Referral Units (PRU) | Workshop and/or formal report | N/a | The Committee identified pupil PRUs as an area of interest, particularly in the educational attainment and outcomes for those children to attend them in Surrey. The intention for this item would be to identify whether further support is needed for PRUs and the children that attend them; and if so, how this could be put in place. |

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

| | | | | |
|--------|---|--|--|---|
| C&E SC | Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) | Member Reference Group and occasional formal reports | N/a | <p>The Committee identifies SEND as a major risk to the Council.</p> <p>Following the Ofsted/Care Quality Commission inspection in October 2017, the committee would like to request a report on progress made against the Council's Written Statement of Action, and a view on the Council's position ahead of the expected re-inspection in late 2017.</p> <p>The Committee also highlighted the following topics as of interest which could be investigated with a Member Reference Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEND Transport • Funding and demand for SEND services • Internal & external residences and the links to EHCP requirements |
| C&E SC | Communication with target audiences | TBC | Possibly the Corporate Services Select Committee | <p>Members raised the methodology of communication with target audiences was a historical weakness for some Services within the remit. A scrutiny approach, either as a Committee or in partnership with the Corporate Services Select Committee, could provide some insight into engagement practices, with an aim to identify and recommend the implementation of a "code of best practice" for the organisation.</p> |

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee

| Select Committee | Topic | Scrutiny method | Involvement of other committees | Expected outcome |
|--|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Environment & Infrastructure Select Committee (E&I SC) | Preparation Of The New Surrey Waste Local Plan: Draft Plan Consultation | Formal Meeting - 5 Oct | None | <p>As part of preparing the new SWLP members' input is required as part of preparing the plan this includes making sure officers have E&I SC's views on the Draft Plan, and appropriate responses, before reporting to Cabinet. An MRG under the previous Scrutiny Board (EPEH) was also set up to help get member's views on the Equalities Impact Assessment and consultation process and to raise the profile of the new SWLP.</p> <p>The Issues and Options Consultation for the SWLP was brought to the Scrutiny Board in June 2016 for consideration and a summary of the responses was reported in January 2017.</p> |
| E&I SC | Community Recycling Centres | Formal Meeting –TBC | None | For the Select Committee to consider the savings proposals to CRC's before formal consideration at Cabinet. |
| E&I SC | Smarter Working for the Environment: Policy Statement and Action Plan- Annual Progress Report | Formal Meeting - 5 Oct | None | <p>To inform members of progress in the delivery of the 'Smarter Working for the Environment' Action Plan, which sets out how the council is taking an integrated, informed and pragmatic approach to environmental sustainability</p> <p>To provide political oversight of the council's progress towards environmental sustainability, following through with the commitment for select committee scrutiny as stated in the 'Smarter</p> |

ANNEXE 1 - SELECT COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN PROPOSALS

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | Working for the Environment' policy approved by Cabinet in 2016. It is not anticipated that this item will be taken to Cabinet. |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Communities Select Committee – to follow

Corporate Services Select Committee – to follow

This page is intentionally left blank



Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee

12 JULY 2017

BUDGET SUB-GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

Purpose of report: Scrutiny of Services and Budgets

Introduction:

1. Under the new scrutiny arrangements agreed by Council at the Annual General Meeting of 23 May 2017, the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee has been given the role of scrutinising budgets and financial management across the Council.

Budget Sub-Group

2. The Budget Sub-Group is chaired by Nick Harrison, Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee with Ayesha Azad, Tim Evans and David Harmer as the other members.
3. The Sub-Group held its first meeting on 28 June 2017 to agree its ways of working. The resultant terms of reference are included as Annexe 1 to this report.

Recommendations:

- a) That the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee reviews and agrees the Budget Sub-Group terms of reference making any changes as necessary.

Next steps:

- The Budget Sub-Group will meet regularly and report its progress to Members at each Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee meeting.

Report contact: Ross Pike, Scrutiny Manager, Democratic Services

Contact details: 0208 541 7368 / ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers: Council Agenda, Surrey County Council, 23 May 2017, available at: <https://members.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=121&MId=5097>

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW & BUDGET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

BUDGET SUB-GROUP

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Purpose

To carry out detailed scrutiny of budgets and costs of services across the Council, review proposed options for service change and identify, where possible, a range of evidence-based options for budget savings.

Membership of the Group

Membership to be drawn from the Overview & Budget Scrutiny Committee, with the option to appoint Members from other committees where appropriate.

The core membership to be as follows:

- Nick Harrison (Chairman)
- Ayesha Azad
- David Harmer
- Tim Evans
- Chairman of the Overview & Budget Scrutiny Committee (ex-officio)

Roles/Functions

- To work with Finance and service officers to develop a good understanding of the Council's budgets and identify any further information which might be required.
- To scrutinise current service financial performance and budget management with regard to the savings plan outlined in the current MTFP and to review and contribute to preparations for next year's budget.
- To consider and appraise officer proposals for changes to service delivery, offering feedback and an opportunity for public acceptability testing.
- To identify a range of evidence-based options for reducing costs of service delivery, generating income and improving performance: if appropriate, this could include options which initially appear challenging or potentially unpopular, either for the public or politically.
- To regularly report the Sub-Group's activity and key findings to the Overview & Budget Scrutiny Committee
- To brief the Leader and Cabinet Members on emerging findings as appropriate.

Principles

Open and honest conversations about the pressures services are experiencing and the impact on service users and residents.

Information and proposals are shared at an early stage to allow the Sub-Group members to inform Cabinet decisions and add most value to the budget-setting process.

A consistent approach across the Council's services in terms of the timeliness, level and quality of information provided, with confidentiality guaranteed by the Member Code of Conduct.

Information is provided in advance of the Sub-Group meeting.

Frequency of Meetings

The Sub-Group will meet monthly, with additional meetings as required. The meetings will be held in private, and Members will be bound by the Code of Conduct to ensure that information discussed remains confidential.

Reporting & Recommendations

The Sub-Group will report its activity, key findings and proposed recommendations at each meeting of the Overview & Budget Scrutiny Committee.

Officer Support

Officer support will be provided by the Deputy Chief Finance Officer and Democratic Services. Other service officers will be called upon as appropriate.

All reasonable requests for information by the Sub-Group will be met by officers in a full and timely manner.