

## CABINET

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet on Tuesday, 30 January 2018 and will take effect on 08/02/2018 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 07/02/18.**

The following represents a summary of the decisions taken by the Cabinet. It is not intended to represent the formal record of the meeting but to facilitate the call-in process. The formal minutes will be published in due course to replace this decision sheet.

County Members wishing to request a call-in on any of these matters, should contact the Senior Manager for Scrutiny or relevant Democratic Services Officer.

The Cabinet at its meeting on Tuesday, 30 January 2018 considered the following matters and resolved:

- **PUBLIC QUESTIONS** (Item 4b)

There were four questions received from members of the public. The questions and responses can be found at Appendix 1.

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

A report was received from the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee relating to item 10 on the agenda. Responses can be found at Appendix 2.

- **SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN 2018 - 2027** (Item 6)

**RESOLVED:**

That the School Organisation Plan 2018 - 2027 is approved for recommendation to Council to determine its publication.

**Reasons for Decisions**

The School Organisation Plan is a key document used by schools and education stakeholders in considering long term plans. It is necessary to review the plan to ensure that the best and most up to date information is published for use in this planning process.

- **ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES FOR SEPTEMBER 2019** (Item 7)

**RESOLVED:**

It is recommended that Cabinet make the following recommendations to the County Council:

**Recommendation 1**

That the published admissions number for Reception at Cranmere Primary School is decreased from 90 to 60 for September 2019.

**Reasons for Decision**

- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school, albeit they would have preferred a reduction in PAN to 30
- There would still be sufficient places for local children if the PAN is decreased
- It would help support other local schools in maintaining pupil numbers
- It would help the school plan its classes and resources
- It would have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

### **Recommendation 2**

That the published admissions number for Reception at William Cobbett Primary School is decreased from 40 to 30 for September 2019.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There would still be sufficient places for local children if the PAN is decreased
- It would help support other local schools in maintaining pupil numbers
- It would make organisation of the school more effective
- It would make appeals easier to defend under Infant Class Size legislation
- It would have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

### **Recommendation 3**

That a feeder link is introduced to The Dawnay School from Polesden Lacey Infant School at Year 3 for September 2019, as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings
- d. Children attending Polesden Lacey Infant School
- e. Children for whom The Dawnay School is the nearest school to their home address
- f. Any other children

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- There was overall support for this change
- It is supported by Governors at Polesden Lacey and The Dawnay schools
- It would align the arrangements for The Dawnay School with Eastwick Junior School so that both are seen as destination schools for children attending Polesden Lacey Infant School
- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children at schools with agreed links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at The Dawnay School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Polesden Lacey Infant School

### **Recommendation 4**

That a feeder link is introduced to Reigate Priory School from Dovers Green and Holmesdale Community infant schools on a tiered basis for September 2019, as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings for whom Reigate Priory School is the nearest to their home address

- d. Children attending either Dovers Green or Holmesdale Community infant schools for whom Reigate Priory School is the nearest to their home address
- e. Other siblings
- f. Other children attending either Dovers Green or Holmesdale Community infant schools
- g. Any other children

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- There was overall support for this change
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governors at Reigate Priory School and Dovers Green and Holmesdale Community infant schools
- It would introduce a feeder link for Dovers Green and Holmesdale Community infant schools where currently none exist
- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children at schools with agreed links
- Children would be less likely to be offered a place from other local primary schools, thus preventing unnecessary movement between schools and creating more stability in the area
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Dovers Green and Holmesdale Community infant schools would not confer an automatic right to transport to Reigate Priory School

#### **Recommendation 5**

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2019 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 which includes the following change:

- i) Oakwood School – increase in Year 7 PAN from 270 to 300

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- Oakwood School is increasing its intake to respond to the need to create more school places
- Any increase to PAN would help meet parental preference
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2018 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The School Commissioning team supports the PANs

#### **Recommendation 6**

That the aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2019, for which no change is proposed, are agreed as set out in Enclosure 1 and its appendices.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- The existing arrangements are working well
- This would ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey's sustainability policies

- Changes highlighted in bold in sections 8 a) i), 11, 12, 13, and 15 of Enclosure 1 which have not otherwise been referenced in this report, have been made to add clarity to the admission arrangements
- Changes to the schools which will not be taken in to account in the assessment of nearest school, as set out in Appendix 3 of Enclosure 1, have been determined by the definition set out in paragraph 12 of Enclosure 1

NB Changes to PAN that are highlighted in bold in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 are referenced in Recommendations 1, 2 and 5

### **Recommendation 7**

That the primary and secondary coordinated admission schemes that will apply to all schools for 2019 are agreed as set out in Enclosure 2.

### **Reasons for Decision**

- The coordinated schemes for 2019 are essentially the same as 2018 with dates updated
  - The coordinated schemes would enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
  - The coordinated schemes are working well
  - Changes highlighted in bold in Enclosure 2 add clarity and are in line with the schemes proposed by other local authorities participating in the Pan London coordinated admissions process
- **RE-COMMISSIONING SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE IN SURREY** (Item 8)

### **RESOLVED:**

It was agreed that:

1. Cabinet approves the use of a Dynamic Purchasing System to commission and award contracts for up to £13.4 million of Supported Accommodation provision for young people in Surrey from April 2018 to March 2022.
2. The providers as listed in the Part 2 Annex of the submitted report are awarded a place on the new DPS as they have passed the Invitation to Tender (ITT) evaluation process, whilst recognising that further organisations will be able to apply throughout the duration of the DPS.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

A Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) under the Light Touch Regime has been selected as the most appropriate route to market because:

- It enables robust control of the quality and cost of supported accommodation services for young people;
- It provides flexibility: this approach attracts a larger range of suppliers and allows providers to enter / exit from the list without having to re-open frameworks, which can be legally challenging and bureaucratic;
- It is responsive. It will enable us to ensure that the service providers who can meet the emergent needs of young people, especially those who are experiencing the greatest challenges, are able to join the list throughout

the length of the commission;

- It demonstrates that we have listened to feedback and suggestions from the market and colleagues following the last tender process which was considered to be overly complicated. The approach was also too restrictive and led to spot purchasing with organisations that were not on the Framework as it was considered that only they were able to meet the needs of vulnerable young people.

*[The decisions on this item are subject to call in by the Children and Education Select Committee]*

- **CHERTSEY HIGH SCHOOL, RUNNYMEDE - ALL-WEATHER PITCH** (Item 9)

**RESOLVED:**

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information of the scheme as set out in Part 2 of the submitted report, the Cabinet approves the business case for the contribution of relevant sums towards the construction of an all weather sports pitch at Chertsey High School.

**Reasons for Decisions**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in Runnymede Borough enabling the provision of Year 7 places when and where they are needed.

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

- **REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2018/19 TO 2020/21, CORPORATE STRATEGY AND KEY FINANCIAL STRATEGIES** (Item 10)

**RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet makes the following recommendations to the Full County Council on 6 February 2018:

**Cabinet recommendations to Full County Council to note the following important features of the revenue and capital budget**

1. The Director of Finance's statutory conclusions that the council's budget is balanced for 2018/19 and is developing a major transformation programme to be able to set a balanced budget for 2019/20 and become sustainable over the medium to long term (Annex 1 of the submitted report).

**Proposed budget: Cabinet recommendations to Full County Council for the revenue and capital budgets**

2. Increase the level of the general council tax by 2.99% (paragraphs 101 and 102 of the submitted report).
3. Increase council tax by a further 3% for the adult social care precept, which will provide a further £20m to support the growth in demand for services (paragraph 102 of the submitted report).
4. Set the County Council precept for band D council tax at £1,411.29 which

represents a 5.99% up-lift. This is a rise of £1.53 a week from 2017/18's precept of £1,331.55.

5. Approve the County Council's £1,705m gross revenue expenditure budget for 2018/19 (Table 9 of the submitted report).
6. Approve the application of up to £15m capital receipts to fund the revenue costs associated with transformation projects (paragraphs 34 to 37 and Appendix 3 of the submitted report)
7. Approve use of up to £24m of earmarked reserves to support the revenue budget (paragraph 109 of the submitted report).
8. Approve £316m three year capital programme, with £139m capital investment in 2018/19 (paragraph 124 and Appendix 7 of the submitted report).
9. Agree to support only capital schemes that do not require borrowing, unless the scheme has a compelling business case developed that demonstrates best value and a sustainable basis for funding borrowing costs (paragraph 135 of the submitted report).
10. Note that the detailed programme of schemes will be agreed ahead of implementation of the detailed budget (if necessary).
11. Require a robust business case to be prepared (and taken to the Investment Panel for review) before committing expenditure for the use of:
  - all revenue 'invest to save' proposals, and
  - capital schemes (paragraph 120 of the submitted report).
12. To help ensure the council achieves its savings programme, require the Chief Executive and the Director of Finance to:
  - continue to ensure delivery of existing MTFP efficiencies and service reductions for the remaining years of the MTFP 2018-21; and
  - continue to ensure services monitor their demand and cost pressures and develop plans to mitigate the impact of those pressures (paragraph 95 of the submitted report).
13. Require the Chief Executive and the Director of Finance to lead the development of a transformation programme to move the council to a sustainable position in 2019/20.

**Corporate and key financial strategies: Cabinet recommendations to Full County Council on the revenue and capital budgets**

14. Approve the refreshed Corporate Strategy for 2018/19 that Cabinet has endorsed (paragraphs 18 to 24 and Appendix 1 of the submitted report).
15. Approve the refreshed Financial Strategy for 2018/19 (paragraphs 30 to 32

and Appendix 2 of the submitted report).

16. Approve the Capital Strategy for 2018-22 (paragraphs 117 and 118 of the submitted report)
17. Approve the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy for 2018/19 (paragraphs 34 to 37 of the submitted report).

### **Treasury management and borrowing: Cabinet recommendations to Full County Council**

18. Approve, with immediate effect, the Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19 (Annex 2 of the submitted report), which includes:
  - the investment strategy for short term cash balances;
  - the borrowing strategy for funding the capital programme;
  - the treasury management policy (Appendix 10 of the submitted report);
  - the prudential indicators (Appendix 11 of the submitted report);
  - the treasury management scheme of delegation (Appendix 12 of the submitted report);
  - the minimum revenue provision policy (Appendix 13 of the submitted report).

### **That the following decisions have been approved by Cabinet:**

19. That services will develop final detailed budgets and savings within budget for review by the council's Scrutiny function, ahead of approval by Cabinet on 27 March 2018 when the final MTFP 2018-21 will be presented.
20. That the draft MTFP for the financial years 2018-21 be approved, which includes:
  - to approve the Total Schools Budget of £505.8m (paragraphs 110 to 115 of the submitted report);
  - to approve overall cash limits for individual services for the 2018/19 budget (Table 9 of the submitted report).
21. That Cabinet approved allocation of a part of the additional funding from the additional 1% increase in council tax, and a change to the funding for the Members Allocations to provide the following to support Members' work in their local communities (paragraphs 104 and 105 of the submitted report):
  - a new Member Local Highways Fund;
  - a Revenue Highways Fund shared among Local Committees; and
  - revised Members Community Allocation

### **Reasons for Decisions**

Full County Council will meet on 6 February 2018 to agree a budget and set the council tax precept for 2018/19. Cabinet will recommend a budget to Full County Council to consider at its meeting on 6 February 2018.

- **MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT (Item 11)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Cabinet noted the following:

1. The forecast revenue budget outturn for 2017/18 was £11m overspend (Annex 1, paragraphs 1 and 8 to 43 of the submitted report). This included: £9m savings to be identified, £16m savings considered unachievable in 2017/18, £13m service demand and cost pressures less £27m underspends, additional savings and income.
2. Significant risks to the revenue budget (Annex 1, paragraphs 44 to 46 of the submitted report) could add £8m to the forecast overspend, including: £7m in Children, Schools & Families and £1m in Adult Social Care.
3. Forecast planned savings for 2017/18 total £79m against £95m agreed savings and £104m target (Annex 1, paragraph 47 of the submitted report).
4. All services continue to take all appropriate 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, state that the council has a duty to ensure its expenditure does not exceed resources available and move towards a sustainable budget for future years.

That the Cabinet approved the following:

6. Reprofiting of £356,000 capital underspends on Superfast Broadband project from 2017/18 across 2018/19 to 2020/21 (Annex 1, paragraph 63 of the submitted report).

### **Reasons for Decisions**

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

- **LEADERSHIP RISK REGISTER (Item 12)**

**RESOLVED:**

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

### **Reasons for Decisions**

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

*[This decision can be called in by the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee]*

- **CONVERTING STREET LIGHTS TO LED** (Item 13)

**RESOLVED:**

That the Cabinet:

Approves in principal the conversion of the Council's street lighting assets to LED and delegates to the Head of Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, the authority to issue a change notice under the Street Lighting PFI contract to enable the development of a detailed proposal.

Take a decision on whether to proceed based on a final detailed business case, including a technical solution and implementation programme, in Autumn 2018.

**Reasons for Decisions**

Energy price inflation is increasing at a significant rate (5%-14%) and to ensure lights are operational when needed, there is little opportunity for the Council to control or reduce its energy costs.

LED technology in street lighting has matured significantly in recent years while the costs have reduced. Many Highway Authorities have either embarked on an LED conversion programme or are in the process of planning to commence one within the next 2-3 years.

Converting to LED will reduce energy consumption by 60% delivering £2 million per year energy savings at today's prices as well as reducing carbon impact by 6200 tonnes and avoiding the Carbon Reduction Commitment tax otherwise payable on the avoided consumption.

In addition to converting to LED street lighting and upgrading the Central Management System, Officers will be able to explore additional innovations now being used or being developed for use with street lighting such as:

- Motion sensor controls to turn lights on in residential areas when people or vehicles approach and, off once they have passed
- Providing real-time traffic movement data to help understand and ease congestion
- Environmental sensors to detect and monitor air quality

The potential for these innovations may be in direct relation to street lighting (e.g. motion sensor controls) or in providing a communications network for other areas of the Council (and extending to partners in District and Borough Councils) to connect equipment to improve the services and outcomes they deliver.

Furthermore, these innovations may present grant funding opportunities through central Government departments and the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) which would reduce the borrowing requirement for the Council.

The PFI contract allows for changes to the specification and service. As

explained in paragraphs 18-22, once a change notice is issued the process of identifying an appropriate solution to meet the Council's needs begins which is expected to take 6-8 months to explore and agree before being presented back to Cabinet for approval, hence the reason for the 2 stage Cabinet approval.

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

- **PAY & CONSERVE, CAR PARK CHARGING ON THE COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE** (Item 14)

**RESOLVED:**

The Cabinet agreed that:

1. Charging is introduced at 15 car parks across the 5 busiest sites as set out in Option 5 in paragraph 35 of the submitted report.
2. Income from car park charging is ring-fenced for the benefit of the Surrey Countryside Estate.
3. The tariffs are agreed as set out in paragraph 21 of the submitted report and thereafter forms part of the annual review process for fees and charges.

**Reasons for Decisions**

In order to ensure a secure future for the Countryside Estate in the stewardship of the County Council and Surrey Wildlife Trust, a steady revenue stream is critical. SWT are working with the County Council to develop a range of opportunities to produce that income and help to protect and enhance the Countryside Estate.

The Countryside Estate is greatly valued by the public, however it is coming under increasing pressure from reducing budgets. The best way to protect and enhance the countryside for the future is to make the Estate self-funding and better protected against declining public sector budgets. Paying for parking is an accepted cost of going to the countryside, demonstrated by the many sites that charge and are still very busy.

Without funding, the countryside will become more inaccessible, overgrown and littered. All car parks on the countryside estate need regular litter collection, management of trees and other vegetation, upkeep of signs and surfacing and car park resurfacing. Income from car park charges can help meet these costs and improve the biodiversity, landscape and access to this valuable asset.

The results of the consultation show us that the public would prefer not to pay to use the car parks however there is recognition that without a reliable income stream the result would be a deterioration in the quality of the estate and in access to the estate. Of the payment options available, cash would be the most acceptable to the public. However there are high operational costs and risks, for example theft and vandalism are more common where cash is collected in meters on remote sites. The National Trust are already reviewing their method of charging as a result of repeated vandalism. The next most popular payment option was by card (some 95% of adults in the UK now have bank cards).

Many countryside car parks in Surrey and other rural areas make charges. Following financial assessment, the analysis of the Pay and Conserve Public Consultation and recommendations from the Environment and Infrastructure

Select Committee, it is felt that the most appropriate way of generating the necessary income is to introduce charging at the 5 busiest sites with card-only Pay and Display machines plus the option to pay by mobile phone or to purchase an annual parking permit. The cost of an annual permit is £60 this equates to a daily cost of 16p.

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

- **HIGHWAY ENVIRONMENTAL MAINTENANCE AGENCY AGREEMENTS**  
(Item 15)

**RESOLVED:**

The Cabinet agreed that:

1. Authority be given for the Head of Highways & Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways to enter into formal agency agreements with the District and Borough Councils to undertake highway environmental maintenance works.
2. Funding levels, at the reduced rates be maintained for the duration of the initial four year agency agreements, with annual adjustment for inflation.
3. Where no agreement can be made with a District or Borough, the County Council will directly manage highways environmental maintenance for that area.

**Reasons for Decisions**

Agency agreements need to be established to ensure that the County Council can continue working with Districts and Boroughs so they can provide highway environmental maintenance activities on behalf of the County Council.

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

- **OPERATION OF ON-STREET CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT** (Item 16)

**RESOLVED:**

That the County Council enters into new Civil Parking Enforcement arrangements from 1 April 2018 as follows:

1. either;
  - a. Five-year agency agreements be introduced with each identified lead authority where a cluster is ready to be implemented,
  - b. Two-year agency agreements be introduced with individual borough/district councils where a cluster is not ready to be implemented,in line with the terms specified within this report, including the split of any surplus as detailed in paragraph 18 of the submitted report.
2. the Head of Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways, be authorised to finalise details, including any

necessary temporary arrangements, and implement agreements.

3. Local or Joint Committees continue to have an oversight and monitoring role for on-street parking enforcement within their area.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

To ensure the County Council effectively, efficiently and consistently manages on-street parking in Surrey, so that the economy of our town centres is enhanced and congestion is reduced, to the benefit of our residents and businesses.

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

- **LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Item 17)

#### **RESOLVED:**

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

### **Reasons for Decisions**

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

- **RE-COMMISSIONING SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE IN SURREY** (Item 19)

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the 16 providers as set out in the submitted report, be awarded a place on the DPS commencing 1 April 2018 because they met the required threshold (50%) in the ITT evaluation process.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

This will enable Surrey County Council to purchase services on a spot basis from these organisations. Providers accepted onto the DPS will be invited to bid for block contracts through mini-competitions in February 2018.

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

- **CHERTSEY HIGH SCHOOL, RUNNYMEDE - ALL-WEATHER PITCH** (Item 20)

#### **RESOLVED:**

It was agreed that:

1. The business case for the project to contribute towards the cost of an all-weather pitch at this new secondary free school that will provide 600 additional school places, at a total cost as set out in the submitted report be approved.
2. The arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Children,

Schools and Families in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education, the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services and the Leader of the Council be agreed.

3. That the authority to approve the award of contracts for works be delegated to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Education, Head of Procurement and Section 151 Officer when a competitive tender is procured through the new Orbis Construction Framework.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

The proposal delivers and supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places to meet the needs of the population in Runnymede Borough.

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

- **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - DISPOSAL (Item 21)**

### **RESOLVED:**

That, following a marketing exercise, a property no longer considered suited to ongoing service delivery nor capable of generating significant income be disposed of.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

The property is no longer considered suited to ongoing service delivery, nor capable of generating significant income. The capital receipt from the sale will contribute to the funding sources available to the council in support of its delivery of services to its residents.

*[The decision on this item can be called in by the Corporate Services Select Committee]*

**CABINET – 30 January 2018**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Public Questions**

**Question 1: Mr David Beaman – Farnham Town Councillor, Castle Ward**

On 23rd December the Department of Transport launched a 12 week consultation exercise on which roads to include in new Major Road Network in which funding would be available for projects of up to £100 million for upgrades and improvements. All the main roads serving Farnham potentially qualify and will SCC be using this opportunity to bid for funding for a relief road to bypass Farnham to reduce congestion, improve air quality and road safety?

**Reply:**

The consultation is on the establishment of a Major Roads Network (MRN), which would be established based on quantitative and qualitative criteria including traffic flow, linking economic centres, ensuring a coherent network and access to/resilience of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The investment decisions are based on five objectives including reducing congestion, supporting economic growth and housing delivery, supporting all road users and the Strategic Road Network. We will be assessing all our roads against these criteria, including the roads around Farnham, and submitting evidence on which roads within Surrey meet the criteria for inclusion in the Network.

**Mr Colin Kemp  
Cabinet Member for Highways  
30 January 2018**

**Question 2: Ms Sally Blake**

The Cabinet is being asked to approve the introduction of car park charges of £1.30 an hour (max £5) at 15 countryside car parks at Chobham, Whitmoor, Rodborough, Witley and Ockham Commons, and Norbury Park.

The paper presented by Cllr Goodman indicates under proposed Option 5 (with payment by card and phone only) an average total revenue of £448,000 pa, with average expenditure (presumably to 'run the parking scheme') of £247,000 pa, and average net revenue (presumably to 'conserve the countryside') of £201,000 pa. These are averages over 15 years.

What is the Council's policy in approving this proposal, based on these figures, relating specifically to the following:

- Presently there are 446,000 cars visiting these car parks each year. Your own consultation, where people were not even told the proposed high level of the charges, showed 54% of people would avoid coming in future and 16% would come less often. The average total revenue of £448,000 pa looks extraordinarily high.
- The financial impact on your social care budget, by reducing access to the countryside for the elderly and less well-off, has not been assessed and included in the figures. Substantial expert evidence has been provided to support the negative impact of reduced public access to green spaces and

the natural environment.

- The cost of 'running the parking scheme' and the amount going to 'conserve the countryside' must be considered separately as they are only permitted under two separate Acts of Parliament. The parking charges must be 'reasonable' and must not make a profit. The charges to 'conserve the countryside' must, over a number of years, equate to the amount being spent on that service. The proposed charges are extremely high for natural countryside car parks with no facilities and may not be considered reasonable.
- Your own figures show that only £201,000 pa, 45% of the total revenue, would be going towards 'conserving the countryside'. This amount could be considerably lower if the total revenue is less, as the cost of 'running the parking scheme' will be fixed. The value of carrying out this project at all, particularly as your consultation results showed 75% public opposition, must be very questionable.

**Reply:**

This proposal is put forward on a basis that the investment would allow the charging scheme to generate enough income to cover the borrowing costs, cover the operating cost and help improve, maintain and enhance the countryside sites. It is important that the car parks are maintained so that they remain available to the public to access them for health and wellbeing.

There may have been a misunderstanding here, because the charges are for parking and there is no proposal to make separate charges for maintenance of the countryside estate.

The parking charges are not set to generate a surplus. It should be noted that, since the parking here is ancillary to the countryside service, the 'cost of the service' for these purposes is the cost of providing the countryside service, and not just the parking. Although the income will make a contribution to the cost of maintaining the countryside estate, it is not expected to exceed the costs of provision of the service. Charges at other car parking sites in the area have also been taken in to account as a relevant factor in determining whether the proposals are reasonable, which is in line with the legislation.

**Mr Mike Goodman**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**  
**30 January 2018**

**Question 3: Mr John Oliver**

Mr Chairman, Cabinet Members have received a copy of my correspondence concerning legal issues relating to the placing of parking charge infrastructure, and introducing charges, at the Pay and Conserve sites. I am not alone in believing that the infrastructure needs consent from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and I have set out the legal arguments to support this. Cllr Goodman has not set out the Council's legal arguments to support not making an application for consent – in fact his paper gives no mention to this contentious issue whatsoever. Even Lord Gardiner, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Rural Affairs, gave no support to Cllr Goodman's approach to him to have the PINS guidance relaxed. This is yet another example of a policy paper failing to

set out the legal background to proposals.

Do you agree that Cllr Goodman should be asked to fully investigate, with the Council's legal team, the need to apply for consent and provide the Cabinet with a full and proper explanation of the legal position before a decision is made on his proposals and, if not, why not?

**Reply:**

The correspondence with DEFRA that you refer to confirmed that there are no plans to make any changes to the current legislation in respect of consent for works which do not prevent or impede access to commons.

In addition, it confirmed that it is for the person proposing to carry out works on common land to come to a view on whether those works would impede access to the common. If the person considers that they do not, there would be no need, on the face of it, to apply for consent.

The Council's view is that an application is not necessary in these circumstances because the work involved in installing pay and display equipment at the car parks is intended to facilitate the maintenance of the car parks and the common to an appropriate standard, thus ensuring access to the common, particularly for those visiting from further afield.

In addition, if the works are so small and or of such short duration that they do not impede access then we do not consider an application necessary. Both criteria are used by the Planning Inspectorate in drawing up the list of works which they consider to fall outside the scope of s38, contained in their Common Land Guidance Sheet 1b. This list is not exhaustive and we consider that it is a guide.

**Mr Mike Goodman**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**  
**30 January 2018**

**Question 4: Mr John Oliver**

Mr Chairman the equalities impact assessment accompanying the policy paper 'Pay and Conserve, car park charging on the Countryside Estate' states "This is on the basis that the parking charges should be set at a reasonable level in comparison to other countryside sites". Section 43 of the Countryside Act 1968 states that charges should be "reasonable", not "reasonable in comparison to other countryside sites".

Legislation dealing with local authority charges stresses that charges should be set to cover the cost of providing the service and not to generate surpluses. "Reasonable" should be viewed in that context and not on what the market can stand, and certainly not in comparison with other, commercially-orientated, organisations.

Do you agree, therefore, that Cllr Goodman and Mr Russell should be asked to revisit the scale of charges based on what the legislation intends, rather than on what others charge and, if not, why not?

**Reply:**

I have answered this point in my reply to question 2, above.

**Mr Mike Goodman**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**  
**30 January 2018**

**Question 5: Ms Julie Brown**

The proposed parking charge policy for the Pay and Conserve sites sets out only one charge, but this is in fact, made up of two legally separate charges; one for the countryside management and the other for parking. They should be discussed and shown separately in the policy proposal for the benefit of Cabinet members. The charge for countryside management can only be made if the receiver of the service agrees to it.

Given that it is well known that many people visit sites, but stay in the car park for a variety of reasons, for example due to infirmity or to have lunch or a period of quiet contemplation, they will not need to access the countryside. Could you please confirm:

- What the charge would be for each of the two services
- How the receivers of the services will be told this and how they will agree it with the council
- People will be able to turn down the countryside management charge and pay only the parking charge if they stay in the car park

In addition, the accompanying paragraph 14 of the policy proposal states, "SCC and SWT will use some of the income to improve access by cycle or foot to sites where appropriate. In addition, public transport access is also being looked at as an option". Please could you explain:

- What authority the Council has to raise surpluses from charging for the management of the Countryside Estate, supposedly to be ring-fenced, and to use them on different services, i.e. the highway service and the public transport service
- What steps are under way to look at the provision of public transport, which sites does this involve, when will this consideration be reported upon and to whom and when and how will the public be told about it?

**Reply:**

I have explained, in my answer to question 2 above, that there is no proposal for two separate charges. By parking and paying the charges, a visitor will have agreed to the provision of the service.

On your second set of points we are looking at access to the countryside sites by foot and on bike via the existing rights of way network or possible with some upgrading of that network and providing bike stands where appropriate.

With public transport we will explore the possibility of providing stopping points on existing public transport routes.

**Mr Mike Goodman**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**  
**30 January 2018**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO OVERVIEW AND BUDGET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**FINAL BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS**

**(Considered by the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2018)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**Corporate Services Select Committee**

- a) There should be a clear five-year strategy in place to deliver savings through improved energy efficiency across the whole of the Council's estate, including an awareness campaign to influence staff behaviour in relation to lighting and heating, replacement of existing lighting with LED bulbs, installation of passive infrared detectors, and effective management of energy contracts.
- b) The Select Committee was informed that relatively little of the existing £4.2M invest-to-save reserve had been used to date to deliver the savings so far in Orbis. Consideration should be given to whether the objectives of Orbis could be achieved without spending all of the allocated reserve, allowing this money to be used to reduce the budget shortfall in 2018/2019.
- c) The Audit & Governance Committee to be asked to review the existing procurement governance arrangements, to ensure that contracts are implemented in a timely manner and managed in an efficient and cost-effective way.
- d) Additional resources to be provided in Property Services to enable a separation between those officers supporting maintenance of the Council's existing property portfolio and those identifying new opportunities for investments which support modern service delivery: this will ensure that projects in other services which will achieve savings and/or relieve service pressure can be progressed in a more timely manner.
- e) The policy of using capital investment to achieve revenue savings by bringing services back in-house (for example SEN and extra care housing) should be prioritised.

**Adults and Health Select Committee**

- f) The Council to work with healthcare partners to reduce the number of disputed Continuing Healthcare Cases particularly those that are not with Surrey's six CCGs, to enable resources spent on administering these cases can be put back into the frontline.
- g) Increased priority to be given to the provision of Extra Care services, in order to achieve a significant improvement in the level of delivery.
- h) The Adult Social Care Directorate develop robust digital and assistive technology strategies in order to reduce demand on the service in the short and medium term.

- i) Proposals to increase charges for the provision of adult social care services to be supported; this to be done in a sustainable way to ensure that it doesn't lead to more individuals being unable to pay for the costs of their care.
- j) Cabinet continues to argue the case for fairer funding with Central Government in respect of Surrey's Public Health allocation.
- k) The Council moves towards a targeted approach to the delivery of Public Health services to ensure that they reach those most in need of support.
- l) Cabinet remains alert to the Council being too liberal in its interpretation of those initiatives that can be shadowed funded through the Public Health budget and is alert to the danger of the shadow-funding target leading to money being taken out of Public Health that would be better spent on the delivery of services actively commissioned by Public Health.
- m) Officers investigate opportunities for collaborating with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector in the planning and delivery of services commissioned by Public Health.

#### **Communities Select Committee**

- n) Encourages the Library Service to progress its development of community supported libraries.
- o) Recommends that the Library Service undertakes appropriate public consultation regarding future changes to libraries in early 2018.
- p) Recommends that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service investigates using a portion of its overtime budget to employ permanent, full-time staff to mitigate risks related staff resilience.
- q) Encourages a more proactive approach to collaborating with East and West Sussex fire authorities as detailed in Surrey Fire & Rescue Service's Public Safety Plan to deliver on potential savings that can be achieved through effective collaboration.

#### **Cross Service**

- r) A Cabinet Member is given responsibility for the delivery of the transformation projects outlined in the Revenue and Capital Budget for 2018/19 to 2017/18 complemented by a similar role for a specific Officer.
- s) The Council's travel policy to be reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure that it supports the aim of minimising costs by:
  - Influencing staff behaviour (for example, encouraging the use of video conferencing, discouraging unnecessary travel and identifying whether lower cost alternatives are available), and
  - Encouraging services to review operational arrangements (for example the frequency and level of attendance by fire crews in response to automatic alarms).

## **RESPONSE:**

The cabinet would like to thank the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee for their recommendations on the budget, and for their work and all the scrutiny boards in reviewing the savings for the financial year.

The cabinet recognise that in order to balance the budget for 2018/19 the council needs to use reserves, as further savings beyond the £66m identified are not considered achievable in 2018/19. As a part of future years' budget planning the cabinet will look to replenish these reserves as a part of a strategy to ensure a sustainable budget.

The strategy to develop and ensure sustainable services and finances will include a major programme of transformation on how we deliver services to our residents. The cabinet recognise that to achieve such a change, the council cannot act alone. It will work even more closely with residents and our partners, whether they be district and borough councils, health, police and importantly, the voluntary, community and faith organisations across Surrey to achieve this transformation. It will be challenging but discussions on taking a more place-based approach are progressing well. I hope that the scrutiny committees will also play an active part in looking at how and where we need to transform to meet residents' needs

Since 2010 the council, under this administration, has saved a total of £540m. Most of this has been through improving efficiencies and the way we deliver services. Although efficiencies are increasingly hard to find, we will still search for them, wherever they are in our organisation, to make sure that the council gets the best value for our residents.

**Mr David Hodge CBE**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**30 January 2018**

<b>DEMOCRATIC SERVICES – CONTACT LIST</b>	
<b>Cabinet, Committees and Appeals</b> Bryan Searle x419019 <a href="mailto:Bryans@surreycc.gov.uk">Bryans@surreycc.gov.uk</a>	
Cabinet Business Manager Vicky Hibbert – x419229 <a href="mailto:Vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk">Vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk</a>	Scrutiny Manager Ross Pike – x417368 <a href="mailto:ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk">ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk</a>
Democratic Services Officer Andy Baird – x417609 <a href="mailto:Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk">Andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk</a>	Democratic Services Officer Huma Younis - x132725 <a href="mailto:huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk">huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk</a>
Democratic Services Officer Angela Guest – x419075 <a href="mailto:Angela.guest@surreycc.gov.uk">Angela.guest@surreycc.gov.uk</a>	Democratic Services Officer Richard Plummer – x132782 <a href="mailto:richard.plumer@surreycc.gov.uk">richard.plumer@surreycc.gov.uk</a>