

Cabinet



Date & time
Tuesday, 29 May
2018 at 2.00 pm

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

Contact
Vicky Hibbert or Angela
Guest
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020
8541 9075

Chief Executive
Joanna Killian



**We're on
Twitter:**
@SCCdemocracy

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk
or
angela.guest@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Members: Mr David Hodge (CBE), Mr John Furey, Mrs Helyn Clack, Mr Mel Few, Mr Mike Goodman, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mr Tim Oliver, Ms Denise Turner-Stewart and Mrs Clare Curran

Deputy Cabinet Members: Ms Charlotte Morley, Mr Cameron McIntosh, Mr Jeff Harris and Miss Alison Griffiths

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

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Vicky Hibbert or Angela Guest on 020 8541 9229 or 020 8541 9075.

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

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

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

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 24 APRIL 2018

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

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

NOTES:

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

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions

The deadline for Member's questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (*22 May 2018*).

b Public Questions

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (*21 May 2018*).

c Petitions

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

d Representations received on reports to be considered in private

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

- 5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL** (Pages 1 - 2)

One report, in the form of a question, has been received from the Children and Education Select Committee's Performance Member Reference Group regarding the Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service. The question and response are attached.

- 6 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/ INVESTMENT BOARD TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Pages 3 - 12)

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

CORPORATE PRIORITIES: 1. WELLBEING

- 7 PRUDENTIAL RIDE LONDON-SURREY 100 & CLASSIC** (Pages 13 - 20)

As part of the legacy of the 2012 Olympic Games, the Cabinet approved support for a cycling event, originally the 'Marathon on Wheels', based on the route for the Olympic Road Race events.

The event, the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey Classic and 100 (PRLS) has now taken place annually since the 4 August 2013. Since the start of the event £2.5m has been given to Surrey Sporting and recreational Charities through the London Marathon Trust.

Surrey County Council has shown commitment to supporting cycling as an affordable means of transport and as a healthy leisure activity and has published the Surrey Cycle Strategy. The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic events are established as the Olympic legacy cycling event for the County and are seen as supporting this wider strategic direction.

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

CORPORATE PRIORITIES: 2. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

- 8 AWARD OF CALL OFF CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF PRINT MANAGEMENT SERVICES** (Pages 21 - 28)

This report seeks approval for the Council to award a call off contract to Corporate Document Services (CDS) for the provision of Print Management Services to commence on 1 August 2018.

N.B. There is a Part 2 annex to this report – item 12

[Decisions on this item can be called in by the Corporate Overview Select Committee]

9 FINANCIAL POSITION STATEMENT

(Pages
29 - 32)

To provide the Cabinet with an early assessment of the financial position of the Council at the start of the financial year and to highlight any areas of concern. To recommend the capital budgets to be brought forward from the 2017/18 financial year.

[Decisions on this item can be called in by the Corporate Overview Select Committee]

CORPORATE PRIORITIES: 3. RESIDENT EXPERIENCE

10 PURCHASE OF FIRE APPLIANCES

(Pages
33 - 38)

A review of the fleet of fire appliances for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) has identified there is a requirement to replace the fire engines on a planned and sustainable basis. To meet SFRS' requirements to replace its ageing fire appliances a competitive tender was carried out.

In order to meet the current Service requirements of the appliance replacement strategy, Cabinet approval is sought to procure a maximum of 18 fire appliances from the flexible contract which enables up to 30 to be purchased. The estimated cost of 18 fire appliances, supplied over 10 years, is a total of £5,126,472. There is no minimum guaranteed number of fire appliances to be ordered from this contract. This provides the ability to adjust the number of appliances ordered subject to future service requirements and financial affordability.

Investment Panel has scrutinised the business case for the fire appliance replacement programme. The capital budget has been approved as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan and will be reviewed on an annual basis.

N.B. There is a Part 2 annex – item 13

[Decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment Select Committee]

11 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

PART TWO - IN PRIVATE

12 AWARD OF CALL OFF CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF PRINT MANAGEMENT SERVICES

(Pages
39 - 42)

N.B. This is the Part 2 annex to item 8.

[Decisions on this item can be called in by the Corporate Overview Select Committee]

Committee]

13 PURCHASE OF FIRE APPLIANCES

(Pages
43 - 44)

N.B. This is the Part 2 annex to item 10.

*[Decisions on this item can be called in by the Environment Select
Committee]*

14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS

To consider whether the item considered under Part 2 of the agenda
should be made available to the Press and public.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Monday, 21 May 2018

QUESTIONS, PETITIONS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

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

Please note:

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

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your co-operation

Cabinet, 26 June 2018 – Item 5**CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE'S PERFORMANCE MEMBER REFERENCE GROUP****Item under Consideration: CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE****Date Considered: 8 May 2018**

The Children and Education Select Committee's Performance Member Reference Group of 8 May 2018 held a meeting which was focussed on the inadequate performance of the Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). At this meeting there was mention of an Interim Project Plan to improve CAMHS services and address the current backlog. Has the Cabinet Member for Children had sight of this plan and is the Cabinet assured that this plan is adequate to address the issues facing the effective delivery of CAMHS? And what processes will be in place to ensure that the implementation of the Interim Project Plan will be monitored?

Mr Tim Evans**Chairman of the Children and Education Select Committee's Performance Member Reference Group****RESPONSE:**

I welcome the question as the delays associated with the current backlog are unacceptable.

I have seen the plan and have been briefed. I confirm I am fully briefed including an overview of the interim plan which has been agreed by SCC, the CCGs and SABP. In relation to monitoring the implementation, there is a joint project board in place, chaired by the Executive Director of Strategic Commissioning Surrey Heartlands CCGs. This board will oversee the interim plan which includes targets and trajectories to address the backlog. Officers will continue to brief me on the implementation and monitoring of the plan.

The interim plan has a renewed focus on using early intervention services and supporting children, families, schools and GPs to use the range of services that are already provided through subcontracted partners. In order to deliver the interim plan and address the waiting list, additional resources are being secured through the Sustainable Transformation Partnership and the CCGs. This work will be supported by a review of case management criteria to reduce caseloads for clinicians to safe and manageable levels. I would like to stress the urgent and crisis referral pathway for children will still be in place during this period.

Mrs Clare Curran**Cabinet Member for Children
26 June 2018**

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 29 MAY 2018****REPORT OF: N/A****LEAD OFFICER: RACHEL CROSSLEY, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (CHIEF OF STAFF)****SUBJECT: LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/ INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

DETAILS:

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

Contact Officer:

Angela Guest, Democratic Services Officer, Tel: 020 8541 9075

Annexes:

Annex 1 – List of Cabinet Member Decisions

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

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS MAY 2018

CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

(i) PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Details of decision:

There were six questions received from members of the public. As these all related to the proposal to close Ripley CofE Primary School, the Cabinet Member took these questions as part of the item. The questions and responses are attached to this report as Appendix 1.

Reasons for decision:

To respond to the public questions.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Education – 8 May 2018)

(ii) PROPOSAL TO CLOSE GREEN OAK CofE PRIMARY SCHOOL AND NURSERY

Details of decision:

It was agreed that;

1. Statutory notices to close are not published.
2. The proposal to close the school is halted whilst further options that have arisen during the informal consultation process are fully explored.

Reasons for decision:

1. During the informal consultation, further options for the future of the school have arisen which require further time to be fully explored.
2. Outcomes for children at the school are improving. This is demonstrated through year 6 2017 outcomes comparative to 2016, the intervening Ofsted Monitoring Report and progress so far in the current academic year.
3. The numbers of children on roll at the school will help to maintain its future viability.
4. The places are required to meet future demand for school places. Closing the school would result in a significant capital cost to the Council for re-providing the places at alternative settings.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Education – 8 May 2018)

(iii) PROPOSAL TO CLOSE RIPLEY CofE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Details of decision:

It was agreed that statutory notices to close are published.

Reasons for decision:

1. No appropriate options for the future of the school have arisen during the informal consultation.
2. Outcomes for children at the school are being affected by the very low number of children on roll and the quality of teaching is variable.
3. The numbers of children currently on roll at the school (41) are problematic for future viability.
4. Projections for future need for school places indicate that future cohorts can be accommodated in adjacent areas.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Education – 8 May 2018)

CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES**(iv) DISABILITY CHALLENGERS, ST JAMES' AVENUE, FARNHAM- SECURING AN OVERAGE RECEIPT****Details of decision:**

It was agreed that:

1. Surrey County Council approves payment of the amount as set out in the Part 2 report as a contribution towards Disability Challengers costs in connection with the preparation and sale of part of the land.
2. Surrey County Council delegates to the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Member for Property & Business Services, the ability to enter into an appropriate update of the Overage Deed, in connection with any subsequent disposal of land retained by Disability Challenge such that it is fair and equitable to both parties.

Reasons for decision:

Surrey County Council (SCC) imposed an overage clause within the 2005 sale of land in order to ensure that any sale of the part or the whole by the purchaser, with an alternative higher value use would enable SCC to participate in such an uplift in value, in the event a disposal was entered into within a defined period.

Recently Disability Challengers (DC) have sought to safeguard their longer term future on the site by disposing of an underutilised part of the site to fund repairs and a refurbishment of buildings on the balance of the site.

SCC suggested further feasibility and viability exercises be undertaken to explore the potential for the provision of new sustainable and fit for purpose facilities for the charity on a smaller foot print, thus releasing a larger site area for redevelopment.

The opportunity to pursue this option was tested with the local planning authority but planning policy would not support the density of development required to enable such a

reprovision to be viable. As a result, DC expended significant additional legal and other professional costs and a diminution in the capital receipt secured as a result of the delays.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services – 8 May 2018)

CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES

(v) PETITIONS

Details of decision:

That the response, attached to this report as Appendix 2, be approved.

Reasons for decision:

To respond to the petition.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Children and Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services – 8 May 2018)

INVESTMENT BOARD

Details of Decision:

The Investment Board approved that Surrey County Council acquire the freehold interest in Park Lodge, Dorking

Reasons for Decisions:

The purchase is approved as a strategic acquisition being adjacent to the council's existing investment at Pixham Lane, Dorking. The investment will deliver an ongoing income to the Council, enhancing financial resilience in the longer term.

(Decision taken by the Investment Board – 17 April 2018)

Public Questions and Responses, submitted by Catherine Bremford

Q1. Can you provide evidence that the full consideration was given to Ripley Primary Schools special status as a rural school?

Accepting that the school has a designated rural status we can confirm as stated in the report, there are 2 schools that are less than 2 miles from Ripley primary school and a further 10 within 3 miles and therefore no students would be expected to travel more than a reasonable distance should Ripley close.

Under half of children remaining on roll at Ripley in years R to 5 reside in the village and will need to travel from the village for school. SCC is aware of its obligations to transport students where necessary as stated in the report.

Q2. Do you accept that neither SCC, the RSC nor the Diocese have fully explored all other alternatives (other than GST) to closing the school?

The Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) together with the Diocese are responsible for identifying and agree a suitable multi-academy trust (MAT) to take on the school. The Council understands that some MATs have approached the RSC, but none so far have been considered appropriate, for example, due to not being able to protect the religious character of the school.

Federations and amalgamations have also been options that the Governing Body have had open to them over recent years. The Council have encouraged these options to be explored but so far none have been deemed viable.

Q3. How does SCC ensure that all stakeholders such as Parish Councils, Borough/District Councils and Councillors and parents and residents at neighbouring schools are consulted? Please provide evidence that Ripley Parish Council, Guildford Borough Council and Councillors, and resident and parents at neighbouring schools and other stakeholders were consulted in the case of Ripley Primary School.

The aim of an informal consultation is to gather people's thoughts on the proposal. Local county councillors for whom education lies within their remit were fully briefed by the Cabinet Member. Notification of the consultation was sent to a wide range of stakeholders on 5th March 2018, including the Parish Council and Guildford Borough Council. A public meeting was held on 13th March at which representatives of the Parish Council were in attendance. The published minutes of the Parish Council meeting on 15th March state that notification of the consultation was received and a copy of the notification is included in the appendices to the minutes.

Maintained schools within 3 miles of the school were notified of the consultation and asked to circulate details to parents and carers. 185 local residents and 45 parents of children attending other schools responded to the consultation, as stated in the report for this meeting.

The report summarises the responses to the consultation. Responses will also be available for the Cabinet Member to refer to at the meeting. Only 121 respondents were current or future users of the schools. Although we recognise the community support for the school, it is not viable with such small take up of places.

If the proposal moves forward to statutory consultation, public notices will be placed in local press to ensure all are aware. Please do advise of any specific email addresses for notification of the statutory consultation, if that would be helpful.

Q4. If information presented proves that figures in the recommendation report are misleading/inaccurate, would you discard these inaccurate figures? Do you accept that the LA pupil planning forecast figures and the housing plans (2017-18) were grossly inaccurate (refer to accurate figures in Long Term GBC future housing forecast in the latest Local Plan)? Do you therefore accept that these figures should not be the basis for the decision about the future need for the school and Ripley CofE should be given more time to explore options?

School place planning has to be looked at across the county and not one area in isolation alone. Across the county projections are within 1% accuracy. However, these are estimates and they are estimates that change regularly as updated data on demographics, housing and pupil migration comes forward.

In the associated paragraph regarding this question (5), the enquirer's basis for inaccuracy of the figures is based on the number of children taking up places in Send and Ripley in September 2017. It should be noted that not only children from Send and Ripley joined the schools in that year, but also children from outside of the area.

A point widely raised in both responses received and at public meetings has concerned the identification of additional housing in the area that will have consequent implications for the demand for school places in the area.

Irrespective of the outcome of the consultation the Council retains the statutory duty to ensure a sufficiency of school places within its boundaries, and this includes providing places to meet the demand of additional housing in an area. If school places were required in the future in the locality, new provision at the existing school site could be explored. As the site has an education covenant its future uses are limited to that extent.

The Council is fully aware of the Wisley development which may come forward, subject to planning permission being granted. As stated in the report for this meeting, the development at Wisley would include a primary school if the development were to proceed. The same is applicable to the potential strategic development Gosden.

Q5. How can a school be issued with a Warning Notice for poor leadership and management and leadership when the LA (in this case SCC/Education Consultants such as Babcock), are responsible for failing to provide the adequate support?

A local Governing Body of any school is responsible for its management. In the case of Ripley school the chair of governors was told a Formal Warning Notice may be issued due to concerns around these duties not being fulfilled adequately and therefore a strategic direction for the school not being established.

Q6. Hypothetically, if a school is under threat of closure and the Diocese refuses to allow a MAT to take the school on, is there anything that the DfE or a local body could do to prevent the school from closing, or does the Church have the final say?

There is a memorandum of understanding between the National Society (Church of England) and the DfE. Within this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) is obliged to consult with the Diocese with regard to any proposed academy sponsor to safeguard the religious character of schools.

Ripley School, as a CofE school within the Diocese of Guildford, falls under these arrangements. The MOU states that there may be circumstances where the RSC or the Diocese regard closure of a school (LA maintained or academy) as the only viable option.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Education
8 May 2018

APPENDIX 2

Cabinet Member for Children and Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services

8 May 2018

LAKERS YOUTH CENTRE PETITION:

‘Help us rebuild our youth centre

On 2 January 2018 Lakers Youth Centre was severely damaged due to a fire. This was a well-used and liked youth centre and accessed by many young people from across Woking. Please support us with our petition’

Submitted by: Sandie Bolger

Signatures: 113

Response:

The Council fully recognises the importance that these community buildings play in generating and providing a social engagement area for encouragement and support to communities. We thank the supporters of this petition which continues to highlight and raise to us as Members the wider role the Council has in supporting local residents.

We are able to advise that there is an ongoing review and establishment of a wider council business case to identify what the potential options are for this site and that working in conjunction with key stakeholders the Council will move swiftly forward with a decision around what the future provision could look like.

Tim Oliver
Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services
8 May 2018

Clare Curran
Cabinet Member for Children
8 May 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE:**

REPORT OF: MRS DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR
COMMUNITY SERVICES

LEAD OFFICERS: JASON RUSSELL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT
AND INFRASTRUCTURE

SUBJECT: PRUDENTIAL RIDELONDON-SURREY 100 & CLASSIC

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

As part of the legacy of the 2012 Olympic Games, the Cabinet approved support for a cycling event, originally the 'Marathon on Wheels', based on the route for the Olympic Road Race events.

The event, the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey Classic and 100 (PRLS) has now taken place annually since the 4 August 2013. Since the start of the event £2.5m has been given to Surrey Sporting and recreational Charities through the London Marathon Trust. A detailed breakdown of beneficiaries is provided in Appendix 1.

Surrey County Council has shown commitment to supporting cycling as an affordable means of transport and as a healthy leisure activity and has published the Surrey Cycle Strategy. The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic events are established as the Olympic legacy cycling event for the County and are seen as supporting this wider strategic direction.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Agree to host the PRLS event in 2020 using a route similar to the previous years to be delivered by the current delivery company, the London-Surrey Cycle Partnership (LSCP) under a one year extension to the current contract.
2. Agrees in principle to continue to collaborate with the Greater London Authority, Transport for London and their delivery partners, to allow planning for events up to 2026. Approval on hosting events from 2021 to 2026 will be sought from Cabinet, following consultation.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

There is a need for both Surrey and London, as the hosting areas, to agree or not to the hosting of the event to be delivered by the LSCP for 2020. This is to allow LSCP to approach the professional cycle teams to open discussions for the London-Surrey Classic. There is a pressing need for this decision because the contract with LSCP expires in 2019 and there is a need to allow them to represent the event in discussions. In addition the Summer of 2020 is a busy period in the sporting calendar due to the

2020 Olympics and Tour de France, and as such there is a need to secure the professional teams for the event.

There is a need for in principle agreement to host the event until 2026 to allow officers to undertake early discussions about possible events beyond 2020 subject to hosting being agreed.

The delegation of the hosting decision from 2021 to 2026 will, if agreed, allow for the subsequent detailed planning of the event with the event organiser.

DETAILS:

1. The continuation of the Prudential London-Surrey 100 and Classic will maintain Surrey's position as a centre for cycling while allowing residents with the opportunity to take part in a world class event and to view professional cycling teams racing in the county. The event has delivered a number of financial benefits to our communities and promotes a health and activity lifestyle. The event promotes cycling as a means of transport with the aim of reducing pollution and car journeys.
2. The event is organised by the London Surrey Cycle partnership (a partnership between the London Marathon Company and Sweetspot Group) on behalf of Surrey County Council and the Mayor of London, with Transport for London holding and managing the contract for the event. The event largely follows the Olympic cycling road race route and is a key part of the UK Olympic legacy. The event comprises a mass participation event, the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and the Prudential RideLondon Classic elite race of 150 professional riders.
3. The event is delivered on a not for profit basis with a charitable trust overseeing the allocation of grants to sporting and recreational charities in Surrey and London. The event is structured to ensure that all event costs are borne by the event organiser. Surrey County Council and other Surrey Partners are not required to provide financial support to the event with input limited to officer time in reviewing event arrangements to ensure that the meet regulatory and safety requirements.
4. Surrey County Council has adopted an Events Policy that requires liaison with Local Members before permissions for associated road closures will be granted. The Policy only allows a given section of road to be closed on one occasion per year for an event.
5. Divisional Councillors have been contacted to gain their view for the continuation of the event. Nine councillors replied with six supporting the continuation of the event, two councillors against and one councillor was neither for nor against.
6. During the period of consultation with County Council Members around 417 resident contacts were made to the Surrey County Council Events email account. The collated responses are attached with the report. The response showed the following:
 - 417 responses
 - 125 (30%) for the event continuing
 - 187 (45%) against it continuing
 - 125 (22%) change route
 - 14 (3%) either complaining about cycling in general or not consulting

7. Of those against or seeking to change the route it is not possible to distinguish between those who object to the road closure and those that object to the associated increase in cyclists and cycling as many site both in their responses. There are broadly 4 issues that have been raised in objection:

- 1 – No consultation with residents
- 2 – Unhappy with road closures
- 3 – Unhappy with the increase in cyclists
- 4 – Saw no benefit to businesses or residents

8. Those in support cited:

- 1 - Closed roads being peaceful / no traffic for a day
- 2 - Enjoy watching the event
- 3 – Community feel / events taking place
- 4 – Raising money for charity
- 5 – Promoting the area
- 6 – Promoting cycling / healthy lifestyle.

9. It is estimated that around 2500 Surrey residents take part in the event each year. The event does receive complaints from local residents and the following shows the complaints and compliments that have been received for the event.

10. Since the first event the following complaints have been received:

	Complaints	Comments	Compliments
2013	41*	0	0
2014	16	0	0
2015	15	0	0
2016	15	1	0
2017	27**	13	4

*Data collated by County Complaints- 8 of these 41 complaints appear to refer to cycling events in general, without specific mention of RideLondon-Surrey noted.

** 2017 saw an increase in complaints due to a delay in the road reopening at Hampton Court Bridge.

11. The record of complaints does not included those sent directly to local members that were not forward to Surrey County Council.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

12. The event organiser will oversee the operational and strategic risks relating to the event.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

13. The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey has been established as Surrey's Olympic legacy event. The County Council and partners will support event planning with officer time to review plans and arrangements put in place by the event

organiser. All costs with the exception of officer time are borne by the event organiser.

14. The event is designed as a 'not for profit' enterprise with the aim of offering the opportunity to generate income for charities. Since the start of the event £2.5m has been given to Surrey Sporting and recreational Charities through the London Marathon Trust.
15. In 2014 Surrey was given an additional £242K through the Queen Elizabeth II Fields Challenge which was used to protect 49 Fields. The Fund was successful in facilitating the protection of Queen Elizabeth II Fields and enabling improvements to the facilities.
16. A detailed study was undertaken in the first two years of the event (2013-2014) which showed spending by the spectators and participants in Surrey to be £7,347,030 (2013) and £10,414,024 (2014). The study was undertaken using standard measures used for events of this type and followed the same methodology used for the London sections of the route.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

17. The event organisers will pay for all costs in relation to the event, for example road closures and diversions, with the exception of officer time.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

18. The general power of competence contained in Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 enables the Council to do anything which an individual may do. Such power would include the ability to promote and support sporting events in the county and across its borders and to devote officers' time to act accordingly. Cabinet will need to satisfy itself that it is reasonable to do so from public funds, taking into account the financial implications and any anticipated benefits such as economic development and public health.
19. The Council has the power to make "Special Events Orders" under sections 16A and 16B of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. A Special Events Order restricts or prohibits traffic on the public highway for the purposes of facilitating a relevant event. They can only be made if it is not reasonably practicable for the relevant event to be held otherwise than on a road. The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey is a relevant event. It should be noted that Section 16B(6) stipulates that where a Special Events Order under Section 16A has been made, no further order under such section may be made relating to the same length of road in the same calendar year, unless it is made with the consent of the Secretary of State. Additional traffic regulation orders may need to be made to other roads to facilitate the safety of the public during the events.
20. The public sector equality duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 applies to the decision to be made by Cabinet. There is a requirement when deciding upon the recommendations to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for people with protected characteristics, foster good relations between such groups and eliminate any unlawful discrimination. These matters are dealt with in the equalities and diversity paragraph of the report and the accompanying Equalities Impact Assessment.

21. Legal Services will be instructed to agree the various contractual arrangements which need to be put in place to implement the event (including those with other local authorities and third party sponsors) and any measures needed to ensure the health and safety of residents arising as a consequence.

Equalities and Diversity

22. An Equalities Impact Assessment (EQiA) has been carried out as part of the development of the Surrey Cycling Strategy. The EQiA includes consideration of the impact of major events on equalities groups.
23. The Event organiser will undertake an EQiA of the event as part of their commitment to the event delivery.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

24. Road closures could have access implications for vulnerable groups and their carers. The event organisers are reviewing reported access issues and putting in place emergency and critical service access arrangements. There will also be extensive engagement and communication with local residents about the road closures and access arrangements.

Public Health implications

25. The Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy identifies physical activity as an important element of tackling and preventing ill-health.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

On agreement with Cabinet the following actions will be taken forward,

- Detailed planning for the delivery of the 2020 will be included alongside the work for the 2018 and 2019 events
- Work will commence to provide the reports required for the decision making of the Executive Director Highways, Transport and Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Communities, Highways, and Environment and Transport concerning hosting the event from 2021 to 2026

Contact Officer: Ian Good, Head of Emergency Management Tel: 020 8541 9168

Consulted:

Surrey County Council members & officers
Borough and District Council members & officers

Annexes:

Annex 1 - LMCT funded projects in Surrey

Sources/background papers:

Framework for co-ordinating and approving events on Surrey's Highway
(https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0018/32760/Framework-for-coordination-of-events-on-the-highway-v1.4.pdf)

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix One - LMCT Funind projects in Surrey

Year	Project	Borough/District	Amount
2013	New changing rooms at Sutherland Memorial Park FOR Guildford Youth Project	GBC	12,000
	Additional gym equipment at Leatherhead & Dorking Gymnastics Club	MVDC	31,000
	All-weather surface and new equipment for Capel Village play area	MVDC	23,000
	MUGA at Kingston Meadow for East Horsley Parish Council	GBC	50,000
	New dormitory building for Girlguiding Surrey East	Not Known	100,000
	Re-equipment of playground at Broome Close, Headley	MVDC	12,000
	New play structure at Challengers, Stoke Park	GBC	7,085
	MUGA at Queen Elizabeth Gardens, Horsell	GBC	50,000
	New community sports pavilion at Capel Cricket Club	MVDC	50,000
	New 3G synthetic grass pitch at Leatherhead Youth FC	MVDC	50,000
	Refurbishment of playground, Abinger	GBC	25,000
2014	Rebuilding of Charlwood Pavilion	RBBC	39,800
	Construction of a skatepark on former recycling site in Brockham	RBBC	45,000
	Resurfacing of the athletics track and creation of a landing area for discus and shot at Holland Sports Athletics Club	TDC	25,000
	Creation of an outdoor gym at Horley Recreation Ground	RBBC	10,000
	Installation of outdoor gym equipment at Hollowdene Recreation Ground	WDC	8,000
	Complete renovation of the track, Runnymede Rockets BMX Club	RBC	50,000
	Replacement of the drainage system for Abinger Cricket Club	GBC	12,000
	Extension and refurbishment of the clubhouse at Byfleet Cricket Club	WBC	35,000
	Creation of a new kayak store and purchase of additional boats at Guildford Waterside Centre	GBC	50,000
	Creation of a new cricket pavilion and scout hut at Newdigate Cricket Club	MVDC	70,000
	Refurbishment of showers and toilets at Oakwood Hill Cricket Club	MVDC	5,000
	Towards the resurfacing of the community tennis courts in Ewhurst which will host a range of local and neighbouring residents and community clubs.	WDC	6,687
2015	Towards the replacement of playground equipment, surfacing and fencing at Mickleham playground, a key facility for residents of three local villages.	MVDC	19,999
	Towards an automated watering system for a new outdoor bowling green at Ripley Bowling Club, which will improve the quality of participation opportunities offered by the club.	WBC	11,000
	Towards a new Girlguiding residential building in Westcott, Surrey, (replacing an expired grant previously awarded in 2013) which will support the delivery of a range of physical activity and sport participation opportunities to children of varying ages.	MVDC	100,000
	Towards a new skate park at Kingston Meadow in East Horsley, for the benefit of the local community, particularly children and young people.	GBC	10,000
	Towards an accessible piazza shooting range and perimeter fencing at Guildford Archery Club.	GBC	14,441
	Towards perimeter fencing for a well-used floodlit 3G artificial turf pitch at Fullbrook School, New Haw.	WBC	10,000
	Towards a new gymnastics facility in The Bishop Wand Church of England School for Spelthorne Gymnastics, Sunbury on Thames, in order to offer a diverse range of participation opportunities for children and young people.	SBC	250,000
	Loan for the above over 10 years	SBC	200,000
	Towards the purchase and installation of an artificial cricket wicket for Claygate Cricket Club, Surrey, to enable the Club to meet capacity demand due to their expanding junior section, junior female section and Kwik cricket.	EBC	8,000
	Towards the replacement of an un-safe wall surrounding a well-used small pool on a school site in Dorking, allowing the facility to be re-opened to the public.	MVDC	12,000
	Towards the creation of a new Inclusive Sports Facility at YMCA East Surrey's Redhill site, which will provide a wide range of fully accessible and affordable participation opportunities for people with a broad spectrum of disabilities and additional needs.	RBBC	350,000
	Towards the development of a new Thames-side training centre in Elmbridge, Surrey, which will provide a larger, more accessible, flood-proof building which can support a variety of water-based and regular sports and physical activities for the benefit of a broad spectrum of the local community.	EBC	75,000
2016			

2017	Towards improvements to the indoor riding school at Casi's Farm in Cranleigh, Surrey, which will safeguard the future of one of only two Riding for the Disabled Association facilities in the county and allow the continuation and expansion of a popular riding programme which benefits people with disabilities and additional needs who otherwise would not take part in any sport and physical activity.	WDC	150,000
	Towards the redesign and refurbishment of a well-used skate park at Kingston Road Recreation Ground in Surrey to provide physical activities for older teenagers and young adults in the area.	MVDC	19,999
	Towards the resurfacing of two tennis courts to enable the Bagshot & Crawley Rise Tennis Club to continue to encourage and support those who are inactive to take up tennis.	SHBC	20,000
	Towards the installation of floodlights for two tennis courts at Coopers Hill in Surrey to encourage and support children and adults to participate in regular physical activity year round.	RBC	18,000
	Towards the creation of a new accessible boat house at the Staines Boat Club site in order to secure the long term future of the club and allow it to offer a wider range of water-based and land-based physical activity opportunities which get the local community involved in rowing and more active.	SBC	110,150
	Towards a clubhouse extension at West End Bowls Club in Surrey Heath to enable the club and othe local organisations to offer year round short mat bowls and a range of other low impact exercise classes aimed at getting older people from the local community more physically active.	SHBC	100,000
	Towards the development of a new full size floodlit artificial turf pitch at Abbey Rangers Football Club in Addlestone, enabling a successful community football club and a new secondary school to work in partnership to offer a wide range of year-round participation opportunities to the local community, including coaching programmes for children and young people, a walking football programme aimed at physically inactive people and an expansion of the club's offer to women and girls and people with a disability.	RBC	75,000
	Towards refurbishment of an ageing clubhouse and the installation of a new accessible toliet, which will particularly support the engagement of children and young people, women and girls, and people with a disability in the club's successful cricket programme.	Not Known	43,000
	Towards a new self-contained female changing room which will significantly improve the participation experience of women and girls at the club and allow the expansion of a successful female community rugby programme.	Not Known	30,000
	Towards the creation of a 90km network of off road cycle trails in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to support and encourage people of all ages and ability to get active using easy to access routes free of charge, through signage of existing bridleways and byways where there is a legal right to cycle.	Not Known	19,000
			£2,512,161

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 29 MAY 2018****REPORT OF: HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SUPPORT****LEAD OFFICER: LOUISE FOOTNER, HEAD OF COMMUNICATIONS****SUBJECT: AWARD OF CALL OFF CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF PRINT MANAGEMENT SERVICES****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report seeks approval for the Council to award a call off contract to Corporate Document Services (CDS) for the provision of Print Management Services to commence on 1 August 2018.

The Council operates a 'digital by default' approach to communications but has a need to print a range of publicity materials from leaflets and booklets to exhibition materials and consultation questionnaires.

This information is aimed at residents and people who use services provided by the Council for the following purposes:

- a. To inform of services the Council is providing (for example, a new Adult Social Care (ASC) online portal, care leavers pack, information for anyone suffering from domestic abuse);
- b. Where the Council is looking to make changes to existing services and is seeking feedback/input (for example, flooding, ASC charging, highways major schemes);
- c. To encourage changes in their behaviour (for example, recycle more, stop smoking, become a foster carer).

This report outlines the procurement process, including the results of the evaluation process. When considered in conjunction with the Part 2 report, it demonstrates why the recommended contract award will deliver value for money, quality and brand consistency across all areas of print.

Due to the commercial sensitivity involved in the contract award process, the names of the bidders and their financial details have been circulated as a Part 2 report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. A call off contract is awarded to CDS for two years from 1 August 2018 with the option to extend for two periods of one year. Over the maximum term of the call off contract (4 years), the anticipated value is £1.5m (approximately £375,000 per annum).

2. The Council will work with CDS over the life of the call off contract to look at ways to standardise, rationalise and aggregate the Council's printing requirements, to reduce costs. In some areas the Council will also look to reduce and remove elements of the printed business stationery.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The current contract is due to expire on 31 July 2018.

As there is an ongoing need to deliver these services, a new call off contract has been procured through a national framework.

A thorough evaluation process has identified awarding the call off contract to CDS will provide the Council with the best value for money.

DETAILS:

Business Case

1. The Council has maintained a contract for a fully managed print service to provide information to residents and people who use services provided by the Council (see Summary of Issue section above).
2. The main users of the contract are the Corporate Communications team, Property Services and the Adult Learning department.

Background and Options

3. Several options were considered in the Strategic Sourcing Plan and presented and approved by the Sourcing Governance Board on 20 March 2018.
4. A mini-competition process under Lot 2 for Tailored Managed Print Solutions of the Crown Commercial Service (CCS) Managed Print & Digital Solutions Framework (Ref. RM3785) was deemed most appropriate and selected because:
 - a. The Council could seek to obtain a best value and innovative solution from suppliers who have been pre-vetted and qualified as demonstrating a high level of technical ability and value for money by the CCS;
 - b. The framework route would allow the Council access to a list of potential suppliers with the ability to develop strategic relationships and who will use their expertise and guidance to drive savings;
 - c. There is potential for cost savings through standardisation, rationalisation and aggregation of demand under a national framework;
 - d. The transparent price model on the framework provides competitive paper pricing and rate cards with maximum rates;

- e. The Council could access a managed print solution where the successful supplier would manage the operational delivery of print requirements including supply chain sourcing and management;
- f. Social value considerations and social value evaluation criteria could be incorporated within the RFQ documents.

Tender Process

- 5. The Council published the mini-competition process on 12 April 2018 issuing the request for quotation (RFQ) documents to all six suppliers on the CCS framework.
- 6. All six suppliers expressed an interest in the mini-competition opportunity. Three suppliers submitted responses to the RFQ, which were evaluated against the criteria and weightings described in the Part 2 report.
- 7. A procurement and project team was set up to include representatives from the Corporate Communications team, Property Services and Adult Learning.
- 8. Bidders were scored based on most economically advantageous tender including price and technical elements.

Benefits of the Contract

- 9. The contract offers the following benefits to the Council:
 - a. Management of a robust supply chain to provide responsiveness, flexibility and scalability to the printing needs;
 - b. Increased control and delivery of brand consistency on all areas of print;
 - c. Printed material sourced via the most appropriate route to drive cost efficiencies and value for money;
 - d. A knowledgeable and experienced supplier to offer advice and challenge the best strategy for individual print jobs.
- 10. The contract offers the following benefits to the local and wider economy and environment:
 - a. Helping to improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of Surrey via the implementation and utilisation of a Surrey based supply chain, where available and cost effective;
 - b. Improve the local economy by sourcing a supplier who would provide social value to the local economy (see paragraph 20 for a summary of Social Value benefits offered by CDS);
 - c. Wherever possible, minimising the carbon footprint of each print job;
 - d. Promoted through the supply chain the use of environmentally friendly materials and practices; recycled and renewable sources of supply;

and the safe disposal of waste materials used in the production of finished goods;

- e. Paper stock that is WWF Timber Pledge (or equivalent) (for organisations seeking to buy all wood from sustainable sources by 2020).

11. Social value considerations and social value evaluation criteria were incorporated within the RFQ documents. Bidders were asked to commit to the delivery of additional social, economic and environmental benefits over and above the core service outcomes outlined in the specification. CDS has offered a number of social value benefits as part of their bid, including:

- a. 60% of the contract spend will be allocated to Surrey-based suppliers;
- b. Adoption of a supply chain model that establishes Surrey-based suppliers as 'preferred suppliers';
- c. All current Surrey-based suppliers are small and medium enterprises;
- d. Working with the Council to consider other Surrey-based suppliers for inclusion;
- e. Monetary contributions to agreed charities;
- f. Monetary support for a social value related event.
- g. Agree a plan with the Council to identify and support a Surrey-based charity;
- h. Agree with the Council to hold an event that adds to the Social Value initiative;
- i. Offer support to any social enterprises/Non-Government Organisations/schools, etc. who may benefit from CDS undertaking appropriate workshops or other sessions;
- j. Encourage, monitor and measure best Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practice by their suppliers;
- k. Support Apprenticeship opportunities for Surrey residents.

Key Implications

- 12. The call off contract is for the period from 1 August 2018 to 31 July 2022 (including two one year extension periods).
- 13. The CCS framework and call off contract set out the terms and conditions under which specific purchases known as "call-offs" can be made on behalf of the Council during the term of the call off contract.
- 14. Contract performance will be monitored through a series of robust key performance indicators as detailed in the call off contract and reviewed at performance review meetings.

15. The management responsibility for the call off contract lies with the Corporate Communications team and Property Services and will be managed in line with the contract management strategy as laid out in the call off contract which also provides for review of performance and costs via benchmarking.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

16. The RFQ documents were prepared jointly by representatives from Orbis Procurement, the Corporate Communications team and Property Services.
17. The CCS framework and call off contract have been reviewed by Orbis Procurement and Orbis Public Law.
18. Key risks associated with the call off contract have been identified, along with mitigation activities.
19. The call off contract terms and conditions include various termination clauses such as a termination without cause clause, which will allow the Council to terminate the call off contract for any reason should priorities/requirements change.
20. Whilst this is a call off contract, there are no guaranteed volumes or spend set within the call off contract.
21. The call off contract will include a non-exclusivity clause, which means that the Council will have the ability to purchase the services outside of the contract if required.
22. All bidders provided complete and compliant RFQ submissions.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

23. Full details of the call off contract value and financial implications are set out in the Part 2 report. Over the maximum term of the call off contract (4 years), the anticipated value is £1.5m (approximately £375,000 per annum).
24. As part of the mini-competition process, bidders were required to price a basket of goods for bespoke printing and a basket of goods for printed business stationery. The Corporate Communications team have advised that the pricing for bespoke printing may change year on year owing to a number of influences such as timescales/deadlines; fluctuations in the market; and paper prices. The basket of goods offers a snapshot of costs at a moment in time in order for the mini-competition to be priced but it is likely prices will fluctuate throughout the life of the call off contract. However, the CCS framework provides competitive paper pricing and rate cards with maximum rates.
25. It is anticipated that the call off contract will deliver a solution with savings through economies of scale; maximum rates on the CCS rate card; ongoing cost avoidance savings from reductions in volumes; and a requirement for the successful bidder to scrutinise the Council's work requests to ensure the most cost effective solution is utilised.

26. The call off contract sets out clear performance objectives and key performance indicators stating reporting requirements and the service levels to be delivered along with benchmarking to be conducted by the Council/supplier.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

27. The Section 151 Officer (Chief Finance Officer) confirms that all material, financial and business issues and risks have been considered/addressed. This contract provides for the ongoing print management requirements of the county. The recommended bidder was selected following a competitive tender exercise in order to secure value for money. The expected value is within the approved MTFP budget. The contract does not commit to any minimum levels of expenditure so the authority will benefit from any future reductions in activity levels.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

28. Under Section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 1999 the Council is under a general duty to “make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness”. In meeting this duty, in addition to achieving monetary savings, the proposed contract will support the further economic development of the county through its local small and medium enterprises (SME) supply chain requirements.
29. The Council is required to act transparently in its purchasing and must adhere to the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (the PCRs) and the Council’s own Procurement Standing Orders (the PSOs) for securing best value. The proposed contract is a call off from a CCS framework and the first placed bidder’s tender has been scored as the most economically advantageous for the Council. This route to market is in compliance with the requirements of the PCRs and the PSOs.

Equalities and Diversity

30. There is no requirement for an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as there are no implications for any public sector equalities duty due to the nature of the services being procured. However, all suppliers are required to comply with the Equalities Act 2010 and any relevant codes issued by the Equality and Humans Commission. In addition, the successful bidder was required to agree to the call off contract terms and conditions which included provisions for the Equalities Act 2010. The successful bidder accepted the terms and conditions.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

31. The timetable for implementation is as follows:

Action	Date
Cabinet decision to award	29 May 2018
Cabinet 5 day ‘call in’ period	7 June 2018
‘Alcatel’ Standstill Period	11 June to 21 June 2018
Contract Signature	29 June 2018
Contract Commencement Date	1 August 2018

32. Although the Council does not have an obligation to run an 'Alcatel' standstill period (which allows unsuccessful bidders the opportunity to challenge the proposed contract award) under a mini-competition process, it is best procurement practice and therefore, an 'Alcatel' standstill period will take place.

CONTACT DETAILS:**Contact Officer:**

Laura Hughes, Procurement Manager, 07815 548 950

Consulted:

Orbis Procurement
Orbis Public Law
Corporate Communications
Property Services
Adult Learning

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

DATE: 29 MAY 2018



REPORT OF: MR DAVID HODGE CBE, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

LEAD OFFICER: SHEILA LITTLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

SUBJECT: CAPITAL CARRY FORWARD REQUESTS FROM 2017/18 AND FINANCE POSITION STATEMENT AS AT 30 APRIL 2018

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report proposes the level of 2017/18 capital programme carry forwards to be considered following deferral of this decision from the April Cabinet meeting.

It also provides an early summary assessment of the Council's financial position for 2018/19, highlighting initial indications of variations to assumptions since the Medium Term Financial Plan was prepared as well as emerging issues, risks and areas of concern.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Cabinet is asked to approve:

1. The capital carry forward requests as detailed in Annex 1 Appendix A.

Cabinet is asked to note the following:

1. The Corporate Leadership Team has reviewed the savings areas identified for 2018/19 with particular focus on those where there is the lowest confidence level of achievability.
2. The business cases for the flexible use of capital receipts to support the 2018/19 budget have been reviewed by the Investment Panel.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

To confirm the level of capital carry forward requests from 2017/18 and to provide an early, high level assessment and update of the financial position faced by the Council for 2018/19 for Cabinet to note, approve and action as necessary.

DETAILS:

Revenue and capital budget background

1. Surrey County Council set its budget and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) in early February 2018 within the context of rising demand and cost pressures, most notably in social care and with over seven years of cuts to Government funding.

2. To balance its 2018/19 budget, the Council needs to achieve £66m savings and efficiencies and apply a significant amount of one off resources at a level which is not repeatable in future years, including flexible use of capital receipts to fund £15m of costs associated with transforming service delivery. Consequently, to reduce costs to achieve a sustainable budget in future years, the Council has begun a programme to significantly transform services further.
3. The Council's capital programme over the coming three years is over £300m, including £144m in 2018/19. This major investment in Surrey's infrastructure and economy is focused on the growth in pupil numbers and the importance residents place on good roads and services. A number of projects from the 2017/18 financial year continue to support these aims and the funding to achieve this is requested to be carried forward from last year.
4. Annex 1 to this report provides further details on these three areas

CONSULTATION:

5. All Cabinet Members will have consulted their relevant Executive Director or Head of Service on the financial positions of their portfolios.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

6. Risk implications are stated throughout the report and each relevant Executive Director or Head of Service has updated their strategic and or service risk registers accordingly. In addition, the leadership risk register continues to reflect the increasing uncertainty of the Council's future funding.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

7. The report considers financial and value for money implications throughout and future reports monitoring the budget will continue this focus.

SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY

8. The Section 151 Officer confirms the information presented in this report is based on reasonable assumptions, taking into account all material, financial and business issues and risks.
9. The Council has a duty to ensure its expenditure does not exceed resources available. In 2018/19, the Council must deliver £66m planned savings and take significant steps towards transforming services to move towards a sustainable budget for future years. All services must deliver existing MTFP efficiencies and service reductions in MTFP 2018-21, or suitable alternatives, monitor their demand and cost pressures and, develop plans to mitigate the impact of those pressures.
10. The Executive Director of Finance has stated the Council's planned use of reserves in 2018/19 will take them below the minimum appropriate levels and will need to consider very closely replenishing these reserves as part of the next Medium Term Financial Planning process.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER

11. The Local Government Finance Act requires the Council to take steps to ensure that the Council's expenditure (that is expenditure incurred already in year and anticipated to be incurred) does not exceed the resources available. Cabinet should be aware that if the Section 151 Officer, at any time, is not satisfied that appropriate strategies and controls are in place to manage expenditure within the in-year budget she must formally draw this to the attention of the Cabinet and County Council and they must take immediate steps to ensure a balanced in-year budget.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

12. Any impacts of the budget monitoring actions will be evaluated by the individual services as they implement the management actions necessary and appropriate formal consultations with stakeholders undertaken in advance of implementation.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

13. The relevant adjustments from the recommendations will be made to the Council's budgets and accounts.
 14. Services will prepare formal consultations with stakeholders to be carried out ahead of implementation.
-

Contact Officer:

Kevin Kilburn, Deputy Chief Finance Officer, Tel: 020 8541 9207

Consulted:

Cabinet, executive directors, heads of service.

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Finance Position Statement May 2018

Sources/background papers:

None

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 29 MAY 2018****REPORT OF: MRS DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES****LEAD OFFICER: RUSSELL PEARSON, CHIEF FIRE OFFICER****SUBJECT: PURCHASE OF FIRE APPLIANCES****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) has carried out a review of its fleet of fire appliances and identified the need for a planned replacement programme.

Whilst the review has provisionally identified a requirement for a minimum of 18 new fire appliances over a 10 year period, further detailed work is required to develop a business case for the full replacement programme.

However, to meet the immediate operational need, Cabinet approval is sought to award a contract and purchase two appliances now. This is from a flexible contract which enables up to 30 to be purchased with no minimum commitment, enabling the number of appliances ordered to be adjusted subject to future service requirements and financial affordability.

Investment Panel has scrutinised the proposal, and the capital budget has been approved as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan and will be reviewed on an annual basis.

This report provides details of the procurement process to award a contract for the purchase of fire appliances, including the results of the evaluation process, and in conjunction with the Part 2 report, demonstrates why the recommended contract offers best value for money.

Due to the commercial sensitivity involved in the contracts award process, the names and financial details of all tenderers have been circulated as a confidential Part 2 report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that :

1. Cabinet approves the award of a flexible contract to Rosenbauer UK Ltd, which enables up to 30 fire appliances to be purchased over a 10-year period, but has no minimum commitment.

2. Cabinet authorises the purchase of two fire appliances from Rosenbauer UK Ltd now, with the purchase of additional appliances subject to Cabinet approval of a detailed business case.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The SFRS fire appliance fleet requires a planned investment programme for service delivery to remain ensured and cost effective.

A full tender process compliant with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and Procurement Standing Orders for the purchase of fire appliances has been completed. A tender offer which provides the best value for money was selected. Rosenbauer UK Ltd offered the best value for money in a competitive tender as recommended on the basis set out in the Part 2 report.

DETAILS:

1. The objective of this project is to replace ageing appliances that support the SFRS fire appliance strategy and delivery of the SFRS. Surrey currently has 40 operational fire appliances (reduced from 47 vehicles over recent years).
2. Fire appliances are provided by specialist contractors, of which there are a limited number in the UK. Historically within Surrey the contracts have been secured directly with these specialist contractors.
3. Front line operational life of fire appliances is informed by National Standards directed by the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) Transport Officer Group. The current guidance on modern fire appliances is that they have 15 years' operational life.
4. There are 16 existing operational Volvo appliances which were built by Saxon Coachworks (who are no longer in business) that have exceeded their operational life. Existing appliances also have considerably fewer safety features, higher maintenance requirements, higher fuel consumption, and environmentally unacceptable engines (Euro 3), producing exhaust emissions that generate charges when entering the London Low Emission Zone, more than their modern equivalents. Whilst this does not mean they need to be taken out of service, there is need to replace two appliances this financial year.
5. All retired appliances will eventually be sold through a controlled market due to security and terrorist considerations. Each appliance is estimated to be sold for between £3,000 and £5,000 each.
6. New appliances incorporate the latest technology and safety systems to meet current EU/UK standards. These features include Euro 6 engines which meet current emission standards which came into force in 2014. The introduction of electronic stability controls, advanced emergency braking systems and enhanced roll over protection has been incorporated. The new design also reduces the risk of cross contamination of equipment and personnel and further reduces manual handling risks. Other features include the uplift of current on-board water capacity and the introduction of modern, more efficient fire pumps. The Service is continuing to look into the future provision of alternative fuels, including electric vehicles. During the summer, the

Service will be conducting further trials of this new technology with the marketplace.

Contract Award

7. Six procurement options were considered:
 1. Open OJEU tender
 2. A mini-competition using the Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation (YPO) framework agreement
 3. The Consortium Fire and Rescue
 4. National Fire Chiefs Council
 5. Welsh Framework
 6. Do nothing
8. The preferred option was to purchase through the Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation who have already been through an extensive vetting OJEU procedure. Leasing was rejected following a recent tendering exercise comparing the leasing and purchase costs on other SFRS vehicles, which established leasing has an estimated 20% uplift in costs.
9. Purchasing the vehicles through The Consortium would incur a surcharge of 1.6% of the total cost of the vehicles, which far outweighed the internal costs of EU tendering and so was also rejected.
10. National Fire Chiefs Council (formerly Chief Fire Officers' Association) did not have a framework in place at the time we went to market.
11. The Welsh Framework is primarily written for Welsh Authorities.
12. Doing nothing was not an option as the fire appliances are required for Surrey County Council to discharge its legal obligations under the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004.
13. The building of the vehicles takes between 12 and 15 months, from the date of order. The chassis, body maintenance and day to day running repairs of the whole vehicle, will be undertaken by SFRS. The supplier has guaranteed chassis parts for 20 years.
14. The competitive tender was carried out between January and June 2017 on the basis that a maximum of 30 fire appliances could be called off from this contract, however, without a minimum guaranteed number of appliances to be ordered. The maximum duration of the contract is 10 years which is split into an initial period of four years and optional extension by six years. The contract provides for flexibility to respond to client requirements and to changes in law over the course of the contract. The contract enables the manufacturer of the fire appliances to offer up to date designs and solutions for the appliances which will be ordered through the contract in the future. There is no a minimum guaranteed number of fire appliances to be ordered from this contract. The use of a single supplier will provide standardisation of appliances and as a result improves quality of build and reduces maintenance costs and training requirements.

15. In order to respond to immediate requirements of the replacement programme, two initial appliances were ordered from the successful tenderer in July 2017 in accordance with the requirements and approval process of the Procurement Standing Orders.

CONSULTATION:

16. As part of the marketing and procurement analysis, Surrey County Council (SCC) reviewed the opportunity to collaborate with neighbouring local fire authorities, but none of these Fire & Rescue Services (FRSs) were in a position to tender at that time.
17. Three suppliers returned a tender and were evaluated to ensure they had the legal, financial and technical capacity (including their health and safety and equal opportunities policies) to undertake the contract.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

18. The following key risks associated with the contract and contract award have been identified, along with mitigation activities.

Category	Risk Description	Mitigation Activity
Financial	Failure to adhere to adequate fire appliance strategy and capital replacement programmes could result in litigious claims against the County Council should systems performance be seen as a contributory factor in personal injury, fatality, or loss of trade.	Quality, specialist contractor appointed through robust contract procurement exercise. Regular contract performance meetings to ensure adherence to works programmes and agree recovery actions if required.
Reputational	Successful supplier does not have necessary skills, experience and technical knowledge to satisfactorily complete the elements of the contract. There is an increased risk as the existing appliances get older that they may become unusable and this will impact on the service's operational strategies and could be seen as a contributory factor in personal injury.	Tender process included 60% quality element towards overall contract award. Replacement with new vehicles through a quality, specialist contractor, following a thorough contract procurement exercise. Regular contract performance meetings to ensure adherence to works programmes and agree recovery actions if required.
Financial	Not purchasing the vehicles will lead to significant increases in revenue costs to deal with higher maintenance costs, the replacement of major component parts and poor fuel efficiency. The existing vehicles have environmentally unacceptable engines producing exhaust emissions that generate charges	New vehicles will provide improved value for money by reducing the need for major repairs, and reduced maintenance costs. The new fire appliance specifications more closely match those used by our neighbouring fire and rescue

	when entering the London Low Emission Zone.	services, increasing the potential for inter-operability. Training costs will be reduced through vehicle standardisation, and reduction in road shock damage costs and road wear through the use of air suspension.
--	---	--

Financial and Value for Money Implications

19. Full details of the contract value and financial implications are set out in the Part 2 report.
20. Benchmarking information will be shared with the South East Fire Services Procurement Group.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

21. The current 2018-21 Medium Term Financial plan has a capital budget allocation to purchase two appliances per year.
22. This contract provides the option to purchase up to 30 appliances over a 10 year period, with no minimum commitment. This provides the ability to adjust the number of appliances ordered subject to service requirements and financial affordability.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

23. Surrey County Council is the fire and rescue authority for the county by virtue of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 (the Act). The Council is under a duty in Section 7 of the Act, among others things, to extinguish fires and protect life and property in the event of fires in its area. In discharging this function the Council must “secure the provision of the personnel, services and equipment necessary efficiently to meet all normal requirements”.
24. The procurement of goods or services by the Council is governed by the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council’s own Procurement Standing Orders. The competitive exercise set out in this report complies with these requirements and secures the most economically advantageous tender for the Council.
25. Cabinet will want to satisfy itself that the proposed arrangements provide adequate safeguards for residents while also maintaining its fiduciary duty to secure a balanced budget for the Council.

Equalities and Diversity

26. All equipment to be used includes the appropriate additional facilities and design standards, as nationally specified. The new appliances’ body stowage systems have been designed for use by a diverse workforce with facilities to minimise manual handling injuries.

27. There is no requirement for an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as there are no implications for any public sector equalities duty due to the nature of the goods being procured. However the contractor will be required to comply with the Equalities Act 2010 and any relevant codes issued by the Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Environmental sustainability implications

28. The new vehicles will meet the current European vehicle emission standards for Euro 6 which will be the new standard for entry to the LEZ (London Low Emission Zone) from April 2019.

Public health implications

29. The new vehicles will meet the current European vehicle emission standards for Euro 6 which will have a beneficial impact on public health by improving air quality.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

Following approval of the award of the contract for the long-term replacement programme, an order for two appliances will be placed in May 2018.

A briefing to Cabinet regarding the future vehicle strategy will follow within four months.

Contact Officers:

Steve Owen-Hughes – Assistant Chief Fire Officer 01737 733613
 Artur Krzyzanski – Strategic Procurement Manager 020 8541 8080
 Peter Simmonds – Procurement Manager 0208 541 9936

Consulted:

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
 Orbis Procurement Service
 Surrey Legal Services and Surrey Finance
 East Sussex Fire Service
 West Sussex Fire Service

Annexes:

Confidential Part 2 paper

Sources/background papers:

- None
-

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank