



We're on Twitter:  
[@SCCdemocracy](https://twitter.com/SCCdemocracy)



Agenda and Reports

**THE COUNTY COUNCIL BUDGET MEETING**

to be held on

**6 FEBRUARY 2018**

(i)

County Hall  
Kingston upon Thames  
Surrey

Friday, 26 January 2018

TO THE MEMBERS OF SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

## SUMMONS TO MEETING

You are hereby summoned to attend the meeting of the Council to be held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, on Tuesday, 6 February 2018, beginning at 10.00 am, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda set out overleaf.

JULIE FISHER  
Acting Chief Executive

**Note 1:** *For those Members wishing to participate, Prayers will be said at 9.50am. Reverend Jane Vlach from the Church of St Peter & St Paul, Godalming has kindly consented to officiate. If any Members wish to take time for reflection, meditation, alternative worship or other such practice prior to the start of the meeting, alternative space can be arranged on request by contacting Democratic Services.*

*There will be a very short interval between the conclusion of Prayers and the start of the meeting to enable those Members and Officers who do not wish to take part in Prayers to enter the Council Chamber and join the meeting.*

**Note 2:** *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.*

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print or braille, or another language please either call Democratic Services on 020 8541 9122, or write to Democratic Services, Surrey County Council at Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 9698, fax 020 8541 9009, or email [joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk)

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Democratic Services on 0208 541 9122

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Chairman to report apologies for absence.

**2 MINUTES**

(Pages 1  
- 16)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 5 December 2017.

*(Note: the Minutes, including the appendices, will be laid on the table half an hour before the start of the meeting).*

**3 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(Pages  
17 - 20)

The Chairman to report.

A list of Her Majesty the Queen's New Year Honour's List 2018 is included within the agenda papers.

**4 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.

**5 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2018/19 TO 2020/21 / UPDATED CORPORATE STRATEGY / TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Report to follow.

**6 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME**

The Leader of the Council or the appropriate Member of the Cabinet or the Chairman of a Committee to answer any questions on any matter relating to the powers and duties of the County Council, or which affects the county.

**(Note: Notice of questions in respect of the above item on the agenda must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Democratic Services by 12 noon on Wednesday 31 January 2018).**

**7 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

Any Member may make a statement at the meeting on a local issue of current or future concern.

**(Note: Notice of statements must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Democratic Services by 12 noon on Monday 5 February 2018).**

**8 REPORT OF THE CABINET**

Report to follow.

**9 REPORT OF THE AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

(Pages  
21 - 46)

To approve the inclusion of the updated Counter Fraud Strategy and Framework (Annex A of the report) in the Constitution.

**10 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS**

(Pages  
47 - 78)

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to Democratic Services by 12 noon on 5 February 2018.

**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*

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 5 DECEMBER 2017 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

	Mary Angell		Naz Islam
	Ayesha Azad		Colin Kemp
	John Beckett		Eber Kington
*	Mike Bennison		Graham Knight
	Chris Botten		Rachael I Lake
	Liz Bowes		Yvonna Lay
	Natalie Bramhall		David Lee
	Mark Brett-Warburton		Mary Lewis
	Ben Carasco		Andy MacLeod
	Bill Chapman		Ernest Mallett MBE
	Helyn Clack		David Mansfield
	Stephen Cooksey		Peter Martin
	Clare Curran		Jan Mason
	Nick Darby		Cameron McIntosh
	Paul Deach		Sinead Mooney
	Graham Ellwood		Charlotte Morley
	Jonathan Essex	*	Marsha Moseley
	Robert Evans		Tina Mountain
	Tim Evans		Bernie Muir
	Mel Few		Mark Nuti
	Will Forster		John O'Reilly
*	John Furey		Tim Oliver
*	Matt Furniss		Andrew Povey
	Bob Gardner		Wyatt Ramsdale
	Mike Goodman	*	Mrs Penny Rivers
	Angela Goodwin		Tony Samuels
	David Goodwin	*	Stephen Spence
	Zully Grant-Duff		Lesley Steeds
*	Alison Griffiths		Peter Szanto
	Ken Gulati		Keith Taylor
	Tim Hall		Barbara Thomson
	Kay Hammond		Rose Thorn
	Richard Hampson	*	Chris Townsend
	David Harmer		Denise Turner-Stewart
*	Jeffrey Harris		Richard Walsh
	Nick Harrison		Hazel Watson
	Edward Hawkins		Fiona White
	Marisa Heath	*	Richard Wilson
	David Hodge CBE		Keith Witham
	Saj Hussain		Victoria Young
	Julie Iles		

\*absent

#### **68/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from John Furey, Richard Wilson, Stephen Spence, Penny Rivers, Mark Brett-Warburton, Mike Bennison, Marsha Mosley, Jeff Harris and Matt Furniss.

#### **69/17 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 10 October 2017 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

#### **70/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Mr Will Forster declared a non-pecuniary interest in Question 6 of Members' Questions as he worked for the European Union.

Mrs Fiona White declared a personal interest in item 8 (ii) as her grandson was a special education needs student at Guildford College.

Mrs Angela Goodwin and Mr David Goodwin declared a personal interest in item 8 (ii) as their daughter received a Surrey County Council care package and attended Guildford College.

Rachael I Lake declared a non-pecuniary interest for item 8(iv) as her son worked for Surrey County Council.

#### **71/17 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

- The Chairman paid tribute to Ann Charlton, Monitoring Officer and Director of Legal, Democratic and Cultural Services, who would be retiring after nearly 30 years of service at the Council.
- He highlighted the spectacular light display of falling poppies that lit the front of County Hall as an act for remembrance on 10 November 2017.
- Members were reminded to nominate a resident for the Chairman's Volunteer Award which was for those who they believe deserve recognition for their services in the Voluntary Sector. The deadline for nominations had been extended to 8 December 2017.
- He reminded those present of the Members' Christmas Lunch on 14 December 2017.
- A silent tribute was held in remembrance of Mr Denis Bailey, a previous County Councillor.

#### **72/17 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]**

The Leader made a detailed statement. A copy of the statement is attached as Appendix A.

Members raised the following topics:

- How to engage residents with a new approach.
- Actions taken to ensure the use or let of vacant Council owned properties.



- Implications to the Investment Strategy following the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) consultation on the proposed changes to prudential framework on capital finance.
- What the Council are doing to support unaccompanied asylum seeking children.
- Changes to providing services with a new approach.
- Unhelpful responses from MPs after requesting extra funding for the Council.
- The potential use of Pond Meadow in Guildford for better health and youth services in the community – the Leader confirm that they were currently out to tender.
- How the place agenda will be different and how Members can play the role of game changers.
- Current progress of extra care accommodation within Adult Social Care.

### **73/17 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

Notice of 17 questions had been received. The questions and replies were published as a supplementary agenda on 1 December 2017.

A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below:

**(Q2) Mr Andrew Povey** asked the Leader if he felt tax payers' money was spent in the best possible way. It was highlighted that a large number of high street businesses were forced to close and that Government was pressing for 300,000 houses to be built. The Leader of the Council expressed the need for affordable housing in the County and highlighted the importance of building a variety of house sizes.

**(Q3) Mr Jonathan Essex** asked if it would be appropriate for the Council to respond to the consultation of the Revised Airports National Policy Statement in order to reassert the importance of following commitments and ensuring that they are reflected in the forthcoming strategy. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport highlighted that there would be a Member Seminar on the Heathrow Airport expansion on 11 December 2017 and stated that the Council would consider its reply to the consultation.

**(Q4) Mrs Hazel Watson** asked if details of the settlement would ever be made public and if the Cabinet Member for Health would agree to a scrutiny investigation to ensure flaws are identified and did not reoccur. The Cabinet Member reaffirmed that she could not comment.

**(Q5) Mr Stephen Cooksey** asked for clarification on timescales and requested that the report be considered by the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee. The Cabinet Member for Highways confirmed that the report would be considered by Cabinet in early 2018 and that he would be happy for it to be considered at Select Committee.

**(Q6) Mr Chris Botten** asked the Cabinet Member for Highways to confirm if he trusted Parish Councillors to honour a five year agreement for street lighting. The Cabinet Member expressed that he did trust the work of Parish Councillors but could not exclude Parish Councils from Part Night Lighting due to various issues associated with area boundaries and driver visuals.

**(Q8) Mr Will Forster** asked if the Leader was concerned that there would not be sufficient certainty for Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and County Councils in order to plan for infrastructure if consultations were to take place in spring 2018, and if he would agree to write to Government to bring forward the consultation. The Leader of the Council stated that if Government gave him the opportunity then he would do so.

**(Q10) Mr Jonathan Essex** asked if plans would be revisited if the removal of £4 million of recycling credits did not accelerate recycling rates in the County. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport stated that he did not believe that it would lead to a decrease in recycling and expressed the importance of working together with Boroughs and Districts.

**(Q11) Mrs Fiona White** asked the Cabinet Member for Adults if he was disappointed that Government did not recognise the need for additional funding for Adult Social Care in the Autumn Budget. The Cabinet Member stated that he was concerned with the rising number of duties and limited funding to the County Council.

**(Q12) Mr Robert Evans** asked if the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services would consider producing an annual statement to the Council to highlight the progress being made on becoming a Fair Trade council.

Mr Jonathan Essex asked if Surrey County Council was officially recognised as a Fair Trade Council and highlighted that some coffee provided to Members in the Council was not Fair Trade.

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services agreed to provide an update to Council on an annual basis regarding the authority's progress to becoming a Fair Trade Council. It was highlighted that the Ethical Procurement Statement and Supplier Code of Conduct would soon be published. The Cabinet Member agreed to confirm whether the County Council was already an official Fair Trade Council after the meeting.

**(Q15) Mr Will Forster** asked if the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport could elaborate on his reply. The Cabinet Member highlighted the work the Council had done to maintain many bus services despite the financial issues. It was further stated that the Council had been in discussions with Hampshire on this matter.

**(Q16) Mr Jonathan Essex** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to confirm where the three additional incinerators would be placed in the County. The Cabinet Member highlighted that this was a consultation and that there would be no commitments until after the consultation had taken place.

**(Q17) Mrs Hazel Watson** asked if the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport would review the County Council's policy to enable people with learning disabilities to retain their concessionary bus passes. The Cabinet Member highlighted that the Council did in some areas give more than they were statutory obligated to do. It was stressed that the Council was in a very serious financial situation.

*Mr Will Forster declared a person interest in Question 6 of Members' Questions as he worked for the European Union.*

**Cabinet Member Briefings:** These were also published with the supplementary agenda on 4 December 2017.

Members made the following comments:

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport** was asked if parking displacement would be taken into consideration when considering the potential introduction of parking fees to rural car parks in Surrey. He responded by highlighting that the money would be used to protect the Surrey countryside and that Members would be working with Officers to consider parking displacement.

**Cabinet Member for Highways** was asked if the technical difficulties had been overcome and if the streetlights would be left on for both Christmas and New Year celebrations. He responded by confirming that the streetlights would be left on for both Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve in order to support residents who are out late for the celebrations.

**Cabinet Member for Children** was asked how they saw the development of Early Help Boards in each of the Borough and Districts of Surrey through the work of the Local and Joint Committees. She responded by highlighting that Early Help was a critical element for improvement in the County and that it was a way of dealing with problems at the earliest possible stage. Members were said to have the responsibility for developing Early Help in their area as they know their local area best.

**Cabinet Member for Children** was asked if she could expand on the recent letter received from Ofsted. The Cabinet Member stressed that she was very perturbed by the letter and that it was clear that recent improvements had not had the effects they wanted. There would be an immediate review of all open cases in order to highlight where responsibilities were not being met. The Director of Children Services had recently met with every front line Social Worker to ensure they are aware of their responsibilities in order to create one clear picture of the work that needs to be done.

**Leader of the Council** was asked for an update on progress with extra care accommodation for the elderly. The Leader of the Council stated that the Pond Meadow site in Guildford had been earmarked for extra care and that the Council was in the process of tender negotiations.

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport** was asked what he would do if the 166 bus was cut as it was heavily relied upon by both the young and elderly. He responded by stating that the bus was run by Transport for London (TfL) and that the Council was in discussion with them and would work hard to ensure that the route was maintained.

#### **74/17 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]**

There were none.

## 75/17 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

*Rachael I Lake declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8(iv) as her son worked for Surrey County Council*

### Item 8(i)

The Leader of the Council proposed that this motion be referred to the Audit and Governance Committee due to there not being sufficient information for debate.

Dr Povey agreed to the referral of the motion.

Therefore it was:

### RESOLVED

To refer the motion to the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on 22 January 2018.

### Item 8(ii)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion. Mr Botten proposed a revised motion which was agreed and therefore, it became the substantive motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Botten moved the revised motion (with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through): which was:

'The Council notes that:

- (i) Significant numbers of children who are either in the care of the County Council or children with special educational needs are being placed in residential care or special schools outside Surrey. This means that children are either living a long way from family and friends or have to travel long distances to get to and from school which is detrimental to children and their families and;
- (ii) The County Council is projecting to overspend its special needs transport Budget by £1.2 million in 2017/18.
- (iii) This Council supports plans to develop travel training for young people with special educational needs and to encourage the take up of the parental travel allowance.

This Council agrees that there is a lack of County Council provided residential place and special needs places for children within Surrey and the County Council ~~must urgently~~ **will** invest in providing more of such places for children in Surrey **as soon as practicable**.'

Mr Botten made the following points:

- That the Council had not provided sufficient care for children in need.
- The current efforts had resulted in a lot of stress for children.
- Cabinet had previously agreed to support children to travel more independently.

- There was growing demand for special needs services in the County.
- That the motion was asking for it to be actioned 'as soon as practicable'.
- The Council needs to be more demanding with service providers and not accept inadequate service.
- Members have the responsibility to be game changers.

Members should endorse good practice and not tolerate long waiting times.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Goodwin who made the following points:

- Many families experience an uphill struggle when dealing with various services.
- Each stage resulted in less support from the Council.
- The Local Authority should be more proactive and invest in quality services for children.
- There should be more provision for carers so they can have their own lives outside of caring.
- Investment in special needs education needs to be holistic.

Eight Members spoke on the motion and made the following comments:

- As corporate parents Members should not accept the current situation for children.
- Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) should be receiving the right support at the right time.
- The Council is committed to working with all partners to ensure children receive the services they need in their local communities.
- Over the last four years the Council has provided £24 million of capital funding to increase special educational needs school places.
- Partnerships with services require very strong leadership.
- There had been some progress from the previous year.
- The Council was faced with very high travel costs for children.
- That the Council should strengthen its relationships with partners.
- All special educational needs schools in the county were rated either good or exceptional.
- Finally, it was stressed that many families do not receive sufficient support.

The Chairman asked Mr Botten, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate.

- He stated that it was clear that Members had a passion to get things right.
- As game changers Members should work differently and promote good practice.

The motion was put to the vote and received unanimous support.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

The Council notes that:

- (i) Significant numbers of children who are either in the care of the County Council or children with special educational needs are being placed in residential care or special schools outside Surrey. This means that children are either living a long way from family and friends or have to travel long distances to get to and from school which is detrimental to children and their families and;
- (ii) The County Council is projecting to overspend its special needs transport Budget by £1.2 million in 2017/18.
- (iii) This Council supports plans to develop travel training for young people with special educational needs and to encourage the take up of the parental travel allowance.

This Council agrees that there is a lack of County Council provided residential place and special needs places for children within Surrey and the County Council will invest in providing more of such places for children in Surrey as soon as practicable.

#### **Item 8(iii)**

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.  
Under Standing Order 12.1 Mrs Watson moved the motion, which was:

'This Council notes that the County Council does not currently have a road sign inspection policy and that it relies upon members of the public to notify the County Council of missing and damaged road signs.

This Council agrees:

(i) to develop a sign inspection policy with regular inspections to be carried out by Council officers to identify missing and damaged road signs and to implement such a policy; or

(ii) alternatively if the County Council is expecting members of the public to notify it of missing or damaged road signs, to provide an interactive map showing which road signs should be in place to enable them to more effectively perform their role.

Mrs Watson made the following points:

- Many Surrey roads were missing road signs.
- Road signs were needed to make Surrey roads safer.
- Surrey relied on residents to inform the County Council of missing road signs.
- The County Council needs to develop a road sign inspection policy as the current system is not working.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey, who reserved the right to speak.

Four Members spoke on the motion and made the following comments:

- There was over 3,000 miles of road in Surrey with close to 120,000 signs.

- A map of road signs would be out of date before it was published and would require a large financial commitment.
- Members should use their local knowledge and report missing road signs.
- Many councils were decluttering roads by removing signs.
- Finally, the Council should improve the response time for the maintenance of road signs.

Mr Cooksey, as seconder to the motion, made the following comments:

- That the system was not working properly
- Many neighbouring counties had systems in place similar to that proposed.

The Chairman asked Mrs Watson, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate

- She stated that this was an important issue and that the Council should not rely on residents to report missing road signs.

The motion was put to a vote with 10 Members voting for and 52 Members voting against. There were 5 Abstentions.

Therefore it was:

**Resolved:**

That the motion was lost.

**Item 8(iv)**

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion. Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Evans moved the motion, which was:

'Surrey Council recognises the huge contribution made to the County by all its employees.

Council notes that:

- local government pay is amongst the lowest in the public sector;
- in real terms, basic pay across local government has fallen by around 21% since 2010;
- Surrey CC workers have now had eight years of below-inflation pay increases;
- there are growing equal and fair pay risks resulting from this situation.

This council recognises that local government pay should not be allowed to fall further behind other parts of the public sector, so therefore supports the aim of restoring fair pay on behalf of council and school workers and calls for an immediate end to public sector pay restraint.

Additionally, this council notes the drastic ongoing cuts to local government funding and calls on central government to provide the additional funding

needed to fund a decent pay rise for its employees.

Surrey County Council therefore calls on the Leader of the Council, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee to:

- a. write to the Prime Minister and the Chancellor supporting the National Joint Council (NJC) and other locally determined local government pay claims and to seek additional finance to fund a decent pay rise.
- b. call immediately on the Local Government Association (LGA) to make urgent representations to central Government to fund the NJC and other locally determined local government pay claims and then to report back on their action in this regard.
- c. meet with local Surrey County Council union representatives to convey support for their claim for a fair pay increase.'

Mr Evans made the following points:

- Many Surrey staff find it hard to live on their current wage.
- Surrey had some of the best employees of any Local Authority.
- Many Surrey staff were very involved with their local communities.
- The motion asks for a decent pay rise by calling on central government to provide the additional funding.
- Research shows the treasury would save half the total cost of the proposed pay rise.
- That this was a sensible proposal.
- Asked the Leader of the Council to write to central government to seek additional finance to fund a decent pay rise.
- Asked the Leader to meet with local union representatives to support their claim.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Essex, who reserved the right to speak.

Four Members spoke on the motion and made the following points:

- The Pay Policy Statement, item 11 of the meeting's agenda, lays out the Council's policy.
- Surrey County Council was not a member of the National Joint Council.
- The motion was not a valid reason to change the current framework.
- Surrey County Council would not retain good staff if they do not provide a good pay offer.
- Finally, that the People, Performance and Development Committee would be a more suitable forum for this discussion.

Mr Essex, as seconder to the motion, made the following comments:

- It was important to recruit and retain good staff.
- Housing costs have risen faster than wages in Surrey.
- This motion would be a game changer.

The Chairman asked Mr Evans, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate.



- He stated he was disappointed with some of the reactions from Members.
- Trade unions support the discussed motion.
- There needs to be improvement with the current policy.

The motion was put to a vote with 11 Members voting for and 52 Members voting against. There were 4 Abstentions.

Therefore it was:

**Resolved:**

That the motion was lost.

**Item 8(v)**

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion. Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Essex moved the motion, which was:

‘Council notes:

That on the 16 November 2017 the Council Overview & Budget Scrutiny committee agreed that our property investments should be guided by an environmental and social governance (ESG) policy, agreed and confirmed in writing, as does our pension fund investments.

Council resolves:

That an ESG policy be agreed with a commitment that this should be applied to all of the property-related investment decisions made by Surrey County Council, both through its local authority property company Halsey Garton and by itself, including for its developments on publically owned sites in Surrey, and that this policy includes specific commitments to:

- genuinely affordable housing;
- investments to reach BREEAM rating of Excellent or higher;
- reaffirm our existing commitment to protect the green belt; and
- for these commitments to be scrutinised in public.’

Mr Essex made the following points:

- Surrey has a £1billion property investment strategy.
- Property investments should be governed by clear guidelines on environmental, social and ethical issues.
- He stated the motion was proposing what the content of an environment, social and ethical policy should be..
- This policy would send a signal to the property market about the environmental standards that the Council expects.

- The policy should be reflected in a plan to improve the environmental standards of the Council's property portfolio.
- Such a policy would recognise that Surrey is an unaffordable place to live for many and new homes should be genuinely affordable.
- A policy would ensure that the County leads on environmental standards.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr MacLeod who made the following points:

- It should not be controversial that the Council's property investments should be guided by an ethical standards policy.

Mr Oliver moved an amendment which was tabled at the meeting. This was formerly seconded by Mr Hawkins.

The amendment was as follows (with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

'Council notes:

That on the 16 November 2017 the Council Overview & Budget Scrutiny committee agreed that our property investments should be guided by an environmental and social governance (ESG) policy, agreed and confirmed in writing, as does our pension fund investments.

Council resolves:

That an ESG policy be agreed with ~~a commitment~~ **an aspiration** that this should be applied to all of the property-related investment decisions made by Surrey County Council, both through its local authority property company Halsey Garton and by itself, including for its developments on publicly owned sites in Surrey. ~~and that this policy includes specific commitments to:~~ **In addition, this Council:**

- **reaffirms its commitment to provide** genuinely affordable **housing on suitable sites and in compliance with the requirements of the local planning authority;**
- **agrees that** investments reach BREEAM standards ~~rating of Excellent or higher~~ **as appropriate for each application determined by the Local Planning Authority;**
- reaffirms ~~our~~ **existing** commitment to protect the green belt **in accordance with both national and local policy;** and
- agrees that these commitments ~~continue to be scrutinised in public.'~~

Both Mr Essex and Mr MacLeod agreed to accept the amendment to this motion and therefore, it became the substantive motion.

Three Members spoke on the substantive motion and made the following comments:

- BREEAM is a method brought about to assess, rate and certify the sustainability of buildings which is now beginning to be seen as a blunt tool.
- We cannot have a one size fits all policy.
- Council needs a balanced approach when providing affordable housing.
- It is important to work in partnership to ensure that the district/boroughs housing needs are met.
- Finally, that both national and local policies on protecting the green belt are changing.

The Chairman asked Mr Essex, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate.

- He was heartened that Surrey County Council is committing to providing genuinely affordable housing.
- He was concerned that the amended motion did not commit to any specific environmental standards.
- He stated he looked forward to Surrey's property investment delivering social value for the county.

The motion was put to the vote and received unanimous support.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

Council notes:

That on the 16 November 2017 the Council Overview & Budget Scrutiny committee agreed that our property investments should be guided by an environmental and social governance (ESG) policy, agreed and confirmed in writing, as does our pension fund investments.

Council resolves:

That an ESG policy be agreed with an aspiration that this should be applied to all of the property-related investment decisions made by Surrey County Council, both through its local authority property company Halsey Garton and by itself, including for its developments on publicly owned sites in Surrey. In addition, this Council:

- reaffirms its commitment to provide genuinely affordable housing on suitable sites and in compliance with the requirements of the local planning authority;
- agrees that investments reach BREEAM standards as appropriate for each application determined by the Local Planning Authority;
- reaffirms our existing commitment to protect the green belt in accordance with both national and local policy; and
- agrees that these commitments continue to be scrutinised in public.'

## **76/17 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 31 October 2017 and 28 November 2017.

### **Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents**

#### **A – Procurement Standing Orders**

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services introduced the report and outlined the amendments to the Procurement Standing Orders.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders be approved, as set out in Annex A to this item.

### **Reports for Information / Discussion**

The following report was received and noted:

B – Local Government Ombudsman Report.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 31 October 2017 and 28 November 2017 be adopted.

## **77/17 REPORT BACK FROM THE PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ON REFERRED MOTION [Item 10]**

Members noted the report.

## **78/17 PAY POLICY STATEMENT REPORT [Item 11]**

The Leader of the Council presented the report.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the Council agree the Pay Policy Statement for 2017 - 2018.

## **79/17 APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE [Item 12]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and highlighted that a long process had been carried out in order to identify a high calibre Chief Executive. It was noted that the People, Performance and Development Committee had agreed the salary of £220,000 per annum.

Members made the following comments:

- It was important to recognise the rigorous process carried out in order to identify a new Chief Executive.
- Hope that the new Chief Executive was able to enhance and strengthen the Council's delivery of services.

- The salary of the new Chief Executive was a good deal in return for her experience and skill.

**RESOLVED:**

That the appointment of Joanna Killian as Chief Executive and Head of the Council's paid service be approved.

**80/17 APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM MONITORING OFFICER [Item 13]**

The Leader of the Council presented the report and highlighted that the appointment will take effect from 11 December 2017.

**RESOLVED:**

That the County Council appoints Sarah Baker as Interim Monitoring Officer of Surrey County Council with effect from 11 December 2017.

**81/17 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 14]**

No notification had been received by the deadline from Members wishing to raise a question or make a statement on any matters in the minutes.

[Meeting ended at: 12.35 pm]

---

**Chairman**

**Order of the Bath**

**Companions of the Order of the Bath**

**Raymond John LONG**

Lately Programme Director, Department for Work and Pensions Digital Group. For services to Government and the Public Sector. (Guildford, Surrey)

**Howard ORME**

Chief Financial and Operating Officer, Department for Education. For public services especially to Finance and Building Delivery Capability. (Dorking, Surrey)

**Stephen John Charles SPEED**

Director, Civil Nuclear and Resilience, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. For services to the Oil and Gas Industry. (Walton on Thames, Surrey)

**Order of the British Empire**

**Dames Commander of the Order of the British Empire**

**Cheryl Elise Kendall GILLAN, MP**

Member of Parliament for Chesham and Amersham. For political and public service. (Epsom, Surrey)

**Ms Rosemary Anne SQUIRE, OBE**

Co-founder, The Ambassador Theatre Group Ltd. For services to Theatre and to Philanthropy. (Pyrford, Surrey)

**Order of the British Empire**

**Commanders of the Order of the British Empire**

**Paul David BAUMANN**

Chief Financial Officer, NHS England. For services to NHS Financial Management. (Ripley, Surrey)

**Shaun KINGSBURY**

Chief Executive, Green Investment Bank. For services to the UK Green Economy. (Woking, Surrey)

**Ms Nuzhat SALEH**

Assistant Director, Directorate of Legal Services, Metropolitan Police Service. For services to Policing. (Chobham, Surrey)

**Order of the British Empire**

**Officers of the Order of the British Empire**

**Professor Karen BRYAN**

Lately Pro Vice-Chancellor, Regional Engagement and Dean, Faculty of Health and Wellbeing, Sheffield Hallam University. For services to Higher Education. (Shalford, Surrey)

**Ms Catherine Jane CLARKE**

Lately Headteacher, King's Oak Primary School, New Malden. For services to Education. (Weybridge, Surrey)

**Michael Hyde COLLON**

For parliamentary and public service. (Esher, Surrey)

**Eamonn HOLMES**

For services to Broadcasting. (Burwood Park, Surrey)

**Dr Elizabeth Angela MCDONNELL**

Lately Head, Biomass Electricity Policy, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. For services to Bioenergy Policy. (Haslemere, Surrey)

**Ms Vinodka MURRIA**

For services to the UK Digital Economy and Advancing Women in the Software Sector. (Weybridge, Surrey)

**John Cook PATTULLO**

Lately Chair, NHS Blood and Transplant. For services to Healthcare. (Guildford, Surrey)

**Pauline, Mrs SHAW**

Director of Care and Service Development, The Royal Star and Garter Homes. For services to Veterans. (Thames Ditton, Surrey)



**Colin Stuart SQUIRE**

For services to the Horticultural Industry and to charity (Laleham, Surrey)

**John Nicholas WOOLF**

Co-founder, Charities Leadership Programme. For services to the Charitable Sector in the UK and Abroad. (Esher, Surrey)

**Order of the British Empire**

**Members of the Order of the British Empire**

**Maria Emilia, Mrs ANGEL**

For services to the community in Normandy, Surrey. (Guildford, Surrey)

**Ms Jacqueline Alexandra GERRARD**

Chair of the Corporation, Stode's College, Egham. For services to Education. (Bagshot, Surrey)

**Timothy James LOVETT**

Lately Director of Public Affairs, British Beekeepers Association. For services to the Beekeeping Industry. (Esher, Surrey)

**Carolyn Ann, Mrs ROSEBERRY-SPARKES**

Deputy Director, Border Force, Home Office. For services to Border Security. (Guildford, Surrey)

**Freda, Mrs STREETER**

For services to Open Water Swimming. (Nutfield, Surrey)

**Patrick Francis Benjamin TATHAM**

For services to the community in the Mole Valley, Surrey. (Dorking, Surrey)

**Order of the British Empire**

**Medallist of the Order of the British Empire**

**Richard CLEAVES**

For services to the community in Ewhurst, Surrey. (Cranleigh, Surrey)

**Betty Irene, Mrs JOHNSON**

Visiting Assistant, The Royal Star and Garter Home. For voluntary service to Veterans. (West Molesey, Surrey)

**Paul David ROY**

Vice President, The Spinal Injuries Association. For voluntary service to Healthcare. (Windelsham, Surrey)

**Adele Ellen, Mrs SILVEY**

Volunteer, Thames Valley Hospice. For services to Hospice Patients. (Windelsham, Surrey)

**Martin Piers Grant THOMPSON**

Higher Officer, Border Force, Home Office. For services to Border Security. (Ashford, Surrey)

**Patricia Catherine, Mrs VENTON**

Business Manager, Camelsdale Primary School. For services to Education. (Haslemere, Surrey)

**Kerstin Yvonne, Mrs WHEELER**

Higher Officer, Border Force Intelligence, Home Office. For services to Preventing Modern Slavery and Protecting Vulnerable People. (Addlestone, Surrey)

*County Council Meeting – 6 February 2018*

**REPORT OF THE AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

- \* Mr David Harmer (Chairman)
- \* Mr Keith Witham (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr Edward Hawkin
- \* Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- \* Dr Peter Szanto
- \* Mrs Fiona White

\* = Present  
A = Apologies  
S = Substitute

**A. HALF-YEAR SUMMARY OF INTERNAL AUDIT IRREGULARITY INVESTIGATIONS AND COUNTER FRAUD MEASURES: APRIL – SEPTEMBER 2017**

1. At its meeting on 4 December 2017, the Committee received a report and questioned officers on irregularity investigations and counter fraud work undertaken by Internal Audit during the first half of the financial year 2017/18.
2. This replaces the Counter Fraud Strategy and Framework found in Part 6 of the Constitution. Link:  
<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/s42412/Part%206%2005%20-%20Counter%20Fraud%20Strategy.pdf>
3. The Committee approved the updated Counter Fraud Strategy and Framework (Annex A) and **COMMENDS** it to Council for inclusion in the Constitution.

**David Harmer**  
**Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee**  
**December 2017**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Counter fraud strategy and framework

## Contents

Counter fraud strategy

Appendix A	<a href="#">Reporting categories</a>
Appendix B	<a href="#">Anti-bribery policy</a>
Appendix C	<a href="#">Anti-money laundering policy</a>
Appendix D	<a href="#">Fraud response plan</a>
Appendix E	<a href="#">Sanctions policy</a>

## Key points

- This strategy and framework set out the council's commitment to preventing, detecting and deterring fraud and corruption.
- The council expects the highest ethical and legal standards from its members, officers, contractors and agents carrying out business on its behalf.
- This framework includes guidance on types of fraud and corruption, how to report concerns and the investigation process.
- All cases of suspected financial irregularity or corruption must be reported to the Chief Internal Auditor.
- A Whistle Blowing Policy is in place to support a safe environment for concerns to be raised.
- Failure to comply with the policies contained within this document will result in sanctions being considered.

Date published: December 2017

Next review date: December 2018



**SURREY**

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Surrey County Council is one of the country's largest local authorities, with a gross budget of £1.7billion in 2017/18 and employing over 26,000 people. The public is entitled to expect the council to conduct its business with integrity, honesty and openness and demand the highest standards of ethical conduct from those working for and with it.
- 1.2 The council takes its statutory duty to protect the public funds it administers seriously. It is essential that we protect the public purse and ensure that council funds are used only for their intended purpose: to support and deliver services to our community within Surrey. As such we maintain a zero tolerance approach to fraud and corruption whether it is attempted from outside the council or within.
- 1.3 This strategy forms part of the council's counter fraud framework, a collection of interrelated policies and procedures including the Code of Conduct, Financial Regulations and Whistle Blowing Policy. It also includes policies and procedures that are specifically targeted at countering fraud and corruption. These are attached as the following appendices:
- A. 'Reporting categories' by which fraud and corruption are reported;
  - B. 'Anti-bribery policy' outlining measures to combat acts of bribery by or to anyone carrying out business for or on behalf of the council;
  - C. 'Anti-money laundering policy' detailing the responsibilities of members and officers, in particular the need to promptly report suspicions;
  - D. 'Fraud response plan' providing guidance on reporting concerns and the investigation process; and
  - E. 'Sanctions policy' explaining how to determine which sanctions are appropriate when fraud or corruption is identified.

## 2. Aims

- 2.1 This strategy sets out the council's commitment to preventing, detecting and deterring fraud and corruption, taking into consideration the council's three strategic goals that it aims to achieve for all residents:
- Everyone in Surrey has a great start to life and can live and age well;
  - Surrey's economy remains strong and sustainable; and
  - Residents in Surrey experience public services that are easy to use, responsive and value for money.
- 2.2 This strategy aims to:
- Embed an anti-fraud culture where people are empowered to challenge dishonest behaviour;
  - Actively prevent, deter and promote detection of fraudulent and corrupt acts;
  - Maintain the council's awareness of emerging fraud risks such as those associated with digital and cyber security;
  - Provide clear guidance on the roles and responsibilities of members and officers; and
  - Identify a clear pathway for investigative and remedial action.

### 3. Our commitment

At Surrey County Council we recognise that every pound lost to fraud reduces our ability to provide services to our residents who really need them.

While the majority of our staff and the people we deal with each day are honest and law abiding, we acknowledge that this may not always be the case and that fraud can and does regrettably happen.

The Council is committed to a zero tolerance policy in relation to fraud and corruption and we fully endorse the Counter Fraud Strategy and Framework.

This has been developed in line with the latest professional good practice guidance and should help to safeguard public funds by minimising the risk of loss as a result of fraud. Everyone at Surrey County Council has a role to play in this.

David Hodge  
Leader of Surrey County Council

Julie Fisher  
Acting Chief Executive Officer

### 4. Definitions

- 4.1 Fraud can be broadly described as a deliberate act, involving deception or concealment, carried out with the intention of making a gain or causing a loss (or risk of loss) to another. The Fraud Act 2006 includes three main offences:
- ‘False representation’ to a person or device, for example, falsely claiming to hold a qualification to obtain a job or misuse of another person’s debit card;
  - ‘Failing to disclose information’ which you are under a legal duty to disclose, such as not declaring assets as part of a means tested application for services; and
  - ‘Abuse of position’ whereby you act against or fail to safeguard any financial interests you are expected to protect, for example, financial abuse of individuals receiving social care.
- 4.2 For the purpose of this strategy the term ‘fraud and corruption’ includes a range of dishonest acts such as those involving theft, misappropriation, bribery, money laundering, concealment of material facts, false representation and abuse of position.
- 4.3 Definitions relating to bribery and money laundering are detailed in Appendices B and C, respectively. A brief description of the categories by which the council reports fraud and corruption, including examples, is attached at Appendix A.

### 5. Strategic approach

- 5.1 The council’s approach to fraud and corruption is based on three key strands, as set out in the Local Government Counter Fraud and Corruption Strategy:
- **Acknowledge** and understand fraud risks
  - **Prevent** and detect more fraud
  - **Pursue** losses and be stronger in punishing fraud

**Acknowledge**

- 5.2 We acknowledge that fraud risks exist both from within and outside the council. These are recorded in a risk register that is updated on a regular basis to reflect both emerging risks and changes to the likelihood and impact of risks in light of any developments. Fraud risks are also considered at the council's Strategic Risk Forum to facilitate coverage of all council services. Internal Audit will work with services and provide advice to mitigate identified fraud risks.
- 5.3 Our response to fraud and corruption is clearly documented in a Fraud Response Plan (Appendix D), which is designed to make available suitable resources and support to tackle fraud and corruption. We will regularly review our approach to tackling fraud, taking into consideration emerging risks, themes and trends both within the council and across wider local government areas.

**Prevent**

- 5.4 We recognise the importance of a strong anti-fraud culture in preventing fraud and corruption. The council operates according to a set of core values (see Section 6) and also has policies in place intended to prevent dishonest behaviour. These include Codes of Conduct, which place a duty on officers and members to declare any interests that may conflict with the council's business, and a Gifts and Hospitality Policy restricting the acceptance of financial or other rewards.
- 5.5 A key measure in the prevention of fraud and corruption is ensuring appropriate checks are made when new employees are recruited. Hiring managers must comply with the Resourcing Policy and Safer Recruitment Policy when conducting pre-employment checks such as verifying identity, obtaining references, confirming the right to work in the UK and, when necessary, Disclosure and Barring Service checks.
- 5.6 The council acknowledges the changing nature of fraud, in particular the risks emerging as a result of increased online access to and delivery of services. In recognition of the importance of robust cyber security and identity assurance, we take a networked approach involving collaboration both with local authorities and also central government agencies and departments.
- 5.7 We will improve controls and processes by learning from instances of proven fraud and corruption and will also take into account findings from the work of Internal Audit. We are committed to making full use of information and technology to proactively detect fraud, as detailed further in Section 7.

**Pursue**

- 5.8 We will ensure appropriate remedial action is taken in all cases of proven fraud or corruption, in line with the Sanctions Policy (Appendix E). This may include collaboration with the police, government departments and other local authorities. We will make every effort to recover funds including, where appropriate, making best use of legislation such as the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.

**6. Culture**

- 6.1 The council is committed to the highest ethical standards ranging from the expected behaviours set out in the Code of Conduct to the four core values (listen, responsible, trust, respect) that are crucial to delivering the Corporate Strategy.
- 6.2 We believe the 'seven principles of public life' are the foundation of a strong anti-fraud culture and we expect all members, officers and contractors to follow these principles, as well as all legal rules, policies and procedures.



6.3 The seven principles of public life and a brief explanation are listed below.

<b>Principle</b>	<b>You should...</b>
Selflessness	...act solely in terms of the public interest and not for the purpose of gain for yourself, family or friends.
Integrity	...avoid placing yourself under any obligation to people or organisations that might seek to influence you in your work.
Objectivity	...act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.
Accountability	...be accountable to the public for your decisions and actions and submit yourself to scrutiny as appropriate.
Openness	...act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should only be withheld from the public if there are clear and lawful reasons for doing so.
Honesty	...be truthful. This includes declaring any conflicts of interest and taking steps to resolve such conflicts.
Leadership	...actively promote and support these principles by applying them to your own behaviour and challenging poor behaviour.

6.4 In essence, we expect everyone carrying out council business to protect the public interest and also to challenge instances of dishonest behaviour. The promotion of a strong anti-fraud culture is therefore vital, as not only will it deter potential fraudsters but it will also encourage a safe environment in which individuals can raise concerns.

## **7. Proactive work**

- 7.1 The remit of Internal Audit includes the delivery of a risk based proactive counter fraud programme. These activities are detailed in an annual Fighting Fraud Plan, which is presented to Audit and Governance Committee. The plan takes into consideration emerging trends across the public sector, proven cases of fraud or corruption and other specific areas where there is an increased risk of fraud or corruption.
- 7.2 As part of the proactive detection of fraud and corruption, we undertake data analytics both within the council (for example payroll) and between other public sector bodies. In conducting data matching exercises, the council will comply with all relevant legislation such as the Data Protection Act 1998 and, from May 2018, the General Data Protection Regulation.
- 7.3 We are required to participate in the biennial National Fraud Initiative data matching exercise administered by the Cabinet Office. This exercise, which compares a wide range of data between publicly funded bodies, includes payroll, pensions, creditors, social care payments and concessionary travel.
- 7.4 We are committed to enhancing partnership working and information sharing as a means to reducing fraud and corruption. Where appropriate, information will be shared with anti-fraud networks such as Action Fraud and the National Anti-Fraud Network, as well as Orbis partners, to enable the identification of patterns and sharing of good practice.
- 7.5 As part of the Surrey Counter Fraud Partnership between the council and Surrey's borough and district councils, we will undertake targeted data matching exercises and publicity drives to detect and prevent fraud across the county.

## **8. Awareness and training**

8.1 The success of this strategy is partly dependent on the awareness and training of members and officers across the council. In recognition of this, we will:

- Include information on the counter fraud framework in relevant training and e-learning packages;
- Continue the delivery of presentations raising awareness to individual teams;
- Include a discussion about fraud risks and training needs as part of Internal Audit's client liaison activities with all services; and
- Continue to deliver an annual fraud seminar to the Audit and Governance Committee.

## **9. Reporting**

9.1 Responsibilities contained within this strategy rest with all officers and members of the council but its delivery will be led by the Internal Audit team. The biannual reports presented to Audit and Governance Committee, summarising investigations and counter fraud work, will include an update on progress against this strategy and the Fighting Fraud Plan.

9.2 This strategy will be reviewed on an annual basis.

## Reporting categories

Reporting category	Description	Examples (not an exhaustive list)	Legislation / Policies (examples)
False representation	Knowingly making an untrue or misleading representation to make gain, cause loss or expose the council to the risk of loss	Submitting incorrect expense claims; falsely claiming to hold a qualification	Fraud Act 2006
Failure to disclose information	Intentionally withholding information to make gain, cause loss or expose the council to the risk of loss	Failing to declare pecuniary interests, or assets as part of a means tested assessment	
Abuse of position	Use of position to act against, or fail to safeguard, the interests of the council or Surrey's residents	Nepotism; financial abuse of individuals receiving social care	
Theft	Misappropriation of assets (often cash) belonging to the council or individuals under the council's care	Removing cash from safes; removing individuals' personal items in care homes	Theft Act 1968
Corruption	Offering, giving, seeking or accepting any inducement or reward which may influence a person's actions, or to gain a commercial or contractual advantage	Accepting money to ensure a contract is awarded to a particular supplier	Bribery Act 2010
False reporting	Intentional manipulation of financial or non-financial information to distort or provide misleading reports	Falsifying statistics to ensure performance targets are met; delaying payments to distort financial position	Theft Act 1968; Financial Regulations; Procurement Standing Orders
Misuse of public funds	The use of public funds for ultra vires expenditure or expenditure for purposes other than those intended	Officers misusing grant funding; individuals misusing social care direct payments	
Procurement	Any matter relating to the dishonest procurement of goods and services by internal or external persons	Breach of the Procurement Standing Orders; collusive tendering; falsifying quotations	
Misconduct	Failure to act in accordance with the Code of Conduct, council policies or management instructions	Undertaking additional work during contracted hours; inappropriate use of council assets and equipment	Code of Conduct; IT Security Policy
Poor Control	Weak local or corporate arrangements that result in the loss of council assets or a breach of council policy	Storing a key to a safe in the immediate vicinity of the safe	

## Anti-bribery policy

### Policy statement

Surrey County Council will:

- Not tolerate bribery or corruption in any form or at any level;
- Consider anti-bribery measures as part of its governance process; and
- Commit to policies and procedures to prevent, deter and detect bribery.

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The council expects its business to be conducted with probity, openness and accountability. Key to maintaining the council's high standards is the requirement for members, officers, contractors and agents carrying out business on behalf of the council to behave honestly, lawfully and with integrity.
- 1.2 This policy forms part of the council's counter fraud framework and sets out:
- Definitions and legal background in respect of bribery; and
  - The council's approach to bribery including fulfilling its duties under the Bribery Act 2010 (the Act).

### 2. Scope of the policy

- 2.1 This policy applies to all areas of council business and therefore all members, officers, contractors and agents carrying out business on behalf of the council. Any act of bribery by a person outside the council will be a matter for the police.
- 2.2 This policy should be read alongside the Gifts and Hospitality Policy. Other relevant policies (such as the Code of Conduct and Procurement Standing Orders) should be referred to where appropriate.
- 2.3 Failure to comply with this policy will result in action being considered under the Sanctions Policy (see Appendix E).

### 3. Definitions and legal background

- 3.1 Bribery is the act of offering, giving, receiving or seeking an inducement or reward intended to influence the performance of a relevant function or duty to gain a personal, commercial, regulatory or contractual advantage.

#### ***Bribery Act 2010***

- 3.2 The Act includes four key offences:
- Offering, promising or giving a bribe to reward a person for improperly performing a relevant function (Section 1);
  - Requesting, agreeing to accept or receiving a bribe as a reward for improperly performing a relevant function (Section 2);
  - Bribing a foreign public official with the intention of obtaining or retaining business or an advantage in the conduct of business (Section 6); and
  - A corporate offence by a 'commercial organisation' of failing to prevent bribery that is intended to obtain or retain business or an advantage in the conduct of business (Section 7).

- 3.3 The Act makes no distinction between a bribe being offered, promised or given directly or through a third party. Further, it makes no difference whether the person requesting, agreeing to accept or receiving the bribe knows or believes that the performance of the function will be improper; or whether this person asks another person to carry out the improper performance of the function on their behalf.
- 3.4 The council accepts that it may be classed as a ‘commercial organisation’ in relation to the corporate offence of failing to prevent bribery. The Act allows for a defence to this corporate offence if an organisation can show that it had in place ‘adequate procedures’ designed to prevent bribery.
- 3.5 Good practice and robust governance arrangements include having adequate procedures in place to prevent bribery and protect the council from reputational and legal damage. Whether an organisation’s procedures are ‘adequate’ will ultimately be a matter for the courts to decide on a case-by-case basis. Adequate procedures need to be applied proportionately, based on the level of risk of bribery in the organisation.

#### ***Public Contracts Regulations 2006***

- 3.6 The Public Contracts Regulations 2006 place a duty on the council to automatically and perpetually exclude from participation in a procurement procedure any company or director that has been convicted of a corruption offence. The council may disregard this regulation on an exceptional basis, for example due to reasons relating to the public interest such as public health or protection of the environment.

#### **4. The council’s approach to bribery**

- 4.1 The council has in place a framework of arrangements intended to manage the risk of bribery and corruption and ensure business is conducted to the highest standards. This policy does not change the requirements of other guidance, which includes:
- Member and Officer Codes of Conduct, which require members and officers to declare any personal or pecuniary interests;
  - Procurement Standing Orders governing the negotiation of contracts; and
  - Gifts and Hospitality Policy, which sets out the restrictions on accepting gifts and hospitality and the need to register approved gifts that are accepted.
- 4.2 In the context of this policy, it is unacceptable for members, officers, contractors and agents carrying out business for or on behalf of the council to:
- Give, promise to give, or offer a payment, gift or hospitality with the expectation or hope that a business advantage will be received, or to reward a business advantage already given;
  - Give, promise to give, or offer a payment, gift or hospitality to a government official, agent or representative to ‘facilitate’<sup>1</sup> or expedite a routine procedure;
  - Accept payment from a third party that is known or suspected to be offered with an expectation that it will obtain a business advantage for them;
  - Accept a gift or hospitality from a third party if it is known or suspected that it is offered with an expectation that a business advantage will be provided by the council in return;

---

<sup>1</sup> Facilitation payments are unofficial payments made to public officials in order to secure or expedite actions, including but not limited to: awarding contracts; making appointments to temporary or permanent positions; and determining eligibility to receive services.

- Retaliate against or threaten a person who has refused to commit a bribery offence or who has raised concerns under this policy; or
- Engage in activity in breach of this policy.

## **5. Reporting suspected bribery**

- 5.1 You should report any suspected acts of bribery. If you have been offered an inducement from another party, you should report this even if you declined.
- 5.2 The council has put in place a safe environment to report suspected cases of fraud and corruption, including bribery. The Fraud Response Plan (see Appendix D) provides full details of who to contact but any individual may contact the council's Internal Audit team directly as below.

Email: [internal.audit@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:internal.audit@surreycc.gov.uk)

Telephone: 020 8541 9299

Post: Internal Audit  
Surrey County Council  
Room 318, County Hall  
Penrhyn Road  
Kingston upon Thames  
Surrey KT1 2DN

## Anti-money laundering policy

### Policy statement

Surrey County Council will do all it can to:

- Prevent any attempts to use the council and its staff to launder money;
- Identify potential areas where money laundering may occur; and
- Comply with all legal and statutory requirements, especially with regard to the reporting of actual or suspected cases of money laundering.

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Money Laundering, Terrorist Financing and Transfer of Funds (Information on the Payer) Regulations 2017, the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and the Terrorism Act 2000 (and all relevant amending legislation) place obligations on the council, including its members and employees, with respect to suspected money laundering.
- 1.2 While most money laundering activity in the UK occurs outside of the public sector, vigilance by council employees and members can help identify those who are, or may be, perpetrating crimes relating to the financing of terrorism and money laundering.
- 1.3 This policy forms part of the council's counter fraud framework and sets out:
  - Definitions and legal background in respect of money laundering;
  - The council's approach to money laundering including the responsibility of members and officers to report suspicions promptly; and
  - Guidance and procedures for members and officers.

### 2. Scope of the policy

- 2.1 This policy applies to all members and officers of the council and aims to maintain the high standards of conduct that the public is entitled to expect from the council.
- 2.2 It is vital that all members and officers are aware of their responsibilities and remain vigilant; criminal sanctions may be imposed for breaches of legislation.
- 2.3 Failure to comply with the procedures set out in this policy will result in action being considered under the Sanctions Policy (see Appendix E). This may include disciplinary action in line with the Officer, or Member, Code of Conduct.

### 3. Definitions and legal background

- 3.1 Money laundering is the process of converting illegally obtained money or assets into 'clean' money or assets with no obvious link to their criminal origin.
- 3.2 There are three primary money laundering offences set out in legislation:
  - Concealing, disguising, converting, transferring, or removing from the UK any criminal property (Section 327 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002);
  - Entering into or becoming concerned in an arrangement which you know or suspect facilitates the acquisition, retention, use or control of criminal property by or on behalf of another person (Section 328); and
  - Acquiring, using or possessing criminal property (Section 329).

- 3.3 There are also two secondary offences:
- Failure to disclose any of the three primary offences; and
  - Tipping off (the act of informing a person suspected of money laundering in such a way as to prejudice an investigation).
- 3.4 Any member or employee of the council may potentially be implicated in money laundering if they suspect money laundering and either become involved with it in some way and/or do nothing about it. The key requirement is to promptly report any suspected money laundering activity to the Money Laundering Reporting Officer.

#### **4. The Money Laundering Reporting Officer (MLRO)**

- 4.1 The officer nominated to receive disclosures about money laundering activities within the council is the Chief Internal Auditor:

Russell Banks  
Orbis Chief Internal Auditor

Telephone: 01273 481447 / 020 8541 9299  
Email: [russell.banks@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:russell.banks@eastsussex.gov.uk)

Surrey County Council  
Room 318, County Hall  
Penrhyn Road  
Kingston upon Thames  
Surrey, KT1 2DN

- 4.2 In the absence of the MLRO, the Audit Performance Manager is authorised to deputise:

David John  
Audit Performance Manager

Telephone: 020 8541 7762  
Email: [david.john@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:david.john@surreycc.gov.uk)

Surrey County Council  
Room 318, County Hall  
Penrhyn Road  
Kingston upon Thames  
Surrey, KT1 2DN

#### **5. Procedures**

##### ***Cash***

- 5.1 The council will not accept any cash payment in excess of £5,000 irrespective of whether this is through a single payment or series of linked payments. 'Cash' includes notes, coins, banker's drafts and travellers cheques.
- 5.2 This does not necessarily mean that cash transactions below this value are legitimate and legal. Professional scepticism is encouraged at all times and any suspicions must be reported to the MLRO or their deputy.

##### ***Responsibilities of members and officers***

- 5.3 Any member or officer who suspects money laundering activity must report their suspicion promptly (as soon as practicable) to the MLRO or their deputy if appropriate. If you prefer, you can discuss your suspicions with your line manager first.
- 5.4 Your disclosure must be made at the earliest opportunity following the information coming to your attention, not weeks or months later, and should be made to the MLRO or deputy using the form attached at the end of this policy.
- 5.5 You must follow any subsequent directions from the MLRO or deputy. You must not:
- Make any further enquiries into the matter;
  - Take any further steps in any related transaction without authorisation from the MLRO or deputy;



- Disclose or otherwise indicate your suspicions to the person suspected of money laundering; or
- Discuss the matter with others or make a note on file that a report to the MLRO or deputy has been made, as this may alert the suspected perpetrator.

### ***Responsibilities of the MLRO***

- 5.6 The MLRO or deputy must promptly evaluate any disclosure to determine whether it should be reported to the National Crime Agency (NCA). Any decision not to submit a report to the NCA must be recorded.
- 5.7 If they so determine, the MLRO or deputy must promptly submit an online Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) to the NCA. Alternatively, a SAR may be manually reported to the NCA. Both online and up to date manual reporting forms are available on the NCA's website.
- 5.8 If a disclosure provides the MLRO or deputy with knowledge or reasonable grounds to suspect that a person is engaged in money laundering, and they do not disclose this to the NCA as soon as practicable, the MLRO or deputy will have committed a criminal offence.

### ***Customer due diligence***

- 5.9 Customer due diligence refers to taking steps to identify customers and checking they are who they claim to be. The Money Laundering Regulations 2017 require customer due diligence measures to be applied when:
- A business relationship with a customer is established;
  - There are doubts about a customer's previously obtained identification;
  - There is a change in an existing customer's circumstances;
  - There is an 'occasional transaction' of €15,000 or more (or the equivalent in Sterling); and/or
  - Money laundering or terrorist financing is suspected.
- 5.10 Customer due diligence measures include:
- Identifying and verifying the client's identity based on reliable and independent sources, such as a passport;
  - Where applicable, identifying the beneficial owners of the client and taking reasonable steps to verify their identity and, if the beneficial owner is an entity or legal arrangement, taking reasonable steps to understand its ownership and control structure;
  - Assessing and, where appropriate, obtaining information on the purpose and intended nature of the business relationship or transaction; and
  - Identifying and verifying the identity of a person who purports to act on behalf of a client and verifying that they are authorised to act on behalf of the client.
- 5.11 Where the customer is a corporate body, you must obtain and verify:
- Its name, company number or other registration; and
  - The address of its registered office and its principal place of business.
- 5.12 In addition, unless the corporate body is a company listed on a regulated market, you must take reasonable steps to determine and verify:

- The law to which it is subject and its constitution or other governing documents; and
- The names of the board of directors (or equivalent managing body) and the senior persons responsible for its operations.

5.13 The level of due diligence required should be determined following a risk assessment. 'Simplified' due diligence is permitted where the business relationship or transaction presents a low risk of money laundering or terrorist financing. Among other criteria, 'Enhanced' due diligence must be applied where the business relationship or transaction involves a 'politically exposed person' or a customer established in a 'high risk third country'.

## **6. Record keeping**

- 6.1 A copy of all documents and information obtained as part of the customer due diligence checks, together with supporting records of the transaction(s), must be retained for a period of five years following the completion of the transaction or end of the business relationship.
- 6.2 The MLRO will keep a record of all referrals received and any action taken to ensure an audit trail is maintained. All disclosure reports referred to the MLRO and reports made to the NCA will be retained by the MLRO in a confidential file for a minimum of five years.

## **7. Guidance and training**

- 7.1 The council will:
- Make members and officers aware of the requirements and obligations placed on the council, and on themselves as individuals, by anti-money laundering legislation; and
  - Give targeted training to those considered to be the most likely to encounter money laundering.
- 7.2 Further information can be obtained from the MLRO and the following sources:
- Anti-money laundering responsibilities from gov.uk: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/money-laundering-regulations-your-responsibilities>
  - Anti-money laundering guidance from the Law Society: <http://www.lawsociety.org.uk/support-services/advice/articles/quick-guide-to-the-money-laundering-regulations-2017/>
  - CIPFA: [www.cipfa.org/members/members-in-practice/anti-money-laundering](http://www.cipfa.org/members/members-in-practice/anti-money-laundering)
  - The National Crime Agency: [www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk](http://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk)

[OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE]

**Confidential report to the Money Laundering Reporting Officer**

To: Money Laundering Reporting Officer

From: \_\_\_\_\_ *[insert your name]*

Title/Service: \_\_\_\_\_ *[insert your post title and service]*

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of report: \_\_\_\_\_

Response needed by: \_\_\_\_\_ *[e.g. transaction due date]*

**Name(s) and address(es) of person(s) involved:**  
*[If a company/public body please include details of nature of business]*

**Nature, value and timing of activity involved:**  
*[Please give full details e.g. what, when, where, how. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary]*

	Yes	No	
Has any investigation been undertaken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If 'yes' please provide details below
Have you discussed your suspicions with anyone else?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Details of investigation undertaken and/or discussions held:**

**THIS REPORT TO BE RETAINED FOR AT LEAST FIVE YEARS**

[OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE]

**To be completed by the Money Laundering Reporting Officer**

Date report received:

Date acknowledged:

<b>Evaluation</b>	
What action is to be taken?	
Are there reasonable grounds to suspect money laundering activity? If so, please provide details	

<b>Reporting</b>	
If there are reasonable grounds for suspicion, will a report be made to the NCA?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'no', reasons for non-disclosure	
If 'yes', date of report to NCA	Online / Manual [delete as appropriate]

<b>Consent</b>	
Is NCA consent required for any ongoing of imminent transactions?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'yes', please confirm details	
Date consent received from NCA	
Date consent passed on to officer	

<b>Other relevant information</b>

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**THIS REPORT TO BE RETAINED FOR AT LEAST FIVE YEARS**

## Fraud response plan

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This plan provides guidance on the action to be taken where fraud, theft or corruption against the council is suspected or discovered. It sets out who to report your concerns to, the investigation process and what to expect from Internal Audit.
- 1.2 This document forms part of the council's counter fraud framework and should be read in conjunction with the other documents that make up the Strategy against Fraud and Corruption. You may also wish to refer to the council's Whistle Blowing Policy, Code of Conduct, Disciplinary Policy and Financial Regulations.
- 1.3 The objectives of this plan are to ensure timely and effective action can be taken to:
- Minimise the risk of inappropriate action or disclosure which would compromise an investigation;
  - Ensure there is a clear understanding of who will lead any investigation and keep other individuals informed and involved as appropriate;
  - Prevent further loss of funds or other assets and maximise recovery of losses;
  - Identify the perpetrator and secure sufficient evidence necessary for disciplinary or legal action;
  - Review the reasons for the incident and identify the measures required to prevent a reoccurrence;
  - Reduce the adverse impacts on the business of the council and minimise adverse publicity arising from fraud; and
  - Identify any action needed to strengthen future responses to fraud.

### 2. Reporting your concerns

- 2.1 You should report your concerns to an appropriate person as soon as possible. All reporting channels shown overleaf are (with the exception of Expolink) available to members, officers, contractors, partners and the public.
- 2.2 Regulation 4.5 of the Financial Regulations requires all cases of suspected corruption or financial irregularity to be reported to the Chief Internal Auditor. The individuals listed overleaf will notify the Chief Internal Auditor of any referrals.
- 2.3 Employees may wish to approach their line manager in the first instance (unless this is not appropriate because, for example, they are implicated) to pass on the information on their behalf. This is acceptable in all cases except suspected money laundering, which must be reported directly to the Money Laundering Reporting Officer or their deputy (see Appendix C).
- 2.4 While you may choose to make an anonymous referral, please consider the following:
- There will not be any opportunity to ask you follow up questions or seek clarification, which may prevent an investigation from reaching a satisfactory conclusion.
  - The Whistle Blowing Policy clearly sets out the council's zero tolerance approach to harassment or victimisation and its commitment to protect officers who raise concerns in good faith.
- 2.5 You must only report concerns that you believe to be true. If it is subsequently determined that a referral was made maliciously, or for personal gain, it may be dealt with as a disciplinary matter.

2.6 You may report your concerns to:

**Chief Internal Auditor** (Money Laundering Reporting Officer – see Appendix C)  
Telephone: 01273 481447 / 020 8541 9299  
Email: [internal.audit@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:internal.audit@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Director of Finance** (Section 151 Officer)  
Telephone: 020 8541 7012  
Email: [sheila.little@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sheila.little@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Director of Legal, Democratic & Cultural Services** (Monitoring Officer)  
Telephone: 020 8541 9088  
Email: [monitoring.officer@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:monitoring.officer@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Elected Members**

Find your local councillor: <http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/mgFindMember.aspx>

**Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee**

Email: [david.harmer@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:david.harmer@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Grant Thornton** (the council's external auditors)

Email: [marcus.ward@uk.gt.com](mailto:marcus.ward@uk.gt.com)

**Public Concern at Work** (charity offering free whistle blowing advice)

Telephone: 020 7404 6609

Email: [whistle@pcaw.org.uk](mailto:whistle@pcaw.org.uk)

**Expolink** (independent, confidential hotline)

Telephone: 0800 374 199

Submit an online report: [www.expolink.co.uk/whistleblowing/submit-a-report](http://www.expolink.co.uk/whistleblowing/submit-a-report)

Please note, this is not available to the public; the access code is available on s-net.

### 3. Initial response

3.1 If someone approaches you to report concerns, you should:

- Listen patiently and without prejudice to their concerns
- Ask whether they wish to remain anonymous (obtaining contact details if not)
- Treat all information seriously and in strict confidence
- Obtain as much information as possible during the referral (but do not conduct your own investigation), such as:
  - Outline of the allegations and their impact
  - People involved including job role in the case of employees
  - Amount of money and/or details of other assets involved
  - Timescales (one-off or ongoing)
  - Evidence (available notes, documents or other evidence)
- Not interfere with any evidence and ensure it is kept secure

3.2 As required by the Financial Regulations, you should contact the Chief Internal Auditor to agree any proposed action. The Chief Internal Auditor may request additional information before determining whether a full investigation is necessary and advice will be given on how to approach this without alerting the suspected perpetrator.

3.3 You should also consider whether the allegations pose any immediate safeguarding risks and contact the relevant managers in Adult Social Care or Children Schools and

Families directorates if necessary. Safeguarding concerns will take priority over an allegation of fraud and corruption, although this should still be reported.

- 3.4 Where an allegation involves an employee, it may not be appropriate for the employee to remain in their role whilst the investigation is undertaken. Any risk assessment and decision to suspend an employee (or move them to alternative duties) will be taken by Human Resources in consultation with the line manager and advice from the Chief Internal Auditor.

#### **4. Investigating officer**

- 4.1 The Chief Internal Auditor will evaluate the outcomes from the initial enquiries to determine whether a full investigation is warranted and, if so, appoint an investigating officer. In most cases this will be an officer from Internal Audit but, where an officer from another service is appointed, advice and support will be provided.
- 4.2 The investigating officer will remain impartial throughout the investigation and will:
- Conduct the investigation in a prompt manner;
  - Obtain evidence in line with the guidance in section 5 of this plan;
  - Record and secure all evidence obtained;
  - Ensure any information and/or knowledge is contained;
  - Involve and notify other key officers as appropriate (management, Human Resources, Insurance, Internal Audit); and
  - Conclude the investigation in line with guidance in section 6 of this plan.

#### **5. Evidence**

- 5.1 It is essential that all available evidence relating to the allegation is preserved. This involves a fine balance between not alerting the suspected perpetrator before it is appropriate, complying with council policies and ensuring evidence remains admissible in a court of law.
- 5.2 Legislative requirements must also be fulfilled, in particular those of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA). If you are uncertain, seek advice from the Chief Internal Auditor. The most common forms of evidence and brief guidance are given below.

##### ***Council premises***

- 5.3 Inspection of any council premises or property must be witnessed by a key/code holder in the case of locked areas, safes and cash tins, or at least one manager in the case of other store rooms, cupboards and work stations. A list of the contents should be made and the list signed and dated by both you and the witness as being a true record of what was found.
- 5.4 You must not remove any cash or other valuables without first speaking with the Chief Internal Auditor to agree such action and arrange alternative secure storage.

##### ***Original documents***

- 5.5 Original documents should be obtained and retained, handled as little as possible and placed in a protective folder. Under no circumstance must they be marked in any way. All copies of original documents or screen images should be formally certified as a true copy with the date of copying. You should maintain a record of all documents detailing how, when and where they were obtained.

**Computer data**

- 5.6 When evidence is held on a computer hard drive, the computer should be secured. You must not attempt to access or download information from the computer yourself. Information may also be held on the council’s network, for example, networked folders and emails.
- 5.7 In both cases, the Chief Internal Auditor and Technical Delivery Manager in IMT will advise on the most appropriate way of retrieving the data in accordance with council policy and the rules of evidence.

**Video footage**

- 5.8 If you suspect that a CCTV or other camera system may have information of value, secure the hard copy media or arrange for a certified download of the data that is compliant with PACE requirements. The camera system engineer should be able to provide an appropriate download but you should seek advice initially from the Chief Internal Auditor about how to proceed.

**Interviews**

- 5.9 You should maintain a record of interviews or meetings held, including the date, location, attendees and, as a minimum, summary notes. When obtaining evidence through interviews and meetings, be aware of how much (or little) information needs to be shared for the meeting to be useful.
- 5.10 Interviews with the suspected perpetrator are normally conducted by two people. Unless the interview is part of a formal disciplinary process, the person is not expected to be accompanied by a representative. You should retain original copies of any handwritten notes made during the interview in addition to any subsequently typed notes. These notes should try to reflect a full account of the conversation.
- 5.11 Within the council, ‘interviews under caution’ will only be conducted by officers from Internal Audit or Trading Standards to ensure such interviews are appropriately recorded and fully compliant with PACE.

**Surveillance**

- 5.12 RIPA provides a clear statutory framework for certain investigative techniques such as surveillance, the definition of which includes:
  - Monitoring, observing or listening to persons, their conversations, their movements or their other activities; or
  - Recording anything monitored, observed or listened to in the course of surveillance; and
  - Surveillance by or with the assistance of a surveillance device.
- 5.13 RIPA authorisation must be obtained before conducting certain types of surveillance. You **must not** use any ‘covert<sup>2</sup>’ and/or ‘directed<sup>3</sup>’ surveillance without first seeking advice from the Chief Internal Auditor. Failure to comply with RIPA may result in evidence being deemed inadmissible in court and the council being fined.

---

<sup>2</sup> Action is ‘covert’ if it is carried out in a manner that is calculated to ensure that the person who is subject to surveillance is unaware that it is or may be taking place.

<sup>3</sup> ‘Directed’ surveillance targets an individual with the intention of gaining private information. This includes information relating to private and family life, home and correspondence, and includes activities of a professional or business nature.



## **6. Investigation conclusion**

- 6.1 You will present your conclusions, together with your evidence and notes, to the Chief Internal Auditor who will review the outcome of the investigation irrespective of whether the investigating officer is a member of the Internal Audit team.
- 6.2 Your conclusions must be based solely on the available evidence and any recommended sanction should be in accordance with the Sanctions Policy (Appendix E). You should be prepared to give a statement, if required, as part of any subsequent disciplinary or legal action.
- 6.3 The Chief Internal Auditor will take into account your conclusions when agreeing the appropriate action to take including sanctions.

## **7. What to expect from Internal Audit**

- 7.1 Any conversations you have, or information that you share, with the Internal Audit team will remain confidential. You should remember, however, that the Chief Internal Auditor has a responsibility to investigate all cases of suspected fraud.
- 7.2 When a decision is made not to conduct a full investigation, Internal Audit will offer advice and assistance to improve management controls and minimise adverse impacts on the service.
- 7.3 If the investigating officer is within Internal Audit, a summary email, briefing note or full report (as appropriate) will be issued to relevant council officers and members. Due to requirements of the Data Protection Act, however, and the council's duty of confidentiality to its clients, employees and members, information about investigation outcomes may be limited for those outside the council.
- 7.4 Any investigation led by Internal Audit will seek to make recommendations to reduce the risk of reoccurrence and strengthen control systems. Information gained during investigation may also be used to help disclose similar frauds within the council.

## **8. Press and publicity**

- 8.1 Publicity can act as a strong deterrent to fraud and corruption with publicity of successful cases demonstrating the council's zero tolerance approach. Under no circumstance, however, must details of any cases suspected or under investigation be released to the press or public.
- 8.2 All press and publicity, whether internal or external, will be managed by the council's Communications team. Disclosure of details of a case, successful or otherwise, to the media without the express authority of Communications may be dealt with as a disciplinary matter.
- 8.3 Publicity within the council will be managed by Internal Audit in consultation with Communications. Case details in any such publicity will be anonymised.

## Sanctions policy

### Policy statement

Surrey County Council will ensure that:

- Appropriate sanctions are applied in all proven cases of fraud, theft and corruption;
- Public funds are recovered wherever possible; and
- The sanction decision making process is robust, transparent and fair.

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The council takes its responsibility to protect public funds seriously and expects its business to be conducted to the highest ethical and legal standards. Where there is evidence of fraud, theft or corruption against the council, those responsible, whether internal or external to the council, will be held accountable for their actions using the full range of sanctions available.
- 1.2 This policy forms part of the council's counter fraud framework and sets out:
- The range of sanctions available; and
  - Guidance on determining the appropriate action to take.
- 1.3 This policy is not prescriptive. A range of factors will require consideration before deciding on the appropriate sanction, including the individual circumstances of each case and the seriousness of the offence.

### 2. Sanction options

- 2.1 Where there is evidence of fraud, theft or corruption, the following options will be considered:
- No further action
  - Referral to professional bodies
  - Disciplinary action
  - Civil proceedings
  - Criminal prosecution
- 2.2 These options are not mutually exclusive and parallel sanctions may be pursued.

#### ***No further action***

- 2.3 The council may consider closing a case without taking any further action. This may be due to the following factors:
- Evidence is not robust or reliable
  - The offence is minor
  - The cost to pursue the case is not proportionate to the offence committed

#### ***Referral to professional bodies***

- 2.4 Where there is adequate evidence that a person or entity has breached professional duties or responsibilities, the council will refer the matter to the relevant professional body. This may include the Disclosure and Barring Service if there is evidence of a safeguarding concern.

***Disciplinary action***

- 2.5 In the event that an allegation is made against a council employee, the investigating officer will consult with Human Resources and the employee's line manager regarding risk assessments and disciplinary action. Any disciplinary action will be in accordance with the council's Disciplinary Policy. Sanctions may include warnings or dismissal on the grounds of gross misconduct.
- 2.6 Additional sanction options will be considered alongside any disciplinary action including referral to professional bodies, civil proceedings and criminal prosecution.

***Civil proceedings***

- 2.7 Where evidence is not sufficient to prove a case beyond reasonable doubt, and therefore successful criminal prosecution is unlikely, the council may consider civil proceedings for which the standard of proof is on the balance of probability.
- 2.8 Regardless of whether any sanction action is taken, the council will always seek recovery of overpaid, misused or unfairly gained monies. The following measures may be considered in the pursuit of financial recovery:
- Consultation with the council's Payroll and Pensions Teams to redress financial loss caused by employees;
  - Application of the Credit Control Team's usual procedures, which includes civil action when necessary;
  - Legal action such as search orders and freezing/tracing injunctions to preserve evidence and assets; and
  - Recovery of money through appropriate legal proceedings.

***Criminal prosecution***

- 2.9 Where there is sufficient evidence to indicate that a criminal act has taken place, the case may be referred to the police. The decision to refer the issue to enforcement agencies, such as Surrey Police, will be taken by the Director of Finance and/or Monitoring Officer as advised by the Chief Internal Auditor.
- 2.10 The police or Crown Prosecution Service will provide a final decision on whether to pursue the case. This decision will consider the following:
- **Evidential criteria** such that the evidence must be:
    - Clear, reliable and admissible in court
    - Strong enough for a realistic chance of prosecution; to prove a case 'beyond reasonable doubt'
  - Whether prosecution is in the **public interest**, taking into account:
    - Seriousness and/or monetary value of the offence
    - Cost and proportionality of the prosecution
    - Age, health and level of culpability of the suspect
    - Circumstances of and harm caused to the victim
    - Other factors such as community impact
- 2.11 Where the council considers it "expedient for the promotion or protection of the interests" of its residents, Section 222 of the Local Government Act 1972 empowers the council to:
- Prosecute or defend or appear in legal proceedings and, in the case of civil proceedings, institute them in their own name; and

- In their own name, make representations in the interests of residents at any public inquiry held by or on behalf of a public body under any enactment.
- 2.12 The council will only consider undertaking prosecutions through this route under exceptional circumstances and any decision to do so will be taken by the Director of Finance and Monitoring Officer as advised by the Chief Internal Auditor.
- 2.13 Any criminal proceedings will include an attempt to recover money under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.

### **3. Leaving the council**

- 3.1 During the course of an investigation or disciplinary action, the employee(s) suspected of fraud, theft or corruption may choose to resign from their employment with the council. In this case, following a review of evidence, the council may continue to pursue referral to professional bodies, civil proceedings or criminal prosecution.
- 3.2 The employee's line manager will also consult with Human Resources to determine whether it will be appropriate to provide a reference to future employers.

### **4. Publicity**

- 4.1 Guidance on publicity is available in the Fraud Response Plan (Appendix D). The decision to publicise outcomes will consider the following criteria:
- Interests of Surrey County Council;
  - Interests of Surrey residents; and
  - Deterrent value to others.

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF  
CABINET HELD ON 14 DECEMBER 2017  
AND 30 JANUARY 2018

Any matters within the minutes of these Cabinet meetings may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 5 February 2018.

Please note that the minutes of the 30 January 2018 Cabinet meeting will be issued as a supplementary agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 14 DECEMBER 2017 AT 2.00 PM  
AT COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,  
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

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

\* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mrs Hazel Watson  
Mr Jonathan Essex  
Mr Keith Witham

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

An apology was received from Mr John Furey.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There were none.



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reasons for Decision:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reason for Decision:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

The council's 2017/18 budget included significant demand and cost pressures, mostly in social care. In the first eight months of the year, demand had increased above that forecast even a short time ago. For example, in Children's Services, demand continued to increase and was expected to add an £8m pressure by the end of the financial year. Partially offsetting these pressures, there were forecast underspends elsewhere, including in Children Schools & Families, Adult Social Care, Orbis, Highways & Transport, Waste and Central Income & Expenditure.

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

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

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

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

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted including the following:

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

3. Forecast planned savings for 2017/18 totalled £79m against £95m agreed savings and £104m target (Annex 1, paragraph 45 of the submitted report).
4. All services continued to take all reasonable action to keep costs down and optimise income (e.g. minimising spending, managing vacancies wherever possible etc.).
5. The Section 151 Officer's commentary and the Monitoring Officer's Legal Implications commentary in paragraphs 16 to 19 of the submitted report stated that the council had a duty to ensure its expenditure did not exceed resources available and move towards a sustainable budget for future years.

That the following be approved:

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

**Reason for Decisions:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reasons for Decisions:**

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

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

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

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

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

Cabinet Members made the following comments:

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

The Leader proposed an additional recommendation which was accepted.

### **RESOLVED:**

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



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

**Reasons for Decision:**

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

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

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

This item was deferred until January 2018.

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

**RESOLVED:**

The decision taken by a Cabinet Member since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report was noted.

**Reason for Decision:**

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reasons for Decision:**

See Minute 218/17.

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 221/17.

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 222/17.

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

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

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

Meeting closed at 3.58 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET – 14 December 2017**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Members Questions**

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

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

**Reply:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Reply:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Reply:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Reply:**

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

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

This strategy is in line with Cabinet approval.

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

This page is intentionally left blank





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

24<sup>th</sup> October 2016

Dear [NAME]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET – 14 December 2017**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Public Questions**

**Question 1: Ms Sally Blake**

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

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

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

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

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

**Question 2: Mr John Oliver**

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

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

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

**Question 3: Mr John Oliver**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Relating to the Pay and Conserve proposal:

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

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

**Combined Response:**

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

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

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

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

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Cabinet agree option 5 with further consideration given to

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

**RESPONSE:**

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

Responding to the recommendations in turn:

**Payment options**

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

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

**Enforcement**

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

**Displacement**

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

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

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

### **Scheme review**

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

### **Cyclist Provision**

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

**Mr Mike Goodman**

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport**

**14 December 2017**



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

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

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

**RESPONSE:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank