

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 29 JANUARY 2019 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr Tim Oliver (Chairman)	*Mr Mike Goodman
*Mr Colin Kemp (Vice-Chairman)	*Mrs Mary Lewis
*Ms Charlotte Morley	*Mrs Julie Iles
*Mrs Sinead Mooney	*Mr Matt Furniss
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Mrs Natalie Bramhall	*Mr Wyatt Ramsdale
*Mr Cameron McIntosh	*Miss Alison Griffiths

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr Ken Gulati, Chairman of Corporate Overview Select Committee
Mr Will Forster, Woking South
Dr Andrew Povey, Cranleigh & Ewhurst
Mr Jonathan Essex, Redhill East
Mrs Hazel Watson, Dorking Hills
Mr Chris Botten, Caterham Hill
Mr Stephen Cooksey, Dorking South & The Holmwoods
Mr John O'Reilly, Hersham

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

1/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were none.

2/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 18 DECEMBER 2018 [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2018 were approved as an accurate record.

3/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

4/19 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

1 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were eight questions received from four Members. The questions and responses are attached as annex A.

Several supplementary questions were asked by Members:-

Q1. Mr Will Forster asked if support would be available to the families of EU staff. The Deputy Leader responded that guidance for the general public was available on the Government website and links would be put on the Council's website as well as social media.

Q2. Mr Will Forster asked what insurance had the Council received, or would receive, as a result of Lakers Youth Centre. The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families responded that she would send that information to Mr Forster.

Q4. Dr Andrew Povey was pleased with the revised recommendations for the community recycling centres and asked for assurance that the assessment would be open and published and that ideas from residents would be sought. The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste gave assurances and stated that further details would be discussed under item 7a on the agenda.

Q5. Mr Jonathan Essex asked if it could be confirmed what the predicted monthly expenditure was for agency and interim workers in the 19/20 year. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support would send a written response for this.

Q6. Mr Jonathan Essex asked:

- (a) In relation to children's centres he asked for an explanation why it was considered that only one mobile bus was deemed to be enough to provide effective coverage
- (b) for consideration of the Government guidance of distance of community recycling centres
- (c) for further consideration of methods for increasing recycling and increasing revenue from recycling, e.g. sorting paper
- (d) for assurances that further proposals would not reduce recycling rates and this is looked at properly

The Leader stated that the questions b) to d) regarding recycling centres would be dealt with under the agenda item when more information would be reported.

With regards to question a) the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families stated that more information would be discussed under agenda item 7a but in a nutshell what the Council was proposing was for an outreach service that doesn't focus on buildings. What came out of the consultation is that the mobile centre would be focussed on hard to reach communities e.g. Gypsy/Roma communities and would provide flexible outreach service. The remaining children's centres would be hubs from which outreach service would be provided to a much wider area.

Q8. Mr Jonathan Essex asked for confirmation how the new Investment Strategy would develop and how one could contribute to it. The Leader responded that the Investment Board would be considering the future Investment Strategy in the near future that will consider whether investment continues out of the county but at the moment the focus will be on the Surrey estate.

5/19 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were three questions received from members of the public. The questions and responses are attached as annex B.

Supplementary questions were asked by:

Q1 Mrs Blake made several points:

- She questioned the data used in the response to her question and stated that the figures using car parking before the charges was double that figure used by the Council and that since charging the use had dropped considerably
- She asked if the negative effect of the parking charges on health of Surrey residents and on the health and social care budget be taken into account when the scheme is reviewed and if not, why not

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste did not support the figures quoted by Mrs Blake and explained that the revenue received from the charges was used to protect the environment.

Q2. Mr Oliver asked that the Council conduct an urgent independent review of the Cabinet area of responsibility for the environment and its relationship with Surrey Wildlife Trust, an organisation which was failing all its objectives and if not, why not.

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste gave details of the Woodland Strategy adopted by the Council and other work undertaken to protect wildlife and the environment. He also stated that he would provide written details to Mr Oliver on how the Surrey Wildlife Trust worked.

Q3. Mrs King asked if the Council would support the offer that Reigate and Banstead Borough Council had made to work with the County on a local delivery model for a service that engages with existing providers including Dover's Green Children's Centre.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families explained that it would be several months before centres started closing and that the Council would work closely with district and borough councils to see what services that residents valued could be located. That will be taking place across the whole county and not just Reigate and Banstead.

6/19 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were nine petitions submitted. Three of these concerned children's centres and six concerning community recycling centres. Details and responses to the petitions are attached as annex C.

Mr George Potter presented the petition in support of Boxgrove Children's Centre and made the following points:

- That Boxgrove Children's Centre was a vital resource
- That if it closed residents would have to take two buses or a one hour journey to the nearest hub
- If it closed it would be social workers and teachers having to pick up the pieces

- That the number signing the petition was larger than the Conservative majority at the last election.

Ms Hannah Nicholson presented the petition in support of Cranleigh Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- Recycling rates had reduced
- There had been increases in fines, fly-tipping and litter
- There was increased build-up of waste in gardens which led to vermin
- Hundreds of new homes were built in Cranleigh which increased waste
- There would be a 20 mile round trip to the nearest centre if Cranleigh closed
- She understood the need to save money but not at the expense of the environment and stated that residents would rather pay a small fee to use the current site

Hazel Watson presented the petition in support of Dorking Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- Further signatories to the petition were tabled
- Highlighted the impact on drive times if the centre closed and that it would be 20 to 30 minutes more to drive to the next nearest centre
- The Leatherhead centre suffered massive queues and there was reduced opening times at other centres
- Requested to keep the Dorking centre open for at least three days per week, if not seven.

Mr Charles Lister presented the petition in support of Warlingham Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- He was pleased that the Council were going to review the options
- He described the anger felt by residents over the initial proposed closure
- Warlingham was the smallest site in Surrey and it averaged one use every two minutes it was open
- Caterham site was not big enough to cope with extra users
- There needed to be a better solution to recycling and that kerbside collections did not compensate.

Ms Sylvia Whyte presented the petition in support of Lyne Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- She was happy that the centre was going to stay open
- Additional signatories to the petition were tabled
- She spoke of increased fly-tipping and 100's of new homes being built
- The A320 was saturated and spoke of journeys to alternative sites
- Closure would mean more burning of waste in back gardens

Daniel Gee presented the petition in support of Farnham Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- He spoke of another online petition that was not presented to Cabinet
- He spoke of the need to relocate the Farnham site so this position was not replicated in the future.

7/19 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

8/19 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

Mr Ken Gulati, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Select Committee presented the committee's recommendations relating to item 7b on the agenda. A response to the report is attached as Annex D.

9/19 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/ INVESTMENT BOARD TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by the Cabinet Members under delegated authority be noted.

Reason for Decision

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

10/19 TRANSFORMATION PROPOSALS - DELIVERING BETTER SERVICES FOR RESIDENTS [Item]

The Leader reported an error in the report: In Annex 4, Table 5, the total estimated saving figure for 2020/21 was incorrect. It currently read as £1,060,000 when it should read £1,110,000.

Mr Chris Botten addressed the Cabinet and expressed concern about the possible lack of children support for the Tandridge area and south of the M25. He highlighted many of the current services that he said needed a building to provide a means of safety and security. He requested that Cabinet reconsider the possibility of a satellite centre in this location as without details of what the proposed outreach service would provide then he was not reassured.

Mr Stephen Cooksey addressed the Cabinet and spoke about the Dorking Children's Centre which had an outstanding rating by Ofsted and provided good services to some of the most deprived in Surrey. The current budget proposals meant that only a shadow of the current services could be provided. He requested that Cabinet rethink its proposals. He also spoke of the Dorking Community Recycling Centre and was glad to see the revised recommendations to keep it open whilst a review was undertaken but again requested that Cabinet find a way to keep this centre open permanently.

Mr John O'Reilly addressed the Cabinet and thanked both the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families as well as the Executive Director for Children, Families and Learning for the engagement undertaken. He spoke of confidence in the two to take forward the transformation of

children's services. He stated that as a realist he understood the need for change but asked Cabinet to exercise flexibility and discretion going forward.

Mr Will Forster also addressed the Cabinet and spoke against the proposed closure of five of the seven children's centres in Woking which was the second most deprived borough in Surrey. He also expressed concern about the budget cuts for the remaining centres where one in particular would have a 40% budget cut. He questioned the use of 2015 data which he said was not reliable and gave details of the numbers of new social properties built since then.

Mr Jonathan Essex spoke of the need for the two children's centres proposed for closure in his area. He spoke of the high cost of living in Surrey and the subsequent areas of deprivation. He understood the need for change and for improving children's services but did not understand the reasoning given for the closures. He requested that Cabinet put the proposals on hold for six months, as they are proposing for the community recycling centres, and press for a comprehensive funding settlement.

The Leader thanked the speakers and stated that all 81 councillors wanted to see improved outcomes. The Cabinet would work with boroughs and district councils going forward. However, there was no intention of changing the recommendations on children's centres today.

Children's Centres

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families thanked the petitioners, speakers and questioners for their interest in the wellbeing of children and highlighted the Vision of the Council where no one is left behind. She went on to explain the need for change and reported that Ofsted had said outcomes for 'children in need of care and protection' were inadequate. She painted a picture of the children and their families that need the support but do not currently access services until a crisis point. She explained that the new service model would focus on outreach taking support into people's homes, making families more resilient.

She went on to explain that the Council would work with borough and district councils to facilitate the provision of non-statutory services such as baby weigh-ins and stay & play. She explained each recommendation and spoke of the evidence that this was the right approach and highlighted evidence from a National Audit Office report on the closure of Children's Centres where it was shown that there was no increase in child protection cases with a targeted service.

The Deputy Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning stated that she had two children's centres closing in her area and spoke of generational problems and lack of parenting skills as well as other issues and that there was a need to look at the whole family rather than just children.

RESOLVED:

1. The remodelling of the remaining Children's Centres to create Family Centres as part of a wider Family Service to support families with children aged 0-11 that are the most vulnerable was endorsed.

2. That the number of Children's Centres in Surrey be reduced from 58 centres to 21 centres and satellite sites, to be located in areas where children are most likely to experience poor outcomes. At least one main centre in each district and borough supported by the use of satellites, outreach workers and community venues.
3. That the number of mobile Family Centres in Surrey be reduced from two to one in order to reach areas where there are small numbers of vulnerable children and families.

The vote was unanimous.

Reasons for decision

Moving to a new model of Family Centre services will help develop a more effective way of supporting families that need help earlier to improve their outcomes. By reorganising Children's Centres into more targeted models of provision, we believe this will support more children and young people to avoid becoming subject to child protection or public care.

The Family Centre model will enable us to help more families and children to become more resilient who would otherwise be more likely to experience poor outcomes without support.

Retention of a mobile Family Centre means we can maintain outreach support to children and families across the county who may struggle to access a main centre or community venue.

By prioritising the location of Family Centres in areas of high deprivation, or where children are likely to be living in households that have low incomes or unemployment, this will enable us to prioritise resources for children who need services most. Deprived areas have been identified using the 2015 Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index, which shows the proportion of children under the age of 16 living in low-income households in different neighbourhoods.

Recognising that some needs cross the boundaries of deprivation, such as domestic abuse and parental mental health, funding allocations are also being based on the total population of children within communities.

The composition of the families the Centres support have children across a range of different ages, which fall outside the current service offer for 0-5 year olds. Centres are already supporting families with children who fall outside of this age bracket. We therefore propose to expand the age range of children supported to 0-11 years as part of the service offer going forward.

Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND)

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning presented this part of the report and explained why the Council were undertaking the path presented. She spoke of the need for earlier identification of needs as well as upskilling of staff to provide the support needed. She also spoke of a question submitted by Family Voice and explained that she would be sharing details with them through the consultation phase.

RESOLVED:

4. That the broad support from consultation respondents for the proposed principles for transformation of SEND services was noted, namely:
 - Children with special educational needs are identified earlier and supported in a timely and effective way in order to improve their outcomes and wellbeing.
 - There is an increased focus on earlier intervention and prevention to offer help and meet needs at the earliest opportunity, reducing the demand on high cost, high need interventions.
 - Children and young people are helped to become resilient and independent so that they can lead independent and fulfilling lives in their own communities.
 - The voices of our children, young people and families are heard so they can shape and inform how we work together to get the best results.
 - Surrey's early years settings, schools, colleges and other providers are able to support children to live and grown up locally and achieve their full potential.
5. That the broad support from consultation respondents for the areas of transformation for SEND services was noted, namely:
 - Early identification and support
 - Developing local services and managing the market
 - Partnership working
 - Improving policy and practice.
6. That further engagement and co-design activity will be undertaken with families, health partners, education and other partners to explore the feedback, ideas and concerns shared through the consultation and develop the council's draft SEND strategy into a jointly owned Surrey special educational needs and disabilities strategy and long term action plan was noted.
7. That authority be delegated to the Executive Director for Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for All Age Learning, to approve the final joint strategy and the long-term action plan, once completed subject to paragraph 77 of the submitted report and further Cabinet decision as necessary.
8. That in the event that any of the co-design activity work, strategy identification and/or action plan gives rise to a change in the delivery of services that necessitates consultation and public engagement that will be undertaken alongside consideration to our Public Sector Equality and Section 11 Children Act 2004 duties.

The vote was unanimous.

Reasons for decision

Agreeing the recommendations for the draft SEND strategy will enable the council to carry out further co-design of those services for some of the most vulnerable children and young people in the county so they are able to access the high quality services they need.

Libraries & Culture

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning also introduced this part of the report and spoke of the need for financially stable spaces needed for community use. She also spoke of the consultation undertaken and highlighted that there had been a lack of representation of those under 18 years of age and that this would be picked up in the next stages. In response to a Member question she confirmed that consultation was undertaken with Surrey County Council maintained schools through their bulletin and that an email link had been sent to independent schools.

RESOLVED:

9. That the refinements, in italics, to the five strategic principles of the proposed Libraries and Cultural Services Strategy, reflecting consultation feedback was noted. These are:
 - Libraries and cultural services provide and enable opportunities for everyone to learn, access information, acquire new skills, literacy and be involved in their communities.
 - There *will be* a focus on the wellbeing and strengthening of communities, particularly the most vulnerable, to enable them to be resilient, *providing touch points and safe spaces*.
 - Libraries and cultural services are most effective and efficient when they work in partnership with the public, voluntary, community and private sectors, including through the creation of shared spaces *creating a model of financial sustainability*.
 - New technologies, including digital, enable libraries and cultural services to reach new audiences, and existing audiences in new ways, and offer 24/7 access.
 - Volunteers are crucial community advocates and assets in libraries and cultural services, who also gain valuable skills and relationships through the work they do.
10. That the Executive Director for Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture will prepare detailed proposals with partners, including district and borough councils, for a proposed future model for library and cultural services in Surrey based on the five newly adopted strategic principles was noted.
11. That a second public consultation be carried out setting out the detailed proposals referred to in Resolution 9 above.

The vote was unanimous.

Reasons for decision

The council can proceed to develop a financially sustainable future model of libraries and cultural services in Surrey, subject to consultation and the Equality Impact Assessment, that reflects modern expectations, is fit for purpose and provides and enables opportunities for everyone to learn, access information, acquire new skills, increase literacy and be involved in their communities.

Community Recycling Centres

Amended recommendations were tabled at the meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste spoke of the new recommendations and thanked organisations and residents that had made their views known. He highlighted that the community recycling centres (CRC) would deal with recycling only and no non-recyclables. He went on to explain the new task group to be set up to review the service. It would be a cross-party task group taking evidence from Suez, borough and district councils, residents, Members of Parliament, officers, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Surrey Waste Partnership so would be wide reaching. The task group would look at keeping the CRCs open whilst still having a balance budget. A report was expected to be brought to Cabinet in June 2019.

The Deputy Leader stated that fly-tipping was a national issue and would urge all residents to check for licenses and get receipts for their waste disposal. He also extended thanks to the Leadership and to officers for the work undertaken.

RESOLVED:

12. That the community recycling centres (CRCs) located at Farnham and Lyne (Chertsey) be retained, based on the current and projected use of these sites.
13. That the current prices for materials in the charging waste scheme be maintained.
14. That a charge for construction wood and roofing felt from Monday 1 April 2019 or as soon as practically possible after this be introduced.
15. That an annual application fee for van, trailer and pick-up permits from 1 May 2019 be introduced, when all permits are due for renewal.
16.
 - a. That the CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham be retained until 30 September 2019, but restrict their use to accepting recycling materials only.
 - b. During this period assess whether different models for operating and funding these four CRCs could achieve the same saving as closing them. If that service cannot be achieved then proceed with their closure on 1 October 2019.

- c. In the event that the four CRCs close, extend the opening hours of Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead CRCs from six days per week to seven days per week.

17. That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste establish a task group to work with officers to develop a new waste strategy for Surrey County Council by September 2020, considering the implications of the Government's Resource and Waste Strategy and to ensure the waste service is affordable within the current financial strategy.

The vote was unanimous.

Reason for decision

Recognising both the value many residents place on Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) and the need to make savings, we propose to limit closure of CRCs to the minimum number possible to achieve savings. Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham are recommended for closure as they handle the least waste and have the lowest number of visitors, however this will be delayed so that alternative options to achieve the savings through alternative operational and funding models can be fully explored. Further CRC usage information can be found in Annex 4b to the submitted report.

As the nearest alternative CRCs within the network, extending the opening hours of Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead CRCs should help to mitigate the impact of the CRC closures if this goes ahead.

In addition, introducing charges for construction wood and roofing felt and launching permits for vans, trailers and pickups will assist in delivery of the savings target for 2019/20. While the option to increase charges on the existing charging waste scheme has been explored, it would have a negligible impact on savings delivery and charges are currently towards the upper end of charges relative to similar councils.

Concessionary Bus Travel

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste presented this part of the report that sought to bring the Council offer on non-statutory concessionary bus travel in line with other councils. He explained that details of the responses to the consultation was available on the Council's website.

He pointed out that paragraph 41 of the report speaks of companion passes being for a trial period. This was an earlier option considered and should be removed from the report.

RESOLVED:

18. That the non-statutory additional travel concession for disabled pass holders and offer the national statutory English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) in Surrey from 1 April 2019 be withdrawn. Disabled pass holders will be able to travel for free between 09.30 and 23.00 on weekdays, all day at weekends and on bank holidays

19. That companion passes be retained, so from 1 April 2019 entitled pass holders and a companion can travel for free between 9:30am and 11:00pm on weekdays, all day at weekends and bank holidays.
20. That officers would continue discussions with bus operators on a commercial offer of a reduced fare or flat fare scheme in the county was noted.

Reason for decision

By agreeing these recommendations, this will help the council to achieve savings of £400,000 to contribute towards its overall savings requirement in 2019/20.

In addition, impact on travel is likely to be minimal. Analysis shows that only 2% of all journeys made using the disabled pass take place before 9:30am and after 11:00pm on weekdays.

Having considered the consultation feedback, and the impact removal of the companion pass will have on disabled pass holders and their companions, we are proposing to retain companion passes, but bring the terms of companion pass usage in line with those of disabled passes. This means companion pass holders will be able to travel on the bus network for free from 9:30am to 11:00pm on weekdays, and free all day for weekends and bank holidays.

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

11/19 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 9]

The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced a report that summarised the most significant issues for the Council's 2018/19 financial position as at 30 November 2018 for both revenue and capital budgets. He explained how the new method of reporting was much improved with real time data and reported that the use of reserves had reduced.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families recognised the huge upheaval for staff in Children's Services of which 2700 staff would have been reconfigured by the end of March. She sought to reassure staff that it was about delivering better services.

The Leader thanked officers for their hard work.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet noted the Council's overall revenue and capital budget positions as at 30 November 2018:
 - £14.5m forecast underspend against the 2018/19 budget;
 - £6.7m forecast total draw down reserves;
 - £2.8m additional revenue funding in 2018/19 from the Department for Education to provide support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) (Annex 1, paragraph 1), and

- £132m forecast service capital programme outturn against £134m budget.
2. That the contribution to a new SEND Reserve an amount matching the overspending on the Dedicated Schools Grant High Needs Block was approved.

Reasons for decisions

This report was 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 Corporate Overview Select Committee]

12/19 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2019/20 TO 2023/24 [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for Finance presented a report which detailed:

- the revenue and capital budgets for 2019/20, including budget reductions
- the council tax precept level for 2019/20,
- the council's capital receipt flexibilities strategy, including the level of investment required to deliver the transformation programme, which aims to significantly change the way the council operates and delivers its services,
- indicative directorate budget envelopes to 2023/24, and
- the council's Capital and Investment Strategy, which provided an overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contributed to the provision of local public services.

He went on to express his appreciation of staff involved in putting the report together and drew Members attention to the S151 Officer comments and emphasised how important it was for Members to read and understand these.

An amendment for recommendations 2 and 3 as published was tabled at the meeting.

An error in the published paper was given as 'paragraph 12 of the report references annex 6 which was incorrect and should say annexes 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet makes the following recommendations to Council on 5 February 2019.

Cabinet recommends to Council to note the following important features of the revenue and capital budget

1. The Executive Director of Finance's statutory conclusions in his Section 25 statement.

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

2. Approve the net revenue budget requirement be set at £886.1 million (net cost of services after service specific government grants) for 2019/20 (Annex 6 of the submitted report), subject to confirmation of the Final Local Government Financial Settlement
3. Approve the total council tax funding requirement be set at £731.5 million for 2019/20. This is an increase in the level of the council tax of 2.99% (Annex 6 of the submitted report).
4. Notes that for the purpose of section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the council formally determines that the increase in council tax is not such as to trigger a referendum.
5. Set the Surrey County Council precept for Band D council tax at £1,453.50, which represents a 2.99% up-lift. This is a rise of 81p a week from 2018/19's precept of £1,411.29. This includes £102.39 for the Adult Social Care Precept, which remains at the same rate as last year. A full list of bands is as follows:

Council Tax Band	2018/19 £	2019/20 £
Band A	940.86	£969.00
Band B	1,097.67	£1,130.50
Band C	1,254.48	£1,292.00
Band D	1,411.29	£1,453.50
Band E	1,724.91	£1,776.51
Band F	2,038.53	£2,099.51
Band G	2,352.15	£2,422.51
Band H	2,822.58	£2,907.01

6. Approve the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy for 2019/20 to meet the statutory guidelines for the use of capital receipts to fund the transformation and reform of services (Annex 8 of the submitted report)
7. Approve the application of a further £7.2 million in the current 2018/19 financial year to fund the transformation under the capital receipt flexibilities strategy (Annex 8 of the submitted report).
8. Approve the use of £16.3 million in the 2019/20 financial year, to fund the transformation under the capital receipt flexibilities strategy (Annex 8 of the submitted report).
9. That the underlying balance on the general fund remains set at £21.3 million as at 1 April 2019.
10. Approve the Total Schools Budget of £492.9 million to meet the council's statutory requirement on schools funding. (Annex 6 of the submitted report).
11. Approve the overall indicative budget envelopes for Executive Directorates and individual services for the 2019/20 budget (Annex 6 of the submitted report).
12. Note the indicative budget envelopes for 2020-24 (Annex 6 of the submitted report).

13. Approve £413.8 million indicative five year capital programme, with £129.2 million capital investment in 2019/20 (Annex 6 of the submitted report).

Capital Strategy: Cabinet recommendations to Council:

14. The Capital Strategy for 2019-24 (Annex 9 of the submitted report)
15. The policy for making a prudent level of revenue provision for the repayment of debt (the Minimum Revenue Provisions policy) (Annex 9A of the submitted report)

Reasons for decision

Council will meet on 5 February 2019 to agree a budget and set the council tax precept for 2019/20. Cabinet must recommend a budget to Council to consider at this meeting.

The budget directs available resources to support the achievement of the council's ambitions and priorities in the Vision and the Organisation Strategy.

In particular, the budget proposals reflect the Vision ambition to ensure no one in Surrey is left behind. We know, as documented in the evidence base compiled to inform the 2030 Vision, that some residents experience a poorer quality of life than their neighbours - we will focus the resources we have available on actions that best support the most vulnerable people in communities, and those who do not have the means or resources to help themselves.

Prioritising spend in the current context of funding constraints and increased demands has necessitated the redirection of some funding from universal services and provision to targeted services and this is reflected in proposals for service transformation articulated in the accompanying Part A report Transformation Proposals – Delivering Better Services for Residents Cabinet report of 29 January 2019. The Part A report also details changes to services that include stopping some services we are not statutorily required to provide.

The budget will also support the delivery of the major transformational changes that are required to ensure that the council can improve priority outcomes for residents while managing growing demands for services and ensuring future financial sustainability.

Following the confirmation of the Council Tax and Business rates bases and collection fund balances by Surrey Borough and Districts, the total council tax to be collected will be £731.506m, an increase of £206,000. In addition, business rates receipts will increase by £77,000.

These changes will be reflected in the papers for County Council on 5 February.

13/19 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES FOR SEPTEMBER 2020 AND SURREY'S RELEVANT AREA [Item 8]

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning presented a report which explained how Surrey County Council was responsible for setting the admission arrangements for its community and voluntary controlled schools and the coordinated schemes. Academies, foundation, free, trust and voluntary aided

schools were responsible for setting their own admission arrangements and therefore their admission arrangements were not covered in the report. She highlighted the second recommendation of the report and reported that the governors of Wallace Fields Infant School had also agreed to the change to the admission arrangements.

RESOLVED:

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

Recommendation 1

That the published admissions number for Reception at Furze field Primary School is decreased from 60 to 58 for September 2020.

Reasons for decision

- It will enable children admitted to the SEND Learning and Additional Needs centre to be educated in the mainstream class more than 50% of the time
- It will reduce the likelihood of the school having to take qualifying measures to meet infant class size legislation
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There will still be sufficient places for local children if the PAN is decreased
- It will have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

Recommendation 2

That the admission arrangements for Wallace Fields Junior School are amended so that the measuring point used to assess nearest school and home to school distance will be the nearest gate of either Wallace Fields Infant School or Wallace Fields Junior School.

Reasons for Decision

- There was overall support for this change
- It will ensure that the school serves the local community around both the infant and the junior schools
- It will enable more local children to transfer from the infant school to the junior school
- It will support families by keeping siblings at schools that are within close proximity
- It will remove uncertainty for some families who have the infant school as their nearest school at Reception but not the junior school at Year 3
- This proposal is in line with a separate consultation by Wallace Fields Infant School to make the same changes to their admission arrangements. The change to the admission arrangements for Wallace Fields Junior School is subject to the governors of Wallace Fields Infant School also agreeing to the same change at their full Governing Body meeting on Wednesday 16 January 2019
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of Wallace Fields Junior School

Recommendation 3

That children previously in state care outside England who left that care as a result of being adopted are given priority under criterion two for children with an exceptional social/medical need.

Reasons for Decision

- It is consistent with the advice issued by Nick Gibb, Minister of State for School Standards, and advice issued by the Department for Education in August 2018
- It provides as much parity as the local authority can provide with children who have been adopted from care in England, who receive priority within criterion one
- It will ensure that this vulnerable group of children will receive priority in the admissions process for community and voluntary controlled schools, regardless of the country in which the child was in state care, as long as they were adopted from that care.

Recommendation 4

That Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Enclosure 3 to the submitted report.

Reasons for Decision

- The local authority is required by law to define the Relevant Area for admissions
- The Relevant Area must be consulted upon and agreed every two years even if no changes are proposed
- Setting a Relevant Area ensures that any schools who might be affected by changes to the admission arrangements for other local schools will be made aware of those changes
- No change has been made to Surrey's Relevant Area since it was last determined in March 2017

Recommendation 5

That the Published Admission Numbers (PANs) for September 2020 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools (excluding Furze field Primary School which is covered by Recommendation 1) are determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 of the Cabinet.

Reasons for Decision

- All other PANs remain as determined for 2019 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The School Commissioning team supports the PANs

Recommendation 6

That the aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2020 for which no change is proposed, are agreed as set out in Enclosure 1 and its appendices.

Reasons for Decision

- The existing arrangements are working well
- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools

- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduce travel and support Surrey's sustainability policies
- Schools which will not be taken in to account in the assessment of nearest school, as set out in Appendix 3 of Enclosure 1, have been determined by the definition set out in paragraph 12 of Enclosure 1

Recommendation 7

That the primary and secondary coordinated admission schemes that will apply to all schools for 2020 are agreed as set out in Enclosure 2 of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Decision

- The coordinated schemes for 2020 are essentially the same as 2019 with dates updated
- The coordinated schemes would enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well
- Changes highlighted in bold in Enclosure 2 add clarity and are in line with the schemes proposed by other local authorities participating in the Pan London coordinated admissions process

Meeting closed at 4.43 pm

Chairman

CABINET – 29 January 2019**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Will Forster (Woking South):**

The Government has previously announced that European Union (EU) citizens, post Brexit, will need to apply and pay for 'settled status'. Adult EU nationals were originally required to pay £65, or £32.50 if they are under 16 years old, though the fee has now been waived.

Please will Surrey County Council agree to automatically apply for settled status for any children in its care? Please will the Council also agree to help staff and their families that are EU citizens with the application process to ensure it does not lose valuable staff?

Reply:

With regard to children in care, the County Council has an existing track record, which it will continue, of assisting children in our care to achieve settled status in the UK when it is in their interests to do so.

With regard to staff, the joint management/Trade Union note on S-net confirms the Council's commitment to supporting staff who are EU nationals; this extends to support with the application process itself if required. A copy of the note (including reference to the Council's commitment to reimbursing staff the cost of applications for settled/pre-settled status ahead of the Government announcing the waiving of this fee), as available via the link below.

https://snet.surreycc.gov.uk/_media/files/hr/Support-for-Surrey-CC-staff-who-are-EU-nationals-an-update.pdf

Mr Colin Kemp
Deputy Leader
29 January 2019

Question (2) Will Forster (Woking South):

One year ago, Lakers Youth Centre in Goldsworth Park, Woking, was badly damaged by a fire and has not been used for youth work since.

Please can the County Council confirm if or when it will repair and reopen Lakers Youth Centre?

Reply:

We are reviewing the existing 'Youth Offer' in Surrey which will involve engaging with young people and key stakeholders to co-design the future service. This will take place in the coming months. The resulting offer will then be implemented in partnership with the District and Borough Councils and partner agencies including the voluntary, community and faith sector. There are no immediate plans to rebuild the Lakers Youth Centre but we will be considering the future need for buildings as part of the review.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families
29 January 2019

Question (3) Angela Goodwin (Guildford North):

If they have not done so already, would SCC investigate the use of technology, such as Centrica's Hive, as an alternative to care homes and live-in carers, in the effort to combat problems such as loneliness, and foster safety, amongst the elderly?

Reply:

The District and Borough Councils provide a community alarm and telecare service to support people and enable them to live safely and securely at home for longer. For those people with eligible social care needs who would benefit from a community alarm or telecare, the Adult Social Care service make a referral to the relevant local council to provide the service. The District and Borough Councils recommend equipment that meets the needs and reduces the risks for the individual. The benefits of telecare and alarm systems are well established in helping to avoid the need for residential care, live-in carers and unnecessary hospital admissions.

We are aware that Carers UK has been working with Centrica to introduce the Hive system, although we have not investigated this to date. Technology Enabled Care [TEC] is a rapidly expanding market. There are a wide range of devices and apps now available that can help someone to live independently for longer. The devices can support people with dementia to manage aspects of daily living as well as supporting younger adults to be more independent. TEC can also provide immense support and peace of mind to the 3 million carers in the UK.

Here at SCC, we are exploring the greater use of TEC and are currently in conversation with two of our District and Boroughs to look at potential pilot sites to test and learn about the best device and app solutions to help us assist residents in different ways. This could include the use of sensors to reduce the need for sleep-ins and on site waking night staff in supported living as well as exploring the options for wearable devices to support more independent living. We are also looking at devices that control lighting and heating systems etc. to help keep people safe in their own homes.

In exploring the options around an expanded TEC offer we are also in discussions with Health colleagues about the opportunities for Telehealth devices to help monitor hydration levels and other indicators of health and wellbeing. These explorations will lead to an expanded TEC offer in the future.

Mrs Sinead Mooney
Cabinet Member for Adults
29 January 2019

Question (4) Dr Andrew Povey (Cranleigh & Ewhurst):

The residents of my division, Cranleigh and Ewhurst, and of surrounding divisions are environmentally conscious and wish to recycle materials to the maximum extent. How can this environmental responsibility be encouraged in the future if Cranleigh community recycling centre is closed?

Reply:

Residents will be able to use alternative CRCs at Witley, Farnham and Guildford which have a full range of recycling facilities.

The council does however accept that the users of the sites recommended for closure will now have a longer journey time to an alternative CRC. We'll try to limit this by improving communications on what alternatives are available to a CRC such as kerbside collections through the district and borough council or commercial waste companies.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste
29 January 2019

Question (5) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):
--

Please confirm the total number of posts filled with agency staff on a rate that is equivalent to an annual salary of a) over £50,000 a year or more, b) over £100,000 a year or more and c) over £200,000 a year or more - and how these figures compare to 1 year ago. Please confirm the current monthly cost of agency staff positions and how this compares to 1 year ago.

Reply:

The Council uses agency workers and interim contractors on a temporary basis for a number of reasons:

- To fill critical roles pending permanent recruitment, for example statutory/leadership roles.
- To fill other critical roles where market conditions make permanent recruitment challenging, for example children's social workers.*
- To fill roles pending a reorganisation/restructure, where it is envisaged redundancies may occur.
- To provide specialist expertise not available within the permanent workforce to enable delivery of critical programmes of work.

* The Council, along with many other Local Authorities, faces significant difficulties recruiting and retaining children's social workers. The Family Resilience Programme underway to improve Children's Services includes plans to address this, however in the short-term it is necessary for us to bring in suitably qualified temporary workers in order to meet our statutory duties to children and their families.

The majority of interim expenditure over the past twelve months has been in support of organisational transformation; given the scale and pace of this there is a need to engage people with the necessary expertise, capacity and competence on an interim basis to support our effort to make the improvements necessary across the Council, as set out in the Transformation Programme.

Whilst there will inevitably be a need for short-term temporary resource on an ongoing basis, for example to cover unexpected vacancies, the requirement for specialist interim resource will diminish and a number of roles currently filled on a temporary basis will, as soon as is practicable, be filled by permanent employees.

Statistics in relation to agency workers/interim contractors are given below:

	December 2018	December 2017
Rate equivalent to a salary of £50,000 - £99,000 p.a.	41	21
Rate equivalent to a salary of £100,000 - £199,000 p.a.	46	2
Rate equivalent to a salary of £200,000 p.a. and above	1	0

2018/19 monthly expenditure on agency/interim workers averaged £2.2m against an average monthly spend of £1m during 2017/18.

Ms Charlotte Morley
Cabinet Member for Corporate Support
29 January 2019

Question (6) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)(JE2):

1. Equality Impact Assessments

- A. The Equality Act 2010 requires consideration of equality of opportunity (as stated on p47 of council papers) for those who share a 'relevant protected characteristic'. Please confirm if this includes living in one specific area (e.g. avoiding a postcode lottery of service provision across Surrey) and also whether this includes equality of income related impacts.
- B. The EIA (equality impact assessment) for children centres considers:
- i. Who is affected by the proposals, does not identify those most affected by the reduction of coverage of the new, reduced number of centres (those near centres to be closed or re-purposed). Why?
 - ii. The assessment of protected characteristics states that because funding and provision is allocated based on the index of deprivation affecting children (IDACI index), which assesses deprivation at a super-output area level, this means that children and families living in areas of lower income will benefit from services being located within their community. Please confirm, firstly that children in poverty in smaller areas of deprivation (for example, Whitebushes estate which has around 700 households, but is smaller than a super-output area scale) will therefore be negatively benefited as this is not picked up in this statistical measure, and secondly, whether any new centres are to be opened leading the positive location-based impacts set out here.
 - iii. Why is the impact of closure of children centres specialising in supporting SEND needs (e.g. Stepping Stones in Earlswood) not identified as an impact to those with disabilities (only impacts on staff with disabilities appear to be considered)?
 - iv. How will the amendments to the proposals to provide mobile provision through use of a bus (how many buses?) provide coverage not just those in remote rural areas but those living in peri-urban areas and smaller towns where children centres are to be closed?
 - v. To what extent is the EIA action plan considered to address the primarily negative issues raised throughout the equality impact assessment? What residual impacts, after the mitigating actions set out are taken, are envisaged?

- C. The EIA for the SEND is mainly positive and notes that Surrey County Council are proposing to follow this strategy with an action plan setting out how SEND transformation is achieved. Please confirm when and where this will be published.
- D. Please confirm when the second public consultation setting out detailed proposals for the Libraries and Cultural Services Transformation will take place and what budget savings this is required to deliver.
- E.
- i. Please confirm (through providing a map and numbers) how many households fail to meet the criteria for CRCs to be reasonably accessible (considering the 3 and 7 mile limits stated) as defined by WRAP, and where these people live. Please confirm which parts of Surrey are defined as 'very rural' by Surrey in ensuring compliance. In February 2017 Surrey announced it had invested so that 7,000 additional homes received Superfast Broadband - achieving a 99% coverage across Surrey. Please confirm the coverage of 'reasonably accessible' CRCs this budget change will result in, and how many households will no longer have reasonably accessible access, as defined by the government's Waste and Resources Action Plan to a CRC.
 - ii. ii) Please provide data on how customer satisfaction, recycling rates and residual waste volumes both at CRCs and households (see paragraphs 12 - 14 and Table 6 of Annex 4) have changed alongside the changes made to the CRCs since 2015/2016 (table 1) and changing levels of usage (table 2).
 - iii. iii) It appears that each year the Surrey waste contractor who runs the CRCs for Surrey Council has been targeted to recommend and deliver at least £1m savings (see Annex 4, Table 5). Please confirm if this is indeed the case, and why the council does not target better separation and collection of high quality recycling in both CRCs and from households instead.
 - iv. iv) Please confirm how the proposed changes to CRCs are predicted to impact on recycling rates at each of the CRCs and overall Surrey County Council recycling rates.
 - v. v) In the EIA for CRCs no consideration for increased distance to travel to a CRC for those with protected characteristics has been considered. Please confirm why not.

Reply:

- A. Area of residence and income are not protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, and therefore the duties in section 149 of the Act do not apply directly to those features. Accordingly there is no duty to have regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity as between persons who live in different areas or as between persons who have different levels of income.
- B. (i) The proposal is relevant to all children and families, as set out in the first bullet point of those affected by the proposal.
- (ii) The new model locates centres where there is evidence of higher numbers of families affected by deprivation (IDACI index), but the funding formula used for each district and borough also takes in to account the total population of 0-4 year olds therefore the Whitebushes estate is included in the calculations. We have not proposed any new locations for main Family Centres but will use community venues to deliver outreach where there is a need to do so. This is in accordance with statutory guidance which states "It follows from the statutory definition of a children's centre that children's centres are as much about making appropriate and integrated services available, as it is about providing premises in particular geographical areas."

(iii) The new delivery model will provide outreach support for families if they do not live near a centre, we do not expect families to travel to centres. We have however identified the potential impact if they do not live near a centre on page 8 of the EIA *“the proposed restructure may reduce the quantity of frontline universal service. This change may affect children with disabilities and their families”*. All of the Children’s Centres support children with SEND needs and therefore the EIA has not specified individual centres.

(iv) We are proposing to retain one mobile children’s centre which will be deployed in areas where there is a lack of suitable community venues. This could either be within urban or rural areas.

(v) The EIA and resulting action plan is a dynamic document and addresses the assessed impact at this point. The EIA will be continue to be reviewed as part of the implementation process and any residual impacts that require further action will be identified, documented and acted on accordingly.

- C. This will be published by 30 April 2019 on the [Surrey Local Offer website](#) and promoted through various channels including social media, accessible formats and partners.
- D. We envisage that there will be further consultation on the Libraries and Cultural Services transformation, with the next round being launched in mid-May. With regard to budget savings, we stated in our first stage consultation document that we are aiming to bring library spending per head in line with the national average per head.
- E. (i)The Waste Resources and Action Programme (WRAP) has suggested that a good minimum level of CRC provision with some exceptions for very rural/urban areas would be. The four areas suggested by WRAP are represented by the bullet points below:

- Maximum catchment radius for a large proportion of the population: **three to five miles (very rural areas: seven miles)**.

We have cross-referenced the proportion of Surrey within a five mile radius of the CRCs being closed with the population of different wards in Surrey, and believe that **90% of Surrey residents** still will be within a five mile radius of an existing CRC in the network. The areas that fall outside are mainly in rural locations in the south of Mole Valley, East of Waverley and South and East of Tandridge.

- Maximum driving times for the great majority of residents in good traffic conditions: **20 minutes (very rural areas: 30 minutes)**

Map 2 in Annex 4b shows that the great majority of residents (95.5% of households) will still be within 20 minutes drive of a CRC.

- Maximum number of inhabitants per Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) (in all but the most urbanised areas): **120,000**

The estimated population in Surrey is 1,194,500 (based on projections by the Office for National Statistics) which is an average of 108,591 residents per CRC site.

- Maximum number of households per HWRC (in all but the most urbanised areas): **50,000**

The estimated number of households in Surrey is 486,939 which is an average of 44,267 households per CRC site.

(ii) table:

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Percentage of residents very satisfied or fairly satisfied with CRC sites (based on a survey of 1,600 residents)	86%	77%	73%
Overall district and borough kerbside collection recycling rate	53%	55%	54%
CRC recycling rate	64%	62%	59%
District and borough kerbside collected (residual tonnage)	193,576 T	190,763 T	191,672 T
CRC residual Tonnage (includes wood)	50,678 T	42,869 T	38,303 T

(iii) The measures set out in Annex 4, Table 2 have delivered £2.5 million of savings since 2015/16 however a further £1 million of savings is required to meet the council's budget envelope and measures to achieve this are set out in Annex 4, Table 5.

Around 80% of waste delivered to the CRCs is collected as separated material, for example wood, green waste and metal and this is sent either for recycling or recovery depending on the nature of the material. The remaining waste comprises black bag waste as well as bulky waste such as mattresses, rigid plastics, carpets and unusable furniture. The bulky waste is sent for secondary sorting where some recovery take place but options for recycling or recovery of this material are limited by economics and markets. Suez already undertake some manual sorting of black-bag waste to recover recyclables and as set out in Paragraph 17 of Annex 4, it is proposed to undertake a mechanical sorting trial to see whether it is economic to extract more recyclable material from black-bag waste.

The Surrey Waste Partnership also have a programme of work aimed at increasing recycling of kerbside collected material. This work includes targeted publicity campaigns, for example to encourage greater levels of food waste recycling as well as employment of a team of officers dedicated to increasing recycling at flatted properties.

(iv) We do not expect the proposed changes to impact recycling rates as a comprehensive range of recycling services will be provided at alternative CRCs to complement the existing kerbside recycling collections provided by the districts and boroughs.

(v) In some cases, service users or staff may have to drive further to an alternative site as a result of permanently closing a CRC site. However having to drive further has no differential impact on those with protected characteristics, as to be able to drive you need to demonstrate that you are in good health, and that any condition does not affect your ability to drive irrespective of the distance driven. Service users may have to spend more money on petrol because of driving further to an alternative CRC. However, low income itself is not a protected characteristic.

Pedestrians (service users) are currently allowed to walk into Warlingham CRC to access this site. If this site were to close it would impact pedestrians who use this site and have no means of other transport to drive to an alternative CRC. This would in theory have a greater impact on pedestrians with limited physical mobility, who are unable to drive. This has been captured in Annex 4a. However staff and contractors indicate that most pedestrians who use the Warlingham CRC actually park their car outside the site and then walk in, so the impact that these pedestrians will have is having to drive further to reach an alternative site, which has no differential impact on protected characteristics. However we acknowledge that some pedestrians who live locally will walk into the site, and while we're not aware that there are many of these pedestrians with limited physical mobility, we recognise the greater impact that it could have on them especially if they are unable to drive to an alternative CRC because of their condition. We anticipate those affected will be able to use alternative methods of disposal available at the kerbside or commercially.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
29 January 2019

Question (7) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)(JE3):

The 2019/2020 Budget together with the proposed 5 year Financial Strategy 2019/2024 (item 7, main report) considers significant changes to Surrey services, including to our Community Recycling Centres, which will have not just impacts on Surrey residents, but on our local environment and climate change. No assessment of climate and environment impacts has been considered in this overall report and only limited impacts on the environment (but not climate change) in the supporting annexes (only for CRCs). Please confirm when this assessment will be made, and how negative impacts made will be mitigated.

Reply:

Where environmental impacts have been identified, services have assessed the implications and detailed them in the annex reports for this item.

On CRCs, additional emissions of carbon dioxide through increased car journeys have been taken into account as part of the analysis related to the proposed changes to them. It is unlikely there will be any other significant climate change implications from the changes to the service. The environmental considerations summary (Annex 4c) provides more detail.

Retaining a mobile Family Centre will enable outreach services to be provided to hard to reach groups.

On concessionary travel, there are around 5 million journeys made under the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme made on weekdays. Less than 1% of these have been made before 09:30 and after 23:00. This means only a small number of people

potentially making the same journey by car, or other transport that would result in increased peak time congestion, and so no assessment was necessary.

This view was also taken in line with the planned negotiation with the bus operators on a reduced or flat fare scheme for disabled and companion pass holders before 09.30. Which, if implemented, will further reduce any potential shift to car or other vehicle use.

The majority of consultation responses indicated people would continue to travel by bus, either by paying or changing travel plans. This, along with the numbers of respondents saying that would drive, get a lift or use a different form of free transport, led to reinforcing the original view.

The consultations on Libraries and Culture and SEND were on the future strategic direction for these services, so it would not be possible at this stage to be able to predict the environmental implications until the future models for these services become clearer. We will review the environmental impacts as new services are developed and implemented.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste
29 January 2019

Question (8) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)(JE4):

Capital and Investment Strategy:

- i. Please confirm if the Capital and Investment Strategy is considering wider strategic and commercial investments beyond property, which has been the focus in recent years.
- ii. Which sites fall under the joint venture arrangement with Places for People (page 308).

Reply:

The Council's investment strategy is delivering a net return which contributes to the council's financial resilience and goes some way towards mitigating the impact of the loss of other more traditional sources of funding, such as government grants. The Council continues to assess other ways in which to deliver an income to enhance its financial resilience and, where appropriate and within its powers, the Cabinet will consider other forms of investments. In order to mitigate risk the Council will however focus on those areas in which it has some experience and expertise.

Four site briefs have been formally submitted to the Joint Venture Partner to undertake options analysis for consideration by the council. These are-

- The former Adult Learning Centre, Dene Street, Dorking
- First & second floors, 61-63 High Street, Staines upon Thames
- First & second floors, Kingfisher House, 160-162 High Street, Egham
- 33 Rookery Road, Staines upon Thames

Further sites will be approved to be passed to the Joint Venture as part of the Council's current wider review of its assets.

Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
29 January 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 29 January 2019

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question 1: Ms Sally Blake, local resident, Guildford

The Council's policy for introducing parking charges at 5 of the commons in the Countryside Estate was based on parking numbers provided to the Cabinet by Cllr Goodman and the SCC Countryside Group, where it was stated that there were 446,000 cars a year parking prior to charges. A Freedom of Information request has since been used to show that the number of cars parking at these commons was likely to have been closer to 900,000.

The base data provided in that FOI shows that, of the 15 car parks at these commons, 6 of them, including 2 of the largest car parks, were neither measured nor included in the 446,000 total. Furthermore, the parking numbers quoted for the other measured car parks were all substantially altered from their base value.

The underestimation of parking numbers is similar to what happened at Newlands Corner where parking numbers reported in the original proposal for parking charges presented to Cabinet was only 122,000 a year. A Freedom of Information request subsequently revealed the actual number of cars parking there was 255,000.

If this information had not come to light, the reduction in the number of people using these 16 car parks as a result of the charges would have looked far less of an issue to councillors, particularly to the health and well-being of Surrey residents. This has, potentially, serious long-term implications for both adult social care policy making and budget formulation, as well as the perceived integrity of the Countryside Estate by the public.

Please could the Council explain how this could happen and what action will be taken to investigate and publicise why the Cabinet and the public have been misled? All relevant information was sent to the Head of the SCC Countryside Group on 7 December 2018 and no response to the concerns raised then has been received since.

Reply:

The numbers used in the original business plan were the figures available at the time and based on numbers from visitor surveys and figures extrapolated from data from a limited number of counters. It is quite clear from the report that not all car parks have counters on them. We understood these may not have been accurate and installed counters in further car parks between 2015 and 2018 and therefore now have more accurate numbers. Adjustments were made for car parks such as Ockham, where a 20 minute free period was factored in. As the County Council was introducing car parking charges for the first time at these locations it seemed sensible to be cautious with the figures when putting together the business case.

However, we have released the actual figures under FOI so there has been no attempt to hide the figures or to change them. We have clearly stated that the actual costs and expenditure will be published in summary once we have a year's worth of figures. Not all the car parking meters are operational yet and several were deliberately vandalised and have

only been operating properly for the last month. Any new business needs to have time to settle in before a true picture can be seen.

We have answered the point about health and wellbeing in a previous answer. We are only charging at 16 car parks of over 30 on the Countryside Estate. Most people who visit the Estate now are paying for parking or using free car parks on other parts of the Estate.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste
29 January 2019

Question 2: Mr John Oliver, Local Resident

Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) manages Norbury Park which is council-owned land. It has a large population of ash trees. SWT is cutting down virtually all ash trees which exist in a 30 metre swathe on each side of footpaths and tracks/roads accessible by harvesting machinery. It amounts to up to 45 hectares of land, equivalent to 60 football pitches. This includes mature trees which can take up to 30 years to die – if at all.

SWT claims the work is being done on the grounds of public safety because of the ash dieback problem which is killing a high percentage of the country's ash population. The Office for National Statistics states that the chances of being killed by a falling tree or branch in a public place is one in 20 million and one in 10 million anywhere.

As I understand it, SWT is selling the cut wood to furniture manufacturers and to Euro Forest for chipping and further shipping to a biomass power station in Kent.

Ash dieback is a national disaster. However, up to 5% of ash trees are known to be resistant to the fungal disease and recent research indicates that survival rates may be higher. Each one of these needs to be protected so that they can form the bedrock of a resurgence in the ash population – a tree that is nationally important. SWT has not identified these trees and is cutting them down.

Current activity at Norbury Park is also destroying lower level habitat where protected species, such as the hazel dormouse, are hibernating (pictures available). It is impossible for SWT give assurances, not least because of the autumn leaf fall, that it will monitor this or that the machinery will not have a significant detrimental effect on the flora and fauna of this site.

As part of its policy to reduce it's funding to SWT, is the council content that:

- Surrey Wildlife Trust is clearing such a huge area, and intends to do the same at Worplesdon Commons, Sheepleas and Shere Woods amongst others, when there is such a small chance of harm to the public;
- resistant and mature trees are being removed as well as dead ones;
- lower-level habitat is being destroyed with potential impact on protected species;
- trees are being sent for burning and thus adding to global warming;
- SWT is pursuing a commercial approach to harvesting these trees rather than an ongoing managed approach to the problem in accordance with Forest Commission guidelines; and

would the council explain its response to each of the parts of this question?

Reply:

SWT is managing the tree safety risk from Ash dieback disease to visitors to Surrey County Council-owned sites in accordance with the appropriate tree safety policy. This winter's works will cover less than 20ha of the 200 hectares of woodland. (Norbury Park is around 445 hectares in total). The work involves selective felling of Ash trees within a maximum of 30m from zones immediately adjoining main paths and carparks where the public would be at greatest risk.

The Forestry Commission have been involved with SWT throughout the decision process. They visited the site with SWT during 2018 and agreed that the Ash on Norbury was showing significant signs of dieback. The majority of Ash trees are being left in place across the site, where they are not considered to be a risk to the public. None of the cut trees are being stump treated and will be allowed to coppice. The situation will be monitored over the next few years to see if ash stumps succumb to ash dieback and if any other trees need to be removed.

The Forestry Commission (FC) released guidance in 2018 linking Ash dieback disease to honey fungus which can cause collapse of trees. They asked woodland managers to revisit their risk assessments and policies. SWT spoke to statutory bodies at length to discuss the appropriate response and a decision was taken with FC and Natural England's support to carry out the works in progress at the moment on the grounds of safety.

As stated above all the work has been approved by Natural England and an ecologist is checking on site to ensure the work causes the least impact on the ecology of the site.

Ash dieback works will need to be undertaken across the countryside estate where there is a risk to the public. The amount of work will vary site by site and area by area as the density of Ash trees adjacent to paths and car parks changes.

Work is currently being undertaken by Euroforest who are taking most of the timber to Kent to be used in generating power. Any income from this is being directly used to fund further ash dieback safety works where they are needed across the Countryside Estate

Ash dieback and the subsequent work to remove the ash will make a significant impact on the landscape and it is now important to accept that and look at ways to manage those changes. Significantly viewpoints are likely to be opened up at sites such as Norbury Park, along with clearings in the woodland that allow a different range of plants and animals to colonise.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste
29 January 2019

Question 3: Ms Katie King, Speech & Language Therapist

Given the overwhelming support from Surrey residents for investing more in to children's services, and the incredible opposition to making cuts to these centres, along with the clear preference residents have to protect Children's Centres financing over other services, what more can the council do to protect these vital resources for all vulnerable children, rather than just a small subset?

Reply:

The proposal to remodel our Children's Centre offer has not been taken lightly. We are facing significant challenges to meet the needs of the most vulnerable children and families whilst managing very challenging financial decisions.

The backdrop to these changes is that Ofsted have twice rated services for children in need and protection in Surrey as inadequate. Too many children are accelerated into high level child protection and public care services. The aim of the new Family Centres and Family Service is to catch these families and children early and work alongside them to improve outcomes. The current model is not effective, it will not meet the requirements set out in the Ofsted inspections and needs to change.

Our new Family Centres will be part of a wider family service that focuses on children and families in the most need. Currently the Children's Centres offer a 'universal' service and there is strong evidence that the families who are in the greatest need do not use the centres, instead accelerating into child protection and public care.

The wider Family Service is also going through a large scale transformation and we are working very closely with the District and Borough Councils and other partner agencies to maximise the opportunities to support families across the levels of need at the right time and in the right way.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families
29 January 2019

CABINET

Tuesday 29 January 2019

RESPONSES TO PETITIONS

1. The petition concerning 'Children's Centre for Leatherhead/the North of Mole Valley'

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to retain a Children's Centre for Leatherhead / the north of Mole Valley'

Submitted by John Moyer on behalf of Leatherhead Living Facebook page

Signatures: 566

2. The petition concerning 'Boxgrove Children's Centre'

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to save Boxgrove Children's Centre from closure'

Submitted by George Potter

Signatures: 282

3. The petition concerning 'Mytchett Children's Centre'

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to save Mytchett Children's Centre'

Submitted by Rebecca Calvert

Signatures: 123

The Cabinet's combined response to petitions concerning Children's Centres

Thank you for the petitions in support of the statements outlined above.

The decision to make the recommendations in today's Cabinet report has not been taken lightly. Ofsted inspected the Outcomes for Children in Need of Help and Protection in Surrey in 2014 and again in 2018 and told us we were 'inadequate'. That means we haven't been keeping some children and families safe and giving them the right help when they need it. Too many children are accelerated into high level child protection and public care services. The current model is not effective and will not meet the requirements set out in the Ofsted inspections. The model needs to change to achieve better outcomes for children and their families.

The recommendations include remodelling Children's Centres to create Family Centres as part of a wider Family Service to support families with children aged 0-11 that are the most

vulnerable. It is proposed that there will be at least one Family Centre based in each district and borough in areas where children most likely experience poor outcomes (21 in total). These centres will be supported by the use of satellite centres (9), outreach workers, community venues, and retaining one mobile Family Centre.

There are currently 58 Children's Centres in Surrey providing a universal service to families with children aged 0-5. Whilst the centres prioritise families with identified need, there is little evidence to suggest that the most vulnerable families 'walk into' the current Children's Centres. Referrals into Children's Social Care largely come via schools, GPs and the police.

In 2011 central government ended the original ring fenced grant that funded Sure Start Children's Centres, in real terms this led to a 49.8% drop in the grant funding. The guidance for Children's Centres was also altered in 2013 to make provision for a more targeted service. Ofsted also ceased inspection of Children's Centres at this time. The proposed changes in Surrey are consistent with the funding and guidance changes from 2013 and in effect we are playing catch-up.

The majority of local authorities have re-organised their Children's Centres into a more targeted model. Large County Authorities including Hertfordshire, Essex and Nottinghamshire have reorganised along the lines of the proposed Surrey model and their services for children in need and protection are rated as good or outstanding by Ofsted.

The reasons for the recommendations are:

1. The current model is not effective and will not meet the requirements set out in the Ofsted inspections. Too many children are accelerated into high level child protection and public care services. The aim of the new Family Centres is to catch these families early and to work alongside them to improve outcomes.
2. We are facing significant challenges to meet the needs of the most vulnerable children and families, whilst managing very difficult financial decisions. We need to make sure that the money we have makes the biggest difference to the children and families who need support the most. This means we need to spend less on universal provision and focus our resources on children and families who are more likely to experience poor outcomes without support.
3. The proposed funding allocation for each district and borough has been designed to reflect the total population of children in communities. Proposed centres have been prioritised in areas with the highest number of children living in homes which have low incomes or where no-one works and therefore in areas that are most likely to have children affected by deprivation. However, we also recognise that some types of need, such as children affected by domestic violence and parental mental health cross the boundaries of deprivation, therefore this has also been taken into consideration.
4. Each of the 11 districts or boroughs in Surrey will have at least 1 main centre. There will also be smaller satellite centres offering fewer services and open less frequently, but they will be places where workers who are supporting families can meet with them. The main centres, however, will also provide outreach support to families in their own homes and will continue to use community venues where needed. This is a model already used to support families that do not live near a Children's Centre.

5. Whilst we propose to focus the county council Family Centre resource on the most vulnerable children and families, Family Centres could act as venues for families to access support from other universal services, such as health visiting, midwifery, citizen's advice and support with housing and employment, just as other community venues can and will in other locations where there is no Family Centre. We will/are working with partners to ensure that access is maintained for these services.

Suggestions to increase outreach support and maintain the use of the mobile children's centres are being taken forward by keeping the use of one bus and wherever possible increasing the number of outreach workers as the Family Centres are implemented. Suggestions to either keep centres open as they are now or with reduced hours have been considered. These suggestions however would increase how much is spent on buildings and leadership rather than supporting vulnerable families and have therefore not been proposed.

Should a decision be taken to close any Children's Centres, any future use of that building will be carefully assessed and used for the benefit of families, children and the community.

Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
29 January 2019

PETITIONS RECEIVED CONCERNING COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES

4. The petition concerning 'Cranleigh Community Recycling Centre'

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Keep Cranleigh Community Recycling Centre open'

Submitted by Hannah Nicholson

Signatures: 3250

5. The petition concerning 'Cranleigh Rubbish Dump'

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to stop the closure of Cranleigh rubbish dump'

Submitted by Annie Green

Signatures: 102

6. The petition concerning 'Dorking Community Recycling Centre'

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to oppose the proposed closure of Dorking Community Recycling Centre and request Surrey County Council to retain the facility for at least three days, and preferably seven days, per week'

Submitted by Hazel Watson on behalf of the Liberal Democrats

Signatures: 1224

7. **The petition concerning 'Warlingham Community Recycling Centre'**

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to keep open the Warlingham Community Recycling Centre'

Submitted by Charles Lister

Signatures: 1028

8. **The petition concerning 'Lyne Community Recycling Centre'**

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to oppose the proposed closure of Lyne Community Recycling Centre'

Submitted by Sylvia Whyte

Signatures: 8207

9. **The petition concerning 'Farnham Community Recycling Centre'**

It states: 'We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Don't Dump the Dump at Farnham Community Recycling Centre'

Submitted by Daniel Gee on behalf of the Farnham Herald

Signatures: 425

The Cabinet's combined response to petitions concerning Community Recycling Centres

The council is faced with some very tough decisions about the way it delivers services to ensure it can continue to support its most vulnerable residents. Therefore we have had to look again at the operation of Surrey's community recycling centres (CRCs), and launched a public consultation on proposed changes to the service. We have listened carefully to the views expressed in the public consultation, and have taken them into consideration when developing a final plan. However changes to the service are absolutely necessary to set a sustainable budget, which enables us to continue to deliver a valued service to our residents in Surrey.

We are recommending that the CRCs in Farnham and Lyne are retained noting that their closure would have effected a greater number of users. However to deliver the required level of savings, we are recommending the permanent closure of the CRCs located in Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham. We recognise this will be an unpopular choice with residents who use these sites, and for this reason we are recommending that the closure is deferred until 1 October 2019, to allow us time to determine if a different operational or funding model could achieve the same level of saving as closing them would do. This will include assessing the impact of limiting their use to recycling centres only.

In the event that it proves necessary to close these 4 CRCs, to reduce the impact of this, we are recommending that the opening hours at Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead CRCs be extended to seven days a week. We are also looking at bolstering staffing numbers with the charging scheme, and Automatic Number Plate Recognition technology, to process users faster, and enforce against illegitimate site use by traders.

We acknowledge the concerns raised about fly-tipping. From our experience of recent changes to the service, and anecdotal evidence from other local authorities who have closed sites fly-tipping is not expected to increase. In recent years the service have introduced measures to enforce against illegitimate use of CRCs by traders and this is reflected in the lower amounts of waste and visitors that the service is now dealing with. However it's possible that some traders are still illegitimately using the CRCs that are proposed for closure, and therefore there is a risk that fly-tipping could increase. We will continue to monitor the position with fly-tipping, and will work with partners to tackle the issue.

We understand the concern about new dwellings and expected population growth in Surrey. However the sites we are recommending for closure are not equipped to handle more users, and we need to send new users to our facilities that are better equipped to handle more waste and visitors. That said, in the next 10-15 years the council would hope to see the positive effects of extended producer responsibility, and advancement in technology, which in theory should mean that businesses take more responsibility for dealing with items such as waste packaging, further reducing the need for recycling centres.

The recommended changes put forward to Cabinet represent a very tough decision, but necessary in the financial context of the council. We believe these recommendations will still deliver a valued service to our residents, and will continue to support the strategic aims of increasing recycling and reducing landfill, and meets our legal requirements as a Waste Disposal Authority.

Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
29 January 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

CORPORATE OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET 2019/20 to 2023/24

Date Considered: 25 January 2019

- 1 At its meeting on 25 January 2019 the Corporate Overview Select Committee considered the Revenue & Capital Budget for 2019/20 to 2023/24. There were Select Committee Chairmen in attendance at the meeting to provide their input on specific service budgets and savings.
- 2 The Committee noted the challenge of delivering a sustainable budget and sought reassurances about the deliverability of the plans in 2019/20. The witnesses stressed that realism was required and that the budget has to support changes to how the Council delivers services and improve outcomes for Surrey residents.
- 3 The Committee focused on the challenges faced by the Council's demand led services – Children's Services and Adult Social Care – and questioned the witnesses on the impact of foster care placements and external placements on the Children's Services budget and how the Council planned to manage Adult Social Care's net expenditure over the coming years. The Committee supported plans to improve social care practice, bring placements back into the county and the drive to recruit more foster carers but warned that this would be difficult.
- 4 The Committee raised some concerns about how effectively the Council forecasts demand in these services. The Chief Executive acknowledged this but thought forecasting would improve through better partnership working with organisations such as the NHS and schools to identify children and families in need early.
- 5 The Cabinet Member for Finance stated that these services represented the biggest challenge to achieving a balanced budget. The Committee queried whether the £10m budget contingency fund was sufficient enough given the substantial risks the Council faced.
- 6 Members were supportive of the Cabinet Member of Finance's view that monitoring of budgets and service activity needs to happen on a weekly basis, not monthly in arrears, to ensure the Council's expenditure stays on track. The Committee agreed that there needed to be greater ownership of Council finances by Officers and Cabinet Members alike.
- 7 The Committee thanked the Chief Executive, members of the leadership team and the Cabinet Member for Finance for their attendance at the Committee to answer questions on the budget prior to the next meeting of the Cabinet.
- 8 The Committee agreed the following conclusions:
 - a) The Committee recognises the difficulty of formulating a new transformative budget for 2019/20 and the consequences of failing to implement this;
 - b) The Committee supports the proposal of the Cabinet Member for Finance that there is rigorous, weekly monitoring of service activity,

- performance and expenditure and that this data must be owned individually and collectively by the Cabinet Members;
- c) The Committee is conscious that the £10m contingency available to mitigate any savings shortfalls could be insufficient given the level of transformation required and the unknown factors or re-emerging risks; and
 - d) Recommends that the Cabinet Member for Finance is invited back to provide evidence on the progress towards achieving the targets set out in the Budget and Financial Strategy at the Committee's next meeting.

Ken Gulati
Chairman of the Corporate Overview Select Committee

Reply:

The Cabinet thanks the Chairman and his Committee for this report. We are in agreement with the Committee's recommendations, specifically recommendation (b) on the need to develop and focus on tracking the key elements of the savings plan contained within the budget and supporting transformation plans.

I look forward to working with the Chairman of the Budget Sub-Group going forward and reporting progress at the May meeting of the Committee.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Finance
29 January 2019