

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 28 JANUARY 2020 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
*Dr Zully Grant-Duff	*Mrs Julie Iles
*Mrs Sinead Mooney	*Mr Matt Furniss
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members:

Mrs Natalie Bramhall	* Miss Alison Griffiths
*Mr Mark Nuti	

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr Bill Chapman, Chairman Adults & Health Select Committee
Mr Nick Harrison, Chairman Performance & Resources Select Committee
Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)
Mr Chris Botten (Caterham Hill)

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

1/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

An apology was received from Mrs Natalie Bramhall.

2/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 17 DECEMBER 2019 [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

4/20 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There was one question from Mr Will Forster who did not attend the meeting. This and the response were published as a supplement to the agenda.

5/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were none.

6/20 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

7/20 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

8/20 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

One report was received from Resources & Performance Committee in relation to Item 7 on the agenda. This and the Cabinet response is attached as an annex.

Mr Bill Chapman, Chairman of the Adults & Health Select Committee and Mr Nick Harrison, Chairman of the Performance & Resources Select Committee addressed the meeting in relation to the report.

Mr Chapman explained that the Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) had not been available to the select committee which affected its ability to properly scrutinise the budget. He said that the main lines of enquiry for the Adults & Health Select Committee over the coming year would be around the impact on residents of programmes put in place. Lastly, he stated that each part of the budget, especially for public health, should be dealt with differently and each part say what service was needed alongside resources needed to deliver the need.

The Cabinet Member for Adults & Public Health responded that there was a need to redesign priorities, apologised for the EIA not being available and thanked Mr Chapman for the feedback and points raised.

Mr Harrison stated that all select committees received a good set of papers on their respective budgets and requested that scrutiny be involved in the budget process much earlier. He thanked Cabinet for the response to the select committees recommendations but also continued to disagree with the principle that RAG (Red-Amber-Green) ratings could not be added at this stage of the budget cycle.

The Leader responded that he wanted select committees to own the transformation programmes as much as Cabinet Members and that he hoped to address issues raised by select committees. He also thought that more may be spent on public transport.

9/20 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

RESOLVED:

That two delegated decisions taken by the Committees-in-Common since the last meeting of the Cabinet be noted.

Reason for decision:

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken by Cabinet Members, Strategic Investment Board and the Committee in Common subcommittee under delegated authority.

10/20 2020/21 FINAL BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY [Item 7]

Cabinet considered the budget report that set out the financial framework within which the Council's refreshed Organisation Strategy and the next phase of transformation would be delivered. Both the Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance highlighted several areas of the final budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for recommendation to the Council meeting on 4 February. It was stated that for the first time in 10 years, Central Government funding for the County Council has increased. It was noted that the Council had no confirmation on the funding for future years and the Medium Term Financial Plan had been done on the basis of the current level of funding reducing over the time period. It was also the first time in over 10 years that a balanced budget without the use of reserves could be presented. It was proposed to increase Council Tax by 1.99%, together with the recommended increase from central government of a further 2% to support the funding of the Adult Social Care service.

The Leader highlighted several areas where investment was to be made, for example, roads and pavements, flood alleviation and tackling the climate emergency.

A Member highlighted the listed budget efficiencies and that going forward select committees would be able to scrutinise their delivery through the transformation programmes. Several Members gave thanks to officers and the Cabinet Member for Finance for his and the finance team's hard work.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet makes the following recommendations to Council on 4 February 2020.

Cabinet recommends that Council:

1. Approve the net revenue budget requirement be set at £968.4 million (net cost of services after service specific government grants) for 2020/21 (Annex B to the submitted report), subject to confirmation of the Final Local Government Financial Settlement;
2. Approve the total Council Tax funding requirement be set at £765.3 million for 2020/21. This is an increase of 3.99%, made up of an increase in the level of core Council Tax of 1.99% to cover core Council services and an increase of 2% in the precept proposed by Central Government to cover the growing cost of Adult Social Care (Annex E to the submitted report);
3. Note 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 (i.e. not greater than 2%);

4. Set the Surrey County Council precept for Band D Council Tax at £1,511.46, which represents a 3.99% uplift. This is a rise of £1.11 a week from the 2019/20 precept of £1,453.50. This includes £131.46 for the Adult Social Care precept, which has increased by £29.07. A full list of bands is as follows:

Council Tax Band	2019/20 £	2020/21 £
Band A	£969.00	£1,007.64
Band B	£1,130.50	£1,175.58
Band C	£1,292.00	£1,343.52
Band D	£1,453.50	£1,511.46
Band E	£1,776.51	£1,847.34
Band F	£2,099.51	£2,183.22
Band G	£2,422.51	£2,519.10
Band H	£2,907.01	£3,022.92

5. Approve the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy for 2020/21 to meet the statutory guidelines for the use of such receipts to fund transformation and the move back into the County (Annex F to the submitted report);
6. Note that underlying General Fund Balances remain at £21.3 million as at 1 April 2020;
7. Approve the Total Schools Budget of £505.7 million to meet the Council's statutory requirement on schools funding;
8. Approve the overall indicative Budget Envelopes for Executive Directorates and individual services for the 2020/21 budget (Annex B to the submitted report);
9. Approve the total £1.447 billion proposed five-year Capital Programme (comprising £851m of budget and £596m pipeline) and approves the £175.7 million capital budget in 2020/21 (Annex C to the submitted report);
10. Approve the Capital Strategy (Annex G to the submitted report), which provides an overview of how risks associated with capital expenditure, financing and treasury will be managed as well as how they contribute towards the delivery of services;
11. Approve the policy for making a prudent level of revenue provision for the repayment of debt (the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy) (Annex H to the submitted report); and
12. Approve the Investment Strategy (Annex I to the submitted report), which provides detail on how the Council will manage commercial investments;

Cabinet recommends that the Audit & Governance Committee:

13. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators (Annex J to the submitted report) which set a framework for the Council's treasury function to manage risks, source borrowing and invest surplus cash.

Reasons for decision:

Council will meet on 4 February 2020 to agree a budget and to set the Council Tax Precept for 2020/21. Cabinet is required to recommend a budget to Council for consideration at this meeting. The budget directs available resources to support the achievement of the Council's ambitions and priorities in the 2030 Vision and the Organisation Strategy.

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

11/20 TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME 2020: NEXT PHASE [Item 8]

The Leader introduced a report that set out the reshaped set of transformation portfolios and programmes that will be delivered to achieve the council's strategic ambitions and priorities for residents. Over the last year the council had made good progress to deliver far reaching and ambitious transformation across a wide range of services. He highlighted the eight core themes guiding the strategic priorities and welcomed scrutiny of these areas over the coming year.

Further to Minute 215/19 (Surrey Schools & Early Years Funding 2020-21) the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning reported that the Secretary of State had rejected the Council's request to transfer budget into the High Needs Block.

The Leader went on to say that there were to be 11 public meetings across the county to engage with the public on transformation plans. Dates and venues would be published shortly.

RESOLVED:

1. That the council's refreshed transformation programme be agreed.
2. That the investment required to deliver improved outcomes and financial benefits through transformation will be considered as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) report to Cabinet (28/01/20) and Council (04/02/20) be noted.

Reason for decision:

The transformation programme, stretching across all aspects of the council's work, will help to ensure we are enabling better lives and a better place, improving the quality of residents' lives and reducing the inequality in life expectancy that exists across the county. It will enable the council to respond proactively and effectively to the complex and rapidly changing context we are

working in. The programme will also make a significant contribution to achieving the financial sustainability required so that the council can deliver priorities for residents within available resources.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]

12/20 CHILDREN'S IMPROVEMENT UPDATE [Item 9]

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young people & Families highlighted several areas of the latest Commissioner's report and the Ofsted inspection letter. The Commissioner's view was that "sustainable improvement is underway in the Authority and that an alternative delivery model no longer needs to be a consideration". Agreement from the Minister on the Commissioner's recommendation and the publication of the Commissioner's report was awaited. She also explained that there was still much work to do and keeping up the pace would be a challenge. The Commissioner would become an advisory role to Surrey.

In response to a question about the 'alternative delivery model' the Cabinet Member explained that this meant if the Commissioner had found that there was no capacity in the council to take forward improvements then the service could be given over to a charity trust for example. It was also recognised that improvements needed to be made in the experience of those accessing our Special Education Needs & Disabilities services for children and young people and that there was a focus on that improvement also taking place.

Several Member spoke in praise of the work undertaken by the Chief Executive, the Strategic Director and officers in getting this progress.

RESOLVED:

1. That the progress made delivering the Children's Improvement programme and the findings from the recent Children's Commissioner Visit and the fourth Ofsted Monitoring Visit be noted.
2. That the on-going scrutiny arrangements of the improvement programme for the next 6-12 months as described in paragraphs 16-24 of the submitted report be reviewed and agreed.
3. That Cabinet would review progress in May 2020 on the delivery of the Children's improvement programme and the findings from the April 2020 Ofsted Monitoring Visit be agreed.

Reason for decision:

The next Ofsted Monitoring Visit will take place on 7 and 8 April 2020 with publication of the inspector's findings in late-April 2020. At this point the service is expected to have greater certainty on whether the Surrey's children's services will be ready for a full re-inspection from Ofsted this year.

As outlined in the main section of the report, the improvement programme is progressing well with Surrey's children's services successfully delivering the actions from the improvement plan to address Ofsted recommendations from the 2018 full inspection. There are comprehensive scrutiny arrangements

already in place for 2020 with involvement from council officers, Members, partner agencies, the Department for Education and other key stakeholders.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee]

13/20 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES FOR SEPTEMBER 2021 [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning explained this annual report and highlighted the changes that were contained in the recommendations.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families asked a question about what the council was able to do in relation to infant class size in relation to children under Special Guardianship Orders (SGO). The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning responded that the council were not allowed to change infant class size limits for SGO children unless they came under the definition of Looked After Children (LAC) or had left LAC to become SGO.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet make the following recommendations to the Council on 4 February 2020.

Recommendation 1

That priority is introduced for children of staff for September 2021.

Reasons for decision

- there was overwhelming support for this proposal
- it will help community and voluntary controlled schools with staff recruitment and retention
- it is permitted under the School Admissions Code
- the definition of children of staff is compliant with the Code
- it will put community and voluntary controlled schools on an equal footing with those academies, foundation, free, trust and voluntary aided schools which already give priority for children of staff

Recommendation 2

That the Published Admission Number (PAN) for Reception at Worplesdon Primary School is decreased from 60 to 57 for September 2021.

Reasons for decision

- It will enable children admitted to the Special Education Needs & Disabilities (SEND) specialist 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 3

That no changes are made to the assessment of nearest school for 2021 admission.

Reasons for decision

- It will allow time for a wider review of the use and definition of nearest school ahead of consultation for 2022 admission
- It will enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences for 2021 admission

Recommendation 4

That the Published Admission Numbers (PANs) for September 2021 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools (excluding Worplesdon Primary School which is covered by Recommendation 2) are determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1.

Reasons for decision

- Most other PANs remain as they were determined for 2020 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences for 2021 admission
- The PAN for Ash Manor School has been increased from 210 to 240 as part of a planned expansion
- The School Commissioning team supports the PANs

Recommendation 5

That the aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2021 for which no change has been consulted on, 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
- The changes highlighted in bold in sections 14 and 15 of Enclosure 1, which have not otherwise been referenced in this report, have been made in response to determinations by the Schools Adjudicator

Recommendation 6

That the primary and secondary coordinated admission schemes that will apply to all schools for 2021 are agreed as set out in Enclosure 2.

Reasons for decision

- The coordinated schemes for 2021 are essentially the same as 2020 with dates updated
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

14/20 2019/20 MONTH 8 (NOVEMBER) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member for Finance gave a brief overview of the report which reflected progress to achieving a balanced budget without the use of reserves by the end of the financial year. He did however draw attention to two main areas which need continued attention: Special Education Needs & Disabilities and the growing number of residents requiring Adult Social Care services.

RESOLVED:

1. That the amended capital budget of £122.1m which includes additional works in Epsom Town Centre funded by Epsom & Ewell Borough Council (£1.1m); be noted and approved.
2. That the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year be noted.

Reason for decision

This report is to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval of any necessary actions.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]

15/20 ON STREET PARKING STRATEGY REVIEW [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Highways introduced a report that set out changes to the council's on- street parking strategy that had taken account of changes to national legislation, new technology, environmental considerations and to reduce dangerous parking and help keep traffic moving on Surrey roads. He explained the update of fees and charges for parking permits and on-street parking related services and that whilst it may seem like a big hike in charges, the strategy had not been reviewed for nine years. He also described some of the many benefits of the new strategy.

Mrs Hazel Watson spoke to this item and objected to recommendations 1 and 2 in relation to Mole Valley and described the detrimental impacts this would have to Dorking town centre. The Mole Valley Local Committee had voted unanimously against introducing on-street parking charges. She explained that parking was limited in small clusters over seven sites and the cost of parking machines was prohibitive.

The Cabinet Member for Highways responded that it was for local and joint committees to consider this and no proposals were being made for specific areas. He also stated that Mole Valley operated up to £90K deficit in civil parking enforcement and that it wasn't appropriate to continue these amounts of deficits going forward without looking at all other options. He and parking officers were happy to talk to local committees.

Several other members spoke in support of the recommendations.

RESOLVED:

Cabinet agreed that:

1. That Local and Joint Committees should consider, as part of the parking review process, the introduction of on-street parking charges where appropriate to help improve access to retail areas or other facilities be agreed.
2. That where there is no parking surplus or other funding source to contribute towards a parking review, proposals in the review will be limited to dealing with road safety and obstruction problems rather than parking schemes be agreed.
3. That the council's intention be advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be agreed to make the following changes to on street parking permits:
 - a. Amend the charge for the first resident permit issued to a household from £50 to £80.
 - b. Amend the charge for 2nd and subsequent resident permits issued to a household from £75 currently to:
 - 2nd permit charge £100
 - 3rd and subsequent permit charge £130
 - c. The maximum charge for visitor permits can be set at £3 per day where it is considered appropriate by local or joint committees. (Note: the £2 daily charge remains the default)
 - d. We introduce a 2 hour visitor permit, to be available in all permit schemes, costing £1 (see recommendation e. for annual eligibility limits)
 - e. Greater discretion is given to district and borough enforcement teams (and local/joint committees) to set annual visitor permit limits as particular circumstances allow. The maximum however should be set at 150 for daily permits or 250 for 2 hour permits per household per year.
 - f. Carers permits (as described in annex 1) will be issued for free (currently £10 per year, permits for medical and care professionals remain free)
 - g. There is no change to our current policy of assessing and providing disabled bays free of charge.
 - h. We introduce a child care permit (as described in annex 1) at the same rate as a resident permit, the charge dependent on how many resident permits had been issued to the property.
 - i. The statutory notice includes the intention of the council to increase the charge for annual resident parking permits by £4 every 2 years for 6 years.
4. That following the statutory advertisement of changes described above, the decision to implement the changes be delegated to the Head of Highways & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways.
5. That paper permits be phased out by 2021 with a shift to 'virtual permits' to reduce waste and improve convenience be agreed.

6. That new residential developments built within the boundaries of existing permit parking schemes (or CPZ's) should not automatically qualify for resident permits be agreed and eligibility be determined by a local/joint committee in a parking review or by the Cabinet Member for Highways.
7. That the following changes to charges made for suspensions and waivers be introduced from April 2020:
 - a. The initial charge for a suspension (valid for up to 3 days) be changed from £65 to £75
 - b. The charge for each additional day that the suspension is in force be changed from £10 to £12
 - c. The initial charge for a parking waiver (valid for up to 3 days) be changed from £15 to £25
 - d. The charge for each additional day that a parking waiver is granted be changed from £5 to £6.
8. That a persistent evader policy is developed and trialled with district and borough enforcement teams that will entail immobilisation or removal of persistent evader vehicles (those whose owners evade payment of parking fines) and that the approval of the final policy is delegated to the Cabinet Member for Highways be agreed.
9. That from April 2020 a charge of £50 be introduced to assess an application for a new Access Protection Marking (APM) or the extension of an existing one and a charge of £120 to provide a new APM (if the application is successful), or to refresh or extend an existing one be agreed.
10. That red routes be used in appropriate locations (following national guidance) and enforced by camera if needed to improve flow of traffic be agreed.
11. That Cameras be used on a trial basis to enforce certain restrictions such as school keep clears to improve safety outside schools. A policy on future use of camera enforcement of parking and other restrictions will be developed and approval sought by the Cabinet Member for Highways in due course.

Reason for decision:

The Surrey County Council (on street) Parking Strategy was adopted in 2011 and sets out our policies about on-street parking regulation and enforcement. It has evolved and developed in the years since and it is now time for a more comprehensive update to ensure it is in alignment with the Community vision 2030 and changes in national legislation. The relevant ambitions of our 2030 vision are outlined below.

Residents live in clean, safe and green communities where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities. The proposals in this report include changes to resident permits that will encourage the use of off street parking thus freeing up road space. Setting increasing charges for multiple permit applications could encourage fewer multi permit applications from a single household (although allowing for this

eventuality). Other proposals include ways of improving safety outside schools with camera enforcement of school keep clears and reducing antisocial pavement parking.

On street Electric Vehicle (EV) charging trials are also planned to commence in 2020 in parts of the county to evaluate how this evolving technology might be made more widely available and so encourage the use of electric vehicles.

Businesses in Surrey thrive. Regular parking reviews help keep pace with changes to the wider built environment and the introduction of improved limited waiting facilities near shops and businesses will improve access to them for customers and deliveries.

Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer. Regular parking reviews can keep on top of obstructive parking issues and new powers to introduce red routes and camera enforcement can help improve traffic flow and safety. We will lobby the government to bring in legislation to make 'footway obstruction' a civil offence that can be enforced under CPE.

By 2030 we want Surrey to be a uniquely special place where everyone has a great start to life, people live healthy and fulfilling lives, are able to achieve their full potential and contribute to their community and no one is left behind. The provision of free disabled parking bays, medical permits and, carers permits will help improve the mobility of disabled residents as well as access to more vulnerable residents who are in need of care by medical staff or relatives. More flexible visitor permit arrangements will improve access arrangements for some residents.

This policy update also looks at the range of charges we or our enforcement agents make for various parking services in light of the Fees and Charges Policy adopted by Cabinet on the 18 December 2018. A key principal of this is that users of discretionary services are expected to pay for the full cost of the service being received rather than it being supplemented/paid for by the general tax payer.

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

Mr Colin Kemp left the room for two minutes at the end of this item.

16/20 MENTAL HEALTH REVIEW PROGRAMME [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Adults & Public Health introduced this report that set out how Following a review of Mental Health arrangements for the commissioning and delivery of Adult Social Care (ASC) Mental Health services phase 2 of the Mental Health Programme Review could now take place. This work was designed to bring about the strategic and operational changes needed to deliver services that were consistent with our obligations under the Care Act and achieve our ambition to be at the forefront of best practice and to establish a clear Mental Health professional identity. This report described the ambitions and timetable for phase 2.

Mr Chris Botten spoke to this item and stated that it was one of the most significant pieces of transformation and was pleased with the report. He believed there was a S75 steering group that was monitoring the progress of this work and suggested that it might be helpful if there was Member

representation on it. He would be willing to undertake the role, if Cabinet thought it would be helpful. The Cabinet Member for Adults & Public Health said she would contact Mr Botten to develop this idea.

RESOLVED:

That the priorities and work programme for phase 2 of the Mental Health Programme Review be approved.

Reason for decision:

Meeting our requirements under the Care Act and delivering the transformation programme for Mental Health requires significant work to reshape commissioning and operational practice as the service has not established a clear professional identity within the previous arrangements. This needs to be managed whilst also undertaking and embedding the organisational development required so that ASC Mental Health can be viewed as a key partner and contributor to the fast developing landscape of Health and social care. The phase 2 programme will enable us to achieve this.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults & Health Select Committee]

Miss Alison Griffiths left the meeting at the close of discussion on this item.

17/20 ANNUAL PROCUREMENT FORWARD PLAN 2020/21 [Item 14]

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support introduced this report which contained project details that, due to an administrative error, were missed off the report that went to Cabinet in December. Exempt financial information was contained within a Part 2 report.

RESOLVED:

1. That approval to Procure for the projects listed in Annex 1 – “Annual Procurement Forward Plan for 2020/21” in accordance with the Council’s Procurement and Contract Standing Orders was approved.
2. That where the first ranked tender for any projects listed in Annex 1 is within the +/-5% budgetary tolerance level, the relevant Executive Director, Director or Head of Service (as appropriate) is authorised to award such contracts was agreed.
3. That the procurement activity that will be returned to Cabinet for review of the commissioning and procurement strategy prior to going out to market, and which is highlighted in grey in Annex 1 was agreed.

Reasons for decision:

To comply with the Procurement and Contract Standing Orders agreed by Council in May 2019.

To provide Cabinet with strategic oversight of planned procurement projects for 2020/21.

To ensure Cabinet oversight is focussed on the most significant procurements.

To avoid the need to submit multiple individual requests for Approval to Procure as well as individual contract award approvals for work taking place in 2020/21.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]

18/20 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 15]

RESOLVED:

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

19/20 ANNUAL PROCUREMENT FORWARD PLAN 2020/21 [Item 16]

This Part 2 annex contains information which is exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

RESOLVED:

See Minute 17/20.

Reason for decision:

See Minute 17/20.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources & Performance Select Committee]

20/20 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 17]

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

Meeting closed at 3.52 pm

Chairman

RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE SELECT COMMITTEE**Item under consideration: REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET 2020/21****Date Considered: 21 - 24 January 2020**

- 1 This year the Select Committees reviewed the draft budgets of the Directorates relevant to their remits. Each Select Committee received budget information in two stages: initially this was a summary of the council-wide budget including capital plans, pressures and risks followed by a detailed supplementary agenda with specific Directorate budgetary information.
- 2 Each Select Committee was attended by the relevant Cabinet Members and Executive Directors supported by Finance officers to present budgets and answer questions from Members.

Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee

- 3 The Select Committee was supportive of the budget whilst noting the risks and challenges presented by the need to deliver on the directorate's capital programme to increase specialist places in the state school sector in the county and the continued social worker recruitment gap. The Select Committee was clear that the greatest challenge for Children's Service in the future was workforce recruitment and retention.
- 4 Questioning was prominent on Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) with concerns raised on the significant £17m efficiencies required in SEND services, the overspend in the High Needs Block and the importance of successful transformation of this service.
- 5 The Select Committee was pleased to note the integration of children's health and social care commissioning and bringing transport under Executive Director, Dave Hill.
- 6 The Chairman suggested that each Cabinet Member should be able to articulate for residents how their relevant budgets support the delivery of the eight outcomes in the Council's Organisation Strategy.

Adults and Health Select Committee

- 6 The Select Committee reviewed the two council budgets in its remit; Adult Social Care and Public Health. Regarding Adult Social Care, Members sought assurances on the operation of the service's strength-based approach to assessment. The Committee also raised concerns about the cost of care, the sustainability of the care market and the locus of spend on mental health.
- 7 The Chief Executive of Healthwatch Surrey raised the risks of making efficiencies to services that are used by vulnerable residents such as learning disabilities/autism services and asked how these would be mitigated. The Executive Director acknowledged that there were considerable risks attached to efficiencies.
- 8 The Select Committee was concerned about the relative funding of Public Health in Surrey per capita relative to other Local Authorities in England. The Select Committee request that the Cabinet Member for Adults and Public

Health confirm that they consider this budget to be adequate to support the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy's emphasis on prevention; and to take appropriate action, including lobbying government, if they are not able to confirm that view.

Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

- 8 The Select Committee emphasised the need for budget contingencies to only be used in a last resort scenario. Contract management must be suitably robust to ensure the delivery of services and value for money for residents with specific references made to highway maintenance and waste.
- 9 Members wished to draw attention to fundamental need for the council's directorates to meet efficiency targets more effectively than they have in the current budget year bearing in mind especially the uncertainties around funding in the following year.
- 11 The Select Committee raised the Greener Future programme and how this would be developed to meet the call for action agreed by council. In particular, the Members discussed the impact of improving public transport in the county.

Resources and Performance Select Committee

- 12 The Select Committee were assured that there was an earmarked reserve to counteract the current SEND deficit. The Committee remains concerned about its eventual resolution in the medium term.
- 13 The Select Committee questioned the status of the efficiencies outlined in the budget. The Cabinet Member for Finance considered these to be deliverable and would monitor the list through a monthly Red-Amber-Green (RAG) rated report to Cabinet.
- 14 Members noted that the contingency allocation in the budget had increased by £10m and that reserves would stand in the region of £40m by the end of the year.
- 15 The Select Committee noted that budget equalisation reserve (BER) existed to absorb large pressures such as the Eco-Park project and Adult Social Care budget pressures as they might arise.
- 16 Members questioned where responsibility for the management of headcounts within Directorate's budget envelopes lay and how the cumulative impact of recruitment and vacancies on the council were managed. The Select Committee would follow this up with the Executive Director for Finance & Resources directly.

Recommendations:

The Select Committees agreed the following:

- a) Select Committees recognise the difficulty of formulating this year's budget given the announcement of a general election in December, however, effective scrutiny requires more time to prepare draft in order to make reasoned, specific recommendations. Select Committees should be involved in budget setting from late 2020 to enable effective scrutiny of the 2021/22 budget

- b) That Select Committees reviewed the refreshed Transformation Programme noting the risks associated to the sustainability of the council's finances on delivering these projects and would plan future scrutiny as necessary
- c) That the Cabinet Member for Highways considers increasing the revenue budget for bus services. This would be to increase the use of these services and to help the council meet its Greener Future ambition to be carbon net zero by 2050
- d) That the Cabinet Member for Adults & Public Health confirm that they consider the Public Health budget to be adequate to support the Surrey Health & Wellbeing Strategy's emphasis on prevention; and to take appropriate action, including lobbying government, if they are not able to confirm this view

Nick Harrison

Chairman of the Resources and Performance Select Committee

Cabinet Reply to recommendations:

- a. We fully appreciate the role that Select Committees play in the budget setting process. The setting of the 2020/21 budget has been extraordinary from the perspective of the external environment, with the announcement of a general election providing a truncated timeline for engagement with Select Committees. We also recognise that this process should commence earlier for setting the 2021/22 budget. Although the external landscape is still uncertain, we are committed to engaging Committees in the scrutiny process by the end of the calendar with a view of improving on this timeline in future years.
- b. The transformation projects and the individually listed efficiency items as listed in the budget paper will be RAG rated as the year progresses as has been the case during the current financial year. It should be noted that each service has a budget envelope in which they are expected to operate within.
- c. I share the ambition of the Select Committee in wishing to increase the use of buses and to be carbon net zero by 2050. This is core to our Rethinking Transport approach that is supporting the council's community vision for Surrey. This council is already committed to increasing our local bus budget by circa 3% in the coming financial year. We are also putting in place plans to accelerate the introduction of more ultra-low emission buses into Surrey, an investment to be delivered in partnership with bus companies in the county. We are also investing in infrastructure to help buses operate more effectively and efficiently, coupled with enhancements to service information for bus users. Our ambition is to make the bus an attractive choice for residents whether they are travelling to work, school, health appointments or accessing other key services.
- d. The level of activity for this service has been structured in accordance with the overall reduction in funding of £9m by central government, which will enable the service to accomplish the activities as set out in paragraphs 3.8 and 3.9 of the budget report.

Mr Mel Few

