

Cabinet

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 25
February 2020 at
2.00 pm

Place

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

Contact

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

Chief Executive

Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:
@SCCdemocracy

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

Cabinet Members: Mr Mel Few, Mr Matt Furniss, Mr Mike Goodman, Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Mrs Julie Iles, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mrs Sinead Mooney, Mr Tim Oliver and Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members: Mrs Natalie Bramhall, Miss Alison Griffiths and Mr Mark Nuti

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

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

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

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

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

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 28 JANUARY 2020

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

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

NOTES:

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

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions

The deadline for Member's questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting 19 February 2020.

b Public Questions

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting – 18 February 2020.

c Petitions

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

d Representations received on reports to be considered in private

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

- 5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL** (Pages 1 - 4)
- A report has been received from Guildford Joint Committee in relation to Item 7 - Bus Lane Enforcement.
- 6 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING** (Pages 5 - 8)
- To note any delegated decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader, Cabinet Members and Strategic Investment Board since the last meeting of the Cabinet.
- 7 BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT** (Pages 9 - 20)
- To update the approval mechanism for bus lanes and bus lane enforcement.
- 8 2019/20 MONTH 9 (DECEMBER) FINANCIAL REPORT** (Pages 21 - 32)
- This report provides the details of the County Council's 2019/20 financial position as at 31 December 2019 (M9) for revenue and capital budgets, the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year and also as a quarter-end report. It includes Treasury Management and Debt. Further details on Service budgets are to be found in Annex 1.
- 9 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (IF NEEDED)**
- 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.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Friday, 14 February 2020

QUESTIONS, PETITIONS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

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

Please note:

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

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your co-operation

GUILDFORD JOINT COMMITTEE**Report to Cabinet**

Subject: Concerns of the Guildford Joint Committee (GJC) regarding the proposed changes to the previous SCC Policy on the use of cameras to enforce Bus Lanes

Committee considered the item: 11 December 2019

Topic/Request:

Guildford Joint Committee (GJC) would like to implement bus lane enforcement in two roads in Guildford as soon as possible but subject to at least the majority of any surpluses from this being used for measures to reduce congestion in Guildford.

Summary:

The published main agenda for the GJC meeting on December 11th included an item (13) on the use of cameras for the enforcement of bus lanes in Guildford. A supplementary agenda included a statement from the SCC Cabinet Member for Highways on changes that being proposed to the previously published SCC Policy on this. As a result, there was a lengthy debate on this item.

At the end of the debate, the GJC members

- (i) **AGREED** that it is supportive in principle of the introduction of bus-lane enforcement at Onslow Street and Woking Road and would like to see it introduced by the beginning of the 2020/21 financial year, subject to the approval by this committee of the final financial arrangements relating to schemes within the borough.
- (ii) **RECOMMENDED** further discussion on both the delivery mechanism and the financial mechanism for the distribution of any surpluses.

* Of the 16 Members present, 14 voted in favour of this motion, 2 abstained.

Background:

1. Guildford has more heavily used bus lanes than any other part of Surrey. In particular, there are two existing bus lanes (Onslow Street and Woking Road) where most local Members and Officers understand that there was a disappointingly high level of non-compliance. One of the Guildford schemes for which EM3/LEP funding had been obtained was for the creation of "Quality Bus Corridors". This scheme was due to be implemented in 2020/21 and would involve extensions to 2 other existing bus lanes and the creation of another new one. The GJC wished to install cameras in these 3 bus lanes at the same time in 2020/21.
2. In October 2018, SCC Cabinet agreed a Bus Lane Enforcement Policy which authorised the then Head of Highways and Transportation, in consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member for Place, to enter into any new bus lane agreements, subject to support from the Local or Joint Committee and to review and agree any future financial arrangements for each Borough or District. Following this decision, the Chairmen investigated funding for this approach and was informed that there was no central budget for the installation of cameras or officer investigation into the viability of cameras on these routes, so this funding would be need to be found from the joint

committee funding. When considering financial viability of the scheme it was presumed that the surpluses would be distributed using the same formula used for the distribution of any surpluses from on-street parking enforcement i.e. 20% to the Central Highways Budget, 20% to the Borough or District Council and 60% to the Local or Joint Committee as per the pilot scheme in Woking.

3. In March 2019, as a result of strong partnership between the two authorities, the GJC allocated £35k SCC highways funding to pump prime the installation of the cameras and Guildford Borough Council Parking team agreed to provide the officer resource. Guildford had a long list of requests for road safety measures that are awaiting funding. The fact that it was approved unanimously again indicates the support for getting on with the installation of the first 2 cameras in 2019/20.
4. The GJC working group that considers highways matters (including this project) concluded the investigation work in November 2019 and agreed that it should be included on the formal GJC agenda for consideration in that December. The new Cabinet Member for Highways has been involved in these discussions as a member of this group but did not give an indication that there was a likelihood of a countywide scheme in the near future.
5. Only after the publication of the agenda for this GJC meeting did the Cabinet Member for Highways tell the Chairman that he intended to make two proposals relating to the Policy agreed by the Cabinet in October 2018. The first of these was that there should now be a single enforcement agency for the whole County. The second was that the Woking precedent was not being carried forward and that 100% of any surplus from bus lane enforcement in Guildford would now go to Central Highways for use throughout the County. A written statement regarding these changes was subsequently received and included in a supplementary agenda circulated the day before the meeting.
6. At the meeting, the Committee were very disappointed by this last minute change in approach. They felt that most of any County wide surplus was likely to be raised in Guildford and that at least a majority of this should therefore be spent on measures to reduce congestion in Guildford. There was also general disappointment that this project would be delayed as it had previously been prioritised.
7. In addition, the media reports about this since the committee have focussed almost entirely on the possibility of funding being spent outside of the borough rather than the positives that could be delivered as a result of the enforcement being implemented. Local respondents to these media reports have been overwhelmingly in favour of money generated in Guildford being spent locally.
8. The Committee is concerned that the cameras will not be ready to be installed by the end of 2019/2020 nor on the same timescale as the Quality Bus Corridor schemes in 2020/21, which would lead to a reduced surplus and benefits of increased bus usage and less congestion that would arise from the enforcement.

The Cabinet is asked to

- a) Reconsider the proposal to centrally hold and allocate surplus funding raised in Guildford to highways projects throughout the County but rather ensure that at least the majority of this is spent on measures to reduce congestion in Guildford and
- b) Ensure that the new enforcement scheme will be implemented in time for cameras to be installed along the Woking Road and Onslow Street bus lanes and active by April 2020.

Reply from Mr Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Highways

The content of the report is noted and, as advised to the Guildford Joint Committee Chairman, a report on bus lane enforcement is being considered at the February Cabinet meeting. It is positive that Members of the Joint Committee support the principle of bus lane enforcement in their area.

The County Council is committed to the green agenda and supporting more sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling and bus provision across the entire County. If any surplus is generated from efficient and well managed bus lane enforcement, it will be used to contribute to supporting this agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 25 FEBRUARY 2020****REPORT OF: N/A****LEAD OFFICER: JOANNA KILLIAN, CHIEF EXECUTIVE****SUBJECT: LEADER/DEPUTY LEADER/CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD AND COMMITTEE-IN-COMMON DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

DETAILS:

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

Contact Officer:

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

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Decisions taken

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

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS JANUARY 2020

CABINET MEMBER FOR ALL-AGE LEARNING

1. HOME TO SCHOOL/COLLEGE TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT POLICY

Details of decision

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning considered and took into account the analysis of the responses to the public consultation (Annex A of the report), the equality impact assessment and the mitigations of key concerns and impacts (Annex B of the report), and

1. endorsed the strong focus on independence and preparation for adulthood in the new policy
2. approved the recommended three policy options that were the subject of consultation covering:
 - a. transport for children below the age of 5 (paragraph 12 of the report)
 - b. transport for children of compulsory school age who turn 8 (paragraph 13 of the report)
 - c. transport for young people aged 17 – 18 (paragraph 14 of the report)
3. approved Surrey County Council's Home to School/College Travel Assistance and Transport Policy (Annex C of the report)
4. approved the policy implementation timetable (paragraphs 15-16 of the report)

Reasons for decision

The Council has a responsibility to support greater independence of young people as an important step towards adulthood and to enabling them to fulfil their potential. Equally, the Council has a responsibility to meet its statutory duties related to home to school transport for eligible children and young people. The proposed policy meets these statutory duties and the implementation timetable allows families and young people sufficient time to prepare for changes to discretionary provision.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning – 31 January 2020)

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 25 FEBRUARY 2020****REPORT OF: MR MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS****LEAD OFFICER: GILLIAN STEWARD - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE****SUBJECT: BUS LANES AND BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The purpose of bus lanes and bus lane enforcement, which this report considers, is to help improve bus journey times and reliability and help to make buses an attractive alternative to the private motor vehicle. This supports both the County Council's 2030 vision to make journeys across the county easier, more predictable and safer, and also the wider climate change agenda.

In October 2018, Cabinet considered and approved a report reviewing the pilot bus lane enforcement scheme operating in Woking and considered options for future enforcement arrangements.

This report reviews and amends the approval processes for introducing bus lanes and bus lane enforcement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. agree the revised Bus Lane and Camera policy (Feb 2020) as attached in Annex A
2. authorise the Director for Infrastructure & Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways to introduce Bus Lane Enforcement
3. authorise the Cabinet Member for Highways to introduce new or amend existing bus lanes and determine any formal objections through the public formal Cabinet Member decision making meeting
4. authorise the Director for Infrastructure & Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways to enter into any new bus lane enforcement agency agreements or external enforcement contracts, subject to County Council procurement and governance processes and procedures.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To ensure the County Council can effectively, efficiently and consistently manage bus lane enforcement and bus lane provision to support the growth of bus use in Surrey as a part of our Greener Futures agenda.

DETAILS:

Introduction and background

1. The only camera bus lane enforcement within Surrey at the moment is for the High Street, Woking. This has been successfully operating since March 2018. A recent feasibility study has been undertaken for potential enforcement in Guildford which confirms it is economically viable.
2. There are 13 bus lanes in operation within Surrey. Due to the legal framework, it is not possible for the County Council to introduce enforcement where there is an “urban clearway”. The County Council has contacted the Department for Transport who have agreed to review this conflict.
3. Approval for the introduction of new bus lanes or amending existing bus lanes currently rests with Cabinet. It is proposed that this will be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Highways and any decision will be made at the public formal Cabinet Member decision meeting. If there are any unresolved formal objections to the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders these too will be considered at the public formal Cabinet Member for Highways decision meeting. This revised process will help to streamline decision making.
4. Most bus lanes are only operational for certain periods of the day, outside of this all vehicles can use them. Certain classification of vehicle are permitted to use a bus lane at prohibited times, such as hackney taxis, motorbikes, some classes of HGVs. This is stipulated in the traffic regulation order, required to enable the bus lane and can be reviewed to suit local conditions.
5. In 2019 the County Council declared a climate emergency and is developing detailed plans to support our Greener Futures agenda. Properly located and managed bus lanes can help improve bus transport and hence impact on the usage of private motor vehicles, potentially aiding both congestion and emissions.

Bus lane camera enforcement policy

6. A policy was approved by Cabinet in October 2018. This has been slightly amended to include the provision of new bus lanes, revisions to existing and approval for cameras. It has been renamed “Bus lane and camera enforcement policy” and is included in annex A.

CONSULTATION:

7. In late summer 2018 public consultation was undertaken seeking the views on increasing bus lane enforcement. This consultation included an on-line survey, plus letters and emails to 237 taxi companies and 659 residents or business located near

to existing bus lanes. Signs were erected on site and County Councillors were made aware that the consultation was taking place.

8. For this type of consultation we received a high amount of feedback, with 489 individual replies. Of these, 55% agreed that some or many enforcement cameras should be introduced.
9. The County Council's Strategic Transport Group confirmed that our bus operator partners support enhanced bus lane enforcement. Journey delays are a prime factor in the ongoing viability of commercially operated routes and impact the performance and cost base of council funded bus services. Measures to enhance bus reliability are cited as being critical by the bus industry.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

10. Before any new cameras are introduced any costs will be determined and funding allocated. It is expected that cameras will only be introduced where they are as a minimum cost neutral.
11. New bus lanes will only be introduced, or amended where there is support from the bus operators and will be subject to appropriate public consultation.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

12. Bus lane enforcement is introduced to support the operation of bus services, which enable our residents to get to work, education, health appointments and access a range of key services by more sustainable means. It is not introduced to generate revenue. Nevertheless it is expected that the costs of enforcement do not add to the general council revenue burden and any scheme is at least self-financing. If an operational surplus is generated, it will all be retained by the County Council and used to support the green agenda of walking, cycling and bus provision, as permitted by law.
13. Each camera costs in the region of £20,000 and depending on the site, signage an additional £1,500. This includes installation costs. The annual maintenance costs and fees are about £3,000, plus staffing costs. The amount of staff needed will depend on the number of contraventions.
14. The level of fines for bus lane contraventions is set by Government. Outside of London it is £60, reduced to £30 if paid within 14 days. Drivers do not receive penalty points on their licence and they may appeal against any penalty in a similar manner to the procedures with a parking ticket.
15. The High Street, Woking bus lane has been in operation for 2 years. The number of contraventions has reduced from approximately 120 per day to around 10-15 as most drivers adhere to the restriction. It has settled operating at about a £60,000 annual surplus, once costs have been accounted for.

16. Any new agency agreements will stipulate that all any operational surplus after legitimate costs will be retained by the County Council. As referenced above this will be used countywide to support the green agenda.
17. New bus lanes or amendments to existing bus lanes are normally introduced as part of highway improvement schemes and will be included in the relevant capital budget(s).

SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY

18. The financial implications of bus lane enforcement are explained in the paragraphs above, along with the purposes for which any surplus can be used. The Section 151 Officer supports the recommendations, which are consistent with the Medium-Term Financial Strategy and the Council's Organisational Strategy.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER

19. Surrey County Council has the power to enforce bus lane contraventions under section 144(3)(b) of the Transport Act 2000 and Schedule 8 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and to delegate, if we so choose to Borough and District Councils. The delegation to Borough and District Councils is under powers in the Local Government Act 2000, together with associated regulations. The geographical area of Surrey has been designated as a Civil Enforcement Area for bus lane contraventions.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

20. The recommendations in this report have no material impact on existing equality policy and therefore a full equalities assessment was not deemed necessary.
21. Before any changes are made on the highway, relevant and proportionate consultation will be carried out with users and interested parties.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

22. The proposals considered in the paper will have no adverse environmental impacts. New bus lanes can contribute toward reducing vehicle emissions by creating modal shift as buses become more reliable and attractive to use. Bus lanes with effective enforcement can help councils meet their travel and environmental objectives as defined in Local Transport Plans.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- a. Camera enforcement will continue for the High Street, Woking and the term agreement will be reviewed prior to renewal (2023)
- b. Options will be explored for introducing bus lane camera enforcement in Guildford in early 2020
- c. Other bus lanes will be reviewed and, if appropriate camera enforcement will be introduced
- d. Amendments to or new bus lane provision will be introduced as part of wider transport improvement, subject to the processes outlined in this report.

Contact Officer:

Richard Bolton, Group Manager – Local Highway Services, Tel: 020 8541 7140

Consulted:

Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Highways
Paul Millin, Group Manager – Strategic Transport
Lucy Monie, Director for Infrastructure & Operations
Gill Steward, Executive Director for Environment, Transport & Infrastructure
Tony Orzieri, Strategic Finance Business Partner
Nancy El-Shatory, Principal Lawyer

Annexes:

Annex A – Bus Lane and camera enforcement policy

Sources/background papers:

Pilot for camera enforcement of Bus Lane, Woking – Cabinet 31 October 2017

Bus Lane Enforcement – Cabinet 30 October 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

Bus lane and camera enforcement policy

Feb 2020



7 Contents

	Page
1. Executive summary	3
2. The case for efficient, reliable and well managed bus lanes	3
3. Legal context	3
4. Introducing both camera enforcement and new or amendments to bus lanes	4
5. Operating camera enforcement	3
6. Traffic Regulation Order process	4
7. Review	5

1. Executive summary

This document sets out the framework to enable efficient and consistent bus lane and bus lane enforcement across Surrey.

The objective is to maintain reliable and timely bus services, through introducing and properly enforcing bus lanes, bus gates and bus only streets.

2. The case for efficient, reliable and well managed bus lanes

The provision of bus priority measures across the Surrey road network is crucial in ensuring journeys are more reliable and bus users in Surrey are able to get to the destinations they need to, including places of education, employment, healthcare and leisure. This paper considers bus priority measures, focused on the use of properly enforceable bus lanes, bus gates and bus only streets.

Congestion is a major constraint across our road network and has a significant role to play in the delays experienced by all road users, but especially local bus services. Therefore, the purpose of bus priority measures is to improve journey reliability times from stop to stop, which makes local bus services more efficient and cost-effective. Enforcement of these measures is crucial to ensure robustness and continued success in improving journey times.

From previous research completed, including findings from the Surrey-wide Local Transport Review and the Knowledge Transfer Partnership, improving reliability is a key factor in attracting new passengers on local Surrey buses. Getting more people using the bus then increases patronage and revenue, which, in turn, leads to a reduction in subsidy paid to the operators.

Being able to improve bus journey times from the enforcement of bus priority measures will also lead to better relationships being developed with operators. With the County Council being committed to such measures, operators may be keen to invest further in their fleets, for example adding wifi, charging points, audio/ visual next stop information and smarter ticketing solutions. Such enhancements will also lead to an increase in patronage and revenue and a reduction in subsidy paid.

3. Legal context

Surrey County Council has the power to enforce bus lane contraventions under section 144(3)(b) of the Transport Act 2000 and Schedule 8 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and to delegate, if we so choose to Borough and District Councils. The delegation to Borough and District Councils is under powers in the Local Government Act 2000, together with associated regulations.

The Bus Lanes (Approved Devices) (England) Order 2005 provides information as to the equipment which can be used for enforcement, as specified within Schedule 1, which supersedes the Transport Act 2000 provisions. In order to enforce a penalty notice, the equipment must be an “approved device” which is able to produce a record

4. Introducing camera enforcement and new or amendments to bus lanes

The decision to enable camera enforcement of bus lanes in Surrey will be made by the Director for Infrastructure & Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways. New bus lanes or amendments to existing bus lanes will be considered by the Cabinet Member for Highways at the formal public Cabinet Member decision meeting. This will include authority to advertise and make relevant Traffic Regulation Orders (see section 6) and determine any objections. Consultation will be undertaken with relevant Divisional Members.

To ensure bus lanes and camera locations meet the objective of maintaining reliable and timely bus services; sites, lanes or streets identified for potential bus lane or camera enforcement should be properly assessed and the proposals supported by the county council's Passenger Transport team.

There must be a comprehensive communication plan to raise awareness of the planned bus lanes or camera enforcement, which includes local residents, businesses and those people that are likely to be affected.

5. Operating camera enforcement

The County Council will decide who operates the enforcement of each camera or cameras within a geographical area.

Department for Transport guidance and code/s of practice (for authorities outside London) will be followed. This will ensure that camera systems and enforcement are managed properly, with appropriate training and qualifications for camera operators and back office staff.

Where there is more than one authority/agency operating camera enforcement in Surrey there will be an additional working code of practice to ensure consistency in enforcement. This will be compiled by the enforcement authorities/agencies, and regularly updated as required. Enforcement authorities/agencies should aim to harmonise the enforcement regime, processes and even systems, hardware and software where possible.

Sign and road markings will be at the required level for successful camera enforcement. This is likely to be at a higher level than required by the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions.

6. Traffic Regulation Order process

The legal order (Traffic Regulation Order or abbreviated to TRO) outlines the hours of operation, conditions and who can and who cannot use a bus lane, gate or bus only street.

It is important that there is flexibility in each TRO so that the most appropriate controls are placed for each location. In order to retain some consistency in approach there will be some conditions that are common to all TROs on bus lane, gates and bus only streets in Surrey:-

- The current TROs stipulate what vehicles are permitted through bus lanes, bus gates and bus only streets, to include any public service vehicles of sixteen seats or more
- where taxis are permitted this will apply only to “Hackney Carriages” licenced by the borough or district council. Private hire vehicles will not be permitted.

Consultation for TROs

To introduce a new TRO, a formal process has to be followed. Local residents, businesses and those affected by a proposed new bus lane, gate or bus only street will be consulted.

The consultation should include making people aware that the council may in the future introduce camera enforcement to enforce the TRO, so that their views can be taken into consideration before the legal order is made. This consultation requirement will apply to all new bus lane, gates and bus only streets in Surrey.

7. Review

This policy may be modified, altered or amended at any time.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

DATE: 25 FEBRUARY 2020



**REPORT OF: MR MEL FEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND
LEIGH WHITEHOUSE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES**

LEAD OFFICER: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESOURCES (S151 OFFICER)

SUBJECT: 19/20 MONTH 9 (DECEMBER) FINANCIAL REPORT

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report provides the details of the County Council's 2019/20 financial position as at 31 December 2019 (M9) for revenue and capital budgets, the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year and, also as a quarter-end report. It includes Treasury Management and Debt. Further details on Service budgets are to be found in **Annex 1**.

Key Messages - Revenue

- To achieve a balanced budget for the year a programme of efficiencies including transformation activities totalling £82m was established. The Council is three quarters of the way through the financial year, with c£69m (c85%) of the £82m target on track to be achieved or delivered.
- The latest forecast for the year-end is for a Revenue deficit of £2.4m. This is broadly due to planned efficiencies not being achieved and emerging new pressures mainly in waste offset by various mitigating actions. If the position does not improve, we will draw down on the base budget contingency to ensure General Fund Reserves are maintained.
- The revenue projection is mainly due to underlying overspends of £16m:
 - £8.2m unachieved/black efficiencies in the programme of £82m set for this year;
 - £3.3m in SEN and mainstream schools transport, from a growth in pupil numbers and increased costs;
 - £3.5m in Waste Management, arising primarily due to declining recycling prices.
 - £1m on the Social Care element of school placements.

Offsets and mitigating actions of c£13.6m include:

- £5.3m highway repairs reclassified as capital expenditure, and therefore funded from borrowing or capital receipts;
- £2m additional government grants - Section 31 Business Rates grants and New Homes Bonus;
- £1.5m reduced forecast for the Corporate Redundancy budget;

- £1.4m contingency draw down to support the ETI LED delayed efficiencies;
 - £1m reduced contribution to the Self-Insurance Fund following the actuarial review showing there was sufficient funding to reduce the contribution;
 - £0.9m underspend on capital financing costs due to slippage in the 2018/19 capital programme; and
 - £1.5m other CFLC mitigating actions including above target efficiencies on Libraries and culture of £0.6m and £0.9m from staffing underspends within education.
- Any further adverse developments in waste will be monitored carefully going forward, which may result in further changes to the year-end forecast. Refer to paragraphs 8 and 9 for further information.
 - The projected year end outturn position has been determined, taking into account seasonal spending profiles.
 - The overall financial position for period 9 reflects a change to prior month mainly as a result of new emerging pressures in Waste recycling prices. There remains some vulnerability in the outlook going forward due to some red risks which are not factored into the current 'non achievable category' (and therefore forecast). If these materialise there will be an adverse impact on the current forecast.

Key Messages - Capital

- The Council set a capital budget for 2019/20 of £129.2m in February 2019. Over recent months the budget has been adjusted for an in-year review leading to re-profiling of budgets to future years to reflect the current position on programme delivery, new schemes and re-profiling reviews. As a result, the current 2019/20 capital budget has been revised to £123m, with forecast in-year underspend of £1.3m at M9.
- Details are set out in **Table 3**.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Cabinet is asked to note the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Revenue Budget

1. **Table 1** below shows the forecast revenue budget outturn for the year by Service. **Annex 1** (attached) provides more detail of Service forecast outturn.

Table 1 - Summary revenue budget forecast variances as at 31 December 2019

Directorate	Cabinet member(s)	Full year budget £m	Full year forecast £m	Current year forecast variance at Month 9 £m	Change in forecast since last month £m
Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture (CFLC)	M Lewis / J Iles	243.0	248.8	5.8	(1.2)
Adult Social Care (ASC)	S Mooney	367.2	367.2	0.0	0.0
Environment, Transport & Infrastructure (ETI)	D Turner-Stewart/ M Furniss/ M Goodman	128.5	128.7	0.2	3.5
Community Protection	D Turner-Stewart	34.5	34.3	(0.2)	(0.0)
Resources (Res)	M Few/ Z Grant-Duff	71.1	71.9	0.8	(0.4)
Transformation, Partnership & Prosperity (TPP)	T Oliver/ Z Grant-Duff/ C Kemp	14.4	15.4	1.0	0.1
Central Income & Expenditure (CIE)	M Few	(858.7)	(864.1)	(5.4)	0.0
Overall Deficit		0.0	2.4	2.4	2.0

Note: The net budget and forecast of Public Health is nil and so has not been shown separately; the gross budget and forecast is £35.7m.

Note: All numbers have been rounded which might cause a difference

Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture (CFLC) Directorate

2. In the CFLC Directorate, the number of pupils requiring SEN transport is expected to rise in a similar pattern to previous years. The Transport Review has identified mitigations to reduce some of these costs and therefore the forecast overspend for SEN Transport is now assessed at £2.4m. There is also an increase in the cost of mainstream and alternative provision transport leading to an overall budget pressure on transport for this year of £3.3m.
3. There have been reductions in the volume of both external residential placements and external fostering, but the activity levels remain above budget, however the focus is on increasing in-County placements.
4. A key area of risk for the Council is in Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), which is funded through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). The current projected position assumes an overspend on SEND of £29m in 19/20 (equivalent to the budgeted contribution to reserves). The number of Non-Maintained Independent (NMI) placements (a significant factor in the cost of SEND) could rise to 1,199 by the end of the financial year based on the current trajectory compared to 1,030 at the beginning of the year and 1,106 which was forecast in the SEND reset business case. In order to limit the overspend to £29m, management actions of

£1.9m were required by the end of the financial year and the forecast reflects that these will have been achieved

5. A Member Board has been established to monitor the transformation programme. There however, remains a substantial risk around the deliverability of the plans and the impact that this could have on 2020/21.

Adult Social Care (ASC) Directorate

6. In ASC, a balanced outturn is forecast as spending on care packages has now fallen for three successive months and the reductions have brought total commitments much closer to the budgeted profile. As a result, ASC is forecast to under achieve against the care package efficiencies budgeted in 2019/20 reflecting an improvement of £2.5m from the prior month.
7. Although risks still remain, the trend for the last quarter is much more promising and ASC aims to continue and if possible, extend this trend in the remainder of 2019/20.

Environment, Transportation & Infrastructure (ETI) Directorate

8. A number of factors are impacting on the Waste financial forecast for 1920/20, which include increased waste management costs, the cost of managing dry mixed recycling and disposing of residual waste. These costs were previously assumed to have been offset by savings elsewhere in the Waste Management budget, but this is no longer considered likely. A sum of £3.5m has therefore been provided for in the forecast to reflect these items. When taking into account existing underspends in ETI, this results in a net pressure of £0.2m across the Directorate.
9. The delay in the completion of the Eco Park has led to a reduced cost which will be set aside in the Waste Sinking Fund. The Sinking Fund is used to smooth waste costs across years, including the financial impact of the Eco Park delay and other cost variations. Officers continue to closely monitor progress on delivering the Eco Park and other movements in waste costs.

2019/20 Efficiency Programme

10. The Council included £82m of efficiency proposals in the annual budget approved by Council in February 2019. At this point in the year c£69m (c85%) of the plan has been achieved or expected to be delivered. The Council considers £8.2m of the remaining efficiency proposals to be unachievable (black proposals). There continue to be risks around the achievability of remaining efficiencies, which are being managed and monitored.
11. Directorate efficiencies are shown in **Table 2** below.

Table 2 - Efficiency Progress as at 31 December 2019

Directorate	Full Year Target	Full Year Forecast	Forecast variance	Blue Achieved	Green	Amber	Red	Black Unidentified Gap	Last Month
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture	21.7	19.0	2.7	13.8	3.8	1.4	0.0	2.7	3.0
Adult Social Care	20.0	20.0	0.0	19.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public Health	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Environment, Transportation & Infrastructure	11.9	9.1	2.8	5.3	1.9	1.9	0.0	2.8	3.0
Community Protection group	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transformation, Partnership & Prosperity	3.4	2.7	0.7	1.8	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.7
Resources	11.0	9.0	1.9	7.7	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.9	1.9
Central Income & Expenditure	12.6	12.6	0.0	9.2	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	81.6	73.5	8.2	58.8	10.0	3.7	0.9	8.2	8.7

Capital Budget

12. The M9 budget of £123m is an increase of £0.9m from M8. This is as a result of additional schools' expenditure of £0.7m, which will be funded by third party contributions, including the Devolved Formula Grant. There is also an increase to the budget of for School Kitchens, which is grant funded spend approved by the Capital Programme Panel in January 2020 (£0.2m).
13. **Table 3** below provides a summary of the forecast outturn for the 2019/20 Capital budget, including the re-profile requests.

Table 3 - Summary capital programme budget forecast as at 31 December 2019

		Year to date	Full year forecast	Full year forecast	Change in forecast	Future years' budget
	Full year budget	actual month 9	outturn at month 9	variance at month 9	since last month	budget
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Adult Social Care	S Mooney	1.9	0.5	2.2	0.3	7.6
Children Services	M Lewis / J Iles	6.8	6.2	6.8	0.0	7.1
Environment	M Goodman	1.0	0.6	1.0	(0.1)	3.8
Highways & Transport	M Furniss	60.1	38.5	56.9	(3.1)	123.5
Information Technology & Digital	Z Grant-Duff	8.0	5.7	8.5	0.5	26.0
Property Services	M Few	23.3	17.8	24.5	1.1	106.6
Schools Basic Need	J Iles	19.5	16.3	19.5	0.0	64.6
Fire & rescue	D Turner- Stewart	2.4	0.5	2.4	0.0	7.1
Total Capital		123.0	86.1	121.7	(1.3)	346.3

Note: All numbers have been rounded - which might cause a casting difference

14. For M9, the forecast variance is a £1.3m underspend. This is an improvement of £1.9m from the M8 position. This is primarily comprised of the following:
- £0.6m overspend – Property: The Linden Farm scheme is complete. Final accounts are currently under negotiation, however there is an expected overspend of £0.6m due to unforeseen ground conditions and planning delays;

- £0.5m overspend – Property: SEN strategy - some projects are ahead of schedule. Budgets in future years will be brought forward to reduce future year spend;
- £0.5m overspend - IT&D Additional spend of £0.4m on the device refresh for IT&D Hardware being brought forward and delays to the Agile Working project (£0.1m) to ensure alignment with Moving Closer to Residents Project; and
- £0.3m additional spend on the ASC Adaptations Scheme, which will be met from the revenue budget.

Offset by:

- £3.1m underspend on the ETI LEPS Programme. - delay due to land purchase and design work in the Guildford Town Centre (£1.8m) scheme; and delay due to drainage issues in the Wider Staines (£1.3m) scheme. There is currently a “deep dive” underway to review LEP scheme delivery in order to provide confidence in the forecast for both 19/20 and 20/21.

Debt

15. During the three months to 31 December 2019, the Council raised invoices totalling £122m (Q2: £100m).
16. The total gross debt outstanding for the Council at 31 December is £53.1m, with £28.2m being overdue. Overall, the overdue debt position over the last quarter has remained largely unchanged (Q2: £28.9m). Similarly, overdue unsecured debt remains largely unchanged (Q2: £13.5m).
17. **Table 4** below shows the age profile of the debts. The overdue debt is the gross debt less those balances not immediately due (i.e. less than 30 days old).
18. The Month 6 Cabinet (Q2) report outlined that in recognition of the challenges and complexities relating to social care debt, a group of senior officers from Adult Social Care, Corporate Finance and Legal Services had been formed to look at issues and identify actions that could be taken to improve the debt position. In the last quarter a number of actions have been taken including:
 - Signing a contract with a company to provide staffing resource to conduct financial assessments, enabling some of ASC’s own financial assessments and benefits staff to focus exclusively on debt recovery. Access to the Council’s systems is currently being tested with go live planned in the next two weeks;
 - Engaging with solicitors with a view to piloting the use of external legal resource to support debt recovery for specific cases. The use of external solicitors would be to supplement and provide additional capacity for the high quality support already provided by the Council’s Legal Services team;
 - Recruiting a post for 6 months to focus specifically on using the money claims online process to try to recover lower value debts; and

- Maintaining additional staffing in ASC's financial assessments and benefits team to maintain performance on the billing of income while other resources are targeted on tackling debt.

19. The progress of the above actions will be closely monitored by the debt group to determine whether temporary arrangements should be extended or made permanent. The debt group will also more broadly continue to monitor performance for billed income and debt recovery to identify any other opportunities for improvement.
20. In relation to the social care debt figures set out in the table below, It is important to note that secured social care debt is not "overdue", as it does not become payable until the relevant properties have been sold.

Table 4: Age profile of the Council's debt as at 31 December 2019

Account group	<1 month £m	1-12 months £m	1 to 2 years £m	over 2 years £m	Gross debt £m	Overdue debt £m
Care debt – unsecured	6.3	3.9	5.0	4.3	19.5	13.2
Care debt – secured	1.1	2.7	2.3	4.1	10.1	9.1
Total care debt	7.4	6.6	7.3	8.4	29.6	22.3
Schools, colleges and nurseries	1.1	0.3	0.1	0.0	1.5	0.3
Clinical commissioning groups	6.5	1.3	0.5	0.1	8.4	1.9
Other local authorities	5.5	0.9	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.9
General debt	4.4	2.2	0.3	0.3	7.2	2.8
Total non-care debt	17.6	4.7	0.8	0.4	23.5	5.9
Total debt	24.9	11.2	8.2	8.8	53.1	28.2
Q1 2019/20	20.0	14.4	6.0	8.6	48.9	28.9
Change	4.9	(3.1)	2.2	0.3	4.2	(0.7)

Note: All numbers have been rounded - which might cause a difference

Treasury Management

Borrowing

21. The Council borrows to finance its capital spending that exceeds receipts from: grants, third party contributions, capital receipts and reserves. The Council's long-term debt stands at £437m, an increase of £40m since the start of the year. This was to take advantage of low interest rates and lock them in for future years.
22. As at 31 December 2019, the weighted average interest rate of the Council's long-term debt portfolio is 3.86%. The Treasury Management Strategy, approved by County Council in February 2019, continued the policy of internal borrowing and where necessary, to borrow short term to meet cash flow liquidity requirements. **Table 5** shows a net £18m decrease in the Council's short-term borrowing activity since 1 April 2019.

Table 5: Short term borrowing as at 31 December 2019

	£m
Debt outstanding as at 31 March 2019	255
Net Movement since start of year	(18)
Current balance as at 31 December 2019	237

Figures are for Surrey County Council only and do not include Surrey Police

23. The weighted average interest rate of the Council's short-term external debt is 0.82% at 31 December 2019.

Investments

24. The Council's average daily level of funds held on deposit is £44m to date compared to an average of £41m during 2018/19. The Council invests temporary cash surplus exclusively, through the use of money market funds (MMF). Other investment facilities are available, including: brokers, direct dealing with counterparties through the use of call accounts or direct deal facilities, or with the government's Debt Management Office (DMO). No new fixed term deposits have been agreed during 2019/20 due to the low cash balances held and the need to maintain high liquidity.

25. **Table 6** shows the weighted average return on all funds held on deposit the Council received in the quarter to 31 December 2019 is 0.68%. This compares to the 0.57% average 7 day London Interbank Bid Rate (LIBID) for the same period.

Table 6: Weighted average return on investments compared to 7-day LIBID

	Average 7-day LIBID	Weighted return on investments
2019/20 quarter 3	0.57%	0.68%
2019/20 quarter 2	0.57%	0.71%
2019/20 quarter 1	0.57%	0.75%
2018/19 quarter 4	0.57%	0.76%
2018/19 quarter 3	0.49%	0.70%
2018/19 quarter 2	0.51%	0.58%
2018/19 quarter 1	0.36%	0.21%

CONSULTATION:

26. Executive Directors and Cabinet members have confirmed the forecast outturns for their revenue and capital budgets.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

27. Risk implications are stated throughout the report and each relevant director or head of service has updated their strategic and or service risk registers accordingly. In addition, the Leadership Risk Register continues to reflect the increasing uncertainty of future funding likely to be allocated to the Council and the sustainability of the MTFP. In the light of the increased

and significant financial risks faced by the Council, the Leadership Risk Register will be reviewed to increase confidence in Directorate plans to mitigate the risks and issues.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

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

SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY

29. The Section 151 Officer confirms the financial information presented in this report is consistent with the Council's general accounting ledger and that forecasts have been based on reasonable assumptions, taking into account all material, financial and business issues and risks.
30. The Council has a duty to ensure its expenditure does not exceed resources available. It is drawn to Members' attention that the Council continues to face ongoing uncertainty about future funding, demand pressures and efficiencies. Within this context the Council will continue to develop and implement plans to ensure the delivery of services are contained within resources.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER

31. The Council is under a duty to set a balanced and sustainable budget. The Local Government Finance Act requires the Council to take steps to ensure that the Council's expenditure (that is expenditure incurred already in year and anticipated to be incurred) does not exceed the resources available whilst continuing to meet its statutory duties.
32. Cabinet should be aware that if the Section 151 Officer, at any time, is not satisfied that appropriate strategies and controls are in place to manage expenditure within the in-year budget they must formally draw this to the attention of the Cabinet and Council and they must take immediate steps to ensure a balanced in-year budget, whilst complying with its statutory and common law duties.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

33. Any impacts of the budget monitoring actions will be evaluated by the individual services as they implement the management actions necessary. In implementing individual management actions, the Council must comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 which requires it to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
34. Services will continue to monitor the impact of these actions and will take appropriate action to mitigate additional negative impacts that may emerge as part of this ongoing analysis.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

35. The relevant adjustments from the recommendations will be made to the Council's accounts.

Contact Officer:

Leigh Whitehouse, Executive Director of Resources
020 8541 7246

Consulted:

Cabinet, Executive Directors, Heads of Service

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Detailed Revenue Budget at 31 December 2019

Detailed Revenue Budget at 31 December 2019

Service	Cabinet Member	Prior year to date actual £m	Year to date Budget £m	Year to date Actual £m	Year to date variance £m	Full Year Gross budget £m	Full year net budget £m	Full Year net forecast £m	Full year net forecast variance £m
Delegated Schools	J Iles	5.2	2.7	2.7	(0.0)	310.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Education, Lifelong Learning & Culture	J Iles	64.2	72.9	65.5	(7.4)	282.0	96.9	99.0	2.1
Corporate Parenting	M Lewis	76.0	72.4	71.3	(1.1)	110.3	96.0	95.5	(0.5)
Commissioning	M Lewis / J Iles	4.3	4.4	4.2	(0.2)	65.4	6.0	6.3	0.3
Family Resilience	M Lewis	34.9	29.4	29.9	0.5	40.6	38.1	39.4	1.3
Quality Assurance	M Lewis / J Iles	3.4	6.4	6.2	(0.2)	10.4	8.6	8.0	(0.6)
Directorate wide savings		0.0	(1.9)	0.4	2.3	(2.5)	(2.6)	0.6	3.2
Children, Families, Life long Learning, and Culture		188.0	186.4	180.3	(6.2)	816.8	243.0	248.8	5.8
Public Health	S Mooney	(0.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Adult Social Care	S Mooney	266.5	273.8	279.4	5.6	488.4	367.2	367.2	0.0
Highways & Transport	M Furniss	45.6	44.9	40.0	(4.9)	73.6	59.0	54.6	(4.4)
Environment	M Goodman	39.0	51.6	41.7	(9.9)	73.4	68.9	72.8	3.9
Communities Support Function	D Turner-Stewart	0.3	0.3	0.2	(0.1)	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0
Leadership Team (ETI)	M Goodman	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.9	0.6
Environment, Transport & Infrastructure		85.6	97.0	82.5	(14.6)	147.9	128.5	128.7	0.2
Fire & Rescue	D Turner-Stewart	23.5	24.1	24.7	0.6	36.2	32.1	32.0	(0.1)
Trading Standards	D Turner-Stewart	1.2	1.3	1.3	(0.0)	3.9	1.7	1.7	(0.0)
Emergency Management		0.3	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.6	(0.1)
Community Protection		25.0	25.7	26.4	0.7	40.1	34.5	34.3	(0.2)
Human Resources & Organisational Development	Z Grant-Duff	2.0	2.8	2.3	(0.5)	3.7	3.2	3.2	(0.0)
Insight, Analytics & Intelligence	Z Grant-Duff	0.7	2.5	2.5	0.0	3.8	3.1	2.8	(0.3)
Customer Services	Z Grant-Duff	2.3	2.4	2.2	(0.2)	2.8	2.6	2.9	0.3
Coroner	D Turner-Stewart	1.6	1.3	1.7	0.4	2.3	1.8	2.3	0.5
Strategic Leadership	T Oliver	0.7	0.7	1.0	0.3	0.7	1.2	1.3	0.1
Communications	Z Grant-Duff	1.2	1.1	0.9	(0.2)	1.4	1.4	1.4	(0.0)
Economic Growth	C Kemp	0.5	0.9	0.4	(0.5)	1.2	0.9	0.7	(0.2)
Transformation Support Unit		0.4	0.6	0.6	(0.0)	1.1	0.8	0.8	(0.0)
Cross County		0.0	(1.5)	0.0	1.5	(1.5)	(0.7)	0.0	0.7
Transformation, Partnership & Prosperity		9.3	10.8	11.6	0.8	15.6	14.4	15.4	1.0
Joint Operating Budget ORBIS	Z Grant-Duff	22.6	23.9	26.5	2.6	31.9	31.8	33.7	1.9
Property	M Few	12.0	13.6	13.7	0.1	28.1	19.0	19.4	0.4
Information Technology & Digital	Z Grant-Duff	7.5	8.1	6.9	(1.2)	11.5	10.9	10.3	(0.6)
Finance	M Few	1.8	2.0	1.2	(0.8)	4.1	2.7	1.6	(1.1)
Legal Services	Z Grant-Duff	3.2	2.7	3.0	0.2	4.0	3.6	4.0	0.4
Democratic Services	Z Grant-Duff	2.5	2.5	2.1	(0.4)	3.6	3.3	3.0	(0.3)
Business Operations	Z Grant-Duff	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.0	0.1	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.0)
Resources		49.6	52.8	53.4	0.5	83.2	71.1	71.9	0.8
Corporate Expenditure	M Few	35.9	32.3	27.0	(5.3)	47.8	32.9	31.0	(1.9)
Total services' revenue expenditure		660.1	678.9	660.5	(18.5)	1,675.4	891.6	897.6	6.0
Corporate funding		(611.9)	(621.4)	(622.4)	(1.0)	0.0	(891.6)	(895.2)	(3.6)
Total Net revenue expenditure		48.2	57.5	38.1	(19.5)	1,675.4	0.0	2.4	2.4

This page is intentionally left blank