

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2022 AT 2.00 PM
AT COUNCIL CHAMBER, WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL,
REIGATE, SURREY ,RH2 8EF.**

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

Members:
(* present)

*Tim Oliver (Chairman)
*Natalie Bramhall
Clare Curran (attended the meeting remotely)
*Matt Furniss
*Mark Nuti
*Denise Turner-Stewart
*Sinead Mooney
*Marisa Heath
*Becky Rush
*Kevin Deanus

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Maureen Attewell
*Rebecca Paul
*Steve Bax
*Jordan Beech

Members in attendance:

John O'Reilly, Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
Andy MacLeod, Vice-Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
Jeffrey Gray, Local Member for Caterham Valley
Will Forster, Local Member for Woking South
Catherine Baart, Local Member for Earlswood and Reigate South

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

23/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were none.

24/22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 25 JANUARY 2022 [Item 2]

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 January 2022 were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

25/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

26/22 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were six members questions. The questions and response were published as a supplement to the agenda.

Jeffrey Gray asked a supplementary question and asked that the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health inform herself of the real world impact of unfair social care costs on disabled people and particularly on working age people, especially those with lifelong disabilities. He asked that the Cabinet Member intensify her lobbying of government on implementing recommendations from the Dilnot report and asked her to ensure that Surrey uses all the discretion at its disposal to minimise the impacts on disabled people of unfair social care charges. The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health offered to meet with Jeffrey Gray to consider the points that had been made.

Will Forster asked a supplementary question in relation to his second question and asked the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health to outline what extra pay and bonuses would be given to care work staff within the council and partner organisations. The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health explained that discussions would commence shortly and would feedback to the member on progress of these.

Catherine Baart asked a supplementary question in relation to her second member question asking if the shuttle bus to Woodhatch would be open to the public. The Leader responded explaining that he did not think the bus would be open to the public but just staff and members. The Leader would confirm the arrangements in due course.

27/22 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were no public questions.

28/22 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

29/22 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

30/22 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There was a discussion regarding the report on local and joint committee highways functions. The Chairman of the Community, Environment & Highways Select explained that the Select Committee had been divided on the report. The Chairman welcomed the response but raised some queries regarding recommendation four. Specifically the ability to present petitions and ask questions at Local Committee which was valued by members and the public. If this was taken away, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure was asked to explain how this would work in practice. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure explained that the service would be aiming to take all highways, executive functions out of the local and joint committees so to leave the questions and petitions element here would be odd. Petitions and questions could still be submitted but would be heard

via a more appropriate committee or person. It was explained that 87% of the petitions received could have actually just been dealt with as a normal course of business, and it didn't require going through a whole committee cycle. The Leader agreed that the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure would send around a process note for how petitions and questions would be dealt with after being removed from Local and Joint Committee functions.

RESOLVED:

That the Select Committee reports and recommendations regarding the Economy and Growth: Programme for Growth and Local and Joint Committee Highway Function be noted. The response from the Cabinet was published as a supplement to the agenda.

31/22 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

There were two decisions for noting.

32/22 COVID-19 DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN [Item 7]

There were two delegated decisions for noting.

33/22 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 8]

The Leader introduced his Cabinet Member of the Month update and made the following points:

- On the 8th February the budget was agreed and passed by Council.
- There had been a council tax increase of 4.994%, 4% of this would go directly to frontline services and the delivery of adult social care. 1% will go to support mental health initiatives where there had been an exponential increase.
- There is a significant capital programme in place which would focus on building or creating independent living accommodations so people can live in their own homes for longer and also a building specialist facilities for children with additional needs.
- Funding had been given to Citizens Advice and Surrey Crisis Fund totalling over £500,000.
- Ofsted had undertaken a full visit of the council in January 2022 and a report would be available in March this year.
- A new piece of work on a refreshed 2050 community vision was being undertaken.
- The council would continue conversations on 'Levelling Up' with the government. The Leader was of the view that a county deal would be in the best interest for Surrey and would give greater autonomy over key areas.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month report be noted.

34/22 THE FUTURE OF RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE OWNED AND OPERATED BY SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL [Item 9]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health who explained that the proposals being discussed impacted eight care homes managed and run by the County Council, following their transfer back from the Anchor Trust in 2019. The following key points were made:

- The homes provided good quality services, and the residents were supported by trained, dedicated and excellent staff who worked tirelessly and had been heroes throughout the pandemic.
- All eight care homes provide residential care and short-term respite care. Two homes also provide day services.
- The homes were built in the 1970s and 1980s and were initially run by the council until they were contracted out to Anchor Trust in 1999. In 2019 they returned to the council and it was only on their return that the council became aware of issues with the infrastructure including with the water systems, heating, drainage, roofs, lifts etc. It also became evident that the design of the buildings did not meet current expectations and that they were inappropriate for individuals with certain conditions, for example severe dementia, as six of the eight homes have open staircases and units on different levels. And vitally, there is a risk that infrastructure could fail at any time which could result in residents having to be relocated at short notice.
- Only 25 out of the 433 rooms have en-suite facilities. The council's aim is to provide an environment where people living in a care home live in comfort and in a home where the design of the building, with support from staff, ensures privacy and dignity is maintained. Shared facilities have proved to be challenging, in terms of infection control for illnesses such as norovirus, flu and Covid.
- A consultation took place between 11 October 2021 and 5 January 2022 and was a listening exercise. During the consultation one-to-one conversations with residents were conducted by staff in the care homes, residents were also invited to complete on-line or paper questionnaires. Meetings also took place both, virtually and face to face, on a one-to one basis and for groups of residents, staff and relatives. Where relatives were unable to attend in person meetings were held on-line.
- Although most people indicated a preference for the council to modernise and refurbish the care homes. It seems that the homes will, unfortunately, no longer be fit for the future and it is uneconomic to make the changes that would be required in order to make them sustainable for the future.
- It was being recommended that the care home residents are supported to move to new homes and all eight care homes are closed, using a phased approach, before the end of 2024. There are currently 406 registered care and nursing homes in Surrey, offering a total of 11,599 registered beds so plenty of sufficient care choices for older people in Surrey.
- Dedicated support would be put in place for residents, their families, staff and all other relevant stakeholders.

Members commented that they felt reassured that staff and residents would be supported if the closures went ahead. Some members commented that they had some of the care homes due for closure in their respective wards. The care homes were well established and had become community hubs. The service provided by staff was exemplary but the buildings themselves were not conducive to providing quality care for the future. It was explained that if the buildings were to close they would undergo full asset reviews.

The Local Member for Woking South commented that he was concerned that the consultation responses had not been listened too and that residents would have to be moved multiple times if the buildings closed. The decision to close the homes would also be contrary to the councils position to invest in social care. The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health explained that a thorough consultation had been undertaken but the conditions of the buildings was a paramount factor to the decision being recommended. The intention was for residents to have one move to a home that's right for them. The Leader hoped people understood the rationale to close the homes and that it would be better for residents to live in more appropriate accommodation with modern facilities.

RESOLVED:

1. Cabinet agreed that the council continue to operate Abbeywood while options are explored regarding development of the site for alternative adult social care services or a joint development with NHS/partners, accept that the building may need to close if large scale essential maintenance or development is required, and if no alternative developments are identified, Option 3 – support residents to move to an alternative care home and close Abbeywood.
2. It was agreed by Cabinet that residents are supported to move to new care homes, Barnfield is closed and further investigation is undertaken to confirm if the site can be redeveloped for alternative adult social care services.
3. It was agreed by Cabinet that residents are supported to move to new care homes, Birchlands is closed and further investigation is undertaken to confirm if the site can be redeveloped for alternative adult social care services.
4. It was agreed by Cabinet that residents are supported to move to new care homes, Chalkmead is closed and further investigation is undertaken to confirm if the site can be redeveloped for alternative adult social care services.
5. It was agreed by Cabinet that residents are supported to move to new care homes, Heathside is closed and further investigation is undertaken to confirm if the site can be redeveloped for alternative adult social care services.
6. It was agreed by Cabinet that residents are supported to move to new care homes, Keswick is closed and further investigation is undertaken to confirm if the site can be redeveloped for alternative adult social care, community or NHS services.
7. It was agreed by Cabinet that residents are supported to move to new care homes, Meadowside is closed and further investigation is undertaken to confirm if the site can be redeveloped for alternative adult social care services.
8. It was agreed by Cabinet that residents are supported to move to an alternative care home and close Orchard Court and explore

- opportunities for developing the site for alternative adult social care services or a joint development in partnership with the NHS or other organisations.
9. That the responsibility for implementing the decisions agreed are delegated to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health in consultation with the Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Integrated Commissioning.
 10. That after considering all aspects of each recommendation and if it is decided that more than one care home should close, a phased approach to care home closures will take place with a view for care home closures to be concluded by the end of 2024. Planning will recognise the need for a staff consultation and be supportive of resident and staff needs. Please note that the council will follow the good practice principles detailed below in the 'What Happens Next' section of this report and ensure comprehensive support is provided to residents, their families, advocates and staff.
 11. That if the decision is taken to close any of the homes, the alternative use of any site will be prioritised in the context of Adult Social Care's Accommodation with Care & Support Strategy that has already been endorsed by Cabinet as a key priority. Should any of the sites be considered unsuitable for a new service as part of the Accommodation with Care & Support strategy, the options appraisal process (as set out in the Council's Asset and Place Strategy 2019) will be used to determine future use.
 12. That Cabinet note that there may be a provider interested in vacant possession of one or more of the buildings and further discussion will take place regarding this which may necessitate an additional report coming back to cabinet in the future.

Reasons for Decisions:

- It is recognised that through the consultation process most people indicated a preference that the council modernise and refurbish the care homes. However when everything is taken into consideration; the challenges with the properties, best use of taxpayers money and the strategic aims of the council, we regret to say that we are recommending that care home residents are supported to move new homes and all eight care homes are closed before the end of 2024.
- The council's Health and Wellbeing Strategy is based on a community vision for Surrey that describes what residents of Surrey and partners think Surrey should look like by 2030: 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 enabled to achieve their full potential and contribute to their community, and no one is left behind.
- The detail provided in this report provides evidence to suggest that the eight care homes are at the end of their natural life span and investing in the services will not provide environments that are fit for the future. Deciding to support care home residents to move to new care homes and then closing the care homes will enable the council to work with partners and invest in services, detailed in the next paragraph, that will empower older people in Surrey to lead physically and emotionally healthier lives and reach their potential.

- The council:
 - a. is committed to working with NHS and private care providers to develop specialist facilities to support people who need intensive support and as Surrey's population grows and ages, appropriate care is available to support people who have complex care needs
 - b. is investing in more preventative services to help people stay healthy and happy in their local communities for longer
 - c. is committed to providing 725 apartments by 2030 in extra care housing, offering people their own front door with care and support always on hand
- The council continues to help transform social care to enable people who do not need to be supported in a care home to lead independent lives and work with our partners to ensure that people with complex needs can receive care which is truly tailored to their needs.
- The council's commissioning strategy for older people 2021-2030, recently approved by the council's Cabinet, aims to champion greater choice, quality and control for older people through:
 - a. meeting the increasing demand for care home placements offering personalised care for high and complex needs
 - b. helping to ensure that people eligible for social care support are offered the same standard of care as those who can afford to pay privately, reducing health inequalities
- The eight care in-house homes run by the council are not best placed to meet the aspirations and commitments outlined above as they are operating towards the end of their economic life span and will require significant investment to maintain them over the coming years. Major investment is needed in all of the homes in some or all of the following areas:
 - replacement of boiler and heating distribution system
 - roof replacement
 - replacement of hot and cold-water systems
 - kitchen refurbishment
 - bathroom modernisation and updating
 - replacement of flooring
 - replacement of windows and doors
 - updating electrical systems
 - updating of lifts
 - remodelling of open staircases in 6 of the 8 homes (to support people living with dementia)
- Expectations of what a residential care service can provide have changed since the services were opened and the council's codesigned long-term commissioning intentions for services for older people focusses on supporting people to live in their own homes or extra care settings for as long as possible and access specialist residential care services if needed later in life.
- Ongoing significant investment will be required to maintain or to make changes to the structure of each care home to ensure that:

- a. a more dignified and safer environment, to live and work in, can be provided
- b. each care home can continue to comply with building and other regulatory requirements.
- The council's 2030 Net-Zero Strategy focuses on reducing scope 1 emissions (Green House Gas) and scope 2 emissions (production of energy used by a building) from buildings. It is estimated that the care homes currently contribute 1,371 tonnes CO₂-eq emissions annually and decisions on the future of the care homes has the potential to impact on meeting targets.
- It is considered that investment would be better made in supporting the development and use of modern services that can meet the aspirations of Surrey residents and are in line with council strategies.

(The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults and Health Select Committee)

35/22 WORKING WITH THE BIG FOSTERING PARTNERSHIP [Item 10]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children and Families who explained that the proposal was for the council to join the Big Fostering Partnership from April 2022. The model had support through the national life chances fund. This would enable more looked after children who are living in residential children's homes to move to living with foster families. This was known as 'stepping down'. The big Fostering partnership had been established in collaboration with Staffordshire County Council and enabled looked after children to move from residential homes to foster placements and sustain those placements for two years.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet endorses Surrey County Council joining the Big Fostering Partnership from 1 April 2022, to work in collaboration with other Local Authorities to enable more looked after children who are living in residential children's homes to move to living with foster families.
2. That Cabinet authorises spend of up to £4 million via this partnership for the period from 1 April 2022 through to September 2024. This is a repurposing of budgeted funds within the existing Children's Services Placement budget envelope for placements.

Reasons for Decisions:

These recommendations will: enable better outcomes for looked after children; support more looked after children to live in or closer to Surrey; and improve value for money. Firstly, evidence shows that when looked after children live in families rather than children's homes this leads to better long-term outcomes, where this is done at an appropriate point in their care journey. Secondly, foster placements are more likely to be made in or closer to Surrey than residential placements, supporting Surrey County Council's ambitious Sufficiency Strategy and statutory duties as corporate parents. Thirdly, successful step-down placements offer improved value for money to

Surrey residents - for comparison, Surrey's average weekly cost of children's residential provision is more than 3 times the price of a supportive and high-quality step-down foster placement. Our modelling suggests that this approach could reduce the spend from our Children's Services placement budget by some £5 million between 2022/23 and 2025/26.

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

36/22 ACCELERATING THE INTRODUCTION OF ULTRA-LOW AND ZERO EMISSION VEHICLES - APPROVAL TO PROCUCE 34 HYDROGEN FUEL CELL BUSES [Item 11]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure who requested Cabinet to approve to Procure for 34 Hydrogen Fuel Cell buses enabling the council to proceed with the previously agreed introduction of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles. It was planned to place an order for the Hydrogen Fuel Cell buses in quarter one of 2022/23, with the buses coming into service during the fourth quarter of 2022/23 and the first quarter of 2023/24. Procurement costs are forecast at £16.4m, the Council investment compliments a £10m investment being made by Metrobus, UK Government and the EU Jive 2 Project that combined is purchasing a further 20 hydrogen fuel cell buses, plus fuelling infrastructure for use on the Fastway network of services operating in Surrey and Sussex. The Cabinet Member for Environment welcomed the report stating that this would support the greener futures delivery plan and providing a broader combination of travel.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet grants Approval to Procure 34 hydrogen fuel cell buses as the next step in accelerating the introduction of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles into Surrey;
2. That Cabinet supports the drafting of an agreement to be entered into by the Council and bus operator Metrobus that confirms the ownership, leasing arrangements, use and maintenance of the 34 hydrogen fuel cell buses;
3. That decision(s) to procure any additional zero or ultra-low emission buses through new partnership schemes with the bus industry be delegated to the Executive Director for Environment, Transport & Infrastructure and the Executive Director of Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure, once approved by the Capital Programme Panel.

Reasons for Decisions:

Procuring the 34 hydrogen fuel cell buses enables the Council to accelerate the introduction of ultra-low and zero emission buses into Surrey, whilst retaining ownership of the capital asset, i.e. the buses. This will help create more carbon neutral transport options and assist in achieving climate change targets by providing residents with greener and more sustainable travel choices.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)

37/22 LOCAL AND JOINT COMMITTEE HIGHWAY FUNCTIONS [Item 12]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure who explained that Cabinet were being asked to change amend executive highway functions, transferring them away from a local and joint committees and delegating them down so that officers can make the decisions in direct consultation with the relevant divisional councillor. The proposed changes would come into force from April 2022 and would sit alongside new engagement methods which were being developed. The proposals would empower divisional councillors by giving them the delegated highways functions that currently sit with local and joint committees. The budget allocation for each county councillor will be raised from £23,000 capital up to £50,000 capital and the revenue will remain at £7,500.

The Vice Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee spoke on the item and was of the view that the local and joint committees worked well and gave residents the opportunity to voice concerns they had. The changes being made were unclear and nobody wanted to travel to Reigate to ask a question or present a petition. There had been no consultation with the leaders group and the local and joint committees would fade away as highways decisions was a core part of the work they covered. The Leader explained that the matter had been raised with the Surrey leaders group but the budget being discussed sat within the county councils remit and therefore the county council was responsible for accounting how this was spent. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure would set out how the questions and petitions process would work and would provide support to members. He added that since 2018, 87% of the petitions received were requests or items that members of the public could just log online or towards their county councillor rather than having to go through the committee cycle.

Some Members commented that the public did not engage fully with the local and joint committees and the number of residents attending the meetings were low. The way the committees functioned needed to be reformed.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agree to the transfer of all executive highway functions from Local and Joint Committees with effect from the 1st of April 2022.
2. That Cabinet agree that all executive functions previously delegated to Local and Joint Committees relating to highways are delegated to Officers in consultation with the relevant Divisional Member with effect from the 1st of April 2022.
3. That Cabinet agree the proposed changes to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) within the Local Highway Schemes budget and the Individual Member Highways Allocations (Capital and Revenue budgets) from April 2022 as set out in this report.
4. That Cabinet note the proposed involvement of the Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee in the development of the criteria that will be used to assess projects coming forward for funding

- from the countywide ITS budget, ahead of the Cabinet Member agreeing such criteria.
5. That Cabinet agree to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Environment, Transport and Infrastructure and the Director for Highways and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure to make all necessary changes to existing highway budgets, criteria, and relevant policies to support the effective transition to these new arrangements.
 6. That Cabinet agree that the Director of Legal and Governance works in conjunction with democratic service officers from Guildford, Runnymede, Woking, and Spelthorne Borough Councils to update their respective Joint Committee constitutions which are in place with the County Council.
 7. That Cabinet agree the Director of Legal and Governance in consultation with the Leader of the Council makes the relevant changes to the Council's Executive and Officer Scheme of delegation as set out within this report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The recommendations within this report will support more efficient local decision making, whilst ensuring that there is transparency and proper scrutiny. These proposals will enable more people to be heard and participate in decision making, leading to better outcomes for our residents.

This is a joint initiative coming from Communities and ETI Directorates consistent with residents' expressed desires to be more involved in what the Council is doing but through events and conversations and not through boards and meetings. This proposal directly supports the commitment the Council made in 2020 to Empowering Communities:

'Reinvigorate our relationship with residents, empowering communities to tackle local issues and support one another, whilst making it easier for everyone to play an active role in the decisions that will shape Surrey's future.'

Research in the past year has shown that far more residents have been able to communicate with the Council through a wider range of mechanisms than has been the case historically using traditional local and joint committee processes. For instance, in 2021/22, 11 online engagement sessions reached over 50,000 members of the public, whilst in comparison only 650 residents attended LC/JCs between 2019 and 2021 which included councillors from Parish, Districts and Boroughs if they attended to hear proceedings.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)

38/22 HARNESSING THE POWER OF DATA [Item 13]

The report was introduced by the Leader who explained that the report provided an overview of the Surrey County Council Data Strategy, its ambition and purpose, and the progress made to date. The report set out the governance around how data would be collected, how it will be stored and how it would be used to make sure interventions are both effective and measurable. Delivering the Data Strategy and building a sustainable data capability will enable the Council to fill the gap and tackle the root causes of

the issues highlighted by the data review. The report was welcomed by the Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up who commented that quality data underpinned everything we did so by ensuring we have access to the right data at the right time, better decisions could be made more effectively. Reliable data was the bedrock of effective decision making and helped ensure fact and evidence based policymaking.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet support the overall ambition outlined within the Surrey County Council (SCC) Data Strategy.
2. That Cabinet support the recommended activities outlined in the strategy.
3. That Cabinet agree to encourage the services within their portfolios to support and engage with the SCC Data Strategy.
4. That Cabinet note the work with partners to develop a Surrey-wide strategy which improves data sharing to deliver better services to Surrey residents.
5. That Cabinet note that the Data Strategy is currently funded through SCC's Transformation Fund and funding for the ongoing permanent costs of the strategy still need to be identified.

Reasons for Decisions:

Data is recognised in the Government's National Data Strategy as a strategic asset and the 'great opportunity of our time, offering the possibility of a more informed and better-connected future.' Surrey County Council also fully recognise the potential data brings and have big ambitions for how data is managed, governed, and used in the future. The Council aspires to be truly data-enabled; using data to not just understand the performance of services and monitor what has happened, but also to help plan and prepare for the future, predicting issues before they arise.

To meet this ambition and harness the power of data for the Council, its partners and residents, the organisation needs to address the 'gap' in capabilities, skills and behaviours highlighted by a data review undertaken last year.

Delivering the SCC Data Strategy and building a sustainable data capability will enable the Council to fill the gap and tackle the root causes of the issues highlighted by the data review. It will build a data literate and data empowered workforce. Focusing on this work will be essential to enabling the Council to contribute fully to a wider partnership data and insight ecosystem, that the Surrey-wide Data Strategy is aiming to define and establish.

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

39/22 2021/22 MONTH 9 (DECEMBER) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 14]

The report was introduced by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources who explained that the report provided details of the

County Council's 2021/22 financial position as at 31st December 2021 (M9) for revenue and capital budgets, and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year. At month 9 the Council was forecasting a £4m deficit which is a £4m improvement for month 8. This was due to the release of £6.2m of centrally held COVID-19 funding to offset further COVID related costs and pressures incurred by services. The release of £6.2m for COVID-19 is offset by £2.2m, being a deterioration in children's in high needs block offset by under spends elsewhere. Directorates continue to work hard to bring their forecasts back in line with budget by the year end. The capital budget is reporting a total slippage of £31.5m against a budget of £202m. The slippage from the key schemes has been reprofiled into 2022-2023.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet note the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions.
2. That Cabinet approve the use of £6.2m Covid-19 reserve to offset the forecast impact of Covid-19 on the budget (paragraph 5 to 7).
3. That Cabinet approve that M9 Capital forecasts be used as a baseline to reset the Capital Programme for 2021/22 to provide a stable and deliverable budget for the remainder of the year.

Reasons for Decisions:

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)

40/22 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.

41/22 THE FUTURE OF RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE OWNED AND OPERATED BY SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL [Item 16]

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the Part 2 report which contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of Paragraph 3: information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet note the information provided in this report when considering recommendations made in the Part 1 report entitled

Future of the Eight Residential Care Homes for Older People Run by Surrey County Council.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Minute 34/22.

42/22 WORKING WITH THE BIG FOSTERING PARTNERSHIP [Item 17]

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced the Part 2 report which contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of Paragraph 3: information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). The Cabinet Member for Children and Families provided some information regarding the finances underpinning the decision.

RESOLVED:

See Minute 35/22.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Minute 35/22.

43/22 ST ANDREWS CATHOLIC SCHOOL, ASHTEAD [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste introduced the Part 2 report which contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of Paragraph 3: information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

See Exempt Minute [E-05-22]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-05-22]

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

44/22 DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION SAFETY VALVE AGREEMENT [Item 19]

1. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning explained that discussions were on going between the DfE and council. The meeting would need to be adjourned for financial information to be obtained so a decision could be made.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet adjourn the meeting and reconvene the meeting on 7 March 2022 to decide whether to enter a Safety Valve agreement

when the value of any financial contributions (from the Department for Education, the Dedicated Schools Grant and Surrey County Council General Fund) and terms of agreement are known.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-06-22]

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

45/22 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 20]

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

Meeting closed at 16:02.

Chairman