

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2022 AT 2.00 PM  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL, WOODHATCH  
PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY ,RH2 8EF.**

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

Members:

- \*Tim Oliver (Chairman)
- \*Natalie Bramhall
- \*Clare Curran
- \*Matt Furniss
- \*Mark Nuti
- \*Denise Turner-Stewart
- \*Sinead Mooney
- \*Marisa Heath
- \*Ayesha Azad
- \*Kevin Deanus

Deputy Cabinet Members:

- \*Maureen Attewell
- \*Rebecca Paul
- \*Paul Deach
- \*Jordan Beech

Members in attendance:

Lance Spencer, Local Member for Goldsworth East and Horsell Village  
Jonathan Essex, Local Member for Redhill East and Green Party Group  
Leader  
Catherine Baart, Local Member for Earlswood and Reigate South  
Hazel Watson, Local Member for Dorking Hills

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**126/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

There were no apologies.

**127/22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 26 JULY 2022 [Item 2]**

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

**128/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**129/22 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

The Leader stated that the council was aware and conscious of the pressures individuals were facing in terms of cost of living, rising inflation and increases in energy prices. The next few months would be challenging for individuals and the county council. A communications campaign would be initiated to

help residents understand what the council was doing to support people around the cost of living crisis. The Leader encouraged residents to view the welfare hub on the county councils website.

#### **129a/22 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

There were ten member questions. The questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda.

With regards to the first question, Hazel Watson queried when the link to the East Surrey College curriculum offer would be put on the county council website. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning stated that it was a priority to get this link on the site as soon as possible and an update would be provided as soon as the link went live.

With regards to member question three, Catherine Baart asked from the 674 children awaiting transport provision how many of these children were on a EHCP. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning would make enquiries of the service and would come back to the member.

With regards to member question four, Catherine Baart asked if the council would commit to repairing defects on bus routes as they would a priority road A. The Cabinet member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth explained that the Horizon programme was being reviewed and that he was of the view that bus routes should be on a higher level within the horizon prioritisation programme.

With regards to member question five, Catherine Baart said that she had been informed that trees at Pixham Lane had been removed due to a property deal. She asked if the Cabinet Member agreed if the property team should be changing their behaviour in line with the wider council's policies on climate change and biodiversity and specifically asked if the team had undertaken carbon literacy training. The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste confirmed that a number of officers within land and property had undertaken carbon literacy training. The trees on site had been inspected by the Mole Valley tree officer who said they were fine to be removed. The trees that were removed did not have much value although Stonegate Homes would be replanting 1000 trees at the location.

With regards to member question six, Jonathan Essex queried if Surrey County Council modelling separated out the outcomes of a scheme in terms of flows of public transport separate from cars and other motor vehicles. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth confirmed this was happening.

With regards to member question seven, Lance Spencer queried what form a stakeholder community involvement exercise would take and if the exercise would take place prior to the business case going to Cabinet. The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste explained that the business case would need to be approved by Cabinet before the community involvement exercise could take place which would probably be in early 2023. With regards to member question eight, Lance Spencer asked if bulk schemes for community buildings included places of worship. The Cabinet Member confirmed that religious buildings were included within the bulk scheme support. With regards to member question nine, Lance Spencer asked how many of the 138 Stage 1

appeals would be going to Stage 2. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning stated that she did not have this detail to hand but would follow up with the member. Last weeks figures had been updated and there were now 119 stage one appeals and 14 stage two appeals.

With regards to member question ten, Lance Spencer queried if the number of children that fall under the category of Emotionally Based School Non Attendance had increased due to Covid or if this was a new trend the council was seeing. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning explained that the term Emotionally Based School Non Attendance was used in Surrey but was not a widely accepted category of absence from school. The emotional well-being and mental health of children and young people had been critically affected by Covid and there was a link between Emotionally Based School Non Attendance and Covid. Covid did however create many alternative ways of learning which were more productive for some children. The service was working hard on inclusion practices to make sure that all children were supported to adjust better with their education and engage in the best way that they possibly can.

### **130/22 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were four public questions. The questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda.

Anne Marie Griffin attended the meeting and thanked the Cabinet Member for the response to her public question.

Malcolm Robertson joined the meeting remotely and asked if the Cabinet Member would reconsider her reply and remove all reference to the term 'eco park' at Charlton Lane. The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste confirmed that there were no immediate plans to remove the current signage at the eco park. Officers were considering how best to develop the wider site which would include landscaping and more trees being planted. The council was looking at restarting partnership working with the community to discuss matters regarding the eco park. This would include Suez, resident associations and local councillors.

Sally Blake joined the meeting remotely and asked why the Council could not produce a survey of which trees needed to be felled and why the tenant was allowed to fell the trees with their contractors. The Cabinet Member responded by explaining that there seemed to be a disagreement about the number of trees that had been felled. The council had been informed that 25 diseased trees had been taken down as they had been tested for Ash dieback. The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment would be visiting Norbury Park and would investigate the number of trees that had been felled. The Cabinet Member explained that surveys had been undertaken on the trees that had been felled and the council did not have a policy of taking down trees unless they were diseased or were at risk of injuring someone or causing some sort of incident.

The Leader informed everyone about the passing of Councillor Alison Todd who had sadly lost her battle against cancer. Councillor Todd had been elected as a member of the county council and had served as a Deputy Cabinet Member. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families made a short statement about Alison, stating that her love and her compassion for her

community was second to none. She had been a tireless advocate for vulnerable people across the county and would be greatly missed by everybody.

**131/22 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were none.

**132/22 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

**133/22 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

There were none.

**134/22 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]**

There were three decisions for noting.

**RESOLVED:**

That the decisions taken since the last Cabinet meeting be noted.

**135/22 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE PROCUREMENT POLICY [Item 7]**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the report which detailed the council's environmentally sustainable procurement policy. The council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and made a commitment to become carbon neutral by 2050. The climate change delivery plan outlined a need for procurement to strategically drive change through the supply chain and the services provided to residents. The report set out the proposed policy to improve environmental consideration in the council's procurement activities so that the council could meet the strategic priority areas for enabling a greener future and growing a sustainable economy so that everyone can benefit. The combined Orbis procurement authorities co-developed the policy with the aim of adopting it across the Orbis partnership so that they could increase the effectiveness of those environmental pressures, simplify the processes for perspectives and create consistency across the whole region. The policy would be a live document that would be monitored and reviewed as and when required.

The Cabinet Member for Environment welcomed the policy and stated that it would support the council in reaching its carbon reduction target and help tackle the climate emergency. The move to become cruelty free was welcomed.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approve the Environmentally Sustainable Procurement Policy on behalf of Surrey County Council (SCC).

2. That Cabinet delegate authority for approving any future changes to the Policy to the Director of Procurement in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Cabinet Member for Environment, to enable the policy to evolve and adapt to local and national developments.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

This policy aims to improve the environmental considerations built into the core delivery of goods, works and services that the Council procures. Having declared a climate emergency and published both the Climate Change Strategy and Delivery Plan, this policy supports the net zero targets of the Council and embeds environmental sustainability, such as increases to Surrey's biodiversity and reducing waste, into procurement decisions to lead to a greener future for Surrey and its residents. This policy will prepare prospective suppliers for the environmental considerations and expectations that will be implemented into the council's future contracts. On average, SCC spends £890million through its procurement activities across an average of 6,300 vendors per annum; increasing environmental considerations across the council's procurement activity presents a significant opportunity to influence a reduction in carbon emissions across the county and within SCC's own services.

As national policy and technology are rapidly changing, the policy must also be agile. Therefore, it is recommended that delegated authority be given to the Director of Procurement in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Cabinet Member for Environment, to enable the policy to evolve as needed. Review of the policy is expected to take place on an, at least, annual basis once approved or as required following local and national policy directives.

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

**136/22 REVISION TO PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT STANDING ORDERS  
[Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the report explaining that the Procurement and Contract Standing Orders (PCSO's) set out how the Council authorises and manages spending and contracts with other organisations. This ensures that prior to any significant expenditure there is proper consideration firstly, of whether there is a need to buy at all and service the need internally or, if external expenditure is required, that it is made in a fair, open and transparent way. Since the approval of the 2021 PCSO's, revisions are now required due to changes in government legislation and internal practice.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet gives approval to amend summary table 2.7a in the 2021 PCSO's to update the current thresholds to ensure compliance with the World Trade Organisation (WTO) GPA (General Procurement Agreement).

2. That Cabinet agrees to change the requirement for further approvals of contract awards over the regulated threshold to only being required when the budget is exceeded by +5%, removing further approval if the recommended contract price is below the allocated budget.
3. That Cabinet agrees to utilise the flexibilities for sourcing the best route to market for below threshold Public Contracts Regulations (PCR) 2015 Light Touch Regime procurements (applicable to Health, Educational, Cultural and Social Care related service procurements).
4. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Resources for future changes to the regulatory thresholds specified in table 2.7a to be made in accordance with the WTO GPA thresholds without submitting to Cabinet / Council.
5. That Cabinet agrees to the removal of the requirement to register and maintain contracts over £5k and to increase this to £25k. This specifically relates to the uploading of contracts onto the procurement contracts database. Procurement is responsible for sourcing contracts over the value of £25K and therefore all contracts below this level are registered and maintained by the service. This amendment does not change any of the controls or the method/process of how we compliantly source the good/services.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

- Care related services falling below the Light Touch Regime threshold have greater flexibility in procurement delivery methods whilst still ensuring value for money is secured.
- Providing delegated authority to amend table 2.7a in line with regulatory thresholds will negate the need for Cabinet / Council approval whenever they are updated.
- The revisions will ensure that the Procurement and Contract Standing Orders (PCSO's) are current and in line with the latest government legislation and internal practice to enable procurement efficiency and compliance.

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

**137/22 STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT - FINANCIAL YEAR 2021/22 [Item 9]**

The Leader introduced the Strategic Investment Board annual report. The report sets out the state of the councils investment and assets including the return on investment and both dividends and interest payments. The Leader briefly updated Cabinet on the companies the council had including Surrey Choices, Hendeca and Connect2Surrey. The status of the councils investments would be explained in detail in part 2 of the meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet endorses the Annual Report of the Strategic Investment Board.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

To inform the council about the activities of the Strategic Investment Board

The Strategic Investment Board has been established in accordance with best practice governance to ensure effective oversight and alignment with the strategic objectives and values of the council.

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

### **138/22 YOUR FUND SURREY- CF149 REBUILDING RIPLEY VILLAGE HALL [Item 10]**

The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety introduced the report explaining that Cabinet were being asked to fund £586,396 from Surrey County Council's Your Fund Surrey, towards the rebuilding of a village hall located in Ripley, Surrey. The building was no longer fit for purpose and the existing space did not cater for the immediate needs of local residents. The project will allow for a new purpose built environmentally friendly village hall, which taps into the council's greener futures ambitions and has an expected lifespan of 100 years. The build would take approximately 12 months. The hall was a popular community asset and posted around 25 different weekly and monthly groups and large popular events. The new hall would also be able to offer a range of healthcare facilities which were not currently available within Ripley such as counselling. The Leader highlighted that the divisional member Colin Cross was supportive of the proposal.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet agrees to fund project CF149 for the full amount requested of £586,396, composed of:
  - £538,084 capital funding towards the rebuilding of the Village Hall, comprising of three fully accessible community rooms, new kitchen, male and female toilets, and offices for the Parish Council.
  - £26,904 (5%) final payment is to be held by Surrey County Council until final evidence of income, expenditure and evaluation is received and building control has signed-off the work.
  - £48,312 is to be held by Surrey County Council as contingency funding, for release only upon an evidenced request.
2. That Cabinet agrees that the following conditions for the applicant be included within the funding agreement:
  - 2.1. The applicant provides evidence, prior to release of any funding, to confirm £600,000 Section 106 funding from Guildford Borough Council (GBC).
  - 2.2. The applicant uses all measures identified to increase sustainability and reduce environmental impact during construction and operation of the facility.

- 2.3. Requests that the applicant develops a usage policy to be adopted by Ripley Village Hall for the life of the facility which ensures the widest access to the community, to include a booking policy to maintain affordable rates and subsidies for the under privileged within the community.

#### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The recommendations will enable expenditure from the Your Fund Surrey to be awarded to Ripley Village Hall Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO). This application has been the subject of a rigorous assessment process by officers, as set out in the body of this report. Officers consider the project meets the aims and published criteria of the Fund and to satisfy the requirements to award funding.

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

#### **139/22 YOUR FUND SURREY- CF211 OLD WOKING AND DISTRICT COMMUNITY CENTRE [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety introduced the report explaining that Cabinet were being asked to approve funding of £982,389 from Surrey County Council's Your Fund Surrey, towards the rebuilding of a village hall located in Woking South, Surrey. The old Woking district Community Centre is a large Community Centre for local residents in Woking South and would be used by Woking College for its students. The centre has a wide range of regular users including dancing groups, singing groups, mother and toddler groups, martial arts classes, scouting and guiding groups, music lessons and a nursery. The project aims to create a fully sustainable and accessible Community Centre by converting a large, inefficient 1960s building to a low carbon, low resources, low running cost community asset.

Members commented on the good partnership working taking place with borough colleagues.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet agrees to fund project CF211 for the full £982,389 requested, composed of:
  - £902,389 of capital funding towards the extension and refurbishment works to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend.
  - £49,119 (5%) is to be held by SCC (Surrey County Council) until final evidence of income, expenditure, evaluation and building control sign-off is received.
  - £80,000 contingency is to be held by SCC, only to be released on evidence of need.
2. That Cabinet recommends the following conditions for the applicant be included within the funding agreement:



- 2.1 evidence that all planning requirements are met prior to the project start
- 2.2 evidence of management agreement, lease and underlease in place prior to release of funding
- 2.3 final evidence of all funding secured to complete the project
- 2.4 the applicant uses all possible measures identified to increase sustainability and reduce environmental impact during construction and operation of the facility
- 2.5 To develop a usage policy to be adopted by Old Woking Community Centre for the life of the facility which ensures the widest access to the community, to include;
  - I. a booking policy to ensure capacity for community uses is maintained at a specified level
  - II. schedule of fees maintaining affordable rates.
  - III. To encourage the applicant to consider all reasonable measures which could be undertaken to expand the reach and use of the facility, in particular to work closely with Woking Borough Council (WBC) and the local voluntary sector.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The recommendations will enable expenditure from the Your Fund Surrey to be awarded to Old Woking and District Community Centre. This application has been the subject of a rigorous assessment process by officers, as set out in the body of this report. Officers consider the project to meet the aims and published criteria of the Fund and to satisfy the requirements to award funding.

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

**140/22 2022/23 MONTH 4 (JULY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the report explaining that the UK was experiencing the highest levels of inflation in decades, putting significant pressure on the cost of delivering services, coupled with increasing demand and fixed government funding. The medium term financial outlook beyond 2022-2023 remained uncertain with no clarity on central government funding in the medium term. The councils working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained. At Month 4, the council was forecasting a full year deficit of £30.1m, against the approved revenue budget. Directorates were expected to mitigate projected overspends and manage spend within available budget envelopes. For the Capital budget the Month 4 position shows a forecast spend of £223.9m against a budget of £220.8m, a variance of £3.0m. This was the net impact of accelerated spend in both land and property and highways and transport. Inflationary pressures both within revenue and capital budgets would be closely monitored throughout the financial year.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That Cabinet note the council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year.

2. That Cabinet note the projected position for Surrey schools following submission of their budget plans for 22/23.

**Reason 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)*

**141/22 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 13]**

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

**142/22 STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT - FINANCIAL YEAR 2021/22 [Item 14]**

The Leader 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 Minute 137/22.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 137/22.

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

**143/22 FUTURE WASTE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL SERVICES [Item 15]**

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-23-22]

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Exempt Minute [E-23-22]

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

**144/22 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 16]**

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

*Meeting closed at 15:13*

---

**Chairman**