

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 28 JANUARY 2025 AT 2.00 PM  
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL, 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 OBE (Chairman)
- \* Natalie Bramhall
- \* Clare Curran
- \* Kevin Deanus
- \* Matt Furniss
- \* Marisa Heath
- \* David Lewis
- \* Sinead Mooney
- \* Mark Nuti
- \* Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members

- \* Maureen Attewell
- \* Steve Bax
- \* Paul Deach
- \* Jonathan Hulley

Members in attendance:

Cllr Liz Townsend, Local Member for Cranleigh & Ewhurst  
Cllr Paul Follows, Local Member for Godalming South, Milford & Witley  
Cllr Fiona Davidson, Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee  
Cllr Trefor Hogg, Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee  
Cllr Bob Hughes Chairman of the Resources and Performance Select Committee  
Cllr Catherine Powell, Leader of the Residents Association/Independent Group

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**6/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

There were no apologies.

**7/25 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 17 DECEMBER 2024 AND 8 JANUARY 2025 [Item 2]**

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

#### **8/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

#### **9/25 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

#### **10/25 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

There was one member question. A response from the Cabinet was published in the supplementary agenda. The Member asked a supplementary question which was that in the event that Camberley Fire Station was not fully staffed due to issues such as illness or other staff absence, could the Cabinet Member confirm that there was sufficient coverage to maintain the planned response times to emergencies.

The Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue and Resilience stated that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service was dedicated to serving the entire county of Surrey and provided a response service based on that principle. This approach ensured that all emergencies received an appropriate response to incidents, based on risk, regardless of their location within the county. The target was to have 16 fire engines available at night and 20 available during the day. This provided the service with sufficient coverage to meet the service response time average of within 10 minutes to a critical incident. It was explained that when the fire service was responding to an incident they sent the nearest and quickest frontline appliance based upon the needs of the incident. Frontline appliances were moving around the county throughout any given shift. A Member development session would be organised in due course to share the gamification version of the Dynamic cover tool.

#### **11/25 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were two public questions. A response from the Cabinet was published in the supplementary agenda.

In response to her original question, Ellen Nicholson asked what the situation was with Heathside Care Home in Woking which had been closed for a number of years. The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure explained that the land and property service was currently reviewing all Surrey County Council assets which the care home was part of and would be presenting future options to the Cabinet. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care stated that options were being explored to develop the site for alternative adult social care services and agreed to contact the questioner to discuss the future of the site.

Anna Sutherland asked a supplementary question on behalf of David and Leigh Chambers who were unable to attend the meeting. She stated that

if it is obvious that due consideration has not been given to all the evidence submitted, in cases where families wish to bring a Judicial Review at what stage will Surrey consider alternative dispute resolution. The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong stated that if families were unhappy with decisions taken by the Local Authority then they would usually pursue action through the SEND tribunal service. Before families get to this stage, formal and informal resolution is sought which would not disrupt the SEND tribunal case. Dispute resolution officers supported the informal route and had been working hard to support families. The questioner asked for more clarity in respect of a Judicial Review. The Leader agreed that the question would be picked up outside the meeting to see if a more detailed response could be provided.

#### **12/25 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were none.

#### **13/25 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

#### **14/25 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

The Select Committee's recommendations regarding the scrutiny of the draft budget proposals were considered by the Cabinet on 17 December 2024. A formal response from the Cabinet had been included in the agenda papers. At the County Council meeting on 10 December 2024, Councillor Liz Townsend moved a motion under Standing Order 11. Under Standing Order 12.3, Councillor Clare Curran, the Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning moved a proposal that the motion be referred to the Cabinet for more detailed consideration. The proposal to refer the motion was put to the vote and received support. The motion would be debated at the 28 January 2025 Cabinet meeting.

The motion was proposed and seconded at the meeting and set out the following resolution:

#### **This Council resolves to call on the Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning to commit to:**

- I. Provide the opportunity for parent/carers of children with additional needs to be involved in the panel decision process with a clearly defined role.
- II. Provide the opportunity for the child or young person with additional needs to be involved in the panel decision process with a clearly defined role.

- III. Ensure the relevant case officer is automatically invited to attend panel decision meetings.

The Leader agreed that the motion proposer Councillor Liz Townsend, the motion seconder, Councillor Paul Follows and the Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee, Councillor Fiona Davidson would introduce and speak to the motion before Cabinet Members did.

Liz Townsend made the following points:

- Highlighted damaging consequences of leaving families out of panel meetings. Parents should be invited to these meetings so they are involved in the decision making regarding their child.
- Parents knew their children better than anyone and it was unfair to leave them out of panel discussions where important discussions were taking place.
- Parents felt that crucial information was being missed in these meetings and some never received summary advice or evidence from these meetings.
- The lack of transparency around what happens in these meetings creates suspicion between the council and parents.
- A recent task group report commissioned by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee criticised the panel process.
- Understood that the panel process was currently being reviewed and asked if parents could be considered as part of the panel process moving forward. This would foster transparency.

The motion was formally seconded by Paul Follows, who made the following comments:

- Members received numerous queries on Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) matters. Case work on SEND matters were increasing. The hardships families go through were difficult and emotional. The process is opaque and difficult to engage with.
- Disappointed that the motion was deferred as the opportunity was lost for all Members to contribute to the process.
- Hoped that any reviews into the process incorporates parents and recognises their rights.

Fiona Davidson, made the following comments:

- Supported the motion. There seems to be a gap between what we say 'nobody left behind' and what we are actually doing.
- The decisions made by the panel are fundamental to outcomes, but are made in private by an unknown group of people.

- How panel decisions are made are down to the local authority and the council chooses to make these decisions in private.
- Have heard lots of stories from parents around difficulties with the panel process. Parents have commented that only after the panel meeting they have found out that the incorrect information was shared at these meetings. This leads to an increase in the number of cases going to tribunal.
- In lieu of transparency, parents think that the council has something to hide.

The Leader made the following comments:

- This was a challenging area which needed reform on a national level. Improving services for children was a priority for the council. Work was being undertaken to transform the SEND arena.
- Following the 2023 Ofsted and Care Quality Commission (CQC) local area inspections, a detailed improvement plan with progress against the plan being closely monitored by the Department for Education (DfE).
- The council had made progress in addressing its Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) backlog and at the moment there were no EHCP applications outstanding over 30 weeks. Between 2017 to 2024 the number of EHCPs had doubled in Surrey.
- The current system does not work for councils, schools, children and their families.

Clare Curran, the Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning, made the following comments:

- Accepted that the SEND service needs to improve the way panel meetings are run and how they capture the views of parents, carers and children. The service is looking to improve how panel discussions are communicated with parents and carers.
- Task groups had been set up to review these issues.
- Decision making is delegated to officers and not to the panel. The role of the panel is advisory only and supports the decision making process. It is important for us to explain the process. The panel is multi-disciplinary and includes various stakeholders. Panels consider up to 240 decisions a week.
- Noted that not all families wish to attend panels and they do not have capacity to advocate for their cause.
- Committed to making a number of changes which would go live in September 2025. She agreed Point III. of the motion.

Members of the Cabinet made the following comments:

- Noted that creating a system whereby some parents attend panel meetings and some do not, would be unfair.
- A transformation programme concentrating on making improvements to the SEND service was being undertaken and was making good progress.

Concluding the debate, Liz Townsend made the following points:

- With regards to the wording of the motion, she was not saying that parents must attend panel meetings but saying they should be given the opportunity if they want to.
- It would be positive to have case workers at panel meetings but they change too often.
- Noted the need for more defined roles for parents, carers and children. This would help the panels operate better.

The Leader made the final following comments:

- Did not think that including children in panel meetings would be a good idea.
- As part of the review, it would be useful to see what other local authorities do.
- Stressed that it is important that the information before panel meetings is accurate. Case officers should be required to attend panel meetings as they are the advocate for the child.

Point I. of the motion was put to the vote with 10 Members voting against and 0 Members voting For.

Point II. of the motion was put to the vote with 10 Members voting against and 0 Members voting For.

Point III. of the motion was put to the vote and was carried.

**RESOLVED:**

**The Cabinet agreed to:**

- III. Ensure the relevant case officer is automatically invited to attend panel decision meetings.

**15/25 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]**

There was one decision for noting.

**RESOLVED:**

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

## 16/25 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]

A Cabinet Member of the Month update was provided by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care. The following key points were made:

- Right Home/Right Support: The Council was in the final stages of construction for a new Short Breaks accommodation in Woking, Emily Lodge. It was anticipated this new service will be operational from Spring 2025.
- The Council would also commence construction for a further new Short Breaks service in Banstead this year. Construction remains on track to deliver new Supported Independent Living at three Council owned sites across Surrey in Horley, Woking and Cobham. The first of these sites will start welcoming new tenants with care and support needs from Autumn of this year.
- For affordable Extra Care Housing, the Council finalised the legal arrangements for the delivery of the first development in Guildford at the end of 2024. Furthermore, the Council secured outline planning for affordable Extra Care Housing at seven sites across Surrey (Epsom and Ewell, Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Surrey Heath, and Tandridge).
- The service was preparing for the planning for your Future Day on Tuesday 11 March 2025. This will provide another focal point as part of our ongoing campaign aimed at self-funders, carers and care arrangers.
- Carers Fair- Carers Rights Day, held on 21 November was a heartwarming celebration dedicated to the incredible unpaid carers of Surrey. Action for Carers Surrey hosted lively Carer Information Fairs, where a variety of local charities and organisations came together to offer practical, financial, and legal advice, along with general support and information.
- TECH- The Technology Enabled Care and Homes (TECH) paper was on the agenda for the Cabinet meeting. The paper marks a significant transition from piloting technology towards embedding technology in all that we do.
- Housing- council officers had been working with colleagues across borough and district authorities to understand the implications for Surrey with the rapidly changing policy position from central government on housing delivery. At the end of 2024, Surrey's first Affordable Housing Roundtable was organised. A second event will be taking place in February to start exploring solutions and an updated "Call to Government", with over 40 businesses and organisations already signed up to be involved in the work and part of designing the solutions.

### RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month update be noted.

## 17/25 2025/26 FINAL BUDGET AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY TO 2029/30 [Item 8]

The item was introduced by the Leader of the Council who explained that the Council had a statutory duty to set a balanced budget in advance of each



financial year. The Final Budget for 2025/26 would be presented to Full Council on 4 February 2025. The Leader explained that the Local Government financial climate was extremely challenging with high levels of inflation, an increase in National Insurance contributions and an increase in demand for our services. The Leader explained that there was a new government in place with a new agenda that would impact the Council. There would be a funding review in 2026 which would lead to a multi-year settlement for councils which would impact the councils funding. A strong focus on financial accountability had enabled the Council to improve its financial resilience. The council had a healthy level of reserves and was investing in prevention and early intervention. The Council was pushing at pace with its transformation programme and had invested in more homes for looked after children and the Your Fund Surrey programme which supported communities around Surrey. The Leader spoke about Local Government Reform and the potential impacts on the county council. The Council would continue to lobby government for additional funding.

The Leader explained that the final budget for 2025/26 proposed total funding of £1,264.1m; an increase of £55.7m from 2024/25. In order to achieve a balanced budget, the following recommendations would be made to full Council on Council Tax and the Adult Social Care Precept which would be a 2.99% increase in Council Tax and 2% Adult Social Care Precept. The increase in the total bill for a Band D property would equate to £1.69 per week. The Capital Programme for 2025/26 – 2029/30 proposed ongoing investment in priority areas such as highways infrastructure, improving the condition of our property estate, creating additional school places including for children with special educational needs and disabilities, the green agenda, transforming our libraries and investing in adult social care accommodation with care and support.

The Leader explained that the final budget delivered investment in our services and recognised the priorities of our residents. The budget would support vulnerable residents and would ensure the council was fit for the future. A thorough consultation and engagement process had been undertaken on the draft budget and the council would continue to lobby government for additional funding.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources commented on the report explaining that the final budget had been a culmination of a years' worth of work. Extensive consultation had been taken place on the budget which involved residents, stakeholders and members. The Select Committees had been involved in the scrutiny of the budget and conducted deep dives into the budget. The Cabinet Member supported a multi-year settlement but was concerned around the funding formula. Thanks was given to finance officers for helping develop a strong and resilient budget.

Cabinet Member lent their support to the budget and recognised the wider community benefits including investment in the Your Fund Surrey programme and extra care and supported independent living.

**RESOLVED:**



That Cabinet makes the following recommendations to Council on 4 February 2025.

Cabinet recommends that County Council:

1. Approves the net revenue budget requirement be set at **£1,264.1 million** (net cost of services after service specific government grants) for 2025/26 (Annex B), subject to confirmation of the Final Local Government Financial Settlement.
2. Approves the total Council Tax Funding Requirement be set at **£972.3 million** for 2025/26. This is based on a council tax increase of 4.99%, made up of an increase in the level of core council tax of 2.99% and an increase of 2% in the precept proposed by Central Government to cover the growing cost of Adult Social Care (Annex E).
3. Notes that for the purpose of section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the Council formally determines that the increase in core council tax is not such as to trigger a referendum (i.e. not greater than 3%).
4. Sets the Surrey County Council precept for Band D Council Tax at £1,846.35, which represents a 4.99% uplift, a rise of £1.69 a week from the 2024/25 precept of £1,758.60. This includes £286.61 for the Adult Social Care precept, which has increased by £35.17. A full list of bands is as follows:

Valuation band	Core precept	ASC precept	Overall precept
A	£1,039.83	£191.07	£1,230.90
B	£1,213.13	£222.92	£1,436.05
C	£1,386.44	£254.76	£1,641.20
D	£1,559.74	£286.61	£1,846.35
E	£1,906.35	£350.30	£2,256.65
F	£2,252.96	£413.99	£2,666.95
G	£2,599.57	£477.68	£3,077.25
H	£3,119.48	£573.22	£3,692.70

5. Notes that underlying General Fund reserve balances are projected to increase to £50.5 million as of 1 April 2025, based on the current year forecast.
6. Approves the Total Schools Budget of £738.7 million to meet the Council's statutory requirement on schools funding (as set out in Section 9 of the 2025/26 Final Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy to 2029/30).
7. Approves the overall indicative Budget Envelopes for Directorates and individual services for the 2025/26 budget (Annex B) and that the Corporate Leadership Team be required to meet the revenue budget for the delivery of Council services.
8. That the Corporate Leadership Team be required to deliver the revenue saving plans as set out in Annex A.

9. Delegate powers to the Leader and Deputy Chief Executive & Director of Resources (Section 151 Officer) to finalise budget proposals and recommendations to County Council, updated to take into account new information in the Final Local Government Finance Settlement;'
10. Approves the total £1,398.8 million proposed five-year Capital Programme (comprising £1,016.8 million of budget and £382.0 million pipeline), including the £406.3 million annual Capital Budget for 2025/26 (Annex C).
11. Approves the Capital and Investment Strategy (Annex F - Sections 1 to 3), which provides an overview of how risks associated with capital expenditure, financing and treasury will be managed as well as how they contribute towards the delivery of services.
12. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators (Annex F – Section 4) which set a framework for the Council's treasury function to manage risks, source borrowing and invest surplus cash, as considered by the Audit & Governance Committee on 22 January 2025.
13. Approves the policy for making a prudent level of revenue provision for the repayment of debt - the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy (Annex G).
14. Approves and reviews the re-set of the Earmarked Reserves, as set out in Annex D.
15. Notes that the investment in Transformation required to deliver improved outcomes and financial benefits is built into the proposed Medium-Term Financial Strategy (as set out in section 3 of 2025/26 Final Budget Report and Medium-Term Financial Strategy to 2029/30).

#### **Reasons for decisions:**

Council will meet on 4 February 2025 to agree a budget and to set the Council Tax Precept for 2025/26. Cabinet is required to recommend a budget to Council for consideration at this meeting. The budget directs available resources to support the achievement of the Council's ambitions and priorities in the 2030 Vision and the Refreshed Organisation Strategy.

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

#### **18/25 COMMUNITY RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN (CRMP) 2025-2030 [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience introduced the report stating that the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's (SFRS) Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) for 2025-2030 has been meticulously developed following an extensive and robust consultation process. Engaging staff, partners and the public, the consultation had spanned from May to September 2024 ensuring a comprehensive collection of feedback and insights. A great amount of resource had been dedicated to promoting the CRMP and consultation. It was a statutory requirement to have a CRMP with a minimum duration of three years, the current one, the Making Surrey Safer Plan, ended as of 2024 and

therefore a new one for 2025 was required. The new plan supported the Council's vision of No One Left Behind and will be delivered in stages to ensure the changes could be monitored.

The Cabinet Member stated that the plan was not a cost saving measure but was based on managing risk appropriately within our county and how we utilise our resources to manage that risk. A major focus for this consultation and subsequent engagement was the closure of Banstead Fire Station and relocation of some resources from Camberley Fire Station to a station north of the county. If this was approved, a thorough review of alternative locations in Whyteleafe would be undertaken. In relation to the Camberley proposal, there was still appropriate fire and rescue cover for the risk in that area and this fire station was not closing. Irrespective of the outcome of any review or changes, the ten-minute Surrey-wide response target to critical incidents and our fire engine availability requirements remained unchanged. Two key changes were being suggested following analysis of consultation responses. These were firstly, proposal 1.1, to Relocate the current Banstead fire engine and crew to Godstone Fire Station in 2026, following an updated and extensive review of any options within the Whyteleafe area. Secondly, proposal 1.3 to Review current resources at Camberley Fire Station and consider relocation options within the boroughs of Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Runnymede. The plan had received external verification from Nottingham Trent University (NTU) and various fire and rescue professionals.

Cabinet Members welcomed the focus on prevention work within the plan and the extent of the consultation undertaken. The plan had been considered by the relevant Select Committee who welcomed the plan and the robust process undertaken. The Leader thanked the Chief Fire Officer and staff for an excellent and comprehensive document.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approves the CRMP for 2025-2030, ensuring that SFRS can begin implementing the service-wide strategy from April 2025 in a staged approach.

### **Reasons for decisions:**

- SFRS has consulted both its staff and the public on the seven CRMP proposals, details of which were shared with them via a thorough communications and engagement campaign.
- The plans set out how the service will prevent, protect and respond to emergencies during 2025-2030, aligning resources to the right locations, ensuring vital equipment is appropriate and effective, and supporting the wider health and wellbeing agenda.
- The feedback gained during this consultation has shown that there is a majority positive 'approval rating' for the six proposals requiring an agreement/disagreement level, ranging between 62% to 76%. The analysis

report (**annex 3**) was created by Surrey County Council's (SCC) Research Intelligence Unit (RIU) following the consultation period.

- An audit of SFRS's CRP (**annex 2**) has been conducted by Nottingham Trent University (NTU) to ensure accuracy and robustness. NTU are leaders in public research who led on the National Fire Chiefs Council's (NFCC) National Risk Methodologies, reviewed the data and evidence used to develop the CRMP's strategic aims and proposals. They confirmed that "...Surrey FRS has undertaken a robust process to develop the CRMP for Surrey".

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

## **19/25 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS FOR SEPTEMBER 2026 AND SURREY'S RELEVANT AREA [Item 10]**

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning introduced the report which asked Cabinet to make recommendations to Full Council on the admission arrangements that will apply for Surrey's community and voluntary controlled infant, junior, primary and secondary schools for admission in September 2026, as well as a determination on Surrey's Relevant Area. Surrey County Council was responsible for setting the admission arrangements for 68 community and voluntary controlled schools for 2026 by 28 February 2025. The Cabinet Member covered the recommendations in the report which included three key recommendations that the Published Admission Number (PAN) for Year 3 at Reigate Priory is reduced from 150 to 120 for 2026 admission, that a PAN is not introduced for admission to Year 3 at Audley Primary School for 2026 admission and that a PAN for Reception at Earlswood Infant School is reduced from 120 to 90 for 2026 admission.

### **RESOLVED:**

It is recommended that Cabinet make the following recommendations to Full Council on 4 February 2025:

#### **Recommendation 1**

That the Published Admission Number (PAN) for Year 3 at Reigate Priory is reduced from 150 to 120 for 2026 admission, as set out in Appendix 1 of Annex 1.

#### **Reasons for Recommendation**

- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- It is supported by Surrey's Education Place Planning team
- There will still be sufficient places for local children if the PAN is decreased
  - It will help the school maintain financial viability as they will be able to operate with just four classes
  - It will have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

- The decision is not related to the future provision of places in Reigate

### **Recommendation 2**

That a Published Admission Number (PAN) is not introduced for admission to Year 3 at Audley Primary School for 2026 admission.

#### **Reasons for Recommendation**

- There are spaces at other schools in the area which negates the need to introduce a Year 3 PAN at Audley Primary School
- Although a small number, the introduction of a Year 3 PAN of 2 at Audley Primary School could have a detrimental impact on other schools in the area
- It will have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

### **Recommendation 3**

That the Published Admissions Number (PAN) for Reception at Earlswood Infant School is reduced from 120 to 90 for 2026 admission, as set out in Appendix 1 of Annex 1.

#### **Reasons for Recommendation**

- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school, having been requested by them
- It is supported by Surrey's Education Place Planning team
- There will still be sufficient places for local children if the PAN is decreased
- It will help the school maintain financial viability as they will be able to operate with just three classes
- It will have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

### **Recommendation 4**

That the Published Admission Numbers (PANs) for September 2026 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools (excluding Year 3 at Reigate Priory and Reception at Earlswood Infant School, which are covered by Recommendations 1 and 3) are determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Annex 1.

#### **Reasons for Recommendation**

- Most other PANs remain as they were determined for 2025 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences for 2026 admission
- The PANs provide for the sufficiency of places at community and voluntary controlled schools
- The Education Place Planning team supports the PANs
- Each community and voluntary controlled school were given the opportunity to comment on the proposed PAN if they wished

### **Recommendation 5**

That all other aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2026, for which no change has been consulted on, are agreed as set out in Annex 1 and its appendices.

### **Reasons for Recommendation**

- The local authority has a duty to determine the admission arrangements for 2026 for all community and voluntary controlled schools by 28 February 2025
- The admission arrangements are working well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend a local school and in doing so reduce travel and support Surrey's sustainability policies
- The arrangements are compliant with the School Admissions Code
- Section 20 of Annex 1 has been amended to remove reference to an offer of a place being withdrawn 'even if the child has already started at the school'. This is because registered pupils may only be removed from roll in the limited circumstances set out in regulation 9 of the School Attendance (Pupil Registration) (England) Regulations 2024, as amended.
- Section 21 of Annex 1 has been updated to include the following wording in relation to travel assistance, which ensures it reflects the recent changes to Surrey's travel assistance policy:  

'To be considered for travel assistance to a school that is not your nearest, you will normally be required to demonstrate that you have applied for and been refused a place at any nearer schools....'

### **Recommendation 6**

That Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Annex 4.

### **Reasons for Recommendation**

- The local authority is required by law to define the Relevant Area, within which admission authorities must consult with other schools on their admission arrangements
- The Relevant Area must be consulted upon and agreed every two years even if no changes are proposed
- Setting a Relevant Area ensures that any schools who might be affected by changes to the admission arrangements for other local schools will be made aware of those changes
- No change has been made to Surrey's Relevant Area since it was last determined in February 2023

## **20/25 EVERYDAY LIVING OPPORTUNITIES [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care introduced the report explaining that Cabinet approval was being sought to progress the Commissioning Plan for supporting Everyday Living which would establish quality metrics and key performance indicators, establish a benchmarked pricing methodology and secure market sustainability and growth. With population growth, an ageing population, greater numbers living with disability, and financial constraints, more cost-effective



approaches to procuring high quality support for people with eligible needs needed to be established. The Cabinet Member also presented the first published Adult Social Care Travel Policy which would play a central role in facilitating increased independent travel and supporting people who draw on services (and their families) to understand eligibility criteria and independently consider their travel options when accessing support with everyday living.

The Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee welcomed the report and the approach being taken which would help residents live in their own homes for longer and live fulfilling lives in the community.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approves the commissioning strategy for supporting everyday living for adults and young people in transition with eligible needs, through a Light Touch Regime procurement process under The Public Contracts Regulations 2015 or the Procurement Act 2023, as appropriate.
2. That Cabinet approves that the ELO tender be commenced in quarter 4 of financial year 2024/25.
3. That Cabinet approves delegated authority to the Executive Director, Adults, Wellbeing and Health Partnerships in consultation with the Cabinet Member of Adult Social Care. for awarding the contract/s.
4. That Cabinet notes the outcome of the formal consultation on the AHWP Travel Policy and to approve and agree to publish the AWHP Travel Policy as an integral document that supports the aims and desired outcomes of the Everyday Living Opportunities Tender.

**Reasons for decisions:**

Most community services are currently commissioned via individual spot contracts, which offer a limited overview of equity, quality or price. With population growth, an ageing population, greater numbers living with disability, and financial constraints, more cost-effective approaches to procuring high quality support for people with eligible needs must be established.

The Travel Policy is an important enabler for this work, playing a central role in facilitating increased independent travel and supporting people who draw on services (and their families) to understand eligibility criteria and independently consider their travel options when accessing support with everyday living. The policy is an important tool for communicating with Surrey's residents.

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



## 21/25 TECHNOLOGY ENABLED CARE AND HOMES (TECH) [Item 12]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care who explained that the report builds upon previous Surrey initiatives in the area of Technology Enabled Care and Homes (TECH). With increasing financial pressure on health and social care and the need for more equitable access to personalised care and support, a reliable, scalable and more diverse offer of TECH was essential. The Cabinet Member was excited to see the roll out of TECH across the Council and the opportunities for service users. The delivery approach for TECH was robust with a strong commissioning and procurement approach. The Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee welcomed the Council's approach to TECH and the opportunities it would give to residents especially letting residents live in their homes for longer. The Select Committee welcomed the service opening up the TECH offer to self-funding residents as well as those directly supported by the Council.

A query was raised around privacy and the use of TECH and if TECH would be bespoke to the individual. The Cabinet Member stated that technology had become common place in society and had many benefits including keeping people safe and enhancing their lives. Care and support outcomes would always be the number one priority for the service followed by technology. Assurances were given that individuals information would be kept safe and service users would be explained how their data was being used to support them. The Cabinet Member stated that TECH would be tailored to individual needs and people would be given the option of pick the individual TECH they wanted.

The Leader stated the Council was keen to progress this work as soon as possible as it would improve outcomes for residents. This was also a cost effective way to support residents in their own homes for longer.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet notes progress made to date to review current pilot technologies.
2. That Cabinet notes benchmarking and profiling of our service, including our need to improve outcomes tracking and benefits realisation approaches.
3. That Cabinet agrees our strategic ambition for developing technology enabled care and homes (TECH).
4. That Cabinet approves our commissioning and procurement approach
5. That Cabinet approves our priority areas and phasing of technology roll out to support staff with culture growth and technology adoption.

6. That Cabinet agrees the financial investment required for first 2 years of delivery.
7. That Cabinet notes the intention to return to Cabinet in 2026 to set out 5 to 10-year strategic delivery plan and strategy.

### **Reasons for decisions:**

Whilst benefits have already been achieved through our current TECH offer in Surrey, there is considerable opportunity for greater growth and benefits realisation. This paper sets out a more ambitious delivery model with clear commissioning and procurement approaches that maximise opportunity and reduce risk to the Council.

Our recent review of the current offer has highlighted some key focus areas. We must improve our internal processes and enable easier identification of TECH solutions. We must also improve our systems and outcomes tracking if we are to be able to demonstrate TECH benefits more quickly and clearly.

Our strategic ambition is to embed TECH as a core part of social care delivery. By demonstrating outcomes more clearly, we will be better placed to identify future investment from partners to grow our offer and align with other TECH, AI and digital programmes. We will also develop a strong self-funder and front door offer for residents.

With no new funding we must target our core delivery of TECH to the areas of highest need and greatest impact. Prioritisation will therefore be based upon corporate transformation, demand management and high-cost areas.

Prioritisation is also key to ensuring staff can be supported to embed the culture growth required to see TECH succeed. Members shared that they felt TECH would fail if it was to be used everywhere, with all staff from the start. A recent review demonstrated staff knowledge and confidence was generally low across the organisation and varied considerably from team to team across Surrey. Positively, the majority of staff spoken to so far seem excited about TECH and want to engage so we must use this interest to progress.

The Contract Management Advisory Service (CMAS) were asked to support the TECH team to assess the options for the provision of TECH in Surrey. Commissioning, operations, IT&D, finance and the TECH team were involved in the process. Three options, detailed later in this paper,

were explored with one preferred and recommended to help further our ambition.

Given the above we intend to outsource a core commissioned service for a minimum of two years. This will allow us to gather more robust data and evidence to develop a better offer for TECH with greater evidence of staff learning and engagement. The recommendation for a longer-term strategy is based upon national comparators and benefits realisation timeframes.

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

## **22/25 DISPOSAL OF QUADRANT COURT, 35 GUILDFORD ROAD, WOKING, GU22 7QQ [Item 13]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure who explained that the report was seeking Cabinet approval for the freehold disposal of Quadrant Court in Woking following an extensive marketing campaign. The property in question was an office building and was deemed surplus to operational requirements. Staff based in the building would be relocated to Victoria Gate, Woking. Delegated authority was requested to the Executive Director for Environment, Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. That Cabinet approves the sale of Quadrant Court, Guildford Road, Woking to the party and upon the terms outlined in the part 2 Report.
3. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Executive Director for Environment, Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

Quadrant Court is deemed surplus to operational requirements and to enable the disposal, Cabinet is to formally declare the asset surplus under the Councils Constitution.

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

### **23/25 2024/25 MONTH 8 (NOVEMBER) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 14]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources who explained that this report provided details of the Council's 2024/25 financial position, for revenue and capital budgets, as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2024 (M8) and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year. At M8, the Council was forecasting an overspend of £18.6m against the 2024/25 revenue budget. All Directorates were continuing to work on developing mitigating actions to offset forecast overspends. Most of the increase this month in the forecast overspend related to the Place Directorate and particularly to the facilities management contract. At M8, capital expenditure of £325m is forecast for 2024/25. This was £3.6m more than the re-phased budget. The Leader stated that it was imperative the council came within the £20m contingency by the end of the year.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue budget and capital budget positions for the year.

#### **Reasons for decisions:**

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

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

### **24/25 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.

### **25/25 EVERYDAY LIVING OPPORTUNITIES [Item 16]**

A part 2 report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. See Exempt Minute E-03-25
2. See Exempt Minute E-03-25

**Reasons for decisions:**

See Exempt Minute E-03-25

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

**26/25 DISPOSAL OF QUADRANT COURT, 35 GUILDFORD ROAD, WOKING, GU22 7QQ [Item 17]**

A part 2 report was presented by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure. Details were given of the bids received and the successful bidder.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. See Exempt Minute E-04-25
3. See Exempt Minute E-04-25
4. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Executive Director for Environment, Property and Growth, in consultation with the Director of Land & Property to finalise the transaction and conclude all associated legal agreements.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To enable the disposal, Cabinet is to formally declare an asset surplus to operational requirement under the Council's Constitution.

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

**27/25 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 18]**

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

Meeting closed at 4.19 pm

---

**Chairman**