

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 17 March 2014.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 4 FEBRUARY 2014 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr John Furey
*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)	*Mr Michael Gosling
Mrs Mary Angell	Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr Mel Few	Mr Tony Samuels

Cabinet Associates:

*Mr Steve Cosser	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Clare Curran	*Mr Mike Goodman

* = Present

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

1/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mrs Mary Angell, Mrs Linda Kemeny and Mr Tony Samuels.

2/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 17 DECEMBER 2013 [Item 2]

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2013 be agreed and the Chairman be authorised to sign them.

3/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

4/14 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Nine questions had been received from Members. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 1 to these Minutes**.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment provided a response to question 5 at the meeting. It was noted that it was not possible to give figures for the damage caused by the recent storms at that time as the situation was ongoing. Flooding was still present in the county and this prevented the examination of damage to those bridges and carriageways which were still underwater. Forecasts were that the poor weather conditions would continue. A full review would take place however, for now, it was right that the priority remained focused on the emergency response. The council

and the emergency services would continue to act swiftly in response to the extreme conditions.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment, with the support of the Cabinet, thanked all highways officers, voluntary services, the police, ambulance and fire and rescue services for the manner in which they had worked together to come to the aid of the residents of Surrey. The response of the emergency services and all groups had created considerable goodwill and provided an effective response.

Mr Tim Hall asked a supplementary question relating to the Prudential Ride London-Surrey event and the economic benefits in the county. The Cabinet Member for Community Services advised that a detailed breakdown of the economic figures was not available for the past year but was something that had been requested for future events. The Deputy Leader noted that, though there were the difficulties involved in producing detailed breakdowns of the economic impact per event or rider, the economic benefits experienced by the county in the years in which previous events had been held had been considerable. The measure of growth used by the National Audit Office had shown that Surrey's economy had grown by 8% in 2012 (an additional £2.5billion pounds). Surrey's economy had been growing faster than the rest of the UK and the Olympic events held in the county had been one of the factors involved.

(b) PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Three questions had been received from residents. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 2 to these Minutes**.

(c) PETITIONS [Item 4c]

A petition was received in relation to agenda item 10 – Changes to Fire Deployment in the Borough of Spelthorne. A response was tabled and is attached as **Appendix 3**.

The petition was presented by Mr Richard Jones, Secretary of Surrey Fire Brigades Union (FBU) and member of Save Our Services in Surrey (SOSiS). Mr Jones addressed the Cabinet on the proposed changes to fire and rescue service deployment in Spelthorne. He raised concerns about the consultation process and, in particular, that a question relating to no change in services had not been an option. He noted that the outcome of the consultation had been that 92% rejected the original option for a change in service. Mr Jones advised that he believed that the development of a new option in response to the consultation, without its own consultation, could be subject to challenge. He also advised that he felt that the risk assessment was incomplete and subject to challenge due to the increased risk of fire in Spelthorne and issues with congestion locally. Mr Jones asked that, instead of the proposals before them, the Cabinet consider ending the contract with Specialist Group International which he suggested would save the council money and improve industrial relations.

It was noted that the points raised would be included as part of the consideration of the agenda item on this matter (Minute Ref 6/14).

(d) **REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

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

Recommendations were received from the Adult Social Care Select Committee, Communities Select Committee and Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Responses to the Adult Social Care Select Committee and Communities Select Committee were tabled and are attached as **Appendices 4 and 5 to these Minutes** respectively.

The Chairman of the Communities Select Committee, Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos, presented the Committee's recommendation to Cabinet on fire service deployment in Spelthorne. Mrs Saliagopoulos noted that the development of an option which included two engines in Spelthorne showed that residents' concerns had been listened to and it was on this basis that Members of the Communities Select Committee had been able to support option 5. The importance of ensuring the same professional high standard of response in Spelthorne, whether provided by full time or retained crews, was stressed. Mrs Saliagopoulos asked that her thanks to the fire and rescue service for their work in Spelthorne with the recent flooding be recorded.

The report of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee was considered as part of agenda item 7 - Revenue and Capital Budget 2014/15 to 2018/2019. In response to the recommendations, the Chairman welcomed the focus of the Scrutiny Committee on the challenges within the Medium Term Financial Plan and the recognition of the enormous achievement to date in terms of the Council's budget. The budget was complex and required very careful attention to the relevant details. The Chairman advised that he believed some of the comments to be based on inaccuracies and misunderstandings. The Cabinet had been clear on the considerable challenges facing all councils. Whilst the Medium Term Financial Plan was dependant on the delivery of identified and agreed savings, it was crucial to note that at this stage, services had not been asked to find additional savings.

In terms of inaccuracies, £20 million of the £26million cited had come from the Budget Equalisation Reserve. This reserve had been specifically built up over the previous few years in order to smooth council spend across the medium term. Accordingly, only £6million was being applied this year from other reserves. Savings anticipated from Families, Friends and Communities are significant and considerable work was underway to identify the scale and timing of how these would be delivered. It was crucial to recognise that this was the correct strategy and therefore the discussion was entirely about the execution of the approach.

The Chairman advised that the Committee had missed the point about risk contingency. This was created by adding additional savings targets to savings and to date it hadn't been required. It would be illogical at this point to add further pressures to services such as Adult Social Care in order to create a contingency in case they didn't meet their existing targets.

It was clear that the future of Adult Social Care services was fundamentally entwined with how health and social care was integrated. Detailed conversations had taken place with CCG colleagues in the health service to confirm both how whole system funding with work in 2014/15 and how we will work together with Better Care Funding proposals from 2015 onwards. There was no lack in the clarity of this process or the shared objectives with health colleagues.

With regard to the Committee's recommendations, the Chairman advised that it would be a tough year and that no secret had been made about this fact. This is why the Council had been adamant about the need for a council tax strategy for Surrey. It would be simply wrong to say that there was no contingency or reserves to manage slippages. Reserves were in a healthy position than they were in 2008 and the Council had reasonable levels although it was careful not to build up unnecessarily large reserves in a period where householders were facing severe challenges. The strategy of working with Members of Parliament to secure a fairer share of national funding, not least when Surrey contributed so much to the Exchequer (Surrey was the second most contributor to the Exchequer in the country), was already working. The Council was also working very well with health colleagues on Better Care Funding.

6/14 CHANGES TO FIRE DEPLOYMENT IN THE BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE [Item 10]

The Cabinet considered options relating to the closure of Staines and Sunbury Fire Stations and the provision of an alternative service model in Spelthorne. A public consultation had been held on proposed changes in fire deployment. This included the boroughs of Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Runnymede. As a direct result of the feedback received from the consultation, an amended proposal had been developed which consisted of a new fire station at an appropriate location with two fire engines. One of these engines would be whole-time and one "On-call", with both providing 24/7 response cover and a waterborne rescue capability. This option had been developed by working collaboratively with the local community and borough leaders and recognised the comments and concerns raised by stakeholders. The optimised location of the new fire station would support Phase 2 of Surrey Fire and Rescue Services transformation programme, the Public Safety Plan (PSP) 2011-2020.

In addition to the contributions of the petitioner and the Chairman of the Communities Select Committee made under previous agenda items, the Cabinet heard representations from Mr Robert Evans (Stanwell and Stanwell Moor). Mr Evans thanked the Cabinet Associate Responsible for Fire and Police Services for her attendance at consultation events. He drew attention to the results of the public consultation and the opposition of the MP for the area and local councillors of different parties, in response to the original proposals. He noted the willingness of residents, when asked, to consider paying more to keep both existing fire stations open and expressed concern about the potential for access difficulties in operating from a potential new site. Mr Evans stated that there was no budget for the proposed changes, that they could put lives at risk and questioned the practicalities of the proposed 'on-call' arrangements. He asked that the Cabinet vote not to approve the proposal or to send the amended proposal out for further public consultation.

The Cabinet Associate Responsible for Fire and Police Services expressed her thanks to the members of the Fire and Rescue Service for their hard work and commitment, noting that they had suspended their strike action in order to respond to the recent emergency conditions and help the residents of Surrey.

The proposals being considered were noted to form part of Phase 2 of the Public Service Plan previously agreed by Cabinet. Consultation had taken place and the Council had listened to the residents. Residents and the local borough council had raised concerns about the original proposal to reduce the number of fire engines based 24/7 in the area to one and this had been directly addressed in the amended proposal. Spelthorne residents would now benefit from a new fire station with two engines based on site 24/7. The provision of the service from one optimised base had been assessed and would enable the service to meet response standards within Spelthorne whilst also providing new equipment and facilities for the use of the service. On-call fire fighters already performed a valuable role in Surrey and consideration of their use had been encouraged by Sir Ken Knight in his recent national report on fire services.

The points raised in the petition and by the Local Member were considered. It was noted that the contract with an outside partner had enabled services to be provided to residents during the recent fire strike and had given access to specialist equipment during the recent flooding. This would not have been the case had the partnership contract not been agreed. The Council was required by the Government under the Fire Services Act to make ensure such business contingency arrangements were in place.

Cabinet Members noted the work that had taken place to ensure that risks had been properly assessed and that equalities implications had been addressed. The changing shape of response patterns was noted. Responding to fire incidents had increasingly formed a reduced part of the Fire and Rescue Service's work in comparison to its broader rescue work over the past twenty years. The evidence in support of the proposals provided by response time mapping was noted as was the commitment towards a new fire station in the Council's budgeting.

The Cabinet heard from the Chief Fire Officer who advised that risk assessments had taken place and that, given the reduction in incident numbers and the fact that the fire service was not excluded from the need for efficiencies in the current financial climate, the service was prepared to professionally subscribe to and recommend the proposal.

The Chairman advised that the amended proposal, Option 5, was good for Spelthorne. The Council had listened to the residents of Spelthorne and had responded with a proposal that addressed the concerns which had been raised. The proposal before Cabinet would continue to keep the people of Spelthorne safe. Though the Council faced huge financial pressures, these changes would enable it to make an investment in a new fire station and new facilities for Spelthorne, just as it had agreed previously for Guildford and Woking. By focusing the right fire service cover in the right places across the whole county, both in preventing incidents and responding to them, the Council would continue to protect Surrey residents.

RESOLVED:

1. That the amended proposal Option 5 and the commissioning of a new fire station in an appropriate location be agreed subject to a further business case setting out the delivery costs of a new station returning to Cabinet in due course. The new fire station will have two fire engines, one 24 hour whole time and one 24 hour "On-call" and a waterborne rescue capability. This will retain the same number of fire engines in that part of Surrey and supports improvements in the response standard across Surrey.
2. That the subsequent closure of Staines and Sunbury fire stations be agreed.
3. That the implementation of Option 4 be agreed should the provision of Option 5 and the "On-call" unit not be secured.

Reasons for Decisions:

Option 5 supports improvements in the provision of a more equitable level of fire service response in support of the Surrey Response Standard and the Public Safety Plan.

The amended proposal has given due consideration to the concerns of local communities and leaders and surrounding boroughs by listening to their ideas and by involving residents in the decision making process. Their local knowledge combined with the revised response modelling had influenced the design and delivery of future services in Spelthorne.

7/14 CORPORATE STRATEGY 2014 - 2019 [Item 6]

The Cabinet was asked to endorse a refreshed version of *Confident in our future*, the Council's Corporate Strategy. The Strategy will then be presented to the County Council meeting on 11 February 2014 for approval alongside the Revenue and Capital Budget. Continued delivery of the Strategy will ensure that Surrey residents remain healthy, safe and confident about their future.

The Chairman stated the Council's commitment to continue to provide value for money for residents and noted the "50 ways Surrey County Council adds value" document circulated with the agenda. Discussions with MPs had all been positive and had highlighted the Council's position as the only one to produce an account of its unit costs. The Council would continue to focus on improving Surrey's road network, supporting economic growth, building its schools and strengthening partnerships.

The Deputy Leader noted that Surrey had been recognised as having the strongest economy in the country, ahead of any other county or city (ONS figures 2012). Key achievements had included improving the condition of Surrey's roads through Project Horizon, improving performance in schools, increasing the recycling rate, working together to find better ways of helping to keep families healthy, and the increased amount of investment in young people through apprenticeships. 1,000 young people would benefit from

apprenticeships following the investment of £750k by the Leader. Surrey County Council would continue to make a difference.

Cabinet Members noted the commitment to address recent flooding in the county and the £10million investment which had been made. The Leader drew attention to the good work previously carried out in this area by Mr Nick Skellett when he was leader of the council.

RESOLVED:

That the refreshed version of *Confident in our future*, Corporate Strategy 2014-2019 be endorsed and that it be recommended to the County Council for approval alongside the Revenue and Capital Budget 2014-2019 at its meeting on 11 February 2014.

Reason for decision:

By reconfirming a long term vision for the county and setting priorities for the next financial year the refreshed Corporate Strategy provides a clear sense of direction for Council staff and signposts the Council's approach for residents, businesses and partner organisations. As part of the Council's Policy Framework (as set out in the Constitution) the Corporate Strategy must be approved by the County Council.

8/14 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2014/15 TO 2018/19 [Item 7]

The Cabinet considered the draft revenue and capital budget for the five years 2014-19 and the level of the council tax precept for 2014/15 with a view to recommending them for consideration at the budget meeting of the County Council. This included consideration of the revised treasury management strategy, including the borrowing and operation limits (prudential indicators) for 2014-19, the policy for the provision of the repayment of debt (minimum revenue provision (MRP)), and the treasury management policy.

The Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Mr Nick Skellett, addressed the Cabinet on the budget proposals and the Chairman's response to the Committee's recommendations. Mr Skellett advised that the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee recognised the position with regards to the ongoing need to make savings and the pressures placed in terms of funding. Committee Members had wanted to bring concerns and uncertainties to the attention of Cabinet to ensure that the budget works. These concerns included a belief that more comprehensive, deeper processes for savings and efficiencies needed to be embedded in order prevent any potential for drastic changes in year.

The Chairman addressed the points raised and agreed that efficiencies would get harder and harder to achieve. Robust systems were in place to regularly monitor and check efficiencies across the whole of the Medium Term Financial Plan. The Better Care Fund presented a unique opportunity for the County Council and the Clinical Commissioning Groups to look at their services and address any potential for waste. The work that had been taking place with partners had proved to be very helpful and would benefit the residents of Surrey. The Audit Commission did not wish local authorities to

hold high balances in reserves and the Council's budgeting reflected this by maintaining them at an appropriate level.

The recommendation to Council would be for an increase in the council tax precept of 1.99%. It was noted that a proposed increase of 2.49% had initially been planned to enable further investment in roads and other resident priorities. The Chairman advised that the cost of £2m for a referendum to ask residents about this level of rise would be a waste of money and so the level had instead been recommended at 1.99%. He noted that the right decision had been made not to accept the government offer of a freeze for the coming financial year and that no guarantee had been provided that this funding would remain in the base after 2015/16. The decision to reject the freeze in the current year had proven to be correct and had enabled the Council to do the right thing for Surrey residents.

Members of the Cabinet noted the success of the public service reviews and processes for driving efficiency programmes against a backdrop of increasing levels of demand and continuing reductions in the government contribution to services locally. The decisions taken by the Council to reject the Government's freeze proposal and drive efficiencies locally had enabled investment in schools and highways, addressed residents' priorities such as social care and driven apprenticeship programmes for young people. Members noted that these decisions had been backed by the residents of Surrey at the County Council Elections in 2013.

The Chairman advised that Surrey received the lowest proportion of government grant contribution in the country. The services that residents expected and needed were funded from council tax. Sensible planning had taken place in preparing the budget. This had included consultation based on proper assumptions about the level of council tax. The Chairman had been pleased that the Government had listened and had given a clear indication in June 2013 of the level at which a referendum would be required. This had allowed the Council to carry out consultation with residents on an informed basis. He expressed surprise that others had circulated rumours that the Government might consider changing this agreement and advised that the Chancellor's word on this should be taken and trusted. Should any change be made, a further Cabinet meeting would be held prior to the budget meeting of Council.

RESOLVED:

1. That recommendations be made to the Full County Council on 11 February 2014 as follows:

On the revenue and capital budget:

1. Note the Chief Finance Officer's statutory report on the robustness and sustainability of the budget and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves (Annex 1 of the report submitted).
2. Set the County Council precept for band D council tax at £1,195.83, which represents a 1.99% up-lift.
3. Agree to maintain the council tax rate set above and delegate powers to the Leader and the Chief Finance Officer to finalise detailed budget proposals following receipt of the Final Local

Government Financial Settlement.

4. Approve the County Council budget for 2014/15 as £1,644.2m.
5. Agree the capital programme proposals specifically to:
 - fund essential schemes over the five year period (schools and non-schools) to the value of £760m including ring-fenced grants; and
 - make adequate provision in the revenue budget to fund the revenue costs of the capital programme.
6. Require the Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer to establish a mechanism to regularly track and monitor progress on the further development and implementation of robust plans for achieving the efficiencies across the whole MTFP period.
7. Require Strategic Directors and Senior Officers to maintain robust in year (i.e. 2014/15) budget monitoring procedures that enable Cabinet to monitor the achievement of efficiencies and service reductions through the monthly budget monitoring Cabinet reports, the quarterly Cabinet Member accountability meetings and the monthly scrutiny at the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee.
8. Require a robust business case to be prepared for all revenue invest to save proposals and capital schemes before committing expenditure.

On treasury management and borrowing:

9. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy for 2014/15 and approve that their provisions have immediate effect. This strategy includes:
 - the investment strategy for short term cash balances;
 - the treasury management policy (Appendix B1);
 - the prudential indicators (Appendix B2)
 - the schedule of delegation (Appendix B4);
 - the minimum revenue provision policy (Appendix B7).
2. That the medium term financial plan (MTFP) for the financial years 2014-19, be approved including:
 - approval of the Total Schools Budget of £563.1m;
 - reduction of the revenue budget risk contingency for 2014/15 to £5m to mitigate against the risk of non-delivery of service reductions & efficiencies;
 - applying £20.1m from the Budget Equalisation Reserve (including £13.0m contributed by the unused risk contingency from 2013/14) and £5.8m from other reserves to support the 2014/15 budget;
 - provision of £0.75m to support the apprenticeship programme;
 - setting aside £1.25m in a reserve for Business Rates Appeals as mitigation against potential business rates valuation appeals.

3. That it be noted that the Cabinet will receive the final detailed MTFP (2014-19) on 25 March 2014 for approval following scrutiny by Select Committees.

Reason for Decisions:

Full County Council will meet on 11 February 2014 to agree the summary budget and set the council tax precept for 2014/15. The Cabinet advises the Full County Council how best to meet the challenges the Council faces. The reasons underpinning the recommendations agreed by Cabinet include:

- to ensure the Council continues to maintain its financial resilience and protect its long term financial position;
- to enable the Council to meet the expectations of Surrey's residents as confirmed in their responses to the in depth consultation exercise undertaken in 2012; and
- to provide adequate finances for key services such as school places, highways, adults social care and protecting vulnerable people.

9/14 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 8]

The Cabinet considered the council's financial position at the end of period 9 – December of the 2013/14 financial year, with particular focus on the year end revenue and capital budgets forecasts and the achievement of efficiency targets.

The Chairman noted that the corporate strategy had ensured a prudent level of balances by applying reserves. There had been a £0.9 million improvement on the revised forecast since November and it was noted that this would have been even greater but for the additional work necessary to address the recent flooding. Demand for services was continuing to increase, offset by underspends in other areas, however there were no plans to use the contingency to achieve the year end target of a £13.9 million underspend. The risk contingency would be used to support the 2014/15 budget and keep any calls on the taxpayer to a minimum. The Council was also working to ensure that it was less reliant on government grants in the longer term.

The Deputy Leader commended the performance and achievements towards the £13.9 million saving on top of previous savings. It was noted that this represented the finances being managed to come in below budget each year since the appointment of the Leader of the Council. This represented a remarkable level of performance in difficult circumstances.

RESOLVED that the following be noted:

- (i) Forecast revenue budget for 2013/14 is to underspend (£0.9m) on services, adding the unused £13m risk contingency brings this to £13.9m overall underspend (paragraph 1 of the report submitted).
- (ii) Forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end is £60.3m (paragraph 74 of the report submitted).
- (iii) Forecast capital budget position for 2013/14 is -£22.3m on services and +£7.0m overall (paragraphs 79 to 84 of the report submitted).

- (iv) Management actions to mitigate overspends appear throughout the report submitted.
- (v) Quarter three balance sheet, reserves, debt and treasury report (paragraphs 85-93 of the report submitted)
- (vi) debt written off during quarter three totals £583,828 (paragraph 92 of the report submitted)

Reasons for decisions:

To monitor the budget in compliance with the agreed monitoring strategy.

10/14 PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFORMATION [Item 9]

Partners in Surrey have a shared ambition to transform services and outcomes for Surrey residents. The vision is that by working together more effectively across the public sector, partners will shift services away from an emphasis on high cost responses towards prevention and earlier intervention. The intention is for services to deliver better value for money and improved outcomes for Surrey residents.

This ambition had been strongly endorsed by central Government. Surrey was one of only nine areas in the country to be included in the Public Service Transformation Network which was providing active support to the work underway.

The Cabinet considered an update on the progress made since it agreed five outline business cases as part of the public service transformation programme in October 2013. Officers had continued to develop business cases for each area. Due to the markedly different nature of each strand, the businesses cases were noted to be at different stages of development, however each represented significant progress towards the ambition agreed with partners and endorsed by the Cabinet.

The work to date had identified additional resource requirements for limited specialist support to the public service transformation programme over the coming two years. This investment would enable further development and implementation of the proposals and the delivery of improved outcomes and savings.

The Chairman advised that Surrey was taking a lead in work to transform services and that this had been recognised by Government. Cabinet Members agreed that the benefits of this approach were being seen with organisational boundaries being crossed. The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board provided an update on the potential of team building across organisations in Surrey, exemplified by the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board, and the conversations now taking place with partners which couldn't have happened previously. Prevention was noted to be the next area to address across organisations. This work should result in a better health and social care system for residents.

RESOLVED:

1. That the next steps for each of the public service transformation strands, as outlined within the report and Annex 1 submitted, be

agreed and the final partnership endorsed business cases for each of the individual projects be brought back to Cabinet as they are ready.

2. That the broad approach and methodology taken for the cost benefit analyses and the business cases based on this methodology be agreed.
3. That it be noted that £10m of efficiencies relating to Surrey County Council services' element of the public service transformation programme is included in the council's Medium Term Financial Plan(2014-19) from 2015/16 onwards and that progress towards delivery of these efficiencies will be monitored using the same mechanism agreed for all MTFP(2014-19) efficiencies.
4. That the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board as co-chairman, be authorised to sign-off the 'draft' Surrey Better Care Fund plan for submission to NHS England.
5. That Surrey County Council commit an 'invest to save' funding of £300,000 for additional resources as outlined in paragraph 29 of the report submitted, covering the period to March 2016.
6. That the Chief Executive be asked to work with partners to bring forward proposals for effective and appropriate governance arrangements.

Reasons for decisions:

Partners in Surrey believe that working together more effectively will enable services to be transformed so as to give better value to Surrey residents.

The council is working closely with partners to develop its plans for public service transformation in Surrey, which forms a key part of its overall strategy to improve services and outcomes as well as delivery of its medium term financial strategy. Significant progress has been made towards the ambitions of the County Council and its partners, providing a strong basis for further development of both the business cases and implementation plans.

11/14 JOINT STRATEGIC REVIEW OF SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES [Item 11]

The Joint Strategic Review of Short Breaks is a joint project between Surrey County Council and NHS Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group on behalf of Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups. The scope of the Review was to look at the provision of short breaks for children and young people with disabilities in Surrey, including:

- Funding and provision of short breaks for Children and young people with disabilities in Surrey;
- Residential services at the Beeches and Applewood;
- Other residential services in Surrey and out of county;
- Community based services;

- Value for money from services commissioned in all settings.

The Review had focused on options for the future use and funding of Applewood (Surrey County Council) and Beeches (NHS) as other areas of residential short break services had been found to be working well. The Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families drew attention to the Equalities Impact Assessment which had been completed and set out those groups that might be affected and what this impact might be. Surrey County Council's Children's Services spent over £8million every year on short breaks in fulfilment of its statutory duty and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups spent £1.3million a year. Surrey invests significantly more in short break provision than many other local authorities and was committed to its priority in this area. Stakeholders had been in touch, including the Chair of Surrey Mencap, and the points raised would be addressed as part of the consultation and responded to.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Joint Strategic Review of Short Breaks for children and young people with disabilities be endorsed.
2. That the options for consultation be approved.

Reason for decisions:

To enable recommendations to be considered by Cabinet on 27 May 2014 based on a comprehensive consultation process in February and March 2014.

12/14 PROVISION OF EMOTIONAL WELLBEING AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS IN SURREY [Items 12 and 19]

Surrey County Council and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups have a statutory responsibility to provide, ensure the residents of Surrey have access to and receive the safest needs based Emotional Wellbeing & Mental Health Services.

The Cabinet was asked to approve the award of one year contracts from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, to four existing providers for the provision of Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) & HOPE (Integrated service including Education, Social Care & Health, working with children and young people with complex mental health needs). The Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families drew Cabinet Members' attention to the contents of the Equalities Impact Assessment and the contract details circulated in Part 2 of the agenda.

RESOLVED:

1. That contracts be awarded for a period of one year, from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, for the continued safe provision of CAMHS & HOPE.
2. That these contracts be awarded to the four existing Providers:

- Surrey & Borders Partnership (SaBP) NHS Foundation Trust
- Virgin Care Limited
- CSH Surrey (formerly Central Surrey Health)
- First Community Health

Reasons for decisions:

Awarding one year contracts to the four existing providers ensures that the Council:

- Adheres to statutory requirements regarding the safeguarding of children by securing the provision of Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Services by contractually bound providers.
- Facilitates the implementation of changes in legislation and recommendations from authorised bodies whilst maintaining continuity of service and minimising risk to service delivery.
- Enables the joint re-commissioning of a co-designed, outcomes focused, streamlined service model that engages service users in order to deliver improved service quality and a service that is fit for purpose.
- Promotes internal collaboration and builds synergy with partners and providers which will yield efficiency savings and value added benefits.

13/14 APPROVAL TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO AWARD FUTURE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS PROCURED THROUGH BUILDSURREY [Item 13]

In response to an increasing demand for school places across Surrey, the Council had established in its Medium Term Financial Plan 2013-2018 a Capital Programme to fund the provision of additional places in a number of schools.

As part of this programme 30 school capital construction projects would be procured over the next few years, along with a variety of non-school capital works. Procurement and Property Services had developed a strategy to engage local building contractors to tender for schools and other projects through the BuildSurrey portal.

The Cabinet considered a request for delegated authority to be granted to the Chief Property Officer, with Member and financial oversight, in order to engage with local building contractors outside of the Framework Agreement. Cabinet Members noted the aim that 60% of the expenditure would go to businesses in Surrey. The Council spent around £1million a day with Surrey businesses. It was noted that this policy could really enhance the local economy and help small businesses in Surrey.

RESOLVED:

1. That authority to award future construction contracts above £500,000 in value, where a competitive tender procedure has been followed through the BuildSurrey portal, be delegated to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Head of Procurement, Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, Cabinet Member for Business Services, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, the Leader of the Council and Section 151 Officer.

2. That authorisation obtained under the above delegation be formally minuted with the Section 151 Officer retaining the paperwork.

Reason for decisions:

The agreed delegation ensures that the limited delivery timescales of 30 School Basic Needs projects are met. The school projects totalling approximately £50m over the next two years, and other non-schools capital works up to £10m in aggregate will be tendered through the BuildSurrey portal. This will ensure that as much of the over £60m of construction works as possible will be delivered directly through Surrey based contractors.

The delegation is in line with the principles established under previous arrangements. The consultation and decision recording requirements of the delegation will provide an appropriate governance structure.

14/14 HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES FOR SERVICE USERS (SUPPORTING PEOPLE) [Items 14 and 20]

The Cabinet considered the award of new contracts for Housing Related Support Services from 1 April 2014.

Supporting People services provide housing-related support services to a range of people who require support to live independently within Surrey. This includes older people, those with learning disabilities, those with mental health issues, vulnerable young people, those with an offending history, those experiencing domestic abuse and those who are at risk of homelessness.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care complemented the work carried out by the service on the Equalities Impact Assessment and advised that a continuous link was in place with the district and boroughs, including three meetings each year, to ensure their perspective was fully captured.

RESOLVED:

1. That the new contracts for Housing Related Support Services be awarded to run on a continuous contract basis with on-going service reviews and fixed annual reviews effective from 1 April 2014 as detailed in Annex 2 to the report submitted.
2. That the information relating to the contract process be noted.

Reasons for decisions:

To meet the need for localised provision that enables individuals to stay in their communities and continue to be supported by friends, family and the community thus reducing costs to the wider social care system.

The approach of this contracting strategy aligns to the wider commissioning intentions of Adult Social Care and recognises the needs of individuals who want continuity of providers and the support they receive. It also recognises the on-going partnership arrangements with, and objectives of, the District

and Borough Councils. In some cases there is also the opportunity for service remodelling to enable more focussed service and value for money delivery.

15/14 CONTRACT AWARD FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL ASBESTOS CONSULTANCY SERVICES [Items 15 and 21]

It is estimated that asbestos related diseases are responsible for over 4000 deaths a year in the UK. Surrey County Council must discharge its duties under the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012 by managing the way it deals with asbestos containing materials (ACMs) in the workplace.

The risks posed by asbestos are managed in a number of ways and require the use of a UKAS accredited consultant to carry out inspections on known or suspected ACMs, manage any remedial works where damage has occurred and manage its removal when required.

The Cabinet considered the award of a contract to the recommended supplier following the completion of a comprehensive procurement exercise.

RESOLVED:

1. That the background information set out in the report submitted be noted.
2. That, having considered the results of the procurement process (as set out in the Part 2 annex submitted as agenda item 21), the award of the contract to the supplier detailed in the Part 2 annex submitted be agreed.

Reasons for decisions:

To support the council's duty to protect its workers, visitors to its buildings, pupils etc., from the effects of asbestos and this is only possible through a risk management approach.

A full tender process, in compliance with the EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council. In addition to delivering savings compared to existing rates, the contract will also deliver an improved service with strengthened performance measures and robust contract management.

16/14 TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS - PROCUREMENT OF INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE [Items 16 and 22]

The County Council is required to manage its road network to ensure safety and to minimise congestion. Traffic Control Systems are an essential tool in achieving this. They include: traffic signals at junctions, pelican, puffin, toucan, and equestrian crossings, variable message signs, fire station "wig wags", car park counting equipment, bridge height warning (secret) signs and rising bollards.

The Cabinet considered details of the procurement process to award two separate contracts for the Inspection and Maintenance of Traffic Control Systems. These included the results of the evaluation process and how this demonstrated that the recommended contracts offered the best value for money.

The contract procurement did not relate in any way to the deployment of temporary traffic signals to safely manage traffic through road works activities. The deployment of such temporary signals was approved and coordinated by the Street Works team using powers under Surrey's New Permit Scheme

RESOLVED:

That contracts be awarded to the preferred bidders on the basis set out in the report submitted under agenda item 22 in Part 2 of the agenda.

Reasons for decision:

To support Surrey County Council's duty to inspect and maintain traffic control systems on its highway network across the county.

A full tender process for the inspection and maintenance of Traffic Control Systems, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

17/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 17]

The Cabinet received the list of delegated decisions taken by Cabinet Members since its previous meeting for information.

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting as set out in Annex 1 to the report submitted be noted.

Reasons for decisions:

To be informed of the decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

18/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 18]

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 paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

19/14 PROVISION OF EMOTIONAL WELLBEING AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES - CONTRACT ANNEX [Item 19]

The Cabinet noted and agreed the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 12.

20/14 HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES FOR SERVICE USERS [Item 20]

The Cabinet noted and agreed the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 14.

21/14 CONTRACT AWARD FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL ASBESTOS CONSULTANCY SERVICES [Item 21]

The Cabinet noted and agreed the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 15.

22/14 TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS - PROCUREMENT OF INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE [Item 22]

The Cabinet noted the financial information circulated in Part 2 in connection with agenda item 15.

23/14 PROPERTY ACQUISITION [Item 23]

The Cabinet considered the acquisition of a property to facilitate opportunities for public service integration with partners, regeneration and the provision of a site suitable for an identified service need.

RESOLVED:

1. That the freehold interest in the property be acquired on the basis set out in the report submitted.
2. That the changes to the overage provisions which had been negotiated be noted and authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration to agree any further changes to the detail of the Heads of Terms.
3. That the Chief Property Officer be instructed to develop a full business case in relation to the future use of the site on the basis set out in the report submitted.

Reason for decisions:

To facilitate opportunities for public service integration with partners, regeneration and the provision of a site suitable for an identified service need

24/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 24]

No publicity was agreed in relation to the information circulated in Part 2.

[Meeting closed at 4.20 pm]

Chairman

CABINET – 4 FEBRUARY 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members' Questions**Question (1) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:**

In December 2013 and January 2014 parts of Surrey, including parts of my own Division, suffered severe flooding involving properties being flooded, in some cases people being rescued by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service by boat, and some roads including major A roads being impassable as a result of flooding.

What action is the County Council taking to work with the Environment Agency to reduce the risk of flooding in the future by improving flood defences in flood affected parts of Surrey? What action is being taken to improve the advance warning to residents so that they can take appropriate action to safeguard themselves, their properties and belongings?

Can the County Council provide progress reports to County Councillors, including myself, whose Divisions have suffered flooding so that we can reassure local residents that action is being taken to tackle flooding in Surrey?

Reply:

The Flood and Water Management Act, introduced in 2010, made the County a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) responsible for managing the flood risk associated with surface water runoff, ordinary water courses and groundwater. These responsibilities are in addition to the duties also imposed on the council as Highway Authority.

The LLFA has a duty under the Act to:

1. Produce a local flood risk management strategy
2. Create an asset register
3. Carry out an investigation where significant flooding occurs
4. Create a Sustainable Drainage Approval Body (not yet enacted)

In these circumstances Surrey has and will continue to respond to flooding issues throughout the county providing practical support and assistance with partner organisations where possible. The council is also ensuring that flood information is obtained, maintained, shared and communicated widely with other flood risk management authorities, and internal and external stakeholders, for future reference and action where appropriate.

Following the flood events over Christmas and in the interim the council has been evaluating the data to confirm whether official 'investigations' are required at approximately 20 sites across the county where significant flooding occurred. Any individual investigation of this nature will require the involvement of all the relevant flood risk management authorities concerned in order to provide appropriate conclusions.

Planning for the response to flooding incidents is undertaken through the Surrey Local Resilience Forum, chaired by the Surrey Chief Fire Officer. Flooding is assessed as one of the three very high risks for the County and plans to support residents affected by flooding are in place and reviewed on a regular basis. Based on risk assessments provided by the Environment Agency work is currently underway to plan for the response to a 1%-5% flooding event in the Lower Thames area that could impact on approximately 15000 properties in Surrey. Planning for the response to other flood risk in the County continues.

The council's operational response to the severe weather events and emergency situation over Christmas and the New Year included officers from a variety of services, together with staff from our service provider partners who successfully delivered on the ground. Many of the individuals concerned worked throughout the holiday period and over subsequent weekends to ensure services to Surrey residents were generally maintained. I would like to acknowledge the work done by all parties and thank the individuals and services concerned.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (2) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

At the Cabinet on 17th December 2013, the Cabinet Member for Communities promised to produce the Economic Impact Figures for Surrey and by District of the Ride London Surrey 2013 Race. Could she please supply them. Also how those figures were calculated?

Reply:

Independent research carried out during the event demonstrated that it generated £13m in direct economic benefit. The research used the "eventIMPACT" methodology, the UK government-endorsed standard approach to calculating the impact of events, which takes into account expenditure by organisers and visitors. The £13m direct economic benefit is made up of the proportion of the expenditure by participants, spectators and organisers during, and in the lead up to the Prudential RideLondon FreeCycle, Prudential RideLondon Grand Prix and Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic that would not have been spent without the event.

In addition, independent research was carried out to assess the value of the national and international TV broadcast. This demonstrated that London and Surrey benefited from £21m worth of media coverage from Prudential RideLondon-Surrey Classic which would not have occurred without the event.

Unfortunately we are not able to break down this data in order to provide Surrey specific figures, however, we have asked for this to be made available for this year's event. Event organisers are also working closely with businesses along the race route to help them prepare for this year's event, to

ensure that local communities in Surrey reap the maximum economic benefit going forward.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (3) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Mole Valley District Council has agreed to "waive" their proportion of the Council Tax on those properties that were flooded in the recent storms, while the properties are empty.

Will the County Council do the same?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been working in partnership with district and borough councils to support residents throughout the recent flooding, which is still on-going in many parts of the county. On 19 February 2014 I will be meeting with all district and borough leaders to assess our response, and to discuss how we will support residents who have been affected by flooding going forward. This matter should be properly considered there.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

Question (4) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Communities tell us how much Prudential PLC is sponsoring the Prudential Ride London Surrey in both 2013 and 2014?

Reply:

Surrey County Council does not have access to this information as it is commercial and confidential to the event organisers.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (5) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Highways and the Environment give the latest updated figures for storm damage to Bridges and Other Structures from the recent Storms and Floods?

Reply:

An update on the flooding situation was provided at the meeting.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (6) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

At both the Cabinet on 17th December, and the Meeting with Councillors on 20th November. The Cabinet Member for Communities stated erroneously that in the Cabinet in December 2011, had agreed the 2013 Ride London Surrey Race. Would she re-publish the Minute and admit that she was as was pointed out at both meetings to her wrong.

Reply:

Mr Hall will be aware that the Leader and I have already answered numerous questions regarding the process for agreeing the Ride London Surrey event. In December 2013 this Cabinet agreed to host the event for the next four years, as well as approving the Surrey Cycling Strategy, after a thorough public consultation. The Cabinet has learnt lessons from the 2013 event and we are now working with event organisers and local communities along the race route to deliver an improved event for 2014.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (7) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Sir Paul Beresford MP has stated publicly that he is working with the Leader of the County Council on the issues of Flooding. Could I ask how many meetings Sir Paul has had with the Leader on this subject if any?

Reply:

The flooding experienced in Surrey since late December has been some of the worst in recent memory. In order to support residents effectively through this time it has been vital that the Council works closely with emergency services, district and boroughs and the NHS, as well as communicating regularly with local stakeholders such as MPs. As we now begin to assess our response we will continue to work with MPs, including as Sir Paul with whom I have been in contact with, to ensure that lessons are taken forward for the future.

Perhaps Mr Hall is unaware that Sir Paul has recently raised the specific issues of Mole Valley flooding on the floor of the House of Commons when addressing the DEFRA Minister. This direct action by Sir Paul demonstrates

that he is actively working with SCC, Mole Valley District Council and other agencies for the benefit of the residents in his constituency.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

Question (8) from Mr Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East) to ask:

Could the Cabinet Member for Communities explain why the Route of the Ride London Surrey 2013 was not consulted on at all? And why the Route for 2014 was published before Consultations even started in certain communities such as Leatherhead?

Reply:

As with my response to Mr Hall's previous question, the Leader and I have already answered numerous questions regarding the process for agreeing the Ride London Surrey 2013 event. My focus is now working with event organisers and local communities along the race route to deliver an improved event for 2014.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (9) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills) to ask:

Mole Valley District Council has established a hardship fund for flood victims whose insurance does not cover double council tax. Will the County Council establish a similar hardship fund to refund the County Council's part of the Council Tax for flood victims who are forced to vacate their flooded homes and to live elsewhere to avoid them having to pay Council Tax on two properties?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has been working in partnership with district and borough councils to support residents throughout the recent flooding, which is still on-going in many parts of the county. On 19 February 2014, I will be meeting with all district and borough leaders to assess our response, and to discuss how we will support residents who have been affected by flooding going forward. This matter should be properly considered there.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
4 February 2014

CABINET – 4 FEBRUARY 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions**Question (1) from Mr Michael Connolly to ask:**

With regard to the new lamp posts in Surrey Villages, especially Parsonage Lane, Westcott RH4 3NL:

- i). Why do you consider all lamp posts in Surrey (towns and villages) should be urban in style?
- ii). Why were we not consulted about the style?
- iii). Why would different lamp posts (i.e. suitable for a village) cost any more? This is a village - not Sutton or Kingston or Surbiton!
- iv). Was there an environmental impact report? For instance, why were LED lights not used (90% cheaper to run)?
- v). Why do the lights pollute the houses and the streets (more power wasted)?
- vi). Why were they replaced (they seemed to work)?
- vii). After filling Dorking with unnecessary traffic lights, are you planning to urbanise all of rural Surrey?

Reply:

- i). The style of lanterns was chosen to reflect the type of road and its use. Principally there is a lantern used for residential roads and one for traffic routes and these were selected to ensure the correct levels of lighting were achieved within each type of road. This is no different to the lights which were previously being used to replace faulty or damaged lights although it is fair to say that prior to the replacement programme, lights were often replaced on an individual basis which resulted in a variety of styles of lantern, bracket and even light colour along many of the county's roads.

There were exceptions to this, namely in conservation areas and town centres. Within these areas, if the lights being replaced were already of a "special" design, they were (or will be) replaced with a similar design – discussions have taken place with officers within the relevant district or borough council's planning, heritage, or conservation department to agree what styles would be installed.

Given that nearly 90,000 lights will have been replaced by the end of the programme it would have been impractical to have a wider variety of styles and would also have seen a significantly increased cost to the council to install a wider variety.

- ii). Discussion and consultation took place covering a number of factors within a number of groups prior to the award of the PFI contract which included councillors (individually, in select committees and sub-

committees), planning and conservation officers and representatives from the Campaign for Rural England among others.

It would not have been practical to consult all residents prior to awarding a new contract of this size.

- iii). I am not clear on the correspondent's definition of lights that would be suitable for a village. I can however advise that the special design columns used in conservation areas are considerably more expensive (ranging from £450 to over £1000 per column) compared the standard equipment installed in the majority of roads. The details of these additional costs are published on the council's website since the replacement programme started and in some cases, residents groups, parish councils and other interested parties have contributed to the cost of installing special design columns instead of the standard replacements. This option remains open to replace lights, however the council cannot bear the cost of installing additional special design lights out of its maintenance budgets.
- iv). The impact to the environment was considered and was included in the business case for replacing the lights. At the time of contract award, LED technology in street lighting was not fully proven and was in many cases not cost effective with the initial cost of the units being higher than the savings it would have generated. The council did however adopt another energy saving technology through the installation of a Central Management System. This, amongst other things, allows us to control the on/off times remotely and dim the lights in the very late evening and early morning. By dimming the new lights by 25-50% between 23.00 and 05.30 each day, the council expects to save in the region of £12m in lower energy bills and approximately 60,000 tonnes of CO2.
- v). The new lights actually reduce "light spill" compared to many of the previous lights. This is because, rather than being housed in an open glass/plastic cover, the lamp is recessed into the luminaire with a series of angled mirrors redirecting this light back downwards to the road and footpath it is intending to light. On occasion some residents do experience a unwanted light into their property – should this be the case, the residents can make a request through the council's contact centre to have a shield fitted and provided it doesn't reduce the light to the footpath or road, will be fitted free of charge.
- vi). Although individual lights worked, the volume of lights requiring replacement or expensive repairs was increasing year on year. Added to this, a significant majority of the council's street lighting columns were over 40 years old (their expected life), some being in excess of 60 years old; the result being an increased risk of structural failure. By entering into the PFI credit, the county council received support from the Department of Transport in the form of £74m funding to carry out the replacements. It also enabled the council to freeze the budget for street lighting, preventing the continuing increase.

Full details of the rationale for the new Street Lighting Service and contract can be found on the Council's website.

- vii). Traffic signals for road junctions and pedestrian crossing facilities are needed in Dorking for pedestrian safety and to enable traffic to flow around the town. We monitor the functionality and reliability of these signals regularly to ensure they operate to maximum efficiency. Any new proposed signals in more rural areas of Surrey will only be commissioned where a specific need is identified, usually by locally elected representatives.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
4 February 2014

Question (2) from Mr Tim Jones to ask:

Following Kay Hammonds statement at the Communities Select Committee meeting in January, where she said that "she had listened to the concerns of the Spelthorne residents, about the NEED for two appliances stationed in Spelthorne and that Option 5 was a result of her listening to those concerns," will she (and the Senior Management of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service) state, categorically, that they GUARANTEE, that they WILL provide a RELIABLE, COMPETENT, On-call crew 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, albeit with the understanding that this is unlikely to be achieved 100% of the time, but they will GUARANTEE that if the availability drops below 90% (the stated success rate of Cranleigh's first appliance), they will recognise that Option 5 is NOT a feasible option and WILL reinstate 2 full time, wholetime appliances?

Reply:

On a daily basis Surrey Fire and Rescue Service seeks to ensure that it delivers the right balance of services to people and communities across Surrey. This includes community fire prevention work, community fire protection advice to businesses with enforcement where necessary and responding to incidents, some of which are emergencies. Today's Fire and Rescue Service does much more work to prevent fires and other emergencies from arising through a variety of initiatives and important work with other partners and agencies whilst at the same time ensuring that it has the right people with the right skills and the right equipment to respond to incidents wherever and whenever they arise. In support of that the Fire and Rescue Service already has an agreed competency based framework and assurance regime for all uniformed staff (full-time and On-call) which is well established and effective.

The establishment of the On-call unit at the new fire station will require the community and other stakeholders to work closely and diligently with the Fire and Rescue Service to achieve the right people who are consistently capable of delivering the variety of community emergency prevention work which is central to the community risk reduction activity of today's Fire and Rescue Service, as well as responding to incidents. By recruiting the right people and employing them on a part-time basis using the new On-Call contracts – ostensibly an orthodox part-time job with time-slots that must be fulfilled - the Service seeks, so far as is reasonably practicable, to achieve a reliable service 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. There will of course always be

factors that mean that fire appliances are not available 100% of the time due to operational commitments, training commitments or vehicle maintenance schedules, for example. Nevertheless, by attracting people from the local community who are willing to play their part in delivering a wide range of fire and rescue services in Spelthorne and Surrey we will maximise the availability of the On-call appliance which will have a initial target for operational availability of 90% - the Service decides on a constant basis how to continue to achieve its target attendance standard in all areas of the County which can be achieved by a variety of means e.g. moving fire engines and crews to different locations informed by operational intelligence

Should an On-call unit not be secured in the way described we have made it clear that the alternative option is to locate one whole-time fire engine at one location, which was the original proposal.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

Question (3) from Mr Jeremey Spencer to ask:

Would the fire authority please advise what the annual spend on fire crews based in Spelthorne would be if option 5 is approved (ie one wholetime fire appliance and one on-call fire appliance) and advise how that compares with the total annual fire budget for 2013/14. This can then be compared with the number of rate payers in Spelthorne compared with the rest of Surrey to determine how heavily Spelthorne will be subsidising fire cover for the rest of Surrey?

Reply:

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service provide a county wide response to the communities of Surrey. If 10 fire appliances are required for a fire in or outside of Spelthorne, costs are not apportioned and money does not move either way. We have 35 frontline fire appliances, 2 of which are located in Spelthorne. Under Option 5, 2 fire appliances will continue to be located in Spelthorne and will continue to meet the agreed attendance standard all things being equal, whilst securing £880,000 as a part contribution to the revenue savings target allocated to fire and rescue under the Medium Term Financial Plan.

This is being taken as part of a rationalisation of fire and emergency cover to achieve the agreed attendance standard and providing a balanced level of county wide service provision within a given total budget. Therefore the network of fire stations is being configured to provide the requisite assurance of achieving the response standard, acknowledging that incident numbers and types have reduced by a significant degree, that the risk profile still exists and that the prevention and protection work will remain a high priority to support the management of that risk. This will be supported by appropriate response resources in neighbouring boroughs and districts and will provide a suitable and sufficient presence to assure local, sub-regional, regional and national responsibilities when the Service is looked at as a whole.

The majority of the “annual spend” in Spelthorne comprises revenue costs (staff wages). To staff one whole-time 24/7 fire engine at one fire station costs £1.05million per annum. The current costs for Spelthorne with Sunbury and Staines fire stations amount to £2.1million per annum. By contrast the cost per annum of staffing one 24/7 On-call fire appliance is in the order of £170,000. Therefore the total “annual spend” under option 5 will be £1,220,000 per annum on staff in Spelthorne. The total annual budget for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service for the year 2013/14 was set at £45,752,000.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO FIRE SERVICE PETITION

“Keep both of our fire stations open in Spelthorne”

Presented on behalf of ‘Save our Services in Surrey’

RESPONSE

The consultation undertaken by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service provided valuable information with regard to the views of the people who responded to the surveys or who attended the meetings. Having considered the comments Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has considered and put forward another option in order to address the concerns expressed by Spelthorne residents and local leaders and which is now referred to as option 5 in the paper placed before the Communities Select Committee.

Option 5 suggests a new centrally located fire station with two fire engines, one 24/7 whole-time crewed fire engine and one 24/7 fire engine staffed by people who are on-call (part-time staff who are available on a pager system from their home, a place of work or from within a certain time of the fire station) from the local community and who are trained to the same standards as whole-time staff. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service already operate this type of duty system in other parts of the county, for example, at Walton and Guildford. Under this option 18 new, local jobs would be created and would be recruited from within a 4-5 minute response footprint of the new location. As part time workers they would then commit to being available at least 54 hours each week.

This option provides the community with two fire engines which will support the provision of fire cover across the county not just the borough of Spelthorne. It will also provide the communities of Spelthorne with an opportunity to work with the Fire Service to continue to reduce the risk from fire and other incidents through community fire prevention work which is a key role of today’s Fire Service.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS TRAINING

That the Cabinet Member for Business Services consider the need for internal training for Surrey County Council employees, in order to prevent discrimination against staff and residents with mental health difficulties.

I welcome the recommendation to promote mental and emotional well-being in the workplace and put an end to the stigma and discrimination that people with mental health problems can face. I consider our internal training adequate for our employers, in order to prevent discrimination against staff and residents with mental health difficulties. As well as supporting Time to change Surrey¹ we have in place a number of programmes and are developing new ones. These are:

1. **Manager Masterclasses “ Supporting mental and emotional Well-being“**

A 90 minute Manager Masterclass called ‘supporting mental and emotional well-being’ was launched on 8 Jan 2014. There are four 90 minute masterclasses per day, over 6 days, from February to March 2014 in multiple locations. They are delivered by Santia (our occupational health provider) and Workplace Options (our employee assistance programme provider). Up to 20 managers can attend each workshop, so in total up to 480 can attend. We can roll this out further from April 2014. There will be a strong emphasis on spotting early signs, early support and creating workplace environments that support mental well-being. As of 29 January 2014, 180 managers and supervisors have pre-booked.

2. **E-Learning**

We are putting together a mental health awareness e-learning package. We are using embedded video from Time To Change, MIND, Mindful Employers² and Re-Think³, using actual clips of people with mental health problems, to make the offer more powerful.

3. **Equality and inclusion matters training**

This is mandatory one day training for all new staff. Also, refresher

¹ **Time to Change Surrey** – Campaign to tackle discrimination, stigma and inequalities in mental health services

² **Mindful Employer** – National Campaign for employers to sign up to action that supports a healthy workforce

³ **Re-think** - Rethink Mental Illness helps millions of people affected by mental illness by challenging attitudes and changing lives.

sessions are available. On average 4-6 sessions are delivered per month and there is coverage of mental health awareness. These sessions have been delivered since 2010 and are regularly refreshed.

4. Reasonable adjustments and flexible working training for managers (Institute of Leadership and Management accredited)

Covers mental health conditions and supporting staff with various challenges. Has been delivered since 2010.

5. Time To Change – Employer Health Checks – Engagement Study

The council has been successful in becoming part of a national study, with 49 other organisations in a comprehensive study and review of their performance, in relation to mental health in the workplace. A Time To Change consultant will work with the Council for 3 months, using a survey, interviews and desktop research, to produce a comprehensive report, identifying current and future improvements.

6. ‘Flashpoint’: Interactive drama training

It is intended to roll out a programme of drama workshops which illustrate the impact of stigma and discrimination. The forum theatre style enables participants to re-direct the script to enable more positive outcomes for the characters. Rollout, delivery and funding options are currently being discussed.

7. Mental Health Awareness (multi-agency training)

Aimed at anybody who works with people who may be at risk of developing symptoms of depression, anxiety or any other mental illness, or anyone interested in learning about mental health and emotional well-being.

8. Mental Health Awareness and Improving Wellbeing at Work (multi-agency training)

A further mental health awareness programme has been developed as a joint training venture by Surrey CC as part of their Time to Change campaign in collaboration with the First Steps⁴ team and Employment Support Retraining Agency.

9. SADAS Substance Misuse and Mental Health Programme (multi-agency training)

An exciting programme of modules in the Guildford area facilitated by the Southern Addictions Advisory Service (SADAS)⁵ and their partners

⁴ **First Steps** – Universal primary care access to mental health services

⁵ **Southern Addictions Advisory Service (SADAS)** - Southern Addictions Advisory Service are an organisation dedicated to improving the lives of drug and alcohol users and people with mental health problems by providing different services to meet needs

aimed at health and social care staff, mental health staff, emergency services personnel, volunteers and all those whose work brings them into contact with people who may have mental health or substance abuse issues in Surrey.

I believe we have an excellent workforce whose values are consistent with the aims of the County Council but we need to ensure that all directorates are aware of, and avail themselves of the training that tackles inequalities discrimination and stigma within the council.

Ms Denise Le Gal
Cabinet Member for Business Services
4 February 2014

CABINET RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

**CHANGES TO FIRE ENGINE DEPLOYMENT IN THE BOROUGH OF
SPELTHORNE**

Communities Select Committee recommends the inclusion of option 5 for the Cabinet report for 4 February 2014.

Response

I would like to thank the Communities Select Committee for the scrutiny that they applied to this paper. I also note the key points that were discussed which demonstrates the diligence that was applied by the Committee in allowing the inclusion of option 5 for the Cabinet report. I will ensure that this option is now presented to Cabinet on 4 February 2014 for their decision.

**Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
4 February 2014**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2014 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr John Furey
*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)	*Mr Michael Gosling
*Mrs Mary Angell	*Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Helyn Clack	Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr Mel Few	*Mr Tony Samuels

Cabinet Associates:

*Mr Steve Cosser	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Clare Curran	Mr Mike Goodman

* = Present

[Prior to the start of the meeting, the Leader of the Council made an urgent statement in relation to the flooding in Surrey – Appendix 1]

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

25/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Denise Le Gal and Mike Goodman.

26/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 4 FEBRUARY 2014 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

27/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

28/14 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

The Leader of the Council said that the report re. the Schools Expansion Programme from September 2014 (item 11) had been amended to remove references to St John the Baptist School because the decisions on this school have been withdrawn from this meeting and therefore item 22 has also been withdrawn.

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were none.

29/14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

One question has been received from Mr Sawyer, Vice-Chairman of Banstead Village Residents Association. The question and the response was tabled and is attached as Appendix 2.

30/14 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

No petitions were received.

31/14 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

No representations were received.

32/14 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There were none.

33/14 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2015 FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES [Item 6]

Following the statutory consultation on proposed changes to Surrey's admission arrangements for September 2015, Cabinet was asked to consider the responses and make recommendations to the County Council on admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and Surrey's coordinated schemes for September 2015.

The report covered the following areas in relation to school admissions:

- Auriol Junior School (Stoneleigh, Ewell) - Recommendation 1
- Reigate Priory School (Reigate) – Recommendation 2
- St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 3
- Meadowcroft Infant School (Chertsey) and St Ann's Heath Junior School (Virginia Water) – Recommendation 4
- Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools (Thames Ditton) – Recommendation 5
- Admission criteria for two year olds applying for nursery - Recommendation 6
- Esher CofE High School (Esher) – Recommendation 7
- St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School (Farnham) – Recommendation 8
- Published Admission Number for Year 3 at The Dawnay School (Great Bookham) – Recommendation 9
- Published Admission Number for Reception at North Downs Primary School (Brockham) – Recommendation 10
- Own admission authority schools to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 11
- Out of County schools not to be used in the assessment of 'nearest school' – Recommendation 12

- Published Admission Numbers for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 13
- Admission arrangements for other community and voluntary controlled schools – Recommendation 14
- Coordinated Admissions Schemes – Recommendation 15

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning presented the report and said it was a complex and lengthy report. She highlighted the proposed arrangements for Reigate Priory School (recommendation 2) and the proposals for Esher High School, which would be subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to their admission arrangements (recommendation 7).

Cabinet Members were given an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

The Leader of the Council asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, who confirmed that the Equalities Impact Assessment was comprehensive.

He also reminded Members that these recommendations would be considered by the County Council at its meeting on 18 March 2014.

Finally, he thanks the Principal Manager Admissions and Transport (Strategy) and her team for an excellent report.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

Recommendation 1

That a feeder link is introduced for Auriol Junior School for children attending The Mead Infant School for September 2015, as follows:

- | | |
|----|---|
| a) | Looked after and previously looked after children |
| b) | Exceptional social/medical need |
| c) | Children attending The Mead Infant School |
| d) | Siblings not admitted under c) above |
| e) | Any other children |

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other schools which have a feeder link and reciprocal sibling links
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within close proximity
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There was overall support for this proposal
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at The Mead Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Auriol Junior School

Recommendation 2

That tiered sibling criteria are introduced for Reigate Priory for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings in to the same school, this would only apply if it is not their nearest school
- The pressure on places means that on balance a greater disadvantage might be caused to local families than to future siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- There was overall support for this proposal
- It reduces the likelihood of local families having to travel to schools that are further away

Recommendation 3

That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children attending Meadowcroft Infant School for September 2015, in addition to the existing feeder link with Trumps Green Infant School, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School or Meadowcroft Infant School
- e) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Meadowcroft Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to St Ann's Heath Junior School

Recommendation 4

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Meadowcroft Infant School and St Ann's Heath Junior School for September 2015 so that these schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools with agreed links
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 5

That a reciprocal sibling link is introduced between Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools for September 2015 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school
- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 6

That criteria for admission to nursery for two year olds who are eligible for the free extended provision are introduced for September 2015, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children who will have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
- d) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for clear, fair and transparent criteria
- The criteria are consistent to those used for other years of entry
- They are lawful and comply with the School Admissions Code

- They will enable parents to understand how places will be allocated at nurseries which choose to admit children at two years old
- It supports the Government's agenda of extending free nursery provision to families on low income

Recommendation 7

That, subject to Hinchley Wood School also agreeing changes to admission arrangements as they have proposed, the catchment area for Esher CofE High School is extended for September 2015 to include the whole of Claygate village.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides for families in Claygate to have a greater opportunity of being offered a local Surrey school
- It coincides with an increase in PAN at Esher High thereby minimising the impact on other families applying for Esher High
- There was overwhelming support for this proposal
- This proposal is linked to a separate proposal by Hinchley Wood School to extend its catchment area and to introduce feeder links which, if not introduced in line with this proposal, would lead to an untenable increase in applications for Esher High. This recommendation is therefore conditional on the changes at Hinchley Wood being agreed before this recommendation is ratified by Full Council
- If Esher High School becomes an Academy on 1 March 2014, before ratification of the recommendation by Full Council, the school's Governing Body will need to ratify the recommendation of Cabinet in order to ensure the admission arrangements have been lawfully determined

Recommendation 8

That admission priority based on a catchment is introduced for St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School for September 2015 so that, after siblings, children who live within the published catchment area for the school would receive priority for a place ahead of those who do not, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children living within the catchment area of St Andrew's CofE Infant School
- e) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It helps to support the future viability of this school
- It provides for a joined up approach to admissions in the area of Farnham
- It helps to protect the existing feeder link from St Andrew's to South Farnham School
- It is supported by the Governing Body of St Andrew's CofE (Controlled) Infant School as it is recognised that this is a step towards formalising the links between these schools

Recommendation 9

That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for The Dawnay is decreased from 30 to 15 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will provide for a better use of resources within the school
- It will reduce the impact of in year admissions on the school
- It will not lead to a pressure on school places because the number will better reflect numbers on roll
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 10

That the Reception Published Admission Number for North Downs Primary School is decreased from 64 to 60 for September 2015.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It will enable the school to meet its duty with regard to infant class size legislation
- It will enable the school to optimise the most efficient use of its sites
- It will reflect the number that the school is working to maintain after the initial offers are made
- School Commissioning and the school support this change

Recommendation 11

That Bishop Wand CofE School, Saint Ignatius Roman Catholic School and St Andrew's Catholic School are added to the list of own admission authority schools which will be considered to admit local children when assessing nearest school for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that there will be a consistent approach in selecting schools which will be taken in to account when assessing 'nearest school' when applying the admission arrangements of community and voluntary controlled schools
- It ensures that there is equity in the application of admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools County wide

Recommendation 12

That Camelsdale Primary School in West Sussex is discounted for the purpose of applying the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools in Surrey.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It ensures that families who live nearer to Camelsdale Primary School but who are unlikely to be offered a place there will not be disadvantaged in their applications for their nearest community Surrey school
- It is consistent with the approach taken with other out of County schools for which Surrey parents are generally unsuccessful based on catchment

Recommendation 13

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2015 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1, of the submitted report, which include the following changes:

- i. Bell Farm Primary School – removal of Junior PAN
- ii. Bishop David Brown – increase in PAN from 120 to 150
- iii. Esher High School – increase in PAN from 210 to 240
- iv. Holmesdale Community Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- v. The Hythe Community Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- vi. Manorcroft Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 58 to 60
- vii. Meath Green Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 70 to 90
- viii. Onslow Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix. St Ann’s Heath Junior - increase in Junior PAN from 64 to 90
- x. St Mary’s C of E (VC) Infant – increase in Reception PAN from 25 to 30
- xi. Stamford Green Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where a decrease in PAN is proposed the decrease has already been agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school
- Where increases in PAN are proposed the schools are increasing their intake to respond to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2014 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 14

That the remaining aspects of Surrey’s admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2015, for which no consultation was required, are agreed as set out in Appendix 1 and its Annexes, of the submitted report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey’s parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The existing arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey’s sustainability policies

Recommendation 15

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2015/16 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2015 are similar to 2014
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

34/14 CHANGES TO FIRE ENGINE DEPLOYMENT IN THE NORTH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for Community Services invited the Cabinet Associate for Fire and Rescue Services to introduce the report. She began by saying that the changes to fire deployment in Reigate and Banstead would have some impact on Epsom and Ewell.

She reminded Cabinet that, in March 2013, they had approved Surrey Fire and Rescue Service's (SFRS) proposal to operate a chain of single fire engine stations running through the boroughs of Epsom and Ewell (E&E) and Reigate and Banstead (R&B).

Part of the plan was to create a new fire station within the Burgh Heath area. However, no site has been found in this area and therefore Cabinet was being asked to approve the provision of a new fire station within a wider area (a three mile radius) around Burgh Heath. Until a permanent site is identified SFRS intend to relocate to a temporary location within the same area, which would still deliver an improvement in the response standard. This is in order to enable SFRS to meet its response targets, which have become an operational imperative due to a reduction in the reliability of the fire cover in that part of the County due in part to London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority closing Purley Fire Station for a period of 18-24 months from summer 2014.

She also drew attention to paragraph 34 of the report, which stated that there would be continued engagement with the relevant committee in Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead. Referring to the Equalities Impact Assessment and the impact of the proposals on people with protected characteristics, she confirmed that modelling had predicted slightly longer response times but they were still within the Surrey Response Standard.

Finally, she tabled a small amendment to recommendation (3), inserting 'interim' before Strategic Director Adult Social Care and adding in, 'in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services'.

RESOLVED (as amended):

That the following proposals be proposed:

Officers should identify and deliver a permanent site for a single fire engine station within a three miles radius of Burgh Heath, to serve the north of Reigate and Banstead.

Until such time as a permanent site is available, to relocate the second fire engine from Epsom to a temporary fire station within the same geographical area, to deliver improvements against the Surrey Response Standard.

Authority be delegated to the Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, to assess the options to relocate the second fire engine from Epsom and to identify an available location which meets the requirements identified in this report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The relocation of a fire engine into the proposed area will secure improvements against the county wide Surrey response standard. Whilst it may not be the optimal location this still delivers improvements against the response standard to meet the operational imperative that is compounded by the reduction in the provision of fire cover due to the temporary removal by London Fire Brigade of Purley's fire appliance. The fire station is being refurbished from summer 2014 and the fire engine is being moved further away to Mitcham which will have a detrimental impact on response times when requests are made by SFRS under section 13 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004.

It provides an opportunity to work with Blue light partners and other agencies to collocate to further integrate service provision and share information to generate efficiencies through shared spaces and networking.

35/14 SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH [Item 8]

The Deputy Leader said that the Cabinet had agreed in February 2013 the importance of promoting Economic Growth in Surrey and he was proud of the role of the County Council in it. He highlighted some of the measures that would help businesses to grow and succeed:

- The apprenticeship scheme for Surrey businesses, which had resulted in the creation of more than 500 apprenticeship places
- The rollout of a county wide high speed broadband network
- 60% of county council spend with local small and medium sized enterprises that had resulted in almost £1m per day being spent with local companies
- A major programme of road schemes

He also referred to the Surrey Employment and Skills Board which was established in April 2013 and the Local Transport Bodies.

He said that Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) were expected to take a lead role in the day to day management of the European Structural and Investment Fund for 2014 – 2020 programme and he referred to the funding opportunities through the Local Growth Deals.

A summary of draft Strategic Economic Plans for Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3 were attached as Annexes to the report.

Finally, he tabled an amendment to recommendation (3), adding in 'either the Leader or' before the Deputy Leader.

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. That Surrey businesses be congratulated on their success in achieving significant economic growth in recent years, which means that the gross value added of the Surrey economy is now in excess of £32 billion a year.
2. That the progress made with both of the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), of which Surrey is a member, in making the case for additional investment in the county be noted and that the Deputy Leader, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment, should agree the final Strategic Economic Plans for both LEPs in accordance with the approach set out in this report.
3. That the county council be represented by either the Leader or the Deputy Leader in the proposed new local authority governance arrangements for Enterprise M3 (EM3) and Coast to Capital (C2C) Local Enterprise Partnerships.
4. That the financial implications of the ongoing work with Local Enterprise Partnerships, including the potential to secure additional funding for transport and infrastructure schemes and for skills development given that the LEPs are intending to bid for £850-£950 million for the period 2015-2021 be noted.
5. That it be noted the Surrey Connects Board are currently considering a range of options for their future operation and that decisions on any financial and organisational changes that are needed in the county council, once that consideration is concluded, should be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure in discussion with the Deputy Leader
6. That the arrangements for enhancing collaboration with district and borough councils, including potential areas for joint working to secure additional benefits across the whole of Surrey be noted.
7. That an all member workshop on economic growth and the Local Enterprise Partnerships be held in March 2014.

Reasons for Decisions:

The approach set out in this report will assist the Council in achieving the 'Confident in our Future' Corporate Strategy 2014-19 (as agreed by Cabinet on 4 February 2014 and by full Council on 11 February 2014), which includes a specific priority to make Surrey's economy strong and competitive. In particular, it will support the council in its efforts to secure additional investment in Surrey, more flexibility to meet the distinct needs of the county and more joint working with boroughs and districts to promote economic growth. Additional investment in strategic and local infrastructure, in skills and in employment and business support will help to promote economic growth across the county, maintain the quality of life for residents and develop Surrey's already very strong offer as a place to do business.

36/14 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 9]

The Leader of the Council presented the Council's financial position at the end of period 10 (January) of the 2013/14 financial year and said that the Council's financial strategy had four key drivers to ensure sound governance in managing finances and providing value for money:

(1) Keep any additional call on the council taxpayer to a minimum

- That there had been a £1.1m improvement on the revenue forecast since December and the forecast was for a £2.1m underspending. The improvement would have been greater but for the additional costs faced in tackling the flooding
- This was the fourth consecutive year that the council had a small underspending.

(2) Continuously drive the efficiency agenda

- At the end of January, services were making good progress in delivering efficiencies and forecast achieving over £61m on-going savings for the full year against a stretch target of £68m savings
- Underspends had been identified and delivered by services to cover the shortfall this year.

(3) Develop a funding strategy to reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and government grant income.

- Reducing reliance on government grants and council tax was key to the Council's ability to balance budgets in the longer term. Significant in the Council's ability to achieve this was the Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund. By year end it was forecast that over £59m would have been invested, and net income of £700,000 generated by the end of this year. Rental savings could also total over £1m over the next 10 years.

(4) Continue to maximise our investment in Surrey

- The council's capital programme not only improved and maintained service delivery, it was also a way of investing in Surrey and of generating income for the council. This year the budget was £224m.
- Finally, he said that, in addition to the £59m capital investment in assets, it was estimated that £193m would be invested in service delivery, from improving roads to the creation of more school places. However, with any large capital project there would be some delays with planning issues and archaeological finds.

Other Cabinet Members were invited to highlight the key points and issues from their portfolios, as set out in the annex to the report.

Cabinet Members also thanked all staff who had worked tirelessly, and often outside normal working hours, during the recent flooding emergency.

RESOLVED:

1. That the forecast revenue budget for 2013/14 to underspend by £2.1m on services, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 1) of the submitted report, be noted.
2. That the forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end were £61.3m, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 79) of the submitted report, be noted.
3. That the forecast capital expenditure and investment of £232.6m against a budget of £224.7m, as set out in the Appendix (paragraphs 83 to 89) of the submitted report be noted.
4. That the transfer of £2m from increased business rates and government grants to the Budget Equalisation Reserve for supporting future years' budgets, as set out in the Appendix (paragraph 62 and 67) of the submitted report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

To comply with the agreed strategy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

37/14 FORMATION OF WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Community Services said that she was delighted to present the report for the proposal of a Joint Committee of Surrey County Council (SCC) and Woking Borough Council (WBC) which would be the first of its kind to be established in Surrey.

Both Surrey County Council's Cabinet and County Council approval was needed to establish the Joint Committee, to agree to delegate recommended functions to the committee and to agree the Constitution and Standing Orders under which this committee would operate. Woking Borough Council had sought approval from its own Executive and Full Council earlier in February.

She highlighted the possibility of deciding that representatives from the voluntary sector may be co-opted onto the joint committee. She also said that the Chairmanship of the committee would be a County Council appointment but the Vice-Chairmanship would be a Borough appointment.

Functions jointly delegated by Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council were also set out within the report.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- It was a good example of partnership in practice and a good template to take forward
- Other Districts and Boroughs should be encouraged to follow and establish joint committees
- The joint committee would enable greater local accountability and residents would be more involved in decision making

- Encourage Woking to act as its local Health and Well Being Board and oversee and set priorities for general health and wellbeing matters within the framework of Surrey's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- The joint committee had the full support of Woking Borough Council
- No substitutes would be permitted for both County and Borough Members
- A belief that this could be a template that could be used throughout two-tier Government

Cabinet Members publically thanked the Programme Manager and Lead Manager for Community Safety and Partnership and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and their teams for their hard work in formulating the arrangements for the Woking Joint Committee. They also acknowledged the role that the Leader of Woking Borough Council had played in supporting the proposals.

In putting the recommendations to the vote, the Leader of the Council said that he hoped for all-party support for these proposals when the item was considered at County Council on 18 March 2014.

RESOLVED:

1. To recommend to County Council the establishment of a Woking Joint Committee to deal with both executive and non-executive functions from 1 June 2014 in place of the current Local Committee in Woking which will cease to function from that date.
2. To agree (as set out in Annex A of the submitted report):
 - that the current Local Committee executive functions be delegated to the Woking Joint Committee
 - that the Surrey County Council element of the new joint SCC/WBC executive functions be delegated to the Joint Committee
 - to recommend to Council that the current non-executive functions delegated to the Local Committee be delegated to the Woking Joint Committee
 - that the advisory functions that will come under the remit of the Woking Joint Committee be agreed.
3. That the functions that Woking Borough Council has delegated to the Woking Joint Committee, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report, be noted.
4. That the Woking Joint Committee Constitution, including the Standing Orders under which it will operate, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report be agreed, and authority be delegated to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to agree to any minor amendments to the Constitution which may be required.
5. To recommend that Council agrees to the relevant changes to the County Council's Constitution to enable the Joint Committee to be established and become operational, as set out in Annex B of the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions:

Cabinet and Full Council agreement is required to establish a Working Joint Committee in place of the current Local Committee arrangements; to delegate recommended executive functions to the newly formed Working Joint Committee; and to agree the new Constitution and Standing Orders under which the newly formed committee will operate.

The new Joint Committee will simplify and speed-up local decision making processes, enabling for the first time, all functions and budgets delegated to it by both authorities to be jointly decided upon.

38/14 SCHOOLS EXPANSION PROGRAMME FROM SEPTEMBER 2014 [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that there was significant demand for new school places within Runnymede and there was an opportunity to increase provision at Lyne and Longcross Infant School to meet demand for primary school places in this area.

This expansion was also supported by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning and the Headteacher, Governors and parents of this school.

RESOLVED:

That the expansion of Lyne and Longcross Infant School, as detailed in the submitted report, and subject to the consideration and approval of the detailed financial information for the school as set out in Part 2 of this agenda (item 21) be approved and that Lyne and Longcross Infant School (increase by 120 places to 210 places) and the school change from an infant to a primary school.

Reasons for Decisions:

The scheme is essential to meeting basic need in Surrey. The scheme delivers a value for money expansion to the school, which supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide additional school places for local children in Surrey. The individual project and building works are in accordance with the planned timetables required for delivery of the new accommodation at the school.

39/14 EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that this report sought approval to extend the Grant Agreement for Welfare Benefits Advice, Information and Support for two years from 1 April 2014.

A one year grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support was awarded in April 2013 after a competitive bidding process. The agreement included the option of extending for a further two years, which he was recommending to Cabinet.

He also referred to the case studies, attached as Annex 1 and which illustrated the benefits of this advice and support.

Finally, he proposed a small amendment to recommendation (2) – deleting 'should' and adding 's' to remain.

The Leader of the Council said that the provision of this service was important and referred to the Equality and Diversity and the Corporate Parent / Looked After Children implications set out in the report.

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. That the grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support be extended for two additional years from 1 April 2014.
2. That the service remains with the current lead provider Surrey Disabled People's Partnership (SDPP) on behalf of the "getWIS£" consortium.

Reason for Decisions:

There is a continuing demand from residents of Surrey for advice, information and support about welfare benefits especially with regard to changes as a result of the Welfare Reform Act (2012). From 1 April 2013, the providers have seen 1,448 people and helped them claim £940,416 of benefits they were entitled to.

40/14 BLOCK CONTRACT WITH HILLCREST CARE FOR 20 INDEPENDENT FOSTERING PLACEMENTS [Item 13]

In presenting this report, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families said that the County Council had a statutory duty to provide suitable alternative accommodation for children that become Looked After either under Section 20 or 31 of the Children Act 1989 and as part of this provision Surrey County Council (SCC) had a block contract for 20 placements with Hillcrest Care Services Ltd (Hillcrest).

In 2013 Procurement and Commissioning reviewed the contract with Hillcrest and assessed the options regarding future delivery (beyond March 2014). Thorough review of the contract as well as future commissioning intentions resulted in a recommendation that a new 3-year contract was awarded to Hillcrest because this was the best option and there would be no disruption to children receiving this care.

Finally, she drew attention to the comprehensive Equalities Impact Assessment attached to the report.

RESOLVED:

That a new contract be awarded to Hillcrest for three years from 1 April 2014 until 31 March 2017.

Reasons for Decisions:

Surrey County Council commissions its other IFA requirements through a Regional Framework Contract with 11 South East Local Authorities. This requirement was tendered in 2011/12. The Framework Contract started on 1 April 2012 and is due to end on 31 March 2017.

Under the Block Contract with Hillcrest, SCC pays one of the lowest rates for IFA placements in the South East of England. The Council is seeking to continue this best value arrangement until the Regional IFA Framework contract comes to an end. An award of a 3-year contract to Hillcrest will mean that both contractual arrangements for IFA placements will be aligned. This will allow a full option analysis to be carried out with Children's Services and Children's Commissioning and development of the placement strategy for the entire area of Looked After Children services.

41/14 ICELANDIC BANK DEPOSIT [Item 14]

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Business Services, the Leader of the Council presented the report which concerned the outcome of the sale of the priority claim of the Council as a Landsbanki depositor/creditor.

He made the following amendments to the report:

- (i) Paragraph (9) of the report: **Delete** consultation with the Chairman of the County Council and **replace with** the Chairman of Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- (ii) What Happens Next: Add in: 'Landsbanki' so it now reads:

Officers to close the **Landsbanki** accounts with regard to the sale transaction and write off irrecoverable balance to the Financial Investments Reserve.

Members were confident that the £1.6m relating to Glitnir would be paid in full at a future date and agreed that this was a successful outcome. They complimented finance officers, and in particular the Strategic Finance Officer, for their efforts in pursuing this claim.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the overall position be noted.
- (2) That the successful outcome with regard to the sale of the £10m Landsbanki investment be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

Given recent developments within Iceland and the LGA collective negotiation offer, as well as the underlying uncertainty that existed with regard to full repayment of its claim, the Council needed to fully consider the available offers by interested third parties to buy out its claim in Landsbanki. To enable

this, the Council authorised the LGA to negotiate on its behalf and concluded a successful outcome.

42/14 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS [Item 15]

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that currently, both Surrey County Council (SCC) and the National Health Service (NHS) in Surrey entered into contracts with providers of paediatric therapy services in Surrey to provide services to Surrey children with special educational needs and disabilities who attended Surrey schools.

The provider organisations were Virgin Care Services Limited (VCSL) and Central Surrey Health Limited (CSHL). The County Council and the NHS in Surrey had agreed to move as soon as possible to a joint commissioning arrangement.

As the SCC contracts terminate on 31 March 2014 and the NHS contracts terminate on 31 March 2017, April 2017 is the agreed date to commence joint commissioning.

She also proposed an amendment to Recommendation (2), adding after April 2016:

‘taking advantage of a break clause in both contracts which enables early termination.’

In his capacity as Local Authority Governor of the Abbey School, the Chairman of the Council was invited to address Cabinet. He said that the provision of speech and language therapy for special schools was critical and this report was welcomed. He hoped that the joint commissioning would come to fruition and asked that during the negotiation of the contracts that the pay and conditions for staff be addressed to ensure consistency.

Finally, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment and said that in Surrey there were over 5000 children and young people with Special Educational Needs statements.

[The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board abstained from this item]

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. That new contracts be awarded until 2017 under newly agreed terms from 2014 with Virgin Care Services Limited (VCSL) and Central Surrey Health Limited (CSHL) a Surrey-based social enterprise, whilst joint commissioning arrangements are agreed with the NHS.
2. Milestones be agreed to enable early action to be taken before 2017 if a joint commissioning framework cannot be agreed with the NHS. These milestones will be measured and will inform the decision on whether this service should be re-tendered earlier than 2017. If a joint commissioning framework cannot be agreed with the NHS by April 2015, the service will be re-tendered and new contracts will be awarded

from April 2016, taking advantage of a break clause in both contracts which enables early termination.

Reasons for Decisions:

Although commissioned by two organisations (Surrey County Council and the NHS), as far as the child or young person at Surrey's maintained Special Schools is concerned, they are accessing one service. If Surrey County Council (SCC) were to re-tender this service alone, it could potentially mean that two different providers would be going into the same school. This could cause disruption and dissatisfaction to our vulnerable service users.

Significant progress has been made with the NHS over the last six months, with agreement from the Health and Wellbeing Board to establish joint commissioning arrangements in Surrey for the delivery of paediatric therapies.

For joint commissioning to take place our contract arrangements with providers need to be aligned, therefore the recommendation is that new contracts should be awarded until 2017 in line with termination of NHS block contracts with the same providers.

This will enable SCC and the NHS to jointly commission the delivery of paediatric therapy services in Surrey providing single and equitable outcomes focused services for children and young people.

Tendering at this stage would not support the local authority's aim to agree joint commissioning arrangements with the NHS to deliver the paediatric therapy service in Surrey. The current shared commissioning arrangements for this service means that contracting with new providers may only add confusion and further dissatisfaction to our service users. By using the same providers as the NHS, SCC has been able to secure competitive rates for these services. Running a competitive process would not necessarily remove the existing contractors from the service delivery as it is likely that they would win the tenders or parts of the tenders.

Improving the management of the contract will still go ahead with the existing providers and it avoids the variable performance in services that is sometimes experienced by end-users when a new contractor mobilises at the start of a new contract.

43/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 16]

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

44/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]

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 paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

PART TWO – IN PRIVATE

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BUSINESS WERE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE BY THE CABINET. SET OUT BELOW IS A PUBLIC SUMMARY OF THE DECISIONS TAKEN.

45/14 EXTENSION OF GRANT AGREEMENT FOR WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care drew Cabinet's attention to the competitive tendering process and the scoring results of this confidential annex to item 12.

RESOLVED:

That the grant agreement for the provision of Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support, with Surrey Disabled Partnership (SDPP) be extended for an additional two years from 1 April 2014.

Reasons for Decisions:

The existing grant agreement will expire on 31 March 2014.

46/14 BLOCK CONTRACT HILLCREST CARE FOR 20 INDEPENDENT FOSTERING PLACEMENTS [Item 19]

This item was the confidential annex for the Block Contract with Hillcrest Care, which detailed the Financial and Value for Money implications and the recommendation and reasons for decision were set out within item 13.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families also informed Members that the recent negotiations had resulted in a commitment from Hillcrest Care to offer additional bespoke services.

47/14 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF THERAPY SERVICES TO SURREY SCHOOLS [Item 20]

This item was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning and was the confidential annex for the award of contracts for the delivery of therapy services to Surrey Schools, which detailed the Financial and Value for Money Implications. She said that the proposal was to extend the existing contracts at current prices to enable longer term service redesign.

[The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board abstained from this item]

RESOLVED:

That new Surrey County Council contracts be approved to cover the period 2014 – 2017, as set out in the recommendations for item 15, as amended.

Reasons for Decisions:

Set out within item 15.

48/14 LYNE AND LONGCROSS COFE INFANT SCHOOL: EXPANSION [Item 21]

The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes said that there was strong support from the parents of this school and other local schools for this expansion and commended the recommendations to Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

1. That the business case for the project to expand Lyne and Longcross Infant School at a total cost, as set out in the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes and the Leader of the Council be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Runnymede area.

49/14 ST JOHN THE BAPTIST CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL [Item 22]

This item was withdrawn.

50/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 23]

That non-exempt information relating to items considered in part 2 of the meeting may be made available to the press and the public, as appropriate.

[Meeting closed at 3.30pm]

Chairman

Flooding Statement

As everyone in the county will know, many of our residents and business have suffered some of the worst flooding in living memory.

More than 3,600 families have been affected and nearly 1,300 people have been rescued by Surrey firefighters. But these numbers don't begin to convey the full impact on our residents, who are now counting the personal, emotional and financial cost.

Our staff and Members have been working round the clock with the police, Environment Agency, the military and local councils to support our communities to get through a situation that has, for many people, literally turned their lives upside down.

While Surrey fire crews have rescued families from the floods, our social care teams have made sure vulnerable people remain safe and well. In addition, our teams have been working hard to keep as many roads and schools open as possible. Not to mention supplying and distributing more than 50,000 sandbags.

With the flood waters now going down the work has not stopped and our focus has turned to helping affected communities to recover. We have worked with our borough and district colleagues to set up recovery centres to provide people with advice and support. A concerted effort has started on the clean up operation.

I am sure I speak, not only for my Cabinet colleagues, but also for all county council Members when I say how grateful I am to all those who have helped and volunteered to assist the county and local communities to get through this.

The work to help families to get back on their feet is not yet done and the cost to the county is only just emerging. The cost alone of putting our roads back in shape currently stands at £12.5 million and is set to rise. So, we must look to the future and that is why we are now in discussion with central government about what measures can be taken to limit the chances of this happening again. It is vital we leave no stone unturned to ensure our communities are properly protected in the years to come.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
25 February 2014

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question (1) from Mr Mike Sawyer, Vice-Chairman of Banstead Village Residents Association to ask:

In the context of the current PSP review and impending closure of the London Fire Brigades Purley Station, we recognise the need for, and benefits of, siting a fire appliance in the Burgh Heath/Banstead area with direct access to the A240 or A217. With regard to the change of “preferred location” from Burgh Heath to the busy Banstead High Street as a site for a fire appliance we deplore the inadequate “consultation” in our immediate area and ask that we be told:-

1. Why, given the length of time that it has been known that the LFB's station at Purley will close for at least 18 months from this summer without short term replacement cover, has it not been possible to secure a site that meets the fire service's requirement (as stated at the public consultation meeting in January 2013) of direct, or virtually direct, access onto the A217 or A240?
2. Why was the only public meeting to discuss this proposal held in Ewell Village when siting only affects Banstead Village and its surrounding area, when Banstead has many meeting rooms that could have been made available for a vastly greater public response?
3. Why has the former Ambulance station adjacent to the A217 not been secured as the long term, or even interim, site, when it has existing garaging and the potential for re-opening the access onto, and across, the A217, and shared messing with the retained Ambulance HQ buildings? This is especially hard to understand as the site owners are known to be moving the main headquarters establishment from this location.
4. What practical research has been carried out on the delays inherent in siting the new station in the High Street – other than theoretical computer based modelling? We were told that this modelling does not have information specific to the congestion in Banstead High Street. Whilst it is practical to expect a fire tender to gain access to an emergency in the High Street, it is an entirely different practical problem to make all calls from the High Street – with its' and the surrounding roads' congestion as the starting point for each journey.

Reply:

- (1) Property Services working with Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) have found it difficult to secure a permanent site and this is why SFRS intend to locate to a temporary location. This will ensure that the Service can meet its response targets. This includes the reduction in the reliability of fire cover in that part of the county due in part the closing of Purley Fire Station for a period of at least 12 months

from summer 2014. We will continue to search for a suitable site that is closer to our optimal location in the wider identified area in the consultation. Once a suitable site/premises has been found, securing it will be subject to a separate Business Case and Cabinet decision.

- (2) This was also discussed at the public meeting. We explored around 20 venues between Epsom and Ewell and Reigate and Banstead and Bourne Hall was the only available venue for this date, with the suitable capacity and accessibility criteria. A comprehensive consultation and communications plan was established to target those who are likely to be most affected by the proposals. We used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as a range of communication channels to gather the views of our stakeholders and Item 7, Annex 3 – Consultation report highlights in more detail the methodology, analysis, key findings and next steps from the consultation process. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service organised a public meeting on 9 January 2014 that was publicised through the consultation website and also in 200 outlets, including libraries, community centres, churches, schools and post offices. The event was also publicised to 200 groups and individuals invited to complete an online survey and through social media sites, Twitter and Facebook. County and local Members were also briefed on the event so they could raise it with their constituents.
- (3) SCC Property Services and the Service continue to investigate available sites/premises in search for a permanent site. This work will continue and should a suitable long term site become available then this will be worked through accordingly.
- (4) The modelling commissioned by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service to identify the optimal location for a fire station is modelled on our incidents to examine historical trends and incident locations, along with appliance utilisation, demand (temporal and geographical) and time spent at incident. Due to the fact that it looks at historical data it will indirectly take into account local variations, as it will consider the time taken to respond to an incident in that area.

Our ambition for the future is to operate not from fixed fire stations but use fire engines for community work and dispatch them when they're out and about, so they can be mobilised from anywhere.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
25 February 2014

-