

## 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 13 October 2014.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 22 JULY 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 Mike Goodman
Mrs Mary Angell	Mr Michael Gosling
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Le Gal

Cabinet Associates:

*Mr Steve Cosser	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Clare Curran	*Mr Tony Samuals

\* = Present

**PART ONE**  
**IN PUBLIC**

**144/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Angell and Mr Gosling.

**145/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 24 JUNE 2014 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**146/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**147/14 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

**(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

Mrs Watson had submitted two questions, however, they had been ruled 'out of order' by the Chief Executive because they related to Council rather than Cabinet decisions.

#### **148/14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

A question from Jenny Desoutter was received. The question and response is attached as **Appendix 1**.

Ms Desoutter said that she disagreed with the distinction between closing a road as opposed to a network of roads, which caused significant disruption and asked that the consideration of the route used for the cycle event was given a higher priority so that disruption to residents was minimised.

The Leader of the Council said that, following last year's cycling event, the Council had run an extensive consultation exercise and had also received two conflicting petitions. A balanced decision had been made to go ahead with this year's cycling event and Surrey County Council now had responsibility for Public Health and would be promoting exercise. The County Council ran very few Surrey wide events and had improved communications to residents for this year's event this year.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services assured Ms Desoutter that the event organisers would be doing all they could to mitigate inconvenience to local residents and businesses and those individuals who may need assurance should ensure that the event organisers were aware.

#### **149/14 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were none.

#### **150/14 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

No representations were received.

#### **151/14 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

Environment and Transport Select Committee in relation to its Interim Report of the Flooding Task Group (**Appendix 2**), together with the response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery (**Appendix 3**).

The Chairman of the Environment and Transport Select Committee was invited to speak. He thanked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery for his response and informed Cabinet that the Members of the task group had visited 9 divisions and were planning to hold a further 20 witness sessions. They had also spoken to the Environment Agency and were due to have meetings with Thames Water and the Police. He expected that the final report would be available for submission to Cabinet in November.

Turning to the Cabinet Member's response to the interim recommendations of the flooding task group, he made the following points:

- (a) – agreed
- (b) – Lower Thames Scheme – a completion date of 2025 was unacceptable. He said that the task group would come up with some options for Cabinet to consider.
- (c) - consideration of whether to say ‘of the county’ or ‘in the county’. Also, he urged officers to prioritise the clearance of ditches and soakaways.
- (d) – agreed but continue to lobby Government to urge utility companies to work together.
- (e) – this recommendation was supported by the Environment Agency and was thought to be helpful as Surrey may wish to test alternatives to sandbags.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery responded by stating that:

- Despite assurance from the Prime Minister that money was no object, funding did not appear to be an issue.
- Acknowledgement of ownership of land and drainage issues.
- Issues with water authorities and waiting for an OFWAT agreement for their 5 year programme, which would not be available until September.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services referred to the work of the local flood forum in Mole Valley and asked the Chairman of Environment & Transport Select Committee if the task group would like evidence from this forum. Also, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning suggested that the task group may also want to consider evidence from Surrey Heath as flood alleviation work had been undertaken there a few years ago.

#### **152/14 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN REPORT WITH A FINDING OF MALADMINISTRATION [Item 6]**

On behalf of the Cabinet, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that the County Council took the findings of the Ombudsman seriously and made a public apology on behalf of the Council. She said that action had already been taken and a copy of the response to the recommendations would be produced and sent to the Ombudsman and all Members of the Council within three months of the receipt of this report.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Ombudsman’s report be noted.
2. That the Cabinet is satisfied that steps have been taken to address the findings of the Ombudsman’s report.
3. That the requirement to produce a response to both the Monitoring Officer’s report and the Ombudsman’s report, and to ensure that this is sent to all Members and to the Ombudsman, be delegated to the Assistant Directors for Children’s and Safeguarding Services and

Schools and Learning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

There is a statutory requirement to respond to an Ombudsman report that identifies maladministration and a need for the Cabinet to consider what action needs to be taken as a result of the report.

**153/14 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR JUNE 2014 [Item 7]**

The Leader of the Council presented the first quarter's budget monitoring report for 2014/15, including recommendations for reprofiling the capital programme and the Council's response to the severe winter weather. He said that the Council continued to face demand growth and funding reductions as austerity continued. As stated at previous Cabinet meetings, he referred to the Council's financial strategy which 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 the end of year forecast was for a balanced revenue position.
- Though it was early in the year, he believed that this would be the fifth consecutive year the council had a small underspend or a balanced budget, demonstrating Cabinet's strong commitment to tight financial management, backed up the actions of managers across the Council.
- This year it was important to remember that the Council's risk contingency had been reduced to £5m and will be removed altogether next year. The reducing risk contingency required all Members and officers to focus on delivering the savings targets.
- The Chief Executive and Director of Finance outlined progress with the support sessions they have held to ensure the robustness of services' efficiency savings plans.

**2. Continuously drive the efficiency agenda**

- At the end of June, services forecast delivering efficiencies of £71m and of the £71m, over half has either already been achieved or is on track, a third has some issues and less than £10m is considered to be at risk.

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

- That reducing reliance on government grants and council tax was key to balancing the budgets over the longer term and the Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund had already invested nearly £5m this year.

**4. Continue to maximise our investment in Surrey**

- The council's capital programme not only improved and maintained our service delivery, it was also a way of investing in Surrey and generating income for the council. The reprofiled capital programme plans £780m investment for 2014-19, including £195m in 2014/15. The current forecast is to overspend by nearly £7m, including long term investments.

Finally, he drew Cabinet attention to:

- (i) a typo on page 3, Annex 1, paragraph 3, third bullet point:

The Environment and Infrastructure end of June variance was correct at £1.6m but the reason was due to the timing of the waste sinking fund payment and not flooding as shown in the report.

- (ii) paragraph 27, Annex 1 which said:

'Following robust negotiations Public Health (PH) has now had agreement to invoice the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) for the £3.3 million genitourinary medicine (GUM) funding which was misallocated from the government grant. Work was now underway to ensure that the GUM funding is in the base budget for 2015/16.'

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

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the revenue budget to the end of June 2014 and the forecast outturn for 2014/15, as set out in the submitted report, be noted.
- (2) That the forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end, as set out in the submitted report, be noted.
- (3) That the capital budget position to the end of June 2014 and the forecast expenditure for 2014/15, as set out in the submitted report, be noted.
- (4) That the first quarter balance sheet, reserves, debt and treasury management report, including debt written off under the Director of Finance's delegated authority, be noted.
- (5) That the Chief Executive's and Director of Finance's assessment of the council's efficiency savings programme be noted.
- (6) That the request from Environment and Infrastructure for £0.3m additional funding, to cover planning and development work on the schools expansion programme, be approved.
- (7) That the re-profiling of the council's capital programme for the years 2014 to 2019, as set out in the submitted report, be agreed.
- (8) That use of £1.8m revenue and £1.2m of capital developer contributions to fund the costs of response and recovery from the severe weather and flooding be approved.
- (9) That use of £10m of the current capital budget to fund the capital costs incurred in 2014/15 be approved.
- (10) That Highways realigns the revenue budget to respond to service pressures including flood repairs.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

This report is presented to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary. Additionally, there is an up-date on the wider Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP 2014-19), in terms of the implications for savings delivery and the severe weather on the councils revenue and capital budgets. This up-date was requested when the MTFP was agreed in March 2014.

The Cabinet approved the carry forward of capital budget from 2013/14 at its meeting in May 2014. Since the setting of the capital budget, the schools basic need and property programmes have been reassessed. The recommendation of this report is to re-profile the council's capital programme to ensure that its objectives are delivered and value for money is achieved.

**154/14 ST PETER'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL, LEATHERHEAD [Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that this was the first of three reports being considered by Cabinet today, which demonstrated that the County Council was pressing ahead with its school expansion programme. She thanked officers from Education and Property Services who were working hard to deliver this programme and requested that Cabinet approved the business case for the expansion of St Peter's Catholic Primary School from a 1 Form of Entry primary (210 places) to a 2 Form of Entry primary (420 places) creating 210 additional places in Leatherhead, to help meet the basic need requirements in this area.

She stated that St Peter's Catholic School was a popular school which had been judged 'good' by Ofsted. Finally, she confirmed that the expansion had the support of the Diocese of Arundel and Brighton and that the planning application would be considered by the Planning and Regulatory Committee in the Autumn.

**RESOLVED:**

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in agenda item 17 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional 1 form of entry (210 places) primary places in Leatherhead 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 Leatherhead area.

**155/14 HILLCROFT PRIMARY SCHOOL, CATERHAM [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that this was another popular school which had been judged 'good' by Ofsted and asked Cabinet to approve the business case for the expansion of Hillcroft Primary School from a 1.5 Form of Entry primary (315 places) to a 2 Form of Entry primary (420 places) creating 105 additional places in Caterham to help meet the basic

need requirements in that area. The planning application would be considered at a future Planning and Regulatory Committee meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in agenda item 18 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of an additional 0.5 form of entry (105 places) primary places in Caterham 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 Caterham area.

**156/14 HURST PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, WEST MOLESEY [Item 10]**

This was the final school expansion report to be considered by Cabinet today and was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, who confirmed that Hurst Park Primary School was another popular school judged 'good' by Ofsted.

She asked for Cabinet approval for the business case to build a brand new 2 form of entry (420 places) primary school with a 26 place nursery on a new site (the former John Nightingale Special School), to replace the existing Hurst Park school and to enable the expansion of the school from its current 1 form of entry primary (210 places) and nursery to a 2 form of entry primary (420 places) creating 210 additional places in West Molesey, to help meet the basic need requirements in the Elmbridge area.

She acknowledged the concerns of some local residents re. parking and additional traffic and confirmed that Highways officers would be working towards mitigating these issues. Finally, she said that planning permission had been recently agreed by the Planning and Regulatory Committee, but was subject to certain conditions relating to car parking issues.

**RESOLVED:**

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in agenda item 19 in Part 2 of this agenda, the business case for the provision of a new 420 place school and 26 place nursery on a new site providing an additional 1 Form of Entry (210 places) primary places in West Molesey 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 Elmbridge area.

**157/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL HOME BASED CARE SUPPORT SERVICES  
[Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that providing Home Based Care support services to vulnerable adults in Surrey was a statutory obligation of the Council, which was delivered through external Home Based Care providers and that currently, the Council delivered Home Based Care support services to approximately 4800 service users, equating to about 8000 calls per day.

He said that this report was seeking approval to award a contract for the provision of Home Based Care support services to the providers listed in the Part 2 report (item 23) effective 1 October 2014. Also, in response to the changing requirements and demographics of Surrey as well as considering the impact of the implementation of the Care Act (2014), officers had undertaken a joint tendering exercise with the Surrey Downs Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), the lead Commissioner for continuing healthcare, to identify the most appropriate way to deliver Home Based Care (HBC) in Surrey.

He confirmed that checks on all proposed, successful bidders had been undertaken with the Care Quality Commission. He highlighted both the extensive consultation that had taken place, as set out in paragraphs 20-22 of the submitted report, and also the risk management and implications. Finally, he said that a detailed Equalities Impact Assessment had been undertaken, which the Cabinet Member for Community Services also endorsed, and this was attached to the report as Annex 4.

The Cabinet team recognised the importance of this large contract and were pleased to note that residents would receive a better service from this new contract.

**RESOLVED:**

That a Strategic Partnership Contract (SPC) for the provision of Home Based Care (HBC) support services for vulnerable adults in Surrey, to the bidders set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be approved.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

A comprehensive review of Home Based Care support services and the market was carried out during 2013, identifying a need to replace the existing arrangements to enable a new approach to commissioning and delivering services. This led to the development of the Strategic Partnership Contract (SPC) and an Any Qualified Provider (AQP) contract model, established through a competitive tendering exercise. This was conducted in compliance with EU Procurement Legislation, and Procurement Standing Orders. The recommendations provide best value for money for the council and CCGs (jointly referred to as the commissioners).

## **158/14 LEGAL SERVICES FRAMEWORK [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services commended this report that sought approval to award contracts which will provide additional legal support to local authorities in the county, through a Framework agreement, to Cabinet. These contracts were intended to give all local authorities in Surrey, together with some neighbouring councils, access to specialised advice, which cannot be provided cost-effectively in-house.

It provided details of the procurement process, including the results of the evaluation process, and in conjunction with the Part 2 report, to be considered later in the meeting, demonstrated why the recommended contracts offer best value for money.

### **RESOLVED:**

That contracts be awarded to the preferred supplier(s) as agreed on the basis set out in the Part 2 report (item 22).

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

To ensure that local authorities have access to best value for money external legal advice and support from solicitors and barristers selected by a full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders.

## **159/14 BADGERS WOOD SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME [Item 13]**

Badgers Wood was a Surrey County Council in-house residential care home for people with learning disabilities (PLD) and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that the report recommended that a consultation on the future of the home was undertaken. The preferred option was to close the home and different services to be sourced for the individuals currently supported by the home because the strategy now was to move away from providing care for people with learning disabilities in a residential home to a broader range of personalised accommodation options such as shared living.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the Council will consult on the proposal to close Badgers Wood Home and that following the consultation a further report will be presented to Cabinet for a decision on the future of the home.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

- The existing service does not fully provide the opportunity for residents to maximise their independence and live in a supported living environment. It is recognised the building is too large to provide a sufficiently individualised service.
- The current service does not accord with the strategic direction of Surrey Adult Social Care, in terms of a shift from residential care to a

broader range of personalised accommodation options such as supported living.

- The vulnerability of people living in the home due to age and infirmity has increased and their needs will be difficult to meet appropriately within the present service.
- The service in its current form has experienced a lack of demand in at least the last 5 years.
- Reviews of the 10 residents care and support needs have found that at least 2 residents will move-on from the service as part of Adult Social Care annual review and reassessment processes.
- A high and increasing vacancy level compromises the financial viability of the existing service. Given the concerns about the building and the lack of fit with current commissioning priorities, there is no expectation that new referrals will be made and so demand is projected to continue to decline over time.
- Significant financial investment in the building is required and it presents a number of challenges to adaptation and refurbishment. New Learning Disability schemes are generally developed on the basis of accommodation for 4 to 8 people.
- Young adult (18+) and their parents / carers would not choose a service that comprises 17 bedrooms and does not provide an environment for personalised services.

#### **160/14 SERVICES TO SCHOOLS AND SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT EXTENSION - BABCOCK 4S LTD [Item 14]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning was pleased to present the recommendation to approve the extension of the Schools Support Services contract between Surrey County Council (SCC) and Babcock 4S Limited (B4S) for school improvement and back office support services to schools for a further 4 years from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2019. She said that the contract was initiated in 2004 and had been a 'ground breaking' decision to engage with a commercial partner to deliver the County Council's school support and improvement services and that the Council's relationship with B4S was very good. She was very pleased that B4S had delivered year on year improvement on outcomes for children and raised educational standards in Surrey schools. Finally, she said that the financial information would be discussed later in the part 2 section of the meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services stressed the importance of this contract and in particular, the improvement programme and mentioned a school in her division, North Downs Primary which she was pleased to report had now been assessed by Ofsted as a 'good' school.

The Deputy Leader reiterated the County Council's aim, which was to provide every child in Surrey with a good education and highlighted the improvements

made by B4S. He also referred to the key objectives which the joint venture should achieve over the next five years.

**RESOLVED:**

That, in principle, the contract on the existing contractual terms and conditions for the permitted 4 year extension term be extended, subject to, any final variations in the shareholders agreement and approval through delegated authority by the Strategic Director of Children, Schools and Families, the Cabinet Member for Business Services, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, the Leader of the Council, and the Section 151 Officer.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Extending the existing contract will enable the joint venture to continue to deliver the “every school a “Good” school” project by 2017. The stability of this work is crucial and is one of the key reasons for the extension.

**161/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 15]**

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

**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.

**162/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 16]**

**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.

**163/14 ST PETER'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL, LEATHERHEAD [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that this report contained the financial information pertaining to the business case for the project to

expand St Peter's Catholic Primary School. Leatherhead and requested Cabinet's approval.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the business case for the project to expand St Peter's Catholic Primary School by 210 places, at a total estimated 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 Schools and Learning, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and the Leader of the Council be approved.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

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

**164/14 HILLCROFT PRIMARY SCHOOL, CATERHAM [Item 18]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that this was similar to the previous report because it also contained the financial information pertaining to the business case for the project to expand a school, namely Hillcroft Primary School, Caterham. She commended the recommendations to Cabinet.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the business case for the expansion of Hillcroft Primary School from a 1.5 form of entry primary (315 places) to a 2 form of entry primary (420 places) creating 105 additional places at a total estimated 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 Schools and Learning, the Cabinet Member for Business Services 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 Caterham area.

**165/14 HURST PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, WEST MOLESEY [Item 19]**

The Cabinet Member for School and Learning said that this report set out the business case and financial details for a project to build a brand new school on the site of the former John Nightingale special school, approximately 400

metres from the existing school site. She advised Cabinet that the planning application had been considered recently by Planning and Regulatory Committee and it had been permitted subject to conditions relating to car parking issues.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the business case for the project to build a brand new 2 form of entry primary school, at a total estimated 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 Schools and Learning, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and the Leader of the Council be approved.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

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

**166/14 WOKING TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION [Item 20]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services reminded Cabinet that in September 2012, it agreed that Surrey County Council (SCC) would participate in a Joint Venture Company, Bandstand Square Developments Ltd, with Woking Borough Council (WBC) and Moyallen Ltd to regenerate Woking Town Centre.

SCC's and WBC's participation was in the form of development loan funding to the Joint Venture to deliver the first phase of the project. However, the Joint Venture company has now approached SCC and WBC for additional funding, to be provided equally and on the same terms as the original loan facility, to complete Phase 1. Additional funds were required primarily as a result of increased land acquisition costs to provide the replacement Fire Station in the town.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the increase in the Phase 1 loan funding provided to Bandstand Square Developments Ltd, as set out in the submitted report, be approved.
2. That the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the S151 officer, be authorised to approve appropriate contractual amendments to extend the loan facility.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The increase in the loan facility provided by SCC is required in order to fully complete Phase 1 of the Woking regeneration project. The first phase of the

project will deliver the land acquisition required for the development, all necessary planning consents and the construction of a new Fire Station to enable relocation from the existing site.

The full project will deliver a large scale regeneration of the town centre, improving the long-term viability of the existing retail offer in the town.

SCC's financing costs associated with providing the Phase 1 loan facility will be offset by interest payments received from the Joint Venture.

#### **167/14 ESTABLISHMENT OF A TRANSPORT RELATED LOCAL AUTHORITY TRADING COMPANY [Item 21]**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning said that Surrey County Council, together with a consortium of five other county councils, owned a transport trip rate database known as TRICS which is widely used by the transport and planning profession. The operational management of the database is currently provided by a third party on a contract basis.

He drew Cabinet's attention to the Memorandum of Terms (Annex 1 to the report) and also the TRICS Business Plan 2014 (Annex 2 to the report).

After hearing from the Planning and Development Group Manager from Environment and Infrastructure, Cabinet were very supportive of the preferred option which was to create a Local Authority Trading Company, to be owned equally by the consortium members.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the business case for the creation of a Local Authority Trading Company to be owned by Surrey County Council and five other local authorities be approved.
2. That the governance arrangements for the Company, as set out in paragraphs 13 to 17 of the submitted report, and as described in memorandum of terms form in a Shareholders Agreement between the local authorities and the Articles of Association for the company be approved.
3. That the provision of equity finance to the Company, as described in paragraphs 29 to 31 of the submitted report, be approved.
4. That the Cabinet Member for Business Services and New Models of Delivery and the Strategic Director for Business Services be authorised to agree appropriate contractual arrangements on behalf of the County Council following completion of appropriate due diligence.

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

The creation of a Local Authority Trading Company, to be owned by six local authorities, will ensure that the commercial activities of the consortium are delivered in an appropriate manner and will enable the growth potential of the database to be fully exploited. Subject to the company being able to declare

a dividend, the recommended delivery model will produce an ongoing income for the council to support future service provision.

#### **168/14 LEGAL SERVICES FRAMEWORK [Item 22]**

##### **RESOLVED:**

That a Legal Services Framework for Lot 1 General and Commercial Panel (General Advice), Lot 2 General and Commercial Panel (Specialist and Advocacy), Lot 3 Environment and Infrastructure Panel (General Advice), Lot 4 Environment and Infrastructure Panel (Specialist and Advocacy), Lot 5 Care Panel (General Advice), and Lot 6 Care Panel (Specialist and Advocacy) be approved.

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

A full tender process, 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.

#### **169/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL HOME BASED CARE SUPPORT SERVICES [Item 23]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that this report contained details of the procurement and evaluation processes undertaken to identify suitable providers for Surrey County Council's Home Based Care Support Services and the annex detailed the quality and pricing scores for each bidder in each zone that they tendered for.

##### **RESOLVED:**

That a flexible block contract be awarded to the providers, for the provision of Home Based Care support services, for a total value, as set out in the submitted report, to commence on 1 October 2014.

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

A full tender process, 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, Clinical Commissioning Groups (referred to as the Commissioners), Surrey residents and individuals who receive HBC support services (service users).

#### **170/14 SERVICES TO SCHOOLS AND SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT EXTENSION - BABCOCK 4S LTD [Item 24]**

Introducing the part 2 report, in relation to the Babcock 4S Ltd (B4S) contract extension, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that this report contained the financial details which had been fully discussed and reviewed by officers. She also drew attention to the risk, financial and value for money

implications, as set out in the report. Cabinet discussed the contract and the reasons for extending it and the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning was invited to address the meeting and clarified some points concerning B4S and its provision of educational support services to Surrey County Council for its schools.

**RESOLVED:**

As per Part 1 report - item 14.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Education provision has changed considerably since the start of the joint venture agreement, with the greatest changes being in recent years with the roll out of academy schools nationally. As the contract extension will be largely based on the current terms and conditions, this will provide the greatest level of flexibility to respond to the growing academisation of Surrey's schools. As the Education Services Grant (ESG) funding reduces with more money being paid direct to academies, there is the continuing need to be able to vary the services covered by the Service Delivery Agreement (SDA) under the B4S contract throughout the extension period.

The associated risk of these reducing services remains with B4S whilst the current contract and the proposed extension remains in place.

**171/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 25]**

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

[Meeting closed at 3.45pm]

---

**Chairman**

**Public Questions**

**Question (1) from Jenny Desoutter to ask:**

My question relates to permission granted by SCC for Road Closures on 10 August.

**Background**

The right to use public highways, together with freedom of movement, is a universal right. It is also essential in order that people may discharge commitments and meet responsibilities and live safely and independently.

SCC have adopted a policy of such disproportionate discrimination in favour of those who enjoy cycling as a sport, that all others, including Surrey residents, are prevented for a whole day from access to an extensive network of roads in order that a spree for cycling enthusiasts can take place. This not only causes inconvenience and disruption, but also aggravates anxiety, isolation and risk.

SCC claim that they are entitled to take this action under section 16A of the Highways Act 1984. In spite of much opposition last year, and many untoward incidents, SCC have decided to continue with this divisive and discriminatory policy.

SCC have, however, repeatedly stated that they will do all they can to minimise disruption to residents: as might be expected from a body whose powers are necessarily linked to an inalienable statutory duty of care.

It is with some surprise therefore that I note that this year's route will leave most residents in Dorking with no means of egress or ingress for the entire day between 5.00am and the evening. This particularly affects those who are vulnerable, or unable to walk long distances, and those who live where there are no pavements. This has occurred largely because of the addition of Ranmore Road and Denbies Vineyard to the route, perhaps at the request of the event organiser whose main concern is the fun of the event, rather than the interests of people who live here. It is also with surprise that I note that the Prudential Ride London booklet claims to offer "**Important information to help you plan your travel around Surrey on 10th August**" when the reality is that in many areas no travel will be possible.

**Question**

Section 16A contains references to circumstances relevant to closure of "a road". (Until recently events did generally involve just that - closure of a road.) Section 16A also requires (Clause 8) that, "When considering the making of an order under this section, an authority shall have regard to the safety and convenience of alternative routes suitable for the traffic which will be affected by the order."

This would suggest that the Act did not envisage paralysing entire essential networks for a recreational event.

- (i) Can SCC state whether they consider that in permitting communities such as western parts of Dorking to be cut off completely, with no safe

or convenient alternative route, they have met the requirements of this clause, and if so, how?

- (ii) Since SCC has stated repeatedly, including during the consultation, that they would seek to minimise disruption to residents, why did SCC agree to an event route that increases disruption and stress to residents who live in the areas affected, instead of insisting on a route which would, as they had assured us, minimise disruption, for example by provision of rolling closures or by ensuring the availability of alternative routes for essential travel?

**Reply:**

The legislation does envisage the closure of a road for events. The legislation has allowed for the United Kingdom to deliver a number of world ranking sporting events including the London Marathon and visits of the Tour de France to the country. The Prudential London-Surrey 100 and Classic are part of a wider weekend festival which is becoming recognised as a world class event that shows the very best of Surrey on a global stage.

While recognising the benefits that the Prudential Ride London-Surrey 100 and Classic have brought to the County, in particular to our local and national charities, it is acknowledged that events of this scale will cause some level of disruption. The needs of residents, both those who are taking part in either the Prudential London-Surrey 100 or the celebrations connected to the event and those residents who live on or near to the route, have been a key consideration in the planning for the event.

While we would encourage local residents to support this legacy for the Olympic events of 2012 by taking part in the event itself, or in the community events planned for the 10 August, arrangements have been made to allow residents access across and away from the event route. Both Surrey County Council officers and the event organiser have reviewed arrangements following the 2013 event to look at improvements that can be made. The event organiser has been making arrangements with residents and communities in the west of Dorking and all areas to allow for access across the route where possible, or to make alternative arrangements to ensure that as far as possible residents can go about their normal business.

If any resident has an access requirement we would encourage them to contact the event organiser who will provide all possible support regarding access, while ensuring the safety of the event is not compromised.

Where possible rolling road closures have been put in place for the 2014 event. This will particularly benefit residents to the west of Dorking where only the mass participation event in the morning will be undertaken under road closures and the professional race will be facilitated by rolling road closures. The event organiser is continuing to work with residents and communities to provide access to alternative routes in numerous ways and we should acknowledge the flexibility our communities and residents have shown to support the delivery of the event. We will ensure that we continue to learn from the event in the coming years to further support access for residents on the event day.

As previously stated, any resident that has access requirements should contact the event organiser who will work with them to provide all possible support.

**Mrs Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services**  
**22 July 2014**

**ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: INTERIM REPORT OF THE FLOODING TASK GROUP**

**Date Considered: 17 July 2014**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Committee strongly supported the view of the report in that firmer decisions needed to be made by the relevant planning authorities in relation to planning permission on flood plains. It was noted that Local Planning Committee decisions to refuse applications were often overturned on appeal as a result of Environment Agency advice as to the predicted likelihood of flooding taking place in certain areas.
2. Members were also concerned at the fact that a number of utility companies' sewage systems struggled to cope with the volume of water flowing through them during the flooding, and were particularly supportive of the Task Group's recommendation that utility companies be encouraged to keep up to date plans of their networks, but also of other protocols.
3. It was felt that issues around road closures during the recent flooding were a significant problem, with residents frequently ignoring road closure notices and confusion around which roads were closed and by whom. It was suggested that in future communication of this matter be improved, and clarification sought as to who had the authority to close roads during flood events.
4. The Repair and Renew Grant was discussed and concern raised around the fact that businesses were not eligible to apply, as this increased the risk of consequential loss of business.

**Recommendations:**

- a) That a review of the communications arrangements between the County Council, Districts and Boroughs and relevant partner organisations be carried out, with a view to avoiding duplication of effort and to improve communication as perceived by residents. This should include keeping County and District & Borough Councillors informed.
- b) That the County Council determines how the River Thames Scheme can be implemented as soon as possible.
- c) That, in order to reduce the quantity of water entering the fluvial system, priority be given to the clearance of all ditches and soakaways in the County, and, where appropriate, the reinstatement or creation of ponds.
- d) That utility companies be encouraged to keep up to date plans of their networks and other protocols.

- e) That the County Council explores alternatives to the use of sandbags in flood defences.

**David Harmer**  
**Chairman of the Environment & Transport Select Committee**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE**

**INTERIM REPORT OF THE FLOODING TASK GROUP  
(considered by E&TSC on 17 July 2014)**

**SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

- a) That a review of the communications arrangements between the County Council, Districts and Boroughs and relevant partner organisations be carried out, with a view to avoiding duplication of effort and to improve communication as perceived by residents. This should include keeping County and District & Borough Councillors informed.
- b) That the County Council determines how the River Thames Scheme can be implemented as soon as possible.
- c) That, in order to reduce the quantity of water entering the fluvial system, priority be given to the clearance of all ditches and soakaways in the County, and, where appropriate, the reinstatement or creation of ponds.
- d) That utility companies be encouraged to keep up to date plans of their networks and other protocols.
- e) That the County Council explores alternatives to the use of sandbags in flood defences.

**RESPONSE**

Generally Environment and Infrastructure are supportive of the recommendations of the Task Group, and we look forward to working with them to support the development of their final report. A few comments on each recommendation are provided below:

- a) Communication between the various organisations involved in flood risk management has been reviewed as part of the lessons learned exercise undertaken by the Local Resilience Forum (LRF). However, I understand from the discussion at the select committee that this recommendation covers wider communication issues. Whilst the LRF will consider communications improvements relevant to them, we will ensure that the communications issues raised by the Task Group relevant to Environment and Infrastructure are also reviewed.
- b) We are working very closely with the Environment Agency, and the other Local Authorities affected, to support this scheme. We can provide further information to the Task Group on the details of this support, if required.
- c) As part of the County's £23m flood recovery programme, we are undertaking work to highway drainage systems, including ditches and soakaways, to restore them, following the flooding. As part of our longer term 'Highways for the Future' programme, we are reviewing service levels for our highways, and will consider the investment into drainage assets as part of this review. We are working with a Member Reference Group

(comprising members of the Environment and Transport Select Committee) on this programme.

- d) We agree that this is important, however our powers in this area are quite limited. We do have some powers, as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority, and we will review how effectively we are using these powers to get information from statutory undertakers. We believe that lobbying Government on this issue may be beneficial, and would ask that the Task Group consider this.
- e) We are looking at options for temporary flood defences, and will make recommendations to the Task Group and Select Committee.

**John Furey**

**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery**

**22 July 2014**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 23 SEPTEMBER 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 Mike Goodman
*Mrs Mary Angell	*Mr Michael Gosling
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Le Gal

Cabinet Associates:

Mr Steve Cosser	Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Clare Curran	*Mr Tony Samuals

\* = Present

**PART ONE**  
**IN PUBLIC**

**172/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mr Cosser and Mrs Hammond.

**173/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 22 JULY 2014 [Item 2]**

The minutes held on 22 July 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**174/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**175/14 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

**(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

One question was received. The question and response is attached as Appendix 1.

Mrs Watson asked a supplementary question, requesting clarity on what was meant by 'higher speeds' and 'vast majority'. The Deputy Leader said there were many factors that affected the Superfast Broadband speed, including the number of users and the time of day and therefore, it was not possible to provide precise data.

#### **176/14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

One question was received from a member of the public – Chris Botten, Chairman of East Surrey MENCAP. The question and response is attached as Appendix 2.

#### **177/14 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

No petitions were received.

#### **178/14 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

No representations were received.

#### **179/14 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

- (i) Children and Education Select Committee in relation to:
  - (a) Developing the first University Technical College in Surrey
  - (b) Creating Opportunities for Young People – re-commissioning for 2015 - 2020

The responses from the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning are attached as Appendix 3 and 4 respectively.

- (ii) Adult Social Care Select Committee in relation to Recruitment, Retention and Introduction to Workforce Strategy

The response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care is attached as Appendix 5.

The Chairman of Adult Social Care Select Committee thanked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care for his response. He also made the following points:

- (i) Referring to the centralised recruitment process, he asked if the option to recruit locally, if appropriate, could be considered, and:
- (ii) Requested assurance that, in order to alleviate concerns of clients and members of the public, that any overseas workers recruited would have a high standard of spoken English.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that he was already aware of the concerns of this select committee, that his key concern was the safeguarding of vulnerable adults and all staff recruited would undergo standard recruitment tests.

## **180/14 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR AUGUST 2014**

### **[Item 6]**

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report for period five 2014/15. This was the council's financial position at the end of August 2014.

He highlighted three specific points from the report: (i) Efficiencies, stating that the Council's forecast, at the end of August was to deliver efficiencies of £68.7m by year end, (ii) the re-profiled Capital Programme planned investment of £780m for 2014-19, and (iii) that the end of year revenue forecast was for services to overspend by £2.4m. However, he believed that the Cabinet's strong commitment to tight financial management, backed up by management action would result in a balanced budget or a small underspend by year end.

Finally, he said that the report included recommendations for transferring Government grants into the Children, Schools and Families service to cover additional or extended responsibilities.

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

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the council forecasts a £2.4m overspent revenue position for 2014/15, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 2 of the submitted report.
2. That Services forecast achieving £68.7m efficiencies and service reductions by year end, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 53 of the submitted report.
3. That the council forecasts investing £205m through its capital programme in 2014/15, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 58 of the submitted report.
4. That Services' management actions to mitigate overspends, as set out throughout the submitted report, be noted.
5. That the following virements of further Government grants totalling £2.6m made for the following purposes, as set out in Annex 1, paragraph 19 of the submitted report, be approved:
  - SEND (special educational needs and disabilities) Implementation Grant (£0.805m to Schools & Learning)
  - KS2 (key stage 2) Moderation and Phonics Funding (£0.034m to Schools & Learning)
  - Adoption Reform grant (£0.493m to Children's Services)
  - Staying Put grant (£0.138m to Children's Services)
  - Troubled Families Payment by Results grant (£0.462m to Strategic Services)
  - Troubled Families Co-ordinator grant (£0.102m to Strategic Services)
  - Troubled Families Co-ordinator attachment fees (£0.549m to Strategic Services)

**Reasons for Decisions:**

This report is presented to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval and action as necessary.

**181/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL TRANSPORT REVIEW [Item 7]**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning acknowledged the excellent work that the transport team had undertaken so far on the Local Transport Review and he thanked officers in advance for their future work in the forthcoming consultation.

He said that the Local Transport Review had embraced several aspects of public transport in Surrey: provision of financial support to local buses, concessionary fares available to passengers, and provision of community transport for people who cannot use conventional local bus services. He also referred Cabinet to Annexe G of the submitted report which set out the outline proposals for consultation and engagement – these included input from the Environment and Transport Select Committee, Local Committees and Member Reference Groups.

He said that he was looking for savings of approximately £2m and that the Review was an opportunity to make changes, in particular, to the Community Transport Schemes. However, he confirmed that he was not pre-determining the outcome and recommendations following the consultation period for the Local Transport Review.

The Leader of the Council commented on the previous bus review in 2010 and said that he considered that had been one of the best reviews undertaken by the County Council. He hoped that those standards would feed through to this review. He also said that Surrey County Council's had a generous scheme, with Surrey taxpayers subsidising approximately 50% of the 29 million bus journey each year and he hoped that residents would continue to use Surrey buses.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That officers be authorised to carry out wide-ranging consultation on proposed changes to Local Transport with partners, stakeholders, and the wider public during the period October 2014 to January 2015.
2. At a further meeting in spring 2015, Cabinet consider a report incorporating an equality impact assessment and costed proposals for change which take into account views expressed in the consultation.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The recommendations will provide a clear mandate for officers to undertake a wide-ranging consultation on the proposed changes. This will not only explore the response of the public and stakeholders, but may also generate new

ideas for improving existing provision or creating new forms of community-based transport.

The report back on the consultation will enable the Cabinet to take a fully informed decision on changes to Local Transport in Spring 2015.

### **182/14 POLICY FOR ADOPTING ROADS AND STREETS AS HIGHWAYS MAINTAINABLE AT PUBLIC EXPENSE [Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery provided Cabinet with the background and reasons for changing the policy introduced in December 2010 for the adoption of roads and streets as highways maintainable at public expense. He said that a revised policy should be introduced from 1 October 2014 so that it allowed and encouraged a greater number of roads and streets to be adopted under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 because this would assist the County in fulfilling its future statutory function as Sustainable Drainage Approval Body under its role as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The report also recommended delegating decisions on Section 38 adoptions to officers and this would be self-financing.

Cabinet had a short discussion about the Sustainable Drainage Approval Body and Surrey County Council's relationship with its District and Borough Planning Authorities concerning building regulations. They were reassured that the necessary checks and balances were in place.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the policy for the adoption of roads and streets as highways maintainable at public expense for all new requests for Section 38 Agreements from 1 October 2014, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be approved.
- (2) That the decisions on Section 38 Adoption and Instructions to enter into Section 38 Agreements be delegated, to the Group Manager Planning and Development and Transport Development Planning East and West Managers as set out in paragraph 11 of the submitted report, and that officers establish an advising process on these decisions to local committees and ask the Lead Manager Democratic Services to amend the Scheme of Delegation accordingly.

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

The recommendations are being made for the following reasons:

- There is the need to adopt a greater range of developments to facilitate our role as Lead Local Flood Authority, which requires the County to maintain surface water drainages systems that have been built in accordance with SUDS specification.
- So that the County can better influence the form of newly created environments that will increasingly become a greater proportion of urban and suburban Surrey.

## **183/14 HIGHWAYS COLD WEATHER PLAN 2014/15 [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery introduced the Highways Cold Weather Plan for 2014/15 and said that this plan set out the delivery of the Highways Winter Service which would be delivered in two distinct operations:

- Pre-treatment of routes and advance planning
- Management of a severe snow event

He referred to the priority salting network and confirmed that stocks of salt should continue to be maintained at the maximum capacity of 16,000 tonnes. He also advised Cabinet that there would be greater emphasis on partnership working with Boroughs and Districts and acknowledged the valuable contribution of the 51 farmers that the County Council could call on to provide additional assistance in times of severe weather.

Finally, he thanked the Environment and Transport Select Committee's winter performance task group for their excellent report and recommendations which he believed had been addressed in the report.

The Leader of the Council requested that a copy of the Highways Cold Weather Plan 2014/2015 (Annex 1) be sent to all Members, Borough, District and Parish Councils, and at the request of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, that a paper copy of the Plan is placed in all Community Libraries.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Highways Cold Weather Plan 2014/15, attached as Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved for the forthcoming winter season.
2. That Cabinet respond to the Environment and Transport Select Committee Winter Performance Task Group recommendations, as detailed in the submitted report.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

To agree the Highways Cold Weather Plan for the coming winter season.

## **184/14 SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH THROUGH INVESTMENT IN HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE [Item 10]**

Initial allocations from the Government's national Local Growth Fund to the LEPs were announced in July 2014, along with a prioritised list of transport schemes. This first Local Growth Deal targeting 2015/16 and releasing £2bn is the first part of £20bn over the period 2015-20. EM3 was awarded £118m and C2C £202m with £79m of this to be used in 2015/16.

The Deputy Leader said that the County Council was now required to confirm the local contribution towards the cost of the first tranche of transport schemes, which are due to start in 2015/16.

Business cases for the first tranche of schemes were required to be submitted by 30 September 2014 to EM3 and by 31 October to C2C. These have been set out in paragraph 6 of the submitted report and are:

- Runnymede Roundabout
- Egham Sustainable Transport Package
- Epsom TC Plan E

He confirmed that the County Council contribution would come from the Economic Regeneration Capital Budget. Finally, he proposed an amendment to recommendation (2), to add: 'within the limits set out in the Constitution' and commended the recommendations, as amended to Cabinet.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the county council's share of the local contribution to the cost of the first tranche of the 2015/16 Local Growth Deal programme of schemes be met from the Economic Regeneration capital budget.
2. That authority be delegated, within the limits set out in the Constitution, to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery and the Director of Finance, to agree the precise amount of the SCC contribution.
3. That the principles, set out in paragraph 7 of the submitted report, should form the basis for discussions with the Boroughs and Districts on how the local contribution to schemes might be shared in the future.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The prioritised transport infrastructure schemes are a key element of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEPs), submitted by the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to Government in March 2014, which set out how they will support the economic development and regeneration of their areas. The proposed schemes will deliver a range of benefits to Surrey's residents, including reduced congestion, improved journey time reliability, enhanced safety, improved access for cyclists, pedestrians and buses, as well as enabling economic development and regeneration.

Under the funding arrangements, local authorities are required to provide a local contribution to the schemes to reflect the local benefits that will be provided. Therefore if we wish these schemes to proceed to business case submission, we will need to confirm that this local contribution is available.

This is the first tranche of schemes that has been funded from the Local Growth Deal. The precise amount of the contribution that the county council will need to make will be finalised once discussions with relevant Borough Leaders/Chief Executives have been completed in accordance with the approach set out in this report.

## **185/14 DEVELOPING THE FIRST UNIVERSITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE IN SURREY [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that the development of the first University Technical College in Surrey was an important new initiative for Surrey and a brand new learning opportunity for young people.

She said that the County Council, with key partners, were forming a University Technical College (UTC) Academy Trust to submit a bid for a University Technical College (UTC) in Guildford. The key partners, who would be the Founding Members of the Academy Trust, were Royal Holloway - University of London, Guildford College, Guildford Education Partnership, CGI Group and Surrey County Council.

She thanked officers within the Children, Schools and Families Directorate who had been working on developing this initiative for a year. She said that the UTC would focus on key skill shortage areas of computing and engineering, and these areas have been selected with employers and the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership. She also informed Cabinet that the development of the UTC would be funded through a bid for capital funding, upto £10m, from Central Government and the bid was being prepared for submission to the Department for Education (DfE) in October 2014.

She also raised the issue of the impact of the UTC on local schools, stating that some schools had seen the proposed UTC as a threat and may discourage young people from joining. However, Guildford had been chosen as the place for the first UTC because it had good transport links and could recruit students across Surrey and Hampshire. It would also help to meet the need for school places in this area and had support from George Abbot School.

Other Cabinet Members stated their full support for the development of this UTC. They asked about the admission arrangements and the publicity for the UTC. They also considered that it would widen the opportunities for young people and liked the focus on computing and engineering.

Finally, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning acknowledged and thanked the Children and Education Select Committee for their comments and support for the UTC (set out in item 5), following their consideration of the UTC at their committee meeting in July. She said that she had tabled a written response to them.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the forming of the Academy Trust Company be approved.
2. That the submission of a bid by the Academy Trust Company for a University Technical College (UTC) in Guildford by the founding members of the trust be approved.
3. That Surrey County Council be approved as one of the founding members of the UTC with Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, acting on the Council's behalf.

### **Reasons for decisions:**

The UTC will be designed to provide high quality education for 14-18 year olds in Surrey, developing the skills employers need. Through the support of Royal Holloway, Guildford College, Guildford Education Partnership, CGI Group and other leading employers, the UTC will provide real world learning experiences that blend academic and technical education. As well as helping to address need for an increase in secondary school places the curriculum design of the UTC has been informed by employers and evidence from the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership to address local skills gaps and support future economic growth.

### **186/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: RE-COMMISSIONING FOR 2015 - 2020 [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning asked the Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families to present this report to Cabinet. She reminded Cabinet that they had agreed the strategic goal and a revised Surrey Young People's Outcomes Framework on 22 April 2014. Since then, the service had been working to develop a new model to deliver improved outcomes; had adapted and developed new commissions to deliver the model including seeking Cabinet agreement to take commissions to the market; and sought agreement to increased delegation to Local Committees. The model included commissions which were delivered as services by Surrey County Council and commissions where providers would be sought through procurement.

She drew attention to the Commissioning Model – 'the Smartie Diagram' set out in the report and expanded on the options considered for each commission, the rationale for its inclusion and the reason for the recommended procurement approach. She was also pleased to report that, as part of the engagement in July 2014, with partners, staff and the market on the proposals, over 100 responses were received from a wide range of staff and organisations. She highlighted the key changes proposed as set out in paragraph 19 – 30 of the submitted report.

She also informed Cabinet that the Children and Education Select Committee had received a report on this topic at their July meeting and that their comments were set out in item 5. She said that she was grateful for the issues raised by them and considered that they have been addressed in this report to Cabinet.

Finally, she drew attention to the EIA appended to the report and thanked members of the Project Board, including the young people, and the officers for their input in formulating the new model for commissioning.

Other Members made the following points:

- Services for Young People had been a success – in the last 4 years, costs had been reduced whilst services had been maintained and more decisions were taken locally
- Outcomes were important
- Timebanking was an excellent idea

- Commissioning would be improved this time
- Pleased with the reduction in NEETS and that there had been 90% reduction in first time offending
- Liked the inclusion of Health Young Surrey and 16-25 yr olds SEND within the 'Smartie Diagram'.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the new model for commissions, as described in paragraphs 12 to 15 of the submitted report, be approved to deliver the goal of employability and the Surrey Young People's Outcomes Framework.
2. That procurement of £8.115 million of services for 2015-20 for commissioning Local Prevention and Year 11-12, as specified in paragraph 27 of the submitted report, be approved, subject to future medium term financial plan budget changes.
3. That changes to the delegation of decision making to Local Committees and Woking Joint Committee in relation specific youth services as shown in Annexe 1.a and 1.b. of the submitted report, be approved.

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

This report sets out the commissioning model and procurement approach to deliver the Surrey Young People's Outcomes Framework for 2015-2020 to meet statutory duties outlined in paragraph 8 of the submitted report and to build on the success of the achievements since the transformation in 2012.

### **187/14 JOINT STRATEGIC REVIEW OF SHORT BREAKS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES [Item 13]**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families confirmed that Surrey County Council had a statutory duty to provide short breaks for children and young people with disabilities and that the Joint Strategic Review of Short Breaks was a joint project between Surrey County Council (SCC) and NHS Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) on behalf of the six Surrey CCGs.

The key area of the review considered options for the future use and funding of short break services in East Surrey. The review focused on Applewood which is located in Tadworth and run by SCC; and Beeches which is located in Reigate, commissioned by the NHS Surrey CCGs and provided by Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABP). Both facilities were underused.

Beeches is funded by Surrey CCGs from a block contract, which is high cost and if the recommendation were agreed, the County Council and NHS Guildford and Waverley CCG would work with Surrey and Borders Partnership to transfer commissioning arrangements to individual spot purchases.

The Cabinet Member referred to the detailed consultation process undertaken, including issues raised and action taken. She also mentioned the EIA and considered that the proposals should not have a negative impact for

the children and their families. She confirmed that the service would work closely with the individual families.

Finally, she said that she hoped that she had addressed the points raised in Mr Botten's question (submitted under item 4).

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. The responsibility for funding short break services for children and young people currently accessing Beeches be transferred from Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups (NHS) to Surrey County Council.
2. Surrey County Council continues to run Applewood as a short break service.
3. Beeches remains as an option for families through their personal budgets by direct payments or arranged by Surrey County Council rather than the current block contract arrangements, subject to agreement with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (who run Beeches).
4. Surrey County Council and NHS Guildford and Waverley CCG work with Surrey and Borders Partnership to transfer commissioning arrangements to individual spot purchases at a fair price.
5. Surrey County Council continues to develop options for the use of personal budgets with families either through direct payments or arranged by SCC.

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

Overnight short breaks are a positive experience for children and young people with disabilities to spend time away from their parents, relax and have fun with their peers. They are also a lifeline for many families giving parents a break from the day and night care for their child. They give siblings an opportunity to spend some quality family time with their parents. SCC and NHS Guildford and Waverley CCG are committed to ensure that this type of support continues to be available.

The recommendations acknowledge that:

- Both Applewood and Beeches have capacity to deliver services to a wider group of children at this point in time; both are highly valued by the families and young people who use them.
- Local Authorities are responsible for funding short breaks for children with social care needs and disabilities. The recommendations allow an opportunity to correct a historic financial legacy where the CCGs in Surrey inherited responsibility to fund Beeches although children were referred by SCC but required an assessed Health need.
- All 15 children who access Beeches have assessed social care and disabilities needs.

The recommendations take into account the views expressed by the parents, carers and professionals and the desire to find a solution that enables ongoing access to both Applewood and Beeches facilities.

Given the current underuse of Beeches, it would not be good value for money for SCC to purchase the service through a block contract in addition to funding Applewood. The recommendation made is therefore to start negotiations with NHS Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation Trust to establish whether they would continue to deliver Beeches once the NHS block contract ceases by agreeing to individual purchasing of placements at a market rate that acknowledges any complexity of need.

The CCGs could consider redirection of funding currently used for block contract of Beeches to support a wider range of children and young people through investment in Community Nursing, Therapies or other healthcare services for children if this funding is released.

SABP would continue to own and run Beeches.

#### **188/14 BADGERS WOOD SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL RESIDENTIAL HOME [Item 14]**

At its July 2014 meeting, Cabinet agreed that a consultation on the future of the Badgers Wood residential home be undertaken, with the preferred option that the home be closed and new services sourced for the individuals supported by the home.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care said that this report provided Cabinet with details of the consultation process, as set out in Annex A to the submitted report and that an EIA had been developed for the proposal to close the home. This was attached as Annex B. He confirmed that local Members and Philip Hammond, the local MP had been informed. He also thanked officers, and in particular Philippa Alisiroglu, for their work.

In summary, he said that no one had raised an objection to the proposal that the home should close and he commended the recommendation to Cabinet.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Badgers Wood residential care home closes and the residents are supported to move to appropriate alternatives.

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

As previously reported to Cabinet, Badgers Wood residential care home has a number of issues related to the physical structure of the property, a high and increasing vacancy rate, no new referrals to the home for at least 5 years combined with changes in service users' expectations.

During the consultation no objections to the preferred option of closing Badgers Wood residential home were raised.

**189/14 APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACTS FOR THE PROVISION OF AN INTEGRATED OFFENDER INTERVENTION SERVICE AND A MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT SERVICE FOR DRUGS AND ALCOHOL [Item 15]**

The Council's Public Health Service delivers drug and alcohol recovery services to Surrey residents and following a competitive tender process seeks to award two separate contracts:

- (1) Integrated Offender Intervention Service
- (2) Psychological Treatment Service for Drugs and Alcohol

The current contracts are due to expire on 31 March 2015 and it is therefore necessary to award new contracts to begin on 1 April 2015.

The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board drew attention to the EIAs attached to the submitted report – one for each service. He also said that due to the commercial sensitivity involved in the contract award process, the financial details were included as confidential information in Part 2 of the agenda.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the contract for the provision of the Integrated Offender Intervention Service be awarded to Crime Reduction Initiatives as described in the Part 2 report for a period of three years commencing on 1 April 2015, with the option to extend for a maximum of a further two years.
2. That the contract for the provision of the Medical and Psychological Treatment Service for Drugs and Alcohol be awarded to Surrey and Borders NHS Foundation Trust as described in the Part 2 report for a period of three years commencing on 1 April 2015, with the option to extend for a maximum of a further two years.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The recommended contract awards will deliver improved outcomes and will increase the numbers of service users accessing the services with a particular focus on severely dependant alcohol users.

The services will be delivered in Surrey by providers with a local presence and will provide apprenticeship opportunities to Surrey Young People whilst delivering efficiencies for Public Health Services.

**190/14 BUSINESS REMOVAL SERVICES [Item 16]**

The Council had a requirement for Business Removal Services and the Cabinet Member for Business Services said that this requirement was covered by the current contract which expired on 30 September 2014. It was therefore necessary to award a new contract. She also said that the framework agreement required the supplier to comply with all relevant equality and diversity legislation whilst performing their services.

**RESOLVED:**

That, following consideration of the results of the procurement process, the award of a contract to Harrow Green be agreed, on the basis set out in the Part 2 report.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contract will expire on 30 September 2014. A full tender process, 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.

**191/14 NATIONAL AUTISTIC SOCIETY / CULLUM AUTISM CENTRES IN SURREY SCHOOLS [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning was pleased to present this report which detailed the culmination of the work of the Assistant Director of Schools and Learning and his team working in partnership with the National Autistic Society (NAS) and four nominated secondary schools to develop four Centres of Education Excellence for young people with autism, with funding up to £4m being provided by the NAS specifically for the delivery of the facilities.

She said that the centres would be delivered in 2 phases: - phase 1, Salesian School, Chertsey and Rodborough School, Godalming had each agreed to host an autism-specific resourced provision for 20 students aged 11-16 with a proposed opening date of Easter 2015 for the Salesian Centre and September 2015 for the Rodborough Centre. Phase 2 centres were planned to be located at Howard of Effingham School and Hinchley Wood School the timescales for which were to be finalised with NAS.

She said that the Authority was extremely grateful to the Cullum Family Trust who were providing upto £1m for each centre and approval was being sought from the County Council to provide a development contribution of £50K for each centre as requested by the NAS and also to fund updating existing SEN facilities at Salesian School.

Finally, she drew attention to a typo in paragraph 22 of the report – the average annual cost of a non-maintained or independent day place for a pupil with autism was £74K not £43K, as stated in the report. Also, referring to paragraph 29, she confirmed that no representations, relating to the new SEN centre at Salesian School, had been received by 12 September deadline.

Other Cabinet Members strongly supported this initiative and expressed their sincere thanks to the Cullum Family Trust.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That entering into a development and commissioning agreement and a service level agreement with the National Autistic Society to set up four resource centres at secondary schools for young people with autism

and to provide £50,000 funding for a development contribution for each centre be approved.

2. That the statutory notice be determined for the inclusion of an SEN unit at Salesian School, for which the representation period ended on 12 September 2014.
3. That the capacity of the centre at Salesian School be increased, providing funding of £321,902 to include updated and fit for purpose facilities for its existing SEN pupils.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The Learning Difficulties Review (2012) identified an ongoing shortage of Surrey maintained provision for young people with high functioning autism (HFA) and related conditions. There is currently no autism-specific resource centre at secondary level.

This proposal will increase the capacity of SEN provision for high-functioning autism in Surrey by 40 places in the first phase and by 80 places on completion of the second phase. It will develop improved integration with mainstream schooling. The four schools where centres are proposed indicated their willingness to work with the project and on the basis of their geographical spread offer equality of provision across the county.

Surrey currently places approximately 250 students with autism in non-maintained independent (NMI) schools. Additional high quality maintained provision within Surrey is expected to reduce these costs.

The NAS is a nationally respected provider of autism education. A partnership offer will enhance the credibility and quality of Surrey autism provision. Parental confidence will be increased, reducing parental preference for NMI.

### **192/14 MODELS OF DELIVERY - OPTIONS APPRAISAL [Item 18]**

In presenting this report to Cabinet, the Cabinet Member for Business Services said that the Council had identified the potential to generate income and secure efficiencies by delivering fire training and other associated services to a range of organisations.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services said that option 3 was the preferred option, as set out in the report. She also said that currently, it was not necessary to provide an EIA because there were no proposals for Cabinet to consider, however, this decision would be kept under constant review.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That a commercial partner be sought for the delivery of training (including fire training) services to third parties and other relevant activities as stated in Option 3, paragraph 10 of the submitted report.
2. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, following an appropriate procurement exercise and, in

consultation with the Cabinet Members for Business Services and Cabinet Member for Community Services, to enter into a collaborative agreement with the successful commercial partner.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The Council has identified the potential to generate income by delivering training, including fire training, services and potentially other relevant activities to a range of organisations and wishes to pursue this opportunity. The Cabinet is asked to support this approach and agree that, through a procurement process, the Council seeks a commercial partner for the delivery of these activities and enters into a collaborative agreement with the successful partner to jointly pursue work in this area.

**193/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 19]**

**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.

**194/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 20]**

**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.

**195/14 APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACTS FOR THE PROVISION OF AN INTEGRATED OFFENDER INTERVENTION SERVICE AND A MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT FOR DRUGS AND ALCOHOL [Item 21]**

The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board confirmed that this report contained the commercial details relating to awarding the contracts for the provision of an integrated offender intervention service and a medical and psychological treatment centre for drugs and alcohol.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the contract for the provision of the Integrated Offender Intervention Service be awarded to Crime Reduction Initiative at the value, set out in the submitted report.
2. That the contract for the provision of the Medical and Psychological Treatment Service for Drugs and Alcohol be awarded to Surrey and Borders NHS Foundation Trust at the value, set out in the submitted report.
3. The prices for both contracts are fixed for the 3 year duration of the contracts.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

1. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation (Part B) and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed. The recommendation demonstrates that best value for money for the Council will be delivered following a detailed evaluation process.
2. The new service will deliver enhanced benefits through a strengthened outcome focused service specification at a reduced cost. The savings have been achieved by undertaking a competitive tender exercise benefitting from efficiencies.
3. The competitive procurement process demonstrates that this is the market rate to deliver the specified service as the three financial bids were close in value.
4. The financial model for the Medical and Psychological Treatment Service for Drugs and Alcohol incorporates an incentive payment mechanism to encourage a) quality and innovation and b) to achieve the desired recovery outcomes. The model will award an additional 5% of the fixed contract price split as follows: 3% against quality and innovation and 2% against improvement targeted Key Performance Indicator Measures.
5. The key performance indicators will be jointly agreed at the start of the contract based on existing numbers of individuals accessing the service and national indicators published by Public Health England.
6. The tender process was undertaken using an open process. A pre-qualification process was included within the process to ensure suppliers were able to demonstrate sound business standing prior to proceeding to evaluation of the bids.
7. There are currently two service providers providing the Integrated Offender Intervention Services in Surrey, one being the successful bidder. As a result, staff from Surrey and Sussex Probation Service will transfer by operation of TUPE to Crime Reduction Initiatives. Transition planning between new provider and the outgoing provider has been built into the tendering process to enable a smooth transfer.

8. Staff from the existing Medical and Psychological Treatment Service for Drugs and Alcohol will continue to be delivered by Surrey and Borders NHS Foundation Trust.

#### **196/14 BUSINESS REMOVALS SERVICE [Item 22]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services said that this report contained the commercial details for the contract award for the framework contract for Business Removal Services.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That a framework contract be awarded to Harrow Green, at an estimated value, as set out in the submitted report, for the provision of Business Removals to commence on 1 October 2014.

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

The existing contract will expire on 30 September 2014. A full tender process, 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.

#### **197/14 GATWICK DIAMOND SITE - PROGRESSION TO PLANNING AND CONTRACT TENDER [Item 23]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services informed Cabinet that by authorising the funding of this planning application and submission of tender documentation in respect of this site in Crawley would enable the development of a South East Coast Ambulance (SECAmb) Headquarters and associated infrastructure. She also drew attention to the financial appraisal and risks as set out in Annex 2 of the submitted report and confirmed that both the Cabinet Associates for Fire and Polices Services and Assets and Regeneration had been consulted on the report.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. Property Services be instructed to progress and submit a detailed planning application, in line with the masterplan attached as Annex 1 to the submitted report, to Crawley Borough Council to enable the construction and development of part of the 10 acre site, which will include a SECAmb dispatch and control centre with Headquarter offices as phase 1 with an estimated cost for design fees and planning application fees, as set out in the submitted report.
2. Property Services commence the contractor selection programme, with construction contracts to be awarded at SCC's risk pending receipt of planning approval.
3. Property Services progress the negotiation of commercial terms with SECAmb to agree tenancy arrangements, subject to planning approval.

4. Approval be delegated (i) to proceed to the construction for Phase 1 of the project and (ii) to enter into an agreement for and a lease with SECAMB, to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business Services, the Leader of the Council and S151 officer, subject to the following pre-conditions; receipt of full planning consent, confirmation that agreed contracts do not exceed a total project cost estimate as set out in the submitted report and confirmation from the Chief Property Officer that terms agreed with SECAMB comply with S123 of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To allow Surrey County Council to:

- Secure the release of the accommodation currently occupied by SECAMB at The Horseshoe, Banstead to enable a fire station to be constructed to serve the Burgh Heath area with wider regeneration and reconfiguration opportunities.
- Secure planning consent of a master planned site appropriate in scale for the long term needs of SECAMB and with potential for other public services to be accommodated in any future joint strategic partnership for a combined dispatch and control / call centre or shared office accommodation as part of the Public Service Transformation Network (PSTN).

**198/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 24]**

That non-exempt information relating to items considered in Part 2 of the meeting may not be made available to the press and public.

[Meeting closed at 3.50pm]

---

**Chairman**

**Members' Questions**

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

In May 2013 the Cabinet launched the high profile roll-out of the Surrey Superfast broadband programme, claiming that 99% of Surrey premises would receive fibre-based broadband by the end of 2014 and that 94% of these premises would achieve Superfast Broadband speeds of 15Mb or more.

The fibre-based technology is now being rolled out through the commercial roll-out programme and the Surrey Superfast Broadband programme and many users in village centres and rural hamlets, as well as isolated rural properties, in both the commercial and Surrey Superfast Broadband rollout areas are finding that they cannot achieve Superfast Broadband speeds of 15 Mb or more if they live half a mile or more from their local fibre-enabled cabinet. It is becoming apparent that this is arising as a result of the length of copper wire through which the superfast broadband service has to pass from the fibre-enabled broadband cabinet to reach these premises.

Given the high profile that the administration has attributed to the roll-out of Superfast Broadband in Surrey and this emerging issue that is likely to mean that the targets set will not be met, what actions will the Cabinet be taking and what solutions will the Cabinet be seeking to provide to ensure that the target of 94% of Surrey premises will receive superfast broadband by the end of 2014?

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council is aiming to ensure that more than 99% of Surrey residents and businesses are covered by the fibre broadband network by the end of 2014 - making it one of the best connected counties in the UK.

To achieve this ambition, the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme contract is deploying fibre broadband infrastructure to 84,000 premises (about 20% of the premises in the county) that were excluded from the commercial fibre broadband rollouts by BT or Virgin Media. The programme is on target to achieve this. When this is complete there will still remain a small number premises that are very hard to reach and where costs exceeds cost thresholds that are already significantly higher than the commercial deployment area.

The Superfast Surrey deployment area (known as the Intervention Area or IA) has a target to ensure that the fibre network will cover 98.6% of IA premises. The 94% figure that is referenced in the question relates to the 93.9% (78,800 premises) that will be able to achieve a minimum download speed of 15Mbps in the IA.

The programme is on target to deliver the 93.9% of premises within the IA able to obtain a minimum download speed of 15Mbps, with the vast majority able to achieve much higher speeds. The Superfast Surrey Programme team constantly monitors the status of the deployment using a contractually agreed reporting mechanism.

The contract targets do allow for as much as 6.1% (5,100) of premises to have speeds below 15Mbps. The principal factor determining the distribution of the slower speeds is the length of the telephone line between the cabinet and the end user premises. This has resulted in a slightly higher proportion of slower speeds in the more rural Boroughs and Districts.

For all the sub 15 Mbps premises within the IA, Openreach is currently undertaking a review to identify what, if any, improvements can be made within the constraints of cost and technical feasibility. Superfast Surrey will be reviewing the costed options and determining where additional deployment can be undertaken. Once both the results of the analysis are known and the programme team have determined where improvements can be undertaken within the available budget, the relevant parish councils will be updated and will be requested to convey this information to their communities.

These issues also affect residents within the larger Commercial roll out area. The Council is aware of this and that some cabinets in the commercial area are not yet fibre enabled. The Superfast Surrey Programme is subject to state aid funding regulations that prevents the programme targeting any improvements or deployment within the commercial rollout areas. The Programme therefore has no oversight of the commercial programme and does not have any data source to inform them of actual speeds being achieved there. However Surrey County Council is pressing BT senior management both directly and through Government to improve performance and to complete its commercial programme as soon as possible.

The rollout of fibre to enable as many homes and businesses as possible to access broadband is a large and complex engineering project. Nearly 400,000 metres of fibre cable is being deployed to reach 84,000 premises - nearly equivalent to the distance from Dorking to Durham. Some 30 exchanges, not covered by the commercial programme have been upgraded and some 620 green street-side cabinets will be installed. This is a technology that will continue to evolve over the coming years, and by extending the fibre network as far as possible we are ensuring that our residents will have access to new technologies and services as they become available.

**Mr Peter Martin**  
**Deputy Leader**  
**23 September 2014**

**Public Questions**

**Question (1) from Chris Botten, Chairman of East Surrey MENCAP to ask:**

Is the Cabinet aware, in making its determinations today, that Recommendation (III) is unrealistic as:

- (a) SABP have not been consulted on the possibility of spot purchase,
- (b) that the withdrawal of £565,000 from their block contract is likely to precipitate the closure of the Beeches and, therefore that:
- (c) the choice of short breaks and in particular overnight stays will be limited only to Applewood.

In the light of this disingenuous wording, is it possible for Cabinet to make a fair or realistic recommendation on the basis of this report?

**Reply:**

The Local Authority has a duty to provide short breaks. These may be commissioned internally or externally. A range of providers are used across the County.

The Beeches, a highly valued provision by families, is owned by the NHS and commissioned through CCGs. Commissioning decisions and arrangements are the responsibility of commissioners, in this case currently the NHS. The Cabinet paper seeks to address the anomaly of these commissioning arrangements for short breaks.

**Mrs Mary Angell  
Cabinet Member for Children and Families  
23 September 2014**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE**

**DEVELOPING THE FIRST UNIVERSITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE IN SURREY**

**(considered by C&ESC on 10 July 2014)**

**SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Cabinet support the proposal for the establishment of Surrey's first University Technical College and give consideration to:

- how the Council can support the UTC to ensure capacity is met in future years;
- how positive, collaborative dialogue can be developed between the UTC and local schools and colleges, to ensure they work in partnership; and
- how the benefits of vocational education are communicated to young people and their families.

**RESPONSE**

I welcome the Children and Education Select Committee's support for the proposed first University Technical College in Surrey.

I note the Select Committee's question in relation to how the Council can support the UTC to ensure the UTC is full to planned capacity. The profile of both the university and employers is key to future recruitment of students. Employers in particular will be able to highlight future employment opportunities in sectors which are growing fast and offer rewarding careers. Officers are already working with key employers and I have asked officers to engage employers closely in future marketing of the UTC to prospective students and parents and carers. This will include additional employers not yet involved and Members may well be able to highlight further contacts to increase the range of employers included.

Additionally, enrolment will be supported through close engagement of schools and colleges in the area. The development of the UTC has been taken forward working with local schools, keeping them informed and reviewing the new provision to ensure there is a complementary curriculum and that the planned timing of the opening links to demographic growth. The UTC includes Guildford College of Further and Higher Education, Guildford Education Partnership and the Council among its Founding Members. This extent of involvement is unique for a UTC and will support future marketing of provision and enrolment to ensure planned capacity is met. As a Founding Member I will be working to ensure the positive collaboration and dialogue to date is maintained for the next phase.

Through the close involvement of employers in promoting the UTC, the

benefits of vocational education will also be promoted. This will include employers promoting the UTC to secondary schools and primary schools. Young people will benefit from both the work relevant curriculum and the development of vocational skills and experience in areas of high demand, which will ensure they are well placed for future employment in leading high technology businesses.

**Linda Kemeny**  
**Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning**  
**23 September 2014**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE**

**CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: RE-COMMISSIONING FOR 2015 - 2020  
(considered by C&ESC on 10 July 2014)**

**SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

- That the Cabinet support the proposal concerning bringing in-house the provision of Centre Based Youth Work, but also note the need to ensure continuity and employment security for the high quality staff that deliver these services.
- That the Cabinet support proposals concerning social enterprises and time banks, and that consideration is given as to how community business expertise and experience can be utilised to support these activities.
- That, in order to build an evidence base for how public savings are shared across services within the Council:
- Officers bring a future report to the Committee demonstrating the benefits in improved outcomes through engaging with Health & Wellbeing partners, such as Public Health, in sharing youth centre provision and resource.
- Officers explore with Adult Social Care how the benefits of time banks can be evidenced as impacting on the savings required as part of the Family, Friends & Community Support project.

**RESPONSE**

I welcome the Children and Education Select Committee's support for the proposals and thank the Committee for its additional suggestions and the contribution through membership of the Project Board.

I note the points raised in relation to staff and recognise the importance of the skills and expertise of the staff in delivering high quality youth work. I assure the Select Committee that staff have been closely engaged in the development of the proposals and will continue to be closely involved in helping to shape the future service.

I welcome the support for the development of social enterprises and time banks and assure Select Committee that local community and business expertise will be at the core of these developments.

I welcome the proposed further report to Select Committee on the wider public savings to be achieved through programmes such as time banking, work based social enterprises and joint commissions with Public Health. Officers are already exploring the benefits of time banks with Adult Social Care as part of the Family, Friends and Community Project.

I look forward to the continuing contribution from Select Committee, including through representation on the Project Board, to the implementation of these changes and realisation of the benefits for Surrey young people.

**Linda Kemeny**  
**Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning**  
**23 September 2014**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE**

**RECRUITMENT, RETENTION AND INTRODUCTION TO WORKFORCE STRATEGY**

**(considered by ASC Select Committee on 5 September 2014)**

**SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Committee recommends that the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet concentrate on urgently finding ways to recruit to the (currently) 95 key frontline vacancies that exist across the Adult Social Care Directorate.

**RESPONSE**

I welcome the Adult Social Care Select Committee raising this issue. Your question is appropriate and the Service is well aware of the issues that not having the full complement of staff has on both the service users and the staff. In response to your question, current action being followed by the Service is outlined below:

Adult Social Care continues to try and recruit to all vacancies in a variety of ways. To support this we currently:

- Continue to run a centralised recruitment process to ensure a streamlined approach and to release the managers time from the day to day recruitment processes.
- Continue to actively recruit to all posts via permanent adverts on our website and various other media.
- We actively engage with 20+ permanent recruitment agencies to source the best possible candidates for a variety of roles.
- We are working closely with Manpower to improve our success in recruiting suitable locum candidates. This includes better communication between Surrey County Council, Manpower and the panel vendors. It also includes bench marking our locum pay rates with our competitors.
- We are looking at alternative options of recruiting locums i.e. what options are available to us if Manpower are unable to fill a vacancy.
- We have piloted and are now implementing a full four week induction for all new starters into Adult Social Care. We hope this will help improve the quality, confidence and competence of our new recruits as well as investing in them to try and improve our retention of staff.
- We are exploring options with regards to recruiting overseas workers.
- We actively encourage our managers to use our current bank staff to fill temporary vacancies.
- We are working closely with Ken Akers' team, in the Human Resources and Organisational Development Service, to devise and implement a

recruitment and retention strategy.

- We have streamlined our appointment process to support local managers and also to improve the "candidate experience".

**Mel Few**  
**Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care**  
**23 September 2014**