

## 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 8 December 2014.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 21 OCTOBER 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 Curran and Mr Gosling.

**145/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 23 SEPTEMBER 2014 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 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]**

There were none.

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

A question from David Beaman was received. The question response is attached as **Appendix 1**.

Mr Beaman asked a supplementary question regarding when the traffic works would be completed and Mr Hodge confirmed that he would ask the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding to reply on this issue outside of the meeting.

#### **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]**

Report of Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the Finance and Budget Monitoring report for August 2014 as appendix 2.

The response from the Leader of the Council is attached as appendix 3.

[Note: Items 12 and 13 were moved up the agenda and taken after this item as the Deputy Leader left to attend another meeting at 2.30pm]

#### **152/14 SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH: IMPLEMENTING THE LOCAL GROWTH DEALS [Item 12]**

The Deputy Leader introduced the report detailing how the Council proposed to support local growth deals around transport and infrastructure. He explained that it was the second paper of three, looking particularly at the principles around how Surrey County Council would contribute to schemes in conjunction with district and boroughs.

The report sought agreement about how the Council proposes to: take forward securing the local contribution to the second tranche of schemes for which funding had been agreed by the Enterprise M3 (EM3) and Coast to Capital (C2C) Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) for 2015/16; prioritise bids for currently unallocated funds held by the LEPs for 2015/16 to support sustainable transport and resilience projects; and prioritise new projects for funding through the LEPs from 2016/17.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding explained that the major issue was timing and having the resources to obtain additional resources from central government.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services said that Surrey is the powerhouse of the national economy and that investing in infrastructure is critical for the country's further prosperity.

## **RESOLVED:**

1. The principles and approach for determining local contributions for transport schemes be agreed and a further report to Cabinet in December 2014 will seek agreement to the County Council match funding contribution to the second tranche of 2015/16 schemes.
2. The proposed approach to prioritising schemes be agreed and be applied to the sustainable transport and resilience schemes for 2015/16.
3. That approval of the prioritised list of sustainable transport and resilience schemes for submission to the LEPs be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Leader, the Deputy Leader and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Flooding Recovery.
4. That further schemes should be prioritised for funding for 2016/17. Identification of these schemes be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Leader, the Deputy Leader and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Flooding Recovery.

## **Reasons for Decisions:**

The LEPs' Strategic Economic Plans, submitted to Government in March 2014, were developed with considerable input from the County Council and identified priority schemes for Surrey. Almost all of the schemes put forward for funding for 2015/16 were successful, including all of the transport projects.

Councils are required to provide a local contribution to the schemes to reflect the local benefits that will be secured. A critical part of the business case submission to secure funding will be identifying the source and amount of such local contributions. Hence the need for agreed principles and a firm agreement with the relevant borough or district on their financial contribution (Recommendation 1). The second tranche of schemes for 2015/16 requiring a contribution from the County Council will come forward in a report to Cabinet in December.

Whilst large schemes were identified in the Growth Deals for specific funding, smaller schemes will be supported through pots of additional funding. The Council needs to make bids into these pots reflecting priority schemes. The approach set out in this report will be the basis for such prioritisation (Recommendation 2). Given the deadlines for submission of proposals to the LEPs and the level of detailed work still to be completed within these timescales, the report proposes that the application of these principles is delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in discussion with the relevant portfolio holders (Recommendation 3).

Government have also set a very tight timetable for any bids for further funding for 2016/17. The report identifies the schemes being considered for Surrey and proposes that the final decision on which ones to put forward is also delegated to the Strategic Director, in consultation with the relevant portfolio holders (Recommendation 4).

## **153/14 LOCAL STRATEGIC STATEMENT AND SURREY STRATEGIC PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE PARTNERSHIP [Item 13]**

The Deputy Leader presented the report on the Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership and drew attention to the Localism Act (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that required public bodies to cooperate on planning issues that crossed administrative boundaries.

This sets out that, at a Local Plan Examination, local planning authorities are expected to demonstrate evidence that they have complied with this legal 'Duty to Cooperate'. Infrastructure was a strategic planning matter and the County Council had a key role in Local Plan preparation as the Local Highways Authority, the local planning authority for waste and minerals and as a major infrastructure provider, particularly for transport and schools, and was subject to the duty.

He explained that Surrey Leaders had agreed to meet as the Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Board to provide a vehicle for cooperation and joint working to help districts and boroughs in Surrey meet the challenging requirements of the duty. They have agreed a Memorandum of Understanding on how the local authorities in Surrey will work together to prepare a Local Strategic Statement setting out common priorities on strategic planning matters and actions. The partnership would also facilitate a co-ordinated approach to engaging with neighbouring authorities, particularly London and its growth impacts on Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services commented that it was very important to have a coordinated approach on this and this was supported by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning stating that working together would achieve so much more.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Leader of the Council be authorised to sign the Memorandum of Understanding for the Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership to work towards the preparation of a Local Strategic Statement for Surrey.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

A number of local authorities who have recently had their plans examined have failed to meet the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate and have had to withdraw their Local Plans. Most Surrey local authorities are in the process of preparing planning documents and it is increasingly clear that meeting the requirements of the duty is a test that has been extremely difficult and would be significantly more likely if an appropriate framework to coordinate partnership working to address common strategic planning issues is established.

The Memorandum of Understanding and preparation of a Local Strategic Statement setting out common priorities can help overcome the difficulties that local authorities are presently experiencing and will help to make the

case for investment in Surrey, especially funding for transport and other infrastructure from the Local Enterprise Partnerships.

The proposed partnership will also ensure a collective voice exists within Surrey to manage relationships with neighbouring authorities, particularly London, where projected increases in population suggest that it will not be able to meet all its future housing needs and this is likely to create further pressure to increase housing provision above locally identified needs in Surrey.

## **154/14 SURREY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2013 - 14 [Item 6]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care asked the Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Mr Cosser, to introduce the Annual Report of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board (SSAB). Mr Cosser highlighted that the report presented the priorities and programmes covered by the board in 2013/14 and stated the SSAB would become a statutory board from 1 April 2015 as part of the implementation of the Care Act 2014. He then invited the independent chairman, Simon Turpitt to provide an overview of the report.

Mr Turpitt began by stating how pleased he was that the SSAB would become statutory and that he felt that this would provide the accountability and responsibility to deliver safeguarding for adults on the same footing as children. He referred to the Adult Social Care peer review findings in relation to safeguarding and stated that the Council and Members should be proud of these achievements.

He talked about challenges and highlighted resources as the biggest challenge. The Cabinet Member for Business Services questioned Mr Turpitt on what the board was doing to address the constraints on resources to ensure that they were ready for the implementation of the Care Act. Mr Turpitt replied that all 6 member agencies were looking at adjusting policies and procedures and he is confident in the board but there was some work to do.

The Cabinet Associate for Assets and Regeneration asked what the board was doing about shared resources to which the Chairman of the SSAB stated that joint funding would assist with improving governance going forward as the board was solely funded by the Adult Social Care directorate.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care thanked the Board for the report and referred to the dedicated team of officers that manage the cases.

The Leader closed the discussion by extending a personal thank you to the SSAB on behalf of the residents of Surrey.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. Prior to it being published, the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report be noted.
2. The provision of paper copies of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report to Surrey libraries be agreed.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

By accepting the recommendations, the Cabinet will show that the council has fulfilled its obligations to co-ordinate the activities of the SSAB. It will support the SSAB to be transparent by providing information to the public on the performance of the Board in the delivery of its strategic plan.

The provision of paper copies of the SSAB Annual Report to Surrey libraries will assist to ensure that there is easy access to the report for Surrey residents who do not have internet access.

From 1 April 2015 when the Care Act 2014 will be implemented, it will be a statutory requirement for Safeguarding Adults Boards to produce and publish a Strategic Plan and an Annual Report. The Strategic Plan will need to set out how SSAB will protect and help adults in Surrey and what actions each member of the SSAB will take to deliver the plan. The Annual Report will need to state what both the SSAB and its members have done to carry out and deliver the objectives and other content of its strategic plan. The SSAB wish to comply with these future requirements in advance of the statutory duty.

### **155/14 SURREY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD (SSCB) ANNUAL REPORT 2013 - 2014 [Item 7]**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Mrs Angell, introduced the Annual Report of the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) for 2013/14 which it is a statutory, multi agency board, chaired by an independent chairman, Mrs Alex Walters. She commented that 2013/14 had been a difficult year with budget constraints and a major restructure within Children's Services and that the Board had played a key role in monitoring and evaluating changes. Mrs Angell invited Mrs Alex Walters, to present the detail of the report.

Mrs Walters began by explaining that there had been a statutory duty to have the SSCB since 2006 and that it was a strategic partnership and not a delivery board. Its primary function was to coordinate safeguarding arrangements and look at the effectiveness of safeguarding. She signposted Members to the four priority areas of achievement from within the report and outlined the key achievements of the SSCB. She commented on the publication of the Serious Case Reviews and highlighted the evidence of learning from these. Mrs Walters then praised the positive engagement of partner agencies before referring to the key messages at the end of the annual report.

Cabinet Members queried attendance at the board and were reassured that Mrs Walters felt that engagement was increasing and the work of subgroups was helping with this.

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning commented that she was very pleased to see that section 11 had been completed for schools.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families thanked the Chairman and Board Members for their hard and the step up in performance made.

The Leader of the Council concluded the discussion by providing his personal thanks on behalf of the 272,000 children in Surrey.

**RESOLVED:**

1. Prior to it being published, the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report be noted.
2. The provision of paper copies of the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report to Surrey libraries be agreed.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The Board is constituted Under Section 13 of the Children Act 2004; its objectives are set out in Section 14 of the Children Act 2004. Regulation 5 of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) Regulations 2006 sets out the statutory functions of the LSCB.

Section 14a of the Children Act 2004 requires that the independent Chairman publishes an Annual Report on the effectiveness of child safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the local area.

Accepting the recommendation will provide evidence the Council has fulfilled its obligations under Section 13 of the Children Act 2004.

**156/14 SURREY EDUCATIONAL TRUST - ANNUAL REPORT [Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning introduced the first report of the Surrey Educational Trust. She explained that the Trust was established as a Company Limited by Guarantee in 2010, to distribute a proportion of the earnings generated through the joint venture between Surrey County Council and Babcock 4S and that the purpose of the Trust was to provide support to Surrey state funded schools, educational projects and organisations for the benefit of children, young people and learners from Surrey.

She explained that applications must support one of a number of criteria themes including:

- Leadership development;
- Extending educational opportunity;
- Increasing young people's resilience and personal growth;
- Modern Foreign Languages;
- English as an Additional Language; and
- Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics.

There was a nominal limit of £25,000 on bids and that £360,755 had been allocated to 25 projects to date through three bidding rounds.

Mrs Kemeny also drew attention to paragraph 19 of the report where Trustees were considering investing £600,000 into a building society.

The report highlights 3 case studies where funding had been granted and Members showed their support for them.



**RESOLVED:**

That the projects funded through the Surrey Educational Trust be noted.

**Reasons for Decision:**

Reporting the activity of the Trust to Cabinet demonstrates a continuing investment in improving outcomes for Surrey's children and young people. It also ensures greater public accountability and transparency about how the funds are used to support projects of an educational nature. To date the funding allocated to the Trust by the County Council totals £1,213,003.07.

**157/14 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 2014  
[Item 9]**

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report for the mid year point for 2014/15, for the period up to 30 September and focused his introductory comments around the four core elements of the Council's financial strategy to:

- Keep any additional call on the council taxpayer to a minimum;
- Continuously drive the efficiency agenda;
- Develop a funding strategy to reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and government grant income; and
- Continue to maximise our investment in Surrey.

He stated that the forecast revenue position was for an overspend of £400,000 at year end and that he was pleased to report this £2m improvement on the previous month's forecast.

He also highlighted the recommendation to transfer budgets of £1.1m to reflect the movement of the vast majority of the Pensions Administration team into Shared Services, building the capacity to offer efficient pensions services to the public sector. The remaining £100,000 transfer brought the pension fund management and commissioning of pensions administration into the same team.

In relation to keeping any additional call on the council taxpayer to a minimum he highlighted:

- The end of year revenue forecast was for services to overspend by £0.4m.
- Though services had forecast a small overspend, the Cabinet's strong commitment to tight financial management, backed up actions of managers across the council would make this the fifth consecutive year the council has a small underspend or a balanced budget.
- The Chief Executive and Director of Finance had held support sessions with heads of service and concluded the key efficiencies strategies were valid. To keep up progress in the rigour of services' savings plans, the support sessions would continue. The Chief Executive and Director of Finance would continue to report progress at the council's regular briefings to all Members.

On Continuously drive the efficiency agenda he stated:

- At the end of September, services forecast delivering efficiencies of £69m.

- Of the £69m, nearly 75% had either already been achieved or was on track, about 15% had some issues and less than 10% was considered to be at risk.

With regards to developing a funding strategy to reduce the Council's reliance on council tax and government grant income, the Leader reported the following:

- Reducing reliance on government grants and council tax was key to balancing the budgets over the longer term. The Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund had already invested over £5m this year and forecasts delivering £0.5m net income.

With regard to continuing to maximise our investment in Surrey he said:

- The Council's capital programme not only improved and maintained the Council's services, 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 £200m in 2014/15. The current forecast was to overspend by £6.5m, including long term investments.

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:**

That the forecasted +£0.4m overspent revenue position for 2014/15 (paragraph 2 of the submitted report) be noted.

That services' forecast achieving £69.0m efficiencies and service reductions by year end (paragraph 54 of the submitted report) be noted.

That the Council forecasts investing £207m through its capital programme in 2014/15 (paragraph 58 of the submitted report be noted).

The quarter end balance sheet as at 30 September 2014 and movements in earmarked reserves and debt outstanding (paragraphs 61 to 63 of the submitted report) be noted.

Services' management actions to mitigate overspends (set out throughout the submitted report) be noted.

The virement of £1.1m gross expenditure budget from Human Resources & Organisational Development to Shared Services (£1m) and Finance (£0.1m) to realign budgets and service responsibilities (paragraphs 33 to 35) be approved.

#### **Reasons for Decision:**

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

## **158/14 SURREY SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORMULA 2015/16 [Item 10]**

Schools were funded on the basis of a formula determined by each local authority within parameters set by the Department for Education (DfE). Following annual consultation with all school during September and the Schools Forum on 1 October 2014, the report set out the recommended formula for the funding of Surrey schools in 2015/16.

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning began by thanking officers for their work and then explained that the submitted report was necessarily a technical report seeking approval for the proposed funding mechanisms and values of key formula factors through which Surrey schools would be funded in 2015/16.

Schools and many school support services are funded by Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and were split into three categories of educational provision. The report recommended that a transfer of £10 million was made from Schools to High Needs to support children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and this was a key piece of work.

She went on to say that the report set out the recommendations from the Schools Forum (Annex 2 of the submitted report) and that the Council was required to submit its proposed schools' funding formula to the Education Funding Agency by 31 October 2014. The equalities impact assessment (annex 3 of the submitted report) was referred to.

The Leader of the Council considered that this was the result of the good work done over a number of years by a number of Members and officers.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. The funding formula for Surrey schools be prepared on the basis of a £10m transfer within Dedicated Schools Grant from Schools to High Needs -principally to children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).
2. The commitment to a long term resolution of funding pressures in special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) be noted, with the Cabinet to receive a report on progress in February 2015.
3. The revisions to the schools' funding formula, as recommended by the Schools Forum and set out in paragraph 21 of the submitted report, be introduced.
4. The proposed Surrey formula factors as set out in Annex 2 of the submitted report be approved for submission to the DfE by the 31 October deadline.
5. Authority is delegated to the Assistant Director, Schools & Learning, in conjunction with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Schools & Learning, to update and amend the formula as appropriate following receipt of the DSG settlement and DfE pupil data in December 2014. This is to ensure that total allocations to schools under this formula

remain affordable within the council's DSG settlement to be announced during December.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To comply with DfE regulations requiring notification of the Council's funding formula for schools by 31 October 2014.

**159/14 CREATION OF A JOINT TRADING STANDARDS SERVICE WITH BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Community Services introduced the report and explained that the proposal was a natural continuation from the 2012 Public Value Review and recommended the creation of a joint Trading Standards Service between Surrey and Buckinghamshire.

The new service would provide an enhanced service for residents and businesses in both counties. It would also ensure future service resilience, whilst at the same time reducing costs. The cashable savings would equate to approximately 12% of the joint service delivery costs by year 4. The alternative for each service would be service delivery reductions which would reduce both the protection for residents and the support for local businesses.

She commented that Buckinghamshire County Council had agreed the proposal at their Cabinet meeting the previous day and that the Communities Select Committee had also reviewed the proposals and voted in favour of the approach.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care stated that he welcomed the approach and that it was a fantastic development for the Trading Standards service.

Following agreement of the recommendations in the submitted report, Councillor Margaret Ashton from Buckinghamshire County Council spoke to explain her enthusiasm for the joint service and confirmed that Buckinghamshire Cabinet had agreed wholeheartedly with the approach yesterday. She asked Members to note the importance of the work done and how it should be used as a promotion tool to other local authorities who may be considering similar options. She expressed particular thanks to the officers from Surrey and Buckinghamshire for the work they had done and that she looked forward to working together in partnership.

**RESOLVED:**

1. The proposal to create a new Joint Trading Standards Service with Buckinghamshire County Council with effect from 1 April 2015 be approved.
2. That the Executive functions of the Council, which are within the remit of the Trading Standards service, shall be discharged by a newly constituted Joint Committee to be established with Buckinghamshire County Council with effect from 1 April 2015 be agreed.
3. That the Joint Committee will comprise one Cabinet Member from each partner authority, together with another member from each who may attend regularly in an optional advisory and supportive capacity but who would not form part of the Joint Committee itself be agreed.
4. The responsibility for agreeing the detail of an Inter Authority Agreement with Buckinghamshire, and other related issues including establishing the Standing Orders for the Joint Committee, be delegated to the Strategic Director for Customers and Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services.
5. The responsibility to amend the Council's Constitution to reflect the changes arising from the report be delegated to the Director of Legal and Democratic Services.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The creation of a new joint Trading Standards service will enhance services for residents and business in Surrey and in Buckinghamshire.

A new joint service will enable both local authorities to achieve the Medium Term Financial Plan targets, and will position the service better to generate further income in future years.

The alternative for each service would be to make service delivery reductions which in turn would reduce protection for residents and the support available for local businesses.

**160/14 RIGHTS OF WAY PRIORITY STATEMENT [Item 14]**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning introduced the revised Rights of Way Priority Statement set out as an annex within the submitted report.

He explained that the Rights of Way Priority Statement set out how the County Council prioritises and sets targets for undertaking legal orders associated with keeping the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way in Surrey up to date.

He thanked the officers involved in this area of work and explained that the changes set out will benefit Surrey residents and landowners. He referred to the equality impact assessment (annex B of the submitted report) and

commented that although this was set out in the old format and dated 2009, what was included was relevant but he had asked officers to update the EIA going forward.

**RESOLVED:**

The revised Rights of Way Priority Statement be approved by the Cabinet and recommended to Council for approval.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The revision alters the document to better reflect the Council's statutory duties, address public safety issues and maximise opportunities to improve the rights of way network.

**161/14 SUNNYDOWN SCHOOL, CATERHAM: SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT [Item 15]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning explained that the purpose of this item was to approve the Business Case for the improvement of teaching and dining facilities at Sunnydown School. The school was a specialist facility that taught 90 boys from 11 to 16 years of age with specific difficulties. The proposal would enable refurbishment and specialist teaching facilities to be provided.

The financial information was detailed under item 19 but was subject to part 2 requirements.

It was confirmed that the local member Mr John Orrick supported the improvement project for Sunnydown School.

**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 improved teaching and dining facilities at Sunnydown School in Caterham be approved.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide appropriate facilities for all vulnerable children who attend the school and who have failed to thrive in a mainstream setting and will benefit from this specialist facility.

**162/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL IN HOUSE RESIDENTIAL CARE HOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE [Item 16]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care began by stating that the Council was well aware of the impact on all residents, their families, carers, staff and that any decision on the future of these homes would have over time.

Mr Few stated that the primary role of the Council was the safeguarding of all vulnerable adults and that no action would be taken if it put any adult in an unsafe position. He also stated that should the consultation support the preferred option to close these homes, no relocations will take place until spring of 2015.

The decision to proceed with this consultation on the future of the homes has been taken after considering the following factors.

- Along with the trend throughout the country the strategy was to encourage the elderly to remain in their own homes where many have lived for many years among their own friend's families and communities.
- It is also recognised that this change was creating a need for nursing homes where the elderly move to when they can no longer remain in their own homes. None of Surrey's homes were equipped to provide such care.
- The six homes were commissioned in the late 1970's. The facilities do not match today's requirements in that bathrooms and toilets were not gender specific. Also bedrooms were not of an acceptable size, which often places stress on the staff as they regularly have to manoeuvre the resident's furniture to accommodate lifting equipment.

Mr Few went on to state that the homes were under-utilised, and would continue to remain so in order to enable staff to provide the attention that each resident requires.

He confirmed that the sites on which the homes were located limited the amount of expansion that could be achieved including implementing ensuite rooms and additional facilities and in doing this, the bed capacity would be reduced by between 40-60% making the cost of running these homes cost prohibitive. In order to modernise these homes it would require significant capital expenditure in the order of £60m.

Mr Few highlighted that the report and annexes contain the details of all the homes under consultation, details of the consultation process and a full equalities impact assessment. He confirmed that the results of the consultation process were expected in February 2015 and following this the Cabinet will be asked to assess the results and accept the conclusion that they deliver.

The Leader of the Council concluded that it is important that the Council provided the right form and level of care but the realities were that the physical state of the homes. He stressed the importance of seeing the evidence from the consultation to find the best way forward for the residents.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That a consultation with residents, families, carers, staff, trade unions and other affected stakeholders commences regarding the future of Surrey County Council's six in-house older people's residential care homes be approved

The homes are as follows:

- Brockhurst in Ottershaw
  - Cobgates in Farnham
  - Dormers in Caterham
  - Longfield in Cranleigh
  - Park Hall in Reigate
  - Pinehurst in Camberley
2. Further recommendations on the results of the consultation on 24 February 2015 be received.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

As people continue to live independently in the community for longer, when they do require residential care their needs tend to be more complex. As such, there has been an increase in the number and proportion of nursing care placements being commissioned as opposed to residential care placements. Surrey County Council is considering its commissioning strategy as a result of this.

Surrey County Council's Adult Social Care Directorate, in partnership with Clinical Commissioning Groups, continues to commission services that support a shift away from residential care to personalised social care in community settings, supporting individuals to live independently and safely. The physical environments of the homes reduce the ability to deliver a quality service maintaining dignity and no longer represent best value for money in light of the new CQC requirements.

**163/14 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 17]**

The delegated decisions taken by Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet were noted.

Gratitude was expressed by a number of Cabinet Team regarding the Leader's Community Improvement Fund.

**RESOLVED:**

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.

**164/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 18]**

**RESOLVED** that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.



## 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.

### **165/14 SUNNYDOWN SCHOOL , CATERHAM: SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT [Item 19]**

This report was the confidential annex for item 15 of this agenda.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. The business case for the provision of improved teaching and dining facilities at Sunnydown School in Caterham be approved at a total estimated cost of £2,167,960.
2. 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.

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

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide appropriate facilities for all vulnerable children who attend the school and who have failed to thrive in a mainstream setting and will benefit from this specialist facility.

### **166/14 WOKING FIRE STATION [Item 20]**

The Cabinet agreed in September 2012 that Surrey County Council (SCC) would participate in a Joint Venture Company, Bandstand Square Developments Ltd (BSDL), with Woking Borough Council (WBC) and Moyallen Ltd to regenerate Woking Town Centre. An important element of the project was the provision of a new fire station in Woking.

The Cabinet were requested to approve a payment to BSDL Ltd for improvements to facilities that would be delivered under Phase 1 of the project, and which were required to ensure future resilience and flexibility as determined by the Public Safety Plan.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services confirmed her support for this project.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. A payment of £2m (in two tranches as set out below) to BSDL Ltd in consideration of improvements in facilities delivered in relation to the new Woking Fire Station, being developed under Phase 1 of the

project, over and above the direct replacement of the existing station be approved.

2. The consideration be paid in tranches; for example with the first payment being made upon exchange of the Development Agreement and a second tranche upon effective completion of the new Fire Station in 2016, with the proposed underlying contractual arrangements being subject to appropriate financial and legal due-diligence be approved, in principle.
3. Appropriate contractual and financial arrangements, following completion of the required due-diligence be delegated to the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business Services and the Section 151 Officer.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The proposal to develop an enlarged fire station on Goldsworth Road in Woking will provide a modern facility with enhanced capability and enhanced training facilities and will ensure resilience to the provision of fire fighting capability in the west of the county.

The project as a whole will deliver further regeneration of Woking Town Centre and will improve the long-term viability of the existing retail offer in the town. The development will create additional employment in both the development phase and in the longer term.

The Council's payment to BSDL recognises that the new fire station delivers substantial betterment compared to the facilities at the existing station and to recognise that the backlog maintenance associated with the existing building can be removed.

**167/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 21]**

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

However, it was agreed that Sunnydown School, Caterham: Special Education Needs Improvement Project would be publicised.

[Meeting closed at 3:55pm]

---

**Chairman**

**CABINET – 21 OCTOBER 2014  
PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Public Questions**

**Question (1) from David Beaman to ask:**

There is a long standing concern of many residents of Hale and Upper Hale regarding the increasing level and general speed of traffic which includes a high number of HGVs using Upper Hale Road. On behalf of the constituents of Upper Hale that I represent on Farnham Town Council I submitted a question to the meeting of the SCC/Waverley Local Committee that was held on Friday 26 September regarding a number of issues relating to Upper Hale Road including a number of suggestions to improve safety of all road users and pedestrians using Upper Hale Road as well as improving the general environment of all residents living along Upper Hale Road and associated side roads. The response that I received to my question was more or less what is already known although there is one interesting fact given in the reply that the average recorded speed on Upper Hale Road is 32 mph which is higher than the speed limit along most of this road and being an average implies that some traffic is travelling even faster! The reply that I received does not give any indication of any action that is planned to be implemented in the foreseeable future by either SCC or WBC to either reduce the number of HGVs and /or reduce the general average speed of all traffic using Upper Hale Road. I am particularly concerned that any proposals that are implemented to reduce the level of traffic passing through Central Farnham to improve conditions for people living, working and visiting Farnham Town Centre and in particular reduce vehicle emissions to levels within allowed European limits will only result in more traffic including more HGVs using Upper Hale Road. A high number of children walk and cross Upper Hale Road when travelling to and from Hale Primary School which has 443 children aged between 3 and 11 on its school roll (Ofsted report on visit made in June 2013) and Hale Sure Start Children's Centre whose reach area includes 754 children under the age of 5 (Ofsted report on visit made in January 2014). Both Hale Primary School and Hale Sure Start Children's Centre are located on Upper Hale Road as is the Sandy Hill Community Bungalow which is used for a number of various community activities at all times of day by a significant number of local residents and particularly those living on the Sandy Hill estate whilst the Tesco Express store at the junction of Upper Hale Road with Alma Lane is the main convenience store used by residents of Hale and Upper Hale many of whom are elderly. With this high level of pedestrian movement and with narrow footpaths in many places the current situation is an accident waiting to happen.

I have the following questions for Surrey County Council's (SCC) Cabinet:-

1. Could an assurance be given that any traffic measures that are implemented in Farnham Town Centre will not result in any increase in total traffic and in particular HGVs using Upper Hale Road;

2. Could SCC working with Waverley Borough Council and Farnham Town Council actively investigate means that could be implemented to reduce the level of traffic, and in particular HGVs, using Upper Hale Road and reduce the average speed of traffic that is currently recorded at 32 mph to an average speed within the existing 30 mph speed limit; and
3. In the response to my written question to the SCC/Waverley Local Committee, I was advised that in October and November work would be undertaken to raise kerbs at vehicle accesses to preserve a surface water check along the edges of Upper Hale Road and in the supplementary question allowed to me, I asked if specific attention could be given to resolving the problems caused by the formation of surface water outside 67 Upper Hale Road which currently takes place on a frequent basis, and has remained unresolved despite being reported to SCC on several occasions over recent years. I would be grateful if an assurance could now be given to ensuring that whatever action is necessary will be taken to resolve this long outstanding problem.

**Reply:**

1. A public consultation has been undertaken considering pedestrianisation of Farnham Town Centre. This has been led by the Local Member of Parliament (Mr Jeremy Hunt) but has not yet formally been considered by the County Council. Before any formal decision is made as to the viability or otherwise of such a proposal, work will be undertaken to assess any potential consequences. In advance of this work, it is not possible to give you an assurance that there will not be any impact on Upper Hale Road.
2. Highway improvements to amend traffic flow or speeds are a matter for the Waverley Local Committee, who have to determine priorities for their area. I would refer you to the answer provided at the Waverley Local Committee on 26 September 2014.
3. The County Council is arranging kerbing works to be completed as you have described in the coming months. Officers have been advised of your concerns for 67 Hale Road and will address the problem as appropriate.

**Mr John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery**  
**21 October 2014**

**COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING  
REPORT FOR AUGUST 2014**

**Date Considered: 2 October 2014**

- 1 At its meeting on 2 October 2014 the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered the finance and budget monitoring report for August 2014. This had previously been reviewed by the Committee's Performance & Finance Sub-Group, along with detailed monitoring reports for the three areas within the Committee's remit: Business Services; Chief Executive's Office; and Central Income & Expenditure.
- 2 The Committee was mindful of the budget pressures faced by services in the current financial year, and was also aware that these pressures were likely to intensify in the coming year. The Central Income & Expenditure budget includes risk contingencies totalling £5m, and the Committee was of the view that, as the budget position was likely to become more challenging in the future, this contingency fund should be carried forward in its entirety and not be used to deal with any budget shortfalls which may arise in services in the current financial year. The Committee therefore **recommends:**

**That the full risk contingency budget of £5m contained within the Central Income & Expenditure budget be carried forward to 2015/2016.**

**NICK SKELLETT  
Chairman of the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

**FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR AUGUST 2014  
(considered by COSC on 2 October 2014)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Committee recommends that the full risk contingency budget of £5m contained within the Central Income & Expenditure budget be carried forward to 2015 / 2016.

**RESPONSE:**

The council takes a multi-year approach to its budget management, which has served it well in meeting and managing the budget pressures it has faced. As a part of this approach, the council has successfully balanced its budget each year and been able to carry forward the risk contingency each year. The council has achieved this by considering the use of reserves and balances, along with the carry forward of budgets, as a part of a coordinated approach to budget planning. In doing so, the council is aware that the use of carry forwards and reserves are only a one-off measure, and that ultimately, the council must achieve a sustainable budget through achieving on-going savings and, or increases in income.

The budget monitoring for the end of September 2014, which is on the agenda for today's meeting, is forecasting that the council will have a balanced budget for the current financial year. The forecast is for an overspending of £400,000. While this is positive and welcome, there are still risks ahead.

The option of carrying forward the risk contingency budget to help off-set pressures in the next financial year is only achievable if revenue budget does not overspend. Officers are working on plans to achieve a balanced budget and the Chief Executive and the Director of Finance are continuing their supportive challenge sessions with budget managers to ensure the Medium Term Financial Plan is delivered. If successful, the council can look to carry forward the risk contingency budget to be used as the motion recommends when it considers the budget outturn.

**David Hodge  
Leader of the Council  
21 October 2014**