

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 27 NOVEMBER 2012 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)	*Mrs Kay Hammond
Mrs Mary Angell	*Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Helyn Clack	*Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr John Furey	*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)
*Mr Michael Gosling	*Mr Tony Samuels

\* = Present

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

**152 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell.

**153 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 23 OCTOBER 2012 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**154 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**155 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

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

Six Members questions were received and their responses were tabled and are attached as Appendix 1.

Supplementary questions:

**Q1 – Mr Orrick** asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety if Surrey Fire and Rescue cover for the southern part of the county would continue at the current level. The Cabinet Member said that the latest performance figures indicated that Surrey Fire and Rescue were exceeding their target but it was being closely monitored. She also said that any major changes such as potential closure of fire stations were subject to public consultation and the Public Safety Plan was a bi-annual plan agreed last year.

**Q2 – Mrs Watson** considered the use of Farnham Castle for a Cabinet / CLT awayday was different to a conference that comprised of Councillors and Chief Executives from across the country and asked why Surrey County Council accommodation had not been used. The Leader of the Council

responded by likening the Council to a 100FTSE company where top management went off-site for discussions on their strategic direction.

**Q3 – Mrs Watson** requested comparative data for the last 10 years and also asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games to comment on any public transport links between Capel and Redhill. It was agreed that a response would be provided outside the meeting, within 10 days.

**Q4 – Mrs Watson** asked a supplementary question relating to the date that this item went to select committee and at which meeting of the Cabinet the policy was agreed. The Leader of the Council requested a note of the full question from Mrs Watson so that he could ask Mrs Angell to respond on her return from leave.

**Q5 – Mr Beardsmore** asked who would provide 'due diligence' now that Ascot Environmental was being wound up? The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment confirmed that it had taken some time to get to this point and two other types had been looked at. He confirmed that the construction of the Ecopark would be for the betterment of Surrey.

**Q6 – Mrs Watson** asked for clarification that a response had been sent to the Secretary of State. The Leader of the Council confirmed that he had taken advice and submitted a response to the Department of Transport's Draft Aviation Policy Framework Consultation.

## 156 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Six questions from members of the public were received and the responses were tabled and are attached as Appendix 2.

Supplementary questions:

**Q1 – Mr Tombs** asked if the Public Value Review of Adult Mental Health Services would permit carers to highlight any omissions in the report. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health responded by stating that the project group had not yet been set up but it would engage with the whole community and that he had his details. He also referred to the Engagement meeting on 21 January 2013.

**Q2 – Mr Telford** asked if the County Council would engage with CPRE and also Egham Museum? The Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games said that governance arrangements were at an early stage and it would become clearer as the process develops. She welcomed his assistance and interest in this area.

**Q5 and 6 – Mrs Bates** asked whether Runnymede Borough Council had received any private sponsorship since the last meeting? The Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games said that she could not answer for Runnymede Borough Council. She re-affirmed that the decision of the Cabinet taken on 23 October 2012, was 'in principle' and said that officers had been requested to prepare a business case. Mrs Bates also asked for assurance that a flood risk assessment would be undertaken and this was confirmed.

**157 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were none.

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

There were none.

**159 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

**(a) COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE CALL-IN - MAGNA CARTA 800TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS [Item 5a]**

The comments of the Communities Select Committee 'call-in' meeting, held on 14 November 2012, to review the decision taken by Cabinet on 23 October 2012 to make an in principle decision to fund the Magna Carta Visitor Centre, were tabled.

Mr Cosser, Chairman of the Communities Select Committee was invited to present them. He said that his committee had taken the decision to 'call-in' the decision to support the National Magna Carta 800<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebrations because the report considered by Cabinet on 23 October did not contain a detailed business case. In summary, the select committee's conclusions were: (i) whether or not it was appropriate for Surrey County Council to support making a contribution of £5m towards the funding of a new visitor centre for the Magna Carta celebrations, at a time when there were many pressures on the Council's budget, and (ii) that a robust business case should be in place before decisions were taken, including consideration of the many risks that surrounded this project.

The Leader of the Council responded by stating that the agenda item and the minutes from the Cabinet's 23 October 2012 meeting were clear that this was an 'in principle' decision.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games said that the select committee's call-in and witnesses input would all form part of the process on whether the County Council would proceed with this decision. She informed Cabinet that she had received a large number of emails from local people which she would also consider. However, Cabinet needed an 'in principle decision, in order to consider the proposal and investment in this project. It would only proceed, after further work has been undertaken, if she was satisfied that there was a robust business case and Cabinet would receive a further report.

Other Cabinet Members supported the 'in principle' decision and hoped that this would be an opportunity to showcase Surrey and celebrate in an appropriate way.

The Leader of the Council thanked everyone for their input and assured Members that further work would be undertaken before a final decision was taken.

## **RESOLVED:**

That the decision made at Cabinet on 23 October 2012 be confirmed.

### **Reasons for Decision**

This is an in principle decision, which will be subject to consultation and a robust business case.

## **160 SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN [Item 6]**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning asked Cabinet to consider the Surrey School Organisation Plan 2012 -2022.

The Surrey School Organisation Plan (previously called 'School Organisation in Surrey, SOIS) for 2012-21 was a contextual document which set out the policies and principles underpinning school organisation in Surrey. It highlighted the likely demand for school places as projected over a 10 year forecast period and set out the potential changes to provision that may be required in order to meet the statutory duty to provide suitable and sufficient places.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning said that it was a 'live' document with much detailed information and hoped all Members would read it to see how it affected their own divisions.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- Reference to the huge increase in the birth rate and the five year capital programme to expand school places across the county, to provide 8000 more primary school places and 600 more secondary places.
- That the county provides sufficient school places for all its pupils.
- The importance of regular reviews and consideration of demographics and house building in the county.
- Working relationships between schools and the Local Authority.
- Local committees should challenge the results of schools in their areas, to ensure that all schools provided the best education for their pupils.
- Paragraph 11.14 (Runnymede annex) to be amended to read 1500 not 3500 homes.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning thanked Members for their comments and said that she would ask the Chairman of the Education Select Committee to request that all local committees also reviewed the Plan. She would also share this information with Districts and Boroughs.

Finally, she thanked the County Council for its forward thinking approach in agreeing a capital programme and budget to enable the Plan to be delivered.

## **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND:**

That the School Organisation Plan 2012 – 22 be approved for recommendation to Council.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

The School Organisation Plan is a key contextual document used by Schools and Education Stakeholders when making long term plans. Its annual review is necessary to ensure that the best information is used in this planning process. Any comments received can both inform the existing plan and shape future iterations.

## **161 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW PROGRAMME CLOSING REPORT [Item 7]**

The Leader of the Council said that, as part of the Public Value Review (PVR) programme, 29 reviews had taken place with £279m of savings identified, which would be delivered by 2016 and no external consultants had been used in the process.

He also acknowledged the work of the Member Reference Groups and the excellent feedback from them and he stressed that select committees must continue to scrutinise services to ensure that the savings were being delivered.

He also praised the Rapid Improvement Events (RIEs) and said that this work had been recognised by Government. He thanked officers involved with the PVR programme including the Assistant Chief Executive, the Head of Policy and Performance and the Chief Finance Officer.

Other Cabinet Members made the following comments:

- As part of the transformation programme for the PVR in Services for Young People, there had been a reduction in NEETS (Not in Education, Employment or Training)
- A large percentage increase in waste re-cycling
- Huge efficiencies and savings across the Authority

## **RESOLVED:**

1. That the achievements delivered through the Public Value Review Programme be acknowledged.
2. That officers, Members and other stakeholders who contributed to the PVR Programme be thanked.
3. That the PVR Programme be formally closed and Cabinet Members and Strategic Directors be asked to ensure agreed PVR improvements and savings are delivered and monitored through the Council's financial, performance and risk management arrangements.
4. That Select Committees continue to play a vital role via monitoring and scrutiny to ensure delivery of PVR improvements and savings.

5. That the PVR Programme Closing Report be published on the Council's website and circulated widely within and outside of the Council.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

The PVR Programme Closing Report provides a summary of the benefits the Programme has delivered (and will continue to deliver) for Surrey residents and also describes key lessons learnt over the past three years.

## **162 ONE COUNTY, ONE TEAM - STRENGTHENING THE COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO INNOVATION [Item 8]**

The Leader of the Council presented this report to Cabinet Members and stressed the importance of innovation for the Council in order to continue improving outcomes and value for money for Surrey's residents. He cited specific examples of innovations – the street-lighting and highways contracts, changes to the provision of youth services, the introduction of community partnered libraries and the opening of citizen hubs run by and for disabled people. He also gave examples of innovative joint working with other organisations such as new agreements with Districts and Boroughs to regenerate local communities and work with South East 7 regional collaboration of highways.

He reminded Cabinet that, in his Leader's statement to County Council on 16 October 2012, he had mentioned the need to strengthen capacity and capability to innovate in order to deal successfully with the significant challenges that the County Council would face over the next five to ten years.

Finally, he said that this report set out how the County Council would begin to go about achieving this. It would require sustained effort over the long term but he believed that staff and Members had a vital role to play in taking it forward. He also advised Cabinet that there would be an LGA organised peer challenge on innovation taking place between 26 February – 1 March 2013 and there would be an update report to Cabinet on 26 March 2013.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the strategic framework for innovation set out in the report in order to build on the council's recent achievements and further strengthen its innovation capacity and capability be agreed.
2. That the Chief Executive works with colleagues to develop and implement the strategic framework for innovation and provides a progress report to the Cabinet on 26 March 2013.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

To further refine and strengthen the council's approach to innovation so it can exploit new opportunities, navigate significant challenges and achieve improved outcomes and value for money for Surrey's residents.

**163 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW - COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP [Item 9]**

The comments from the Communities Select Committee together with the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games' response were tabled at the meeting (Appendix 4a and 4b).

Also, tabled were the comments from the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games' response. (Appendix 5a and 5b)

Mr Cosser, Chairman of Communities Select Committee was invited to speak and present his report. He began by complimenting officers on how this Public Value Review had been conducted. He also asked the Cabinet Member for assurance on issues pertaining to Localism and the recommendations from his select committee's Localism Task Group.

The Cabinet Member thanked both the Communities Select Committee and the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their comments and made reference to her tabled responses. She confirmed that she was willing to continue to work with Members to take the recommendations forward. She fully supported the outcomes of this PVR but acknowledged that some recommendations, such as consideration of a joint committee model would require a constitutional change.

She thanked both Mark Irons, Head of Customer Services, who had worked hard to engage with all stakeholders and partners in this review and all the Community Partnership teams for their input.

The Leader of the Council expressed concern on two points; (i) paragraph 44, he said that the Council would not be in a position to give a definitive response until the forthcoming Government settlement had been received later in December, and (ii) the proposal for joint committees would stretch resources.

After a discussion on the report in which some concerns were raised, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games confirmed that this was an 'in principle' decision, to deliver some services locally and that all recommendations were subject to further work.

**RESOLVED:**

1. The Community Partnership Public Value Review and its recommendations (as summarised in paragraph 6 and detailed in this report) be noted.
2. That the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games discuss the conclusions of the PVR report with the Local Committee Chairmen and agree how the recommendations will be taken forward.
3. That some of the recommendations will need full Council agreement be noted.

## **Reason for Decisions**

The aim of the Community Partnership PVR was to review the role of SCC's Local Committees and the Community Partnership Team "to improve outcomes for residents by strengthening local democracy and placing much greater emphasis on partnership working." (David Hodge, Leader of SCC).

The recommendations in this report are designed to:

- support Members in their role as community leaders and champions
- improve decision making and speed-up processes
- promote greater accountability and local scrutiny
- increase the involvement of residents, local communities, businesses and partners.

The recommendations recognise that each local area is different and attempt to create flexibility within a framework, allowing each Local Committee to operate in a way which best suits the local need.

### **164 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEWS OF ARTS, HERITAGE AND ADULT & COMMUNITY LEARNING [Item 10]**

The comments from the Communities Select Committee together with the Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games' response were tabled at the meeting (Appendix 6a and 6b).

Mr Cosser, Chairman of Communities Select Committee was invited to expand on the recommendations of his committee. He said that he welcomed the assurance of continued Member involvement in the completion of the individual Public Value Reviews, as well as the monitoring of the combined Cultural Services PVR and said that he hoped that the select committee would continue to contribute to policy development.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games thanked him for his committee's comments and referred to her tabled response. She confirmed that the outcome of this review was a serious proposition which needed to be developed and thanked the officers involved in delivering this Public Value Review.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment, and the detailed and helpful information set out within it, which helped to provide an understanding of Surrey's communities and different cultures so that services could be shaped to meet their needs.

In relation to a query regarding Mental Health, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety agreed to provide a response to the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency outside the meeting.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the outcomes of the three Public Value Reviews be agreed and these roll forward into a new strategy and vision for Cultural Services

in Surrey, with detailed Service Improvement Plans in place by March 2013.

2. That a refreshed strategy and vision be developed for Cultural Services, including Libraries and Registration Services, which will position Surrey to become a leader for quality cultural activity in the country.
3. That a feasibility study be undertaken to create options for the provision of a new cultural hub that would position Surrey at the forefront of culture nationally and internationally, to be brought back to Cabinet for decision.
4. That a detailed research and evaluation project be undertaken to assess the potential benefits and risks of a new approach to the delivery of Cultural Services through other business models.
5. That, following completion of the Service Improvement Plans, a follow-up report is presented to the Cabinet Member, detailing all financial implications for final decision.

#### **Reasons for Decisions**

Carrying out the actions within this report will ensure SCC's cultural services create a framework to deliver an innovative cultural and learning offer that ensures value for money and establishes a leading cultural role for SCC nationally.

#### **165 PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW: ADULT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health said that this Public Value Review (PVR) has provided an excellent opportunity to focus on improving adult mental health services in Surrey. The 'bottom-up', co-design approach taken had enabled Surrey County Council to work with a range of partners to develop recommendations that promote positive mental health, encourage innovation and make ideas a reality to improve the mental health of Surrey residents.

He asked for endorsement of the co-produced recommendations from the adult mental health services PVR and to agree that the implementation plan started immediately. He said that the fourteen recommendations would need to be embedded in Surrey's culture and announced an Engagement event on 21 January 2013. He also said that the implementation of this Public Value Review (PVR) required additional funding for the personalisation agenda.

Mrs Marks, Chairman of the Adult Social Care Select Committee was invited to address the Cabinet. She informed Members that her select committee had held a special meeting to discuss this PVR and its recommendations. She confirmed that service users had been consulted and that the select committee had an in-depth debate on the PVR. She also stressed the importance of getting the transition from Children to Adults Service right, especially for those clients with Mental Health issues and she considered that the current six month waiting list for CAMHS was unacceptable and must be addressed. Finally, she thanked Donal Hegarty and his team for their work on this PVR.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety commented on the Equalities Impact Assessment and commended the Communications Strategy (Annex 5 of the report).

The Leader of the Council thanked the Chairman of Adult Social Care Select Committee for her comments and her efforts in championing Adult Mental Health Services throughout Surrey.

**RESOLVED:**

That the recommendations set out below and in detail in paragraphs 16 -58 of the report be endorsed and that implementation should start immediately.

The recommendations from the Public Value Review are as follows:

**Recommendation 1:** Establish a clear commissioning framework for mental health services, to ensure clear and measurable outcomes and expectations for providers of adult mental health services across Surrey.

**Recommendation 2:** Drive forward a strategic shift to early intervention and prevention, by investing more resources into the voluntary sector, to ensure equity across Surrey, to keep people well in their communities.

**Recommendation 3:** Embed personalisation in all adult mental health services in Surrey to create independence, not dependence, and promote choice and control for individuals.

**Recommendation 4:** Improve knowledge and awareness of mental health across the county, and address stigma and discrimination, to make sure mental health is everyone's business. This will be done in partnership with Public Health, partners and the communications team.

**Recommendation 5:** A focus on improving the mental health and well-being of Surrey County Council's workforce.

**Recommendation 6:** Ensure high quality services, by making sure people who use services and carers are involved in developing and delivering the services across all the districts and boroughs in Surrey and ensuring services reflect the outcomes of this PVR.

**Recommendation 7:** 'Think family' when working with people with mental health needs and include mental health indicators as part of Surrey's Family Support Programme.

**Recommendation 8:** Value and support carers, by building on the delivery of successful carers support in the mental health field across all districts and boroughs in Surrey.

**Recommendation 9:** Improve the pathway through mental health services to make sure people don't fall between the gaps in services. This will be achieved with our partners as a 'whole systems' local approach to mental health and emotional well-being.

**Recommendation 10:** Explore how we deliver social care outcomes and innovations in Adult Social Care mental health services across Surrey.

**Recommendation 11:** Provide support for people across Surrey with mental health and other needs by making links with other specialist areas of work such as learning disability services and substance misuse services.

**Recommendation 12:** Improve housing options and support to maintain tenancies by working in partnership with districts and boroughs, NHS Surrey/Clinical Commissioning Groups and housing providers, to enable people to find and maintain appropriate housing.

**Recommendation 13:** A focus on young people and transition, by working as one team to scope the needs of young people in Surrey who do not meet the criteria for young people's or adult services, yet need support.

**Recommendation 14:** Promote access to information, support inclusion and reduce inequalities by implementing the PVR communication strategy and measuring all providers on equalities outcomes.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

Over the past 10 months this PVR has identified the need for a strategic shift in the way that services for adults with mental health needs are commissioned and delivered in Surrey. The recommendations outlined in the main body of this report have been developed with a broad range of stakeholders and partners; implementing them will deliver Surrey's ambition of moving towards early intervention and prevention, personalised services and improved outcomes for people with mental health needs and their family/carers.

*[Note: The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes left the meeting after this item]*

## **166 BUDGET MONITORING FORECAST 2012/13 (PERIOD ENDING OCTOBER 2012) [Item 12]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and said that the council set a tough revenue budget that incorporated a number of risks, which were anticipated in the inclusion of contingencies.

He said that there were increasing demand pressures for services with both adults and children's social care but that the contingencies prudently set aside were more than sufficient to cover these growing pressures this year and would lead to a forecast year end underspending of £5.5m.

However, it was important to look to the future and Strategic Directors were looking to see how these pressures can be managed or alternative savings found so that the Medium Term Financial Plan remained on track.

He reported that the great success of the council's participation in the Olympics over the summer was all achieved within the budget set aside, and there was no recourse to the contingency set aside for this.

He said that one of the Council's most important objectives was to empower more of our adult service users through personalisation and to progress this

policy more rapidly, he proposed a one-off £1m corporate contribution to the Adult Social Care service, which would be funded through the unused provision for increased interest rates within the capital financing budget.

On Staffing, he said that Directorates were continuing to actively manage their staffing budgets, through holding vacancies to achieve savings and the appropriate use of temporary workers. Currently, 92% of staff were on contracts which was considered to be right for a healthy organisation. This had led to an underspending of £6.4m for the seven months to the end of October, and this was expected to fall to £5.1m by the end of the year as staff were recruited to our essential services. The number of occupied posts in August had increased to 7,266 while 209 posts were being recruited at the end of the month.

Finally, he said that the Cabinet was determined to deliver the Council's capital programme, especially in building new classrooms and was on track to deliver this and at a lower cost this year due to improved procurement (and partnership working with Hampshire CC).

Management actions were in place to reduce overspend, however winter demand may play a factor in delivery and the Cabinet acknowledged that it would be tough to come within Budget by the end of the financial year.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the projected revenue budget (Annex 1 – Section A) and the Capital programme direction (Section B) be noted.
2. That government grant changes be reflected in directorate budgets (Section C)
3. That the one-off corporate contribution to the funding of personalisation in Adult Social Care, as highlighted by the Leader in June 2012 (paragraph 68, Section A) be approved.

#### **Reasons for Decisions**

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

### **167 SUPPORTING THE ECONOMY THROUGH INVESTMENT IN TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE 2012 - 2019 [Item 13]**

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment said that, building on the council's success in attracting c. £20m of funding through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, this report set out proposals for developing up to 16 schemes for bidding.

The Government had released a number of new funding and financing sources to facilitate the development of major transport infrastructure, in particular those supporting the economy. This included the Growing Places funding provided to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and most recently, financing expected to become available through the Local Transport Bodies

(LTBs) yet to be set up. This is expected to amount to £7 – 10m per annum for Surrey, based on a per capita share.

The report sought endorsement: (a) for the preparatory work required to enable Surrey County Council to bid for all new funding sources to deliver major transport infrastructure, and (b) for the list of Major Schemes.

The paper summarised the various schemes being proposed as the new Major Schemes programme. This included some new schemes that have been proposed by district and borough councils, to tackle key areas of congestion on our transport network, including several town centres. It also re-prioritised the previous list of proposed schemes to be in line with the Government's proposed funding regime and to more accurately meet current and anticipated needs.

He said that a programme of major schemes had last been approved by the Executive in 2007. He also informed Members that the proposed schemes, set out in Annex 1, were not in priority order and that the first tranche of schemes ready for delivery in 2015 – 2019 would be submitted to the Local Transport Bodies by 31 March 2013.

Mr Munro, local Member for Farnham South was invited to speak. He welcomed the report and in particular, the inclusion of the Wrecclesham Relief Road and the A31 Hickley's corner junction, both near his division. He considered that it was crucial that both schemes remained in the programme, however the development of Farnham town centre could result in the order of the schemes being reversed.

After Mr Munro urged local Members to get more involved in this area, the Leader of the Council requested that officers involved local Members in the consultation process – Think Councillor, Think Resident.

Cabinet Members made the following additional points:

- Congestion (road, rail and aviation) was a key issue in Surrey
- The importance of having a series of schemes that could quickly be developed when funding became available.
- The inclusion of the A23/M23 Hooley scheme was welcomed.
- That the local committee's task groups were the forums for prioritising and agreeing the schemes.

Finally, the recommendations in the report were amended, and it was:

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND:**

1. That the revised list of Surrey County Council Major Schemes be endorsed and these changes to the Major Schemes programme in the Local Transport Plan be referred to the Council, as set out in Annexes 1 and 2.

2. That the choice of Major Schemes to be progressed in any given year to be taken by the Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.
3. That the “New Homes Bonus” funding be used to provide for that proportion of the preparatory work relating to the schemes, which is not recoverable from capital funding. The estimated cost of this for the 2012-15 period is c. £1.2m.
4. That the Cabinet be provided with a high-level update on the Major Schemes programme every 2 years, except where significant developments require immediate referral.
5. That support continues to be given to Highways Agency (HA) and National Rail (NR) schemes in Surrey detailed in their programmes and set out in Annex 3 of the submitted report.
6. Delegated authority be given to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to approve changes to the list of schemes where these are individually valued at less than £5 million.

#### **Reasons for decisions**

The programme has been designed primarily to support economic growth and regeneration in Surrey, in partnership with district and borough councils. However, schemes will also be consistent, where applicable with other objectives in the Surrey Local Transport Plan.

#### **168 TAKING PUBLIC HEALTH FORWARD IN SURREY [Item 14]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health introduced the report, explaining that following the Health & Social Care Act (2012), local authorities would take on a range of new responsibilities for protecting and promoting the public’s health from April 2013, funded by a ring-fenced grant. This includes the transfer of approximately 60 specialist public health staff from the NHS to local authorities to provide professional leadership for public health. The Surrey public health team relocated to Surrey County Council premises in April 2012 to support the Council in preparing to meet its new responsibilities.

The report outlined:

- the new public health responsibilities and functions transferring to Surrey County Council
- an overview of how the function operates, including finance, people and performance.
- the opportunities, impact and issues for the Council.

He confirmed that redistribution of public health finances was still being finalised. However, it would be set out in the forthcoming Council Budget papers. He also said that working arrangements had been developed with Borough and District Councils and the Clinical Commissioning Groups.

Cabinet Members welcomed the report and the opportunity that the transfer of Public Health to Surrey County Council would have to create a more integrated preventative approach for Surrey residents.

Finally, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health agreed to attend local committees, if invited and give a similar presentation to them, as had been given to Borough and District Councils.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Council's public health responsibilities from April 2013 be acknowledged and welcomed.
2. That the aims and aspirations for public health in Surrey, as set out in the submitted report, be agreed.
3. That the steps set out in the submitted report, that aim to encourage and enable all public agencies in Surrey to take actions to improve the life chances of every resident, be agreed.
4. That a programme of communication and engagement with stakeholders including boroughs, districts, communities and the voluntary, community and faith sector, be agreed.

#### **Reasons for Decisions**

These recommendations are made because:

- The Council is required to take on its new public health responsibilities, including six mandatory service areas (see Annex 1 of the submitted report) from April 2013.
- The public health team has the expertise to enable the Council to deliver its new responsibilities, working in partnership with other organisations, where appropriate, including Public Health England.
- The Council needs to make the most of this opportunity for a new way of working and ensure that its policies reflect its role in providing local leadership for public health.

Our partners need to understand how the Council will meet its new responsibilities.

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

The Cabinet noted the delegated decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting as set out in Appendix 7 be noted.

### **Reason for Decisions**

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

#### **170 ENGLISH NATIONAL CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL SCHEME - SURREY SCHEME FOR 2013/14 [Item 16]**

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment confirmed that Surrey County Council was responsible for the administration of the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) within the county boundary and this report reviewed the existing scheme and set out the Surrey concessionary travel scheme for residents aged 60+ and disabled residents for 2013/14. He said that the scheme was driven by resident demand and that the two local scheme enhancements were a relatively small additional cost. He also said that figures quoted in paragraph 10 were still being validated and that he would update the Cabinet outside the meeting.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the existing Surrey concession travel scheme offer be retained for 2013/14.
2. That the ability to decide on amendments to bus operator reimbursement is delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure together with the Group Manager, Travel and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.

### **Reason for Decisions**

This is a statutory obligation for the council. The two local scheme enhancements proposed have a relatively low additional cost but a high value placed upon them by their users.

#### **171 ONSLOW PARK AND RIDE CONTRACT [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency thanked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment for his work with Guildford Borough Council which enabled Onslow Park and ride to come to fruition. She was also pleased to report that an excellent procurement exercise had been undertaken. Finally, she reported that commercial details were set out in a confidential annex (minute ref: 174/12)

#### **RESOLVED:**

Following consideration of the results of the procurement process, the award of a contract be agreed on the basis set out in the Part 2 Annex to design and construct a 550 space park and ride site at Onslow, west of the A3 and adjacent to the University of Surrey Sports Park.

### **Reason 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.

#### **172 EAST SURREY GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT FOR SCHOOLS AND OTHER SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPERTIES [Item 18]**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency presented the report and advised Cabinet that this was a renewal of an existing contract and that the commercial details were set out in a confidential annex (Minute ref: 175/12).

#### **RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the results of the procurement process, set out in item 21, the award of a contract be agreed on the basis set out in the Part 2 Annex.

### **Reasons for Decisions**

The existing contracts will expire on 31 December 2012, a waiver has been agreed by PRG number WR0590 (8/8/12) to extend existing contract arrangements for one month until 31 January 2013 to allow for adequate 'start up' processes to be ready. 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.

#### **173 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 19]**

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

#### **174 ONSLOW PARK AND RIDE ANNEX [Item 20]**

Further to the item considered in Part 1 of the meeting (Minute reference: 171/12), the Cabinet considered the commercial details relating to this contract and were pleased with the procurement savings of this contract.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the contract be awarded to Skanska at the figure set out in the report and based on a bill of quantities. This scheme is fully funded by the LSTF.

### **Reason 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.

**175 EAST SURREY MAINTENANCE CONTRACT FOR SCHOOLS AND OTHER SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPERTIES - ANNEX [Item 21]**

Further to the item considered in Part 1 of the meeting (Minute reference: 172/12), the Cabinet considered the commercial details relating to this contract.

**RESOLVED:**

That contracts be awarded to Lotus Landscapes Ltd for contracts numbered 2, 5 and 6, at a value, as set out in the submitted report, for 5 years for the provision of Grounds Maintenance at Schools and other Surrey County Council properties to commence on 1 February 2013 and that contracts be awarded to Quadron Services Ltd for contracts numbered 8, 9 and 10, as set out in the submitted report, per annum for 5 years for the provision of Grounds Maintenance at Schools and other Surrey CC Properties to commence on 1 February 2013.

**Reason for Decisions**

The existing contracts will expire on 31 December 2012. 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.

**176 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 22]**

That non-exempt information relating to the Onslow Park and Ride contract (item 20) and East Surrey Maintenance Contract for Schools and other SCC properties (item 21) considered in Part 2 of the meeting may be made available to the press and public, as appropriate.

Meeting closed at 4.35pm.

---

**Chairman**

**ITEM 4 - PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Member Questions**

Question (1) from Mr John Orrick (Caterham Hill)

The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service Public Safety Plan 2011-2020 states: "9.16 We will continue to liaise with our neighbouring Fire and Rescue Authorities about emergency response provision arrangements and their effect on Surrey. Specifically, West Sussex Fire and Rescue Authority have removed one of the two fire engines from Horley Fire station following their consultation. The agreement that we have with West Sussex for the provision of an emergency response to areas of Horley remains in place and we consider that we are able to provide an appropriate level of response to this area based upon the resources available from Surrey and West Sussex." As a result of the SFRS Public Safety Plan cuts in the number of appliances at Lingfield and Cranleigh were made when it was known that West Sussex were reducing cover at Horley.

The proposed closure of Horley Fire Station poses a significant threat not only to residents of Horley, but also to residents of a large section of the southern area of Surrey stretching from Waverley Eastern Villages, through Mole Valley and Reigate & Banstead, to Tandridge as a reduced number of appliances will have a larger area to cover.

What action does the Cabinet Member propose to take to ensure that residents are kept safe and have no lowering of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service cover in those areas?

**Reply:**

Surrey Fire Authority have duties under the Fire Rescue Act 2004. The Public Service Plan which was consulted upon widely and agreed in June 2011 reiterates the obligations under the Act and has agreed response times across Surrey.

Officers from Surrey Fire and Rescue Service have been in regular contact with their West Sussex counterparts during their consultation discussing the potential implications and some options on how we can address this change. Now that we know the West Sussex decision and their timelines, we are making arrangements to minimise the impact on emergency response in Surrey. This was discussed with my Fire and Rescue Advisory Group on 16 November and they agreed with the following course of action.

It is important to note that West Sussex are removing their fire engine from Horley Fire Station, they plan to continue to base their technical rescue vehicles and other specialist vehicles at this site. They have also offered the opportunity for Surrey FRS to lease part of the site and base a fire engine there to assist with the provision of fire cover in the area.

An options analysis has been undertaken to consider a range of potential courses of action in response to the change proposed by West Sussex. These included doing nothing, relocating existing resources or funding additional resources from a range of sources and availability options. The options were considered in relation to their impact on emergency response performance, cost, achievability within time and resource constraints as well

as anticipated public acceptability and conformity with the principles agreed under the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority Public Safety Plan 2011-2020.

The preferred option is to relocate a Surrey fire engine to the Horley area. This option is in accordance with the PSP principles and public opinion will be gauged through the forthcoming consultation process, which is due to start in December 2012.

In view of the short timescale associated with this change, parallel planning will be put into place to enable implementation by 1st April 2013; subject to the decision of the Fire and Rescue Authority following feedback received during the consultation. It is important to note that we are continuing to discuss all options with West Sussex regarding implementation and impact. Also, the normal mutual aid arrangements with West Sussex will continue as it does with our other neighbouring Fire and Rescue Services. This means that fire engines based at Horsham (where the Horley fire engine will be relocated), Crawley and East Grinstead can respond to the southern area of Surrey if required.

Regarding the changes detailed within the PSP, that are specifically highlighted by Councillor Orrick at Lingfield and Cranleigh, we are also planning to consult widely on the next stage of PSP implementation, which will be the second two year action plan. This will be occurring early next year and will be taking into account what has happened since the PSP was published two years ago, such as the changes at Horley and the development work undertaken on the on-call duty system in Surrey. This is designed to provide greater control over when on-call fire engines are available to respond, as well as ensuring staff are rewarded appropriately and have sufficient time allocated to be trained so that they can undertake their role effectively.

Naturally I would encourage all Surrey residents to do what they can to keep themselves safe, such as making sure they have a working smoke alarm and fire escape plan. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service can assist with this by providing advice through a Home Fire Safety Visit and targeting our "at risk"<sup>1</sup> groups and installing a free smoke alarm to those most in need. These are available on our [website](#) or by calling 0800 085 0767.

**Kay Hammond**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Safety**  
**27 November 2012**

<b>Question (2) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)</b>
---

On 5 – 6 November 2012, the Conservative Cabinet, together with senior officers of the Council, spent two days with an overnight stay at Farnham Castle on a residential Corporate Leadership Team meeting, at Surrey Council Taxpayers expense. Given the large amount of property the County Council owns, why could this not have been held in a Surrey owned building, with officers and members attending on a daily basis? What was the cost to

---

<sup>1</sup> Elderly (aged over 65, but especially those over 75 years), mental health, alcohol or drug issues, living alone, smokers

Council Taxpayers of holding the event at Farnham Castle including accommodation, food, conference facilities and travel?

**Reply:**

The cost of the two day workshop held at Farnham Castle was £4158 - this equates to £160 per head for accommodation and food.

I am sure you will agree with me that it is imperative for the leadership team to spend time tackling and determining key issues in a focussed and collective way. Surrey County Council is a huge organisation, dealing with a variety of issues of an increasingly complex nature and it is essential that we address these issues seriously. I believe for practical purposes it is more efficient on time and energy and is less disruptive on day to day services, if this happens at a location other than County Hall.

I am sure you will understand this having just spent two days yourself at a conference paid for by the taxpayer.

**David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**27 November 2012**

**Question (3) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)**

Since the County Council entered into a contract with East Surrey College to run the adult education service in the eastern half of the county, which adult education centres have closed and what evidence is there that the adult education provision in the east of the county is equivalent to that provided in-house in the western side of the county in terms of quality and quantity of provision?

**Reply:**

Since East Surrey College was awarded the direct contract for Community Learning from the then Learning and Skills Council from 2007 two centres leased at Bletchingley and Dorking from the County Council have been closed by the College. The Dorking centre was scheduled to be returned to the Council as part of the contractual arrangements when East Surrey College's lease expired. Bletchingley was closed last year when their new building was opened.

In 2011 East Surrey College opened a new, well designed building with excellent facilities in Redhill. The College' strategy is to attract the maximum number of enrolments through this facility while maintaining a community based programme offer from various venues in the east of the County.

The latest data available from the Skills Funding Agency show that there is not a great deal of difference in adults engaging in learning in the eastern third of the County when compared to the area where the County Council retains the direct contract. The County Council Service did deliver more enrolments at a lower unit cost than the College. However, the participation rates are similar. The College advises that their enrolment numbers have

continued to grow since the opening of the new building. Further data analysis will be undertaken in first quarter of 2013 when the next release of County wide information will be available from the Skills Funding Agency.

The County Council's Adult Learning Service delivers Family Learning across the whole County. While other providers have smaller Community Learning contracts including Nescot and the WEA who are prominent in the east of the County.

The County Council's Adult Learning Service continues to work with the College Principal to build a stronger relationship that will lead to an improved learning offer across the County. The new College building in Redhill is something that we should be all proud to have located in our community. It is as good as any in the country.

**Helyn Clack**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**27 November 2012**

<b>Question (4) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)</b>
---

The 2011 report "Reconfiguring in-house short breaks service provision for children with disabilities" stated:

7. In 2010 a review of the three homes was undertaken using the following principles:
  - a) Residential provision should only be used for children assessed as having the greatest level of care needs
  - b) No child under 10 years of age should be accessing residential short break provision except in exceptional circumstances

What are "exceptional circumstances" and what is the difference between "exceptional circumstances" in (b) and "the greatest level of care needs" in (a)? At what meeting of Cabinet was the policy that "No child under 10 years of age should be accessing residential short break provision except in exceptional circumstances" agreed? Why is the policy that "no child under 10 years of age should be accessing residential short break provision except in exceptional circumstances" not included in the "Shorts Breaks Statement for parents and carers of disabled children and young people in Surrey, October 2012", the Council's duty statement under the Children & Young Person's Act 2008?

**Reply:**

Residential short break services that are provided or commissioned by the Council deliver specialist support from purpose built or adapted accommodation and skilled and trained care staff. These services are able to meet the needs of disabled children and young people who cannot safely access universal services. This will include children with severe learning difficulties, often with communication difficulties and challenging behaviour, or children and young people with complex health needs requiring specialist support. These are children with 'the greatest level of care needs' where there is a serious risk of the family breaking down or the child or young person

needing to become looked after by the council as their family are unable to cope without support services in place.

For younger children, community or family based provision will always be preferred as a more child centred and appropriate option to residential care. Residential settings can be busy and noisy places, and there are particular issues involved with multiple carers looking after the children and the possible impact of other children and young people with challenging behaviour who may be staying in the unit. However for some younger children their particular needs will mean that it is not possible for them to access family based care. They may require specialist behavioural or health care support or care in an emergency. This is what is meant by 'exceptional circumstances'.

In undertaking a review of Surrey County Council's three in-house residential short break units for children with disabilities – Ruth House, Applewood and Squirrel Lodge – in 2010, a set of principles were used to provide the framework for this review. The 'Reconfiguring in-house short breaks service provision for children with disabilities' report was considered by the Children and Families Select Committee on 8 March 2011, including the principles that were used for the review. A further report was presented to Cabinet on 26 April 2011. The focus of this report was to agree proposals for the future use of Surrey County Council's three in house residential short break units for children with disabilities, Ruth House, Applewood and Squirrel Lodge.

The Children Act 1989 requires local authorities to provide short break services designed to assist individuals who provide care for disabled children. This duty and the Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011 came into force on 1 April 2011. These require local authorities to produce a short breaks services statement so families can know:

- What services are available in their area
- The criteria in place to access these services
- How the range of services is designed to meet the needs of families with disabled children in the area.

The Short breaks Statement published by the Council sets out the range of services to be provided under the headings of 'Universal', 'Targeted' and 'Specialist' provision. Residential overnight short breaks are listed as a 'Specialist' service. There is further explanation that specialist services are accessed by families following a statutory social care assessment of need, and that the Social Care Eligibility Criteria will be used to determine the type and level of services to be provided. Services will be discussed with families following assessment and the Council's policy explained.

Surrey's Short Breaks Statement was reviewed and re-drafted in October 2012 with the support of parents of disabled children from 'Family Voice' and guidance from 'Impact', the organisation commissioned by the Department for Education to support Local Authorities to deliver the Short Breaks Duty. The Statement is aimed at a wide range of families of children and young people with SEN and disabilities and is intended to be an overview of the services available. It does not therefore cover all the details regarding access to specific services or Council policies.

**Mary Angell**  
**Cabinet Member for Children and Families**

**Question (5) from Mr Ian Beardsmore (Sunbury Common and Ashford Common)**

Ascot Environmental, the company responsible for the gasification plant at the Eco Park and the gasification plant in Dumfries cited by SITA as the model for the Eco Park went into administration on 18 May 2012 and has been wound up.

The report to Cabinet on 14 March 2011 "World Class Waste Solutions: Amendment to Waste Contract" stated:

6.1.6. The Council's technical advisors, Mott MacDonald have undertaken an assessment of the BOS Gasification technology and have advised that they can see no reasons, for the scale of the process, why the plant proposed for Charlton Lane should not be able to treat the waste, divert it from landfill and recover energy from it. They have however identified that, as this is a relatively new technology, further data and testing will be required before it is known whether the plant can meet the qualifying criteria for a renewables obligation certificate (ROC). This will not affect the operation of the plant and the financial effect has been taken into account in the financial assessment.

Is it not the case that the latest development with Ascot Environmental being wound up that the proposed gasification plant will no longer be built? What is the impact on the proposed timetable for construction of the Eco Park, if construction now takes place at all? What is the advice from DEFRA on the PFI credits received by Surrey County Council and future PFI credits with this latest development? What is the advice of Mott MacDonald on alternative gasification technology providers being found within budget and proposed timescales? What is the advice of Deloitte LLP, who are both the County Council's financial advisers on the project and the administrators of Ascot Environmental?

The Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment and, the Strategic Director Environment & Infrastructure, together with managers from the County Council and SITA recently visited the Energos gasification plant operated by Hafslund Miljo Energi AS in Sarpsborg, Norway, what were the findings of this visit?

**Reply:**

Due to the time that has elapsed since the Eco Park was first proposed in 2010, SITA are undertaking a further procurement for an Engineering, Process and Construction (EPC) contractor. Because the gasification system provided by Ascot Environmental is no longer available as a result of that company going into administration, SITA will be looking to identify an alternative gasification provider.

The work that is being undertaken is still in progress and being supported by the council's technical advisors, Mott MacDonald; The council's financial advisors, Deloitte and the council's legal advisors, Simmons & Simmons.

It is anticipated that an update on the position with regard to the development of the Eco

Park will be provided to the council's Cabinet once the procurement exercise is complete.

Subject to the outcome of the procurement process, the advice of the council's advisors and the satisfaction by SITA of the various pre commencement conditions required by the planning consent including diversion of a public footpath, it is expected that work on the Eco Park could start early in 2013.

Defra is aware of the proposed change in gasification provider and have been supportive to date. A response to the council's variation business case is expected very shortly and we anticipate that response to be a positive one with Defra continuing to support the development of the Eco Park.

We will continue to ensure, that the solution proposed by SITA provides the best value for money and is affordable to the council.

The purpose of the visit to Norway was to observe a gasification plant in operation.

**John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment**  
**27 November 2012**

<b>Question (6) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)</b>
---

At the 16 October meeting of Full Council the following motion was passed:

'That this council opposes any proposals out of line with existing county council policy to build additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick airports or increase air traffic at other local airports.

Council agrees to write to the Secretary of State for Transport to express its view that while being pro economic growth the Surrey environment must be protected and to express support for the Government's approach in requesting Sir Howard Davies to assess options for managing airport capacity in the UK.'

When was the letter referred to in the motion sent to the Secretary of State? Please could the Leader publish the content of that letter and any response received from the Secretary of State?

**Reply:**

On 26 October 2012, Surrey County Council submitted a response to the Department for Transport's Draft Aviation Policy Framework Consultation, where we outlined our position. In that response we stated that Surrey County Council supports the Government's objective to achieve the country's long term economic growth and recognises the considerable economic benefits that the proximity of two major international airports brings to Surrey. However, the County Council has concerns regarding the potential impact that

any expansion of either Heathrow, Gatwick or local airports could have on Surrey's environment and transport networks and will be pressing the Commission for assurances regarding these concerns.

**David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**27 November 2012**

**ITEM 4 - PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Public Questions**

**Question (1) from Mr David Tombs**

My question is relating to item 11: Public Value Review of Adult Mental Health Services for the meeting of the Cabinet on the 27 November 2012.

What assurances can the Cabinet give me that Social Care for the mentally ill with specialist social care needs will be delivered as a result of this PVR into Adult Mental Health Services?

**Reply:**

The outcomes and recommendations of this public value review (PVR) have come from a co-design process of engagement with people who use our services as well as carers and other stakeholders. What they have told us has been evidenced by our findings which strongly support the case for change.

With regard to delivering social care outcomes, recommendation 10 - 'explore how we deliver social care outcomes and innovations in adult social care mental health services across Surrey' will address your query. We have clearly heard throughout the PVR that we need to deliver social care more effectively. We will be bringing together a project group with user/carer representation to look at different options for delivering social care in Surrey and will reach a preferred option by summer 2013.

The outcomes we achieve will define our success which will be performance monitored through the implementation period. We will be accountable to local stakeholder groups and Surrey Coalition and are confident that what we have recommended will be delivered.

**Michael Gosling**  
**Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health**  
**27 November 2012**

**Question (2) from Mr Andrew Telford, Chairman CPRE Surrey Runnymede District**

Whereas:

1. The Communities Select Committee has referred back to the Cabinet, for reconsideration, its decision of 23 October 2012 to grant £5m in a single upfront payment to RBC for a Magna Carta visitor centre on Runnymede Pleasure Grounds.

2. £5m represents around 30% of the 2012/13 Council Tax increase of 2.99%.
3. The Cabinet has an enviable history of prudent and careful consideration of matters of expenditure even for modest amounts, including conducting its own thorough investigations, in particular with regard to value for money and alternatives.

And whereas:

4. Visitor centre or not, and in any case, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II will be invited to attend celebrations at Runnymede to mark the 800<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the sealing of Magna Carta.
5. RBC's proposed visitor centre will not engage with the local community as it is sited remotely from them, and furthermore will have a detrimental effect on the wider site.
6. A heritage asset, Egham Museum, already exists which has been serving the local community for over 40 years with minimal support from its local authority. It has staff and a management structure in place, its *modus operandi* is recognised by the HLF, and it has excellent ties with, and support from, Royal Holloway University of London.
7. Investing in a community museum will give the opportunity and flexibility to be able to celebrate all of North Surrey's and Runnymede's rich history, including Magna Carta, that investing in RBC's single purpose centre will not give.
8. As far as can be deduced from RBC Committee papers, Egham Museum does not feature in RBC's plans for Magna Carta or 2015.

**The question:**

Will the Cabinet, prior to agreeing to funding arrangements of any kind, carry out its own investigation into alternatives to RBC's proposal, and, in any case, formally engage with Egham Museum with a view to exploring the Museum's potential as a considerably cheaper option to establish a Magna Carta centre within the community?

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council notes the points that are made. The County Council's decision to support the visitor centre proposal is in principle and it is currently carrying out a robust review of all aspects of the project which will be completed before it takes a final decision regarding its financial commitment.

In respect of Egham Museum as a specific alternative to Runnymede Borough Council's proposal for the visitor centre this museum, whilst making an important local contribution with a permanent exhibition on the Magna Carta and Runnymede, is a small museum with part time opening hours and currently attracting around 2000 visitors a year. However, the Council is aware of recent changes and a more ambitious agenda for the future of the Museum.

Their recent Magna Carta bid involves some key areas of work such as engaging with schools, universities and communities in the area and envisages that via this programme the museum will be a stakeholder in the programme of events and activities to celebrate the Magna Carta 2015 anniversary.

**Helyn Clack**

**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**

**27 November 2012**

**Question (3) from Professor Justin Champion, on behalf of *The Centre for Public History, Heritage and Engagement with the Past*, Royal Holloway, University of London**

The question is submitted in regard of the Communities Select Committee referral of the Cabinet decision of 23 October 2012, to grant a £5m contribution to RBC for a Magna Carta visitor centre on Runnymede Pleasure Grounds. Some context is outlined below:

1. *The Centre for Public History, Heritage and Engagement* recently established in the Arts and Social Science Faculty at Royal Holloway has grown out of the general College mission to communicate its learning and engage with local public communities. The History Department currently hosts a public engagement ambassador who connects it to the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement: his project concerns 800 years of commemorating 1215.
2. The History Department at Royal Holloway already undertakes a wide range of activities that bring it into partnership with a variety of cultural and heritage partners. In particular its successful MA in Public History has established a national benchmark for engagement practices: it has worked with Historic Royal Palaces, English Heritage, The National Trust, The Surrey History Centre, The Houses of Parliament, The BBC, as well as a range of national and local museums, media production companies and publishers. **In short, the Department and Centre contain a range of expertise, in both the theory and practice of commemoration, memory and public history, which it is willing to put at the disposal of a local Magna Carta initiative.**
3. The College is already involved in the Magna Carta Trust committees. Indeed for the last eight years it has hosted the annual Magna Carta Public Lecture each June which has attracted distinguished speakers including The Archbishop of Canterbury, David Davis, Dame Mary Arden and The Master of the Rolls. A number of future academic and public events are already being organised in partnership with The History of Parliament Trust.
4. Our current anxiety is that the nature of the current proposal for a visitor centre on the Thames side location is inappropriate for serious engagement with the local community.

5. There are other opportunities to exploit in the nearby locality, in particular, to build on the successful application for Heritage Lottery Funding achieved by Egham Museum for its range of Magna Carta events.
6. 2015 will be an ideal moment for creating and more importantly sustaining a legacy of local, national and international interest in the significant and important history of Surrey. There is potential to create benefits for not simply the local business community, but to achieve and invest enormous social and cultural capital in the local community young and old.

**THE QUESTION:**

How far has Surrey County Council considered and reviewed the specific plans (advanced by Runnymede Borough Council) for ensuring that the legacy of 1215-2015 commemorative activity is sustained and developed amongst the broader community of Surrey in subsequent years: in particular, what evidence is there that it intends to connect and embed ongoing commemorative and historical activity with local partners and volunteers?

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council notes the points that are made. The County Council's decision to support the visitor centre proposal is in principle and it is currently carrying out a robust review of all aspects of the project which will be completed before it takes a final decision regarding its financial commitment.

This review, which is currently being undertaken, is considering the Business Case for the Visitor Centre, and its Business Plan/and operation sustainability. Working with local partners, stakeholders, and the local community through a programme of education and community engagement programmes will be critical to the success of the visitor centre - not just in the 800th anniversary year but in future years.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**27 November 2012**

<b>Question (4) from Jill Reynolds</b>
--

Please could the following question be put to the Cabinet Members when they meet to re-discuss the £5 million grant to the proposed Visitor Centre.

In the light of the following points:

- Totally inadequate public consultation and indeed lack of transparency in these plans which have apparently been evolving for three years largely unbeknown to the local community.
- No serious consideration of the alternative sites in Egham town where the local economy would be boosted if the 'visionaries' behind this scheme are to be believed.

- Lack of a sound business plan with serious concerns about its long term viability.

Please may I have assurances from the Cabinet that no grant will be given unless these three issues are returned to the drawing board for the appropriate and much overdue re-consideration.

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council notes the points that are made. The County Council's decision to support the visitor centre proposal is in principle and it is currently carrying out a robust review of all aspects of the project which will be completed before it takes a final decision regarding its financial commitment.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**27 November 2012**

**Question (5) from Mrs Lynne Bates (Lead petitioner of Petition for opposition to Magna Carta Visitor Centre)**

Runnymede Borough Council have been planning for two years for this project. They were refused Heritage Lottery Funding in July 2012 as they did not support the principle of a new build at the Runnymede Pleasure Grounds location. With 'Event Live' they focused their attention in trying to obtain commercial companies for sponsorship, none has been forthcoming and the deadline has expired of 1 November 2012.

May I ask why at the last hour did they approach Surrey County Council for the £5million funding and not earlier?

**Reply:**

The involvement of Surrey County Council, and the offer of financial support in principle, may be late in the day but Surrey County Council recognises that there has been a concern about the quality of the visitor experience at this historically important site.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**27 November 2012**

**Question (6) from Mrs Lynne Bates (Lead petitioner of Petition for opposition to Magna Carta Visitor Centre)**

A pre-feasibility study on where to locate the visitor centre narrowed down the choice to 3 possible sites, the 1st option Brunel Boatyard and a new build close to the River Thames in Runnymede Pleasure Grounds were eliminated

due to the flood risk assessment yet the 3rd site ALSO in Runnymede Pleasure Grounds with the same flood risk was considered a suitable location. The flood risk was carried out by RBC officers and at the time they had no plans, drawings, idea of size and layout of building. Can I ask therefore why was no feedback obtained from the Environment Agency?

**Reply:**

It is our understanding that there has been consultation with the Environment Agency but this is an aspect of the Business Case/Feasibility Study that SCC is reviewing as part of its current on assessment of the project before making a final commitment to the project.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**27 November 2012**

**COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: Support for National Magna Carta 800th Anniversary Celebrations**

**Date considered: 14 November 2012**

The Communities Select Committee held a Call In Meeting to review Surrey County Council's Cabinet decision of 23 October in relation to support for the National Magna Carta 800th Anniversary Celebration.

The members of the Select Committee support and endorse all of the recommendations in the model resolutions 1-20, which includes the proposal for a National Holiday on 15 June 2015 to celebrate the 800th anniversary. The Call In related to the £5,000,000 contribution to the funding for a new visitor centre. The full details of the Call In are set out below.

**Reason for the Call In**

The Communities Select Committee views with concern the decision of the Cabinet to make a contribution of £5,000,000 towards the funding of a new visitor centre in Runnymede in connection with the 800th Magna Carta anniversary celebrations. It asks the Cabinet to review its decision with a view to supporting these celebrations in a way that involves a very significantly reduced financial contribution from the County Council.

The Committee asks the Cabinet to take particular account of the following points in reviewing its decision:

1. In difficult financial circumstances, with many County Council services under strain £5,000,000 (which represents nearly 1% of our annual Council tax yield) is perhaps better spent on other key Council services.
2. Whatever benefits may accrue from this development will principally benefit the Borough of Runnymede yet the Borough Council is making no direct financial contribution towards the estimated £8,000,000 costs. This might reasonably be considered to be unbalanced by the many Council Tax payers in other parts of Surrey who will bear most of the costs.
3. Many of the financial arguments advanced in favour of the development seem to be based on untested and potentially optimistic assumptions about tourism numbers and employment. It is of concern that no detailed business case or environmental impact assessment have been prepared or considered by Cabinet before this decision was taken. Consideration should be given to asking the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee to undertake an investigation of the financial assumptions underlying this proposal before approval of any County Council funds is given.
4. There is little clarity about exactly how the £8,000,000 figure has been arrived at and exactly what the County Council would be getting for its investment.

The report also refers to the need for 'requisite local improvements to the highways'. It is unclear if this expenditure is in addition to the £8,000,000 project cost. It is also unclear if it is a reference to fairly minor local highways expenditure or major roundabout works, costing several £million, which it has been argued would be necessary if the Visitor Centre project went ahead. There is a need for transparency on this point so that any impacts on the County's overall highways budgets and priorities can be assessed.

5. There does not seem to have been proper consideration given to other alternative proposals which would be less costly and potentially more appropriate in celebrating the 800th Anniversary celebrations. (Details of some of these are included in the written representations made to the Select Committee which are included in the background papers) Attention is also drawn to the fact that this project was rejected for funding by the Heritage Lottery Fund as it was considered 'not a strong match' against the necessary criteria of conservation, learning, participation benefits, need and value for money. It is suggested that the Cabinet should seek further information on this assessment as part of its own reconsideration of support for the project.

6. Representations made to the Select Committee suggest very limited consultation with local people and growing opposition to the proposal (on grounds of cost, feasibility and loss of a valued local open space) now that it is clear that the Visitor Centre proposal involves somewhat more than the 'minimal public funding' it was stated would be used in the Borough Council 2012 questionnaire.

7. Runnymede has accepted that there are significant risks in completing this project in accordance with the compressed timescale for the building. There are also potentially linked problems and challenges in connection with use of open space and the common land running along side the site which present further risks. The Cabinet should seek legal and other appropriate officer advice on these matters so that any risks can be properly calculated and the Cabinet can satisfy itself that investment of such a significant sum of public money is appropriate.

**STEVE COSSER**  
**CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE**

**COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: Public Value Review of Community Partnerships**

**Date considered: 21 November 2012**

The Communities Select Committee at its meeting of the 21 November 2012 considered the Cabinet Report of the Public Value Review (PVR) of Community Partnership. The Committee generally welcomed the report as it was felt that it was informed by effective consultation with Members and other stakeholders.

There was a wide-ranging discussion, which included:

- The importance of flexibility in the proposed framework which will enable Local Committees to adopt the model which best suits their local circumstances.
- An acknowledgement that District and Borough representatives can enhance discussion within Local Committees as they bring a more local perspective.
- The need to reconsider the role of District and Borough representatives in relation to voting rights and contribution of resource.
- The role of Local Committee meetings in presenting an opportunity to showcase the work done by the County Council. It was recognised that in some cases resident engagement and attendance could be improved and that this could be stimulated by providing extra resource to publicise the work of the Committees.
- The acknowledged links between this report and the Localism Task Group Report.

**Recommendations:**

The Committee decided to submit the following recommendations to Cabinet:

1. That now the Community Partnership PVR has concluded, promised discussions (from the April 2012 Cabinet meeting which considered the Localism Task Group report), are initiated between the portfolio holder, the Chairman of the Select Committee and officers to enable the Task Group recommendations also to be taken forward.
2. The importance of retaining the flexibility of the Local Committee structures as outlined in the PVR Report is taken forward and supported.
3. That discussions are facilitated with District and Borough partners to consider which of their services and resources could come under the umbrella of the Local Committees with a view to promoting a more unified local approach.
4. That further consideration should be given to the resources available to Local Committees, particularly around communications and media, for example through release of resource from the centre or as part of the One Team Review of Communications.

**STEVE COSSER  
CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**CABINET 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**CABINET MEMBER RESPONSE TO THE COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE WITH REGARD TO THE PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW (PVR) OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP**

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games is pleased to note that the Communities Select Committee generally welcomed the PVR's recommendations and felt that the review had been informed by effective consultation with Members and other stakeholders.

In response to the specific recommendations made by the Communities Select Committee:

**Recommendation 1: That now the Community Partnership PVR has concluded, promised discussions (from the April 2012 Cabinet meeting which considered the Localism Task Group report), are initiated between the portfolio holder, the Chairman of the Select Committee and officers to enable the Task Group recommendations also to be taken forward.**

The Cabinet Member is grateful for the work of Steve Cosser and the other members of the Localism Task Group, Eber Kington, Sally Marks and John Orrick which has informed the recommendations in the final PVR report.

The Cabinet Member has committed to work with the Local Committee Chairmen and would also be pleased to work with the Chairman of the Select Committee and officers to take the PVR's recommendations forward.

**Recommendation 2: The importance of retaining the flexibility of the Local Committee structures as outlined in the PVR Report is taken forward and supported.**

The Cabinet Member agrees that it is important to recognise the need for some local differences between each Local Committee. The Cabinet Member believes that the recommendations made in the PVR report have created a flexible framework which will allow each Local Committee to operate in a way which best suits local need whilst, ensuring processes remain efficient and offer value for money.

**Recommendation 3: That discussions are facilitated with District and Borough partners to consider which of their services and resources could come under the umbrella of the Local Committees with a view to promoting a more unified local approach.**

The Cabinet Member agrees that it is very important to continue to work together with our partners in the Districts and Boroughs to deliver the best possible outcomes for residents.

The decision to pass functions to the Local Committee would clearly be a matter for each District and Borough to consider individually. During the

course of the PVR there was some interest expressed in pooling resources and sharing more decisions to achieve improved outcomes for residents.

If the desire to share functions becomes stronger the Council may wish to consider Joint Committees as a model, as recommended in the PVR report. Adoption of a Joint Committee model would allow the Local Committee to consider both County and District and Borough functions.

**Recommendation 4: That further consideration should be given to the resources available to Local Committees, particularly around communications and media, for example through release of resource from the centre or as part of the One Team Review of Communications.**

The Cabinet Member agrees that improving communications with local residents, businesses and partners is a vital part of supporting Members in their role as community leaders and champions.

The PVR's recommendation to implement an e-communication strategy, based upon the recommendation in the Localism Task Group Report, will support councillors in doing this. Improving local communications will also be considered as part of the 'One Team Review' of Communications.

In addition, the efficiency recommendations made in this report and the improvements to local web pages will enable the Community Partnership team to spend more time supporting local engagement activity.

The Cabinet Member thanks the Communities Localism Task Group's work and contribution to the PVR report.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**27 November 2012**

**COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: SELECT COMMITTEE TASK GROUP  
TRACKER**

**Date Considered: 14 November 2012**

At its meeting in November 2012, the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee received a report updating progress on the work of current and recent Select Committee task groups. The report included details of the work of the Communities Select Committee's Localism Task Group, the recommendations of which were presented to the Cabinet on 24 April 2012.

The Task Group's report contained 12 recommendations, all of which were accepted by the Cabinet. However, the Cabinet agreed at that time that implementation of the recommendations should not be taken forward pending the outcomes of the Community Partnership Public Value Review (PVR). This was to ensure that any links between the outcomes from the two pieces of work could be managed effectively. As the PVR has now concluded, the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee is keen to ensure that the work of the Task Group is taken forward.

Therefore the Committee recommends:

That the Cabinet provide a statement as to the current status and proposed timetable for implementing the recommendations of the Communities Select Committee's Localism Task Group.

**MR MEL FEW**  
**Chairman of the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

**CABINET 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**CABINET MEMBER RESPONSE TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WITH REGARD TO THE LOCALISM TASK GROUP REPORT AND THE PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP**

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games, in her response to the Localism Task Group Report presented to the Cabinet in April 2012, committed to considering some of the recommendations in the report as part of the work being conducted by the Public Value Review (PVR) of Community Partnership.

The Cabinet Member believes the PVR has built on the conclusions of the Localism Task Group Report, particularly with regard to:

- supporting the role of the individual divisional member as a community leader
- reviewing where decisions should be taken, or influenced, more locally
- strengthening local priority setting and the advisory role of SCC's Local Committees
- implementing an e-communications strategy
- strengthening the role of the Community Partnerships Team to facilitate partnership, engagement and democratic support.
- implementing a culture change programme to deliver the Leader's vision of a member led, customer focused Council.
- recognising that each committee may need to adopt a different approach

The Community Partnership PVR has been accompanied by a detailed action plan which the Cabinet Member has committed to take forward with the Local Committee Chairmen and the Chairman of the Communities Select Committee.

The Cabinet Member was pleased to note that there was support for the PVR's recommendations from the Local Committee Chairmen following her attendance at Local Committee Chairman's informal meeting on the 10 October 2012 and 23 November 2012.

The Cabinet Member was also pleased to note that the Communities Select Committee, who reviewed the Cabinet report and action plan on 21 November 2012, also generally welcomed the recommendations and felt that it was informed by effective consultation with Members and other stakeholders.

**Helyn Clack  
Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games  
27 November 2012**

**COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Item under consideration: Cultural Services PVR final report**

**Date Considered: 21 November 2012**

The Communities Select Committee at its meeting of the 21 November 2012 considered the final report on three Cultural Services Public Value Reviews (PVR).

There was a wide-ranging discussion, which included:

- Concern was expressed by some members over moving all cultural services under one umbrella due to the potential adverse impact on the quality and specialism of individual services. Music was highlighted as a particular example.
- It was noted that there was a need for clarity about the creation of a new 'cultural hub,' as it was not apparent whether this referred to a new location and/or a virtual offer.
- Surrey's strategy on tourism was unclear and it was agreed that this was an area which required further consideration.
- The importance of continued member involvement in sign off the individual PVRs as well in the implementation of the combined Cultural Services PVR was felt to be essential.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee decided to submit the following recommendation to Cabinet:

1. That arrangements are put in place to ensure that the high quality and good practices within small but excellent services are not lost in a combined Cultural Service.
2. That Members continue to be involved through Member Reference Groups in the development and recommendations of the individual PVRs as well as in monitoring the combined Cultural Services PVR.

**STEVE COSSER  
CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE**

**CABINET 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**CABINET MEMBER RESPONSE TO COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE WITH REGARD TO THE CULTURAL SERVICES PVR FINAL REPORT**

The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games welcomes the comments of the Communities Select Committee on the report regarding the Cultural Services PVR, and the concerns contained therein.

In response to those concerns, and the specific recommendations made by the Communities Select Committee:

**Recommendation 1: That arrangements are put in place to ensure that the high quality and good practices within small but excellent services are not lost in a combined Cultural Service.**

Concern was expressed by some members over moving all cultural services under one umbrella due to the potential adverse impact on the quality and specialism of individual services. Music was highlighted as a particular example.

The Cabinet Member notes the concerns of the Select Committee with respect to retaining the specialism of individual services. The combined PVR report is a strategic summary of the three outstanding PVRs within Cultural Services - and the details of recommendations for individual service areas will be addressed in separate Service Improvement Plans which will be formally reported to me as Cabinet Member reports. Furthermore, all services will continue to produce their individual Service Plans as part of the SCC service planning process.

The Cabinet Member recognises the need for clarity about both tourism strategy and the creation of a new 'Cultural Hub'. The Hub is envisaged as a physical development but ways in which cultural services can be integrated using new technology would be explored to raise the profile of individual services and encourage wider use by the people of Surrey. There will be further work undertaken in the form of a Cultural Strategy, which will bring together a vision and ambition for all areas of services within Cultural Services, and also consideration of Tourism issues within the Legacy report. Both reports will be shared with the Committee before being brought to Cabinet for consideration in the new year.

**Recommendation 2: That Members continue to be involved through Member Reference Groups in the development and recommendations of the individual PVRs as well as in monitoring the combined Cultural Services PVR.**

The Cabinet Member recognises the importance of continued member involvement and confirms that Member Reference Groups will play their part in the completion of individual PVRs as well in the implementation of the combined Cultural Services PVR.

The Cabinet Report proposes that there will be continued member involvement in sign off the individual Service Improvement Plans resulting

from the three service specific PVRs, as well as with the implementation of the combined Cultural Services PVR.

The Cabinet Member is passionate about the need for cultural services in our society and the well being they bring to their communities. All of the PVR studies have confirmed that these are high performing services and the intention is to further improve their performance and the value and benefit to residents across all areas of delivery, and to raise their profile.

**Helyn Clack**  
**Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games**  
**27 November 2012**

**CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS**

**NOVEMBER 2012**

**(i) SPEED LIMIT A245 STOKE ROAD, STOKE D'ABERNON**

That the Elmbridge Local Committee request for a reduction of the current speed limit on the A245 Stoke Road, Stoke D'Abernon, from its existing 40 mph, to 30 mph, between the existing 30 mph limit near Leigh Hill Road to a suitable point just east of the Chelsea Football Club training ground, not be endorsed

**Reasons for decision**

A 30 mph speed limit does not comply with the Speed Limit Policy and is not supported by the Police

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 21 November 2012)

**(ii) APPROVAL OF A BUDGET VIREMENT IN EXCESS OF £250,000**

That the virement for £1.568m to offset the demand led service pressures as described in the submitted report, be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

The virement has a neutral impact on the net directorate budget overall. The purpose of the virement is to update the budget in line with developments during the year thus making budget monitoring more meaningful and encouraging improved financial management.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 21 November 2012)

**(iii) CONSULTATION ON ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND CO-ORDINATED SCHEMES FOR 2014 ADMISSION**

That the proposed admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools and Coordinated Schemes for 2014, to include the changes set out in the submitted report, and as amended at the meeting to reflect (i) the withdrawal of a change in the admission criteria for Eastwick Junior School and (ii) Connaught and Hammond Junior School for September 2014, be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

There is a statutory requirement to consult on admission arrangements every seven years, or sooner if there is a proposal to change any part of a school's admission arrangements. The Local Authority is proposing changes to the admission arrangements and as such there is a statutory duty to consult.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 21 November 2012)

**(iv) A PROPOSAL TO REMOVE RESIDENTIAL PROVISION AT GOSDEN HOUSE SCHOOL, BRAMLEY FROM SEPTEMBER 2013**

That the proposal such that Gosden House will no longer provide residential provision at the school from 1 September 2013 be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

The school is currently in deficit. Should nothing change, this deficit will significantly increase in the future. The current residential provision is viewed as an important part of the school but it does not meet any educational need as currently defined in children's statements. Maintaining residential provision at the school would make it difficult for the school to put its finances on a sustainable footing affecting its core function of educating pupils. The proposed extended day model will go some way to meeting the social/play/friendship needs raised by pupils and parents in the consultation. The Senior Management Team of Gosden House support this proposal.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 21 November 2012)

**(v) SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S CHOICE OF PREFERRED PROPOSER FOR A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL IN REDHILL**

That option 3, the Glyn Learning Foundation be approved as the preferred proposer for a new 2-form entry school in Reigate and Banstead and this proposal be submitted to the Department for Education for consideration and determination.

**Reasons for decision**

Additional primary places in the area are necessary. Provision of a new school would increase diversity of provision, providing school places to meet the long term needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential. SCC should identify the most appropriate Proposer to meet the needs of the area.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 21 November 2012)

**(vi) DARLEY DENE INFANT SCHOOL CHANGE TO A PRIMARY SCHOOL - DECISION**

That the following proposals be approved such that:

- Darley Dene Infant School would become a primary school on 1 September 2013
- the Published Admission Number (PAN) would be 30
- Darley Dene Infant School would extend its age range by 1 year each year until 1 September 2016
- the school would increase its number of places by 30 pupils each year from 2013 until it has become an all through primary school.

Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 90 to 210 places

#### **Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in the area are necessary. The expansion of Darley Dene Infant School would increase parental certainty of progression for their children and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 21 November 2012)

#### **(vii) TRUMPS GREEN INFANT SCHOOL PROPOSED EXPANSION - DECISION**

That the following proposals be approved:

- Trumps Green Infant School to expand on 1 September 2013
- the PAN would increase from 30 to 60 in September 2013
- the school would increase its number of places by 30 pupils each year from 2013 until it has fully expanded
- Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 90 to 180 places

#### **Reasons for decision**

Additional infant places in the area are necessary. The expansion of Trumps Green Infant School would increase parental choice and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 21 November 2012)

#### **(viii) EXPANSION OF ST ANN'S HEATH JUNIOR SCHOOL – DECISION**

That the following proposals be approved:

- St Ann's Heath Junior School to expand on 1 September 2015

- the PAN would increase from 64 to 90 in September 2015
- the school would increase its number of places by 26 pupils a year until 2018, when it will have fully expanded
- Additional classrooms would be built to accommodate the additional pupils and increase the capacity of the school from 256 to 360 places.

### **Reasons for decision**

Additional junior places in the area are necessary. The expansion of St Ann's Heath Junior School would increase parental choice and provide effective long-term provision to meet the needs of local children, promoting high standards, ensuring fair access to educational opportunity, and promoting the fulfilment by every child of their educational potential.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 21 November 2012)

### **(ix) RELOCATION OF PHAB FROM LINTON'S YOUTH CENTRE TO NESBOT, EWELL**

1. That the capital expenditure relating to internal adaptation works and the creation of a single Multi Use Games Area at NESBOT (subject to receipt of competitive quotations) as detailed in the schedule of works, set out in the part 2 annex to the submitted report be approved in principle.
2. That the works are not commenced until NESBOT has entered into an Agreement for Works with SCC and NESBOT and Phab have entered into a formal Licence, the terms of which meet with SCC's approval, and which guarantees Phab's use and enjoyment of the new facilities for a minimum period of 20 years.
3. That approval of the final costs, when quotations have been procured, be delegated to the Chief Property Officer (Property Services), in consultation with SCC Procurement.
4. That SCC will meet NESBOT's reasonable legal fees incurred in drawing up and agreeing with SCC an Agreement for Works, as well as Phab's and NESBOT's reasonable legal costs incurred in agreeing a formal long term licence to safeguard Phab's future use of the completed facilities. The fees are not expected to exceed £10,000.
5. Officers be asked to support Phab in their efforts to secure additional external funding, in order to fund a larger outdoor games area at NESBOT.
6. Officers be asked to continue to work with Disability Challengers to support their move to NESBOT but recognising that any resources not deployed at the Edge would need to be reconsidered in the Council's wider financial planning.

### **Reasons for decision**

To ensure the valuable services to the community offered by Epsom Phab continue to be available to young local people following the closure of Lintons Youth Centre, with a minimum of disruption to that organisation. The proposal represents an opportunity for Phab to move from an outdated, unsustainable property to one which has been specifically adapted for their use.

Officers are making these recommendations on the following grounds:

- It provides a MUGA built to Sports England's standards, marked out for more than one type of game, securely fenced and floodlit for year round use.
- The area within which the MUGA is to be constructed has been identified by NESCOT, within their master-plan for improvements at the college, as a possible future location for the provision of further external games facilities. Therefore, there is a strong possibility that Phab could, with NESCOT's approval, carry out fundraising or make grant applications with a view to securing funding for the construction of additional games facilities alongside the proposed MUGA in the future. Alternatively, there could be opportunities for Phab to share the use of any new outside sports facilities in that location which might be provided by NESCOT as part of the college's own future improvement plans.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes – 22 November 2012)

### **(x) LINTON'S LANE YOUTH CENTRE REPROVISION: THE FORMER PHOENIX CLUB, DEPOT ROAD, EPSOM**

That the acquisition of a lease be approved in principle on the basis of the Heads of Terms attached in Appendix C , together with capital expenditure (subject to receipt of competitive quotations) as detailed in the annexe, for building adaptations as set out in the schedule of works at Appendix D of the submitted report.

That approval of the final costs, when agreed with the freeholder and quotations procured, be delegated to the Chief Property Officer (Property Services), in consultation with SCC Procurement.

### **Reasons for decision**

The reasons for seeking approval now are to:

- a) Mitigate the risk of the property being leased to another party prior to SCC being authorised to enter into a formal 'agreement for a lease'.
- b) Enable officers to commence procurement of the works forthwith, in order to eliminate any risk of not being in a position to relocate Services for Young People out of Lintons prior to 31 December 2013, or incurring a claim for damages from the purchaser of the Linton's site.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes  
– 22 November 2012)

**(xi) PURCHASE OF ADDITIONAL HYRAULIC RESCUE EQUIPMENT**

That the purchase of five additional sets of Hydraulic Rescue Equipment for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, at a cost of £75K be approved.

**Reasons for decision**

At the time when determining the amount of equipment that was required a number of assumptions were made by the project team based on the Public Safety Plan.

Firstly, it was anticipated that a reduction in the number of fire appliances would be implemented through 2012. This plan is still to be realised and therefore three front line appliances are operating without the new rescue equipment.

Secondly, with the range and advanced capability of the new equipment and the need to maintain firefighter competencies, the training department need equipment to support simultaneous training events without impacting on the front line operational equipment.

Lastly, when the project was completed it was not envisaged the maintenance and servicing, which is carried out in house, would tie up all the spare equipment and therefore, not provide the necessary resilience should other equipment become damaged or break down.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 26 November 2012)

**(xii) CHOBHAM YOUTH CLUB AND BLY LAWSON BEQUEST**

That Surrey County Council transfer the amount of £111,407 in full to the Community Foundation for Surrey, so they are able to set up the Chobham Youth Fund Panel and the young people of Chobham are able to utilise the funds.

**Reasons for decision**

The County Council is confident that the Community Foundation for Surrey is a very suitable vehicle to distribute long term funds in the form of grants to the young people in Chobham. This will be with full involvement of local people, is in line with the intentions of Mrs Lawson and value for money as additional funds will be generated to support the bequest.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 26 November 2012)