

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 22 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

*Mr David Hodge (Chairman)	*Mr John Furey
*Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman)	* Mr Mike Goodman
* Mrs Helyn Clack	* Mrs Linda Kemeny
*Mrs Clare Curran	* Ms Denise Le Gal
*Mr Mel Few	*Mr Richard Walsh

Cabinet Associates:

*Mr Tim Evans	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Mary Lewis	*Mr Tony Samuels

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mrs Hazel Watson

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

215/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were no apologies.

216/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

217/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

1. Mr Furey declared a personal interest in the reports relating to the Runnymede Roundabout Scheme (item 13 and 21) because he was also a member of Runnymede Borough Council.
2. Mrs Kemeny declared a personal interest in the reports relating to the Support Services for Carers contract award (item 9 and 19) because she was closely related to a previous grant recipient.

218/16 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

219/16 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

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

220/16 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Two questions from were received. The questions and responses were attached as Appendix 2.

221/16 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

No petitions were received.

222/16 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

No representations were received.

223/16 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY BOARDS, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

A report from the Social Care Services Board in relation to Adult Social Care budget monitoring was received.

A response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence was tabled at the meeting. (Appendix 3)

224/16 SURREY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2015 - 16 [Item 6]

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement began her introduction of this report by stating that keeping children safe was a key priority for the County Council. She said that the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) was a statutory, multi agency board, chaired by an independent chairman. In the year 2015-2016 the SSCB had two chairmen: Mrs Alex Walters from April to August 2015 and Elaine Coleridge Smith from September 2015 – March 2016, and that she continued to chair the Board.

The Annual Report for 2015-2016 detailed the progress made against the four SSCB priorities and how partners were held to account to deliver improvements.

Working Together to Safeguard Children 2015, issued by the HM Government covering the legislative requirements and expectations on individual services to promote and safeguard the welfare of children and which provided a clear framework in which to monitor the effectiveness of local services, requires that the Annual Report covers the preceding financial year and should be submitted to the Chief Executive, Leader of the Council, the local Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

She drew attention to the foreward of the report and said that the County Council's Improvement Board, SSCB, SCC, Police and partners had worked hard to improve their understanding of the needs of vulnerable children and professionals in Surrey. She also considered that the 'building blocks' for

continued improvement were in place and anticipated that the 2016/17 Annual report would show evidence of improved services for children in Surrey.

Within the report, she highlighted the SSCB Membership, which she considered worked well, the breakdown of the financial arrangements of which SCC contributed 46.52% of the total budget of £635,500 and the summary of the SSCB key areas of scrutiny 2016/17.

Finally, she referred to the Addendum to the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board report which set out progress in Surrey.

Other Cabinet Members made the following points:

- Acknowledgement that whilst the 'building blocks' were in place, there was still work to be done
- Safeguarding of children must be taken seriously
- All Members share responsibility for corporate parenting
- The importance of recognising that this Board was independent of SCC
- Improved relationships with partners
- This was an important document
- That a great deal of work had been achieved since the establishment of SCC's Improvement Board and the publication of an improvement plan in September 2015
- Referring to the attendance record of some of the partners, the Leader of the Council requested that the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement write to them to remind them of the role that they have to play in this area.

RESOLVED:

1. The Surrey Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) Annual Report be noted and be conscious of the time period of the report which is 2015 - 2016.
2. The appointment of a new independent chairman, who is a member of the Council's Improvement Board, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Cabinet has a responsibility to ensure the safety and wellbeing of children and young people in Surrey.

The SSCB Annual report provides Cabinet with an opportunity to reflect on what is going well and what areas require improvement in Surrey.

225/16 SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN [Item 7]

Introducing this report, the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement requested that the Cabinet considered and recommended to Council, the Surrey School Organisation Plan 2016/17 - 2025/26, for publication.

She said that the County Council was in the middle of a huge school expansion programme and that the School Organisation Plan set out the policies and principles underpinning school organisation in Surrey. It also highlighted the likely demand for school places projected over a 10 year period, and set out any potential changes in school organisation that may be required in order to meet the statutory duty to provide sufficient places. She said that this Plan set out the current position in Surrey and included more detail on Early Years and 14 – 25 year old provision than in previous Plans. This Plan also included a review of the Special Educational Needs and Disability provision in Surrey.

She confirmed that the Council worked closely with Boroughs and Districts to ensure that appropriate contributions from developers were received, to meet the future education infrastructure demand of additional housing.

She thanked officers from the school place planning team for their accurate forecasting which continued to be nationally recognised.

Lastly, she proposed replacing recommendation (2) so that it now read:

‘That, at present the funding for the increased number of school places within the Plan has not yet been fully identified.’

Other Cabinet Members were invited to comment on the proposals in their Boroughs and Districts and made the following observations:

- The considerable challenge to Surrey, as the birth rate in the County increased, as demonstrated by the table within the report.
- That the need varied between Boroughs and Districts.
- Concern for the future funding for increased numbers of school places.
- The number of bulge classes in Reigate and Banstead – thanks to all staff who helped to ensure that there were places for all pupils in that area.
- That need can vary within a Borough, particularly between rural and urban elements of the Borough / District but that staff in rural schools had different challenges.
- The importance of working closely with Boroughs and Districts to ensure there was accurate forecasting for school places

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. The School Organisation Plan 2016/17 - 2025/26 be approved for recommendation to Council to determine its publication.
2. That at present the funding for the increased number of school places within this Plan has not been fully identified.

Reasons for Decisions:

The School Organisation Plan is a key document used by schools and education stakeholders in considering long term plans. It is necessary to review the Plan to ensure that the best and most up to date information is published for use in this planning process.

[Note: the following item was moved up the agenda and taken next.]

226/16 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT TO 31 OCTOBER 2016 [Item 11]

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report covering the period up to the 31 October 2016.

He said that last month, several significant financial risks crystallised, resulting in an unprecedented forecast outturn of £22.4m overspend for this financial year. However, by the end of October, the forecast outturn position had improved to £15.0m but the 2016/17 budget was still not balanced and neither had the County Council achieved a sustainable Medium Term Financial Plan.

He said that a significant issue was the £20m shortfall against the £83m savings target for 2016/17 and that this had a substantial and detrimental impact on the Council's future financial position and it was not yet sustainable.

He informed Cabinet that there were many reasons why the County Council needed to keep working to restore its financial position. Not least, as pointed out in the Section 151 Officer's and the Monitoring Officer's commentaries, that it was a requirement of the Local Government Finance Act to ensure the County Council's spending did not exceed its resources.

He advised Members that cost, demand and funding pressures had meant that there were overspends in Adult Social Care, Children's Services and Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND), and that many of these pressures were preventing the Council from implementing its savings plans.

However, over the last month, the Chief Executive and Director of Finance had agreed a series of actions with Service Directors to review all planned spending and all service demands with a view to managing them more efficiently and that wherever sensible, the Cabinet would not agree further spending commitments until a balanced budget was assured and progress had been made towards a sustainable Medium Term Financial Plan.

He also said that the improvement seen in October's financial position was largely due to increased income from the Investment Strategy, lower interest charges and additional savings in Property and Orbis but that it was imperative to find improvements across the board. Given the gravity of the situation, it was vital Members and officers continued their actions to identify and implement ways to reduce the overspend in 2016/17 and address the issues affecting the Council's financial sustainability for 2017/18 and subsequent years.

Finally, he urged the Cabinet team and other leading Members to continue to bring the Council's budget issues to the attention and understanding of Surrey's MPs because the forecast £22.4m overspend closely matched the

“shock” reduction in 2016/17 Revenue Support Grant that the Government imposed upon the County Council less than a year ago.

Other Cabinet Members were given the opportunity to highlight key points and issues from their portfolios.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. That the forecast revenue budget outturn for 2016/17 was a £15.0m overspend, down from £22.4m last month, as set out in paragraph 1 of the Annex to the submitted report.
2. That forecast efficiencies and service reductions for 2016/17 were £62.9m, up from £60.3m last month, as set out in paragraph 42 of the submitted report.
3. The Section 151 Officer’s commentary and the Monitoring Officer’s Legal Implications commentary, as detailed in the covering report, paragraphs 16 to 20.
4. That virements to reflect service changes from creation of the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and Early Help Services, as detailed in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Annex to the submitted report, be approved.
5. That officers and Members continue actions to reduce the 2016/17 overspend, as detailed in paragraph 4 of the Annex to the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

227/16 SALESIAN CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL, CHERTSEY [Item 8]

Following on from the previous item, where the financial details of the Council had been presented, the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement acknowledged the difficulties of approving funding for school expansions in this challenging financial climate and reminded Members of the huge sums of money that had already been borrowed by the County Council to fund additional school places.

However, she presented this report which requested the approval of the business case for the expansion of Salesian Catholic Secondary School from 220 admissions per year (1100 places) to 270 admissions per year (1,350 places), thereby creating 250 additional places in Runnymede and the Elmbridge Catholic Deanery to help meet the basic need requirements in the Runnymede and Elmbridge area from September 2018.

The Leader of the Council considered that in the light of what had been discussed in the previous item in relation to the County Council’s financial position, it was not possible to make a decision on this scheme today and

therefore, proposed deferring a decision until the next Cabinet meeting on 13 December 2016.

Following the Leader's proposal to defer a decision on this item, other Cabinet Members acknowledged that the County Council had a statutory obligation to provide school places and also the effect on the planning application that a deferral would have. However, it was the view of most Cabinet Members, to reluctantly agree to its deferral to the next Cabinet meeting, when it was hoped that the Local Government Financial Settlement for the Council would be known and would enable a decision to be made.

After debate, the proposal to defer this item was put to the vote, with seven Members of the Cabinet voting for deferment and three Members voting against it.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this item, and the related Part 2 report (item 18) be deferred to the next Cabinet meeting on 13 December 2016, when the reports' recommendations can be re-considered in the light of the Autumn Statement and the Secretary of State's announcements on the Local Government Financial Settlement and their impact on the Council's financial situation.

228/16 SUPPORT SERVICES FOR CARERS CONTRACT AWARD [Item 9]

Mrs Kemeny declared a personal interest in the reports relating to the Support Services for Carers contract award (item 9 and 19) because she was closely related to a previous grant recipient and left the meeting for this item.

Prior to the report being introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence, Mrs Fiona White was invited to speak. She made the following points:

- That the Social Care Services Board had received very little information regarding these two contract awards for support services for carers and that the information that they had received was confidential and not split into Part 1 and 2. [The Leader agreed to pick this point up outside the meeting.]
- That existing suppliers of this service had been informed that the last element of their grant would be with held.
- She requested evidence that the proposed new providers could deliver their services because there was little detail on how the innovative approach, including using modern technology could be achieved, and whether carers could cope with new technology.

The Cabinet Member began his introduction by praising the role of carers in Surrey and referred to paragraph 23 of the report.

He said that, currently the Independent Carers Support Services provided essential advice, one to ones, peer and other external support to Adult carers. The service was currently delivered as 24 individual grant agreements that

come to an end on 31 March 2017 and there were both financial and quality efficiency gains to be achieved by rationalising the current offer.

Surrey's Home Based Breaks for Carers provision provides respite for young and adult carers by allowing them to go on scheduled breaks with the assurance that their loved ones are being supported by competent care workers. The current contract would expire 5 February 2017.

Both proposed contracts supported the corporate aim of promoting wellbeing and provides invaluable support to carers in a preventative way, thus reducing stress and more expensive reactive interventions.

He detailed the timeline leading upto the tendering of the Independent Carers Support contract, which was as follows:

1. Consultation pre-procurement – 29 February 2016
2. Initial meeting held with local carers support organisations – 27 April 2016
3. Counter proposal received from carers support organisations – 30 May 2016
4. Commissioners met with the Chairs of carers support groups – 2 June 2016
5. Commissioners meeting with six CCGs re final decision making regarding the recommended model – 8 June 2016
6. Response to carers organisations issued by Sonya Sellar on behalf of the commissioners – 18 June 2016
7. Bidders briefing session – 25 July 2016
8. Date of Dispatch of the OJEU tender notice – 25 July 2016
9. Issue of invitation to tender – 27 July 2016
10. Clarification request deadline – 23 August 2016
11. Tender submission deadline – 6 September 2016
12. Evaluation of tenders – 8 to 16 September 2016

He also informed Members that he had received correspondence from Elmbridge, Mole Valley and Epsom and Ewell expressing concern about the new contracts and he shared with Cabinet a copy of his response to Epsom and Ewell, which he agreed to send to Mrs White.

In addressing the point raised by Mrs White, he confirmed the existing organisations would continue to be paid until the end of the grant period.

Finally, he drew attention to the Equality Impact Assessments attached as Annexes to the report.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing said that the County Council recognised that some of these services were provided to children and their families.

RESOLVED:

Independent Carers Support

That the award of new contracts based on four geographical lots to Action for Carers Surrey, each contract commencing on 1 April 2017, be approved.

The contracts will be for an initial two year period, with the option to extend for up to two further periods of twelve months.

The geographical lots being:

Lot 1 - Woking, Runnymede and Spelthorne

Lot 2 - Guildford, Waverley and Surrey Heath

Lot 3 - Covering Epsom and Ewell, Banstead*, Mole Valley and Elmbridge

Lot 4 - Area within the boundaries of East Surrey CCG (Reigate, Redhill and Horley* and Tandridge

* The borough of Reigate and Banstead is split between lots 3 and 4 based on the respective boundaries of Surrey Downs and East Surrey CCG

Home Based Breaks for Carers

That the award of new contracts based on two lots to Crossroads Care, each contract commencing on 6 February 2017, be approved.

The contracts will be for an initial two year period, with the option to extend for up to two further periods of twelve months.

The lots being:

Lot 1 - Home Based Breaks for Carers

Lot 2 - End of Life Care

Reasons for Decisions:

The Council has a statutory duty to support carers in case of need, which could be met through a variety of approaches. Following an assessment of several service delivery and procurement options, it was decided that a full competitive tender based on geographic lots was the most appropriate approach in both instances. This model increases the reach of the service, without increasing costs and allows for greater efficiencies through rationalisation of services.

An open, fair and transparent tender process was undertaken for each service. Following a thorough evaluation process two suppliers were selected. One for the countywide Independent Carers Support and the other for the countywide Home Based Breaks for Carers.

This procurement exercise has been carried out in collaboration with Surrey's six NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to secure the best supplier(s) to deliver cost effective, high quality services against agreed specifications that will improve the quality of life for carers.

The recommended bidders have demonstrated that they can deliver high quality services expected by Surrey County Council (SCC) and the CCGs and will work with us over the lifetime of the contract to make continuous improvements and add value.

There is strong evidence from national cost modelling, that support to carers helps prevent breakdown of caring situations and avoids far greater cost for the provision of more expensive, more intrusive “care packages”. Based on this calculation an estimated £38.8 million of additional care costs will be prevented over the life of both contracts.

229/16 RE-COMMISSIONING SHORT BREAKS FOR DISABLED CHILDREN [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing said that this report sought agreement to extend the deadline for re-commissioning short breaks for disabled children and young people in Surrey from the previously agreed date of 4 September 2017 to 1 December 2017. This extension would allow additional time for formal public consultation on the specific recommendations agreed by Cabinet following the procurement process and would enable the impact of these changes to provision to be fully considered when Cabinet makes the final decisions about contract and grant awards. She highlighted the proposed revised timeline set out in paragraph 7 of the report.

She also drew attention to two typos in the report:

- Paragraph 7 – within the table, the date should be 13 December 2016 not 2017
- Paragraph 8 – the word ‘not’ was omitted from the third line of this paragraph and the end of that sentence should read: ‘...if breaks from caring were **not** given.’

She considered that short breaks were a ‘lifeline’ for families caring for disabled children and hoped that more families would be able to benefit from this provision in future.

RESOLVED:

1. That an extension to the deadline for re-commissioning short breaks in Surrey to 1 December 2017 be approved.
2. That all existing contracts terminate on 30 November 2017 and the newly commissioned short breaks offer begins on 1 December 2017.
3. That a three-month extension until 30 November 2017 be sought to the contract with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABP) for overnight residential short break provision at Beeches.

Reason for Decisions:

The proposal to extend the re-commissioning of short breaks to 1 December 2017 will:

- i. allow for a formal six-week public consultation with the children, young people and families directly affected by the specific changes to short breaks recommended by the procurement process.
- ii. support Cabinet to make a fully informed final decision about the re-commissioned short breaks offer, taking account of the views of children, young people and families on the specific changes to services recommended by the procurement process.
- iii. strengthen engagement and co-design with families to further increase robustness of the re-commissioning process and deliver better outcomes for more children, young people and families.
- iv. allow any perceived negative impacts of the recommended changes on particular children, young people and families to be planned for and, as far as possible, mitigated so that families continue to be supported.

230/16 SCHOOLS AND HIGH NEEDS FUNDING 2017/18 [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement said that this report set out the recommended funding formula for Surrey schools in 2017/18 for approval. It was produced annually, ahead of the Council's main budget decisions, in order to meet the Department for Education (DfE) deadline of 20 January 2017 and followed the annual consultation with all Surrey schools during September and the recommendations of the Schools Forum on 7 October 2016.

All Surrey schools, including academies, were funded from the Council's Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) allocation. This was divided by the DfE into three blocks covering Schools, High Needs special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and Early Years. Councils were permitted to move funding between blocks and continuing pressures in High Needs SEND provision in recent years had necessitated funding transfers from the Early Years and the Schools blocks.

As further unfunded SEND pressures totalling £10m are expected during 2017/18 and schools are reluctant to see further transfers from the Schools block, they were consulted on the scope for savings in SEND services in a series of events during 2016. A working group of Schools Forum members met with officers and CSF Cabinet Members to finalise savings proposals during November and the Cabinet Member updated Cabinet on its outcome. She confirmed that she was confident that these savings could be made and that a further report to Cabinet on 13 December 2016 was now not required.

She said that 177 schools had submitted responses to the proposals and that their collective response had been discussed at the Surrey Schools Forum. She also drew attention to the Equality Impact Assessments annexed to the submitted report.

Finally, she thanked the Schools Forum and Council officers for their work in producing this report and its recommendations.

Cabinet Members made the following points:

- Clarification of the DfE's reasoning for the removal of DSG sixth form funding as a permitted formula factor and that the County Council should monitor its impact on small sixth forms.
- The disparity in funding for Surrey schools versus schools in London boroughs and that credit was due to Surrey schools for achieving good results with less funding.
- SEND issues.

RESOLVED:

1. The approach to identifying and delivering £10m savings in SEND services in 2017/18, as described in paragraph 13 of the submitted report be approved and final approval of the savings be delegated to the Assistant Director, Schools and Learning, the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Achievement. (Any proposal that requires a public consultation will be referred to Cabinet.)
2. The following changes to the schools funding formula, as recommended by the Schools Forum, be approved:
 - a) That following the DfE's removal of DSG sixth form funding as a permitted formula factor, the current allocation of £1.327m be allocated across all secondary schools in 2017/18.
 - b) That following changes in DfE regulations, DSG funding previously targeted to school improvement be allocated to all schools on a per pupil basis.
 - c) That a sum of £300,000 arising from a surplus on the risks contingency to which primary schools contributed, be returned to primary schools.
3. The proposed Surrey formula factors for 2017/18, as set out in Annex 4 of the submitted report, be approved.
4. Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Schools and Learning, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Achievement to approve amendments to the schools funding formula as appropriate following receipt of the DSG settlement and DfE pupil data in December 2016. This is to ensure that total allocations to schools under this formula remain affordable within the council's DSG settlement to be announced during December 2016.

Reasons for Decisions:

To comply with DfE regulations requiring formal Council approval of the local funding formula for Surrey's primary and secondary schools, including academies.

231/16 RUNNYMEDE ROUNDABOUT SCHEME [Item 13]

Mr Furey, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding declared a personal interest in the reports relating to the Runnymede Roundabout Scheme (item 13 and 21) because he was also a member of Runnymede Borough Council.

Introducing this report to Cabinet, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding said that the prioritised transport infrastructure schemes were a key element of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEPs), submitted by the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to Government in March 2014, and which set out how they would support the economic development and regeneration of their areas.

He said that Runnymede Roundabout was one of the prioritised schemes selected during 2014 because this scheme was in a strategic location, with immediate connections to M25 (Junction 13 including to Heathrow Airport), Staines-upon-Thames, Egham and Windsor and all roads connected to the roundabout experienced significant traffic bottlenecks at peak times. This junction was considered to be one of the worst congested areas in the county.

He considered that the proposed scheme would deliver a range of benefits to Surrey's residents, including reduced congestion, improved journey time reliability, enhanced safety, improved access for cyclists, pedestrians and buses.

This scheme had been approved by Cabinet on 23 September 2014 with an original budget of £4.80m, together with the Egham Sustainable Transport Package (STP) with a budget of £3.70m. The Runnymede Roundabout project had since been revised, including a re-design, and an enhanced overall budget of £7.225m. The Egham STP has been redesigned and its budget reduced to £1.775m and was currently under construction.

Following Cabinet approval of the scheme, and the LEP approval to treat the two schemes as a package, detailed design has been undertaken. Approximately £800,000 had been spent on detailed design and charged to the capital account.

However, given the current financial climate Cabinet was asked to re-affirm the financial support it gave to this scheme in December 2014 and he drew attention to the S151 finance commentary, as detailed in the report.

Finally, he advised that if Cabinet decided to delay a decision on this scheme, the contract award process would fall outside the 120 day period during which tenderers were required to hold their prices, and therefore there was a risk that costs could change. Also, a significant delay could result in the LGF funding allocated to the scheme being withdrawn by EM3 LEP and allocated to other projects, and the scheme being cancelled.

The Leader of the Council considered that in the light of what had been discussed earlier in the meeting in relation to the County Council's financial position, it was not possible to make a decision on this scheme today and therefore, proposed deferring a decision until the next Cabinet meeting on 13 December 2016.

Following the Leader's proposal to defer a decision on this item, it was the view of most Cabinet Members, despite the risks in doing so, to reluctantly agree to its deferral to the next Cabinet meeting, when it was hoped that the Local Government Financial Settlement for the Council would be known and would enable a decision to be made.

After debate, the proposal to defer this item was put to the vote, with seven Members of the Cabinet voting for deferment and three Members voting against it.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this item, and the related part 2 report (item 21), be deferred to the Cabinet meeting on 13 December 2016 when the reports' recommendations can be re-considered in the light of the Autumn Statement and the Secretary of State's announcements on the Local Government Financial Settlement and their impact on the Council's financial situation.

232/16 SMARTER WORKING FOR THE ENVIRONMENT: POLICY STATEMENT AND ACTION PLAN [Item 14]

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning reminded Cabinet that, in December 2015 a motion was carried by the full Council to support action in reducing the Council's emissions and building resilience to a changing climate. In February 2016, the Council signed up to the Local Government Association's Climate Local Initiative, which included a commitment to produce an action plan outlining the County Council's approach. Both the action plan and an environment policy statement and action plan had now been developed and were attached as Annexes to the submitted report.

He said that the Environment Policy Statement set out the context in which the County Council would work with its stakeholders to manage the Council's environmental responsibilities and demonstrate its leadership.

RESOLVED:

1. The proposed 'Smarter Working for the Environment' Policy Statement, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report and the associated Action Plan, as set out in Annex 2 of the submitted report, be approved.
2. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, to authorise minor future revisions to the policy and action plan.

Reasons for Decisions:

Implementing the policy and associated action plan will:

- Provide a basis for engagement with our suppliers when seeking their support for our objectives and maximising value from our contracts
- Increase value for money by being joined up in our decision making

- Provide support to external funding bids by publishing the council's overall commitment to environmental sustainability
- Support a 'one team' approach for improved outcomes in relation to corporate priorities for the economy and resident wellbeing.

Delegating authority for minor revisions, to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, would allow the Council's approach and commitments to be kept up to date; incorporating continuous improvement internally, reflecting changes in the national policy context and if necessary, to prioritise activities in response to resource constraints.

233/16 SUB NATIONAL TRANSPORT BODY [Item 15]

The Deputy Leader introduced the report and commended its recommendations to Cabinet. He said that the South East 7 authorities, including Surrey County Council (SCC) had been working together to develop the proposition that would see Government, South East Transport Authorities and/or Combined Authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) working together with Highways England, Network Rail and port, airport and bus operators in one body. Under the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act, Sub National Transport Bodies (SNTBs) may expect strategic transport providers to take account of their priorities.

The SNTB would be the main mechanism to influence and prioritise investment by the major national transport agencies including Highways England and Network Rail in a way that had not been available to SCC before and its specific focus would be for the delivery of major strategic transport infrastructure.

He said that this report sought approval to establish a shadow body and to develop the Transport Strategy.

Cabinet noted that a contribution of £20k was requested to develop the constitutional arrangements and the Transport Strategy and to provide officer support to the shadow body but having acknowledged that no work would be undertaken without this contribution and, due to the benefits that this Body would have, agreed its approval.

RESOLVED:

1. It be agreed that Surrey County Council should join a shadow Sub National Transport Body for the South East, known as Transport for the South East (TfSE).
2. Authority be delegated to the Leader of the Council to agree the shadow arrangements on behalf of Surrey County Council, including the shadow constitution.
3. That a report be received, following an appropriate period of time reviewing the operation of the shadow arrangements and prior to entering into a formal SNTB.

- 4 Funding of £20,000 be provided to develop the constitutional arrangements and the Transport Strategy and to provide officer support to the shadow Body.

Reasons for Decisions:

TfSE provides an opportunity to support and deliver growth plans across the region through the development of a long-term strategic programme to identify a comprehensive package of transport measures to make the South East more competitive. It would complement the work of the LEPs and support delivery of Local Plans.

It would specifically enable SCC to influence the prioritisation of investment by the major national transport agencies such as Highways England and Network Rail in a way that has not been possible in the past.

The SNTB would address some of the barriers to growth of the economy that have been held back by transport infrastructure shortcomings, notably strategic infrastructure, that is the responsibility of Network Rail and Highways England. The SNTB would enable SCC to more directly influence the priorities and programmes of these agencies, so helping to secure delivery of longstanding transport infrastructure ambitions.

234/16 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 16]

This Annex set out the decisions taken by individual Cabinet Members since the last meeting of the Cabinet. Members were given the opportunity to comment on them.

RESOLVED:

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

Reasons for Decisions:

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

235/16 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]

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

236/16 SALESIAN CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL, CHERTSEY [Item 18]

RESOLVED:

This item has been deferred until the next Cabinet meeting on 13 December 2016.

237/16 SUPPORT SERVICES FOR CARERS CONTRACT AWARD [Item 19]

Introducing this report, which contained the financial and value for money information relating to item 9, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence made reference to the importance of 'quality' when assessing bids for these contracts. He also confirmed that he had re-checked and confirmed the hourly rates, as set out in paragraph 38 of the report.

RESOLVED:

That the information in this Part 2 report be noted, in conjunction with the recommendations made in the Part 1 report.

Reason for Decisions:

Following two separate, competitive tendering processes in compliance with the requirements of Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders, the recommended bidders have demonstrated they are able to deliver the high standard of service expected by Surrey County Council and will work with the Council over the full contract duration to make continuous improvements and add value. The service will improve the quality of life for carers.

[Note: the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience left the meeting]

238/16 RE-COMMISSIONING SHORT BREAKS FOR DISABLED CHILDREN [Item 20]

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing said that this report contained the confidential, financial and value for money information relating to item 10.

RESOLVED:

1. An extension to the deadline for re-commissioning short breaks in Surrey to 1 December 2017 be approved.
2. All existing contracts terminate on 30 November 2017 and the newly commissioned short breaks offer begins on 1 December 2017.
3. That a three-month extension until 30 November 2017 be sought to the contract with Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABP) for overnight residential short break provision at Beeches. This would be at a cost, as detailed in the submitted report, for which there is funding in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).

Reasons for Decisions:

The proposal to extend the re-commissioning of short breaks to 1 December 2017 will:

- i. allow for a formal six-week public consultation with the children, young people and families directly affected by the specific changes to short breaks recommended by the procurement process.
- ii. support Cabinet to make a fully informed final decision about the re-commissioned short breaks offer, taking account of the views of children, young people and families on the specific changes to services recommended by the procurement process.
- iii. strengthen engagement and co-design with families to further increase robustness of the re-commissioning process and deliver better outcomes for more children, young people and families.
- iv. allow any perceived negative impacts of the recommended changes on particular children, young people and families to be planned for and, as far as possible, mitigated so that families continue to be effectively supported.

239/16 RUNNYMEDE ROUNDABOUT SCHEME [Item 21]

RESOLVED:

This item has been deferred until the next Cabinet meeting on 13 December 2016.

240/16 BLOCK CONTRACT FOR RESIDENTIAL CARE AND DAY CARE SERVICES EXTENSION. [Item 22]

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence introduced the report and informed Members that Surrey County Council had entered in to a 20 year block contract with Anchor Trust in March 1998. The care contract was currently due to expire in March 2018 and the leases associated with this contract are not co-terminus with the contract.

He also confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment had been undertaken and was attached as an Annex to the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That a one year extension of the block contract with Anchor Trust for residential and day care services, to align the end of the care contract across all 17 care homes with the end of the leases of the eight refurbished homes, expiring in March 2019, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

To continue to meet the needs of the residents in the care homes in the most cost effective way. To align the end of the care contract with the end of the leases expiring in March 2019.

241/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS [Item 23]

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience, the Cabinet Associate for the Built Environment said that this acquisition continued the Investment Strategy agreed by Cabinet in July 2013 and commended its approval to Members. He confirmed that the Investment Advisory Board Members had been consulted.

RESOLVED:

1. That equity investment and a long-term loan, both as detailed in the submitted report, be provided to Surrey County Council's wholly owned property company, Halsey Garton Property Ltd, as outlined in paragraphs 9 to 11 of the submitted report.
2. That Legal Services be authorised to agree appropriate contractual arrangements for the provision of financing on behalf of the Council with funds to be released upon the completion of appropriate due-diligence in relation to the property acquisition.
3. That HGP be authorised to acquire the freehold interest in the property detailed in the submitted report, for a purchase cost, including associated costs of purchase, as set out in the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions:

The provision of financing to the Council's property company to facilitate the proposed investment acquisition is in accordance with the Council's Investment Strategy and provides an asset that will contribute to the creation of a diversified portfolio over time to spread risk.

The investment will deliver an ongoing income to the Council, enhancing financial resilience in the longer term.

242/16 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 24]

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

Meeting closed at 4.40pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 22 NOVEMBER 2016**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Member Question****Question from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):**

Over the last five years, please could you provide the figures for total and yearly spend on consultants.

Please also provide the figures for the highest hourly/day/monthly rate that Surrey County Council has paid out for consultancy work and to who/whom.

Reply:

This administration discourages the use of consultants, instead preferring to use the Council's own staff to undertake the work. There have been many examples of this over the last five years that have helped the council achieve nearly £400m of savings over this time.

There are a number of professions where we customarily use external resources to provide specialist technical expertise, such as architects, surveyors and engineers as well as legal opinion or advice. However, beyond these there are times when it is right and proper to use an external consultant to support our development as an organisation. This is where we do not have the relevant expertise and knowledge in house and it obviously makes sense to use a consultant in those cases. It would not be good value for money to employ such specialists on a permanent basis.

Prior to 2015, the figures included these broader external resources and it is not now possible to isolate them historically. However, I can report that in 2015/16 we spent £305k on such consultants, and so far this year we have spent £431k. I receive regular quarterly reports and all requests to spend more than £50k require my personal sign-off, enabling me to ensure there is proper control and continued commitment to minimise the use of consultants in this organisation, and I will only continue to use consultants where we need this expertise.

Unfortunately, due to the commercial nature of the request re. day rates it will not be appropriate to release this however typical day rates range from £350 to £1800 per day and due to the very nature of the consultancy market, assignment are short term.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
22 November 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2
Item 4**CABINET – 22 NOVEMBER 2016****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Public Questions****Question (1) from Mr Dominik Lemanski:**

Why are there three levels of bureaucracy in local government in Tandridge (1. Surrey in Kingston, 2. Tandridge, 3. Surrey in Tandridge)?

Surely redundancies could be made across the board at points 2 and 3 and residents could just deal with Surrey directly. I see no need for the three tiers of bureaucracy especially given the lack of repairs to the roads etc.

Reply:

Local government is based on the right of residents to elect councillors to represent them for specific duties and functions within a given area. To refer to these as bureaucracy reflects a disappointing misunderstanding of that basic democratic principle.

Within Surrey matters that have a very local implication for places are dealt with by the local District or Borough. Matters that have wider implications for residents and businesses across the whole county are dealt with by Surrey County Council.

The two tiers of government try to work very closely and effectively together.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
22 November 2016

Question (2) from Mr John Oliver:

Given that the provision of tea, coffee, biscuits and bottled water for meetings across the Council's estate costs thousands of pounds each year, when will the Council be adopting a Council-wide policy of self-provision for meeting attendees, or, at best, provision of tap water, for all meetings (including committee meetings) in which Members or officials are involved?

Reply:

The Council does not provide biscuits at its meetings. Bottled water is provided for some of our decision making meetings, as is tea and coffee if it is appropriate.

Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
22 November 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 3
Item 5**CABINET RESPONSE TO SOCIAL CARE SERVICES BOARD****ADULT SOCIAL CARE BUDGET MONITORING**
(considered by Social Care Services Board on 26 October 2016)**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That the Cabinet set out the actions that be undertaken in the next three months in order to reduce the projected overspend;

That the Cabinet consider revising the methodology for finance planning;

That the Cabinet prioritise a sustainable set of savings for Adult Social Care as part of the planning for the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2017-2022.

RESPONSE:

Cabinet has already asked that urgent actions be identified to tackle the projected overspend. These will be reported each month as part of the budget monitoring.

The methodology for developing a balanced and sustainable Medium Term Financial Plan is under continual review as part of the approach to planning over the financial year.

Cabinet's responsibility and indeed the Council's is to secure a balanced and sustainable budget for the whole Council. Given the proportion of spend that goes on adult social care that is always a key part of our discussions.

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence
22 November 2016

This page is intentionally left blank