

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 13 DECEMBER 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  
Mr David Harmer  
Mr Colin Kemp

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

**243/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

There were no apologies.

**244/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 22 NOVEMBER 2016 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**245/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Mr Furey declared a personal interest in the reports relating to the Runnymede Roundabout Scheme (item 11 and 26) because he was also a member of Runnymede Borough Council.

**246/16 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

**247/16 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

No questions from Members were received.

**248/16 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

No questions from members of the public were received.

#### **249/16 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

No petitions were received.

#### **250/16 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

Written representation was received from Mrs Hazel Watson to release information in paragraphs 15 -18 in the report relating to the Provision of Independent Advocacy Services in Surrey (item 24). A revised report was tabled at the meeting to reflect that some of this information was now included in the Part 1 report.

#### **251/16 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY BOARDS, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

No reports were received.

#### **252/16 SALESIAN SCHOOL, CHERTSEY: BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT [Item 6]**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement reminded Cabinet that they had considered this report at the previous Cabinet meeting and deferred the decision. She said that she personally supported the request to approve 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) 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.

She said that Salesian was a popular school, judged outstanding by Ofsted and that the catholic diocese of Arundel and Brighton were fully supportive of the proposed expansion and would contribute to the scheme, thereby reducing the overall cost to the County Council. However, she acknowledged that the provisional local government settlement had not yet been received and requested that Cabinet approved the expansion, subject to the inclusion of the following additional recommendations and reason for decision, which were:

2. That the expenditure of the sums planned in the MTFP be approved, subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.
3. That it be noted that the Leader will decide whether the condition in recommendation 2 has been met in consultation with the Director of Finance and the Chief Executive.

#### **Reason:**

There is demonstrable public benefit to these proposals and strong value for money arguments. Nevertheless the county council is facing unprecedented financial pressures therefore it would not be sensible to agree to additional

expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional local government settlement.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience confirmed her support for the scheme, subject to inclusion of the additional recommendations.

Other Members of the Cabinet team expressed regret about having to include conditions within the recommendations and hoped that this action would not damage the good partnership working with the diocese.

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

1. That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion as set out in Part 2 of the agenda, the business case for the provision of 250 additional Catholic secondary places be approved.
2. That the expenditure of the sums planned in the MTFP be approved, subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the county council.
3. That it be noted that the Leader will decide whether the condition in recommendation 2 has been met in consultation with the Director of Finance and the Chief Executive.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population. Additionally this proposal expands an outstanding secondary school and adds to the diversity of provision within Surrey.

There is demonstrable public benefit to these proposals and strong value for money arguments. Nevertheless the county council is facing unprecedented financial pressures therefore it would not be sensible to agree to additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional local government settlement.

**253/16 ACCOMMODATION WITH CARE AND SUPPORT PROGRAMME - EXTRA CARE [Item 7]**

The Accommodation with Care and Support Programme is a programme of work looking at all accommodation-based adult services that is commissioned and provides for residents of Surrey who have care and support needs. The Accommodation with Care and Support Strategy was approved by Cabinet in December 2015, giving a commitment to the direction of travel.

The Accommodation with Care and Support Programme aims to increase the options available for residents needing accommodation with care and support, by integrating the County Council approach across health, care and the community, and re-shaping the market to ensure everyone has access to the right support regardless of tenure.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence said that the report set out the rationale for the programme within paragraphs 5-10 of the report. He said that a number of the procurement models had been explored, including a public private partnership, a joint venture, a fully commissioned design, build and deliver package, in house design and build with commissioned delivery.

He referred to the consultation process which had been carried out and drew attention to the risk implications, as set out in the report. He also said by focussing on ensuring better understanding of future demand and developing the market to meet those needs, whilst maximising the Council's assets, additional capacity for extra care housing would contribute towards savings already planned in the Medium Term Financial Plan, and those required for future years.

Finally, he referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment, which was included as an Annex to the report.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident experience confirmed that the Adult Social Care service would be working with colleagues in Property Services to develop this initiative, which she considered would improve residents wellbeing and help them to live independently for longer.

**RESOLVED:**

1. The use of Surrey County Council assets, as appropriate, as part of the business case and offer to the market as outlined and described in the Part 2 report, be approved.
2. That responsibility for the exact sites that will be used as part of the offer to the market be delegated to the Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing & Independence and the Cabinet Member for Business Services & Resident Experience.
3. That the Council will be going to market in the Spring of 2017 to identify a development partner to begin delivery of the strategic ambition for Extra Care housing.
4. That further engagement with the market and a competitive tendering process will be taking place, with the appropriate delivery model and award of contract being subject to further Cabinet consideration at a later date.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

With changing demographics, increasing financial challenges, and a joint health and social care strategy to support people to live independently in their homes for as long as possible, we need to commission the right accommodation options to meet our resident's health and wellbeing needs. To do this, the Council will need to work with partners and the private sector to shape the market for accommodation with care and support and to meet the strategic aims of the Accommodation with Care and Support strategy. By

approving the approach to market to stimulate additional capacity within Extra Care housing market, the Cabinet sets out a clear direction of travel and message to the market in relation to future needs and our commitment to work in partnership. Further detail on this recommendation can be found in paragraph 14 of the submitted report.

**254/16 THE PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES - FIRST STEPS AND COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS IN SURREY - APPROVAL OF CONTRACTS [Item 8]**

This item was deferred.

**255/16 THE PROVISION OF INDEPENDENT ADVOCACY SERVICES IN SURREY - APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence said that this report sought approval to award a contract for the provision of Independent Advocacy Services in Surrey as detailed in the recommendations to commence on 1 April 2017. The service was jointly funded by Adult Social Care, Public Health and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups.

He said the key focus of the new contract was on statutory provision, with some discretionary advocacy support services for those on the cusp of requiring adult social care intervention.

Finally, he confirmed that a consultation exercise had been undertaken, which had given a number of opportunities for stakeholders to co-design the specification for this service.

**RESOLVED:**

That the contract be awarded to the recommended provider for three years from 1 April 2017 with an option to extend for up to one year. Details of the award and the contract value were contained in the Part 2 report, considered later in the meeting.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The current contractual agreements will expire on 31 March 2017. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of Public Contract Regulations and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

The newly commissioned service represents a substantial change of direction for the Council moving towards a more focussed advocacy service in Surrey.

The service will be delivered in Surrey from local bases and will provide apprenticeship opportunities to Surrey Young People whilst delivering efficiencies for the Council.

Re-focussing the way that advocacy is delivered under the new contract will allow a 50% reduction in spend, meeting the Councils need to make savings.

## **256/16 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT TO 30 NOVEMBER 2016**

### **[Item 10]**

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report covering the period up to the 30 November 2016.

He said that in September, 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 and by the end of November, it has improved again to £6.1m overspend, which was much better. However, this year's budget was still not balanced. He said that there was still some way to go before a sustainable Medium Term Financial Plan was achieved.

He informed Cabinet that there were many reasons why the County Council needed to keep working to restore its financial position. Not least among them, as again pointed out in the Section 151 Officer's and the Monitoring Officer's commentaries was the 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 Schools & SEND (Special Education Needs & Disabilities) and that many of these pressures were preventing the Council from implementing its savings plans and contributed to the £20m shortfall against the £83m savings target for 2016/17. These pressures were having a substantial and detrimental impact on the Council's medium term financial position, which was not yet sustainable.

The Chief Executive and Director of Finance had agreed a series of actions with Service Directors to review all spending plans and consider all options for managing service demand more effectively 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 said that the improvement in November's financial position was due to reducing the costs of the Council's capital assets. October's improvement was from higher Investment Strategy income, lower interest charges and extra savings in Property and Orbis but it remained imperative that improvements were found across the board.

Given the gravity of our 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 and other leading Members to continue to bring the Council's budget issues to the attention and understanding of Surrey's MPs because the peak forecast £22.4m overspend closely matched the "shock" reduction in 2016/17 Revenue Support Grant which the Government had imposed upon the Council less than a year ago.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted, including the following:

1. That the forecast revenue budget outturn for 2016/17 was £6.1m overspend, down from £15.0m last month, as set out in paragraph 1 of the submitted report.
2. That the forecast efficiencies and service reductions for 2016/17 were £62.9m, the same as last month, as set out in paragraph 45 of the submitted report.
3. That the Section 151 Officer's commentary and the Monitoring Officer's Legal Implications commentary, as set out in paragraphs 16 to 20 of the submitted report be noted.

**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.

**257/16 RUNNYMEDE ROUNDABOUT SCHEME [Item 11]**

Mr Furey, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding declared a personal interest in the reports relating to the Runnymede Roundabout Scheme (items 11 and 26) because he was also a member of Runnymede Borough Council.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding began his introduction by stating that this item had been deferred from the previous Cabinet meeting. He said that he understood and acknowledged the financial situation that the County Council was facing. However, unlike other items, the requested money for this roundabout would provide a high return on investment because the required investment of £2.025m would return a sum of £5.2m, due to the successful Local Enterprise Bid (LEP). He said that within the contract, there had been included works to the drainage system which had been achieved at a lower cost price - these works would need to be delivered irrespective of this outcome.

Without a decision this week, he considered that it was highly likely that the scheme would be cancelled, for the following reasons:

- The contract award would fall outside the period which process were fixed, with consequent risk that prices could change.
- The construction programme for the scheme, if delayed would be outside the funding window required and agreed with Enterprise M3 LEP.
- Without the Runnymede Roundabout project, the County Council would still need to address the highway drainage system at some point and carry out re-surfacing works to the carriageway at the roundabout junction which requires repair. These works would be subject to the

Council's consideration of priorities and are estimated to cost in excess of £1.5m.

- Currently the County Council had carried out approximately £800,000 of LEP funding related work which would need to be funded by the County Council.

He said that he had considered the benefits and drawbacks of the decision being made this week and agreed with the proposed additional recommendations and reason for recommendation, which were:

3. Cabinet confirms that recommendations 1 and 2 are subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.
4. That the Leader will decide by Friday 16 December 2016 whether the condition in recommendation 3 has been met, in consultation with Director of Finance and Chief Executive.

**Reason:**

There is demonstrable public benefit to these proposals and strong value for money arguments. Nevertheless the County Council is facing unprecedented financial pressures, therefore it would not be sensible to agree to additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional local government settlement.

Finally, he requested that, once the provisional Local Government settlement had been received, that the Leader re-considered the request to proceed with the scheme because he thought that the benefit /cost savings were quite marginal.

Other Cabinet Members agreed that they wished to support the scheme and that the Council did not want to lose LEP funding. However, they acknowledged that the County Council's finances were under severe pressure and agreed to support the amendments to the recommendations and reasons for decision.

The Leader confirmed that he would take advice from the Chief Executive and the Director of Finance before making a decision, which would be in the best interests of Surrey residents.

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

1. That the financial support Cabinet gave to this scheme in 2014 be re-affirmed.
2. That the award of the tender for construction works for the Runnymede Roundabout scheme, on the basis set out in the Part 2 report to be considered later in the agenda, be approved.
3. Cabinet confirms that recommendations 1 and 2 are subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.

4. That the Leader will decide by Friday 16 December 2016 whether the condition in recommendation 3 has been met, in consultation with Director of Finance and Chief Executive.

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

This report recommends approval to let a contract to construct an improvement scheme for Runnymede Roundabout (part of the combined Runnymede Roundabout and Egham STP package), one of the county's most serious congestion hot spots, near to Staines and Egham, supported by 75% government funding through the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership and a contribution from Runnymede Borough Council.

A mini-tender process for the Runnymede Roundabout scheme, in compliance with the requirements of the GEN3 Regional Highways Framework has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process. Funding for this scheme has been secured from the Local Enterprise Partnership £4.950m plus a direct contribution of £1.525m from Surrey County Council (approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 23 September 2014) and a partner contribution of £0.250m from Runnymede Borough Council. An additional £0.500m has also been allocated from the Flood Resilience capital budget to complete required priority drainage maintenance scheme at the same time as the LEP scheme works in order to minimise disruption and cost, and this is a more efficient way to deliver this associated scheme. The Runnymede Roundabout and drainage scheme has a combined total budget of £7.225m.

There is demonstrable public benefit to these proposals and strong value for money arguments. Nevertheless the County Council is facing unprecedented financial pressures, therefore it would not be sensible to agree to additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional local government settlement.

#### **258/16 INVESTMENT OF PROGRAMME FUNDING TO EXTEND SUPERFAST BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE TO SURREY PREMISES. [Item 12]**

Prior to the Deputy Leader presenting the report, Mrs Watson and Mr Harmer were invited to speak.

Mrs Watson said that this investment of £3.8m (Gainshare), from BT was insufficient to enable all 15,300 Surrey properties still without fast broadband to receive the service. She considered that the original plan had been 'watered down' and asked if Value for Money criteria would be applied when deciding who would benefit from this funding. She said that remote, rural areas missed out and requested that the County Council provided 100% coverage across Surrey. Finally, she asked when the postcode information would be publically available.

Mr Harmer said that there had been an extensive discussion on this investment of programme funding to further extend the superfast broadband infrastructure to Surrey premises at the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board (EPEH). Both he and the Board supported the overall strategy and considered that the proposed solution was brilliant.

He acknowledged that the outstanding issues did not affect the majority of divisions in Surrey and the problems were mostly in the south and east of the county. He understood that the postcode information would not be available until after the Cabinet had agreed the way forward. Finally, he gave an assurance that the EPEH Board would continue to scrutinise the financial and value for money implications of this investment and the contract.

Surrey County Council's investment in fibre broadband infrastructure over the past four years through the contract with BT has had a very significant impact on the well-being and economic prosperity of thousands of residents and businesses around the county. All of the contractual targets in the main phase of the contract have been achieved.

The Deputy Leader said that the contract with Openreach had been signed in 2012 and now, as a result of the County's investment into broadband infrastructure, more than 96% of all Surrey premises were able to access fibre download speeds of 15mbps or above. According to Think Broadband, Surrey was currently the best connected county in England.

He was pleased to announce that, due to the County's very successful demand stimulation campaigns, take-up of the fibre broadband services by residents and businesses was significantly higher than projected in the contract finance model, resulting in additional clawback funding flowing into the contract and BT have offered Surrey County Council an advance against this clawback funding of £3.8 million, known as 'Gainshare'. He hoped that this funding would enable a further 4000 - 5000 properties to receive the fibre broadband services and also hoped to receive the postcode information early next year.

Finally, he drew attention to paragraphs 14 and 15 in the report which set out details of how the Government had also intervened to try and improve broadband provision.

The Leader considered that the previous Head of Procurement had done a terrific job in negotiating this contract in 2012, which he felt had improved the economic prosperity for Surrey residents. He also congratulated the Deputy Leader for his work on the project.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the investment of State Aid approved funds that have been generated by the contract with BT to further the deployment of Next Generation Access (NGA) broadband infrastructure within a revised Intervention Area be approved.
2. That final approval for the investment of contract funds be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader.

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

Utilising available funding within the existing contract with BT enables the County Council to proceed with the deployment of additional broadband

infrastructure, providing high speed broadband to as many of the remaining 15,300 premises as possible.

The recommendation requires no new capital expenditure as the funding is generated wholly through the existing contract and higher than modelled take up of fibre broadband services in Surrey County Council's original Intervention Area. This funding is already State aid approved and can be used immediately through the existing contract with BT.

**259/16 SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH THROUGH INVESTMENT IN TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE - SCHEMES FOR STAINES AND LEATHERHEAD [Item 13]**

Improving transport infrastructure was a key part of the Council's strategic goal of economic prosperity.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding said that approval was sought to retrospectively submit a business case to the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership for Staines STP (Phases 1A and 1B) (EM3 LEP), and approval was also sought to submit a business case to the C2C Local Enterprise Partnership for Greater Leatherhead STP (C2C LEP), as additional schemes for the 2016/17 Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) programme of EM3 and C2C Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs).

He said that partner investment was required, that the Council had been in discussions with the relevant Borough and District Councils to secure local contributions and it was a requirement that the County Council confirmed that the specified local financial contribution was available when it submitted the business cases.

Finally, he confirmed that Surrey County Council's direct contribution to these schemes was nil.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That retrospective approval to submit a Business case for Staines STP (Phases 1A and 1B) (EM3 LEP) be approved.
2. That a business case for Leatherhead STP, subject to local contribution being made available be submitted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

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

Under the funding arrangements, delivery bodies are required to provide a local contribution for the schemes, to reflect the local benefits that will be provided.

For the Leatherhead STP project, Mole Valley District Council is extremely supportive of the proposed scheme, and is committed to doing all it can to identify local match funding.

## **260/16 M3 ENTERPRISE ZONE [Item 14]**

The Deputy Leader informed Cabinet that Enterprise Zones (EZs) were a Government initiative to support business growth, create new jobs and attract private sector investment to specific areas. Within the designated EZ boundaries newly located or expanded businesses were able to benefit from financial incentives, including reduced business rates. Business rate growth accruing from these new businesses would be used for investment to support the EZ.

Enterprise M3 LEP, in partnership with Basingstoke Borough Council, Runnymede Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council, submitted a successful application to Government for a multi-site EZ covering: Basing View in Basingstoke, Longcross Park in Chertsey, and Whitehill and Bordon's Louisburg Barracks.

The M3 EZ would start in April 2017 and last for 25 years. The Government required a 5 year Implementation Plan setting out an investment programme to accelerate growth in the area and enable a greater business rates uplift. There was also a Programme Steering Group overseeing the development of the EZ of which Surrey County Council was a voting member.

Referring to paragraph 12, relating to retaining local business rates, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence, who was the local Member for the Longcross area, requested that he was consulted on any proposed support for local initiatives in that area.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Surrey County Council gives consent for Enterprise M3 to sign the Agreement for the M3 Enterprise Zone with Government on the basis of the principles, as set out at Annex 1 of the submitted report.
2. That Surrey County Council and Runnymede Borough Council establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on agreeing the local initiatives for the Longcross site that are to be funded from the portion of retained business rates allocated to local authorities.
3. That Surrey County Council, along with each of the other local authorities involved, makes a one-off contribution of £20,000 to co-fund the Enterprise Zone Programme Director position and consultancy support. The contribution to be found from the Surrey Growth Fund.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

The M3 EZ is a major opportunity to support economic growth on one of the largest available sites for commercial development in Surrey and to secure

additional investment in the area. Over 25 years the ambition is for the EZ to deliver over 200 new businesses and over 10,000 new jobs and to generate an additional £178 million in retained business rates. The specific ambition for the Longcross site is for 49 new businesses, 5600 new jobs and 118,000 sqm of new floor space with the development generating £8.5bn in additional GVA over the 24 year construction and operational period.

The Programme Director will provide the dedicated leadership needed given the complexity of developing a multi-site zone. The Government requires an Implementation Plan for the EZ which needs specialist input alongside the LEP and the local authorities and two consultancy firms with experience of other EZs have been brought on board to make sure that the approach maximises income and has a well targeted investment programme. Successful implementation of the EZ requires support from all the relevant Local Authorities and agreement between SCC and Runnymede about the infrastructure and other interventions that are needed to maximise development on the Longcross site will ensure that the package of measures is well targeted.

### **261/16 DEVELOPING A SINGLE WASTE APPROACH [Item 15]**

Before the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning introduced the report, the Chairman of Economic Prosperity, Environment and Planning was invited to speak. He said that his scrutiny board had set up a Member Reference Group to support this area of work and that there had been good progress in developing a single waste approach in Surrey and commended this proposition to Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member said that he was pleased to present this report, which illustrated that Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP), by working as One Team, had identified that significant savings and improvements for residents could be made by changing the way in which waste was managed in Surrey.

He said that since the Surrey Waste Partnership was formed in 2008, significant progress had been made with waste collection arrangements now largely aligned and the range of recycling materials able to be collected greatly increased. He considered that only by working together in partnership could savings continue to be achieved.

A business case developed by the SWP proposed that waste services were delivered via a new partnership arrangement which was collectively owned by SCC and Surrey's district and borough councils and details were set out in the report. It would mean the benefits gained by working together would be shared across all authorities.

He confirmed that there had been extensive consultation and the feedback had formulated the Plan. Finally, he said that the Medium Term Financial Plan required that SCC makes savings from its waste budget in the short term, and this report was an important step forward, making a difference to how waste was collected. Encouraging a high recycling performance would contribute to budget savings and be of benefit to Surrey taxpayers.

Other Cabinet Members made the following points:

- It was an excellent way forward for Surrey County Council
- Woking Borough Council wished to be at the forefront of this approach
- It was hoped that the remaining districts and Boroughs would consider the benefits of joining the new partnership arrangements
- Being partners in common benefitted Surrey residents
- The important role of Members and officers in this initiative
- Working together was the way forward

**RESOLVED:**

1. To agree to combine SCC's Waste Disposal Authority partnership functions, as described in paragraph 28 of the submitted report, with the functions of the four joint waste collection contract authorities in early 2017/18, and that authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, to enter into the required agreements.
2. That officers be tasked to develop a business case, which recommends the optimum solution for the transfer of the remaining core Waste Disposal Authority functions, as set out in paragraph 27 of the submitted report, to the new partnership entity, and to return to Cabinet in June 2017 with detailed proposals.
3. That officers continue to work through the Surrey Waste Partnership to engage with district and borough councils on how all authorities can adopt a single waste approach that is mutually beneficial, whilst delivering savings and improved services for Surrey residents.
4. The proposals for financial arrangements with Waste Collection Authorities in 2017/18, as set out in paragraphs 42 and 43 of the submitted report, be approved.
5. That officers write to all Waste Collection Authorities to give formal notice of SCC's intention to centrally manage kerbside collected recyclables, via SCC's waste disposal contractor.

**Reason for Decisions:**

Delivering waste collection and disposal services through a single organisation that is co-owned by all Surrey's authorities will deliver significant cost savings for the County Council and Surrey's district and borough councils, whilst improving services and delivering value for Surrey residents.

Combining SCC's waste partnership functions with the four district and borough councils which are part of the joint waste collection contract will demonstrate the early benefits of partnership working, reduce the duplication of effort inherent in the current system, improve the service offered to Surrey residents, and concentrate combined effort on the delivery of savings.

More work is required to fully appraise the benefits of integrating SCC's remaining Waste Disposal Authority functions into a joint entity. It is also

necessary to engage positively with all Surrey Waste Collection Authorities to continue to develop and deliver plans for a fully co-owned entity that are mutually beneficial and maximise benefit for Surrey residents.

Changes to the financial arrangements with Waste Collection Authorities in 2017/18 are necessary to improve performance and make savings in the short term, whilst work continues on the delivery of a single co-owned approach to waste management which will deliver savings in the longer term. This will include giving early notice of the council's intention to centrally manage kerbside collected recyclables in order to deliver cost savings and replace the existing recycling credit system.

## **262/16 PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN 2016 - 2025 [Item 16]**

The Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing said that the County Council's revised Public Safety Plan covered the period 2016 – 2025 and that some of the proposals within it were instrumental to achieving the savings required in the service's budget.

The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services informed Members that Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority was required to produce an Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) which considered all the fire and rescue related risks that could affect its communities. This planning process helps to identify longer term priorities, to make sure there was an up to date assessment of risk, and how to mitigate it effectively.

She said in Surrey, the Council set out its IRMP in the Public Safety Plan (PSP), which was currently valid until 2020. However, within a constantly changing environment, new threats and opportunities have emerged and this new document provided a framework for how SFRS would respond and adapt to these changes.

The PSP refresh document covered the period 2016-2025 and there were nine proposals set out in paragraph 2 of the covering report. She said that the PSP was consulted on from 27 April – 7 June 2016 and the feedback was supportive of the proposals. She confirmed that the Fire Brigade Union had been fully engaged throughout the process and was supportive of the Plan and that the refreshed PSP 2016 – 2025 would remain as a 'draft' until final approval by Cabinet.

She said that it was a large document, containing a wealth of information including some amazing case studies. Referring to the Equalities Impact Assessment, she highlighted the following paragraph within it:

'The Public Safety Plan (PSP) is the over-arching business strategy that guides the priorities and improvements Surrey Fire and Rescue Service will make over the next ten years The Public Safety Plan (PSP) is our key planning document that describes how we will play our part in keeping Surrey residents, and those that work or travel through the county, safe over the next 10 years. It outlines our understanding of the risks and challenges facing the county and how we will maintain adapt and enhance our service accordingly.'

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence wished to put on record his thanks to SFRS for the services it provided for Adult Social Care.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Surrey Fire and Rescue Public Safety Plan, setting a framework for 2016 – 2025, be approved for publication.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

In acknowledging the public consultation feedback and finalised version of the Public Safety Plan, the Fire and Rescue Authority gives confirmation to the direction of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and endorses its plans.

**263/16 APPROVAL FOR THE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE TO TRIAL THE USE OF INITIAL RESPONSE VEHICLES AND AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing said that changes to how Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) responded to incidents needed to be implemented to achieve targets within the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). Therefore, the service were proposing to trial the introduction of a different response method using Initial Response Vehicles (IRV) that can be sent to specified incident types in place of a traditional fire appliance.

However, he recognised the County Council's financial pressures and proposed adding the following recommendations and reason:

3. Cabinet confirms that recommendations 1 and 2 are subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.
4. That the Leader will decide whether the condition in recommendation 3 has been met in consultation with the Director of Finance and Chief Executive.

**Reason:**

Whilst the potential value for money from this approach is clear the County Council is facing unprecedented financial pressures, therefore it would not be sensible to agree additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional Local Government Settlement.

The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services said that this report was asking Cabinet to agree that the service trialled the use of IRVs and highlighted the potentially significant savings that could be achieved by replacing a traditional fire engine with an IRV.

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

1. That Surrey Fire and Rescue Service trial the use of Initial Response Vehicles to prove safe systems of work under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, leading to a more flexible and efficient response model to Surrey residents.
2. That a contract for Initial Response Vehicles be awarded in January 2017 to Rosenbauer UK Ltd for a two phase contract, consisting of an

initial trial period with two vehicles with an option to extend for a further two years with up to an additional four vehicles, subject to the completion of a successful pilot.

3. Cabinet confirms that recommendations 1 and 2 are subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.
4. That the Leader will decide whether the condition in recommendation 3 has been met in consultation with the Director of Finance and Chief Executive.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

In order to better meet demand with the resources available, SFRS need to adjust the way it delivers services to improve efficiency and support a more sustainable approach that is value for money and continues to meet the needs of Surrey residents.

The IRV trial will enable the Service to assess capabilities and gathering data on the scope of operations that could be delivered through a different response method. The trial will ensure that the vehicles, equipment and crewing can be tested across a wide range of incidents and peaks of operational activity. The outcomes from the trial will inform the decisions around implementation, policy and safe and effective service delivery for Surrey residents.

Whilst the potential value for money from this approach is clear the County Council is facing unprecedented financial pressures, therefore it would not be sensible to agree additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional Local Government Settlement.

## **264/16 CHANGES TO HOW SURREY FIRE & RESCUE SERVICE RESPONDS TO AUTOMATIC FIRE ALARMS [Item 18]**

The Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing said that he hoped that the changes proposed to how the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SF&RS) responded to automatic fire alarms would improve resident safety. He said that the proposed changes were set out in paragraphs 17 – 20 of the report.

The Chairman of the Resident Experience Board confirmed that the Board had considered this item in depth and was supportive of the proposed changes.

The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services confirmed that SF&RS already did 'call challenge' and details of this were set out in the background section of the report. She also drew Members attention to both the risk assessment and the equality impact assessment, which she considered were very thorough and were appended to the report. Finally, she thanked Members of the Resident Experience Board for its scrutiny of this issue and commended the recommendations to Members.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Surrey Fire and Rescue expand on its existing call challenge policy through the three Phases, as set out in paragraphs 17-20 of the submitted report.
2. That authority be delegated to the Chief Fire Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing to undertake the reviews of Phases 1 and 2 and make the decision concerning whether to proceed to the subsequent Phase of implementation.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Due to the increasing number of call outs to automatic fire alarms that have proven to be false alarms, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) is reviewing how it responds to these calls.

This is because when the Service is emergency responding to what turns out to be a false alarm, they are not available to deal with real fire and rescue situations, and it may disrupt training and prevention work. In addition, using resources in this way and responding on 'blue lights' creates a risk to crews and to the public.

The proposal to review how the service responds to automatic fire alarms formed part of the consultation on the draft Public Safety Plan in 2016.

**265/16 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 19]**

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.

**266/16 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 20]**

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

**267/16 SALESIAN SCHOOL, CHERTSEY: BASIC NEED EXPANSION PROJECT  
[Item 21]**

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

1. That the business case for the project to expand Salesian School by 250 places, at a total cost, as detailed in the submitted part 2 report, be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience and the Leader of the Council, be approved.
3. That the expenditure of the sums planned in the Medium Term Financial Plan be approved, subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.
4. That it be noted that the Leader will decide whether the condition in recommendation 3 has been met in consultation with the Director of Finance and the Chief Executive.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

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

There is demonstrable public benefit to these proposals and strong value for money arguments. Nevertheless the County Council is facing unprecedented financial pressures, therefore it would not be sensible to agree to additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional local government settlement.

**268/16 ACCOMMODATION WITH CARE AND SUPPORT - EXTRA CARE [Item 22]**

Introducing this report which set out further information regarding the estimated financial savings that are expected to be delivered by developing further extra care provision and the proposed assets that could form part of the Council's offer as part of a commercial tender exercise, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence highlighted the care cost savings and also the identified sites that could be offered to the market as part of the procurement process.

**RESOLVED:**

That the use of Surrey County Council assets as part of the business case and offer to the market, as described in this Part 2 paper and the Part 2 Annex, be approved.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

As detailed in the part 1 report (item 7).

**269/16 THE PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES - FIRST STEPS AND COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS IN SURREY - APPROVAL OF CONTRACTS [Item 23]**

This item was deferred.

**270/16 PROVISION OF INDEPENDENT ADVOCACY SERVICES IN SURREY - APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT [Item 24]**

The Leader requested that the contract be reviewed after 12 months.

**RESOLVED:**

That a contract be awarded to Surrey Disabled People's Partnership (SDPP) for the provision of Independent Advocacy Services in Surrey with an annual value, as detailed in the submitted reports, for three years from 1 April 2017 with an option to extend for up to one year. The total value over the contract period is also set out in the submitted report. The service is jointly funded by Adult Social Care, Public Health and Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The existing contractual agreements will expire on 31 March 2017. 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.

**271/16 INVESTMENT OF PROGRAMME FUNDING TO EXTEND SUPERFAST BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE TO SURREY PREMISES [Item 25]**

**RESOLVED:**

That this part 2 annex to the main part 1 report be noted.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

As detailed in the part 1 report (item 12).

**272/16 RUNNYMEDE ROUNDABOUT SCHEME [Item 26]**

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

1. That the financial support the Cabinet gave to this scheme in 2014 be re-affirmed.
2. That the award of the tender for construction works for the Runnymede Roundabout scheme, on the basis set out in the submitted Part 2 report, be approved.

3. That Cabinet confirms that recommendations 1 and 2 are subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.
4. That the Leader will decide by Friday 16 December 2016 whether the condition in recommendation 3 has been met, in consultation with Director of Finance and Chief Executive.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

As detailed in the part 1 report (item 11).

There is demonstrable public benefit to these proposals and strong value for money arguments. Nevertheless the County Council is facing unprecedented financial pressures therefore it would not be sensible to agree to additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional local government settlement.

**273/16 APPROVAL FOR THE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE TO TRIAL THE USE OF INITIAL RESPONSE VEHICLES AND AWARD A CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION [Item 27]**

**RESOLVED (as amended):**

1. That a contract for an Initial Response Vehicle Concept be awarded to Rosenbauer UK Ltd, consisting of an initial period of one year to provide two IRVs and the financial details were set out in the submitted part 2 report.  
Subject to the completion of a successful pilot, an option to extend for a further two years for up to a further four IRVs be agreed.
2. Cabinet confirms that the recommendations are subject to the provisional Local Government Settlement providing a significant response to the fundamental financial challenges facing the County Council.
3. That the Leader will decide whether the condition in recommendation 2 has been met, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Chief Executive.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

As detailed in the part 1 report (item 17).

Whilst the potential value for money from this approach is clear the County Council is facing unprecedented financial pressures therefore it would not be sensible to agree additional expenditure without understanding the implications of the provisional Local Government Settlement.

## **274/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - DISPOSAL [Item 28]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience informed Cabinet that the County Council had acquired Parkside House, Epsom in 2013. However, the property was now surplus to the requirements of the service and therefore recommended its disposal.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Surrey County Council take the benefit of the recent lease re-gearing which commences in December 2016 and disposes of the freehold interest conditional on the net receipt exceeding the sum as outlined in paragraph 7 of the submitted report.
2. That responsibility for the sale of the property be delegated to the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

Securing the lease extension has significantly improved the asset value and the recommendation from Surrey County Council's strategic investment advisors is that the council should take advantage of this particularly as the market conditions are favourable and prior to the asset value falling again as the break clause nears. The disposal will contribute to providing further financial flexibility should this be required to be considered as part of the options to achieve a balanced budget.

## **275/16 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS - ACQUISITION [Item 29]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience commended this acquisition to Cabinet.

### **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.

**276/16 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 30]**

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

[Meeting closed at 4.00pm]

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank