

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 11 February 2013.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 18 DECEMBER 2012 AT 10.30 AM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| *Mr David Hodge (Chairman) | *Mrs Kay Hammond |
| *Mrs Mary Angell | *Mrs Linda Kemeny |
| *Mrs Helyn Clack | *Ms Denise Le Gal |
| *Mr John Furey | *Mr Peter Martin (Vice-Chairman) |
| Mr Michael Gosling | Mr Tony Samuels |

* = Present

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

119/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Michael Gosling and Tony Samuels.

120/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 27 NOVEMBER 2012 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

121/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

122/12 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

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

In relation to her second question, Mrs Watson asked a supplementary question about the minimum level of cash reserves normally held by the council and what was considered a prudent level by the S151 officer. The Leader said that cash levels would be reviewed as part of the budget monitoring process, over the next few weeks.

123/12 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

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

Q2 Mr Placitelli asked for a further explanation of the County Council's policy relating to no child under 10 years of age accessing residential short break provision except in exceptional circumstances. The Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families was invited to respond and explained that changes had been procedural rather than policy. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families confirmed that since she had been Cabinet Member for this portfolio, there had not been a written policy about age limits – each case was assessed on an individual basis by social workers. However, she believed that for children of 5/6 years old, the best support was usually within the home environment with support from a link worker.

Q3 Mr Robertson disagreed with the response provided to his question and requested an apology. He referred to a copy of a statement released by the Council's press office on 15 December 2009. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment agreed to investigate and provide a response outside the meeting.

Q4 Mrs Gill referred back to Mr Placitelli's question and response and said that her daughter had used The Beeches provision since she was 8 years old. She asked how many children under 10 years old had been assessed as exceptional cases and had been referred to family based care and was there a waiting list? The Cabinet Member for Children and Families agreed to provide an answer outside the meeting.

124/12 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

125/12 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

126/12 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

Adult Social Care Select Committee comments in relation to Budget Monitoring

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

127/12 ENABLING NEW DEVELOPMENT - THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA - SUITABLE ALTERNATIVE NATURAL GREEN SPACES (SANGS) - POLICY REVISION [Item 6]

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment introduced the report and set out the reasons and benefits for altering the existing Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces policy (SANGS) and to the removal of the requirement of an uplift payment on a site by site basis, to be replaced with a standard landowner charge per development. He considered that the proposed changes would enable the County to be fair to both developers and residents.

He also drew Cabinet's attention to the map of Thames Basin SANGS (Annex 1, Appendix B of the submitted report).

Finally, Cabinet noted the S151 officer's comments in relation to this decision which could result in a reduced income to the County Council. Both the Legal and Equality and Diversity implications were also noted.

RESOLVED:

1. That the County Council's current Policy be altered by the removal of the requirement that proposals for SANGS are to be considered in the light of whether new housing development is being proposed on land in the Green Belt or on land covered by any other protective or environmental designation, including Sites of Special Scientific Interest, ancient monuments, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Areas of Great Landscape Value; such issues being left for determination by the relevant local planning authority.
2. That the County Council's current Policy be altered by the removal of the requirement that an uplift payment is to be negotiated upon a site by site basis and instead a standard landowner charge per development be secured for the use of its land as SANGS, in addition to the on-site costs of bringing the land up to the required Natural England standards for use as SANGS in perpetuity with the necessary capital, maintenance and management costs, all being secured through developer payments.
3. That the question of whether future SANGS should be provided on individual County Council sites to continue to be considered and approved by the Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment, in consultation with the Strategic Director for Environment and Leader of the Council, on a site by site basis.
4. That the Policy, as set out in Annex 2 of the submitted report, be adopted.

Reasons for Decisions

The potential benefits of SANGS assist in the protection of the bird species which are considered to be at risk due to the ability of SANGS to influence the behaviour of heathland visitors;

As a result of the use of County Council land as SANGS capital, maintenance and management improvements can be undertaken on the land, at no cost to the County Council through developer payments, at the same time as supporting those affected local authorities in achieving their housing targets;

Use of County Council land as SANGS releases land for new development for which the County Council will receive a landowner charge in recognition of the uplift in value that the SANGS bestow on the proposed development sites.

128/12 CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES DIRECTORATE ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2011-2012 [Item 7]

This report set out the Children, Schools and Families Directorate's progress in 2011/12 and was presented by the Cabinet Member for Children and Families. She referred to the Ofsted inspection in September 2012 of Surrey County Council's arrangements for the protection of children, which had found the Directorate's work to be effective. She acknowledged the areas for improvement that needed to be addressed and she informed Cabinet of the increasing numbers of child protection cases and the impact of budgetary pressures on the Directorate. However, she was pleased to report the success of the savings scheme for Looked After Children, which was the first scheme of its kind nationally and also the implementation of the integrated children's system (ICS) which had also been recognised nationally.

She acknowledged the work to do in strengthening the cohesiveness of partnership working and implementing a coordinated programme of early help. These areas would be taken forward through a public value programme, the children and young people's partnership and the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board.

Key points made by other Cabinet Members were:

- The service had made a dramatic improvement in the last four years.
- Surrey County Council's work to safeguard children was effective, child focussed and was making a difference.
- That this was now a tough inspection regime in which many other local authorities had been voted 'inadequate'.
- There had been excellent achievements in both reducing the numbers of young people Not in Education, Employment or Training and also the first time entrants into the youth justice system was at an all time low.
- Reference was made to tackling Domestic Abuse and that this continued to be a significant priority for the Council.
- That, the new Youth Support Services provided an integrated response for Surrey's most vulnerable young people. The restorative justice element of this service was the right way forward and the work in partnership with Surrey Police was commended.
- The early years provision, together with work being undertaken in the service, to increase the provision of nursery places for 2 year olds was also praised.
- The excellent work of HOPE, a therapeutic service for young people with mental health issues was noted.

The Cabinet congratulated all staff who looked after children, sometimes in difficult circumstances and the Cabinet Member for Children and Families agreed to make this annual report available to all Members.

RESOLVED:

1. The good progress that has been made by the Directorate and achievements over the last year be noted.

2. The publication of the CSF directorate annual report be agreed.

Reasons for Decisions

To note the progress and plans detailed in the 2011/2012 annual report and allow them to be published and shared with the wider council and its partners.

129/12 2012 PROVISIONAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES [Item 8]

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning was pleased to introduce a report which presented an overview of the provisional educational outcomes of children and young people in early years, primary, secondary and special school phases for the academic year ending in the summer of 2012.

Provisional results briefings containing results for Surrey and regional comparators for each key stage were available as annexes. Results were provisional and subject to change. However, since the report had been published, KS3 results had now been verified. All figures represented the latest available data and would not be the same as those presented in the Children's, Schools and Families directorate annual report.

The Cabinet Member considered that the results were a 'solid set of achievements' and recognised the excellent work taking place within Surrey schools. However, she mentioned a need for more focus on teaching effectiveness and progress. She also referred to paragraph 36 of the report which set out the Inspection results for all state funded schools within Surrey, to the end of the 2011/12 academic year.

Confirmation was also given that the Education and Achievement Plan would be presented to Cabinet in February 2013.

Finally, she drew attention to her tabled response to the comments from the Education Select Committee (Appendix 4).

The Deputy Leader referred to the diversity of Surrey schools and said that in excess of 20% of Surrey pupils were educated at Independent Schools and their results were not reflected in these statistics.

RESOLVED:

That the provisional education outcomes be noted.

That schools and Babcock 4S are currently undertaking a full review of the School Improvement Strategy which will inform the annual school improvement plan for the local authority, to be finalised by 31 March 2013.

3. That the Head of Education and Head of School Effectiveness, Babcock 4S return to Cabinet in February 2013, with the Education and Achievement plan and an update on more recently published Ofsted inspection results and performance headlines.

Reasons to Decisions

To ensure that Cabinet is fully informed of the latest provisional education outcomes and to be aware of the current policy context prior to receipt of the Education and Achievement plan in February 2013.

130/12 SURREY MINERALS AND WASTE PLANS - ADOPTION OF THE AGGREGATES RECYCLING JOINT DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT [Item 9]

Cabinet Members were advised that the annexes to the report were available in the Members Reading Room and the Cabinet Room. They were also available on the SCC website.

The Surrey Minerals and Waste Plans formed part of the policy framework which had been agreed by the County Council. The Cabinet was requested to recommend to the next meeting of the County Council that the DPD be adopted. The DPD contained modifications and amendments as recommended by the Inspector following independent public examination. The Inspector concluded that the DPD was sound and legally compliant and provided an appropriate basis for the planning of the county over the next 14 years.

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment highlighted the reasons for the recommendations and stated that the completion of the final element of the Minerals and Waste Plan was a legal requirement. He also drew attention to the main modifications, as set out in paragraph 9 of the submitted report, which the Inspector had endorsed. He also mentioned the proposal to allocate Milton Park Farm, Egham which had the most number of written representations and people attending at the Examination. The Inspector nevertheless found this allocation to be sound. A number of further comments had been received the day before the Cabinet meeting relating to Milton Park Farm from a local organisation and he asked that officers consider if any of the matters raised should be brought back for further consideration by Cabinet prior to the matter being considered by Council.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet recommend to County Council that the Surrey Minerals and Waste Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document (incorporating the main modifications recommended by the Inspector and additional modifications and minor amendments) as attached as **Annex 2**, to the submitted report, be adopted.

Reasons for Decisions

To secure completion of the final element of the Minerals and Waste Plan, fulfilling the associated legal requirements for Local Development Frameworks and comply with the adopted Minerals & Waste Development Scheme legal requirements.

**131/12 PROVISION OF HOME BASED BREAKS SERVICES FOR CARERS:
APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT [Item 10]**

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency presented the report. The Cabinet were advised that the existing contract expired in February 2013 and this report was to award a fixed price contract to the recommended tenderer for the provision of Home Based Breaks Services for Carers from February 2013. The report provided details of the procurement process and demonstrated why the recommended contract award delivered best value for money for carers and Surrey residents alike.

A project group, comprising representatives from Adult Social Care, Children Services, NHS and Procurement was established and a universal tender was run. This helped to ensure a consistent approach and to obtain value for money, due to economies of scale.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families said that this was an excellent example of joint working between Children's Services and Adult Social Care. Also, both she and the Leader acknowledged the contribution that carers made in the County.

The Leader and the Cabinet Member for Community Safety made reference to the Equalities Impact Assessment, attached as an annex to the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the background information set out in this report be noted.
2. That the award of a contract be agreed following consideration of the results of the procurement process as set out in item 17.

Reasons for Decisions

The existing contract supplied by Surrey Crossroads will expire on 5 February 2013. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Regulations and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders has been undertaken. The recommendations arising out of the above processes provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

**132/12 CONTRACT AWARD FOR MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND ROOFING
MAINTENANCE FRAMEWORKS [Item 11]**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency said that the report sought approval from Cabinet to award three Specialist Construction Framework agreements to the recommended tenderers for the provision of mid-sized planned roofing, mechanical and electrical engineering projects. This was the third contract relating to the strategy to improve the County Council's existing building maintenance, agreed by Cabinet on 27 March 2012.

RESOLVED:

That the selected contractors be appointed onto Roofing, Mechanical and Electrical Works Frameworks, jointly procured with Hampshire County Council as detailed in item 16, the confidential annex.

Reasons for Decisions

The recommended contract award delivers best value for money for Surrey County Council.

133/12 BUDGET MONITORING FORECAST 2012/13 (PERIOD ENDING NOVEMBER 2012) [Item 12]

The Leader presented the Budget Monitoring Forecast report and made the following points:

Revenue – After eight months of the current financial year, and despite some significant demand pressures in both Adults and Children’s Social Care, a net underspending of £1.5m was currently being forecast, for this financial year. This was a variance of just 0.1%.

In setting the budget, a contingency against the risk of additional budget pressures and not achieving all of the savings and efficiencies in the Medium Term Financial Plan was prudently set aside. After applying £4.4m to cover the pressures in social care and highways, the council would underspend by £5.9m.

Strategic Directors and service managers were continuing to apply stringent management action plans to meet the savings and efficiencies target in the MTFP of £71m. The current forecast is that services will achieve £66m of these savings. However, the shortfall of £5m would be off-set by other savings, a large proportion of which were due to the underspending on staffing budgets. He said that he was working with Cabinet colleagues and Strategic Directors and Managers to find alternative on-going savings for the next financial year and beyond.

Staffing - Directorates were continuing to actively manage their staffing budgets. This is through holding vacancies to achieve savings and the appropriate use of temporary workers. Currently there were 92% of staff on contracts which is considered to be right for a healthy organisation.

This has led to an underspending of £6.9m for the eight months to the end of November, and this is expected to fall to £5.1m by the end of the year as staff were recruited to essential services. The number of occupied posts in November has further increased to 7,330 – an increase of 64 from October – and 204 posts were being recruited to at the end of the month.

Capital – He said that he was determined to deliver the council’s capital programme this year, especially in providing additional school places and had asked officers to bring forward building schemes from future years and deliver more places for the county’s children earlier. In combination with real savings on the procurement of alternative accommodation, the current year’s School

Basic Need budget of £32m is expected to be nearly fully spent. Overall the capital budget is expected to underspend by £4.6m, which is a significant achievement..

Cabinet Members had the opportunity to comment on the budget forecast variances of their portfolios.

RESOLVED:

1. That the projected revenue budget underspend (Annex 1 – Section A) and the Capital programme direction (Section B) be noted.
2. That government grant changes be reflected in directorate budgets (Section C).

Reasons for Decisions

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

134/12 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND EAST SUSSEX PARTNERSHIP - SHARED SERVICES [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency welcomed the opportunity for Surrey County Council to enter into a partnership agreement with East Sussex County Council to carry out transactional support activities and IT hosting services on behalf of East Sussex County Council. She considered that it was a very important strategic opportunity, which would enable both Councils to make further efficiencies through economies of scale.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) that the report stated would be carried out in January 2013. She requested the opportunity to review it, prior to the start of the arrangements on 1 April 2013 and this was agreed.

RESOLVED:

1. That the establishment of a partnership agreement with East Sussex County Council for support services be supported.
2. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, to agree final terms of an arrangement under which East Sussex County Council will delegate the provision of transactional support and IT hosting services to Surrey County Council from 1 April 2013.
3. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director for Change and Efficiency, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Change & Efficiency, to agree the terms for the short-term lease of the Uckfield premises.
4. That the approval of the decision to establish a partnership agreement for the provision of transactional support and IT hosting services to

East Sussex County Council be considered by the full Council at its meeting in February 2013.

Reasons for Decisions

This partnership will build upon the strength of Surrey County Council's shared services enabling both Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council to make further efficiencies through economies of scale and build resilience in service delivery. Efficiencies will be delivered to the public sector from the joint procurement of IT technical support, utilisation of capacity within Surrey County Council's Data Centre and from shared management and reduced overheads. In the longer term, the partnership could consider further sharing of common systems and the use of common processes enabling further functions to be shared across the two organisations.

135/12 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 14]

The Leader highlighted the decisions made by him, in relation to the Community Improvements Fund and confirmed that he had sanctioned all recommendations from the Panel.

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

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting as set out in Appendix 5 be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

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

136/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 15]

137/12 CONTRACT AWARD FOR MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND ROOFING MAINTENANCE FRAMEWORKS (PART 2 ANNEX) [Item 16]

A replacement paper for item 17 was tabled. This set out the details of the contract award and confirmed that the six top scoring tenderers would be appointed to each of the Frameworks, in accordance with the published OJEU advert, if agreed.

RESOLVED:

That the contractors, as detailed in the submitted report, be appointed onto Roofing, Mechanical and Electrical Works Frameworks.

Reasons for Decisions

A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

138/12 PROVISION OF HOME BASED BREAKS SERVICES FOR CARERS APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT (PART 2 ANNEX) [Item 17]

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency said that this was the confidential annex relating to item 10, which provided the commercial details for the contract award.

RESOLVED:

That a fixed price contract be awarded to Surrey Crossroads at a value, as set out in the submitted report for two years (with the possibility to extend for further one year with a maximum of two years) for the provision of Home Based Breaks Service for Carers to commence on 6 February 2013.

Reasons for Decisions

By awarding the contract to Surrey Crossroads, we will continue to receive a high quality of service with a low rate. Also, Surrey Crossroads are a Surrey based voluntary sector supplier and have six offices covering all parts of Surrey.

In addition, the contract will enable the Council to make further payments to Surrey Crossroads on the receipt of funding from Clinical Commissioning Groups, which will consequently increase the number of hours provided as a break to carers.

139/12 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND EAST SUSSEX PARTNERSHIP - SHARED SERVICES [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency advised Members that this item was the confidential annex relating to item 13. She also drew their attention to the Risk Implications, which were duly noted.

RESOLVED:

As noted in item 13 (part 1 report).

140/12 URGENT ITEM: SITE ACQUISITION FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES [Item]

This item was considered under Special Urgency Arrangements with the reason for urgency being stated that the opportunity to purchase this site would be lost if the County Council did not act quickly. The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning introduced the report, which was tabled at the meeting.

Cabinet Members acknowledged the pressure for school places in the Guildford area and considered the proposals carefully. They agreed to approve the recommendations in principle.

RESOLVED:

1. That the acquisition of this site for school purposes for an amount as set out in the submitted report, be approved in principle.
2. That it be agreed, in principle, to enter into a back-to-back agreement with Governors of the school named in the submitted report, to enable it to purchase the land from Surrey County Council, in order to construct a new school on the site a future date.
3. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director of Change and Efficiency and the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families in consultation with the Leader, the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning and the Chief Finance Officer to agree final terms and conditions of the sale agreement with the owners and the back-to-back agreement with the Governors of the named School.

Reasons for Decisions:

There is an education need to provide additional secondary school places in the Guildford area and due to constraints within existing secondary school sites there is a need to consider potential options for future provision.

The report was presented as an urgent item, under Special Urgency Arrangements, with the approval of the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and is therefore not subject to call in.

141/12 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 19]

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

[Meeting closed at 12.10pm]

Chairman

ITEM 4 - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Member Questions

Question (1) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

The budget monitoring report to the Cabinet in October 2012 contained the following information on overdue debt:

Table D3 –Overdue debt summary as at 30 September 2012

| | 2012/13 | 2012/13 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | Q2 | Q1 | Q4 | Q4 | Q4 |
| | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m |
| Care Related Debt | 6.1 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 6.1 |
| Non Care related debt | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| Total | 9.1 | 9.4 | 9.1 | 10.7 | 9.7 |

Given that £5m equates to approximately 1% of Council Tax revenue, and that the level of debt has remained relatively static over a number of years, what urgent action is being taken to reduce this level of debt significantly?

How much debt has written off in the current financial year since April 2012?

Reply:

A careful analysis of the figures for debt shows there is a downward trend in the level of outstanding debt, and this is when the total level of income is going up. Over the period of this administration, this has been achieved through a much greater focus on debt security and its recovery.

This administration has ensured that as much care debt as possible is secured against property. That means that in caring for our vulnerable people, we can be confident that the debt can be recovered against the value of the property in the future. Since 2010, the amount secured against property has increased from £5.2m to £7.3m today.

We have also increased the action taken to recover old debt, and this can be demonstrated that debt over six months old has fallen from £7.8m in 2010 to £6.2m.

Like any other business that wants to continue, we will pursue debt until it is no longer realistically possible or economic to recover. This will be the case where the debtor has passed away and the estate does not have sufficient resources, or bankruptcy. During this year 395 debts have been written off totalling £305,000.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
18 December 2012

Question (2) from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

I reproduce below the table of earmarked reserves from as listed in Annex 7 of Item 6 "REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2012/13 TO 2016/17" at the Cabinet meeting 31 January 2012.

Annex 7

Earmarked reserves

Forecast year end balances for earmarked reserves

| | Balance | Projected balance | Current Balance |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| | 1 April 2011 | 31 March 2012 | (End November 2012) |
| | £m | £m | £m |
| Investment Renewals Reserve | 2.6 | 13.2 | 12.7 |
| Equipment Replacement Reserve | 3.4 | 0.7 | 3.6 |
| Vehicle Replacement Reserve | 3.4 | 2.2 | 5.3 |
| Waste Sites Contingency Reserve | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Budget Equalisation Reserve | 22.2 | 15.2 | 0.0 |
| Financial Investments Reserve | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| Street Lighting PFI Reserve | 2.7 | 4.6 | 5.8 |
| Insurance Reserve | 6.2 | 6.2 | 7.2 |
| Severe Weather Reserve | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Eco Park Sinking Fund | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Land Acquisition Reserve | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Investment Reserve | 0.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Interest Rate Risk Reserve | 0.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Economic Downturn Reserve | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| General Capital Reserve | 8.4 | 6.2 | 7.6 |
| Capital Receipts Reserve | 17.0 | 3.5 | 14.8 |
| Total Earmarked Reserves | 83.7 | 81.9 | 87.4 |

Please provide itemised details of the present level of each of these reserves and any new and other contingencies and reserves, e.g. 2012 Olympics Reserve? What is the realistic prospect of each of these reserves being needed? What risk assessments have been made to lower the overall level of

these reserves to take into account the unlikely requirement that they will all be called upon?

Reply:

As with any prudent family budget, this council sets some money aside to invest in the future and to hold some back for a rainy day. This was readily acknowledged in a recent Audit Commission report, and is one of the reasons why our external auditors commended Surrey County Council on its financial resilience in its recent Annual Governance Report. Like all local authorities we face a future of real uncertainty in our funding from central government. Making sure we have sufficient reserves to not only invest in the future and to cover any risks that we face, but also to ensure that we continue to protect the most vulnerable in our county is essential. I cannot predict the exact timing of the future and when things will happen, but our officers constantly assess the risks for the future. For example, we hold £7.2m to cover self-insured insurance risks. We currently have actuaries assessing if this is the appropriate level, and the cabinet will decide what changes should be made to this reserve based on sound, professional and independent advice.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council
18 December 2012

ITEM 4 - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question (1) from Mr David Beaman

On 8 October 2012, the Chancellor of The Exchequer announced provision of an additional £450 million to assist local authorities keep Council Tax for 2013/2014 frozen for a third year. Surrey County Council was one of the few local authorities that rejected the offer of a similar grant last year and, as a consequence, Council Tax charges for the current 2012/2013 year for residents of Surrey had to be increased by 2.5% in April. Have any circumstances changed that will allow Surrey County Council to accept this additional grant and allow Council Tax charges for 2013/2014?

Reply:

Last year Surrey County Council declined to accept the offer of the Council Tax Freeze Grant. Whilst we acknowledged that this would be a great benefit to residents in many local authorities, it was not appropriate for Surrey and its residents. By accepting the Freeze Grant, which was for one-year only, the county council would have foregone £15m a year every year from 2013/14, which would be the equivalent of £70m over five years. By making the decision not to accept this, Surrey County Council has been able to fund the building of an extra 1,440 school places (equivalent to more than three new primary schools/one secondary school), invest £2m in local road schemes, ensure £10m over five years to help older people stay in their homes and invest £300K in the Apprentices programme.

The offer made by the Chancellor on 8 October 2012 of a two year grant equivalent to a 1% increase would leave the council with a financial black hole of about £50m over five years. This would have a severe impact on our ability to deliver the improvements to roads and highways that residents need and to continue to help more older people to live at home.

Whilst the council recognises the need to keep council tax rises to a minimum to help people in these difficult times and we are making savings totalling £200m per year by 2017 to reflect this, the council is also committed to continue to deliver the services that our residents value and need.

**David Hodge
Leader of the Council
18 December 2012**

Question (2) from Mr Paul Placitelli

With regards to Surrey County Council's policy that no child under 10 years of age should be accessing residential short break provision except in exceptional circumstances, can you please inform of the exact date that this

policy was introduced and the details, dates of the consultation process that took place with stakeholders, parents, carers, guardians of disabled children under 10 and carers forums throughout Surrey that enabled SCC to arrive at this policy?

The date and results of the Equality Impact Assessment that was completed that enabled SCC to arrive at this policy or other formal assessment that was completed instead.

Reply:

Surrey County Council does not have a specific policy in relation to age restrictions for children accessing residential short breaks. As part of ongoing improvements to service delivery, good practice principles have been introduced periodically.

The principle that younger children (under 10) should only access residential short break provision in exceptional circumstances, was a principle of practice to give consideration to family setting placements rather than residential units; for those with needs assessed at a level that required residential short break support. The principle recognised that there are some young children for whom a residential short break unit is the only appropriate provision due to the level and complexity of need.

This principle was considered at the Children and Families Select Committee on 8 March 2011. It was contained within a report on the re-configuration of in-house short breaks service provision for children with disabilities. It was one of 8 principles that had been used for a review of short break provision completed by the service in 2010. These principles were listed within the Committee report.

There has not been a policy change thus there is no specific consultation or Equality Impact Assessment regarding age application in relation to residential short break but an over arching Equality Impact Assessment was completed in relation to the wider Public Value Review in 2010/11.

Mary Angell
Cabinet Member for Children and Families
18 December 2012

Question (3) from Mr Malcolm Robertson, Charlton Lane Community Liaison Group member

- (1) Will you please instruct your waste contractor to confirm it has no claim on, (nor will it claim), any land outside the existing perimeter fence (as existed prior to the first of the two planning applications) of Charlton Lane Waste Management Facility?
- (2) Will you ensure that the county's waste contractor provides written confirmation that it will not apply to increase the capacity of the site beyond its present maximum of 175,000 tonnes?

Kindly indicate the County's acceptance of these proposals.

- (3) Finally, confirm Surrey's ban on in County incineration applies to all its forms, including gasification, and that in future it will work towards truly sustainable methods of waste management.

Reply:

Firstly and before answering Mr Robertson's specific questions, I would point out that SITA's proposal for an Eco Park has been subject to intense and detailed scrutiny as part of the planning and environmental permitting processes. Following this detailed scrutiny the County Planning Authority were satisfied that they could grant planning consent for the development and the Environment Agency were satisfied that the processes on site could be regulated by means of an Environmental Permit.

Contrary to what Mr Robertson says, the council has not 'banned' incineration within the county. It has developed a joint municipal waste management strategy together with district and borough councils which promotes minimising waste and high levels of recycling. As a consequence there is less residual waste to be dealt with and therefore the requirement for smaller treatment facilities. Such facilities are more suited to the use of advanced thermal treatment technologies such as gasification.

With regard to the specific questions raised by Mr Robertson I would respond as follows.

(1) "Will you please instruct your waste contractor to confirm it has no claim on, (nor will it claim), any land outside the existing perimeter fence (as existed prior to the first of the two planning applications) of Charlton Lane Waste Management Facility?"

(A) SITA will be required to develop the Eco Park site in accordance with the planning consent, including compliance with the boundaries within that consent. A significant amount of landscaping has been included in the scheme to mitigate against any impact and this landscaped area plus part of the development lies beyond the existing perimeter fence. Therefore we will not agree to instruct SITA as you have indicated.

(2) Will you ensure that the county's waste contractor provides written confirmation that it will not apply to increase the capacity of the site beyond its present maximum of 175,000 tonnes?"

(A) When the Eco Park is developed the capacity of the site will be fixed at 143,000 tonnes per year. There are no plans to increase this capacity. Should the Eco Park not be built for some reason then the council may have to reconsider its waste strategy, including the use of the Charlton Lane site. In this circumstance we could not guarantee that there would be no requirement for an increase in capacity at the site, though there are no plans for this at present and any change would be subject to a planning application.

(3) Finally, confirm Surrey's ban on in County incineration applies to all its forms, including gasification, and that in future it will work towards truly sustainable methods of waste management."

(A) As I have stated above, the council does not have a ban on incineration or any other thermal treatment process within the county. The county council continues to work towards a more sustainable way of managing its waste, reducing its reliance on landfill, increasing recycling and reuse and recovering energy from what is left over. Residents in Surrey are now recycling around 55% of the waste that they produce, which makes the county one of the highest recycling performers in the country. Together with the district and borough's we have set ambitious targets to recycle 70% of our waste by 2014. There will however always be the need to treat waste that cannot be recycled and we will continue to ensure that this is dealt with in the most environmentally sound and cost effective way for the taxpayer.

John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment
18 December 2012

Question (4) from Shirley Gill

Why is Surrey County Council Social Services referring so few children with severe learning difficulties, behavioural problems and complex needs (often including uncontrolled epilepsy,) to good suitable short break respite with trained disability nurses in a safe controlled setting?

These are a specific group of children who often can't communicate, have no sense of safety, are anxious and difficult to manage, and need trained disability nurses to look after them. They all attend schools for children with severe learning difficulties, and are the hardest group of children to look after. Often they don't sleep for three or four nights in a row. They need watching all the time either because of their seizures or their behaviour. They are often doubly incontinent. Their families quite often bear bruises but still carry on trying to look after them. Family Link is not suitable for them and they can't access a lot of what the youth schemes do.

The Head of Countywide Services for the Children's and Safeguarding Service from Surrey County Council has said that children are referred in exceptional circumstances, but if this is the case why are so many parents of these children so desperate for respite.

These are the children whose families are on the edge of not coping and when they break the children have to go into residential care. The cost to the County Council of residential care is huge (I have been told £300k a year)

Reply:

The Children with Disabilities Teams are currently working with c.785 children and young people (as of November 2012) the majority of whom have severe learning disabilities, physical disabilities, complex health needs or challenging behaviour. A range of support services are provided to these families including day and residential care, domiciliary care, playschemes and activity breaks or direct payments. Following an assessment of need a care package is agreed with the family tailored to the individual child or young person. Many other families access community based services directly; a total of 1,920 Surrey children and young people accessed a short break during 2010/11.

Children with the highest level of needs, such as Mrs Gill describes, may be referred to one of the seven residential short break services run by or commissioned by Surrey County Council, or the Beeches service commissioned by NHS Surrey. These services are all registered with Ofsted or the Care Quality Commission and graded as good or outstanding in the care they provide. They all employ trained care staff, who are skilled and experienced in managing the care needs of children with complex needs and disabilities. For younger children, and particularly those under 10, family based care will always be our preferred option. However, in some circumstances individual children may be best placed within a residential setting due to their specific care needs; these are the 'exceptional circumstances' as referred to by Sheila Jones, Head of Countywide Services.

We would therefore like to reassure Mrs Gill of our continued commitment to the provision of short breaks and support to families of children and young people with disabilities. An assessment of need will be undertaken with families where parents are struggling to cope or where there is a risk of family breakdown. The social care teams will continue to work closely with parents and carers to support them to keep their children at home through packages of support, direct payments and 'shared care' arrangements.

Mary Angell
Cabinet Member for Children and Families
18 December 2012

CABINET 18 DECEMBER 2012

CABINET MEMBER RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE WITH REGARD TO BUDGET MONITORING

Adult Social Care Select Committee recommendations

Therefore the Select Committee recommends to the Cabinet:

1. The Adult Social Care Directorate has worked extremely well over the last two years to meet very challenging financial savings targets;
2. The Committee continues to champion preventative measures that will affect the long term figures positively;
3. The savings that have been required and will need to continue may now begin to affect the quality of care in some areas;
4. The Adult Social Care Select Committee formally requests that the Cabinet re-consider the savings targets being imposed on the Adult Social Care Directorate, bearing in mind the demographic challenges and increased demand facing it; and
5. The public need to be informed and prepared for possibly difficult announcements and impacts of the funding allocation from central government due in December and in the future.

Reply:

I am grateful to the Select Committee Members for their work in scrutinising the forward budget position.

They rightly recognise the achievements of Adult Social Care Directorate in making savings approaching £90m over the past three years while reducing neither quality of service nor the underlying investment; and I agree that we should continue to invest for the longer term in such programmes as Reablement, Telecare and Supporting People.

I also agree that increased funding would be very welcome. However, we do need to make those decisions within the overall funding available to the County Council, and to make them on a fully informed basis. Accordingly, a substantive response will have to wait until after the Government's settlement has been received and its consequences analysed.

What I propose, therefore, is to feed the Committee's views into the relevant Cabinet discussions, and to attend the Committee's own budget workshop on 15 January to make sure I am fully aware of Members' views as we move towards making the decisions needed to set the budget for 2013/14

**Michael Gosling
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health
18 December 2012**

CABINET 18 DECEMBER 2012

**CABINET MEMBER RESPONSE TO EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE
WITH REGARD TO 2012 PROVISIONAL EDUCATION PERFORMANCE
OUTCOMES**

Education Select Committee recommendations

The Education Select Committee welcomed Babcock 4S' review of its school improvement activities and requested that the final validated data presented to Committee include:

- Detailed analysis of performance results for individual phases;
- Analysis of performance between students attending combined primary schools and those educated in separate infant and junior schools;
- Greater clarity concerning the changes to the Ofsted inspection framework.

Reply:

- We agree to the recommendations made by the Education Select Committee and information will be shared with Education Select Committee and Cabinet at the earliest opportunity.
- We are currently undertaking a full review of our School Improvement Strategy with our partners, Babcock 4S, with a view to making a number of changes. In particular we will ensure that our support is targeted in a more effective way in reviewing, supporting and developing the capacity of leadership and governance in schools. This is key to school improvement.
- In addition, there is a need to engage earlier, in a more focused manner, with a greater number of schools. It is less costly to work with schools before they significantly decline leading to better value for money. In order to do this we are implementing a more rigorous risk assessment to identify schools that are declining or likely to decline from good and intervene and challenge at an earlier stage.
- Final validated data for Primary key stages will be made available to Education Select Committee in January 2013; final validated data for Secondary key stages and detailed analysis of the new Ofsted framework will be shared with the committee in March 2013.
- Discussion of the focus of the 2013 committee papers will be undertaken on Monday 17 December 2012 at the Education Select Committee planning meeting with the Chairman / Vice-chairman.

**Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Children and Learning
18 December 2012**

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

NOVEMBER / DECEMBER 2012

(i) COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS FUND - PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

That the proposed grants funding set out in attached Annex be approved from the Community Improvements Fund Budget, and the position of the applicants agreed within the previous meeting, especially the Stroud Green Community Association shop redevelopment be noted.

Reasons for decision

This will enable the Community Partnerships Team to progress with facilitating the payments relating to the Fund.

(Decision of Leader of the Council – 28 November 2012)

(ii) PETITION: ASHTEAD KIDS CLUB

That the respond to the petition, circulated with the agenda, be agreed.

Reasons for decision

To respond to the petition.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Community Safety – 13 December 2012)

(iii) SPEED LIMIT A245 STOKE ROAD, STOKE D'ABERNON

After careful consideration of the referral from the Environment and Transport Select Committee, requesting that the decision in relation to the speed limit on A245 Stoke Road, Stoke D'Abernon, taken at his meeting on 21 November 2012 be re-considered, together with advice from the Road Safety & Traffic Management Officer, Surrey Police and the Highways officers, he agreed that he would not endorse the reduction from 40mph to 30mph as requested by Elmbridge Local Committee, for the stretch of road between the existing 30mph limit near Leigh Hill Road to a suitable point just east of the Chelsea Football club training ground.

Reasons for decision

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

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 13 December 2012)

(iv) BLACKHORSE ROAD SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT: REFERRAL FROM WOKING LOCAL COMMITTEE

- (1) The decision to introduce a 30mph speed limit in Blackhorse Road be not endorsed.
- (2) The recommended outcome proposed by officers be approved.
- (3) The Woking Local Committee be asked to support the proposal to carry out a feasibility and design study to look at targeted safety improvements at the junction with Blackhorse Road and Saunders Lane where the majority of accidents have occurred as part of their 2013/14 ITS programme.

Reasons for decision

As detailed in the report to Woking Local Committee on 26 September 2012, a 30mph speed limit is considered to be inappropriate for Blackhorse Road, as it is contrary to County Council policy, contrary to the advice of the Police and Highways Officers, and unlikely to result in any public safety benefit. Carrying out a feasibility and design study for safety improvements at the junction where the majority of accidents have occurred is likely to positively address the concerns of Members and local residents.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 13 December 2012)

(v) BID TO DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT SAFE CYCLING FUND

That the bid to the Department of Transport for safe cycling infrastructure be formally endorsed.

Reasons for decision

This funding bid supports the corporate priority to tackle levels of cycling casualties. It will directly benefit areas of high cycle casualty rates: Walton-upon-Thames and Leatherhead. It will benefit all road users by segregating cyclists from motorised traffic and will provide economic benefit by making it more possible for more people to cycle, reducing travel costs and congestion, and by improving cycle routes to town centre locations.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – 13 December 2012)

(vi) REQUEST BY ST ANNE'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL, CHERTSEY FOR A PLANNED LICENSED DEFICIT

That the request for a planned licensed deficit of £95,000 for St Anne's Catholic Primary School, Chertsey, repayable over three years, subject to final agreement that the project is affordable when tenders are received, be approved.

Reasons for decision

The proposal will allow a successful school to provide extended and improved accommodation at no cost to the council.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 13 December 2012)

(vii) PROPOSAL TO PERMANENTLY EXPAND WEST EWELL INFANT AND NURSERY SCHOOL

- (1) That the school be enlarged by one form of entry (from 3 FE to 4 FE) allowing for a roll of 360 pupils in total, plus the 98 existing nursery places.
- (2) That additional classrooms be provided through a building project to meet the requirements of a larger roll.
- (3) This expansion be effective from 1 September 2013.

Reasons for decision

West Ewell Infant and Nursery is a popular school which delivers a high quality education. It was rated by OFSTED at its previous two inspections as 'Outstanding'. The provision of additional places here meets the government's policy position to expand successful schools in order to meet parental preferences.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Children and Learning – 13 December 2012)

(viii) APPOINTMENT OF SUPPLIERS TO THE INSTALLATION, SERVICING AND MAINTENANCE OF INDUSTRIAL, PEDESTRIAN AND FIRE DOORS FRAMEWORK

That a framework agreement for the provision of the installation, servicing and maintenance of industrial, pedestrian and fire doors services be awarded on the basis as set out in paragraph 1 of the submitted report.

Reasons for decision

The existing contracts for the servicing and maintenance of industrial and automatic pedestrian doors will expire on 31 March 2013. 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 County Council following a thorough evaluation process.

The recommendations in the submitted report showed that Surrey County Council would make an estimated annual saving of £122,800 per annum, which provided best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

(Decision of Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency – 14 December 2012)