

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

June 2017

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**(I) PROPOSED AMALGAMATION OF STARHURST AND CHART WOOD SCHOOLS****Details of decision**

The Leader of the Council:

1. approved the closure of Starhurst School as part of the proposed amalgamation with Chartwood School (formerly St Nicholas) such that there will be one school for pupils with social, emotional and mental health needs (SEMH) in the south east area of the County from 1 September 2017;
2. noted that the amalgamation of Starhurst and Chartwood schools will take place in two phases with the children currently at Starhurst School being moved to the Chartwood School site in Merstham following which the amalgamated school will be relocated to a new, permanent site in Dorking upon completion of the new building which would then reduce the number of residential places at the school to 24.
3. noted the financial information related to the proposed amalgamation of Chartwood and Starhurst schools as outlined in the Part 2 report.

Reasons for decision

The proposal will streamline SEMH provision in the south east of Surrey. It will allow for the more effective use of the available Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) resources. The aim is to develop outstanding provision with a larger and more sustainable single special school for SEMH in the east quadrant of Surrey based on one site in Dorking. Critically, it will release the site of Chartwood in Merstham to allow for delivery of a new mainstream secondary free school.

The Leader is asked to take a decision prior to 6 June 2017 otherwise, in accordance with statutory processes, the decision will pass to the Schools adjudicator to make.

(Decision taken by the Leader of the Council – 5 June 2017)

CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH**(II) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS****Details of decision:**

A Member question was received from Mrs Barbara Thomson and the response is attached as Appendix 1.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Health – 13 June 2017)

(III) PETITIONS

Details of decision:

That the response, attached as Appendix 2, be approved.

Reasons for decision:

To respond to the petition.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Health – 13 June 2017)

CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND BUSINESS SERVICES

(IV) AWARD OF FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF OFFICE STATIONERY

Details of decision:

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services:

- I. approved the award of a framework agreement (which sets out the terms and conditions under which specific purchases known as “call-offs” can be made on behalf of the Council during the term of the framework agreement) to Banner Group Limited for four years from 1 September 2017 in accordance with information on the contract tendering process as set out in the Part 2 report;
- II. noted that the duration of each call off agreement will be two years with the option to extend for a further two years one year at a time; and
- III. noted that over the full term of the framework, the anticipated value is £900,000 (approximately £225,000 per annum).

Reasons for decision:

Surrey County Council (SCC) currently has separate contracts for office stationery and printer consumables (that fall outside the scope of the Multi-Function Device contract), both of which expire on 31 August 2017. The Council conducted an Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) tender process, in compliance with the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement Standing Orders. A thorough evaluation process has identified awarding the framework to Banner Group Limited will provide the Council with the best value for money.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services – 13 June 2017)

CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

(V) PETITIONS

Details of decision

That the response, attached as Appendix 3, be approved.

Reasons for decision

To respond to the petition.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Education – 13 June 2017)

(VI) SELECTION OF PREFERRED PROPOSER FOR THE HORLEY NORTH WEST FREE SCHOOL

Details of decision:

The Cabinet Member for Education reviewed the background to the project and summary of Internal Assessment Panel scoring process provided within the report and associated annexes and, on that basis, decided on Aurora Academies Trust as the preferred proposer to open and operate the new 2FE Primary Free School in North West Horley from September 2020 and to submit this preference to the Secretary of State for Education for their consideration.

Reasons for decision:

There is an increasing demand for primary school places in the Horley area, which reflects a rise in the primary-age population over recent years. This demand will be augmented by the Westvale Park development in North West Horley which is due to deliver over 1,500 new homes across the period 2016/17 to 2026/27. The proposal to create a new 2FE Primary Free School in Westvale Park represents SCC's strategy to deliver additional places in this area and thereby meet rising demand. Accordingly, SCC has undertaken the requisite competition process to seek proposers for the new Free School and six formal bids were received as part of this. Of these bids, the Internal Assessment Panel scored the submission of Aurora Academies Trust the highest, on the grounds that the '8 Pillars' educational model and vision, together with the 'Paragon' curriculum were particularly well suited to adding an exciting new dimension to the educational offer in the local area (thereby promoting parental choice).

For these reasons, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member approves the selection of Aurora Academies Trust as the preferred proposer in respect of the Horley North West Primary Free School, for onward communication to the Regional Schools Commissioner.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Education – 13 June 2017)

(VII) PROPOSED EXPANSION OF OAKWOOD SCHOOL

Details of decision

The Cabinet Member for Education agreed to determine the Statutory Notice, thereby bringing into effect the formal expansion of Oakwood School by one Form of Entry (1 FE) for September 2018 and a further 1FE for September 2019 onwards.

Reasons for decision

There is an increasing demand for primary school places in the Horley area which reflects a rise in the primary-age population over recent years that is beginning to transition into the secondary sector. In order to meet this demand, Surrey County Council (SCC) is overseeing an ongoing school expansion programme designed to increase the capacity of the school estate. The proposal to expand the capacity of Oakwood School by 1FE represents SCC's strategy to deliver additional places in this area. In line with this, SCC has undertaken the requisite statutory consultation to inform the decision making process, to which there were 90 responses. For these reasons, it was recommended that the Cabinet Member determine the Statutory Notice so as to bring the expansion of the school formally into effect.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Education – 13 June 2017)

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS

(VIII) PETITIONS

Details of decision

That the response, attached to this decision sheet as Appendix 4, be approved.

Reasons for decision

To respond to the petition.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways – 13 June 2017)

Member Questions**Question (1) from Mrs Barbara Thomson:**

"Is the Cabinet Holder for Health aware of the impending closure of South Park Doctors Surgery and is there any more action that we can take as a Council?"

There are currently 4,600 patients registered at this Surgery some of whom are very frail, elderly and disabled who will have to travel by public transport to other surgeries to obtain health support, advice and treatment. The threat of this closure is very unsettling for the residents.

I understand that the root cause of the proposed closure relates to unaffordable proposed increases in the rent for use of the land and buildings. Is there any action that the Council can take to Compulsory Purchase the building on the basis of the community need for this facility?"

Response:

The Cabinet Member for Health is aware of the forthcoming closure of South Park Surgery, near Reigate, and has explored whether there is any action the Council can take. The Cabinet Member for Health recognises that the situation may be unsettling for residents, however, there is no action the Council can take which will enable a surgery to be retained in the South Park area.

NHS England are the commissioners of local general practice services and they have been working with colleagues in NHS East Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), local councils and with communities to explore various options following the healthcare provider, Malling Health (which is now part of the IMH Group), giving notice on their contract to provide services at South Park Surgery in 2015. NHS England initially secured an agreement with Malling Health to continue to provide GP services at South Park Surgery for a further year, until the end of March 2017, while work took place to find a long term solution to ensure ongoing care for the surgery's patients. This agreement with Malling Health was then extended by a further six months until the end of September 2017, to ensure alternative arrangements for patient care could be put in place in a safe and managed way. This arrangement cannot be legally extended any further and NHS England has had to ensure arrangements are in place for the ongoing care of all South Park Surgery patients that will ensure their continued care after the end of September.

NHS England have explored whether it would be possible to retain a GP surgery in the immediate South Park area and have ultimately exhausted this possibility. This included approaching other local GP practices to see if they would be interested in opening a branch surgery in the South Park area, in addition to their existing services.

The barriers do not relate to unaffordable proposed increases in the rent for use of the land and buildings but include issues about the viability and sustainability of the surgery for health

care providers due to the relatively small practice size. GP practices, particularly smaller ones like South Park Surgery, face an increasing number of challenges including: managing the health needs of an ageing population; an increasing number of patients with complex care needs and difficulties recruiting GPs and other practice staff to care for patients. In the past, viability and sustainability issues have led to frequent changes in healthcare providers at the practice which results in prolonged uncertainty for patients.

NHS England have engaged with local GP practices and found that some of them are interested in growing their patient lists in order to develop and strengthen their services. Therefore, ahead of the closure of South Park Surgery at the end of September 2017, patients will be supported to register at other local practices to ensure their continued care. NHS England will be sending out letters to all registered patients shortly to provide clear information to patients about which other local GP practices they could register with. Re-investing funding from South Park Surgery into existing local family GP practices could help strengthen other existing local GP practices making them better placed to provide a wider range of care and services in the future and ensuring that patients have ongoing access to care, given the lack of other feasible options to achieve this.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Health
Surrey County Council

CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH

Tuesday 13 June 2017

RESPONSE TO THE PETITION CONCERNING THE DECISION TO HAVE ONLY THREE SEXUAL HEALTH HUBS IN SURREY, AT REDHILL, WOKING AND GUILDFORD**The Petition**

Review the decision to have only 3 sexual health hubs in Redhill Woking Guildford. For the revised service & close sexual health/ community contraception clinics including Epsom, Leatherhead, Cobham, Walton etc leaving the north of the county with inadequate provision. To note the views of those currently providing the service that the plans are flawed and make the services difficult for young girls/women to access. To provide information about outreach via GPs pharmacies and school nursing. For the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing to make a public statement with her rationale for the proposals and whether she believes they are consistent with joining up health & social care more effectively.

Sexual health or genitourinary medicine (GUM) clinics offer a range of services, including: testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections (STIs) advice and information about sexual health. Free condoms. Contraception – including emergency contraception, such as the morning after pill. <http://www.dorkingandleatherheadadvertiser.co.uk/question-marks-raised-over-future-of-sexual-health-clinic-set-for-a-change-of-provider/story-30173292-detail/story.html> We know that for each pound cut in Sexual health, they will have to spend £84 more (Unprotected Nation document.) They are planning a £6 million ‘saving’ over the next 3 years. The increased costs are too massive to contemplate! A staggering £504 million over 3 years, in increased benefits, social housing, social workers, creche places, school places, increased costs in terminations and maternity cases-25% of unplanned pregnancies result in a delivery, increased HIV transmission, increased cancer cases, increased infertility investigation and treatment etc.

By J P Moyer

Signatures: 137

Response

Continued cuts to funding, rising costs and increasing demand for key services means that the need for Surrey County Council to find savings has reached unprecedented levels. This year alone we need to make savings of around £150m – that’s about 10% of our overall budget.

We are determined to meet our responsibilities and will continue to support our residents as effectively as we can, but despite having achieved £450m worth of savings since 2010, changes to services are still needed.

One of those services is sexual health. Sexual health sits within public health. In Surrey we receive below target funding per head of population. In addition to this there have been national cuts to the public health grant, meaning that by 2019 there will have been a significant decrease in funding for public health services in Surrey.

The financial envelope available for the sexual health procurement reflected this but still allows for a quality service that is in-line with national requirements and responsive to local needs as identified in the sexual health needs assessment.

Surrey County Council jointly re-procured sexual health services for Surrey with NHS England (who are the lead commissioner for HIV services). The service specification reflected local engagement work which was undertaken throughout the early part of 2016 to tailor this to meet local needs. This included a well-attended Concept Day, a "Surrey Says" survey and a Market Engagement Event.

Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust (CNWL) began delivering sexual health services in Surrey in April 2017 having been awarded the contract in October 2016.

CNWL are providing three main HUB services in Surrey. These are located in Woking, Guildford and Redhill. In addition to this CNWL are operating clinical outreach spokes in Leatherhead and Epsom and are planning for clinical outreach spokes in Spelthorne and Runnymede.

This work will be complimented by extended clinical outreach working with at risk and vulnerable groups including young people, Black African populations, men who have sex with men, and sex workers.

It is important to note that the phased transfer of services from Frimley on 30th June 2017 and from ASPH on 30th September 2017 means that the transformed services will not be operational as the new integrated service fully until January 2018. A summary of services is included in annex 1.

From January 2018 residents will be able to register online, book appointments and collect test results. Residents will also be able to request testing kits online.

Public health also commission long acting reversible contraception from general practice and emergency hormonal contraception from pharmacy.

Facilitated by public health, CNWL will be working in partnership with CCGs, school nurses, services for young people, education and boroughs and districts to ensure that sexual health messages are accurate and consistent across the county.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Health
13 June 2017

During 2017 CNWL will be delivering:

- **Services from three Clinical Hubs**
 - Buryfields (Guildford) - Level 3 GUM and Contraception
 - Earnsdale (Redhill) - Level 2+ (description in annex 2)
 - Woking Contraception – Level 2+
- **Spoke Clinical Outreach services**
 - Leatherhead Hospital – Mondays and Fridays, 10:00 am to 12:30 am (improving access for young mothers and the wider community) – started 28th April 2017
 - Epsom Clinic – Mondays and Wednesdays 3:30 pm to 6:00 pm (improving access for young people) – starting on June 12th 2017
 - Based on public health need Runnymede and Spelthorne spoke clinical outreach services are in development. Due to open in July 2017

Fully Operational Service Model in 2018

- Patients able to register online, book appointments and collect test results – there will be new Mobile App
- Extended clinical outreach working with at risk and vulnerable groups including young people, Black African populations, men who have sex with men, and sex workers
- Full availability of home screening kits, online, in Hubs, General Practice (pilot)
- More Dual Trained staff (GUM/Contraception) so where possible care be provided in one appointment
 - Buryfields open every Saturday from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm
 - Young People Saturday clinics – running on alternate weeks from Woking and Earnsdale from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm
- Improved support for General Practice and Pharmacies

Should you wish to contact CNWL directly their contact details are:

- Phone: CNWL on 01483 783 340 (staffed Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm)
- Email: sexualhealth.cnwl@nhs.net

For more information and updates please visit our 'Heathy Surrey' website www.healthysurrey.org.uk/your-health/sexual-health or

visit CNWL's website www.sexualhealth.cnwl.nhs.uk

CNWL Level **2+** spokes

- Nurse delivered
- Access to medical advice from level 3 service who can view patient record and prescribe/record advice in EPR remotely
- Fully auditable and good governance
- All laboratory tests available
- On site medications availability for STIs and contraception same as level 3



CNWL Level **2+** services for Women

- Screening and treatment of all STIs in:
 - Asymptomatic women
 - Women with vaginal discharge and lower abdominal pain
- Emergency contraception
- Non-LARC
- LARC including IUC
- Onward referral to Guildford for conditions requiring face to face assessment via more senior clinician
 - Complex contraception incl. access to pelvic US
 - Post sexual assault
 - Recurrent or recalcitrant conditions e.g. resistant candida or persistent vaginal discharge
 - Complex dermatological presentations



CNWL Level **2+** services for Men

- Onward referral for conditions requiring face to face assessment via more senior clinician
 - STIs with complications e.g. proctitis
 - PEP (Post Exposure Prophylaxis)
 - Complex dermatological conditions



Wellbeing for life

CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION

Tuesday 13 June 2017

RESPONSE TO THE PETITION TO GUARANTEE THAT SUMMER BORN CHILDREN HAVE ACCESS TO RECEPTION AT COMPULSORY SCHOOL AGE (CSAGE) AND TO ENSURE THAT THEY REMAIN WITH THE SAME COHORT THROUGHOUT THEIR EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS WHERE SURREYCC IS THE ADMISSION AUTHORITY**The Petition**

Guarantee summer born children access to reception at compulsory school age (CSAge). And ensure that they remain with the same cohort throughout their education in schools where SurreyCC is the admission authority

Children born 1Apr–31Aug are not required to start school until the September following their 5th birthday (Compulsory School Age or CSAge). If parents wish for them to start in reception at CSAge, rather than year1, they must ask the admissions authority. Legally, the decision about *when* a child starts full time education is solely down to the parents. The School Admissions Code states that the admissions authority must then decide *which year group* is in the child's best interests to join - reception or year1. If placed in year1, the child will miss a whole year of *essential/critical* education, which is not in their best interests, and defies the government's position on school attendance. Unlike other LAs, SurreyCC does not adopt a flexible approach to these requests. Parents are routinely advised that, without exceptional circumstances, their child will be placed directly into year1 or miss a year later on if reception entry is agreed. We urge SurreyCC to allow summer born children to start at CSAge in reception and continue their education with that cohort, if this is their parents' wish.

By Elena van der Graaf

Signatures: 575

Response

The guidance issued by the Department for Education on the admission of summer born children (www.gov.uk/government/publications/summer-born-children-school-admission) makes clear that whilst there is no statutory barrier to children being admitted outside their normal age group, 'parents do not have the right to insist that their child is admitted to a particular age group'. In addition, the guidance makes clear that once a decision is made it is only binding on that school and at the point of transition the parent must make a fresh application to the admission authority of any new school they are considering.

The School Admissions Code sets out that it is for admission authorities to make the decision on out of year group requests. The local authority is the admission authority for community and voluntary controlled schools and either the governing body or academy trust is the admission authority for academies, foundation, trust and voluntary aided schools. Each admission authority has a statutory duty to consider requests for summer born children

to be admitted to reception a year later and, in order to comply with the Code and guidance, must take in to account the circumstances of the case, what is in the child's best interests and the views of the head teacher, as well as bearing in mind the age group the child has been educated in up to that point.

Whilst there is not currently any policy to automatically agree requests for summer born children to start Reception a year late, Surrey operates flexibly and the majority of requests are agreed. In 2016 Surrey agreed 27 out of 35 requests for decelerated entry to reception for community and voluntary controlled schools. In addition, according to the data held by Surrey, own admission authority schools agreed 31 out of 45 requests.

The admission of summer born children has been debated within the House of Commons and it is clear that Ministers have been reviewing whether the parents of summer born children should be allowed to decide that their child will start Reception in the term after they turn five, rather than leave the decision to the admission authority of the school. However in an adjournment debate in the House of Commons on 10 October 2016, Nick Gibb, the Minister for Schools, made clear that it was important that the Government considered the wider impact of any policy changes; that it would not be right for every summer-born child to delay starting school until they were five, as many would be ready to take on the challenges earlier; that parents did not use the flexibilities as a mechanism by which to gain an unfair advantage in the admissions system; and that there were not unintended consequences for the early years sector. He went on to indicate that early indications showed the costs of full implementation were high and that more information and data needed to be collected.

As such, until the Government has completed its review and issued a revised School Admissions Code, Surrey, as admission authority for community and voluntary controlled schools, will continue to work within the current requirements of the Code. This includes considering each request flexibly according to the circumstances of the case, considering what is in the child's best interests and seeking the view of the Headteacher of the school concerned.

At this current time, Surrey is therefore unable to agree to the petitioners request to 'guarantee summer born children access to reception at compulsory school age' or 'ensure that they remain with the same cohort throughout their education in schools where SurreyCC is the admission authority'.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Education
13 June 2017

Cabinet Member for Highways

15 June 2017

RESPONSE TO PETITION REQUESTING THAT SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL ABOLISH PLANS TO SWITCH OFF STREET LIGHTING OVERNIGHT**Petition:**

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Abolish plans to switch of street lighting overnight.

Submitted by: Stewart Meaton

Signatures: 1,246

Response:

Among many initiatives, the Council identified the opportunity to save electricity and thereby benefit from both the financial and carbon savings by switching off some street lights for some of the night.

Many Highway Authorities are now already using part night lighting in some roads or are in the process of implementing it. Surrey County Council officers researched current practices by other authorities to determine its approach.

In October 2016, the Council's Cabinet approved the implementation of part night lighting which was on the basis of risk assessments for each road. It was and is recognised that this could have an impact on residents in respect of road safety and crime and so the risk assessment was designed to take this into account.

For example, part night lighting was limited to non-traffic routes and delayed until midnight with lights staying off until 0500. By limiting part night lighting to non-traffic routes and switching lights off when the number of people using the county's roads are significantly fewer than at other times of the day, the above risks are mitigated as much as possible.

On roads where it was proposed to implement part night lighting, road by road risk assessments were carried out and if any of the Avoidance Criteria* were present those roads were excluded. All roads that "passed" the risk assessment were then considered by the Council's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police to evaluate any concerns where part night lighting might have an adverse effect on either road safety or crime and if this was the case the roads were excluded.

Finally, any roads in close proximity to a railway station or bus stop which operates after midnight or before 0500 (but were otherwise suitable for part night lighting) had the start and or finish time for part night lighting adjusted to accommodate the first and last buses and trains.

The Council has also implemented a decision review process which allows residents to challenge the decision either to exclude or include a road in part night lighting. It should be noted that having carried out the above risk assessments, decisions will normally only be reversed where something has been missed or new information has been provided which impacts the risk assessment.

Whilst there are residents who do not support this programme, there are many in favour of it for differing reasons. As part of the Cabinet paper, 842 people responded to the consultation with over 75% in favour of switching off some lights. Whilst this number of responses is a small proportion of the population of Surrey, it is reflective of the anecdotal feedback in the media, including social media, both prior to and since implementation.

***Avoidance Criteria:**

- a) Traffic Routes – this will predominantly be A, B and C classified roads, however some lower trafficked roads in this group may be included and equally some higher trafficked unclassified roads may be excluded by this criteria.
- b) Town centres where this is a night time economy.
- c) Where traffic calming measures (speed cushions or humps, chicanes etc) or formal pedestrian crossings such as zebra crossings are present and they require illumination.
- d) Locations where Council or Police CCTV is in operation to reduce crime.
- e) Locations where the Council's Road Safety Team or Surrey Police believe that implementing part-night lighting could have an adverse effect on either crime or road safety.
- f) In cases where buses or trains run beyond the proposed switch off time, roads will be assessed and may either be excluded from part night lighting or have a later switch off time.

**Mr Colin Kemp
Cabinet Member for Highways
Surrey County Council**

This page is intentionally left blank