

MINUTES of the meeting of the **CABINET** held at 2.00 pm on 28 November 2017 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 14 December 2017.

Elected Members:

- * Mrs Helyn Clack
- * Mr Mel Few
- Mr John Furey (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Goodman
- * Mr David Hodge CBE (Chairman)
- * Mr Colin Kemp
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- * Mr Tim Oliver
- * Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
- * Mrs Clare Curran

Members in attendance:

Mr Chris Botten
Mr Jonathan Essex

188/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

An apology was received from Mr John Furey.

189/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

190/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

191/17 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

1 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were four questions received from Members. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 1.

Q4. Mr Essex asked how many full-time equivalent staff had been recruited as a result of the advertising campaign. The Cabinet Member for Children responded that a significant number of newly qualified social workers were from the academy and that they made up a significant proportion of new recruits. The figures would be sent to Mr Essex.

192/17 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were three questions received from the public. The questions and responses are attached as Appendix 2.

Mr Beaman stated that he had asked the question in his role as Chair of the South West Surrey Disabled Alliance Network and that he would be submitting further questions to the Cabinet Member for Health.

Ms Collings sought clarification on the responses she had received to her questions. The Cabinet Member for Education explained that the task group would be made up of Members and that Family Voice and others would be invited to give evidence to the task group. Ms Collings requested that a reference group of service users also be set up. The Leader responded that he would look into this and write to Ms Collings.

193/17 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

One petition had been received on the following matter:

- 'Surrey Performing Arts Library' (2019 signatures received)

The response to the petition can be found at Appendix 3.

Mr Ges Ray, Chairman of Leith Hill Music Festival, presented the petition and expressed concern about the dispersal and storage of the library collections. He requested that the council find a viable commercial model and to ensure a future for the library. The Cabinet Member for Communities thanked Mr Ray for his passion and explained that the council were united in their fondness for the library and was confident that a constructive and suitable solution could be found. Any potential solutions would be scrutinised by the Communities Select Committee in 2018.

194/17 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

195/17 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY BOARDS, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

The response to the report from the Environment & Infrastructure Select Committee is attached as Appendix 4.

196/17 NEW SEND TRAVEL ASSISTANCE POLICY FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH AN EDUCATION, HEALTH AND CARE PLAN OR STATEMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, 0-25 YEARS [Item 6]

The Cabinet Member for Education introduced this report which explained how following extensive consultation with families, Surrey County Council (SCC) was introducing a new Travel Assistance Policy for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). The new Policy was designed to improve support to get them to school, college or placement through a broader, more flexible range of assistance options. The Council's existing policy provided limited flexibility to work with families to

explore alternative arrangements that might better meet children and young people's needs, contributing to costs rising to almost £27m in 2016/17. Families were supportive of the new proposals.

Building on the Council's decision to commission independent travel training for children and young people with SEND in October 2017, the new Travel Assistance Policy recognised that whilst some children and young people would continue to require door-to-door transport, many others could benefit from other, more sustainable options that enabled them to travel successfully with their peers, family members, or independently, where appropriate, increasing their confidence and better preparing them for adulthood and independence. A task group was to be set up to monitor the progress.

Mr Chris Botten stated that he was proud that Cabinet had chosen not to do the statutory minimum. He was also supportive of the proposals in that it was in the child's best interest to gain independence into adulthood. However, he stressed that children with complex needs needed to be supported in preparing for implementation of the new policy. He requested that a pilot be arranged to model a case where the child had complex needs. He also raised concern about the £50 charge to clean a vehicle if the child was sick. Also, when expanding schools Cabinet should consider provision of specialist placements and capacity building in order to provide SEND placements closer to home. Mr Botten offered to be part of the task group.

The Leader responded that he agreed with Mr Botten's comments and that the new Chief Executive would be looking at provision closer to home. He also accepted Mr Botten's offer to be part of the task group.

Other Members made the following comments:

- That this new policy would bring a change in culture and leadership.
- The current model was inflexible and the new policy would help children grow up with more independence into adulthood.
- That the Equality Impact Assessment needed more detail on how the changes were to be communicated.
- School providing services were not praised enough for their work and dedication.

RESOLVED:

1. That the new 'Travel Assistance Policy for Children and Young People with an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) or Statement of Special Educational Needs (SEN), 0-25 years' be approved.
2. That authority be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Education, in consultation with the Assistant Director Schools and Learning, to approve future changes to this policy as required.
3. That the set-up of a Task Group made up of the relevant Members and officers to monitor the progress and outcomes of this policy be approved.

Reason for Decisions

This policy is required for the Council to meet its statutory duties for travel assistance to support eligible children and young people with an EHCP/SSEN to access education and training. It also responds to the need for a more flexible and sustainable approach to SEND transport in Surrey, for the reasons outlined in this report.

197/17 FARNHAM HEATH END SECONDARY SCHOOL, FARNHAM [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for Education explained the significant increase in the demand for school places in the Farnham area reflecting increases in birth rates in the area and the consequent increase in the Primary age population. The Council had supported increases in primary schools in the area, and this increase was now being experienced in the Secondary Sector. She was confident that the expansion and the new Executive Head would give impetus to improvements for the future.

This report sought the approval of the business case for the expansion of Farnham Heath End School from 190 places per year / 7 Forms of Entry (950 places) to 220 places per year / 8 Forms of Entry (1,100 places) to help meet the demand for additional secondary places in Farnham from September 2018.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the expansion set out in item 14 in Part 2 of the agenda, the Business Case for the expansion of Farnham Heath End School, providing an additional 30 places per year (150 places in total) was approved.

Reason for Decision:

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places relative to demand.

[The decisions on this item may be called in by the Children and Education Select Committee]

198/17 CHERTSEY HIGH SCHOOL, RUNNYMEDE [Item 8]

RESOLVED:

That this report be deferred until 2018.

Reason for Decision:

To allow for further investigation of potential issues.

199/17 FINANCE AND BUDGET MONITORING REPORT TO 31 OCTOBER 2017 [Item 9]

The Leader of the Council presented the budget monitoring report for the eighth month of the 2017/18 financial year, covering the period up to 31 October 2017.

He explained that in February this council set its budget for 2017/18 in the face of significant rising demand pressures (particularly in social care); falling Government funding and continuing restraint on the ability to raise funds locally. To balance 2017/18 budget the council had to make plans to deliver an unprecedented £104m of savings. This significant challenge for the council came on top of already making over £450m savings since 2010.

He also explained that within the £104m savings target, the council had agreed plans for £95m savings, with £9m savings to be identified. After seven months of the financial year, services had already achieved £55m of savings with another £19m on track for delivery, and £5m facing potential barriers. At this stage, £16m savings were now thought to be unachievable in this year.

The council's 2017/18 budget included significant demand and cost pressures, mostly in social care. In the first seven months of the year, demand had increased above that forecast even a short time ago. For example, in Children's Services, demand continued to increase and was expected to add a £9m pressure by the end of the financial year. Partially offsetting these pressures, there were forecast underspends elsewhere, including in Children Schools & Families, Adult Social Care, Orbis, Highways & Transport, Waste and Central Income & Expenditure.

The combined impact of delivering lower savings than planned and demand rising faster than anticipated is a forecast year end overspend of £18m for 2017/18. This is a £1m increase on last month's forecast position. Additional volatility-related risks that are outside the council's control remain in some key budgets and the forecast year end position could potentially worsen.

He concluded that services had already taken action as part of the recovery plan to reduce costs by £4m. However, he also stressed the need to continue to take all reasonable action to manage spending within available resources by keeping costs down, managing vacancies, optimising income and being aware of the current financial position before committing additional future expenditure.

Cabinet Members spoke of the financial and demand pressures as well as work being undertaken in their portfolio areas.

RESOLVED:

That the following be noted:

1. The forecast revenue budget outturn for 2017/18 is £18m overspend (Annex 1, paragraphs 1 and 8 to 41 of the submitted report). This included: £9m savings to be identified, £16m savings considered unachievable in 2017/18, £13m service demand pressures less £20m underspends, additional savings and income.
2. That significant risks to the revenue budget (Annex 1, paragraphs 42 to 47) could add £13m to the forecast overspend, including: £9m in Children, Schools & Families and £3m in Adult Social Care.

3. The forecast planned savings for 2017/18 total £79m against £95m agreed savings and £104m target (Annex 1, paragraph 50 of the submitted report).
4. That all services continue to take all reasonable action to keep costs down and optimise income (e.g. minimising spending, managing vacancies wherever possible etc.).
5. The Section 151 Officer's commentary and the Monitoring Officer's Legal Implications commentary in paragraphs 16 to 19 of the report stated that the council had a duty to ensure its expenditure did not exceed resources available and move towards a sustainable budget for future years.

That the following be approved:

6. The transfer of £0.9m revenue from the New Homes Bonus budget to the Strategic Transport group to enable major transport scheme development to continue (Annex 1, paragraph 48 of the submitted report).
7. That the SEND reform staffing budget be increased by £0.6m and to increase the corresponding grant income budget by £0.6m (Annex 1, paragraph 49 of the submitted report).
8. That £0.9m of Surrey Fire & Rescue Service's vehicle and equipment replacement programme capital budget from 2017/18 to 2018/19 be reprofiled (Annex 1, paragraph 66 of the submitted report).
9. That £83,000 from amounts carried forward from 2016/17 by Schools & SEND for planned spend on school kitchen schemes in 2017/18 be drawn down (Annex 1, paragraph 67 of the submitted report).

Reason for Decisions:

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

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee]

200/17 SAP ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLATFORM MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT 2018-2020 [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services introduced the report and explained that SAP Enterprise Resource Platform (ERP) was a critical software application that enabled a number of essential management, payment and resource related tasks for Surrey County Council.

Two years ago, Surrey County Council (SCC) authorised a change to the Support and Maintenance services on its ERP that resulted in Surrey County Council buying from an independent supplier who provided a cost-effective delivery model that did not require access to SAP released product enhancements; this meant that the software version in use had not been updated since that time.

The consequence of working on older software had resulted in an increasing burden and growing risk on the Service teams who use the system, the Operational teams who manage it and on some other systems with which the ERP interacts.

RESOLVED:

That modifications to the original Supply and Maintenance contract with SAP for 3 years of Support and Maintenance from 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2020 and an immediate SAP refresh / re-instatement to update the software version in use be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

It is now in the best interests of efficiency for Surrey County Council to update the software. The Council is targeting higher levels of automation, productivity and wants to take greater advantage of its investment in ERP through its Orbis partnership by offering more services to other public bodies to generate revenue.

There are many benefits available to Surrey Council from moving on to the latest software level as set out in section 5.

[The decisions on this item may be called in by the Corporate Services Select Committee]

201/17 CHANGES TO PAYMENTS TO DISTRICT AND BOROUGH COUNCILS FOR THE RECYCLED WASTE THEY COLLECT [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member presented the report the explained changes to the mechanisms for waste-related financial transfers from Surrey County Council (SCC) to Surrey district and borough councils, and changes to the levels of funding over the next three years. There were no proposed changes to the kerbside waste collection services provided to Surrey residents resulting from these plans.

He explained that over the last few years, Surrey authorities had made significant progress in improving the delivery and performance of waste collection and disposal services. Surrey was now one of the best performers for waste management in the country, and all authorities in Surrey continued to explore options for how further improvements could be made through joint working. Part of this was to replace the arrangement whereby each district and borough was individually responsible for procurement of the disposal of its kerbside collected recyclable material with a new arrangement that benefitted from economies of scale and would deal with market volatility better.

In parallel to this, the current system of financial transfers for recycling from SCC to district and borough councils had become complex and unaffordable and no longer provided the incentive for better performance that it used to. For this reason it was proposed that a new system of financial transfers to district and borough councils for recycled waste be introduced from 2018/19 onwards.

The new system, which would replace all existing waste payments, aimed to allocate funding on a fair and equitable basis, whilst encouraging waste reduction, increasing recycling and reducing the cost of waste management to the taxpayer. Proposals for the new mechanism have been developed in close consultation with district and borough councils, and the Surrey Waste Partnership, and SCC was grateful to partners who had been involved in this work.

The new financial arrangements should be viewed as an interim solution, which would be reviewed as the plans for delivering greater joint working progress towards a single co-owned waste management approach, as previously considered by Cabinet in May 2016 and December 2016. A step towards this approach had already been made by four Surrey waste collection authorities who had created a new organisation called Joint Waste Solutions to manage their waste services. Some SCC waste disposal authority functions had also recently been transferred to Joint Waste Solutions.

The Cabinet Member concluded that there was significant scope for making further savings for the Surrey taxpayer by improving performance and changing the way in which waste was managed in Surrey. SCC remained committed to working with district and borough councils, via the Surrey Waste Partnership, to develop these new ways of working.

Mr Jonathan Essex spoke to this item and asked what if the expected results given in the report were not fulfilled and what would be the negative impacts? He also made the following comments:

- The increase in the council's share of the waste cost was not as a result of recycling credits but the increased landfill tax,
- Credits could be used to reduce costs by increasing the quality of recycled material,
- With regards to reducing recycling incentives by £4m; there were step changes in recycling performance so should be step changes in reducing disposal costs.
- He was happy that each area was to be looked at separately and explained that in Reigate, paper was collected separately from other dry recyclables. By doing so Reigate earned more for recycling and were this to be rolled out across the county it could save the council £8m.
- If there were negative impacts would this be re-considered.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport responded that boroughs and districts were on board with this proposal and he also believed that it would incentivise increased recycling. He stated that views of Reigate

and Banstead were not shared by officers across the county however, if after looking at the true cost of collection it was found to be a sound way forward then the council would consider that route. He again praised the districts and boroughs for the good partnership working.

Cabinet Members spoke of some of the different ways in which recycling was done in various areas.

RESOLVED:

That the proposals for changed financial arrangements for recycled waste with district and borough councils for 2018/19 to 2020/21, as outlined in the submitted report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

The current system of financial transfers from SCC to district and borough councils has become unaffordable and no longer provides an incentive for further performance improvement.

The principles of the new mechanism have been developed in consultation with district and borough councils. They have been designed to give a reasonable degree of budgetary certainty whilst incentivising waste reduction and improved recycling performance.

The new financial mechanisms are projected to deliver a saving of £2 million for SCC in 2018/19, with a further £2 million split across the following two years.

[The decisions on this item may be called in by the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee]

**202/17 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/
INVESTMENT BOARD TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING
[Item 12]**

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by the Leader / Cabinet Members under delegated authority be noted.

Reason for Decision:

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

203/17 VOTE OF THANKS [Item]

The Leader led a vote of thanks to Ann Charlton, the council's Monitoring Officer. He spoke of how well respected she was and thanked her loyalty as well as the 15 years of service and sensible advice given to Members.

The Cabinet took a break at 3.53pm and reconvened at 3.57pm.

204/17 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 13]

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.

205/17 FARNHAM HEATH END SECONDARY SCHOOL, FARNHAM [Item 14]

The Cabinet Member for Education said that this report contained the confidential financial and value for money information relating to item 7.

RESOLVED:

1. That the business case for the project to expand Farnham Heath End School by 150 additional places, at a total cost, as set out in the 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 Education, the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services and the Leader of the Council.
- 24.
3. That the authority to approve the award of contracts for works be delegated to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Education, Head of Procurement and Section 151 Officer when a competitive tender is procured through the new Orbis Construction Framework.

Reason for Decisions:

The proposal delivers and supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide necessary school places to meet the needs of the population in Waverley Borough.

[The decisions on this item can be called by the Children and Education Select Committee]

206/17 CHERTSEY HIGH SCHOOL, RUNNYMEDE [Item 15]

See Minute 198/17.

207/17 SAP ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLATFORM MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT 2018-2020 [Item 16]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services said that this report contained the confidential financial and value for money information relating to item 10.

RESOLVED:

See Minute 200/17 above.

Reason for Decision:

See Minute 200/17 above.

**208/17 SPECIAL URGENCY ITEM - TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION -
NOVEMBER 2017 UPDATE [Item 16a]**

In accordance with Standing Order 56.1 (Special Urgency), the Chairman of the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee had agreed that the decisions on this item could not reasonably be deferred and therefore was not subject to call in.

The report was exempt as it contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Following the October Cabinet approval to proceed with a long leasehold interest, the DCLG issued a consultation on its proposed changes to Investment & Minimum Revenue Provision guidance. Having considered advice from officers, Members debated whether the uncertainty introduced by this consultation impacted so unfavourably on the outcome they intended to achieve that they wished to revisit their previous decisions and agreed that it did not.

RESOLVED:

It was agreed that:

1. Cabinet's approval for Surrey County Council's acquisition of a long leasehold interest as highlighted in the submitted report in accordance with the details outlined in that report be reaffirmed;
2. Cabinet's approval that Surrey County Council facilitates the regeneration by payments, as set out in the submitted report, was reaffirmed;
3. That approval to agree appropriate contractual and financial arrangements be delegated to the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Leader, Director of Finance and the Director of Legal & Democratic Services, following the completion of all necessary due diligence and upon exchange of agreements to lease with the key pre-committed tenants and the rental guarantee.

Reasons for decisions

The proposed acquisition of the leasehold supports economic prosperity, one of Surrey County Council's corporate priorities.

[In accordance with Standing Order 56.1 (Special Urgency), the Chairman of the Overview and Budget Scrutiny Committee has agreed that the decisions on this item cannot be reasonably deferred so this item is not subject to call in]

209/17 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 17]

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

Meeting ended at: 4.32 pm

Chairman

CABINET – 28 November 2017

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members Questions

Question (1) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

The Budget Monitoring Report published at Cabinet on Tuesday 31st October 2017 refers to £45,714 of non-care related debt being written off in the quarter to 30th September 2017. Please provide a breakdown of this figure and also the total amount of non-care related debt written off in the current financial year 2017/18 and in the previous financial year 2016/17.

Reply:

The council has a robust process for ensuring all income due is collected, as this contributes to the provision of services to residents and vulnerable people. There comes a point when the cost of this will outweigh the value of the debt, or is just irrecoverable. The council's financial regulations allow for the write off of debt in the following circumstances;

- a) the debtor has gone into liquidation;
- b) the debtor is deceased and there are no funds and the debt has been registered as a liability to the executor;
- c) the evidence against a debtor is inconclusive, and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services recommends write-off;
- d) the debtor has absconded and all enquiries have failed; or
- e) the debtor is in prison and has no means to pay.

At the end of September the council had total non-care debt of £12.2m, and of this just over £45,000 was written off. Over half of this - £34,000 was in circumstances where the debtors had gone into administration or liquidation. The remainder was for the non-payment of rent, or overpayments where the conditions above applied.

The equivalent amounts in the first quarter were £36,600, and for 2017/18 the total amount was £170,600. The council regularly reviews its debt provision and makes prudent provision

**Mr David Hodge CBE
Leader of the Council
28 November 2017**

Question (2) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

Please provide the income and expenditure figures (broken down into the usual budget heads) for the Performing Arts Library for the last three financial years (2014/5, 2015/6, 2016/7 and the expected 2017/8 Outturn Budget) so I can look at options on the way forward for this library with sound financial information. Furthermore, can this information please be split between direct running costs of the library and any overhead recharges that are charged to the PAL from central budgets.

Reply:

As Mrs Watson sat in at the Communities Select meeting on 7 November she will be well aware that the Select Committee is overseeing the ongoing work of the Library Service to work on two possible solutions to delivering a sustainable performing art library: one is to

keep the music collection and drama collections intact but to host them in two of our major libraries. Option 2 is to work with key stakeholders and interested parties to develop and deliver an independent future for PAL while retaining access for Surrey users and others wishing to use the service,

Both proposals are intended to protect the functionality of the Performing Arts Library service and ensure there is continued availability to hirers while still achieving the council's required savings target.

Mrs Watson will also recall that the Select Committee recommended that we establish a forum to investigate the viability of the second option and this group - comprising a number of key stakeholders – has already met with the library service twice since the Select Committee meeting. The ambition is to find a secure long-term solution for SPAL and we are open to giving emerging propositions the fullest consideration.

Mrs Watson should therefore be very well aware that a considerable amount of work is underway to “look at options on the way forward for this library with sound financial information” and members and stakeholders are already fully engaged in this task. Whilst any contribution she has would be most welcome could I suggest that she discusses her thoughts with David Goodwin who is the Liberal Democrat's nominated member of the committee and so can feed her contribution into the ongoing work? Her current approach risks adding to the pressure on our already stretched resources. I have set out the information she has asked for below but it is not clear why she seems to want to set up her own parallel process and expects officers to provide detailed information for her, with little or no acknowledgement of the ongoing focused work elsewhere.

Performing Arts Library Expenditure and Income 2014-15 to 2017-18 (£)

Financial Year	Staffing Costs	Property Costs	Other Costs	Resources	Income	Direct cost to SCC	Central & Corporate Recharges	Total
Estimated 2017/18	138,896	93,173	9,741	5,000	(66,485)	180,325	38,120	218,445
Outturn(Actual) 2016/17	160,301	93,173	8,797	30,243	(66,485)	226,028	38,120	264,148
Outturn(Actual) 2015/16	153,903	84,904	9,148	33,473	(71,567)	209,860	74,265	284,125
Outturn(Actual) 2014/15	148,994	42,000	11,278	40,841	(76,027)	167,085	81,637	248,722

Notes

The table above shows the expenditure incurred and income received by the Performing Arts library plus their direct property costs, to give a cost of service provision. Corporate recharges have been excluded as these are an allocation and not directly attributable to the service.

2017/18 estimate staffing costs - staff budget, other costs, income and direct property costs based on 2016/17.

2015/16 rent increase from £6k to £46k

**Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for
28 November 2017**

Question (3) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):
--

Please confirm for the Adult Social Care and Children, Schools & Families budgets the following:

- How much of the in-year overspend for 16/17 and 17/18 has been due to cost increase and how much due to demand pressures. Please provide a breakdown.
- Please provide figures for staffing increases in both of these budget lines (both in-house and for agency/contract/temporary staff) for 16/17 and 17/18, and also the spend on contracts/services purchased outside of SCC to deal with this increased demand.

Reply: Adult Social Care response

Question a)

The table below provides a breakdown of the actual overspend in 2016/17 and 2017/18 against the Adult Social Care budget.

Budget variance	2016/17 Outturn £m	2017/18 October 17 Forecast £m
Budget variance directly related to demand pressures	+4.7	+5.2
Underachievement against savings plans not directly related to demand	+13.0	+6.1
Increased contractual commitments above budgeted price increases	+1.3	0.0
Underspend against increased Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards budget	-2.3	0.0
Additional fees & charges income	-1.4	-3.9
Staffing budget variance	+0.7	-1.8
Other budget variances	+0.1	-0.1
Total budget overspend	+14.7	+5.5

As outlined in this table, total additional demand pressures above what was budgeted amounted to £4.7m in 2016/17 and are forecast to be £5.2m in 2017/18. Increased contractual commitments of £1.3m occurred above budgeted price increases in 2016/17. At present increased contractual commitments are within what was budgeted for 2017/18, although there is a risk that costs may be higher than budgeted when the current cost of care project underway with Learning Disability providers is concluded.

Question b)

The Adult Social Care staffing budget for the last 3 years has been set as follows:
 2015/16 - £62.8m
 2016/17 - £60.9m
 2017/18 - £61.9m

The total staffing budget for Adult Social Care has therefore changed very little (£0.3m reduction) in the last two years. There have been reductions due to the closure of the Older People homes previously operated in-house by the council and an increase to the vacancy factor built into the budget to more reflect staff vacancies. These reductions have been offset by increased national insurance contributions in line with government legislative changes and the pay awards for ASC staff as part of the council's pay and reward offer, in particular the establishment of the career pay model for social workers and occupational therapists.

The amounts spent by Adult Social Care on agency/contracted staff over the last three years are listed below.

2015/16 April to March - £3.1m

2016/17 April to March - £3.2m

2017/18 April to September - £1.0m

ASC has not employed any temporary staff beyond this. The service does rely on a number of bank staff to fulfil front line functions, but these staff do regular work on an ongoing basis and so are not temporary.

Adult Social Care spent £390m in 2016/17 on contracts and services provided by external organisations to support Surrey residents outside of expenditure on services provided in-house by the local authority and ASC's workforce. This was the total gross expenditure excluding income. Adult Social Care is forecasting to spend £408m on these contracts and services in 2017/18, an increase of £18m from 2016/17. Price increases essential to maintain social care market sustainability and enable the council to continue to purchase sufficient capacity and quality of care services are expected to cost £9.5m in 2017/18 (although there is a risk this could be higher when the current cost of care project underway with Learning Disability providers is concluded). Demand pressures account for the majority of the remaining increase of £8.5m.

Reply: Children's Social Care response

Question a)

I have answered these questions in relation to Children's Social Care and not across the whole CSF Directorate.

The overspends in 2016/17 and 2017/18 in independent sector placements for children looked after, as per my previous note are due to complexity of need and a corresponding change in the placement profile, rather than an overall increase in demand. More placements are being made in independent residential and fostering placements, which are more expensive. This change in placement profile across the two years has seen an increase in spend and therefore the budget and there is still an overspend in 2017/18.

	£'000
2016/17 Independent placement budget	17,096
Increase in 2017/18 budget	8,225
2017/18 independent placement budget	25,321
Current overspend on 2017/18 budget	3,499
2017/18 current spend on independent placements	28,820

The increase in spend relates to around 100 additional independent placements across the two years.

The number of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children significantly increased between 2015/16 and 2016/17, but there hasn't been a significant increase in 2017/18. The overall subsidy that the local authority is having to fund is around £4m. Not all of this is funded hence the overspend of £2.5m.

Question b)

There hasn't been any significant change in frontline staffing in Children's Services between 2016/17 and 2017/18. The breakdown between permanent and locum staff is outlined below:

	fte's
Permanent front line staff	361
Vacancies covered by locums	44
<hr/>	
Budgeted fte's	405
Posts over establishment covered by locums	30
<hr/>	
Actual fte's	435

Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adults
Clare Curran
Cabinet Member for Children
28 November 2017

Question (4) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

Please can you confirm how much has the County Council spent on Social Worker recruitment campaigns since 2015?

Reply:

In total the County Council has spent £122,163.00 on both Adult and Children's Services Social Worker recruitment campaigns since 2015 through a mix of advertising campaigns social media and personal references.

Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adults
28 November 2017

CABINET – 28 November 2017

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question 1: David Beaman, Chairman Leith Hill Music Festival

"Whilst there is greater public awareness of mental health issues what procedures have SCC in place to ensure that all primary and secondary care staff assigned to deal with the needs of citizens with mental issues have the necessary qualifications and receive the training required to safeguard the needs of their clients and that these procedures and good practices will not be affected by reductions in public expenditure".

Reply:

SCC (ASC&PH, CSF) have procedures in place to ensure that all our staff are qualified and trained to the appropriate level for their role to safeguard the needs of people with MH. The independent safeguarding Boards for Children and Adults (SSAB and SSCB) have a statutory requirement to ensure all partners, including NHS service providers (GPs, Hospitals, Community Healthcare providers) have access to safeguarding training appropriate to staff roles and responsibilities.

Mrs Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Health
28 November 2017

Question 2: Andrea Collings, Family Voice

As the new policy aims to create a more collaborative approach to working with parents to arrange support with SEND transport, will Cabinet agree to include parent representatives in the Task Group monitoring programmes and outcomes of the policy?

Reply:

Thank you for these questions. Family Voice Surrey have been working closely with officers in developing this policy, and I would like to thank them for their input and support. Due to the importance of this policy for children, young people and families, the Leader of the Council has asked Members to take on a monitoring role for the new policy and travel assistance options. The Task Group will provide the necessary oversight and scrutiny, in keeping with Members' statutory duty to champion and challenge for children and young people. In this role, Members will want to ensure they have a good understanding of families' experience of the service, and will therefore actively seek feedback from Family Voice and other partners in evaluating the impact of the Council's new travel assistance offer.

Officers will also ensure that there are regular opportunities for Family Voice Surrey to participate in implementing the new policy, and will continue to work together with families and other partners to ensure that children and young people who are in need of assistance are effectively supported to access education and training.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Education
28 November 2017

Question 3: Lucy Young/Andrea Collings, Family Voice

Will cabinet members agree to revise the wording of the new policy to remove any remaining ambiguity about the council's duty to make suitable arrangements to support eligible children and young people with SEND to travel to their education setting, enabling them to reach school without such stress, strain or difficulty that they would be prevented from benefiting from the education provided (for example, changing "may" to "will" when describing the actions that the council proposes to make; making it clear that the council can only delegate responsibility for the necessary arrangements to parents or young people with their express consent)?

Reply:

The Council is committed to working closely together with families, schools and colleges in ensuring that all eligible children and young people are safe and supported to access education and training, and that they arrive on time and ready learn. This new policy aims to introduce a new way of working with families, encouraging and enabling collaboration where this is possible. This is in response to feedback from families that they would like to work with the Council more flexibly in making home to school transport arrangements. This new policy is designed to support this, and provides the framework to make such arrangements, where this is agreed between parents/carers and the Council.

**Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Education
28 November 2017**

CABINET

Tuesday 28 November

RESPONSE TO PETITION

Petition concerning 'Surrey's Performing Arts Library'

It states: "We the undersigned value the unique service provided by Surrey's Performing Arts Library and call upon Surrey County Council to retain the service, with staff, on one site and in its current format for the benefit of all Surrey residents."

Submitted by Mr Ges Ray

Signatures: 2019

The Cabinet's response

The County Council fully values and appreciates the contribution that the Performing Art Library (PAL) makes to resident wellbeing and wants to ensure a service that has a sustainable future. The growing demand for our services to vulnerable residents and the budget pressures on the Council mean that we must constantly re-think and look at ways to provide our services differently. We recognise that, given the importance of PAL to the wellbeing and community agendas of the county, it is crucial that access to the PAL collections continues to exist and be available to the arts community in Surrey. Officers have already identified solutions that would protect the functionality of the Performing Arts Library service and ensure there is continued availability to hirers.

The Communities Select Committee is fully engaged in developing a future business model for this specialist library and has developed further lines of enquiry for officers to pursue. Work is already underway on the following:

- Further evaluation work to cost a new IT system, better suited to the specific needs of a performing arts library;
- Further analysis of the current inter library loan systems and developing proposals to improve the financial viability of the performing arts aspect of the inter library loan service and evaluate the impact of withdrawing from the system;
- A range of revised pricing for PAL services which can be implemented in shorter and longer timescale;
- Officers are reviewing staffing costs to secure immediate savings and to investigate the use of volunteers.
- The creation of a wider forum to contribute to the way forward.

Officers will report back on progress to the Communities Select Committee at its meeting on 8 February 2018.

The ambition is to find a secure long-term solution for Surrey's PAL. The forum has already met on several occasions and if other partnerships arise that can ensure a sustainable operation for PAL, based on the current format and business model then we are open to giving such propositions the fullest consideration

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Communities
28 November 2017

CABINET RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE SELECT COMMITTEE

**Proposals to Change Financial Arrangements for Waste Management in 2018/19 [Item 7]
 (Considered by the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee on 5 October 2017)**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee recommended:

- a) That the Cabinet ensures clarity in regard to strategy aims, including achieving recycling targets, and variable payments and, in particular, the thresholds included within those aims, how progress against them is measured and agreed and the level of payment and loss of payments associated with delivery and non-delivery.
- b) That the Cabinet makes a clear statement in regard to its position on a single co-owned approach.
- c) That the Committee receives an update once the financial arrangements are in place.

RESPONSE:

Clarity with regard to strategy aims and financial mechanisms:

The joint waste strategy aims are to reduce household waste, increase recycling, reduce waste sent to landfill, and to maintain the cost of waste management. The indicators and targets are summarised below.

Indicator	2019/20 target
Total waste and recycling per person	Quartile 1 (when compared to other waste disposal authorities in England)
Recycling and recovery rate	70%
Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill	0%
Cost of waste management per household	No increase from 2013/14

As explained in the Cabinet report, a number of factors should ensure that performance continues to improve:

- The SWP will continue to be funded at current levels which means that its comprehensive and well established improvement programme will remain in place.
- The agreement between SCC and districts and boroughs with regard to the fixed payment will be designed to ensure that authorities do not reduce their level of service and continue to work towards the aims of the joint strategy. A reduction in service is defined as stopping collecting a key recyclable material or reducing the frequency of recycling collections. The Surrey Waste Partnership will be consulted when drawing up the agreements and it is proposed that the Partnership would be the body that decides if an authority is not acting in the spirit of the agreement.
- The variable payment mechanism has been designed to incentivise future performance improvements. Any cost saving as a result of improved performance (an

increase in recycling or reduction in residual waste) would be shared with partners. There is no threshold to trigger payment. Any saving as a result of performance improvement would be shared. For example, if one tonne of residual waste was removed from the system, this would save the £110 per tonne disposal cost, therefore this saving would be shared between SCC, the district or borough in question, and the SWP in the agreed proportions (40:40:20).

- All authorities have to report their waste performance on a national reporting system on a quarterly basis and the Surrey Waste Partnership monitors this data regularly. SCC will also closely monitor performance and will review arrangements if they do not deliver the expected outcomes.

In order for SCC to meet its savings targets, the proposals for the new financial arrangements do represent a reduction in funding for district and borough councils. As explained in the Cabinet report, there are significant opportunities for all authorities to make savings through working better together to improve performance, increase efficiencies and generate income.

Single co-owned approach:

In May 2016, Cabinet agreed that combining the function of the Waste Disposal Authority with that of Surrey's Waste Collection Authorities to deliver waste services via a new co-ownership partnership is essential to deliver public value for Surrey's residents. In December 2016, Cabinet asked officers to 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.

A co-ownership approach would involve the creation of a single entity that is co-owned by SCC and the 11 district and borough councils. It would manage the collection, recycling and disposal of all of Surrey's waste and would mean the integration of all waste services currently delivered individually by the 12 authorities. The barriers to unlocking savings would be removed and the greater benefits gained by working together would then be shared across all authorities.

The precise nature of the 'final state' co-owned entity and the legal form and governance arrangements are to be determined, but the creation of a joint waste collection contract, and the transfer of some of SCC's waste functions to Joint Waste Solutions, are important steps towards this approach. The next phase is the work that the Surrey Waste Partnership is currently undertaking on how to enhance the governance of the partnership and align it with the governance of Joint Waste Solutions.

Providing an update:

The new financial arrangements will start on 1 April 2018. We are happy to provide an update to the Select Committee and would suggest that this is in the autumn of 2018, or later, in order to allow time for a reasonable amount of waste performance data to become available.

Mr Mike Goodman
Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
(28 November 2017)