

County Council Meeting –19 March 2013

REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Cabinet met on 5 and 26 February 2013.

In accordance with the Constitution, Members can ask questions of the appropriate Cabinet Member, seek clarification or make a statement on any of these issues without giving notice.

The minutes containing the individual decisions for both 5 and 26 February meetings are included within the agenda at item 16. Cabinet responses to Committee reports are included in or appended to the minutes. If any Member wishes to raise a question or make a statement on any of the matters in the minutes, notice must be given to Democratic Services by 12 noon on the last working day before the County Council meeting (Monday 18 March 2013).

For members of the public all non-confidential reports are available on the web site (www.surreycc.gov.uk) or on request from Democratic Services.

1. STATEMENTS/UPDATES FROM CABINET MEMBERS

Celebration and Bursary Fund for Surrey's Looked After Children

In May 2012 all members, in their important roles as Corporate Parents, agreed to contribute £500 from their Local Allocation Funding towards a Celebration and Bursary Fund for Surrey's Looked after Children. This provided the fund with a starting budget of £40,000, half of which was identified for bursaries, and the other half for celebrations.

Members felt that it was important to recognise and celebrate the achievements of our Looked after Children, as we would our own children. Such recognition and support encourages our Looked after Children and Young People to feel valued, and this encourages them to achieve their full potential.

It gives me great pleasure to report to Council just how those funds have been used over the past twelve months.

The Bursary scheme

The Bursary scheme is administered by a Bursary Panel, which is a subgroup of the Corporate Parenting Board. The Bursary Panel has met on 8 October 2012, 13 December 2012, and 25 February 2013. The Panel is chaired by Mary Angell, and has a cross party political membership, with additional members from the Corporate Parenting Board such as Dr Christine Arnold.

I would like to thank Peter Hickman and Colin Taylor for the time they have committed to working on the Bursary panel. I think we have all enjoyed the very positive and enjoyable experience of reading the applications, and subsequently deciding how we can support our Looked after Children and Young People.

The Bursary Award Scheme has been used to reward a child or young person who has made a special effort, and met a target that has been identified, for example in their Personal Education Plan (PEP) or Looked after Child review.

Such targets will be individual to every Looked after Child or young person, and the bursaries awarded reflect this. So, for some young people it was appropriate to reward achievement at the end of a particular Key Stage in their education, while for others it was used to reward a sporting or musical achievement, community work (such as volunteering or mentoring), or accessing other opportunities provided (e.g. therapeutic work). Some of our Children and Young people have experienced considerable emotional neglect or bereavement, and a bursary was awarded to enable them to have a treat that would help them with the difficulties they have experienced in their short lives

The Bursary scheme has been promoted to the Looked after Children area teams, Social workers, Foster Carers, the Care Council, and via websites. To apply for a bursary, an application is completed by or on behalf of the looked after child with their social worker's endorsement.

The panel has received a total of 63 applications to date, indicating that the scheme is gaining in popularity as it becomes better known. Most of these were approved.

Out of the £20,000 budget allocated to the Bursary award scheme, nearly £16,000 has already been awarded, and more applications are being considered. This is excellent as with the first year of any new scheme it takes a little time for people to become aware of the funding stream and submit applications.

Examples of the Bursary awards are:

- Fifteen Lap Tops
- Five celebration events – theatre trip, red letter days, celebration meal
- Sixteen sports equipment/ lessons – football kit, running shoes, riding lessons
- Six educational study support packages - books, equipment
- Four Music equipment packages/lessons – guitar, amplifier, music lessons, iPod
- Seven IT packages – printer/Net Book/iPad
- Two Photographic packages – camera/Developing equipment
- Two sporting challenge events

The Bursary Panel agreed a uniform amount be funded for some requested items that were particularly popular e.g. Lap Top £350, and Football Boots £100.

In this first year of the scheme the Bursary Panel decided not to include applications from older care leavers in this financial year, as we wished to direct our funding towards those children and young people still in our care i.e. being looked after.

I would like to share with you some details of the Bursaries awarded to demonstrate just how worthwhile this innovative scheme has been.

Young Person A

This young boy has a diagnosis of autism with moderate learning disabilities, as well as a history of chronic neglect and the trauma of domestic violence. He has recently moved into his long-term foster placement, and has met a very high target set in his Looked after

Child Review. He has managed to deal with moving to his new family and has worked hard to make strong attachments. He now feels settled and part of the family, which he calls his "forever family". This young boy loves railways, and his most prized possession is his train set.

More than anything he wanted a trip on a steam train. The bursary awarded enabled him to enjoy a special day out with a 21-mile train ride, learning about how the railway runs, including a ride in the engine carriage.

Young Person B

This young girl has had a year filled with changes and challenges as she has autistic traits, and sadly a history of chronic neglect, sexual abuse, and exposure to domestic violence. She has worked very hard to settle into her new school and life with her new foster family. She is making good educational progress, and is now described as always having a smile on her face. The panel were delighted to award her a bursary to attend a Children's Junior Zoo Keeper experience. She had a wonderful time learning about animal care, and was actively engaged in looking after the animals for a day.

Young Person C

This young lady has been involved in setting up a business as part of her business studies course, producing tie-dyed tea shirts and scramble blocks. She and her student colleagues have set up a web site to sell these items, and produced a business plan. She attended a competition similar to Dragons Den along with 13 other teams from several schools, each putting forward their business plans. Her team came first and her business was awarded £100, which has been reinvested into the business. The Panel were very impressed by her business initiative, originality and enthusiasm, and she was awarded a bursary to purchase a Smart TV to help her with her business plans and further educational studies. A potential high flier of the future, we wish her every success with her future endeavours.

Young Person D

This young boy is an accomplished guitar player, and he finds great comfort in his music making. It has proved to be a significant avenue for him to direct his emotional concerns and worries. He has been considered the best guitar player in his special school, and has regularly performed in school activities, even being asked to play with the Drifters.

Music has given him a great deal of confidence, which he did not have before. The Bursary enabled him to purchase additional items for his music making, such as a new base amplifier and other items.

Young Person E

This young lady received excellent GSCE grades in the summer of 2012, enabling her to begin a college course in Public Services. She has excelled on this course, and gained a leadership award at a training camp. She has an excellent attendance record despite suffering some very sad personal circumstances last year.

She plans to participate in the World Challenge, where young people undertake voluntary work. The Panel awarded a bursary to help with the purchase of equipment for the World Challenge (rucksack and hiking boots), and a contribution towards the money she has to fundraise towards this worthwhile project.

Young Person F

This young lady has shown considerable initiative. When she could not find a Saturday job she produced her CV, printed it with letters of introduction and distributed them to local shops and companies. Needless to say she obtained a job, and has since moved on to another, which is more likely to give her the appropriate work experience that she needs for her future career.

She is studying Health and Social Studies at College, and she wishes to work in social care in the future. Her hobby is photography, and wishes to attend a Photographic course. The Bursary awarded will provide funding for some basic equipment, and the cost of the course.

Celebration Events

Half the annual funding (£20,000) was allocated to our Celebration events. These events are hugely appreciated by our Looked after Children and Young People, and are planned in consultation with our Children in Care Council.

In the past we have held an 'Oscarz' evening, but this has become dated and repetitive. The funding gave us the opportunity to be creative, and hold events suited to the different age groups.

On 23 February 2013 we held a hugely successful party for our Under 12 Looked after Children in Dorking Halls. 197 attended. We had a circus theme and the halls were decked with bunting, balloons, and a wide variety of activities took place all afternoon, which included:

- Children's Entertainer/DJ.
- Face painters.
- Numerous Side Show Stalls (i.e. hook a duck, coconut shy, tin can alley).
- Stilt walker, Balloon modelling and juggling.
- Circus Skills Workshop with 2 staff.
- Large Photo Booth that allowed each child to take a 'fun' picture home, and provide us with a CD of all the photographs at the end of the day.
- Candy Floss Bicycle with up to 250 servings.
- Popcorn staff.
- Pick & mix sweet stall.
- Ice cream stall and hot dogs.
- Surrey Arts 'Come and try an instrument': trumpet, guitar, cello, percussion, violin and more.
- Children were provided with a decorative dinosaur food picnic box filled with food.
- All children left with a celebration goodie bag.

There were also celebration walls, where every child had a balloon shaped certificate with each child's name and a celebration note that had been written by their social worker.

They were able to collect them from the wall at the party as a keepsake.

I want to thank the many staff in Children's services who worked so hard to organise this event, and were very busy throughout the day. Everyone went home happy and to my knowledge no children were sick from overeating or excitement.

This event cost £10,000 as we used a professional company to create the circus theme for us. We are finalising plans for our older Looked after Children 12-18, and a summer barbecue is planned.

I envisage that all the funding will easily be used up by the time we hold the other events.

On the behalf of all our Looked after Children I want to thank all of you for your kindness and generosity of spirit in stepping up to the mark as corporate parents. Your initiative was unique among Local Authorities. I am proud to say that now other councils are copying us, and adopting this model of support.

Thank you all. You have given great pleasure and fun to youngsters who have had little joy in their lives. I do hope you feel that the Bursary and Celebration Fund was worthwhile, because I will be asking each of you to make a similar commitment in the new council year by contributing £500 from your Local Area Committee allowance.

Thank you

Mary Angell
Cabinet Member for Children and Families

2. RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

26 February 2013

A CONSULTATION ON SURREY'S ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2014 FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND CO-ORDINATED SCHEMES

1. The Cabinet at its meeting on 26 February 2012 considered the report on the admission arrangements for September 2014 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Schemes. The recommendations and reasons for recommendations considered by Cabinet are attached at Appendix 1. The full report is available as part of the 26 February 2013 Cabinet agenda on the County Council's website.
2. The report covered the following areas in relation to school admissions:
 - Banstead Community Junior School - Recommendation 1
 - Reigate Priory School – Recommendation 2
 - Southfield Park Primary – Recommendation 3
 - St Ann's Heath Junior School – Recommendation 4
 - St Ann's Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School – Recommendation 5
 - Tatsfield Primary School – Recommendation 6
 - Thames Ditton Junior School – Recommendation 7
 - Published Admission Number for Thames Ditton Junior – Recommendation 8
 - Published Admission Numbers for other schools – Recommendation 9
 - Increase to number of preferences allowed under Surrey's primary coordinated scheme – Recommendation 10
 - Coordinated Admissions Schemes – Recommendation 12
 - Surrey's Relevant Area – Recommendation 11

- Admission arrangements for other schools – Recommendation 13

3. The Cabinet RECOMMENDS that the County Council agrees the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2014 for Surrey’s Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Schemes:

- (1) A feeder link is introduced for Banstead Community Junior School for children from Banstead Infant School for September 2014, as follows:
 - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Children attending Banstead Infant School
 - d) Siblings not admitted under c) above
 - e) Any other children
- (2) The introduction of a feeder link for Reigate Priory for children from Holmesdale and Reigate Parish is deferred until alternative options are considered.
- (3) The admission criteria for Southfield Park are changed so that, for September 2014, children who have Southfield Park Primary School as their nearest school would receive a higher priority when allocating places **outside** the catchment area, as follows:
 - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings
 - d) Children living in the defined catchment of the school with priority being given to children living furthest away from the school
 - e) Other children for whom the school is their nearest school
 - f) Any other children
- (4) That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann’s Heath Junior School for children from Trumps Green Infant School for September 2014, as follows:
 - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings
 - d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School
 - e) Children for whom St Ann’s Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
 - f) Any other children
- (5) A reciprocal sibling link between St Ann’s Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School is introduced for September 2014 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.
- (6) A catchment area based on the Parish of Tatsfield and a phased tiered sibling priority based on the catchment is introduced for Tatsfield Primary School for September 2014, as follows:
 - a) Looked after and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need

- c) Children who will have a sibling on roll at the school at the end of the 2013/14 academic year and that sibling will still be expected to be on roll at the school on the date of the child's admission
 - d) Siblings who live within the catchment area
 - e) Other children who live within the catchment area
 - f) Siblings who live outside the catchment area
 - g) Other children who live outside the catchment area
- (7) Tiered arrangements are introduced for Thames Ditton Junior School for September 2014 so that siblings, children at the feeder school and other children who have the school as their nearest receive priority ahead of those who do not, as follows:
- a) Looked After and previously looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
 - d) Children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
 - e) Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
 - f) Other children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
 - g) Other children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
 - h) Any other children
- (8) The PAN for Thames Ditton Junior School is decreased from 120 to 90 for September 2014.
- (9) That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for all other Community and Voluntary Controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report, which include the following changes:
- i) Banstead Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 80 to 90
 - ii) Bell Farm Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 60 to 90
 - iii) Bell Farm Primary to decrease its Junior PAN from 120 to 30
 - iv) Earlswood Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 90 to 120
 - v) Earlswood Junior to increase its Junior PAN from 90 to 120
 - vi) Grovelands Primary to decrease its Reception PAN from 90 to 60
 - vii) Salfords Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 45 to 60
 - viii) Spelthorne Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 60 to 90
 - ix) Trumps Green Infant to increase its Reception from 30 to 60
 - x) West Ewell Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- (10) The number of preferences permitted under Surrey's Primary Coordinated Scheme is increased from three to four.
- (11) That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2014/15 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report.

- (12) Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Appendix 2 of the Cabinet report.
- (13) That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2014, for which no consultation was required, are agreed.

B IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP – CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

1. The Cabinet at its meeting on 26 February 2012 considered the report on the Implementation of the Public Value Review of Community Partnership – Constitutional Changes. The recommendations and reasons for recommendations considered by Cabinet are attached in Appendix 1. The full report submitted to Cabinet, including the annexes is attached as Appendix 2.
2. **The Cabinet agreed:**
 - (1) That Members' Allocations be moved from the remit of local committees to individual Members, enabling Members to agree the spend within their own division or to pool their allocation with other Members for specific projects. Decisions on approval of the funds are delegated to officers in consultation with the relevant individual Members or the relevant local committee Chairman where it is not possible to obtain the individual Member's views.
 - (2) That Local Committee Capital Allocations be pooled at Committee level and decisions on approval of funds be delegated to officers in consultation with all County Members on the relevant Local Committee.
3. **The Cabinet RECOMMENDS:**
 - (1) That the guidance for the allocation of Members Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations be strengthened and the language simplified with the introduction of an updated Financial Framework for these allocations as attached in Annex A of the submitted report.
 - (2) That Local Chairmen should be given greater discretion in relation to public participation at formal Local Committee meetings to make these meetings more engaging for residents. (The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)
 - (3) That Local Committee Vice-Chairmen be given a greater role in Committee business and that consideration be given to Vice-Chairmen taking on a specific role as Highways Spokesperson for their Local Committee.
 - (4) That one consistent set of protocols governing public participation in Local Committees is introduced to make processes clearer for residents and more efficient to administer. (The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)

- (5) That Local Committees allow equal voting rights for District and Borough Members unless restricted by law. (The relevant amendments are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)
- (6) That each Local Committees decides on whether it wishes to employ the rule of District or Borough Member substitutes or not. (The relevant amendments are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)

**Mr David Hodge
Leader of the Council
8 March 2013**

CABINET IS ASKED TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL:

<p>A. CONSULTATION ON SURREY'S ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2014 FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND CO-ORDINATED SCHEMES</p>

Recommendation 1

A feeder link is introduced for Banstead Community Junior School for children from Banstead Infant School for September 2014, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children attending Banstead Infant School
- d) Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would be in line with the criteria that exist for most other schools which have a feeder link and reciprocal sibling links
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Body of the school
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Banstead Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to Banstead Junior School

Recommendation 2

The introduction of a feeder link for Reigate Priory for children from Holmesdale and Reigate Parish is deferred until alternative options are considered.

Reasons for Recommendation

- There were notable concerns regarding the proposals which the Local Authority would wish to explore fully before progressing
- It would allow more time to consider alternative proposals
- It would allow any proposal to be considered in the light of future school place planning considerations in the area

Recommendation 3

The admission criteria for Southfield Park are changed so that, for September 2014, children who have Southfield Park Primary School as their nearest school would receive a higher priority when allocating places **outside** the catchment area, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children living in the defined catchment of the school with priority being given to children living furthest away from the school
- e) Other children for whom the school is their nearest school
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would ensure that families living outside the catchment who have Southfield Park as their nearest school are given priority ahead of those who do not
- It would not displace children living on the Horton Park development, for whom the catchment was originally introduced to serve
- A further review of the admission criteria for this school should be carried out once decisions have been made on expansion proposals at other local schools

Recommendation 4

That a feeder link is introduced for St Ann's Heath Junior School for children from Trumps Green Infant School for September 2014, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings
- d) Children attending Trumps Green Infant School
- e) Children for whom St Ann's Heath Junior School is the nearest school with a Junior PAN
- f) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would provide continuity and a clearer transition for parents, children and schools and would reduce anxiety for parents
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It would reduce the likelihood of families removing their children from the infant school during Year 2 in favour of a primary school
- It is consistent with Surrey's planning principles set out in the School Organisation Plan
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools
- Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school and as such attendance at Trumps Green Infant School would not confer an automatic right to transport to St Ann's Heath Junior School

Recommendation 5

A reciprocal sibling link between St Ann's Heath Junior School and Trumps Green Infant School is introduced for September 2014 so that the schools would be described as being on a shared or adjoining site for applying sibling criteria.

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would support families with more than one child as families with a sibling at one school would benefit from sibling priority to the other school

- It would provide continuity for parents, children and schools and reduce anxiety for parents
- It would enable families to benefit from a sibling link for Reception even if they had a child who was due to leave the infant school before the younger child was admitted
- It would maximise the opportunity for families to keep children together or at schools within a close proximity
- It is supported by the Governing Bodies of both schools

Recommendation 6

A catchment area based on the Parish of Tatsfield and a phased tiered sibling priority based on the catchment is introduced for Tatsfield Primary School for September 2014, as follows:

- a) Looked after and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children who will have a sibling on roll at the school at the end of the 2013/14 academic year and that sibling will still be expected to be on roll at the school on the date of the child's admission
- d) Siblings who live within the catchment area
- e) Other children who live within the catchment area
- f) Siblings who live outside the catchment area
- g) Other children who live outside the catchment area

Reasons for Recommendation

- It provides transitional arrangements for families who do not have Tatsfield Primary School as their nearest school but who already have children at the school
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that in the future some families might not be able to get younger siblings in to the same school, this will only apply if it is not their nearest school and those families would have been aware of this policy when they applied
- The pressure on places and the proximity of the school to the County border means that on balance a greater disadvantage might be caused to local families than to future siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- It reduces the likelihood of local families having to travel to schools that are further away
- In time it would support families within the local area as they will not be displaced in favour of siblings living further away
- It provides a clear and historic boundary for the catchment area

Recommendation 7

Tiered arrangements are introduced for Thames Ditton Junior School for September 2014 so that siblings, children at the feeder school and other children who have the school as their nearest receive priority ahead of those who do not, as follows:

- a) Looked After and previously looked after children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- d) Children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- e) Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address

- f) Other children with a sibling attending Thames Ditton Junior School at the time of the child's admission for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- g) Other children attending Thames Ditton Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- h) Any other children

Reasons for Recommendation

- It would help ensure that a school within a reasonable distance could be offered to all children within the area
- Whilst the nature of this proposal means that some families might not be able to get younger siblings in to the same school, this will only apply if it is not their nearest school
- The pressure on places and the proximity of the school to the County border means that on balance a greater disadvantage might be caused to local families than to future siblings if this proposal is not agreed
- It does not disadvantage families who choose a different infant provision or if those who are unable to obtain a place at the infant school
- It reduces the likelihood of local families having to travel to schools that are further away
- It has the support of Thames Ditton Junior School
- There is not currently a reciprocal sibling link between these two schools but this will be reviewed for 2015 and if proposed, will be subject to consultation

Recommendation 8

The PAN for Thames Ditton Junior School is decreased from 120 to 90 for September 2014.

Reasons for Recommendation

- There were no major objections to the changed PAN
- School Commissioning and the school support this change
- The school can't sustain the admission of 120 pupils each year and the increase in 2013 was only intended to be temporary

Recommendation 9

That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for all other Community and Voluntary Controlled schools are determined as they are set out in Annex 1 of Appendix 1, of the Cabinet report, which include the following changes:

- i) Banstead Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 80 to 90
- ii) Bell Farm Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- iii) Bell Farm Primary to decrease its Junior PAN from 120 to 30
- iv) Earlswood Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 90 to 120
- v) Earlswood Junior to increase its Junior PAN from 90 to 120
- vi) Grovelands Primary to decrease its Reception PAN from 90 to 60
- vii) Salfords Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 45 to 60
- viii) Spelthorne Primary to increase its Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix) Trumps Green Infant to increase its Reception from 30 to 60
- x) West Ewell Infant to increase its Reception PAN from 90 to 120

Reasons for Recommendation

- Where a decrease in PAN is proposed the decrease has already been agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school
- The increase in Reception PAN at Bell Farm Primary has already been agreed through statutory proposals following expansion to a primary school
- Where other increases in PAN are proposed the schools are increasing their intake to respond to the need to create more school places and will help meet parental preference
- The School Commissioning team and the schools support these changes
- All other PANs remain as determined for 2013 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences

Recommendation 10

The number of preferences permitted under Surrey's Primary Coordinated Scheme is increased from three to four.

Reasons for Recommendation

- There is likely to be demand for four preferences as in the 2012 admission round 8,157 parents (62.8% of applicants) named three preferences
- It would be likely to increase the number of parental preferences met and to decrease the number of children who could not be offered a preference school
- It may reduce the number of parents who wish to change or add new preferences after the offer date
- Given the pressure on school places it would help to alleviate the anxiety of parents where local schools are oversubscribed and they are uncertain which schools they might be offered
- Parents would not be obliged to name four preferences but it would give those parents who choose to the opportunity to do so
- It should support less popular undersubscribed schools as parents would not have to give up one of their more preferred schools
- As most applications are submitted online it will not have a significant administrative impact
- It helps to reduce potential for disadvantage for Surrey parents where neighbouring Local Authorities allow their parents to name more than three preferences

Recommendation 11

That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2014/15 are agreed as set out in Annex 4 to Appendix 1 of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The coordinated schemes for 2014 are similar to 2013
- The coordinated schemes will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well

Recommendation 12

Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Appendix 2 of the Cabinet report.

Reasons for Recommendation

- The Local Authority is required by law to define the Relevant Area for admissions
- The Relevant Area must be agreed every two years although no changes have been proposed
- It ensures that any schools who might be affected by changes to the admission arrangements for other local schools will be made aware of the changes

Recommendation 13

That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2014, for which no consultation was required, are agreed.

Reasons for Recommendation

- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools
- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The existing arrangements are working reasonably well
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduces travel and supports Surrey's sustainability policies

B. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP – CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

Cabinet agreed:

RECOMMENDATION 1: That Members' Allocations be moved from the remit of local committees to individual Members, enabling Members to agree the spend within their own division or to pool their allocation with other Members for specific projects. Decisions on approval of the funds are delegated to officers in consultation with the relevant individual Members or the relevant local committee Chairman where it is not possible to obtain the individual Member's views.

RECOMMENDATION 2: That Local Committee Capital Allocations be pooled at Committee level and decisions on approval of funds be delegated to officers in consultation with all County Members on the relevant Local Committee.

AND THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNTY COUNCIL:

RECOMMENDATION 3: That the guidance for the allocation of Members Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations be strengthened and the language simplified with the introduction of an updated Financial Framework for these allocations as attached in Annex A of the submitted report.

RECOMMENDATION 4: That Local Chairmen should be given greater discretion in relation to public participation at formal Local Committee meetings to make these meetings more engaging for residents. (The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)

RECOMMENDATION 5: That Local Committee Vice-Chairmen be given a greater role in Committee business and that consideration be given to Vice-Chairmen taking on a specific role as Highways Spokesperson for their Local Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 6: That one consistent set of protocols governing public participation in Local Committees is introduced to make processes clearer for residents and more efficient to administer. (The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)

RECOMMENDATION 7: That Local Committees allow equal voting rights for District and Borough Members unless restricted by law. (The relevant amendments are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)

RECOMMENDATION 8: That each Local Committees decides on whether it wishes to employ the rule of District or Borough Member substitutes or not. (The relevant amendments are included in Annex B of the submitted report.)

Reasons for Decisions

1. The Community Partnership PVR presented to Cabinet in November 2012 reviewed the role of Surrey County Council's Local Committees and the Community Partnership Team "to improve outcomes for residents by strengthening local democracy and

placing much greater emphasis on partnership working.” (David Hodge, Leader of SCC).

2. The recommendations are designed to embrace the spirit of Localism and empower local councillors to make a real difference in their local community. This report outlines the decisions that are required to implement the recommendations of the PVR in relation to:
 - Supporting Members in their role as community leaders and champions
 - Preparing Local Committees for a greater scrutiny and accountability role
 - Simplifying the financial and administrative processes for Members’ Allocations to increase efficiency and to speed up decision making
 - Making formal Local Committee Meetings more engaging for residents
 - Changing the participation rules of Local Committees to aid partnership working

3. These require a number of changes to the current Constitution of the County Council, for which Full Council approval is required, specifically, standing orders, financial regulations and the Scheme of Delegation.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

DATE: 26 FEBRUARY 2013



REPORT OF: MRS HELYN CLACK, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE 2012 GAMES

LEAD OFFICER: YVONNE REES STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR CUSTOMERS AND COMMUNITIES

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP – CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

In November 2012 the Cabinet considered the Public Value Review (PVR) of Community Partnership which reviewed the role of Surrey County Council's Local Committees and the Community Partnership Team with the aim of delivering improved outcomes and value for money for the residents of Surrey.

The recommendations build on the Localism agenda and aim to provide a greater role for local Members as Community Leaders. The Leader has expressed his belief that, over the next cycle, there is a strong case to increase accountability and scrutiny at Local Committees and that further responsibilities should be passed to Local Committees.

Following engagement with Local Committee Members and Chairmen, the Leader and the Portfolio Holder; and on completion of a Rapid Improvement Event to review financial processes, this report sets out the constitutional changes that are required to implement the PVR recommendations in relation to Member Allocations and the conduct of Local Committee meetings.

The decisions requested are timed to allow the changes to be implemented in readiness for the start of the new council from 22 May 2013.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Cabinet is asked to agree the following recommendations (recommendations 3-8 are to full Council) and the consequential changes that will be required to the wording of the Council's Constitution, Standing Orders and Financial Framework to implement the recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 1: That Members' Allocations be moved from the remit of local committees to individual Members, enabling Members to agree the spend within their own division or to pool their allocation with other Members for specific projects. Decisions on approval of the funds are delegated to Officers in consultation with the relevant individual Members or the relevant local committee Chairman where it is not possible to obtain the individual Member's views.

RECOMMENDATION 2: That Local Committee Capital Allocations are pooled at Committee level and decisions on approval of funds are delegated to officers in consultation with all County Members on the relevant Local Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 3: That the guidance for the allocation of Members Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations should be strengthened and the language simplified with the introduction of an updated Financial Framework for these allocations as

attached in Annex A.

RECOMMENDATION 4: That Local Chairmen should be given greater discretion in relation to public participation at formal Local Committee meetings to make these meetings more engaging for residents. The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included at Annex B.

RECOMMENDATION 5: That Local Committee Vice-Chairmen be given a greater role in Committee business and that consideration be given to Vice-Chairmen taking on a specific role as Highways Spokesperson for their Local Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 6: That one consistent set of protocols governing public participation in Local Committees is introduced to make processes clearer for residents and more efficient to administer. The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included at Annex B.

RECOMMENDATION 7: That Local Committees allow equal voting rights for District and Borough Members unless restricted by law. The relevant amendments are included at Annex B.

RECOMMENDATION 8: That each Local Committees decides on whether it wishes to employ the rule of District or Borough Member substitutes or not. The relevant amendments are included at Annex B.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Community Partnership PVR presented to Cabinet in November 2012 reviewed the role of Surrey County Council's Local Committees and the Community Partnership Team "to improve outcomes for residents by strengthening local democracy and placing much greater emphasis on partnership working." (David Hodge, Leader of SCC).

The recommendations are designed to embrace the spirit of Localism and empower local councillors to make a real difference in their local community. This report outlines the decisions that are required to implement the recommendations of the PVR in relation to:

- Supporting Members in their role as community leaders and champions
- Preparing Local Committees for a greater scrutiny and accountability role
- Simplifying the financial and administrative processes for Members' Allocations to increase efficiency and to speed up decision making
- Making formal Local Committee Meetings more engaging for residents
- Changing the participation rules of Local Committees to aid partnership working

These require a number of changes to the current Constitution of the County Council, for which Full Council approval is required, specifically, standing orders, financial regulations and the Scheme of Delegation. These changes are set out in detail in the following pages.

DETAILS:

Member Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations – Simplifying financial processes to increase efficiency.

4. The November 2012 Cabinet report recommended that members should be able to spend their allocation without having to await the next local committee meeting. The Rapid Improvement Event (RIE), which considered this issue, suggested that the most efficient way of speeding up the process and ensuring decisions are taken robustly, was for the approval of both Member revenue allocations and Local Committee capital allocations to be delegated to officers to make decisions on

expenditure in consultation with Members.

5. Member allocations are revenue funds, these funds would be allocated to each individual Member and decision would be in consultation with that Member (Members can also agree to pool budgets for specific projects). Capital Allocations would be allocated to each Local Committee and decision would be taken following consultation with all County Members on that relevant Local Committee.
6. The PVR evidenced that a high proportion of officer time is currently spent on the administration of local funds and grants. Simplifying processes and streamlining approval arrangements would increase efficiency allowing officers to spend time supporting Members in engagement activities.
7. The PVR also recommended that the current delegated threshold of £1,000 for Member Revenue Allocations be removed to enable Members to spend their allocation more freely and to consider larger projects or grants, which in turn should cut the time spent on administering. Members would retain the ability to pool funds toward specific projects. It is envisaged that Capital Allocations would be spent on a few larger capital projects in the Local Committee area. The following table summarises the changes proposed in detail:

Table 1. Member and Local Committee Capital Allocations	
Individual Members' Allocations (Revenue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsored by individual member • Removal of £1,000 maximum threshold • Funding approved and processed by Community Partnership Manager and Community Partnership Team Leaders in accordance with the Financial Framework for Members' Allocations and Local Committees • Officers advise members and provide oversight ensuring compliance against the criteria for the fund
Pooled Members' Allocations (Revenue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pooled by individual project • Projects with pooled Members Allocations would need the approval of all members wishing to contribute, prior to the dispatch of funds
Local Committee Capital Allocations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding to operate as a pooled fund at Local Committee level • Funding approved and processed by Community Partnership Manager and Community Partnership Team Leaders following consultation with all County Members on the relevant Local Committee in accordance with the Financial Framework for Members' Allocations and Local Committees

8. To ensure Member Revenue Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations are not spent inappropriately and the reputation of the County Council is safeguarded, updated guidance entitled the 'Financial Framework for Members Allocations and Local Committees' has been produced to accompany this change. A copy of this document is enclosed in Annex A of this report. Within this document the criteria for the allocation of funds has been significantly strengthened and the language simplified to promote understanding of its contents. This document would replace the current financial framework and any local financial management arrangements currently in place. The changes require Council approval.
9. The introduction of the new financial framework and the changes in the approval process will be accompanied by detailed training to be undertaken by all Members as part of the induction process. It is suggested that the relevant training should be completed by all members prior to the allocation of any funds under the new system.

Officers will also be fully trained and will advise Members to ensure all spend conforms to the updated guidance.

10. The transparency of funding decisions will be maintained under the new process as funding decisions will continue to be reported to the next relevant Local Committee. Decisions will also be posted online on enhanced public web pages.
11. Occasionally situations may arise when it is not possible for an individual Member to make recommendations to the officers, for example because of prolonged illness or incapacity. In such situations it is recommended that decisions are made by officers after consultation with the relevant Local Committee Chairman.

RECOMMENDATION 1: That Members' Allocations be moved from the remit of local committees to individual Members, enabling Members to agree the spend within their own division or to pool their allocation with other Members for specific projects. Decisions on approval of the funds are delegated to Officers in consultation with the relevant individual Members or the relevant local committee Chairman where it is not possible to obtain the individual Member's views.

RECOMMENDATION 2: That Local Committee Capital Allocations are pooled at Committee level and decisions on approval of funds are delegated to officers in consultation with all County Members on the relevant Local Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 3: That the guidance for the allocation of Members Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations should be strengthened and the language simplified with the introduction of an updated Financial Framework for these Allocations as attached in Annex A.

Local Committee meetings – Public Participation

12. Local Committee meetings are governed by legislation surrounding formal decision making in public¹ and the meetings are very formal. The PVR recognised that whilst some formality is legally necessary, it can mean that the meetings are off-putting for those who attend and recommended that steps are taken to make Local Committee meetings more engaging for residents.
13. It is proposed that the Standing Orders with the constitution governing Local Committees are revised to give Chairmen the ability to take questions or statements as they see appropriate during the formal meeting. This change will allow Chairmen to more effectively manage the business of the committee by, for example, allowing petitions and public questions to be taken with a relevant agenda item as opposed to being taken at the beginning of the meeting, which can appear disjointed.
14. Chairmen when exercising this discretion would need to clearly separate formal decision making from any wider discussion on an item, in order to ensure that the committee decisions are taken only by the committee, informed by the papers before it and the contributions made at the meeting.
15. The PVR also recognised that from a resident perspective the existing Local Committee protocols are varied and potentially confusing, as each committee has evolved its procedures in isolation over the last ten years. For example, the deadline for submitting a petition prior to a meeting ranges from three days to fourteen days, and the number of required signatories for a petition ranges from ten to one hundred people.
16. To make the processes clearer for residents, and to improve efficiency, it is recommended that the Constitution of the County Council is updated to ensure Local

¹ Local Government Acts 1972 and 2000

Committees adopt a consistent approach, as outlined in Table 2 below, whilst still allowing flexibility through Chairman’s discretion.

Table 2. Proposed Local Committee Protocol	
Petitions	
Minimum signatories	30 or at Chairman’s discretion
Public deadline	2 weeks
Time allowed for the presentation of a petition	3 minutes or at Chairman’s discretion
Formal Questions or Public Statements	
Public deadline	4 working days
Member deadline	4 working days

17. The consequential changes to the Standing Orders within the constitution will be accompanied by bespoke training to Local Committee Chairmen for the first time, to guide them through the legislative requirements whilst ensuring effective public engagement. The changes will also require a strong advisory role from officers who will also complete training to provide this support.
18. In recognition of the increased responsibilities of Local Committees, it is suggested that the Vice-Chairmen should provide greater support to Local Committee Chairmen, by playing a stronger role in Committee business and taking the lead on Highways issues as Highways spokesperson.

RECOMMENDATION 4: That Local Chairmen should be given greater discretion in relation to public participation at formal Local Committee meetings to make these meetings more engaging for residents. The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included at Annex B.

RECOMMENDATION 5: That Local Committee Vice-Chairmen be given a greater role in Committee business and that consideration be given to Vice-Chairmen taking on a specific role as Highways Spokesperson for their Local Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 6: That one consistent set of protocols governing public participation in Local Committees is introduced to make processes clearer for residents and more efficient to administer. The relevant amendments to Standing Orders are included at Annex B.

Local Committee Governance – Voting & Substitutes

19. The PVR identified that the current Local Committee model does not afford District and Borough councillors equal voting rights on all matters. There are statutory restrictions which prevent co-opted members to vote on some matters, for example Youth.² However, the current terms of reference are more restrictive than the law allows. Changes are proposed to the wording within the Constitution of the County Council to make it more permissive and clear on the issue of equal voting at Local Committee.
20. The current practice of substituting, when a Member of the Local Committee is unable to attend, also creates an imbalance. To improve partnership working it is recommended that Local Committees are each allowed to decide whether to allow

² Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990

District or Borough Members of the Committee to substitute or not.

RECOMMENDATION 7 (to Council): That Local Committees allow equal voting rights for District and Borough Members unless restricted by law. The relevant amendments are included at Annex B.

RECOMMENDATION 8 (to Council): That each Local Committees decides on whether it wishes to employ the rule of District or Borough Member substitutes or not. The relevant amendments are included at Annex B.

CONSULTATION:

22. The Community Partnership PVR which ran from January 2012 to November 2012 involved a range of stakeholders including:
- Local Committee Chairmen (monthly meetings)
 - The 11 x Local Committees (individual meetings)
 - The Communities Select Committee
 - The Community Partnership PVR Member Reference Group
 - Corporate Leadership Team
 - SCC officers and the Community Partnership Team
 - District and Boroughs officers
 - Residents (Local Committee Survey and Joint Neighbourhood Survey)
 - Other partners (Representatives from Parish Councils, Police & NHS)
 - Businesses (Surrey Connections)
 - Other Local Authorities

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

23. There are no significant risk management implications arising from this report.
24. The changes recommended to financial and administrative processes for Members' Allocations will be accompanied by the introduction of a strengthened financial framework and the provision of detailed training for both Members and Officers.
25. The recommended changes to the Standing Orders within the constitution will be accompanied by bespoke training to Local Committee Chairmen and all Officers acting in an advisory capacity.
26. Any risks associated with delivering identified improvements and savings will continue to be monitored through the Council's risk management arrangements.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

27. The administration of Member Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations following the changes proposed in this report will be monitored to assess the operational efficiencies resulting from the proposed changes.
28. The funding available for Members Allocations is subject to the provision made within the Medium Term Financial Plan.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

29. The section 151 officer (Chief Finance Officer) confirms that all material financial and business issues and risks have been considered / addressed.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

30. The changes proposed by this report are in accordance with the various legal requirements set out in the Local Government Acts and other legislation. The Monitoring Officer and her staff have been directly involved in the formulation of these changes.

Equalities and Diversity

31. An Equality Impact Assessment was completed for the November Cabinet Report and a summary of the key impacts and actions was provided and no negative equalities implications were identified at this time.
32. Equalities issues, particularly in relation to any disabilities, will be given consideration in the arrangements for public participation at Local Committees to ensure that anyone with a protected characteristic is not disadvantaged.
33. There are no further impacts arising from this report. The key impacts identified within the Equality Impact Assessment will continue to be reviewed during implementation against this PVR to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are put in place as required.

Other Implications:

34. The potential implications for the following council priorities and policy areas have been considered. A summary of the implications is set out below:

Area Assessed	Direct implications
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report
Climate change	No significant implications arising from this report
Carbon emissions	No significant implications arising from this report

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

35. Following Cabinet agreement of Recommendation 1 and 2 changes will be made to the delegation of executive powers in relation to Members Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations to delegated approval decisions to officers in consultation with members.
36. Following Cabinet endorsement of Recommendations 3 to 8, Full Council approval will then be sought, with a report prepared for 19 March 2013 Full Council recommending that the changes to the wording of the Council's Constitution, Standing Orders and Financial Framework are agreed.
37. Following confirmation of the required constitutional changes, bespoke training will be provided to all Members and Officers on the new procedures and criteria for Members allocations, linked to the Member Induction programme after the 3 May 2013. Local Committee Chairman and relevant Officers will also receive bespoke training concerning the changes to the conduct of formal Local Committees, to be completed prior to the first round of formal Local Committee meetings.
38. Cabinet to receive a progress report back in due course.

Contact Officer:

James Painter
Community Partnerships Manager
E mail james.painter@surreycc.gov.uk

Annexes:

- A. Financial Framework for Members Allocations and Local Committees
- B. Summary Table of Constitution Changes

Sources/background papers:

- The Public Value Review of Community Partnership 27 November 2012
 - Community Partnerships Team Cabinet Report November 2012
 - Public Value Reviews – Year Two Report, Cabinet 27 September 2011
-

<p style="text-align: center;">Financial Framework for Members' Allocations and Local Committees</p>

Framework Principles

1. As with all expenditure by the Council, spending of members' allocations and budgets delegated to local committees should:
 - Be directed to activities for which the County Council has legal powers;
 - Meet demonstrable local needs;
 - Deliver value for money, so that there is evidence of the outcomes achieved;
 - Be consistent with County Council policies;
 - Be approved through a process that is open and transparent, consultative, accountable, and auditable;
 - Where appropriate, allow opportunities to be taken to pool funds with partner organisations.

Members' Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations

2. These are spent to respond to local needs either in accordance with the County Council's general power of competence (as set out within the Localism Act 2011) or another relevant statutory power. They must also be spent in accordance with this Financial Framework which details the financial management arrangements to ensure proper stewardship and accountability and other policies of the County Council. As regards members' allocations a maximum sum is identified in the budget per County Councillor to be spent each year on needs arising in the Member's electoral division or pooled with other allocations to meet local needs in a number of divisions within the relevant Borough/District area.
3. With regards to budget setting and planning:
The County Council will agree each year the actual amount of funding available to each Member and Local Committee, subject to the provision made within the Medium Term Financial Plan.
4. Approval of both Members' allocations and Local Committee capital allocations are delegated to officers within the Community Partnership Team to make decisions on expenditure in consultation with Members.
5. Members' allocations and Local Committee capital allocations are allocated following an agreed application process.

Exclusions

6. The following exclusions apply:
 - Funding of Political organisations is not permitted

- Members' Allocations expenditure is intended to be of a one-off nature or serve as 'pump-priming'. Funding to cover ongoing revenue costs, including salaries is not permitted
- Funding is not to be used by any other local authority to meet its statutory obligations
- Projects must not contravene any of the Council's agreed policies or priorities. Funding may not be used to support projects which involve taking sides on a planning dispute or relate to matters in which the County Council is a statutory consultee.

7. Where there is any doubt over the appropriateness of intended expenditure, a local member must seek advice from the Community Partnership Team.

Restrictions

8. The following restrictions apply:

- Funding to individuals, private companies, other local authorities, private clubs or other membership organisations will be considered only in those cases where the wider community benefit/s of the project are clearly demonstrated.
- Funding may only be used to supplement existing funding available from the County Council towards a project, if the additional community benefits derived from Members' Allocations are clearly demonstrated.
- Retrospective funding applications are discouraged and will only be considered in cases where the proposed project has been brought to the attention of the Community Partnerships Manager or the Community Partnership Team Leader before the event/ purchase/ expenditure takes place.
- Caution will be exercised in relation to supporting organisations from Members' Allocations where they are already under contract to the County Council following a tendering process; or receiving a grant from the County Council. In order to avoid hidden subsidies or double funding applicants must state any contractual obligations to the County Council within the application for Members' Allocations.
- Funding must not be used for costs wholly or mainly incurred for the delivery of the national curriculum as this is already resourced on a formula basis by the County Council.
- Funding can only be used solely for the purposes specified in the application form.

Guidelines for funding applications

9. The following guidelines apply for both applicants and in assessing applications received:

- Applications need to have regard to the principles of Equality & Diversity (as set out within the Equality Act 2010).
- Applicants shall have regard to economy, efficiency and effectiveness in all expenditure.
- Applicants will be required to acknowledge the receipt of funds from SCC when publicising the event/project.
- When applying for funding, applicants will be required to state whether they are in receipt of any other funds from SCC, or have any other outstanding applications submitted to SCC.

- Applicants will also be asked to state whether they have previously applied to SCC for funding and for what purpose.
- Any application must not bring the reputation of SCC into disrepute.

Guidelines for Members' Allocations

10. The application must have been endorsed by the appropriate local Member(s) unless it is not possible to obtain these views. (Where it is not possible to obtain an individual member's views, e.g. because of long term illness or incapacity, the relevant Local Committee Chairman's view will be sought prior to the Member's allocation being spent).
 - Proposals must be primarily for the benefit of residents in the Member's division from which funding is sought. Members may contribute to proposals based in other Divisions within the Borough/District area provided there is a benefit to their own residents.
 - Members' allocations are a revenue budget but can also be used to fund capital projects.

Guidelines for Local Committee Capital Allocations

11. All County members on the relevant local committee are to be consulted on applications for funding. Where required the views of the Council Leader may be sought in relation to proposed expenditure.

Capital Expenditure

12. Capital funding can only be used for capital projects, and may not be used to support revenue expenditure, such as staffing. Capital projects are those that create or extend the useful life of an asset and are consistent with the County Council's accounting policies in line with the requirements of the statutory accounting framework.
13. The budget allocation for capital grants must meet the following criteria:
 - (a) it must be applied to physical assets with a life of more than one year; such assets include land, buildings, property refurbishments, vehicles, plant, major items of equipment etc; and
 - (b) this funding must not be applied to meet staffing costs or other routine running costs.
14. The applicant shall not sell or otherwise dispose of any assets purchased wholly or partly using SCC grant funding, nor allow a third party to take a change of such assets without the written consent of SCC.

Devolved Funding to Local Committees

15. Where a local committee receives devolved capital or revenue budgets the committee may not vire this funding to other borough/district areas or delegated responsibilities without the consent of the Section 151 Officer.
16. Devolved budgets are agreed annually in consultation with Members and approved by the Cabinet.

17. Devolved budgets may be supplemented by Members' allocations or Local Committee Capital funds.
18. In relation to devolved highway budgets the local committees must take account of Surrey Transport Plan objectives and maintenance priorities for their area. It is for the Local Committee to determine the split between improvement or maintenance works as they determine appropriate, subject to the restrictions for capital funding as detailed above from paragraph 12.
19. Devolved Highways revenue budgets can be used to supplement Highways capital works, in consultation with Corporate Finance.

Budget Monitoring and Management

20. Where members' or Local Committee capital allocations are used to commission a Surrey County Council service, expenditure will be incurred by the service. There will be a transfer from the allocations budgets to fund this expenditure.
21. Where member allocations or Local Committee capital allocations, are used to commission an external organisation to carry out works for the Council, the normal financial regulations and procurement standing orders for the County Council will apply. Where commissioning voluntary sector services, the requirements of the Surrey Compact and associated codes of practice should be met. The Community Partnerships Team will record and administer payments.
22. Transparency of allocation budget decisions will be maintained as funding decisions and will be reported to the next relevant local committee meeting. Decisions will also be posted online on the Surrey website.
23. Proposals to carry underspendings forward will be subject to Cabinet approval as part of the County Council budget monitoring and outturn reporting processes.
24. To ensure effective use of public funds, applicants will need to keep records that show the cost of the project and the use to which the funding has been put. This can be requested by SCC at any time. Evidence of expenditure and achievement of the objectives must be submitted to SCC within 12 months of receiving the funding. Failure to supply the evidence against use of funding as requested may result in SCC requiring the return of funding awarded.

Annex B. Summary Table of Constitution Changes

Please note proposed numbering may be subject to change

Member Allocations	
<p><u>Current:</u></p> <p>Current Decisions on Member Allocations funding are made by the Local Committee or via delegated authority to Officers for sums under £1000. This is set out as follows within the terms of reference of Local Committees:</p> <p><i>7.2 Local committees are responsible for the following Decisions relating to general power of competence</i></p> <p><i>a) The County Council members of local committees may take decisions in response to local needs, within the County Council's general power of competence and in accordance with the financial framework and policies of the County Council up to a maximum sum per County Council Member, which will be determined annually as part of the budget process.</i></p> <p>Financial Framework for Local Committees</p> <p>Part 5 pages thirty four – thirty seven of the Constitution</p> <p>Part 3 Scheme of Delegation to Officers LP2</p>	<p><u>Proposed Change:</u></p> <p>The November 2012 Cabinet report recommended that members should be able to spend their allocation without having to await the next local committee meeting. The Rapid Improvement Event (RIE), which considered this issue, suggested that the most efficient way of speeding up the process and ensuring decisions are taken robustly, was for the approval of Members' Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations to be delegated to officers to make decisions on expenditure in consultation with members.</p> <p>It is proposed that the current delegation to Local Committees for the approval of Members allocations is changed and the constitution updated so that relevant Officers within the Community Partnership Team would have delegated authority to approve revenue funds in consultation with individual Members. Pooled budgets would need to be agreed by all Members who have contributed funds. The Officer scheme of delegation would be updated to reflect this change.</p> <p>Local Committee Capital Allocations will follow a similar process to Members' Allocations but are to be treated as a 'pooled fund' for the Local Committee. Decisions on the approval of Local Committee Capital Allocations will be delegated to relevant Officer following consultation with all County members on the relevant Local Committee.</p> <p>To ensure Member allocation and Local Committee Capital Allocations are not spent inappropriately and the reputation of the County Council is safeguarded, updated guidance entitled the 'Financial Framework for Members' Allocations and Local Committees' has been produced to accompany this change. This document would replace the current financial framework for Local Committees under part five of the Constitution and would replace any local financial management arrangements which are currently in place.</p> <p>Funding against Members Allocations and Local Committee Capital Allocations would continue to be reported to the next Local Committee maintaining transparency. Information reported would be similar to that reported currently on the Member Portal, which is updated on a monthly basis. The terms of reference of Local Committees would be changed as follows in order to reflect this change:</p> <p>7.3 The Local Committees</p> <p><i>In relation to the exercise of executive functions relating to Members allocations, the Local Committee will receive a report on all projects approved under delegated authority of the Community Partnership Manager or Team Leader .</i></p> <p>LP2 delegation Change: <i>Community Partnership Manager and Team Leaders.</i></p>

	<p><i>To make decisions on approval of Member Allocations in consultation with individual members or the relevant local committee Chairman where it is not possible to obtain the individual member's views.</i></p> <p><i>To make decisions on the approval of Local Committee Capital Allocations following consultation with all County members on the relevant Local Committee.</i></p>
<p>Local Committee meetings - Public Participation</p>	
<p><u>Current:</u></p> <p>Local Committee meetings are highly structured because they are governed by legal requirements surrounding formal decision making in public.</p> <p>Whilst the process for meetings must follow a legal framework the lack of discretion for Chairman to influence the running of the meetings they Chair can currently serve to limit public participation within Local Committees</p> <p>The specific rules governing conduct of the Local Committee meetings is set out within the constitution under Part 4. Standing Orders, Part 3 Cabinet and Committee: Meetings and Procedures.</p>	<p><u>Proposed change:</u></p> <p>To amend the current standing orders to include a new specific section governing public participation at Local Committees to make these less restrictive, by giving Chairmen more discretion and the flexibility to take questions or invite comments as they see appropriate during the formal meeting.</p> <p>Specifically that within the Standing Orders, Chairmen are given greater discretion under provisions SO 68 & 69 governing PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL COMMITTEE BUSINESS*,</p> <p>Namely that in relation to <u>Petitions</u> it is proposed that , <i>'Discussion on a petition at the meeting is at the Chairman's discretion,</i></p> <p>In relation to <u>Public questions and statements</u> it is proposed that, <i>'The Chairman may alternatively permit the question to be asked or statement to be made at the start of an item on the agenda if it relates to that item'.</i> It is also proposed that, <i>'The number of questions which may be asked or statements made at any one meeting will be at the discretion of the Chairman'.</i></p> <p>When dealing with any item in which public participation has occurred, as part of these changes it will be important for Chairman to clarify the point at which such public participation is concluded and the Committee's formal discussion and decision making of the item is taking place.</p> <p><i>*(Excluding matters in relation to consideration of a Public Right Of Way (PROW) under which standing order 67 applies).</i></p>
<p>Local Committee meetings - Making Processes Clearer for residents to Understand</p>	
<p><u>Current Issue:</u></p> <p>From a resident perspective the eleven existing different Local Committee protocols are very complex and potentially confusing. For example, the deadline for submitting a petition prior to a meeting ranges from three days to fourteen days, and the number of required signatories for a petition ranges from ten to 100 people.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Change:</u></p> <p>It is recommended that the Constitution of the County Council is updated and that paragraph 41 of Standing Orders that refers to the drawing up of local protocols is deleted in order to ensure Local Committees adopt a more consistent approach. In support of this more consistent approach paragraph 47.2 of Standing Orders would be amended to bring the deadlines for notice of Member questions for Local Committees into line with the current deadline for questions to Cabinet Members and Committees, at four working days before the meeting.</p> <p>In place of the current different local protocols, within the constitution it is proposed that separate provisions are introduced at the end of Part 3 of the Standing Orders governing PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL COMMITTEE BUSINESS, this is set out as follows (numbering to be confirmed) :</p> <p><i>Petitions 68.1 Any member of the public who lives, works or studies in the Surrey County Council area may present a</i></p>

petition, containing 30 or more signatures or at Chairman's discretion, relating to a matter within the terms of reference of the Local Committee. The presentation of a petition on the following business will not be allowed:

- (a) matters which are "confidential" or "exempt" under the Local Government Access to Information Act 1985;*
- (b) planning applications; and*
- (c) matters in relation to public rights of way under consideration by the local committee.*

68.2 A spokesman for the petitioners may address the Local Committee on the petition for up to 3 minutes, or longer, if agreed by the Chairman. Discussion on a petition at the meeting is at the Chairman's discretion. The petition may be referred to the next appropriate meeting of the Committee or to the Cabinet, a Cabinet Member or other committee at the discretion of the Chairman.

68.3 Notice must be given in writing to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer on behalf of the Chief Executive at least 14 days before the meeting. Alternatively, the petition can be submitted on-line through Surrey County Council's e-petitions website as long as the minimum number of signatures has been reached 14 days before the meeting.

68.4 No more than three petitions may be presented at any one meeting of the committee unless agreed otherwise by the Chairman.

68.5 The Community Partnership & Committee Officer may amalgamate within the first received petition other petitions of like effect on the same subject.

68.6 The presentation of a petition on the same or similar topic as one presented in the last six months may only be permitted at the Chairman's discretion

Public questions and statements

69.1 At the start of any ordinary meeting of the Local Committee, any member of the public who lives, works or studies in the Surrey County Council area may ask one question or make a statement relating to a matter within the Local Committee's terms of reference. The Chairman may alternatively permit the question to be asked or statement to be made at the start of an item on the agenda if it relates to that item.

69.2 Questions or statements will not be allowed on matters which are "confidential" or "exempt" under the Local Government Access to Information Act 1985 or on planning applications or public rights of way matters under consideration.

69.3 Notice of questions or statements must be given in writing or by e-mail to the relevant Community Partnership or Committee Officer with details of the question or statement, by 12 noon four working days before the meeting. If the day in question is a Bank Holiday then notice of questions should be received by 12 noon on the previous day.

69.4 Written questions and statements must be submitted by the

	<p><i>deadline set out in section 69.3 The Chairman may alternatively permit questions or statements to be made under relevant agenda items as they consider appropriate during the formal meeting.</i></p> <p>69.5 <i>The Community Partnership and Committee Officer may, having consulted a questioner, reword any question or statement received to bring it into proper form and to secure reasonable brevity. Copies will be tabled and made available in the meeting room for members of the Local Committee and any member of the public in attendance.</i></p> <p>69.6 <i>Questions and statements will be taken in the order in which they are received by the Community Partnership and Committee Officer. The provision of answers to questions being asked, any response to statements, and any discussion of the question or statement will be at the discretion of the Chairman.</i></p> <p>69.7 <i>Following any initial reply to a question, one or more supplementary question/s in relation to the response provided may be asked by the questioner at the discretion of the Chairman. The provision of answers to supplementary questions being asked and any discussion of these questions will be at the discretion of the Chairman.</i></p> <p>69.8 <i>The total number of questions which may be asked or statements made at any one meeting will be at the discretion of the Chairman. The Chairman may decide that questions or statements can be held over to the following meeting, or dealt with in writing and may disallow questions or statements which are repetitious</i></p> <p>69.9 <i>When dealing with any item in which public participation has occurred, the Chairman shall clarify the point at which such public participation is concluded and the Committee’s formal discussion and decision making of the item is taking place.</i></p> <p>One benefit of this change is that any specific local need could be addressed under the discretion provided to each Chairman.</p>
--	--

Local Committee Governance – Voting

<p><u>Current Issue:</u></p> <p>District & Borough (D&B) Councillors on local committees are not afforded equal voting rights. This is because D&B councillors are ‘co-opted’ and therefore unable to vote on Education and Youth matters³. Whilst a point of law, this can undermine the sense of partnership. It was recognised that the wording of the SCC’s Constitution is currently quite restrictive surrounding D&Bs voting rights and that there is also some confusion over who can vote on</p>	<p><u>Proposed Change:</u></p> <p>In line with the recommendations of the PVR, changes are proposed to make SCC’s Constitution more permissive and clear on the issue of Equal voting. Specifically new wording is proposed under Standing Order 33 stating that: ‘Borough/district councillors appointed to local committees in relation to all matters, with the exception of Education, Youth and Member Allocations. To ensure consistency it is also recommended that paragraph 7.1 within the Terms of Reference for Local Committees is updated to state, ‘with voting rights in relation to all matters, with the exception of Education, Youth and Member Allocations.’, to reflect this change.</p>
--	---

³ Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990

<p>what.</p>	
<p>Local Committee Governance – Substitutes</p>	
<p><u>Current Issue:</u></p> <p>The PVR report identified that the current practice of substituting, when a member of the Local Committee is unable to attend, also creates an imbalance. It is less fair for County Councillors, who are unable to nominate a local substitute Councillor. The report recommended that Local Committees have the option to end the practice of substitutes in order to make Local Committees more equal.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Change:</u></p> <p>In line with the recommendations of the PVR the County Council Constitution has been updated so that that each Local Committee can decide on whether it wishes to employ the rule of District or Borough Member substitutes or not. Specifically within paragraph under Part 4. Standing Orders, Part 3 Cabinet and Committee, it is proposed that the following amendment is made to paragraph 40 (f):</p> <p><i>No substitutes are permitted for district/borough council co-opted members of local committees, unless a local committee agrees otherwise at its first meeting following the Council’s annual meeting and in relation to all meetings in the following year, upon which named substitutes will be appointed to the Local Committee on the nomination of the relevant district/borough council.</i></p>