

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 27 OCTOBER 2020 AT 2.00 PM  
VIA REMOTE MEETING.**

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

Members:

*Mr Tim Oliver (Chairman)	*Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Mr Colin Kemp (Vice-Chairman)	*Mrs Mary Lewis
*Dr Zully Grant-Duff	*Mrs Julie Iles
*Mrs Sinead Mooney	*Mr Matt Furniss
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Mrs Becky Rush	*Miss Alison Griffiths
*Mr Mark Nuti	*Miss Marisa Heath
* Mr Edward Hawkins	

\* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mrs Kay Hammond, Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee  
Mr Chris Botten, Vice-Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee  
Mrs Lesley Steeds, Vice-Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee  
Mr Nick Darby, Vice-Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee  
Mr Jonathan Essex, Redhill East

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

**143/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mr Colin Kemp.

The Leader congratulated Julie Iles, Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning, whom was awarded an OBE in the Queen's birthday honours.

**144/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 29 SEPTEMBER 2020 [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 29 September were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

**145/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

#### **146/20 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

The Leader explained that Elmbridge had moved into Tier 2 'high' which means that the rate of COVID infections in the borough had risen to a level which demands swift action to stop the spread of the virus. The Leader re-affirmed the importance of complying with restrictions and abiding by the basic rules put in place to stop the spread of the virus including washing hands and maintaining social distance. The number of cases in the county were rising.

The Leader briefed the public on the Organisation Strategy Refresh and the four key priorities of the refresh. The overarching point being that nobody is left behind especially during these testing times. The Leader went on to explain that a mental health summit had been organised in November which would bring together key partners and stakeholders across the county to discuss how to help those who really need it.

The council had been helping families during the covid-19 period. The money from Government had been distributed to the Surrey Crisis Fund, Bookham food and distribution centre and the district and boroughs. Although there was no specific funding for free school meals, support would be provided to families during half term with the support of partners.

The 'Your Fund Surrey' would go live week commencing 2 November. The council agreed that the civic heart of the council would move to Woodhatch in Reigate and would be one of four bases in Surrey. The council site in Kingston was being actively marketed for disposal.

#### **146/201 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

There were four Member questions. Mrs Kay Hammond asked a supplementary question in relation to her Member question. She thanked the Cabinet Member for a thorough response and queried why Surrey had 23% of children with an EHCP in comparison to the national average which was 17%. She further queried if this was evidence that Surrey's preventative agenda was not working.

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning thanked Mrs Hammond for the question as it spoke to the focus we have on addressing the one remaining issue from the Ofsted inspection of 2016 – that of SEND pupils missing education. Surrey had experienced a significant increase in the number of children and young people with complex special needs in the last 4 years. Surrey's growth rate had been 12% since 2016. The Cabinet Member welcomed the steps taken in the SEND transformation programmes to tackle the increase in numbers and the capital investment to provide additional specialist places closer to home so that no-one is left behind. Our early help offers include the Local Learning Fund for targeted early years' help, the graduated response programme and early intervention before needs escalate to the level where an EHCP is needed and partnership working with schools and governing bodies to provide SEN support in mainstream settings and signposting/immediate triage through the L-SPA.

Mr Essex asked a supplementary question in regards to his Member Question (2) querying when environmental sustainability assessments will be considered as part of the process for all decision making items to Cabinet. The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Environment agreed with the views of Mr Essex stating that environmental sustainability assessments will be taken seriously as part of the Organisation Strategy Refresh. The Cabinet Member was happy to discuss the matter offline with Mr Essex and officers.

Mr Essex asked a supplementary question in regards to his Member Question (3) querying if the Equality Impact Assessment would be changed and improved going forward to include factors such as socio economic backgrounds and health and economic aspects. The Leader explained that the process was being reviewed and how various impacts may be tested including health were being considered. It was added that the community impact assessment work had raised a number of issues. Members would be invited to contribute to work to improve Equality Impact Assessments.

Mr Essex asked a supplementary question in regards to his Member Question (4) querying if Bikeability can be offered to all schools who would like more sessions. The Cabinet Member for Transport explained that the size of groups had been reduced due to Covid-19. An increased investment of £510k had also been made to the programme. The number of sessions taken up are dependent on the school as lessons take place during the day in school hours and depend on instructor availability. As long as social distancing and precautions are taking place the council supports more lessons being taken up by schools. Mr Essex was supportive of the response.

#### **147/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were three public questions. The questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda. Mr Ward asked a supplementary question querying if Surrey County Council would share the details with the 11 district and boroughs of the work undertaken by Price Waterhouse Coopers (PwC). The Leader stated that it was a matter for the district and boroughs on whether they shared their KMPG report. The Leader encouraged other district and boroughs leaders to engage with the council. He added that the PwC report deals predominantly with the financial issues and the unitary application. The Leader stated that the council would be happy to engage with KPMG to look at ways district and borough resources could be saved by working collectively with the County.

Ms Sally Blake asked a supplementary question which was when the tree strategy delivery plan would be completed and shared and if it include annual planting targets and sites, including the current tree planting season. The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Environment explained that the delivery mechanism was being brought forward and it wasn't a target to plant 120k trees every year. In some years more trees would be planted than other years. The River Thames Scheme would look to plant thousands of trees at the site. Many sites have been identified for tree planting and partners would also be planting trees. Over 20,000 trees had been planted in Epsom last year and these were not included in the current tree planting figures.

#### **148/20 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were no petitions.

#### **149/20 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

#### **150/20 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

##### **No Wrong Door Task Group**

The report of the No Wrong Door Task Group was introduced by Lesley Steeds who explained that the task group supported the introduction of a no wrong door in Surrey and made nine recommendations relating to the development and implementation of the local service. The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families was thanked for her response to the task group recommendations. The Cabinet response would be considered by the Select Committee on 14 December 2020.

Mr Jonathan Essex explained that he was a Member of the Corporate Parenting Board and queried if it was enough making changes in just two of our children's centres. He also queried why no looked after children and care leavers views were taken into account, although the report notes that this will be considered at implementation. Clarification was sought if the No Wrong Door could be implemented if the signs of safety policy had ended in Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families thanked the task group for the work undertaken. The task group had drawn attention to a number of serious issues that required consideration. Concern was raised around Recommendation 1 and 2 and around accreditation. It was explained that using expertise from other authorities was supported by Ofsted and the model used by North Yorkshire was supported by Ofsted. It was explained that the Chairman of the task group supported the response from Cabinet to recommendations 1 and 2 and understood that the cost for the accreditation would be justified.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families explained that the work done between the no wrong door and corporate parenting was very different. The no wrong door would be used for very short term interventions with teenagers and their parents so they can be reunited. These children would not come into care. It was further explained that although North Yorkshire used the signs of safety model and Surrey used family resilience, both of these were strengths based models of social work practice so there was not sufficient difference between these. With regards to Recommendation 8 of the task group report, as the task group met over the summer over a short space of time, there was limited opportunity to get young people involved. Going forward the user voice and participation team would be involved with the implementation of this work.

##### **Mental Health Task Group**

The report of the Mental Health Task Group was introduced by Nick Darby who explained that the report was presented to the Adults and Health Select Committee on 15 October. An investigation was undertaken from the bottom

up and effectively as the 'patient journey'. Several of the recommendations were highlighted by the Chairman. Significant improvements are required to mental health services and additional resources would be supported. The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health thanked the task group for the work undertaken and welcomed the recommendations, commending all involved. She went on to say that the work was incredibly helpful in terms of raising the profile of mental health and the awareness of the impacts across the system. It was explained that Surrey County Council and Surrey Heartlands ICS would be launching a mental health summit on 19 November to identify the actions needed to address the current challenges and to plan for the future.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families welcomed the mental health summit explaining that there was lots more to do to align children's and adults mental health services. She added that £4.5M had been ring-fenced for children's mental health intervention work. The Deputy Cabinet Member for People added that transitions was vital in mental health services and also supported the summit in November.

**RESOLVED:**

That the No Wrong Door Task Group report and the Mental Health Task Group be noted. Cabinet responses to the task group recommendations were included in the supplementary agenda.

**151/20 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]**

There were five decisions to note. The Fostering Report & Statement of Purpose 2019/20 was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children's, Young People and Families who explained that the report was very clear and explained the strides that had been taken in 2019/20 in terms of recruitment and delivering new models of support for foster carers. The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning introduced the Consultation on Admission Arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools for September 2022 explaining that this was a statutory consultation about proposed changes to admission arrangements for our community and voluntary control schools from September 2022. The Cabinet Member for Transport explained that the Guildford Quality Bus Corridor and Bus Lane Enhancement report was a commitment to bus operators to provide more reliable and punctual journey times and support with bus patronage. The final two decisions were in regards to the Committees in Common.

**RESOLVED:**

That the delegated decisions taken since the last meeting of the Cabinet be noted.

**Reason for decision:**

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken by Cabinet Members, Strategic Investment Board and the Committee in Common subcommittee under delegated authority.

## **152/20 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE [Item 7]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children's, Young People and Families. The progress and achievements of the services were highlighted including the development of an extended and out of hours safeguarding service which was developed during the pandemic. The development of the outreach services provided by Surrey domestic abuse partnership had also continued during the crisis. Details were provided by the Cabinet Member on how the Corporate Parenting Strategy had been implemented which was agreed by Council in February. The Mockingbird Model had been expanded with a third hub being launched in August. £5.5M of Capital had been made available for children services to develop 2 new community children's homes which evidenced putting the child first. Children's Services had also been selected for one of the Surrey County Council corporate digital innovation projects. A further join up between services had been delivered through the L-SPA which was the learners single point of access which would integrate with the C-SPA. The new Director for Children's Services, Rachel Wardell would be joining the council in a month's time.

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning stated that the L-SPA had gone live as a single point of access. The L-SPA was being promoted to agencies and colleagues and has positively impacted the special needs service with 365 calls from 500 calls being resolved at first contact in the first month. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support highlighted the work IT were doing with children's services especially around actively developing the digital roadmap. Work undertaken by children's services in the digital arena had been very comprehensive.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the Cabinet Member update be noted.

## **153/20 COVID- 19 DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN [Item 8]**

There were no delegated and urgent decisions to report.

## **154/20 ORGANISATION STRATEGY REFRESH [Item 9]**

The report was introduced by the Leader who explained that the Vision 2030 had been widely consulted on and contributed to by partners and residents. Covid-19 meant re-looking at how we adjust services. Work undertaken through the community impact assessment has helped identify some longer term needs. The overarching ambitions of the vision remain true but the focus would be narrowed for the immediate term into 4 key areas which include: **Growing a sustainable economy so everyone can benefit, Tackling health inequality, Enabling a greener future and Empowering communities.** The strategy refresh would be considered by Full Council. The Leader expanded on the 4 key priorities in some more detail.

Mr Chris Botten was invited to speak on the item. Mr Botten paid tribute to colleagues who helped develop the strategy refresh stating that tackling health inequality would be challenging in the winter period. Mr Botten stated that he was proud to work for a committed organisation.

### **RESOLVED:**

368

1. That the content of the refreshed Surrey County Council Organisation Strategy is approved and recommended onto the County Council for approval at its meeting on 8 December 2020.

**Reason for Decision:**

Through our experience in responding to the Covid-19 pandemic, our interaction with residents and partners, and analysis of the latest data, we are confident that the 2030 Vision remains the right destination for the county. While the broad ambitions outlined remain valid, the way we get there needs to change, and a sharper focus on a smaller group of priorities will enable us to more effectively prioritise our resources and activity.

We want to use the refreshed Organisation Strategy to reaffirm our commitment to 'no one left behind' in the county and make this the guiding principle underpinning all of our work. The strategy also sets out more clearly our commitments around equality, diversity and inclusion, including setting four new equality objectives.

Alongside the new priority objectives and guiding principle of 'no one left behind', we will continue to deliver the activities and services that contribute towards the ten outcomes set out in the 2030 Vision. The impact of Covid-19 continues to be felt by our communities and this is likely to continue into the future. The activities outlined in the 'We Will' statements in the strategy reflect not only our contribution to the 2030 Vision, but also how we will support the county in its recovery from the effects of the pandemic.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]*

**155/20 DELIVERY OF CARE LEAVERS ACCOMMODATION, A LIBRARY AND FAMILY CENTRE IN CATERHAM HILL [Item 10]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Resources who explained that the report requested £5.6M of capital to be brought forward from the pipeline budget for the proposed scheme into this current financial year. An existing county freehold property would be used to co-locate a library, accommodation for care leavers and a family centre. The approval of the transfer details scheme and the usual planning process will take place with Tandridge Borough Council.

Mr Chris Botten welcomed the proposals stating that the division he represents would welcome care leavers. The proposals would be strongly supported. Mr Botten stated that he was not consulted on the proposals as the report states. The parish council were also unaware of the proposals. Mr Botten offered his support when liaising with the parish council and borough council going forward.

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning stated that the proposals underpin our commitment to improving the library provision in the communities that they currently serve. The current building requires significant maintenance work so this scheme brings forward opportunities earlier than expected. Co-location of services was at the heart of these proposals and will help bring the community together. The Deputy Cabinet Member to the Leader apologised

Mr Botten was not consulted explaining that a lot of consultation work on the new library delivery had not started and would start later this year into 2021. The project would be exciting and would build a legacy over the years to come and would be an exemplar for the rest of the county.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the transfer of £5.6m (excluding VAT) from the pipeline budget for the proposed scheme; redevelopment of the existing library site to provide accommodation for care leavers, a library and Family Centre is approved.
2. That delegated authority be given to the Director of Land and Property and the Cabinet Member for Resources for awarding the contract to redevelop the site which includes construction works.

**Reason for Decision:**

The proposal will provide a new community facility with excellent facilities which will make a positive difference to the lives of local residents and help to regenerate this area of Caterham. When completed, this scheme will provide a well-designed, sustainable building for a range of users.

The proposed scheme offers an opportunity to build on an existing SCC freehold asset.

The proposals would distinctly enhance the quality of accommodation for care leavers.

This will provide for the delivery of a fit for purpose accommodation for community provisions, namely, a library and Family Centre.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee and/ or the Children's, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee]*

**156/20 ADULT SOCIAL CARE HOME BASED CARE RECOMMISSIONING  
OCTOBER 2021 [Item 11]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health who explained that it was a statutory requirement of the Care Act 2014 for the council to provide a Home Based Care service to vulnerable adults in Surrey. Home Based Care services enable and support people to remain independent and living in their own homes for longer and involves a range of social support services for all user groups. The current contracting arrangements agreed by Cabinet in February 2017 end on 30 September 2021. A new contract needs to be in place with selected providers effective from the 1 October 2021. The Deputy Cabinet Member for Place commended the report and work being done to ensure Surrey residents who require support at home continue to receive this high level of care. This report was a great example of integrated work between Surrey County Council and health colleagues.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the commissioning and procurement strategy as set out in the paper is agreed.
2. That the proposal to procure the proposed tender and service specification for Home Based Care services which will be issued in January 2021 be approved with the contracts being awarded in June 2021 with a start date of the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2021 to allow for a period of contract mobilisation.
3. The continuation of joint arrangements to purchase services with the NHS in Surrey be approved.
4. It was agreed that there should be limited service interruption to residents receiving a home based care service package. If a provider does not form part of the new contract arrangements from October 2021, they can continue to support any existing residents with home based care until the package ends or there is a suitable change point for the provision of care.

**Reason for Decision:**

The current contract is set to end in September 2021. It is necessary to release the tender opportunity to the care provider market in January 2021, in order to allow for a thorough review and evaluation of the responses received and for an appropriate mobilisation period of up to 3 months between June and September 2021. This provides an adequate timeframe to facilitate robust procurement and implementation.

Providers will be bidding to join the new Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS).

Cabinet approval is being sought alongside approval from Surrey Heartlands Clinical Commissioning Group (who hosts Continuing Healthcare on behalf of the three Surrey CCGs) to continue the joint arrangements for the operation of the approved provider DPS with the NHS.

The existing procurement and framework have proved successful and the options appraisal for the re-commissioning of the service in 2021 indicates that this remains the preferred approach. The re-commissioning will see changes to the contracting terms and business rules driving further improvement and enhancement to the current arrangement.

It is envisaged that there will be no interruption of services for residents receiving home based care provision at the point where new contracting arrangements commence. There will be no requirement for a provider to cease providing support to existing residents if they are not continuing to provide further support under the new contracting arrangements.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults and Health Select Committee]*

**157/20 DECISION ON THE ROUTE TO MARKET FOR TWO EXTRA CARE HOUSING SCHEMES [Item 12]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health introduced the report explaining that a paper was presented to Cabinet

in July 2019 setting out Adult Social Care's (ASC) Accommodation with Care and Support Strategy for delivering Extra Care Housing for older persons and Independent Living schemes for adults with a learning disability and/or autism. This paper sets out Surrey County Council's proposed route to market for two sites proposed for Extra Care Housing on the Lakeside and Salisbury Road sites owned by the Council. This would support the council's strategy to deliver accommodation with care and support in line with the council's 2030 vision. These sites would provide 136 affordable extra care units which would help us stay on target to deliver our ambitions.

The Cabinet Member for Resources supported the report and also supported the option in the report for the council to undertake the development on its own if required. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support stated that the report was very comprehensive and fully supported the recommendations.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the development of Extra Care Housing on the Lakeside and Salisbury Road sites owned by the Council set out in the paper be approved.
2. That the Extra Care Housing schemes are approved and developed on these sites on the basis that the Council has 100% nomination rights for all of the units. This will mean that all of the units will be available to support people with Adult Social Care needs for whom the Council has a responsibility to commission care and support services to meet their eligible needs.
3. That the following delivery models for the development of Extra Care Housing on Lakeside, Frimley, Surrey Heath and Salisbury Road, Epsom, Epsom and Ewell sites be approved:
  - a. External delivery through the tender for strategic development and housing management partner(s) as the preferred option.
  - b. In-house delivery whereby the Council would manage and fully fund the costs of the developments if the tender for strategic development and housing management partner(s) is not successful.
4. That grants approval to procure in order to enable a full tender process to identify an Extra Care Housing development and housing management strategic partner(s) for the Lakeside, and Salisbury Road sites as set out in this paper be approved.
5. That in the event of in-house delivery, decisions be delegated for:
  - a. the award of contract to a building contractor,
  - b. final agreement on tenure and lease arrangements,
  - c. agreements with the housing management partner,

Collectively to the Executive Director for Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources and Executive Director for

Adult Social Care in consultation with Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care.

**Reason for Decision:**

The development of Extra Care Housing on the two sites set out in this paper will represent a substantial contribution towards the Council's strategic objective to expand affordable Extra Care Housing provision by 2030.

Tendering for strategic development and housing management partner(s) to take forwards the development of Extra Care Housing on the Lakeside and Salisbury Road sites is consistent with previous decisions made by Cabinet. In October 2019 and July 2020 Cabinet agreed to identify a strategic partner(s) for the development and housing management of Extra Care Housing at the former Pond Meadow School, the former Brockhurst Care Home and the former Pinehurst Resource Centre sites through a tender process.

This is consistent with our ASC vision for development of Extra Care Housing, which has been clearly communicated through market and stakeholder engagement.

A tender was published in the Summer 2020 for an Extra Care Housing development and housing management strategic partner at the former Pond Meadow School site. This process provides the Council with learning and a template to inform any future tenders for further Extra Care Housing schemes.

By approving both delivery models for Extra Care Housing on the Lakeside, and Salisbury Road sites, in the event that the tender is not successful, the in-house delivery option can be employed. This will minimise delay in delivering Extra Care Housing at these sites.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults and Health Select Committee]*

**158/20 CATERHAM ON THE HILL AND OLD COULSDON FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME [Item 13]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change who explained that this scheme was part of the wider Surrey Flood Alleviation Scheme to reduce flood risk to 205 properties within the catchment currently at risk. The total scheme cost is £1.95M with a Surrey County Council contribution of up to £14K. The majority of funding will be provided by the Environment Agency defence grant in aid and the River Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee.

Mr Chris Botten welcomed the report and stated that he was well consulted on the proposals in the report. He went onto explain that events of June 2016 were life changing for many residents and that the proposals in the paper would improve quality of life for many. The Leader confirmed that over £30M had been put into schemes across Surrey and hundreds of millions would be put into the River Thames Flood Alleviation Scheme with the Environment Agency.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the addition of the Caterham on the Hill and Old Coulsdon Flood Alleviation Scheme to the Capital Programme is approved through external funding subject to the approval of the Outline Business Case by the Environment Agency.
2. That the approval of any changes to the Outline Business Case is delegated to the Director for Highways and Transport and Strategic Finance Business Partner in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change.
3. That the procurement of the works through the Environment Agency Property Flood Resilience Framework is approved as the scheme was not included in the 2020/21 Annual Procurement Forward Plan approved by Cabinet in January 2020.
4. That the development of the wider flood mitigation measures in the catchment is supported and decisions on individual schemes as they come forward are delegated to the Director for Highways and Transport and Strategic Finance Business Partner in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change.

**Reason for Decision:**

The Caterham on the Hill and Old Coulsdon Flood Alleviation Scheme will reduce the impacts of flooding to 205 properties within the catchment currently at risk.

Recent flooding in the area has caused significant disruption to the area and damage to infrastructure and properties. The long term impacts on residents' lives cannot be underestimated, and these proposals will offer protection and some comfort to those living with the threat of flooding to their homes.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee]*

**159/20 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL RESILIENCE PLANNING FOR WINTER 2020/21 [Item 14]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Communities. The report details the important and ongoing work of Surrey County Council and services, demonstrating the agility of our resilience to support the organisation and plan resilience of our services. The report covers the imminent end of the EU exit transition period, and the normal seasonal health and non-health related pressures. The report gave assurances around structures and important relationships and processes in place to manage challenging periods. It was added that a 6 week PPE buffer was in place.

With regards to highways, the Cabinet Member for Transport explained that work was being undertaken to ensure freight and traffic was not negatively impacted as part of the EU transition period especially to the east of Surrey. Winter contingency was being developed and the county was well stocked with grit and salt. The Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health felt the county was well prepared for the winter period and key challenges. Key challenges the Cabinet Member was focused on included development of the PPE supply chain.

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning stated that through the Local Resilience Forum, we had very quickly responded to the gap where children in receipt of free school meals may not receive that provision in school holidays. Working with district and boroughs a long term plan would be established to ensure food is available through food banks or other local arrangements. The Leader stated that people who required support should look on the County Councils website for contact details.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the work being undertaken by services across the Council with partners to ensure the business continuity of the services provided to residents and communities across the county be noted.

**Reason for Decision:**

The Council and partners across Surrey face a challenging period over the Autumn and Winter period 2020/21, and the risks and threats facing the authority require services to ensure that they have planned for potential disruption. This kind of organisational resilience requires a robust understanding of the likely threats and risks, but also effective and tested business continuity plans that aim to minimise the negative impacts of such disruption to services on residents and customers served. In addition, it is vital that the Council has effective cross-Council arrangements in place to support an effective response when an incident arises.

As a local authority providing critical services to communities, Surrey County Council has a responsibility to prepare for such threats to business continuity, as well as in its capacity as a Category 1 responder under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 to contribute to multi-agency planning and response.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]*

**160/20 SURREY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2020 [Item 15]**

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health explained that the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board (SSAB) was a statutory multi-agency Board with responsibilities set out in the Care Act 2014. The Board were commended on the improved formatting and presentation of data in the annual report. The report highlights the responsiveness of agencies in Surrey in terms of keeping safeguarding adults at the forefront of all that we do. The Independent Chair of the SSAB, Simon Turpitt introduced the report stating that he hoped everyone enjoyed the new format of the report. He explained that there had been some positive impacts from Covid-19 including partners better working together. The past year had seen an increase in referrals and there has been improved quality in Section 42 arrangements. The Independent Chair made a plea that everyone try and get involved in national safeguarding week which takes place week commencing 22 November 2020.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families reiterated the importance of considering the child at every point of contact when an adult with safeguarding concerns is being reviewed. The Independent Chair stated

the importance of both children's and adults services recognising vulnerabilities and communicating these with partners.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Annual Report for 2019/2020 be noted.

**Reason for Decision:**

This recommendation demonstrates that the Council is fulfilling its statutory requirement under the Care Act 2014 in having established a Safeguarding Adults Board in its area.

It will support the SSAB to be transparent by providing information to the public on the performance of the Board and its strategic plan.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults and Health Select Committee]*

**161/20 SURREY WASTE LOCAL PLAN: ADOPTION [Item 16]**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change introduced the report explaining that the Waste Plan was nearing the end following an examination in public in September 2019. The Inspector who examined the Plan found the Plan sound and legally compliant, so the Council is now able to adopt the Plan. Waste planning is rarely popular and certain communities will be unhappy with the Plan but the County Council has a statutory duty to produce local plans for mineral and waste in order to ensure sufficient capacity. The Waste Plan is 12 years old and is out of date. Trumps Farm under the new Plan will solely be used to facilitate the development of a household waste materials dry recovery facility and not a gasifier. Weylands was reviewed by the Inspector and it was concluded that the site should still be included in the Plan. Routing to the site would be controlled.

The Cabinet Member for Resources welcomed the assurances made that the Waste and Mineral Plan refresh will take place and will consolidate the two Plans and appropriate site selections will be reviewed.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report of the Inspector who examined the Surrey Waste Local Plan as set out in Annex 1 be noted.
2. That Council adopts the Surrey Waste Local Plan, including the Policies Map, as set out in Annexes 2 and 3, at its meeting on 8 December 2020.
3. That the publication be approved alongside the adopted Surrey Waste Local Plan the required post-adoption environmental statement, as set out in Annex 4.

**Reason for Decision:**

The Surrey Waste Local Plan contains updated planning policy affecting the management of waste in Surrey and, with modifications, has been found

sound and legally compliant following examination by an independent Planning Inspector. Council's adoption of the Surrey Waste Local Plan (as modified) will mean that it forms part of the formal Development Plan for Surrey and will be used when making decisions on planning applications for related development in Surrey.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee]*

### **162/20 STREET LIGHTING PFI CONTRACT - REFINANCING [Item 17]**

The Cabinet Member for Transport updated the Cabinet on the current contract in place with Surrey Lighting Services. Despite Covid-19 initial analysis was carried out by the provider to check if there was any gain by refinancing the project debt. The service provider undertook a desktop assessment and it indicated there was significant net gain from refinancing with the council receiving a substantial return. Engagement was undertaken with potential lenders and formal commencement of refinancing was agreed. There would be no more than 10% value difference in the council share of the refinancing gain. Best value for the tax payer was being achieved through this refinancing.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the application of the contract mechanism to refinance the Street Lighting contract which will result in a saving to the Council in the amount it pays for these services either as an annual cost reduction, a one-off saving or a combination of both be approved in principle.
2. That the final decision be delegated to the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure (ETI) and the Executive Director for Resources, in consultation with Cabinet Member for Transport and Cabinet Member for Resources.

#### **Reason for Decision:**

The principal of refinancing the street lighting PFI contract has been explored a few times over the past 10 years and until now any financial benefit from doing so has been outweighed by the costs associated with the refinancing itself. Despite the latest review having been conducted in the months since Covid-19 has impacted the Country, the refinancing gain available has improved significantly.

The balance of the financial return from refinancing is assessed to outweigh any amended/increased risk to the Council.

If the Council were not to proceed with the refinancing exercise, it would be paying more for the service than it needed to and so would not be securing Best Value.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee]*

## **163/20 SURREY ECONOMIC STRATEGY 2030 UPDATE [Item 18]**

The Leader explained that the full strategy would be presented to Cabinet in December. The Economic Commission was set up in 2019 and comprised of a number of business people, chaired by Lord Hammond. The Commission looked at ways to grow the Surrey economy. There are other significant factors the county needs to be cognisant of including the exit from the EU, climate change and the impact of digitalisation. The Commission made a number of recommendations. The government would be pushed for a growth deal which would require a county wide approach.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the progress taken on the development of the Surrey 2030 Economic Strategy and the proposed process of engagement and approval be noted.
2. That the final strategy be presented to Cabinet in December 2020.

### **Reason for Decision:**

Cabinet is receiving this update to ensure that the process of engaging and consulting on the 2030 Economic Strategy is inclusive and that Members are aware of the wider context and emerging themes; this will give all stakeholders the opportunity to contribute to the Strategy in advance of it being presented for approval in December 2020.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]*

## **164/20 BROADWATER SECONDARY SCHOOL, GODALMING, SURREY [Item 19]**

The Report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning who explained the school would expand from 4 forms of entry and 120 Published Admission Number per year (600 places overall) to 5 forms of entry and 150 Published Admission Number per year (750 places overall) to help meet the demand for 150 additional secondary places in Waverley from September 2021. The local Member, Penny Rivers was consulted on proposals and is happy with proposals. The school had been rated as good by Ofsted in 2019 and officers are confident the school can take additional pupils. There are no proposals to amend the admission criteria for the school.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That subject to the approval of the detailed financial information as set out in the Part 2 report, the business case for the expansion of Broadwater School, creating an additional 150 school places be 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 can be called in by the Children's, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee]*

## **165/20 PRUDENTIAL RIDE LONDON-SURREY [Item 20]**

The Cabinet Member for Communities provided details of the Prudential Ride London Surrey (PRLS) cycling events which were conceived as an Olympic Legacy and have taken place in Surrey annually since August 2013. The main 100-mile event route is based upon the route for the 2012 Olympic cycling road race events. The event requires a number of road closures and for 2021 event organisers are planning a shorter event which would focus on women and families. A consultation was undertaken on the future of the event beyond 2021 and there was a marginal majority of 53% in favour of the event. Lengthy discussions took place with event organisers around financial contributions towards a cycle scheme for pupils but this was not successful. The council would therefore focus on smaller events working alongside Active Surrey and with active travel proposals.

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning stated that the race impacted her division and that residents had strong feelings on both sides of the argument. Cycling pelotons throughout the year caused disruption to residents and residents felt that they have done their fair share of hosting the event. Cycling events could and would be organised locally. The Cabinet Member for Transport stated his disappointment that the organisers of the event did not want to support with the funding of Bikeability. The County Council would therefore fund the scheme themselves.

The Leader explained that he had ridden the race three times but recognition of the disruption caused needed to be taken seriously. The Council would be open to further conversations with organisers but financial benefits needed to be taken seriously.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Surrey County Council continues to work with the event organiser to maximise the benefits to Surrey and mitigate any potential negative impacts of the shorter sportive/inspiration ride event scheduled for May 2021 (subject to the implications of the COVID pandemic and any associated restrictions).
2. That Surrey County Council does not continue to host the original 100 mile-event closed road event in Surrey after 2021 but that the council will remain open-minded to and explore opportunities for smaller, less disruptive events (subject to the COVID pandemic and any associated restrictions) that might inspire cycling for everyday journeys, rather than events focussed primarily on sports cycling.

### **Reason for Decision:**

There are reasonable arguments in favour of continuing to support the 100-mile closed road event such as inspiring more cycling, generating grants for sporting and recreation organisations in Surrey and raising money for national charities. However, these benefits are set against the strong concerns from many Surrey residents over the disruption and negative impact on local

businesses and services from the event, and concerns over anti-social behaviour of a small minority of sports cyclists.

With these finely balanced arguments in mind, a better deal for Surrey residents was sought from the event organisers to ensure that the negative impacts of the event on local communities was sufficiently outweighed by the benefits to the wider community. These efforts were led by the Leader, Cabinet Member and relevant senior officers, and specifically sought a financial contribution to provide thousands more children with cycle training across Surrey's schools, but regrettably this commitment was not forthcoming from London Marathon Events.

However, there are smaller events that could be hosted in the county that are less disruptive events and would build on the County Council's existing services to inspire and enable more people to cycle for everyday journeys. This approach would more closely align with the Council's corporate objectives, compared with longer events focused primarily on sports cycling.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee]*

#### **166/20 2020/21 MONTH 5 (AUGUST) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 21]**

The Cabinet Member for Resources explained that at August 2020 (M5) the Council is forecasting a deficit of £9.0m, against a budget of £1,019.7m. The main factors being £12.1m through continuing pressures in the Children, Families and Lifelong Learning Directorate. There was also a £3.1m variance in waste. These variances had been offset through £4.7m of increased grant income received and more favourable outlooks for the year by adult social care and central income and expenditure. He reiterated that work is being undertaken to pursue every opportunity to ensure that the year ends with a balanced budget without the use of reserves. The Cabinet were asked to note the establishment of an early years recovery fund. The Executive Director for Resources, Leigh Whitehouse was congratulated on winning CIPFA finance leader of the year. The finance team were highly commended. The Cabinet commended the service on their hard work and dedication.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year be noted.
2. That the establishment of an Early Years recovery fund to support providers' financial sustainability, included within the current forecast be approved.
3. That the reset to the 2020/21 capital budget including accelerated delivery of £6m of Highways Maintenance be approved.

#### **Reason for Decision:**

This report is to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval of any necessary actions.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]*

#### **167/20 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 22]**

**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.

#### **168/20 DECISION ON THE ROUTE TO MARKET FOR TWO EXTRA CARE HOUSING SCHEMES [Item 23]**

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced a Part 2 report that contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. It be noted that the financial modelling set out in this paper and associated annexes demonstrates that the development of Extra Care Housing on the sites in question is expected to generate financial benefits for the Council in addition to representing an important contribution to the Council's strategic aim to develop an additional 725 affordable units of Extra Care Housing in Surrey by 2028.
2. That capital investment in the development of Extra Care Housing on the sites out of the [Exempt Minutes E-17-20] pipeline funding already approved in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) be approved for this programme as follows:
  - a) Up to [Exempt Minutes E-17-20] for Lakeside and [Exempt Minutes E-17-20] for Salisbury Road if contributions towards developments costs are required by the Council as part of a tender for development and strategic housing management partner(s), which is the recommended delivery approach.
  - b) Up to [Exempt Minutes E-17-20] for Lakeside and [Exempt Minutes E-17-20] for Salisbury Road if the tender for development and strategic housing management partner(s) is not successful, meaning that the development of Extra Care Housing is instead managed in house and fully funded by the Council.

#### **Reason for decision:**

This paper sets out the financial case underpinning the development of Extra Care Housing on the sites in question.

Cabinet is asked to approve the potential capital investment required for both of the two delivery approaches set out in the Part 1 paper – external delivery through a tender for development and strategic housing management partner(s) and in-house delivery whereby the Council would manage and fully fund the costs of development.

As set out further in this paper, external delivery through a tender is recommended as the desired delivery approach as it is modelled to achieve a greater financial return over the initial 40 year estimated life of the assets. The aim will be to avoid or limit as far as possible any capital investment by the Council. Capital investment will only be considered if the winning bidder in the tender for each site requires it as part of their tendered proposal for the development of Extra Care Housing at a site. The level of capital investment Cabinet which is being asked to be approved here has been capped at the estimate existing use value of each site. This means that the modelled financial benefits of developing Extra Care Housing on each site would be no less than the opportunity cost of selling the land. If a higher level of capital investment is required for either site following the outcome of the tender, then the Extra Care project team will consider whether this is financially viable and acceptable to the Council. A further report would then be brought back to Cabinet if appropriate to request approval for additional capital investment above the levels set out in recommendation 2a above.

If the tender for development and strategic housing management partner(s) is not successful, then Cabinet is asked to approve capital investment to cover the estimated full costs of development. As set out in this paper, although in-house delivery is not modelled to fully repay the capital outlay over a 40 year period, it is expected to generate care package savings and to achieve a financial return beyond the initial 40 year life of the assets. The development of Extra Care Housing would increase the land value of the sites, create an asset for the provision of Extra Care Housing, as well as making an important contribution to reaching the Council's strategic ambition. Furthermore, if in-house delivery did become the only viable option, then the Council would re-explore the possibility of securing some form of funding or investment by other public bodies such as Homes England in the sites. This could reduce the scale of capital investment required by the Council and in doing so increase the Council's net financial return.

If Cabinet approves the capital investment requested for the two sites in this paper, then capital funding within the limits approved will be moved from the Council's capital pipeline to the Council's capital budget as required based on the outcome of the tender for strategic housing management partner(s) or if necessary to fund the full cost of developments if in-house delivery becomes the only viable option.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults and Health Select Committee]*

#### **169/20 STREET LIGHTING PFI CONTRACT - REFINANCING [Item 24]**

The Cabinet Member for Transport introduced a Part 2 report that contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs

of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the application of the contract mechanism to refinance the Street Lighting contract which will result in a saving to the Council in the amount it pays for these services as an annual cost reduction of approximately [Exempt Minutes E-18-20] and a one-off upfront payment of approximately [Exempt Minutes E-18-20] payable upon completion of the Refinancing which is expected to be completed in November 2020 be approved in principle.
2. That completion of the negotiation and execution of the final details of the Refinancing including a Deed of Variation be delegated to the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure (ETI) and the Executive Director for Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Cabinet Member for Resources in line with the tolerance set out in paragraph 28.

**Reason for decision:**

See Minute 162/20.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee]*

**170/20 BROADWATER SECONDARY SCHOOL, GODALMING, SURREY [Item 25]**

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning introduced a Part 2 report that contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the business case for the project to expand Broadwater School by 150 places, at a total cost to Surrey County Council of [Exempt Minutes E-19-20] be approved.
2. That the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% of the total value may be agreed by the Director of Land & Property in consultation with the Cabinet Member for All Age Learning, the Cabinet Member for Finance and the Leader of the Council be approved.
3. That the award of contract for works be delegated to the Director of Land & Property in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for All Age Learning, Procurement Partner (Infrastructure and City) Strategic Procurement Team and Section 151 Officer when a competitive tender is procured through the new Orbis Construction Framework.

**Reason for decision:**

See Minute 164/20.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children's, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee]*

**171/20 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 26]**

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

Meeting closed at 17:00

---

**Chairman**