

MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to the Democratic Services Lead Manager by 12 noon on Monday 14 October 2013.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 23 JULY 2013 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

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

Cabinet Associates:

Mr Steve Cossar	*Mrs Kay Hammond
Mrs Clare Curran	*Miss Marisa Heath

* = Present

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

85/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Michael Gosling and from Cabinet Associates Mr Steve Cossar and Mrs Clare Curran.

86/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 25 JUNE 2013 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2013 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

87/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

88/13 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

Three questions had been received from a Member. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 1 to these Minutes**.

Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East) asked a supplementary question relating to the evidence base on which council officers had based their professional judgement on this matter. It was agreed that the Assistant Director, Environment would provide a response in writing, noting that any commercially sensitive information would not be included.

(b) PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

Six questions had been received for the meeting from members of the public. The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as **Appendix 2 to these Minutes**.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

- Mr Malcolm Robertson stated concerns about air pollution and potential risk of fire and asked that the plans for an Eco Park be abandoned. The Chairman advised that the points raised would be covered in the discussion on the Waste Contract item in the main part of the meeting.
- Mr John Seaman asked a supplementary question in relation to whether the proposals before the Cabinet would address the amount of waste going to landfill over the next 25 years and about the use of bottom ash from the Eco Park, noting that the London Eco Park used bottom ash as aggregate replacement material rather than sending it to landfill. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment noted that he had received a number of questions prior to the meeting, including in relation to bottom ash, and that these would receive written responses. The Waste Strategy addressed the 160,000 tonnes currently going to landfill, of which gasification would account for 45,000 tonnes. The council would continue to invest time and effort into reducing waste and increasing recycling, this would include looking at potential uses of bottom ash.
- Mr Peter Crews asked a supplementary question as to the value for money provided by Option 1 in the report to Cabinet on the Waste Contract and whether the Cabinet was satisfied with the assessment provided. The Chairman advised that the points would be covered in the discussion on the Waste Contract item in the main part of the meeting.
- Mr Ian Robinson had submitted a supplementary question in relation to the council's ability to evaluate best value and alternatives within the context of its current Waste Contract. The Chairman noted that a written response would be sent following the meeting.

(c) PETITIONS [Item 4c]

No petitions had been received.

(d) REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

No representations had been received.

89/13 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

(a) ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE - SOCIAL CAPITAL [Item 5a]

The recommendation of the Adult Social Care Select Committee had been circulated with the agenda. The response of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care was tabled at the meeting and is attached as **Appendix 3 to these Minutes**.

(b) COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE - MAGNA CARTA ANNIVERSARY [Item 5b]

The recommendations of the Communities Select Committee were tabled at the meeting. The Cabinet considered the recommendations under agenda item 12 and agreed that a written response would be provided after the meeting.

90/13 AMENDMENT TO WASTE CONTRACT TO DELIVER THE WASTE STRATEGY [Items 15 and 21]

The County Council, along with all Surrey waste authorities, had adopted a Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. The Strategy sets out a plan for managing household waste in Surrey until 2026, with a series of ambitious targets for Surrey's local authorities relating to reducing household waste, increasing recycling and diverting household waste from landfill. As part of the delivery of the strategy, and following extensive consultation, planning and waste site permissions had been granted for an Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton.

The Cabinet, having been updated on significant developments in the approach to waste and having previously been advised of the current status of the Eco Park and grant support from DEFRA to the waste contract, had agreed technology changes at its previous meeting on 25 June 2013. Council officers had also been instructed to continue to progress work to vary the Waste Contract between the Council and SITA Surrey to reflect the changes necessary to deliver the proposed waste solutions.

An assessment of the financial, legal, procurement and affordability aspects of the options supported an amendment to the Waste Contract with SITA Surrey to deliver the Waste Strategy including the Eco Park. Cabinet Members considered the value for money presented by the options, the points raised during public question time and heard representations from Mr Richard Walsh (Laleham and Shepperton) regarding value for money, pollution concerns and requesting that the matter be given further consideration. During the discussion on this item, the following points were made:

- The options before the Cabinet were felt to be full and fair. An enormous amount of work had been put into developing Waste Strategy proposals, including the employment of expert advice and consultation with thousands of households.
- Cabinet Members confirmed that the evidence provided, including the detailed financial information contained in the confidential annex

circulated with Part 2 of the agenda, supported Option 1 as affordable and the best value for money for Surrey and UK taxpayers.

- The evidence showed Options 2, 3 and 4 to terminate the Waste Contract were less affordable, open to increased risk from changing market conditions or would not meet reductions in the amount to be sent to landfill leaving the Council risking an increasing landfill tax burden on Surrey residents.
- Option 1, including the delivery of an Eco Park, would provide multiple benefits including enabling 45,000 tonnes to be diverted from landfill, reducing carbon emissions by 20,000 tonnes and would generate power for 8,000 homes in the process.
- Surrey had taken enormous strides in reducing waste and had outperformed many authorities in this area. The Council took this duty seriously and officers would continue to examine ways of reducing both the amount of waste created and the amount sent to landfill. This would include examining markets for materials that might otherwise end up in landfill.
- The technological aspects of the proposals had been considered at the previous meeting. The Council had performed the necessary due diligence in relation to the environmental and safety aspects of the waste infrastructure and would continue to do so. Work had already taken place in securing the relevant planning and waste permissions and this would continue with any revised applications. The Council would also continue to look to DEFRA, the Environment Agency and other government agencies and regulators for the most rigorous safety assessments.
- Cabinet Members noted the conditions which had been set out in paragraphs 23 and 24 of the report and would need to be satisfied before the final commitment to the contract and the construction of the Eco Park. These included confirmation of financial, legal and contractual acceptability, variation to the existing planning permission, the fulfillment of outstanding conditions and amendment to the environmental permit.
- Cabinet Members were assured of the worldwide reputation of the Council's contractual partner and the quality of the parent company guarantee provided.
- It was noted that there were no equalities implications arising from the proposed variation of the Waste Contract. All planning and safety requirements for infrastructure would be complied with in full, including risk assessments and evacuation plans as necessary.

The Leader noted that council officers would need to ensure that any changes to the contract did not affect the economic balance between the Council and SITA, including avoiding the Council taking on any new risk. The financial assessment from the S151 Finance Officer had been provided and this analysis would need to be updated following the completion of negotiations. Officers would also continue to work closely with the Department for Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Waste Contract be varied to reflect the changes necessary to deliver our Waste Strategy including the Eco Park, subject to relevant conditions being met (as described in paragraphs 23 and 24 of the report submitted).

2. The Council enter into a Direct Agreement with SITA Holdings Ltd for the purpose of the Waste Contract and provides a Local Government (Contracts) Act Certificate in relation to the Direct Agreement.
3. The Strategic Director (Environment and Infrastructure) be authorised to agree any subsequent changes to the proposed variation to the Waste Contract to deliver the Waste Strategy including the Eco Park, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and the Environment, and advised by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Chief Finance Officer.

Reason for decisions

To provide proper authority to deliver the Waste Strategy, including the Eco Park which represents a corporate priority for the Council, enter into contractual commitments and provide assurance to contractual and funding partners to the Council.

91/13 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2013-18, QUARTER ONE 2013/14 REVIEW [Item 6]

The Chairman introduced the review of the Council's financial plan and accompanying reports on the agenda relating to the further development and implementation of the corporate strategy for the next five years. This followed on from the Chief Executive's 6 month report and discussion of the Corporate Strategy at the County Council meeting on 16 July 2013. These documents demonstrated the significant progress that had already been achieved and set out plans to ensure that the future of Surrey was secure. The Council's success had been based on three pillars – taking a long term approach to financial planning and service delivery, being innovative in facing difficult challenges and working as One Team with partners, businesses and residents. Taken together, the reports before Cabinet set out the financial conditions faced by the authority following the recent Government Spending Round and the way Surrey County Council proposed to build on its previous successes to address these challenges and deliver the Corporate Strategy.

The Council faced stark choices in the coming months with demand for its services rising continually. Surrey would receive £24m less in government grant this year, with a further £16m reduction predicted next year as a result of the Government Spending Round 2013. At the same time, the increasing birth rate and service demand meant that a further £93m was needed for school places and £113m for adult social care over the next four years. Savings would only meet part of this gap. One potential alternative would be to spend less, however this would mean difficult decisions on services for older people, the provisions of classrooms and improvements to roads, all of which residents valued and supported the local economy.

It was too early to set out what would be done in response, however officers would be instructed to develop realistic options for the budget planning process. The figures provided by the Government showed an expectation that council tax would need to rise. The Cabinet noted that the government figures did not align with central government requests for local tax freezes and that, in the circumstances, such a freeze would represent a reduction in the funding of services provided for the residents of Surrey.

Sir Merrick Cockell had noted that local government was by far the most efficient section of the public sector, however the further 10% cut in grant meant that it had again been the hardest hit. Surrey had consistently shown that it had the skills and ability to deliver public services efficiently and in accordance with local wishes, however it had to be realistic in the choices it now faced. Savings and reserves could only be spent once and had to be used sensibly.

The Cabinet noted key recent successes achieved by the Council. These included national recognition by the Employers Network in the area of equality and inclusion. Surrey employee Mr Abid Dhar had won the Equality Champion of the Year Award, ahead of competition from 300 national employers such as BT, EDF, IBM and the BBC. This had been a huge endorsement of the individual, the team and the council and showed the trust, leadership and commitment to equality displayed. The Council had also won a 'Libraries change lives' award, including work on tackling domestic abuse, and had also been recognised with awards in the economic arena. The Cabinet congratulated all staff on the achievements. The Chairman noted the key role played by Mrs Kay Hammond as the Cabinet lead on equality and diversity and thanked her for her work over recent years.

Cabinet Members provided updates on the pressures within their respective service areas and work being done both locally and in making the case to central government. It was noted that the demand led pressures in Surrey, for example in terms of social care, were not always appreciated by those outside the county and this lack of understanding always needed to be actively challenged.

The Chairman noted the limit to savings that could reasonably be made. A reduction of £280million out of £1.8billion of costs meant that tough decisions needed to be faced and the Government's figures pointed to more money being raised from business rates and council tax.

RESOLVED that:

1. The potential implications of Spending Round 2013 (SR2013) on the county council's budget position be noted.
2. The proposed MTFP 2013-18 budget assumption changes in light of new information available since February 2013 (paragraphs 13 to 22 of the report submitted) be noted
3. The MTFP 2013-18 be revised to:
 - a). amend the capital programme to include an additional £95m in relation to school basic need and short stay schools for 2013-18 and £0.7m provisional expenditure in relation to the 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta.
 - b). reflect additional revenue budget spend from 2014-18 for:
 - revenue costs of additional capital programme items (£7.4m)
 - unachievable savings targets included in existing MTFP of £0.8m and
 - additional Surrey Fire & Rescue Service spending pressures (£2.0m)

- the provisional contribution to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta (£0.3m in 2014/15 only)
- c). add the level of additional savings that services have identified, which can realistically be delivered for 2014-18 (£56.0m in 2014-18, £19.5m in 2014/15)
 - d). agree the predicted scale of currently unallocated savings required in 2014-18 if recommendations 3a-3c above are supported (£52.6m for 2014-18 and £25.6m for 2014/15).
 - e). recognise that the remaining currently unallocated savings (£52.6m in 2014-18, £25.6m in 2014/15) would need to be met through further savings and/or increased income to ensure a balanced and sustainable budget could be prepared for 2014/15 onwards.
4. That officers continue to work to identify realistic options for discussion with stakeholders and members during the next phase of the budget planning process for preparing a balanced and sustainable budget for 2014/15 onwards.

Reason for decisions

In setting the MTFP 2013-18, the Cabinet agreed to undertake a review in the first quarter of 2013/14 to take account of the need to revise any of the budget assumptions in the light of progress with efficiencies and spending reductions, any impact of the revised Corporate and Directorate Strategies and implications of SR2013.

92/13 INVESTMENT STRATEGY [Item 7]

The Council is committed to the importance of innovation in the delivery of services in the interests of Surrey residents and businesses. The Investment Strategy would support the development of a portfolio of investments, covering investment in property and assets and in new models for service delivery. This would generate additional income to enhance financial resilience in the longer term and be used to support the council's functions and the delivery of services. In addition these arrangements would also allow for investment in schemes that would support economic growth in Surrey in accordance with the Investment Strategy.

The Cabinet noted the steps already taken to enhance income and change ways of working. The use of shared premises with other authorities had already created savings of £3.5m and it was important to ensure that every asset was similarly fully utilised. An Investment Advisory Board would advise Cabinet on implementation of the Investment Strategy and, subject to consideration of a full business case, a Property Investment Company could be established following future consideration by the Cabinet.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Investment Strategy including the proposed process that will determine which investment opportunities come forward for decision by Cabinet be approved.
2. The governance arrangements be approved and an Investment Advisory Board be established comprising four Cabinet Members

supported by appropriate officers (including the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer) who will consider individual investment opportunities and provide advice to Cabinet on investment decisions.

3. The commencement of the procurement process for the appointment of an Investment Advisor or Advisors to provide advice to the Council be approved, with contract award being approved in line with the standard process.
4. A full business case for the establishment of a Property Investment Company to be wholly owned by the County Council be developed by the Strategic Director for Business Services and be presented for consideration at a future Cabinet meeting.

Reason for decisions

The Investment Strategy will provide a framework for investing in innovative solutions and opportunities that enable the council to maintain its financial resilience and increase income whilst providing effective services.

93/13 THE COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO INNOVATION: UPDATE REPORT [Item 8]

On 27 November 2012 the Cabinet approved the development of a strategic framework to achieve a strong "One Team" approach to innovation ("ideas into action to improve lives in Surrey"). This recognised that over the coming years the Council would need to continue to strengthen its capacity and capability to innovate in order to continue improving outcomes and value for money for Surrey's residents. A subsequent update on 26 March 2013 set out progress on establishing the overall strategic innovation framework, encompassing the leadership, culture, skills and tools required to support innovation over the long term.

The Cabinet considered the impact of an "innovation hub" approach (called "Shift"), designed to accelerate and systematise innovation capacity and capability within the Council. Key lessons had been learnt from the first six months of the initiative and Cabinet Members expressed their support for the continued implementation and development of this approach over the medium term. The Chairman noted the success of the Shift room in supporting innovative thinking and advised that the investment had proved to be great value.

RESOLVED that:

1. The good progress made so far to strengthen the Council's innovation capacity and capability, including the achievements and learning from the first six months of the Council's approach - called "Shift" - to accelerate and systematise innovation be acknowledged.
2. It be agreed to continue developing and implementing the "Shift" approach to innovation over the medium term planning period.
3. Following the review by the Investment Panel on 24 June 2013, the use of up to £0.3m from the Invest to Save Fund in 2013/14 and up to a maximum of £0.6m per year until 2016/17 to fund the "Shift" programme be approved.

4. The Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Business Services, continue to develop and implement the “Shift” approach using Invest to Save Funding as required to support this, reviewing progress and plans six monthly.

Reason for decisions

To further refine and strengthen the Council's approach to innovation over the medium term so it can exploit new opportunities, navigate significant challenges and achieve improved outcomes and value for money for Surrey's residents.

94/13 PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFORMATION [Item 9]

The Council is working closely with partners to develop its plans for public service transformation in Surrey. This includes a shared expressed ambition to develop a community budget approach in Surrey. At the LGA Conference on 3 July 2013 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government announced that Surrey had been successful in being appointed as one of the areas to work intensively with the new Public Service Transformation Network on public service transformation. The Network will aim to disseminate the learning from the Government's whole place community budget pilots and encourage application of the principles to a larger number of areas.

The six strands of focus for Surrey's Public Service Transformation programme were:

- Emergency Services Collaboration - transforming the way the emergency services in Surrey work together
- The Surrey Family Support Programme - improving the effectiveness and efficiency of partnership working and early interventions with families, as Surrey's response to the Government's 'Troubled Families' initiative
- Dementia Friendly Communities - improving outcomes for people with dementia and reducing reliance on acute care, by providing a greater level of support for individuals, both within and by their communities
- Better Use of Public Sector Assets - giving additional impetus to existing work on rationalisation of the public estate in Surrey to reduce its overall size and cost,
- Increasing Youth Participation - building on the success in reducing the number of young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEETs) in the county
- Transforming Justice - focusing on more integrated working and case coordination to reduce offending and reoffending, reducing costs to the police and criminal justice system.

The Cabinet noted that the proposals were a way of both saving public money and making things work better for the benefit of all residents. Ministers and senior civil servants had been very impressed with what they had seen in Surrey and this had been represented in the success of the bid.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government's endorsement and recognition of Surrey's approach to public service

transformation be welcomed and support for the forward programme of work be confirmed.

2. Officers develop outline business cases for consideration at the October 2013 Cabinet meeting.

Reason for decisions

The Council is working closely with partners to develop its plans for public service transformation in Surrey. Public service transformation will significantly improve services and outcomes for Surrey residents and generate financial savings. By working as “one team” with partners, public service transformation will focus resources away from expensive, high cost responses towards prevention and earlier intervention.

95/13 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2012/13 [Item 10]

Surrey County Council has a statutory duty under the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011 to publish an Annual Governance Statement (AGS). The AGS provides a comprehensive assessment of governance arrangements and the internal control environment. Once signed by the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive, the AGS is incorporated into the Statement of Accounts and the Annual Report.

The Chairman advised that he and the Chief Executive had attended the Audit & Governance Committee to answer questions and that the Chairman and the Committee had been satisfied with the Annual Governance Statement. Council’s focus would always be on providing taxpayers with maximum value for money. Robust governance arrangements were important as the organisation looked to achieve further efficiencies through difficult decisions.

RESOLVED that:

1. The 2012/13 Annual Governance Statement (attached as Annex 1 to the report submitted) be approved and signed by the Leader and the Chief Executive for inclusion in the Statement of Accounts and Annual Report.
2. The Audit and Governance Committee continue to monitor the governance environment and report to Cabinet as appropriate.

Reason for decisions

To comply with the statutory duty to annually review and report on governance and meet best practice through a responsive approach to addressing governance and internal control issues identified.

96/13 CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES DIRECTORATE ANNUAL REPORT [Item 11]

The Children, Schools and Families Directorate Annual Report summarised the key achievements and progress made over the past financial year. The report was themed under the four areas of priority, which are set out in the directorate’s children and young people’s strategy 2012-17: prevention, protection, participation and potential.

The Cabinet Members for Children and Families and Schools and Learning gave examples of how the directorate was working towards the vision that 'Every child and young person will be safe, healthy, creative, and have the personal confidence, skills and opportunities to contribute and achieve more than they thought possible'. The Council provided services to each of the 272,800 children and young people aged under 19 in the county. The Children, Schools and Families Directorate did this in a child focus way, striving to give each the very best start in life. The additional investment in school improvement had created increased parental choice in school admissions, with 95% being placed in one of their preferred primary schools and with an overall satisfaction rate of 97%.

The Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services highlighted the significant achievements with regard to the restorative justice approach to youth justice. This had led to a 90% reduction in first time entrants to the youth justice system in the last 5 years (the lowest per capita in England), only 15 young people receiving custodial sentences and a 43% reduction in youth crime over the past three years. The Youth Support service and successful apprenticeship scheme meant that young people were well served in the county. This was an achievement for both the young people and those who worked with them.

The Cabinet acknowledged the hard work of all staff and the leadership within the directorate which had contributed to the significant successes over the past year.

RESOLVED that:

1. The progress made in the Children, Schools and Families Directorate and achievements over the last year be noted.
2. The publication of the Children, Schools and Families Directorate annual report on the Surrey County Council website and s-net be approved.

Reason for decisions

The publication of the Children, Schools and Families Directorate annual report will demonstrate how the directorate is providing value for money for Surrey residents. It will show how the directorate has performed over the last year, and what has been achieved.

97/13 MAGNA CARTA ANNIVERSARY [Item 12]

In June 2015, the world will celebrate the 800th Anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta at Runnymede. Through clear strategic leadership, Surrey had been working with the Magna Carta 800th Committee, the Houses of Parliament and all other Charter Towns to provide a co-ordinated plan of activities across the nation and to promote the area to national and international visitors.

The Cabinet considered an outline of the plans for a Partnership Masterplan, which comprised a legacy and programme of events, and the wider benefits that would accrue to the area. The proposals for the Magna Carta Anniversary in Surrey would look to create a lasting legacy in terms of tourism and resources for the Runnymede area. Historic Egham would be promoted as

the gateway to “Magna Carta Country” giving it a clear cultural and tourism identity to attract visitors to the wider area. Significant work had taken place with local people, partners and organisations to develop both an exciting civic event in 2015 and a long term legacy in terms of investment for the area. This work would continue and would look to involve local people, particularly school children, in developing the celebrations.

The Communities Select Committee had considered this item at its meeting on 11 July 2013. The Select Committee’s recommendations had been circulated to Cabinet Members and were tabled at the meeting. The Cabinet Member for Community Services thanked the Communities Select Committee for their consideration of the progress which had been made and noted the comments and concerns which had been raised. The proposals before the Cabinet represented an outline masterplan about which greater detail would be developed as the project progressed. She advised that she had discussed the Select Committee’s concerns with the Select Committee Chairman and had agreed that a Members’ seminar would be held in the autumn to discuss how the masterplan would be developed and to obtain Members’ input on the proposals.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services noted that the decision before the Cabinet was to agree the outline of the partnership masterplan and funding from which further work would take place. It was important that this agreement be put in place to enable funding support to be sought, for example via a major matched funding bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund, and other funding and partnership opportunities explored. Cabinet Members expressed support for the proposals and the holding of Magna Carta celebratory events around Runnymede and Surrey.

It was noted that a bid for funding for work on the Runnymede roundabout was expected to be considered by the Department for Transport around the end of July 2013.

RESOLVED that:

1. The outline Partnership Masterplan be agreed as set out in paragraphs 10 to 19 of the report submitted.
2. Additional project funding support, comprising of £700,000 capital funding for the legacy programme and £300,000 revenue funding for the events programme, be factored into the refresh of the Medium Term Financial Plan.
3. A major bid be made to the Heritage Lottery Fund to contribute to the Magna Carta programme.
4. The financial oversight of the Partnership Masterplan be delegated to the Leader of the Council, with the Assistant Chief Executive to implement the Masterplan in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Community Services.

Reason for decisions

To ensure that the significance of the 800th Anniversary is recognised and the benefits are maximised for the area in 2015 with lasting benefits beyond.

98/13 PROPOSED HOLDING OF A SHARE AND DIRECTORSHIP BY SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL IN SURREY HILLS ENTERPRISES [Item 13]

Surrey Hills Enterprises (SHE) was established with the support of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Board (AONB Board) to promote the Trademark for the Surrey Hills to businesses in the area, promote those businesses and to support projects to deliver the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan.

Surrey County Council had agreed that SHE may sub-licence the Surrey Hills Trademark to generate an income for reinvestment in the community. A condition of the exercise of this license is that the AONB Board would have a share in SHE and a directorship on its board. The AONB Board was a Joint Committee and as such was unable to hold the directorship or own a share in its own right. The County Council would therefore hold these interests on its behalf.

RESOLVED that:

1. It be agreed that the County Council hold a single share worth £1 in Surrey Hills Enterprises on behalf of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Board.
2. A Member be appointed to sit as Director on the Surrey Hills Enterprises Board until May 2017 (length of the Council) and that this and future appointments be made by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader.

Reason for decisions

To promote the local businesses, the Surrey Hills brand and generate income for Surrey Hills Enterprises to be reinvested in its activities and the community. The aim is to distribute the profits as grants to projects that deliver the Surrey Hills Management Plan.

99/13 REVISION OF PROCUREMENT STANDING ORDERS [Item 14]

The Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) set out how the Council governs spending by Officers on goods, works and services. The PSOs had been revised to take account of recent changes in the law and to ensure that they reflected best practice and Council priorities.

RESOLVED that the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) be noted and commended to full Council for final approval.

Reason for decision

To progress the adoption of revised Procurement Standing Orders including amendments to reflect changes in legislation and ensuring that the Council maintains a fit for purpose set of guidance and rules to govern the procurement process.

100/13 CONTRACT AWARD - SUBSTANCE MISUSE AND HOUSING SUPPORT SERVICE FOR ADULTS AND SUBSTANCE MISUSE SERVICE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE [Item 18]

The Cabinet considered the award of contracts for the provision of a Substance Misuse and Housing Support Service and the Substance Misuse Service for Children and Young People to continue from those due to expire on 30 September 2013 and 31 October 2013 respectively.

The services would be provided in accordance with guidance from Public Health England in order to improve the delivery of Substance Misuse Services to develop and sustain recovery among services users. The Adult Substance Misuse and Housing Support Service would provide housing support across Surrey's eleven Districts and Boroughs.

RESOLVED that the contracts be awarded to the Providers on the basis described in the Part 2 Annex (submitted as agenda item 20) to deliver the Adult Substance Misuse and Housing Support Service and the Children and Young Peoples Service.

Reason for decision

The contract awards deliver a saving of 21.5% per annum for the contract periods (3 years + 1 +1). The new services will deliver increased quality in service delivery through a strengthened and outcome focused service specification, ensure enhanced and clearly monitored contract delivery through an incentivised payment model and will provide apprenticeship opportunities to Surrey Young People with an element of the services being delivered through a local provider.

101/13 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR JUNE 2013 AND QUARTER 1 2013/2014 [Item 16]

The Cabinet considered the budget monitoring report for the first quarter of the financial year 2013/14. The forecast end of year position for all services was for a small overspend of £1.7m. However, with the inclusion of the risk contingency, this represented a potential underspend of £11.3m.

A number of years ago the Leader had established the Severe Weather Reserve with £5m. This had been to ensure that the council had sufficient resources to respond to the impact of any very bad weather. The past winter had been especially severe and led to great damage to Surrey roads. This reserve would now be used in the interests of residents to meet the cost of repairing the roads.

The revenue budget required total efficiency savings of £68m in the current financial year. Demand for council services continued to grow and this created additional pressure on the achievement of efficiency targets. Despite these pressures, services were making good progress and had already achieved £11m of savings. Progress would continue to be monitored closely through the year.

The current forecast for the Council's capital programme was for an underspend of £0.5m on service capital budgets. Nearly £17m had been invested in projects that would deliver savings and enhance income in the longer term. Income of £1.5m was anticipated in the current year from such

projects. The capital financing costs would be met from the Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund established at the start of the year. The Council was also beating its 30 day target to collect non-care debt. Care debt had risen by 12%, in part due to new income billing and relatively high value retrospective bills. A Rapid Improvement Event would be held to revise systems to address this.

RESOLVED that:

1. The following be noted (as set out in the report submitted):
 - forecast revenue budget underspend for 2013/14 (Annex 1, paragraph 1);
 - forecast ongoing efficiencies & service reductions achieved by year end (Annex 1, paragraph 56);
 - forecast capital budget position for 2013/14 (Annex 1, paragraph 60)
 - management actions to mitigate overspends (throughout Annex 1);
 - quarter end balance sheet as at 30 June 2013 and movements in earmarked reserves and debt outstanding (Annex 1, page 18);

2. the following adjustments to the revenue budget be approved:
 - virement of £0.4m from Customer & Communities' Legacy team to Chief Executive's Office to realign budgets and service responsibilities (Annex 1, paragraph 6);
 - virement of £0.7m from Adult Social Care to Public Health to realign health and well-being budgets (Annex 1, paragraph 7);
 - virement of £0.14m from New Homes Bonus funding to Environment & Infrastructure to support planning applications associated with the schools building programme (Annex 1, paragraph 8);
 - virement of £5.0m from the Severe Weather Reserve to repair damage to roads caused during the last winter (Annex 1, paragraph 9);

3. the following adjustments to the capital budget be approved:
 - virement of -£0.4m grant reprofiling of Local Sustainable Travel Fund grant in Environment & Infrastructure (Annex 1, paragraph 60);
 - virement of -£0.5m reprofiling of external funding in Environment & Infrastructure (Annex 1, paragraph 60);
 - virement of £0.6m reprofiling of IT Replacement Reserve (Annex 1, paragraph 60);
 - virement of -£0.6m reprofiling of Adult Social Care Infrastructure grant (Annex 1, paragraph 60);
 - virement of the transfer of responsibility for Basingstoke Canal from Business Services (-£0.5m) to Environment & Infrastructure (£0.5m) (Annex 1, paragraph 60); and
 - virement of the addition of £1.8m for Redhill balanced network as a new scheme (Annex 1, paragraph 60).

Reason for decisions

To progress the actions identified as part of the agreed strategy of monthly budget monitoring reporting. Page 92

102/13 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 17]

The Cabinet noted the decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegation since the last meeting.

RESOLVED that the decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting be noted.

Reason for decision

To note the decisions taken by Cabinet Members under delegated authority.

103/13 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 19]

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 paragraphs 3 and 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

104/13 CONTRACT AWARD - SUBSTANCE MISUSE AND HOUSING SUPPORT SERVICE FOR ADULTS AND SUBSTANCE MISUSE SERVICE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE [Item 20]

The Cabinet considered a Part 2 Annex to the report received under minute item 133/13. The Annex had been circulated in Part 2 of the agenda as it contained information 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 that the contracts be awarded as agreed under minute item 133/13 on the basis described in the Part 2 Annex submitted to deliver the Adult Substance Misuse and Housing Support Service and the Children and Young Peoples Service.

Reason for decision

The contracts will deliver improved service quality and reduce costs per annum.

105/13 TREASURY MANAGEMENT ISSUE (SPECIAL URGENCY) [Item 22a]

The Cabinet considered a matter relating to treasury management. This item was considered under the Special urgency procedure, having obtained the agreement of the Chairman of the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee, as a decision could not reasonably be deferred. The report on this item had been circulated in Part 2 of the agenda as it contained information exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Local Government Association and its legal representatives be authorised to represent the Council in negotiations on the basis set out

in the Part 2 report submitted with all options and prices to be considered when this information is made available to the Council.

2. Authority be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader, the Cabinet Member for Business Services and the Monitoring Officer, to make a final decision with regard to the selection of the interested third party and the terms of the deal that is constructed with that party.

Reason for decision

To enable the council to fully consider the available options and secure the best outcome.

106/13 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 23]

No further information on the items heard in Part 2 of the meeting could be released at this time.

107/13 PROPERTY TRANSACTION: ACQUISITION OF AN OFFICE PROPERTY IN EPSOM [Item 22]

The Cabinet considered the acquisition of an office property in Epsom. The report on this item had been circulated in Part 2 of the agenda as it contained information exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person.

RESOLVED that:

1. Surrey County Council acquire the freehold interest in the property on the basis set out in the Part 2 report submitted.
2. The actions identified in recommendation 2 of the Part 2 report submitted be agreed.

Reason for decisions

The acquisition will provide the opportunity for the Council to consider the longer term needs of service delivery and office accommodation in the area.

Meeting closed at 4.45 pm

Chairman

CABINET – 23 JULY 2013

ITEM 4(a) - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members' Questions**Question (1) from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)**

Please confirm the evidence base for the statement, "exposes SCC to the risk of price increase as they seek to peg their prices to landfill increases (at least in the medium term)" in paragraph 10.

Reply:

This statement is based on the professional judgement of council officers and the council's technical and independent financial advisors and knowledge obtained through historic and current market prices for merchant energy from waste capacity for dealing with Surrey's waste.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013

Question (2) from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)

Please confirm if the changes proposed impact upon the total tonnage of waste envisaged to be disposed of using EfW by SCC?

Reply:

The changes proposed do not impact on the total tonnage of waste envisaged to be disposed of by the Surrey County Council. After achieving levels of 70% recycling, there remains about 160,000 tonnes of residual waste to be disposed of and the Eco Park will deal with a proportion of this.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013

Question (3) from Mr Jonathan Essex (Redhill East)

Please provide a breakdown of the CO2 emissions noted in paragraph 46 and energy generated noted in paragraph 47, and set out how this compares to the current approved Eco Park waste management process.

Reply:

Given the detailed numerical nature of the Mr Essex's question, my officers have produced a breakdown of the net reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the energy generation projections that have been modelled (*circulated to Mr Essex at the meeting*). Furthermore, officers would be willing to brief Mr Essex in more detail if that would be helpful.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013

CABINET – 23 JULY 2013

ITEM 4(b) - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions**Question (1) from Ms Debbie Pullen, Epsom**

Are you aware of the fiasco regarding Wallace Fields Junior (WFJS) and Infants (WFIS) schools' admissions over the past four years (please refer to letter emailed from Marsha Mclean-Anderson) and that as a result of this several local children (for whom WFJS is their closest school and within 740m) are highly likely to be displaced to their 13th nearest school after they leave WFIS and will be forced to leave the supportive school community that they are a part of? Are these six and seven year olds just expected to pay the price of the mistakes of Surrey Local Authority by jeopardizing their education and well-being or can something be done to help them, for example a guaranteed place in WFJS or a financially supported increase in the pan of WFJS for September 2014?

Reply:

The determination by the Office of the Schools Adjudicator in 2012 related to admission arrangements for 2013.

For 2013, of the 59 children that we have registered at Wallace Fields Infant School, 52 have been allocated a place at Wallace Fields Junior School. Of the remaining 7 children, the following applies:

No application submitted for any school	1
Late application including WFJS	1
Did not apply to WFJS	1
Offered a higher preference school to WFJS	1
Offered a lower preference school to WFJS	1
Offered Danetree - not named as a preference	2

This demonstrates that only two children currently show as having been offered an alternative school that they did not apply for. While it is the case that for one of these families the school offered was the 13th in distance to their home address, only 4 of the schools that were closer admitted children at Year 3. For this family, Danetree was 3.2 km (2 miles) from the home address and this was still considered to be a reasonable distance.

The principles set out in the arrangements for 2013 apply to 2014 onwards and therefore the local authority has not re-visited the decision in order to propose any further changes. The Principal Manager for Admissions has explained the local authority's legal position fully in that regard in a letter to Mrs McLean Anderson.

Currently there are no plans to expand the junior school as the forecast data for school organisational planning indicates that there is no basic need requirement in the area overall. A group of parents have submitted an objection to the Schools Adjudicator regarding the admission arrangements at Wallace Fields Junior School, and we shall await the outcome of that objection.

Mrs Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
23 July 2013

Question (2) from Mr Chris Netherclift, Sunbury on Thames

We have always said that the Charlton Lane site is too small for an efficient thermal treatment plant. Despite the specification in SiTA's tender advertisements being for a 60,000 tonne per year gasifier the selected design and build company could not come up with a proposal that could match that specification. The site is therefore clearly not large enough to accommodate an efficient ATT plant.

- (i) How small would the throughput of an incinerator on the Charlton Lane site have to be before SCC admitted that they have chosen a site that is too small?
- (ii) Any arguments from such places as Wisley that pollution will harm the plants cannot be considered valid as SiTA contend that there is negligible pollution. Will SCC now re-examine their site selection process to ensure that a site is chosen that is of sufficient size to be able to handle a significant amount of waste on one site using an incinerator that can actually do its job efficiently whilst actually providing heat and power to the local infrastructure?
- (iii) Alternatively, are SCC determined to put an incinerator on the Charlton Lane site no matter how efficient it is?
- (iv) The 2010 JMWMS includes the following "Table 4.3.1 Key Strategic Policies Policy 5 We will adhere to the waste hierarchy, with residual waste treatment preferred to landfill. Recovery and disposal facilities will be delivered to ensure compliance with the Landfill Directive. We will restrict the use of landfill to 0% by 2013/14". How can this Key Strategic Policy fit with the current proposed incinerator which by design will send approximately 8,000 tonnes per year back to landfill?
- (v) If Mott MacDonald's concerns are correct and the incinerator cannot be classified as a gasifier will Surrey County Council accept that they have yet again selected the wrong incinerator for the wrong site?

Reply:

The Council's waste strategy identifies gasification as its preferred technology for dealing with residual waste. The gasification plant at Charlton Lane is sized appropriately to deal with the residual municipal waste that is produced within the local area and the Council's waste strategy does not advocate the use of a single plant to deal with all of Surrey's residual waste in one location. The site selection process was rigorously tested as part of the planning application and through the requirement of the applicant to produce an assessment which looked at the suitability of alternative sites for the development. The planning authority concluded that the Charlton Lane site was the most appropriate location for this development.

SITA has made an assumption that, initially at least, the ash from the gasifier and any non-combustible material that is separated at the fuel preparation stage may have to be sent to landfill. This is in line with ensuring that the risks are adequately dealt with in the financial analysis. However it would be both SITA's and the Council's intention to find or develop recycling markets for some or all of this material, for example in road construction.

The proposed plant at Charlton Lane is designed to operate as a gasification plant with the production of a syngas and its subsequent combustion. The Council's technical advisors Mott MacDonald concur that the plant has been designed to operate as a gasification plant but rightly point out that the contractor constructing the plant will need to demonstrate to Ofgem that the plant qualifies for Renewables Obligations Certificates by measuring the quality of the Syngas produced. Both the building contractor and SITA are confident that this is achievable.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013

Question (3) from Mr Ian Robinson, Sunbury on Thames

Surrey County Council has admitted recently that the latest proposal for a continuous gasification system is more efficient than the earlier proposal for several batch gasification systems. This confirms my concerns that the optimal, proven system may not have been researched and identified yet. This, together with Cllr. Furey's regrettably misleading 24-page report and presentation to your meeting on 25 June 2013, leads me to ask the following Question:-

How can you be fully satisfied that all the many concerns expressed by local residents have been resolved adequately?

It is no good simply saying that your officers and consultants have investigated the scope for optimum solutions "within the SITA contract". For a project life of 25 years, with major implications for local residents, such as my wife and I who live two miles downwind of any toxic emissions from the plant, the investigations should "think outside the box" and include all safe options in the fast-developing "Energy from Waste" industry.

Reply:

The Council commissions regular reviews of advanced thermal treatment processes that are available in the market. The last such review was undertaken by its technical consultant, Mott MacDonald in August 2012 and identified that Outotec as a successful provider of an advanced thermal treatment process within the market.

All elements of the Eco Park, including the gasification plant will have to operate under the terms of an Environmental Permit issued by the Environment Agency. The Permit will control the operation of the plant and any emissions to land, air or water from the plant. The Environment Agency would not issue a permit unless they were satisfied that the plant posed no risk to the environment or to human health.

Mr John Furey

Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment

23 July 2013

Question (4) from Mr Malcolm Robertson, Charlton Lane Community Liaison Group Member

Contrary to information supplied previously to the Cabinet, the proposed new gasifier fails to accord with the Council's own Waste Strategy.

Public consultation and agreement with Surrey's 11 Boroughs and Districts produced a Waste Strategy specifying a 60,000 tonne capacity Batch Oxidation System gasifier.

What has now been proposed as a replacement is a 45,000 tonne net capacity continuous feed gasifier, which is totally different from the Batch system, has 25% less capacity, and lacks both the agreement of the Boroughs and any consultation with the public. (The gasifier has a gross capacity of 55,000 tonnes, but after removing recyclables and oversized items the capacity drops to 45,000 tonnes).

Surrey's own 'due diligence' mentions that stoppages may occur up to 6 times daily depending on the nature of the wastes being processed, but regrettably the document appears not to address the issue of 'tarring', a particular concern of DEFRA's, and the cause of the demise of the boiler of Surrey's reference plant in Dargavel, Dumfries, after just 4 months normal operation.

Furthermore the due diligence neglects to mention that both gasifiers in the UK burning municipal waste have required major re-engineering and on several occasions emitted

carcinogenic dioxins substantially in excess of National and International limits. Both plants were regulated, but nevertheless these breaches occurred.

Bearing in mind these deficiencies and the failure to comply with the County's own Waste Strategy, should it not be recognised by the County Council that a comprehensive due diligence must be completed first, and the consultation and agreement to a new Waste Strategy obtained before it embarks on colossal expenditure, and yet another adventure into gasification?

Reply:

The Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy makes it clear that the detailed arrangements for dealing with residual waste are a matter for the Waste Disposal Authority as part of the Waste Disposal Authority's Action Plan. This plan is updated periodically in the same way as the action plans of the waste collection authorities. The Cabinet report of 25 June, sets out the changes to the Waste Disposal Authority's Action Plan with regard to the waste treatment technologies proposed for the Eco Park and was approved by the Council's Cabinet.

It is correct that the boilers that were initially installed at the Scotgen Dargavel gasification facility suffered from 'fouling'. This was due to the type of boiler which had been fitted to the original plant, which proved to be unsuitable for that particular operation. SITA were well aware of this and had proposed a different type of boiler for this type of gasification process, had it been built at Charlton Lane. There is no evidence that boiler fouling or tarring is a particular characteristic unique to gasification facilities, it can occur in any energy from waste plant if fitted with unsuitable boilers.

The waste management industry is one of the most highly regulated industries in the UK. Emissions are measured and reported and where breaches have occurred, the regulator takes action, including requiring immediate closure of the site. Of the two plants that Mr Robertson may have in mind, one is now operating successfully and the other is under the close scrutiny of the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency who also note that none of the breaches have had any demonstrable significant effect on the environment.

SITA, their parent company SUEZ Environment and the EPC contractor M&W are large, well established and experienced developers of waste facilities. Suez Environment, for its part, is investing significant amounts of its own capital into the development of the Eco Park and M&W are providing substantial guarantees to give comfort that the technology will operate as intended.

Mr John Furey
Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment
23 July 2013

Question (5) from Mr John Seaman

If residual waste is processed to make RDF (Refuse Derived Fuel) which is then combusted in a fluidised bed gasifier at the proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton how much material in total will be sent to landfill each year? If the same amount of residual waste was burnt in an Energy from Waste incinerator how much material in total would be sent to landfill each year?

What does this mean for Surrey during the expected operational life of the Eco Park including Surrey County Council's "zero waste to landfill" policy, landfill gate fees, landfill tax, transport costs and continued availability of scarce landfill capacity?

Reply:

An initial assumption has been made that approximately 8000 tonnes per year of material, comprising ash and the inert rejects from the RDF production process, would be sent to landfill. However as discussed in my answer to a previous question, both SITA and the Council would look to find or develop markets for this material over time. The 8000 tonnes of residue amounts to about 15% of the input by weight. A typical energy from waste plant would produce between 25% and 30% bottom ash by weight, which would also be required to be sent to landfill if suitable markets could not be found.

The cost of dealing with all outputs from the gasification process has been considered within the overall cost of developing and operating the Eco Park.

Mr John Furey**Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment****23 July 2013**

Question (6) from Mr Peter Crews, Sunbury
--

If the Waste PFI Contract is cancelled, how can Surrey County Council deliver Option 3 (waste disposal using existing infrastructure) for £94M less than Option 2 (Surrey builds the plant proposed for Charlton Lane)? If Surrey can deliver Option 3 for £94M less than Option 2, what is to stop SITA delivering an option which is £94M cheaper than Option 1 (SITA builds the plant proposed for Charlton Lane)?

Reply:

Option 2 describes a scenario where the Council terminates its contract with SITA and tenders a contract for waste disposal services including the construction of the Eco Park. Option 3 describes a situation where the Council terminates its contract with SITA and tenders for a contract to operate its existing facilities and exports residual waste to merchant energy from waste facilities. Both options 2 & 3 expose the Council to additional business continuity and cost escalation risk, as it would move away from the relative certainty offered by the contract with SITA.

SITA's contract with the Council is for the provision of services and development of waste infrastructure. If the Council no longer wishes to develop waste infrastructure then from a procurement perspective it would be a different contract and the Council would have to terminate its contract with SITA and re procure a contract in the market place, which is the situation described in Option 3

MrJohn Furey**Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment****23 July 2013**

Questions to receive written answers

Question (7) from Mr Adrian Corti, Shepperton

Regarding the possible variation of the contract for waste between Sita and Surrey CC, have likely changes in plant throughput, EU legislation, UK Government subsidies e.g. ROCs, etc. been taken into account in the financial assessments, especially regarding the new proposed gasification incinerator?

Reply:

The options analysis has identified areas where the Council could be exposed to risk of price uncertainty over time, either through market or legislative changes. In these instances appropriate risk adjustments have been applied in consultation with the Council's independent financial and technical advisors.

Mr John Furey

Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment

23 July 2013

Question (8) from Mr Brian Catt

At June cabinet I asked if the proposed eco park options would be considered objectively and openly, and was assured they would - limited to within SITA's contract - but verbally that this restriction would not affect the choices, or the selection of best value options. The report now submitted is not consistent with the public data on MSW treatment costs I have sent to Cabinet members, and offers no like for like transparently costed comparison to support its conclusions.

Given Surrey planning officer's ex-ante preference to impose Option 1 stated at public meetings, and the hundreds of Millions of ratepayers money involved, will the comparable costings be made available for public inspection, and for detail verification by independent auditors with the data necessary to make a thorough like for like comparison of value to ratepayers?

Reply:

The assessment supporting the recommendation was designed precisely to ensure a consistent comparison between the options available to the Council, due to the significant and long-term nature of the decision before the Cabinet.

The detailed costings of the options are commercially confidential and therefore are not available for public inspection. However they have been produced in consultation with the Council's independent financial advisor, Deloitte and scrutinised by the Council's Chief Finance Officer who both confirm that option 1, including development of the Eco Park represents value for money to the UK taxpayer. The analysis will be made available for the Council's own external auditor if requested.

Mr John Furey

Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment

23 July 2013

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

ASC BUDGET (considered by Select Committee on 20 June 2013)

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That the Cabinet examine and evaluate the realistic potential for savings via “social capital.”

RESPONSE

It will be September before budget monitoring data can be expected to give a clear indication of how well, and how fast, the new policy is working. It is accepted, though, that the plan to achieve £15m savings through the use of social capital in 2013-14 is both unproven and very ambitious, and that is why it is rated high risk. It is understood that the scale of savings required for ASC (£46m, or 13.5% of the net budget) is such that ambition, innovation and risk are inevitable.

There is a profiled savings plan which will deliver to budget once the policy is fully operative. The current position is that we can afford to spend £19.7m per month on individually commissioned care, the key variable spend area, against an actual spend in April-May of £21.2m per month. It is expected that, as the use of Social Capital becomes more integrated within the service, the monthly expenditure rate will reflect the adoption of this strategy by the assessment teams. But there does remain a high level of risk; and as it has taken time to clarify the new approach and explain it to staff through a county-wide series of events, some slippage will occur, which will need to be covered from other savings.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
23 July 2013

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 24 SEPTEMBER 2013 AT 2.00 PM
AT ASHCOMBE SUITE, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,
SURREY KT1 2DN.**

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

Members:

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

Cabinet Associates:

*Mr Steve Cosser	*Mrs Kay Hammond
*Mrs Clare Curran	*Miss Marisa Heath

* = Present

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

110/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Tony Samuels.

111/13 PUBLIC QUESTION FROM MR CREWS

As Mr Crews question (Q2, Appendix 1) related to the Cabinet minutes from 23 July 2013 meeting, the agenda was re-ordered so that his question may be considered prior to confirming and approving the minutes from this meeting.

Mr Crew asked a supplementary question about the discussion of the financial assessment for the proposed development at Charlton Lane which took place at the last Cabinet meeting and said that he was surprised that a reference wasn't included in the minutes. He considered that the county has unfortunately missed the opportunity to record that the financial assessment was indeed carried out in accordance with "what the nation is trying to do" with respect to waste PFI contracts. He asked the Leader if he agreed?

The Leader disagreed and said that the council did not take verbatim minutes of its meetings and that the minutes of the Cabinet meeting were a record of the decisions taken and as appropriate, contained a brief summary of the proceedings and the issue considered.

112/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 23 JULY 2013 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2013 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

113/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

114/13 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

(a) MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were none.

115/13 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were a total of four questions from members of the public.

The questions and responses were tabled and are attached as Appendix 1. (Please refer to item 142/13 for Mr Crews' question and supplementary question.)

Ms Jenny De Soutter asked the Leader of the Council if he would review the decision not to undertake a formal assessment of the Ride London Cycling event. The Leader responded by stating that the County Council was listening to residents because the Surrey Cycling Strategy was currently out for consultation and after the consultation period had closed on 1 November 2013 all comments would be analysed and considered as part of the formulation of the Cycling Strategy.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services confirmed that Surrey was not the event organiser for Ride London, this event was organised by the London Surrey Cycle Partnership, and they were aware of the concerns of some Surrey residents. She also said that the Cycling Strategy would encompass all cycling and not just specific race events.

116/13 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

No petitions were received.

117/13 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

No representations were received.

118/13 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

(a) CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE - INCREASING THE EMPLOYABILITY OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN SURREY [Item 5a]

The recommendation of the Children and Education Select Committee was circulated with the agenda. The response of the Cabinet Member for Schools

and Learning was tabled at the meeting and is attached as Appendix 2 to these minutes.

(b) ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE – ADULT SOCIAL CARE BUDGET 2013/14 [Item 5b]

The recommendation of the Adult Social Care Select Committee was circulated with the agenda. The response of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care was tabled at the meeting and is attached as Appendix 3 to these minutes.

119/13 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT FOR AUGUST 2013 [Item 6]

The Leader of the Council presented the council's financial position at the end of period 5 (August) of the 2013/14 financial year, the first financial report since the summer recess. He stressed the importance of providing Value for Money for Surrey taxpayers.

On the Revenue Budget, he highlighted the following points:

- Despite growth in demand for council services, the financial position was progressing well through achievement of efficiencies and service reductions.
- The forecast end of year position for all services was for a small overspend of £0.6m. This is a £1.1m improvement from the last formally reported position as at the end of June. The budget prudently provided £13m risk contingency (set up to mitigate the risk of non delivery of service efficiencies) that has not been used. This means that the overall forecast year end position is a £12.4m underspend.
- The revenue budget requires total efficiencies of £68m. The report showed services were making good progress in delivering these, forecasting £66m for the year. The shortfall of £2.1m was as a result of delays within Children Services and issues over bus contracts. £11m efficiencies this year had already been achieved and there was increased confidence in many service areas. However, the position included £7.5m of savings against the Social Capital programme, which were one-off in nature. As the half way point of the year approaches, there was still a long way to go and considerable risks remain.

On the Capital Budget, he highlighted the following points:

- That the council's capital programme not only improved and maintained the Council's service delivery, but was seen as a way of raising additional income.
- At the start of the year the 2013/14 programme was reviewed and a small number of schemes were reprofiled. The current forecast was for service capital budgets to have a small underspend of £2.4m. This was due to delays with planning issues and archaeological finds. However, to offset this, some projects may be brought forward – where possible.

- In addition, nearly £27m had been invested in projects that would deliver savings and enhance income over the longer term. For this first year alone, income of £2.2m was anticipated from such projects. The Revolving Infrastructure and Investment Fund Cabinet set up at the start of the year would meet capital financing costs.

Other Cabinet Members were invited to highlight the key points and issues from their portfolios, as set out in the annex to the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the forecast revenue budget underspend for 2013/14, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 1-5 of the submitted report be noted.
2. That the forecast ongoing efficiencies and service reductions achieved by year end, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 62 - 65 of the submitted report be noted.
3. That the forecast capital budget position for 2013/14, as set out in Annex 1, paragraphs 66 - 71 of the submitted report be noted.
4. That management actions to mitigate overspends, as set out throughout Annex 1 of the submitted report be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

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

120/13 TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS ON 2014-15 AND 2015-16 LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE SETTLEMENT AND REVISED POOLING PROSPECTUS [Item 7]

The Leader of the Council advised Cabinet that the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) had published technical consultations on:

- Local Government Finance Settlement 2014/15 and 2015/16
- New Homes Bonus and the Local Growth Fund
- Proposals for the use of capital receipts from asset sales to invest in reforming services

DCLG had also published a revised prospectus for authorities wanting to pool their business rates to apply from 1 April 2014. He said that all the consultations were detailed and technical. Due to the deadline of 19 September, the response in relation to the New Homes Bonus had already been submitted. However, the other responses were for discussion.

Cabinet raised the following points: (i) the need to bid for the new Homes Bonus, (ii) more funding was top-sliced and therefore the council now had to put together a scheme and bid for it, (iii) concern re. an additional level of bureaucracy, (iv) to consider strengthening the response in relation to capital receipts, and (v) the role of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in the development of Transport Schemes.

RESOLVED:

That the final responses to the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) technical consultations be endorsed.

Reason for Decisions

DCLG's consultations are detailed and technical. However, they have important funding implications for Surrey County Council and local government overall. As such, it is important Cabinet appreciates what DCLG's proposals mean for the council.

121/13 GUILDFORD SURREY BOARD [Item 8]

This report set out the progress of the strategic collaboration with Guildford Borough Council, as exemplified by the memorandum of understanding, and also the proposed agreement of the establishment of the Guildford Surrey Board.

Mrs Fiona White, local Member for Guildford West, was invited to address the meeting. She expressed concern that Guildford Borough Council was viewing the establishment of the Guildford Surrey Board as a successor to the local Strategic Partnership Board and raised the issue of the Westborough and Stoke Action Plans, of which the County Council was a signatory. She also considered that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was worded in such a way that it would be difficult to monitor its progress.

The Leader of the Council referred to the Reigate and Banstead public sector board, which was working well and hoped that the new Board in Guildford would achieve similar results.

The Deputy Leader said that its establishment was critical to improving relationships with Boroughs / Districts and that the MoU was similar to that in Reigate and Banstead. It was a non-binding agreement and officers from both councils would support the Board. Any decisions made would be referred back to their respective councils. He hoped that this initiative could be expanded to other partners. He also confirmed that he would raise the issue of the Westborough and Stoke Action Plans.

The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board informed Members of the benefits of the MoU in the Reigate and Banstead area and in particular, referred to its positive impact on the Preston Regeneration project.

RESOLVED:

1. That the establishment of a Guildford Surrey Board comprising representatives of the County Council, Guildford Borough Council and other relevant service agencies to progress shared strategic priorities be approved.
2. That the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council, as set out in Annex 1 to the

submitted report, including the shared priorities for the new Board be agreed.

3. That the Strategic Director for Business Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business Services be authorised, to agree memoranda of understanding with other relevant public service agencies where applicable.

Reasons for Decisions

The above recommendations will improve strategic collaboration between Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and other public service agencies in Guildford.

122/13 SURREY RAIL STRATEGY [Item 9]

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment presented the outcomes for the development of a Surrey Rail Strategy and said that the report made recommendations for immediate active engagement with the rail industry and government. It also proposed the development of an implementation plan to be integrated with the Surrey Transport Plan.

He considered that good rail services were vital for maintaining and growing Surrey's vibrant community and economy. He thanked Surrey residents and other parties for their feedback and also congratulated the consultants (Ove, Arup and Partners Ltd) for their excellent report, which he considered had been deeply researched and had brought out the major issues.

He considered that the report was timely and stressed the importance of working with external partners to achieve a good rail network in Surrey. He also referred to the issues and options, as set out in paragraphs 6- 15 of the report, the Equalities Impact Assessment and the S151 officer commentary, in relation to the funding.

Finally, he proposed an amendment to recommendation (2) and commended the report to Cabinet.

Other Cabinet Members made the following points:

- The Rail Strategy would improve the County's economic performance.
- Acknowledgement of the length of time some of the proposals would take to come to fruition and the importance of lobbying.
- To cope with the increasing number of homes being built in Surrey, more funding would also be needed for other infrastructure, such as roads and schools.
- That the EIA was detailed and clearly set out the impact of the strategy on local residents and for people with mobility issues. There had been extensive consultation which had been incorporated into the EIA, included positive feedback from Surrey Access Forum.

RESOLVED (as amended):

1. That the Surrey Rail Strategy and five suggested priorities: Crossrail 2 (regional route), the North Downs Line, access to airports, access to stations (car parking) and access to London from Camberley, Bagshot and Frimley be noted.
2. That the list of schemes on which Surrey County Council should immediately begin active engagement with government and the rail industry, including on Crossrail 2 (regional route) and the electrification of the North Downs Line (paragraph 13 of the submitted report) be approved. Also, that further work be conducted to quantify car parking problems at certain stations around the county and if appropriate, further action be considered, in consultation with the rail industry.
3. That officers work with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment on developing options for Surrey County Council involvement in specific projects and initiatives. These will be reflected in an implementation plan to be integrated with the Surrey Transport Plan. As part of the Surrey Transport Plan, the implementation plan will need to be approved by Cabinet and Full Council. Proposals which progress specific schemes, including business cases, will be brought back to Cabinet.

Reasons for Decisions

Delivering the Surrey Rail Strategy will support the county council's priorities to promote sustainable economic growth and secure investment in infrastructure. The Surrey Rail Strategy would benefit Surrey residents and businesses by driving economic growth, maintaining global competitiveness, reducing impacts on the environment and accommodating sustainable population growth.

123/13 WINTER SERVICE DEVELOPMENT FOR 2013 / 14 [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and the Environment introduced the report on the Winter Service Development for 2013/14. He said that the delivery of winter service was delivered in two distinct operations: (i) Pre-treatment of routes and advice planning, (ii) Management of a severe snow event.

He said that the Plan had been compiled by the Environment and Transport Select Committee's Winter Service Task Group and provided an overview of last year's winter service performance and also set out recommendations to further improve the service. He thanked them for their work and the excellent report.

He referred to paragraph 3, recommendation (V) and confirmed that the licensing arrangements had now been agreed. He also confirmed that salt had already been bought over the summer months, at a favourable price.

Finally, in the Equalities Impact Assessment, he highlighted the points made in relation to some residents requiring assistance during severe weather

events and mentioned the importance of the farmers' contribution, as well as the local Members.

Cabinet considered that the work undertaken to improve the winter service in the last few years, particularly in response to the severe weather situations, was a credit to a large number of people, including the contractors – May Gurney. They also recognised the partnership working with Boroughs and Districts in clearing footpaths near schools, hospitals and shopping centres.

It was agreed that the Winter Service Plan should be widely published, including distribution to local libraries.

RESOLVED:

That the recommendations of the Winter Performance Task Group, set out in paragraph 3 of the submitted report and the Winter Service Plan 2013/14, included in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

These recommendations are the outcome of a Task Group meeting, held on 26 July 2013, to discuss winter service performance during 2012/13 and the development of the service for the 2013/14 winter season.

124/13 CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES SECTION 75 AGREEMENT WITH SURREY CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUPS (CCGS) [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member for Children And Families informed Cabinet that the existing agreement under section 75 of the National Health Service Act 2006 which established a joint budget between the Council and the PCT for commissioning and providing integrated services for young people with mental health issues had come to an end.

By entering into an overarching section 75 Agreement, the intention was to improve health and social care outcomes for children, young people and their families regardless of whether funding originated from the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) or the Council and to deliver services cost effectively. This included the targeted Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) and the HOPE service.

RESOLVED:

1. To proceed to legal negotiations with the Surrey CCGs on an overarching Section 75 Pooled Funding Agreement which will initially cover the continuing arrangements for targeted CAMHS and the HOPE services (the quantum contributions have been identified in paragraph 12 of the submitted report).
2. That authority be delegated to make amendments to the Section 75 Agreement, enabling the effective use of the agreement and the inclusion of additional services, to the Strategic Director for Children, Schools and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families and/or the Cabinet Member for Schools and

Learning, or Cabinet, in accordance with financial regulations, with advice from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Section 151 Officer.

Reasons for Decisions

By entering into an overarching section 75 Agreement, the intention is to improve health and social care outcomes for children, young people and their families regardless of whether funding originates from the CCGs or the Council and to deliver services cost effectively.

125/13 CONTRACT AWARD - EARLY HELP (VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FOR FAMILIES WITH A CHILD UNDER FIVE YEARS OLD) [Item 12]

As the current contract for the provision of Early Help (Volunteer support for families with a child under 5) Services expires on 31 October 2013, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families said it was necessary to award a new contract. Following a procurement exercise, she said that the proposal was that Home Start Surrey (HSS) be awarded the contract, on the basis described in the Part 2 Annex (agenda item 18) to deliver Early Help Support Services starting on 1 November 2013.

The new contract would be a countywide service model and therefore more cost effective. The County Council's contribution would be 48%, with the provider, Home Start raising the balance through fund raising -this was the same arrangement as the current contract. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families suggested that Members could use some of their Member allocation to assist their local Home Start.

Members were fully in support of Home Start and the excellent service provided for families in need of this support. They were also pleased that the service was now countywide.

RESOLVED:

That the contract be awarded to the provider on the basis described in the Part 2 annex (agenda item 18) to deliver the Service.

Reasons for Decisions

The service will deliver increased quality through a strengthened and outcome focused service specification, ensure enhanced and clearly monitored contract delivery and move to a streamlined Countywide service model, with the lead Provider forming a consortia covering all Districts and Boroughs.

The recommended contract award ensures that the new service will be delivered at a reduced cost than currently paid and will move to a more coherent and streamlined service model, delivering services across the County of Surrey for the contract period of two years, with the option to extend for an additional year.

The Children's Social Care and Wellbeing commissioning team will be the lead commissioner for this contract.

Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) will contribute to the funding of this contract annually, this is an historical arrangement. They will contribute 15% of the total contract value for this service for the first year and we will be seeking further contributions for the remaining contract duration. Colleagues from the CCG have been involved in the recommissioning process ensuring that both Social Care and Health needs are aligned.

The Council will also strongly benefit from the additional resources contributed to the service through fundraising, which will ensure additional services are delivered to families in Surrey.

126/13 PROVISION OF ADVERTISING SERVICES FOR STATUTORY NOTICES [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Business Services introduced the report, which set out the recommendations to award a contract for the provision of Advertising Services for Statutory Notices to commence on 1 November 2013 for a period of 3 years, with an option to extend for a further period of 1 year. The report provided details of the procurement process, including the results of the evaluation process, and in conjunction with the Part 2 Annex (item 20), demonstrated why the recommended contract award delivered best value for money and was more cost effective than an in-house alternative.

She also confirmed that the proposed contract would provide sufficient flexibility should there be any future changes in legislation which may alter the requirement for advertising in newspapers. However, Members acknowledged, as set out in the EIA, that some elderly residents had limited access to the internet and relied on the local press to inform them of local issues.

RESOLVED:

1. That the background information, as set out in the submitted report be noted.
2. That the award of the contract be agreed, following consideration of the procurement process set out in item 20, the Part 2 Annex.

Reasons for Decisions

The existing contract will expire on 31 October 2013. A tender process has been completed, and the recommendations arising out of the above process provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process. The procurement activity is expected to deliver savings of 10% per annum through the use of composite notices, closer working relationships, targeted distribution and alternative designs requiring less advertising space. Also, the contract ensures the Managed Service Provider passes on all discounted rates that the newspapers offer.

The new contract rates are in line with the current rates but the difference is they are fixed for the contact duration; therefore the projected spend is

£540,000 per annum, compared to the current spend of £600,000 per annum, without incurring any inflationary costs.

127/13 HORLEY NORTH EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL - A NEW SCHOOL PROVIDING 210 PLACES AND 26 PRE-SCHOOL PLACES [Item 14]

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes, the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning presented the report, to approve the business case for the provision of a permanent one form entry (210 places and 26 place nursery) Diocesan primary school in Horley, as part of the Schools Basic Need Programme. She said that numbers of children in Horley had been increasing over several years, due in part to large scale housing development in Horley and the surrounding areas.

Mrs Hammond, the local Member for Horley West confirmed the need for additional school places in the area and said that the local community had been involved in the project. She was pleased that the school would open, with a reception class, in September 2014 but asked whether it was feasible to have a Year 3 intake at the same time, as this would alleviate pressure for junior school places in the area.

RESOLVED:

That the construction of a new primary school, as detailed in the submitted report, be agreed in principle subject to the consideration and approval of the detailed financial information set out in Part 2 of this agenda (item 19).

Reason for Decisions

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Horley area.

128/13 SCHOOL EXPANSION AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT IN THE FARNHAM AREA [Item 15]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning who said that it set out plans for the future of Pilgrim's Way Primary School which was located within a mile of South Farnham Academy.

She said that the school had been underperforming and undersubscribed in recent years. Although, the headteacher and staff had worked hard and it was no longer in special measures, it continued to obtain results that were beneath National Floor Targets in some areas and remained of a significant concern to officers.

Therefore, the County Council had entered into discussions with the Governing Bodies of both schools whom are in agreement to place Pilgrim's Way under the management of South Farnham Academy via a multi academy trust which will be expected to have a transformative effect on the reputation and quality of educational outcomes at Pilgrim's Way school. Improvement in the popularity of Pilgrim's Way School will provide increased future capacity in the South Farnham area.

Finally, she drew attention to the amended recommendations (2) and (3).

RESOLVED (as amended):

- (1) That approval be given for the South Farnham Academy to enhance leadership alongside developing and implementing a sustainable school improvement programme at Pilgrim's Way school.
- (2) That approval be given to transfer £750,000 from an existing scheme in the capital programme for capital investment in the South Farnham Academy to facilitate an increase in capacity in the area, through added infrastructure and the proposed leadership improvements.
- (3) That approval to the above is based on tangible and agreed performance measures that South Farnham Academy will implement at Pilgrim's Way within 2 academic years. These improvements will be monitored regularly by the local authority and Babcock 4S and through an annual review by the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning.

Reasons for Decisions

Progress and outcomes for pupils at Pilgrim's way school are of significant concern and early indications from the 2013 performance results show that previous improvements have plateaued. A poor Ofsted judgement is now a very serious possibility. Officers are confident that this leadership intervention will rapidly realise improvements to underperformance.

South Farnham Academy is a very popular and oversubscribed school and its long term success indicates its ability to support and lead improvements at Pilgrims Way school. The ability to admit more pupils overall into successful schools will ensure greater stability for the area and support the Council's aspirations to provide appropriate facilities for local children in Surrey. This scheme of adaptation at the Academy's Bourne site which will facilitate the provision of a further form of entry, increasing from 2 to 3 forms of entry, supports the expansion of popular and successful schools and will meet future demand. Combined with reputational improvements to Pilgrim's Way through its sponsorship by the South Farnham Academy represents a whole locality solution to the quality and quantity of school places in the area.

129/13 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 16]

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Members since the last meeting and the decision taken by the Chief Executive under urgency powers be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken under delegated authority.

130/13 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]

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 paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

PART TWO – IN PRIVATE

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BUSINESS WERE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE BY THE CABINET. SET OUT BELOW IS A PUBLIC SUMMARY OF THE DECISIONS TAKEN.

131/13 CONTRACT AWARD - EARLY HELP (VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FOR FAMILIES WITH A CHILD UNDER FIVE YEARS OLD) [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families presented the report, stating that it contained confidential information relating to item 12. She also confirmed that Guildford and Waverly Clinical Commissioning Group would contribute to the funding of this contract and that this was an historical arrangement.

RESOLVED:

That contracts be awarded to Home Start Surrey (HSS) for the provision of the Early Help (Volunteer Support for Families with a child under 5) Service at the value, as set out in the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions

The service will deliver increased quality through a strengthened and outcome focused service specification, ensure enhanced and clearly monitored contract delivery and move to a streamlined Countywide service model, with one lead provider forming a consortia covering all Districts and Boroughs.

132/13 HORLEY NORTH EAST PRIMARY SCHOOL - A NEW SCHOOL PROVIDING 210 PLACES AND 26 PRE-SCHOOL PLACES [Item 19]

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that this item was the confidential annex to item 14 and set out the business case and financial information for the provision of this new Diocesan Primary School in Horley. She confirmed that the project was included in the County Council's schools basic need programme.

RESOLVED:

That the business case for the project to construct a new primary school be approved, with the cost not exceeding the sum set out in the submitted report.

Reasons for Decisions

The proposal supports the Authority's statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places to meet the needs of the population in the Horley area.

133/13 PROVISION OF ADVERTISING SERVICES FOR STATUTORY NOTICES [Item 20]

This item is the confidential annex to item 13 on the agenda.

RESOLVED:

That a Contract be awarded to Alexander Advertising International Ltd for 3 years with the option to extend for a further year, at an estimated value as set out in the submitted report, for the provision of Advertising Services for Statutory Notices to commence on 1 November 2013.

Reasons for Decisions

The existing contracts will expire on 31 October 2013. A full tender process, in compliance with the requirement of EU Procurement Legislation and Procurement Standing Orders has been completed, and the recommendations provide best value for money for the Council following a thorough evaluation process.

134/13 PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS: CORONER SERVICE RELOCATION [Item 21]

Mr Forster, the local Member was invited to speak and said that this purchase had support of both him and the local community.

RESOLVED:

1. That the purchase of the freehold interest of Woking Magistrates Court for a total consideration as set out in the submitted report, be approved
2. That a contract be awarded for the fit out of the acquired property at a total cost as set out in the submitted report, subject to an appropriate procurement exercise.

Reasons for Decisions

As a consequence of the changes to the statutory responsibilities of the Coroner arising from the implementation of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009, the current Woking Coroner's Court no longer provides suitable or appropriate accommodation. Woking Magistrates Court has been identified as a multi-purpose site suitable for providing office accommodation for the Coroner, the Assistant Coroners, the Coroner's PA and the Coronial Staff (15-20 staff provided by Surrey Police and 2 staff provided by SCC), court accommodation for simultaneous Jury and non-Jury Inquests and archive storage for non-public Coronial records.

135/13 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 22]

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

[Meeting closed at 3.45pm]

Chairman

ITEM 4(b) - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question (1) from Mr Mike Giles, Chairman Westhumble Residents' Association

In answer to a question on costs, Surriya Subramaniam answered that "Surrey County Council has not received, nor will receive, payment from any partners in relation to the Prudential RideLondon-Surrey for closure of the roads on 4 August 2013. The event is being run in Surrey on the basis that it will be delivered at zero cost to local residents, with officer time being provided to liaise with the event organiser and ensure that delivery is safe and in the best interests of the residents and businesses of Surrey. The event organiser will be charged for costs relating to any road works over and above the road maintenance programme, and costs associated with preparation of the Traffic Orders for closing the roads."

If the event organisers pay no other charges than those mentioned, could SCC please clarify how "zero cost to local residents" can be achieved, considering the time and effort involved in liaison, preparation and placing of signage prior to the event plus subsequent removal, erection and removal of barriers, policing on the day, etc., etc., both in relation to this year's event on 4 August and over the next five years of proposed Ride London events, or in relation to other cycling events in the area which may require council involvement, and to arrive at any conclusion, has a cost/benefit analysis been conducted and made available for public scrutiny?

Reply:

Thank you very much for taking the time you have taken to contact me with regards to the query regarding the costs relating to the delivery of the Prudential London - Surrey 100 and Classic.

This event is a joint 5 year project between Surrey County Council and the Mayor of London's Office. The London Surrey Cycle Partnership, (which is a partnership between the London Marathon Company and Sweetspot, a Surrey based events company), were selected as the event delivery organiser.

As part of this agreement I was keen to ensure that we maximised on the long term potential benefits to businesses and residents across Surrey as part of our legacy following the Olympic Games. From the outset the planning principle was that there would be no direct cost to the County, Borough and District Councils while accepting that some officer time would need to be allocated to ensure the safe delivery of the event alongside our statutory requirements. This is the same approach that we have taken with other events in the County.

In relation to the example given for the creation of and deployment of the signs for the event there was no cost to the County Council other than to

review the plans of the event organiser to ensure that the arrangements met with our requirements. The event organiser, London Surrey Cycle Partnership did use our Highways Contractor to produce and place the signs required, this was achieved through a contract between the event organiser and the Highway contractor and payments were made between these two parties.

Surrey County Council does not normally have a relationship with companies involved in the supply and deployment of barriers, and as such could not provide a contact to a supplier. In this case London Surrey Cycle Partnership sourced barriers from a national company, but again officers from Surrey County Council were involved in reviewing the deployment plan of the barriers to ensure that safety aspects were adhered to.

It is the intention to maintain the same delivery model for the Prudential London-Surrey 100 and Classic in future years. It is important that the event is financially sustainable and that any financial costs and risks are covered by the event organiser. We are following the same model used in the successful delivery of the London Marathon for the past 30 years that has seen the benefit for business on the route as well as support to charities through donations from the event participants and the charitable trust.

Surrey County Council works closely with Surrey Police on a range of activities across County. I do not hold the information regarding the detail of how the policing was provided as part of the event delivery, other than to highlight that as with the Olympic events, we worked closely to ensure the safe and successful delivery of the event.

Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
24 September 2013

Question (2) from Mr Peter Crews

Who gave final approval to the draft minutes of the Cabinet Meeting on 23/7/13 before those minutes were published on the Council's web site?

Reply:

Thank you for your question.

In line with Democratic Services standard procedures, following the meeting, the minutes were drafted by the Committee Manager who attended the meeting. They were then circulated to the officers who provided reports for the meeting, as well as to the Cabinet and Cabinet Members who were present, to give them the opportunity to comment on any matters of accuracy. The draft minutes were then published on the website, with a message explaining that they are subject to confirmation at the next formal meeting of the Cabinet. If the Cabinet agree the minutes at today's meeting, this will constitute formal approval.

David Hodge
Leader of the Council

24 September 2013

Question (3) from Ms Jenny Desoutter

Regarding Road Closure Policy

In answer to my previous question (25 June 2013), you stated that the Ride London cycle event of 4 August 2013 was good for business, and you acknowledged that the closure of roads, and removal of the civil rights of movement along public highways would disrupt the lives of "tens of thousands" of people. You stated that an impact assessment had been done, and you also gave assurances that emergency services would be allowed access.

In actual fact, many legitimate Surrey businesses have lost money, and charities such as Wildlife Aid were affected. Also, in the event, several cases have occurred in which emergency vehicles were not allowed immediate access, aggravating risk. Many instances of suffering, hardship, loss of income and inconvenience to citizens' lawful rights to pursue their own lives, for example to return to their homes from hospital or from holidays, or to get to work, to visit sick relatives, or to attend family functions, have also been recorded. Many workers were "laid off" as businesses had to close, and lost money.

It was evident from the outset that through preventing lawful right of movement, and access to the highways infrastructure of the county over such a wide area, not only loss of freedom, and loss of revenue, but also loss of life could be precipitated where essential travel is disrupted. Not everything in life can be pre-planned around a particular event. Risk is increased where swift, flexible responses are impeded.

My question relates to your policy of imposing widespread, day-long road closures throughout the county for a non-essential sporting event, and issues raised by unintended outcomes. For clarity it is sub-divided into 4 parts:

1. Since 4 August 2013 was a prime holiday Sunday when many rural businesses such as pubs, and golf clubs, would expect to have good takings, and families spend money going out for the day, in making their judgements, have SCC ascertained, and taken into account, the extent of loss of revenue to private businesses in Surrey, due to inaccessibility because of road closures sanctioned by SCC, on 4 August 2013, and if so can SCC state what is the total sum in financial terms (in figures) lost to private businesses in Surrey on that day, and how many Surrey workers lost income on that day because of the road closures? If not when will this figure be available?
2. In the light of the many untoward incidents in Surrey which have been reported in the public domain (for example in The Surrey Advertiser, The Dorking and Leatherhead Advertiser, and The Telegraph) - can SCC now state a) how many untoward incidents involving medical and similar emergencies occurred throughout Surrey due to road closures on that day, and b) how many notifications of objection and difficulty you have, to this date, either had expressed directly to you through letter,

email or other, from individuals or organisations, including any you have become aware of through discussion or through the press or through the network of the internet, for example through the online petition called Stop Surrey becoming a Race Track?

3. Given that you have stated publicly that you would ensure that "*those who needed to get through*" would be able to have access, and given the issues surrounding prevention of access even to emergency services, can you state clearly HOW the need for access - bearing in mind that had it not been for SCC's decision to allow large-scale, day-long closures of roads all citizens could have made their own decisions regarding need to travel, and emergency services would have followed normal protocols - is judged, by whom these judgements are made; and by what legal right, and in the light of what training those who are making the judgements are empowered to do so?
4. How do these figures compare with those cited in the post Olympic Cost Benefit Analysis Report ("*public response to the Olympics had been very positive, with over 500 residents providing feedback. Of these 500 responses only 4 were complaints*" - I quote from the meeting of the Communities Select Committee, 16 January 2013, item 74/13). And are the responses and outcomes arising from the 4 August event in line with the impact assessment you had commissioned, or do they give rise to concerns you had failed to anticipate, and suggest that it is time to review a policy which, without due diligence, places the lives, freedom and safety of Surrey residents in a position of increased dependency and risk?

Reply:

1. The Prudential Ride London-Surrey is a long term commitment, and each year we will learn from the previous year and improve all aspects of the event. An economic impact report is being prepared by the event organiser, and we will note its content and work with the event organiser and partners to increase the benefits for both local business and to local communities.
- 2(a) Unfortunately, emergencies take place all too regularly on any given Sunday, and we are proud they are dealt with by exceptional, well trained and hard working professionals. We have been told by Surrey Fire and Rescue that there were no incidents that were outside their normal operating timescales on Sunday 4 August. We are not responsible for the Ambulance Service, but understand that they also continued their service provision throughout the event. This is a tribute to the efficiency of the emergency services and to the painstaking planning that went into the event.
- 2(b) We are aware of a number of online petitions, including the one you mention: 'Stop Surrey becoming a Race Track' and another titled 'Surrey County Council: Continue to support the Ride London Cycling event each year', and that over 2000 Surrey residents rode in the event. Over 20 Surrey charities had cyclists riding for them raising money for good causes. We want to make opportunities for ordinary

Surrey residents like Emily Read, who rode for her daughter Evie, diagnosed with a rare blood disease, and Tina Howard who rode in memory of her mother.

We don't keep a tally of all the written and verbal comments that we have received on the event. What is important is that we continue to listen to everyone's point of view. For next year's event we will pay particular attention to how we can work with the event organiser to reduce impact of the event on residents and businesses.

3. It is important to correct your opening statement, in that the emergency services were not prevented access during the event. Access was guaranteed for all emergencies and critical travel, such as carers travelling to vulnerable people. The control room had representatives from the emergency services sitting beside the event organisers, and all emergencies were allowed through by the event organiser. The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey may be a new event to Surrey. However, the event organisers have worked on many similar events in the past: The London Marathon, The Tour de France, The Olympic Road Cycling, Tour of Britain, all of which have equipped the people involved with the experience to deal with most eventualities as safely as possible.
4. The London 2012 Games were a high point in this country's sporting and cultural heritage, and this was reflected in the tide of positive sentiment after the event. We are grateful for the many Surrey residents who have provided constructive suggestions on how to improve next year's Prudential RideLondon-Surrey events. We are listening and acting on these suggestions. Next year, we will again put safety as our top priority, and we will redouble our efforts to reduce impact and increase benefits to communities and businesses.

Helyn Clack
Cabinet Member for Community Services
24 September 2013

Question (4) from Mr Allen Widdowson

Children throughout Elmbridge Borough are finding it harder and harder to secure places at Local Schools within the Borough. This is particularly the case for children who live close to the borders of Kingston and Epsom.

At the Surrey CC meeting 23 April 2013 Linda Kemeny updated the Council on plans for an expansion of Esher High, adding a further 30 places in 2015. And in the light of this the Council was reviewing the Esher High's catchment area for 2015 to ensure that additional places are allocated fairly. These plans should go some way to alleviate the pressure in some parts of the Borough, particularly in KT10 (Claygate).

Given the recent attempt to vary admissions criteria at Hinchley Wood to give priority to applications from both KT10 (Claygate) and KT7 (Thames Ditton) over those from Long Ditton, Elmbridge, KT6. What assurance can the

Council provide that action will be taken to ensure that ALL Elmbridge children will have an equal and fair opportunity to access local secondary schools, within the Borough, before any more children are placed at a significant disadvantage.

Reply:

The vast majority of children living in Elmbridge have taken up places in one of the 4 secondary schools in the borough. Each year we analyse parental preferences and the 2013 figures demonstrate that, of all the offers made to the secondary schools in Elmbridge, only 8 were to children out of the County. Taking in to account that all the Elmbridge schools have a defined catchment area, this would seem to demonstrate that the admission arrangements for the Elmbridge schools are providing places for local children. Our record for meeting parental preference in Surrey is strong with the County Council providing a higher percentage of parents with a school of their preference than many of the London Boroughs.

Officers are aware of a particular issue which has affected Claygate residents this year and officers are working with local secondary headteachers to try and find a solution that gives families more assurance of a school place within a reasonable travelling distance in future.

All but one of the four Elmbridge Secondary schools are academies and, as such, are their own Admissions Authority and set their own admissions criteria. All schools and academies must follow the School Admissions Code and this ensures that all children have equal and fair access to school places. There is no evidence to suggest that Elmbridge children are at any disadvantage in this regard.

Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
24 September 2013

CABINET RESPONSE TO CHILDREN AND EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

**Increasing the Employability of Young People in Surrey
(considered by Select Committee on 31 July 2013)**

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That Cabinet consider how students who are unlikely to be eligible for a combined plan will be supported following the introduction of Education, Health & Care Plans (EHCP) and the cessation of School Action and School Action Plus, so as not to jeopardise their chances of post-16 participation in Education, Training and Employment.

RESPONSE

Cabinet recognises the concerns of the Children and Education Select Committee in relation to the introduction of Education, Health & Care Plans (EHCP) and the cessation of School Action and School Action plus. New legislation in the Children and Families Bill will replace the School Action and School Action plus categories with a new single category: Additional Special Education Need Support (ASENS). In Surrey, the ASENS category of children will be supported through their school's local offer.

We are expecting schools to be able to demonstrate that their local offer will meet the requirements of pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) who do not meet the threshold for an EHCP. Surrey is supporting schools through this process by providing training in provision management tools which will enable the school to evaluate and describe the effectiveness of a range of SEND interventions. This will lead to provision which is more effective and better targeted at needs. Training will also be provided to SEN Coordinators to ensure they are able to support pupils' SEND needs appropriately.

The changes brought about by the Children and Families Bill will not result in an overall funding reduction for the Surrey pupils who are currently covered by School Action and School Action plus, although funding will be allocated differently in the future. This new model of distribution will place a greater emphasis on the relationship between funding and attainment, with those schools where pupil attainment is lowest receiving a higher proportion of funding than they do currently.

This will mean that there will be some changes in the funding allocated to individual schools. Officers and the DfE recognise that some schools with large numbers of high cost SEND pupils, but few low attaining pupils, may find it difficult to secure funding from the delegated sources. In response to these concerns, and where this is a particular issue for schools, we are proposing to allocate a proportion of the additional high needs funding outside the delegated formula.

While these changes are taking place, Services for Young People will continue to commission work to support participation after age 16 and ensure

that young people with SEND can make successful transitions from Year 11 onwards. The Pathways Team's work with SEND young people, to support their transition to college or employment, will continue for students from Year 9 to Year 11 and beyond, up to the age of 25. Additionally, Year 11/12 provision will continue to identify and support 'at risk' young people who will fall into the ASENS category following the changes.

The service also commissions a range of local interventions, such as Centre Based Youth Work and the Local Prevention Framework. These commissions are focused on young people aged 14 to 19 and will continue to support participation in Education, Training and Employment post 16. As with Year 11/12 provision, a significant proportion of this work supports those young people who will fall into the ASENS category.

In order to ensure that this provision continues to meet the needs of young people following these changes, Officers are carrying out research to establish why SEND young people have a higher propensity to become NEET. The findings from this research will feed directly into the Services for Young People commissioning process, to ensure that these groups receive support into education, training or employment which is closely matched to their needs.

Mrs Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
24 September 2013

CABINET RESPONSE TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE

**Adult Social Care Budget 2013/14
(considered by Select Committee on 5 September 2013)**

SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

That -- in light of the Committee's serious concerns about the possibility of budget overspend -- the Adult Social Care budget for this year be reviewed again to reflect increased demand on the services.

RESPONSE

The Select Committee expressed doubts about the realism of outturn forecasts, and requests that the adult social care budget be reviewed to reflect a more realistic financial position.

1. 2013/14 Budget background

- a. It is acknowledged that this budget does carry risks.
- b. In addition to the savings made over the last three years of £86m, a further savings target of £46m (of £64m for the total County) was passed down to the service for the current financial year.
- c. The Select Committee at the budget setting stage did express its concerns at the level of savings required, and the budget was increased by £11m compared with the previous MTFP assumption.

2. Budget Objectives

- a. To achieve the savings targets the budget had the following main saving initiatives:
 - i. successful negotiation with suppliers
 - ii. no increases in demand beyond those built into the budget (as did occur in 2012/13)
 - iii. minimal slippage in the established savings programs
 - iv. £15 million of savings through the new initiative making better use of social capital

3. Current Status

- a. It is expected that objectives i-iii above will be achieved assuming no new pressures or increase in demand arise.
- b. Objective iv, above is the main item at risk. It must be emphasised that this objective represents a radical change in the way that the service has approached assessment and is the main focus of the service.
- c. It is still believed that £8m of this target can be achieved by the year end. That would leave a gap in achievement of £7m which it is proposed be met this year from unused Whole Systems Funds but will also need to be funded going forward.

4. Ongoing Actions

- a. The service believes that the current management of the budget performance is adequate and in completing the outturn for the year, the full list of objectives in the comprehensive savings list is constantly monitored
- b. By the October reporting date to Adult Social Care select committee and Cabinet will provide the first viable indications of the extent to which that £8 million is likely to be delivered this year, and also some initial indication of the long-term deliverability of the program.

Mr Mel Few
Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
24 September 2013

This page is intentionally left blank