

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 29 JANUARY 2019 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 Tim Oliver (Chairman)	*Mr Mike Goodman
*Mr Colin Kemp (Vice-Chairman)	*Mrs Mary Lewis
*Ms Charlotte Morley	*Mrs Julie Iles
*Mrs Sinead Mooney	*Mr Matt Furniss
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Mrs Natalie Bramhall	*Mr Wyatt Ramsdale
*Mr Cameron McIntosh	*Miss Alison Griffiths

\* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr Ken Gulati, Chairman of Corporate Overview Select Committee  
Mr Will Forster, Woking South  
Dr Andrew Povey, Cranleigh & Ewhurst  
Mr Jonathan Essex, Redhill East  
Mrs Hazel Watson, Dorking Hills  
Mr Chris Botten, Caterham Hill  
Mr Stephen Cooksey, Dorking South & The Holmwoods  
Mr John O'Reilly, Hersham

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**1/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

There were none.

**2/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 18 DECEMBER 2018 [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2018 were approved as an accurate record.

**3/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**4/19 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

**1 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

There were eight questions received from four Members. The questions and responses are attached as annex A.

Several supplementary questions were asked by Members:-

Q1. Mr Will Forster asked if support would be available to the families of EU staff. The Deputy Leader responded that guidance for the general public was available on the Government website and links would be put on the Council's website as well as social media.

Q2. Mr Will Forster asked what insurance had the Council received, or would receive, as a result of Lakers Youth Centre. The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families responded that she would send that information to Mr Forster.

Q4. Dr Andrew Povey was pleased with the revised recommendations for the community recycling centres and asked for assurance that the assessment would be open and published and that ideas from residents would be sought. The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste gave assurances and stated that further details would be discussed under item 7a on the agenda.

Q5. Mr Jonathan Essex asked if it could be confirmed what the predicted monthly expenditure was for agency and interim workers in the 19/20 year. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Support would send a written response for this.

Q6. Mr Jonathan Essex asked:

- (a) In relation to children's centres he asked for an explanation why it was considered that only one mobile bus was deemed to be enough to provide effective coverage
- (b) for consideration of the Government guidance of distance of community recycling centres
- (c) for further consideration of methods for increasing recycling and increasing revenue from recycling, e.g. sorting paper
- (d) for assurances that further proposals would not reduce recycling rates and this is looked at properly

The Leader stated that the questions b) to d) regarding recycling centres would be dealt with under the agenda item when more information would be reported.

With regards to question a) the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families stated that more information would be discussed under agenda item 7a but in a nutshell what the Council was proposing was for an outreach service that doesn't focus on buildings. What came out of the consultation is that the mobile centre would be focussed on hard to reach communities e.g. Gypsy/Roma communities and would provide flexible outreach service. The remaining children's centres would be hubs from which outreach service would be provided to a much wider area.

Q8. Mr Jonathan Essex asked for confirmation how the new Investment Strategy would develop and how one could contribute to it. The Leader responded that the Investment Board would be considering the future Investment Strategy in the near future that will consider whether investment continues out of the county but at the moment the focus will be on the Surrey estate.

## **5/19 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were three questions received from members of the public. The questions and responses are attached as annex B.

Supplementary questions were asked by:

Q1 Mrs Blake made several points:

- She questioned the data used in the response to her question and stated that the figures using car parking before the charges was double that figure used by the Council and that since charging the use had dropped considerably
- She asked if the negative effect of the parking charges on health of Surrey residents and on the health and social care budget be taken into account when the scheme is reviewed and if not, why not

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste did not support the figures quoted by Mrs Blake and explained that the revenue received from the charges was used to protect the environment.

Q2. Mr Oliver asked that the Council conduct an urgent independent review of the Cabinet area of responsibility for the environment and its relationship with Surrey Wildlife Trust, an organisation which was failing all its objectives and if not, why not.

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste gave details of the Woodland Strategy adopted by the Council and other work undertaken to protect wildlife and the environment. He also stated that he would provide written details to Mr Oliver on how the Surrey Wildlife Trust worked.

Q3. Mrs King asked if the Council would support the offer that Reigate and Banstead Borough Council had made to work with the County on a local delivery model for a service that engages with existing providers including Dover's Green Children's Centre.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families explained that it would be several months before centres started closing and that the Council would work closely with district and borough councils to see what services that residents valued could be located. That will be taking place across the whole county and not just Reigate and Banstead.

## **6/19 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were nine petitions submitted. Three of these concerned children's centres and six concerning community recycling centres. Details and responses to the petitions are attached as annex C.

Mr George Potter presented the petition in support of Boxgrove Children's Centre and made the following points:

- That Boxgrove Children's Centre was a vital resource
- That if it closed residents would have to take two buses or a one hour journey to the nearest hub
- If it closed it would be social workers and teachers having to pick up the pieces

- That the number signing the petition was larger than the Conservative majority at the last election.

Ms Hannah Nicholson presented the petition in support of Cranleigh Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- Recycling rates had reduced
- There had been increases in fines, fly-tipping and litter
- There was increased build-up of waste in gardens which led to vermin
- Hundreds of new homes were built in Cranleigh which increased waste
- There would be a 20 mile round trip to the nearest centre if Cranleigh closed
- She understood the need to save money but not at the expense of the environment and stated that residents would rather pay a small fee to use the current site

Hazel Watson presented the petition in support of Dorking Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- Further signatories to the petition were tabled
- Highlighted the impact on drive times if the centre closed and that it would be 20 to 30 minutes more to drive to the next nearest centre
- The Leatherhead centre suffered massive queues and there was reduced opening times at other centres
- Requested to keep the Dorking centre open for at least three days per week, if not seven.

Mr Charles Lister presented the petition in support of Warlingham Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- He was pleased that the Council were going to review the options
- He described the anger felt by residents over the initial proposed closure
- Warlingham was the smallest site in Surrey and it averaged one use every two minutes it was open
- Caterham site was not big enough to cope with extra users
- There needed to be a better solution to recycling and that kerbside collections did not compensate.

Ms Sylvia Whyte presented the petition in support of Lyne Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- She was happy that the centre was going to stay open
- Additional signatories to the petition were tabled
- She spoke of increased fly-tipping and 100's of new homes being built
- The A320 was saturated and spoke of journeys to alternative sites
- Closure would mean more burning of waste in back gardens

Daniel Gee presented the petition in support of Farnham Community Recycling Centre and made the following points:

- He spoke of another online petition that was not presented to Cabinet
- He spoke of the need to relocate the Farnham site so this position was not replicated in the future.

**7/19 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

**8/19 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

Mr Ken Gulati, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Select Committee presented the committee's recommendations relating to item 7b on the agenda. A response to the report is attached as Annex D.

**9/19 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS/ INVESTMENT BOARD TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reason for Decision**

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

**10/19 TRANSFORMATION PROPOSALS - DELIVERING BETTER SERVICES FOR RESIDENTS [Item ]**

The Leader reported an error in the report: In Annex 4, Table 5, the total estimated saving figure for 2020/21 was incorrect. It currently read as £1,060,000 when it should read £1,110,000.

Mr Chris Botten addressed the Cabinet and expressed concern about the possible lack of children support for the Tandridge area and south of the M25. He highlighted many of the current services that he said needed a building to provide a means of safety and security. He requested that Cabinet reconsider the possibility of a satellite centre in this location as without details of what the proposed outreach service would provide then he was not reassured.

Mr Stephen Cooksey addressed the Cabinet and spoke about the Dorking Children's Centre which had an outstanding rating by Ofsted and provided good services to some of the most deprived in Surrey. The current budget proposals meant that only a shadow of the current services could be provided. He requested that Cabinet rethink its proposals. He also spoke of the Dorking Community Recycling Centre and was glad to see the revised recommendations to keep it open whilst a review was undertaken but again requested that Cabinet find a way to keep this centre open permanently.

Mr John O'Reilly addressed the Cabinet and thanked both the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families as well as the Executive Director for Children, Families and Learning for the engagement undertaken. He spoke of confidence in the two to take forward the transformation of

children's services. He stated that as a realist he understood the need for change but asked Cabinet to exercise flexibility and discretion going forward.

Mr Will Forster also addressed the Cabinet and spoke against the proposed closure of five of the seven children's centres in Woking which was the second most deprived borough in Surrey. He also expressed concern about the budget cuts for the remaining centres where one in particular would have a 40% budget cut. He questioned the use of 2015 data which he said was not reliable and gave details of the numbers of new social properties built since then.

Mr Jonathan Essex spoke of the need for the two children's centres proposed for closure in his area. He spoke of the high cost of living in Surrey and the subsequent areas of deprivation. He understood the need for change and for improving children's services but did not understand the reasoning given for the closures. He requested that Cabinet put the proposals on hold for six months, as they are proposing for the community recycling centres, and press for a comprehensive funding settlement.

The Leader thanked the speakers and stated that all 81 councillors wanted to see improved outcomes. The Cabinet would work with boroughs and district councils going forward. However, there was no intention of changing the recommendations on children's centres today.

#### Children's Centres

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families thanked the petitioners, speakers and questioners for their interest in the wellbeing of children and highlighted the Vision of the Council where no one is left behind. She went on to explain the need for change and reported that Ofsted had said outcomes for 'children in need of care and protection' were inadequate. She painted a picture of the children and their families that need the support but do not currently access services until a crisis point. She explained that the new service model would focus on outreach taking support into people's homes, making families more resilient.

She went on to explain that the Council would work with borough and district councils to facilitate the provision of non-statutory services such as baby weigh-ins and stay & play. She explained each recommendation and spoke of the evidence that this was the right approach and highlighted evidence from a National Audit Office report on the closure of Children's Centres where it was shown that there was no increase in child protection cases with a targeted service.

The Deputy Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning stated that she had two children's centres closing in her area and spoke of generational problems and lack of parenting skills as well as other issues and that there was a need to look at the whole family rather than just children.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. The remodelling of the remaining Children's Centres to create Family Centres as part of a wider Family Service to support families with children aged 0-11 that are the most vulnerable was endorsed.

2. That the number of Children's Centres in Surrey be reduced from 58 centres to 21 centres and satellite sites, to be located in areas where children are most likely to experience poor outcomes. At least one main centre in each district and borough supported by the use of satellites, outreach workers and community venues.
3. That the number of mobile Family Centres in Surrey be reduced from two to one in order to reach areas where there are small numbers of vulnerable children and families.

*The vote was unanimous.*

### **Reasons for decision**

Moving to a new model of Family Centre services will help develop a more effective way of supporting families that need help earlier to improve their outcomes. By reorganising Children's Centres into more targeted models of provision, we believe this will support more children and young people to avoid becoming subject to child protection or public care.

The Family Centre model will enable us to help more families and children to become more resilient who would otherwise be more likely to experience poor outcomes without support.

Retention of a mobile Family Centre means we can maintain outreach support to children and families across the county who may struggle to access a main centre or community venue.

By prioritising the location of Family Centres in areas of high deprivation, or where children are likely to be living in households that have low incomes or unemployment, this will enable us to prioritise resources for children who need services most. Deprived areas have been identified using the 2015 Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index, which shows the proportion of children under the age of 16 living in low-income households in different neighbourhoods.

Recognising that some needs cross the boundaries of deprivation, such as domestic abuse and parental mental health, funding allocations are also being based on the total population of children within communities.

The composition of the families the Centres support have children across a range of different ages, which fall outside the current service offer for 0-5 year olds. Centres are already supporting families with children who fall outside of this age bracket. We therefore propose to expand the age range of children supported to 0-11 years as part of the service offer going forward.

### **Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND)**

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning presented this part of the report and explained why the Council were undertaking the path presented. She spoke of the need for earlier identification of needs as well as upskilling of staff to provide the support needed. She also spoke of a question submitted by Family Voice and explained that she would be sharing details with them through the consultation phase.

**RESOLVED:**

4. That the broad support from consultation respondents for the proposed principles for transformation of SEND services was noted, namely:
  - Children with special educational needs are identified earlier and supported in a timely and effective way in order to improve their outcomes and wellbeing.
  - There is an increased focus on earlier intervention and prevention to offer help and meet needs at the earliest opportunity, reducing the demand on high cost, high need interventions.
  - Children and young people are helped to become resilient and independent so that they can lead independent and fulfilling lives in their own communities.
  - The voices of our children, young people and families are heard so they can shape and inform how we work together to get the best results.
  - Surrey's early years settings, schools, colleges and other providers are able to support children to live and grown up locally and achieve their full potential.
  
5. That the broad support from consultation respondents for the areas of transformation for SEND services was noted, namely:
  - Early identification and support
  - Developing local services and managing the market
  - Partnership working
  - Improving policy and practice.
  
6. That further engagement and co-design activity will be undertaken with families, health partners, education and other partners to explore the feedback, ideas and concerns shared through the consultation and develop the council's draft SEND strategy into a jointly owned Surrey special educational needs and disabilities strategy and long term action plan was noted.
  
7. That authority be delegated to the Executive Director for Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for All Age Learning, to approve the final joint strategy and the long-term action plan, once completed subject to paragraph 77 of the submitted report and further Cabinet decision as necessary.
  
8. That in the event that any of the co-design activity work, strategy identification and/or action plan gives rise to a change in the delivery of services that necessitates consultation and public engagement that will be undertaken alongside consideration to our Public Sector Equality and Section 11 Children Act 2004 duties.

*The vote was unanimous.*



## **Reasons for decision**

Agreeing the recommendations for the draft SEND strategy will enable the council to carry out further co-design of those services for some of the most vulnerable children and young people in the county so they are able to access the high quality services they need.

## **Libraries & Culture**

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning also introduced this part of the report and spoke of the need for financially stable spaces needed for community use. She also spoke of the consultation undertaken and highlighted that there had been a lack of representation of those under 18 years of age and that this would be picked up in the next stages. In response to a Member question she confirmed that consultation was undertaken with Surrey County Council maintained schools through their bulletin and that an email link had been sent to independent schools.

## **RESOLVED:**

9. That the refinements, in italics, to the five strategic principles of the proposed Libraries and Cultural Services Strategy, reflecting consultation feedback was noted. These are:
  - Libraries and cultural services provide and enable opportunities for everyone to learn, access information, acquire new skills, literacy and be involved in their communities.
  - There *will be* a focus on the wellbeing and strengthening of communities, particularly the most vulnerable, to enable them to be resilient, *providing touch points and safe spaces*.
  - Libraries and cultural services are most effective and efficient when they work in partnership with the public, voluntary, community and private sectors, including through the creation of shared spaces *creating a model of financial sustainability*.
  - New technologies, including digital, enable libraries and cultural services to reach new audiences, and existing audiences in new ways, and offer 24/7 access.
  - Volunteers are crucial community advocates and assets in libraries and cultural services, who also gain valuable skills and relationships through the work they do.
10. That the Executive Director for Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture will prepare detailed proposals with partners, including district and borough councils, for a proposed future model for library and cultural services in Surrey based on the five newly adopted strategic principles was noted.
11. That a second public consultation be carried out setting out the detailed proposals referred to in Resolution 9 above.

*The vote was unanimous.*

## **Reasons for decision**

The council can proceed to develop a financially sustainable future model of libraries and cultural services in Surrey, subject to consultation and the Equality Impact Assessment, that reflects modern expectations, is fit for purpose and provides and enables opportunities for everyone to learn, access information, acquire new skills, increase literacy and be involved in their communities.

### **Community Recycling Centres**

Amended recommendations were tabled at the meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste spoke of the new recommendations and thanked organisations and residents that had made their views known. He highlighted that the community recycling centres (CRC) would deal with recycling only and no non-recyclables. He went on to explain the new task group to be set up to review the service. It would be a cross-party task group taking evidence from Suez, borough and district councils, residents, Members of Parliament, officers, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Surrey Waste Partnership so would be wide reaching. The task group would look at keeping the CRCs open whilst still having a balance budget. A report was expected to be brought to Cabinet in June 2019.

The Deputy Leader stated that fly-tipping was a national issue and would urge all residents to check for licenses and get receipts for their waste disposal. He also extended thanks to the Leadership and to officers for the work undertaken.

### **RESOLVED:**

12. That the community recycling centres (CRCs) located at Farnham and Lyne (Chertsey) be retained, based on the current and projected use of these sites.
13. That the current prices for materials in the charging waste scheme be maintained.
14. That a charge for construction wood and roofing felt from Monday 1 April 2019 or as soon as practically possible after this be introduced.
15. That an annual application fee for van, trailer and pick-up permits from 1 May 2019 be introduced, when all permits are due for renewal.
16.
  - a. That the CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham be retained until 30 September 2019, but restrict their use to accepting recycling materials only.
  - b. During this period assess whether different models for operating and funding these four CRCs could achieve the same saving as closing them. If that service cannot be achieved then proceed with their closure on 1 October 2019.

- c. In the event that the four CRCs close, extend the opening hours of Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead CRCs from six days per week to seven days per week.

17. That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste establish a task group to work with officers to develop a new waste strategy for Surrey County Council by September 2020, considering the implications of the Government's Resource and Waste Strategy and to ensure the waste service is affordable within the current financial strategy.

*The vote was unanimous.*

### **Reason for decision**

Recognising both the value many residents place on Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) and the need to make savings, we propose to limit closure of CRCs to the minimum number possible to achieve savings. Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham are recommended for closure as they handle the least waste and have the lowest number of visitors, however this will be delayed so that alternative options to achieve the savings through alternative operational and funding models can be fully explored. Further CRC usage information can be found in Annex 4b to the submitted report.

As the nearest alternative CRCs within the network, extending the opening hours of Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead CRCs should help to mitigate the impact of the CRC closures if this goes ahead.

In addition, introducing charges for construction wood and roofing felt and launching permits for vans, trailers and pickups will assist in delivery of the savings target for 2019/20. While the option to increase charges on the existing charging waste scheme has been explored, it would have a negligible impact on savings delivery and charges are currently towards the upper end of charges relative to similar councils.

### **Concessionary Bus Travel**

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste presented this part of the report that sought to bring the Council offer on non-statutory concessionary bus travel in line with other councils. He explained that details of the responses to the consultation was available on the Council's website.

He pointed out that paragraph 41 of the report speaks of companion passes being for a trial period. This was an earlier option considered and should be removed from the report.

### **RESOLVED:**

18. That the non-statutory additional travel concession for disabled pass holders and offer the national statutory English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS) in Surrey from 1 April 2019 be withdrawn. Disabled pass holders will be able to travel for free between 09.30 and 23.00 on weekdays, all day at weekends and on bank holidays

19. That companion passes be retained, so from 1 April 2019 entitled pass holders and a companion can travel for free between 9:30am and 11:00pm on weekdays, all day at weekends and bank holidays.

20. That officers would continue discussions with bus operators on a commercial offer of a reduced fare or flat fare scheme in the county was noted.

### **Reason for decision**

By agreeing these recommendations, this will help the council to achieve savings of £400,000 to contribute towards its overall savings requirement in 2019/20.

In addition, impact on travel is likely to be minimal. Analysis shows that only 2% of all journeys made using the disabled pass take place before 9:30am and after 11:00pm on weekdays.

Having considered the consultation feedback, and the impact removal of the companion pass will have on disabled pass holders and their companions, we are proposing to retain companion passes, but bring the terms of companion pass usage in line with those of disabled passes. This means companion pass holders will be able to travel on the bus network for free from 9:30am to 11:00pm on weekdays, and free all day for weekends and bank holidays.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Corporate Overview Select Committee]*

## **11/19 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING REPORT [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced a report that summarised the most significant issues for the Council's 2018/19 financial position as at 30 November 2018 for both revenue and capital budgets. He explained how the new method of reporting was much improved with real time data and reported that the use of reserves had reduced.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families recognised the huge upheaval for staff in Children's Services of which 2700 staff would have been reconfigured by the end of March. She sought to reassure staff that it was about delivering better services.

The Leader thanked officers for their hard work.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet noted the Council's overall revenue and capital budget positions as at 30 November 2018:
  - £14.5m forecast underspend against the 2018/19 budget;
  - £6.7m forecast total draw down reserves;
  - £2.8m additional revenue funding in 2018/19 from the Department for Education to provide support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) (Annex 1, paragraph 1), and

- £132m forecast service capital programme outturn against £134m budget.
2. That the contribution to a new SEND Reserve an amount matching the overspending on the Dedicated Schools Grant High Needs Block was approved.

### **Reasons for decisions**

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

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Corporate Overview Select Committee]*

## **12/19 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2019/20 TO 2023/24 [Item 7]**

The Cabinet Member for Finance presented a report which detailed:

- the revenue and capital budgets for 2019/20, including budget reductions
- the council tax precept level for 2019/20,
- the council's capital receipt flexibilities strategy, including the level of investment required to deliver the transformation programme, which aims to significantly change the way the council operates and delivers its services,
- indicative directorate budget envelopes to 2023/24, and
- the council's Capital and Investment Strategy, which provided an overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contributed to the provision of local public services.

He went on to express his appreciation of staff involved in putting the report together and drew Members attention to the S151 Officer comments and emphasised how important it was for Members to read and understand these.

An amendment for recommendations 2 and 3 as published was tabled at the meeting.

An error in the published paper was given as 'paragraph 12 of the report references annex 6 which was incorrect and should say annexes 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.

### **RESOLVED:**

That Cabinet makes the following recommendations to Council on 5 February 2019.

### **Cabinet recommends to Council to note the following important features of the revenue and capital budget**

1. The Executive Director of Finance's statutory conclusions in his Section 25 statement.

**Proposed budget: Cabinet recommendations to Council for the revenue and capital budgets**

2. Approve the net revenue budget requirement be set at £886.1 million (net cost of services after service specific government grants) for 2019/20 (Annex 6 of the submitted report), subject to confirmation of the Final Local Government Financial Settlement
3. Approve the total council tax funding requirement be set at £731.5 million for 2019/20. This is an increase in the level of the council tax of 2.99% (Annex 6 of the submitted report).
4. Notes that for the purpose of section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the council formally determines that the increase in council tax is not such as to trigger a referendum.
5. Set the Surrey County Council precept for Band D council tax at £1,453.50, which represents a 2.99% up-lift. This is a rise of 81p a week from 2018/19's precept of £1,411.29. This includes £102.39 for the Adult Social Care Precept, which remains at the same rate as last year. A full list of bands is as follows:

Council Tax Band	2018/19 £	2019/20 £
<b>Band A</b>	940.86	£969.00
<b>Band B</b>	1,097.67	£1,130.50
<b>Band C</b>	1,254.48	£1,292.00
<b>Band D</b>	1,411.29	£1,453.50
<b>Band E</b>	1,724.91	£1,776.51
<b>Band F</b>	2,038.53	£2,099.51
<b>Band G</b>	2,352.15	£2,422.51
<b>Band H</b>	2,822.58	£2,907.01

6. Approve the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy for 2019/20 to meet the statutory guidelines for the use of capital receipts to fund the transformation and reform of services (Annex 8 of the submitted report)
7. Approve the application of a further £7.2 million in the current 2018/19 financial year to fund the transformation under the capital receipt flexibilities strategy (Annex 8 of the submitted report).
8. Approve the use of £16.3 million in the 2019/20 financial year, to fund the transformation under the capital receipt flexibilities strategy (Annex 8 of the submitted report).
9. That the underlying balance on the general fund remains set at £21.3 million as at 1 April 2019.
10. Approve the Total Schools Budget of £492.9 million to meet the council's statutory requirement on schools funding. (Annex 6 of the submitted report).
11. Approve the overall indicative budget envelopes for Executive Directorates and individual services for the 2019/20 budget (Annex 6 of the submitted report).
12. Note the indicative budget envelopes for 2020-24 (Annex 6 of the submitted report).

13. Approve £413.8 million indicative five year capital programme, with £129.2 million capital investment in 2019/20 (Annex 6 of the submitted report).

**Capital Strategy: Cabinet recommendations to Council:**

14. The Capital Strategy for 2019-24 (Annex 9 of the submitted report)  
15. The policy for making a prudent level of revenue provision for the repayment of debt (the Minimum Revenue Provisions policy) (Annex 9A of the submitted report)

**Reasons for decision**

Council will meet on 5 February 2019 to agree a budget and set the council tax precept for 2019/20. Cabinet must recommend a budget to Council to consider at this meeting.

The budget directs available resources to support the achievement of the council's ambitions and priorities in the Vision and the Organisation Strategy.

In particular, the budget proposals reflect the Vision ambition to ensure no one in Surrey is left behind. We know, as documented in the evidence base compiled to inform the 2030 Vision, that some residents experience a poorer quality of life than their neighbours - we will focus the resources we have available on actions that best support the most vulnerable people in communities, and those who do not have the means or resources to help themselves.

Prioritising spend in the current context of funding constraints and increased demands has necessitated the redirection of some funding from universal services and provision to targeted services and this is reflected in proposals for service transformation articulated in the accompanying Part A report Transformation Proposals – Delivering Better Services for Residents Cabinet report of 29 January 2019. The Part A report also details changes to services that include stopping some services we are not statutorily required to provide.

The budget will also support the delivery of the major transformational changes that are required to ensure that the council can improve priority outcomes for residents while managing growing demands for services and ensuring future financial sustainability.

Following the confirmation of the Council Tax and Business rates bases and collection fund balances by Surrey Borough and Districts, the total council tax to be collected will be £731.506m, an increase of £206,000. In addition, business rates receipts will increase by £77,000.

These changes will be reflected in the papers for County Council on 5 February.

**13/19 ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS FOR SURREY'S COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS AND COORDINATED SCHEMES FOR SEPTEMBER 2020 AND SURREY'S RELEVANT AREA [Item 8]**

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning presented a report which explained how Surrey County Council was responsible for setting the admission arrangements for its community and voluntary controlled schools and the coordinated schemes. Academies, foundation, free, trust and voluntary aided

schools were responsible for setting their own admission arrangements and therefore their admission arrangements were not covered in the report. She highlighted the second recommendation of the report and reported that the governors of Wallace Fields Infant School had also agreed to the change to the admission arrangements.

### **RESOLVED:**

It is recommended that Cabinet make the following recommendations to the County Council:

#### **Recommendation 1**

That the published admissions number for Reception at Furze field Primary School is decreased from 60 to 58 for September 2020.

#### **Reasons for decision**

- It will enable children admitted to the SEND Learning and Additional Needs centre to be educated in the mainstream class more than 50% of the time
- It will reduce the likelihood of the school having to take qualifying measures to meet infant class size legislation
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of the school
- There will still be sufficient places for local children if the PAN is decreased
- It will have no impact on children who are currently on roll at the school

#### **Recommendation 2**

That the admission arrangements for Wallace Fields Junior School are amended so that the measuring point used to assess nearest school and home to school distance will be the nearest gate of either Wallace Fields Infant School or Wallace Fields Junior School.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- There was overall support for this change
- It will ensure that the school serves the local community around both the infant and the junior schools
- It will enable more local children to transfer from the infant school to the junior school
- It will support families by keeping siblings at schools that are within close proximity
- It will remove uncertainty for some families who have the infant school as their nearest school at Reception but not the junior school at Year 3
- This proposal is in line with a separate consultation by Wallace Fields Infant School to make the same changes to their admission arrangements. The change to the admission arrangements for Wallace Fields Junior School is subject to the governors of Wallace Fields Infant School also agreeing to the same change at their full Governing Body meeting on Wednesday 16 January 2019
- It is supported by the Headteacher and Governing Body of Wallace Fields Junior School



### **Recommendation 3**

That children previously in state care outside England who left that care as a result of being adopted are given priority under criterion two for children with an exceptional social/medical need.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- It is consistent with the advice issued by Nick Gibb, Minister of State for School Standards, and advice issued by the Department for Education in August 2018
- It provides as much parity as the local authority can provide with children who have been adopted from care in England, who receive priority within criterion one
- It will ensure that this vulnerable group of children will receive priority in the admissions process for community and voluntary controlled schools, regardless of the country in which the child was in state care, as long as they were adopted from that care.

### **Recommendation 4**

That Surrey's Relevant Area is agreed as set out in Enclosure 3 to the submitted report.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- The local authority is required by law to define the Relevant Area for admissions
- The Relevant Area must be consulted upon and agreed every two years even if no changes are proposed
- Setting a Relevant Area ensures that any schools who might be affected by changes to the admission arrangements for other local schools will be made aware of those changes
- No change has been made to Surrey's Relevant Area since it was last determined in March 2017

### **Recommendation 5**

That the Published Admission Numbers (PANs) for September 2020 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools (excluding Furzeffield Primary School which is covered by Recommendation 1) are determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1 of the Cabinet.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- All other PANs remain as determined for 2019 which enables parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The School Commissioning team supports the PANs

### **Recommendation 6**

That the aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2020 for which no change is proposed, are agreed as set out in Enclosure 1 and its appendices.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- The existing arrangements are working well
- This will ensure stability and consistency for the majority of Surrey's parents, pupils and schools

- The arrangements enable parents to have some historical benchmark by which to make informed decisions about their school preferences
- The arrangements enable the majority of pupils to attend their nearest schools and in doing so reduce travel and support Surrey's sustainability policies
- Schools which will not be taken in to account in the assessment of nearest school, as set out in Appendix 3 of Enclosure 1, have been determined by the definition set out in paragraph 12 of Enclosure 1

#### **Recommendation 7**

That the primary and secondary coordinated admission schemes that will apply to all schools for 2020 are agreed as set out in Enclosure 2 of the Cabinet report.

#### **Reasons for Decision**

- The coordinated schemes for 2020 are essentially the same as 2019 with dates updated
- The coordinated schemes would enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated schemes are working well
- Changes highlighted in bold in Enclosure 2 add clarity and are in line with the schemes proposed by other local authorities participating in the Pan London coordinated admissions process

Meeting closed at 4.43 pm

---

**Chairman**