

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 21 DECEMBER 2021 AT 2.00 PM  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT  
HILL, REIGATE, SURREY ,RH2 8EF.**

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

Members:

\* (present)

- \*Tim Oliver (Chairman)
- \*Natalie Bramhall
- \*Clare Curran
- \*Matt Furniss
- \*Mark Nuti
- \*Denise Turner-Stewart
- \*Sinead Mooney
- \*Marisa Heath
- Becky Rush
- \*Kevin Deanus

Deputy Cabinet Members:

- \*Maureen Attewell
- \*Rebecca Paul
- \*Steve Bax

Members in attendance:

Will Forster, Local Member for Woking South  
Jonathan Essex, Local Member for Redhill East  
Catherine Baart, Local Member for Earlswood and Reigate South  
Nick Darby, Local Member for Dittons and Weston Green Residents  
Lance Spencer, Goldsworth East and Horsell Village  
Robert Evans, Stanwell and Stanwell Moor

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**230/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Becky Rush.

**231/21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 30 NOVEMBER 2021 [Item 2]**

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 30 November 2021 were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

**232/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

## 233/21 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

### 233/211 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were ten member questions. The questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda.

With regards to his first questions Will Forster queried what this said about Surrey's influence or lack of influence with the government and if the governments levelling up agenda could mean levelling down places like Surrey. The Leader responded saying that he did not believe this said anything about Surrey's level of influence. Surrey had good representation from Surrey MPs and had received a positive response to its expression of interest. Surrey had not been chosen for the pilot but Surrey would continue with its representations to government.

With regards to his first question, Lance Spencer queried if there was a timescale for the green fleet strategy. The Cabinet Member for Environment said that there was no date at the moment but would be meeting with the Green Fleet Manager in the first week of January 2022. The Cabinet Member invited the member to one of her member surgeries where the matter could be discussed further. With regards to his second supplementary question, Lance Spencer asked if there had been any response from the Cabinet Ministers. The Cabinet Member for Environment explained there had been no response as of yet but would share the response once it had come through and was happy to share the letters that had been sent to them.

With regards to Lance Spencer's question regarding mental health waiting lists, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families confirmed that the average waiting time from referral to the start of assessment was 147 days and at the beginning of this month there were 1512 children and young people waiting between referral and assessment. It was explained that the number of young people that were coming forward for assessment was higher than was expected and as a result of that, Mindworks Surrey had taken on additional capacity and extended contracts with external partners to help to deal with that number of young people and reduce the time that families were waiting.

With regards to her member question Catherine Baart asked if it was possible to have a copy of the travel plan which came up with the recommendations. The member also mentioned that there were very few public buses that travelled up Cockshot Hill to Reigate Station and when a daily shuttle bus was established if this would also be open to members of the public to use. The Leader stated that he was happy to share the travel plan. The plan was to introduce an on demand bus service which was already being piloted in Mole Valley and would be open to the public but this would depend on whether this service being provided by a community transport provider or not which the Leader would need to check.

With regards to his member question, Jonathan Essex stated that the Cabinet Member's response mentioned a retrofit of homes and asked if there was a stocktake of Surrey housing underway across the county. The Cabinet Member for Environment explained that there was data which had been pulled together by Atkins although the robustness of this data had been questioned and as a result more work has been asked to be done on this. The

Cabinet Member explained that one of the priorities was how the council worked with the rented sector in order to drive retrofits through as this was probably going to be one of the hardest areas to drive going forward. Jonathan Essex explained that some of the London boroughs were working together to deal with high rise building retrofits.

#### **234/21 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

There were two public questions. The questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda.

#### **235/21 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were none.

#### **236/21 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

#### **237/21 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

The motion was introduced by Robert Evans who made the following key points:

- Thanked the Leader for writing to the Secretary of State and copying him into the letter.
- Since the Grenfell Tower disaster many questions have been asked about similar properties in Surrey. Therefore an audit and consultation to establish the potential scope of the cladding, EWS1 and snagging issues of all habitable buildings should be carried out. Buildings where an EWS1 form is not being granted are causing issues for owners selling or renting their properties. This was the situation in West Plaza by Ashford Hospital where there were around 150 properties which owners were having difficulties in selling because mortgage lenders will not lend against the property.
- Current estimates to put right all the defects in similar properties across the country would cost between £15-16 billion, in comparison, current estimates for the cost of the government COVID measures announced so far range from £315-410 billion.
- This was a very serious matter that impacted more properties in Surrey than people realised. It was difficult to express in words the heartbreak, anxiety torment and utter despair that this situation has caused to those who were affected and it was only right for the council to take a lead and to be at the forefront of any campaign to support our people and push the government.

The motion was seconded by Jonathan Essex who made the following key points:

- Concern about buildings in Surrey is more widespread than we have been led to believe.

- All homes and buildings should be checked and should be made safe as quickly as possible. The councillor was aware of buildings in Redhill comprising of 3-4 storey block of flats where faults were spotted and remedied by the developer who paid for the full cost of works.

The Cabinet Member for Community Protection responded to the points raised by the motion proposer and seconder stating that the fire and rescue service works closely with all partners with the aim of keeping our residents and visitors safe and well. Through the building risk review programme, the fire service had visited the majority of the high rise residential buildings highlighted by the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government and those identified locally by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service. These totalled 97. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service works with the National Chief Council to support the Grenfell Tower inquiry recommendations. As part of that they have consistently called for improvements to building regulations and provided input to a number of key reviews and consultations across the industry and the government, which will form the basis of an improved building safety system.

The Cabinet Member explained that EWS1 forms were not a statutory requirement and not all premises will require one. With regards to asking the boroughs and districts, in conjunction with Surrey Fire and Rescue Service to perform an audit and consultation to establish the potential scope of the cladding, EWS1 and snagging issues of all habitable buildings, this was a matter for the district and boroughs to decide.

The Leader explained that some of the biggest challenges lay in the fact that building regulations were the responsibility of the district and boroughs and not the county council. The Leader would be happy to raise the issue with the Chairman of the relevant Select Committee and discuss a potential public hearing around cladding in Surrey buildings. The Leader agreed to raise the issue with the other Surrey MPs and the Surrey Leaders Group meeting.

#### **RESOLVED:**

At the County Council meeting on 12 October 2021, Robert Evans moved a motion under Standing Order 11. It was agreed for the motion to be referred to Cabinet for consideration. The motion called on the leadership to support all those in Surrey affected by this scandal and to resolve to:

- I. Formally raise the issue with H M government through Mr Gove and the County's other MPs.
- II. Support other local authorities and the LGA's initiatives with the government in exploring ways in which local councils can be empowered to support their residents and ensure building regulations are complied with, or retrospectively repaired, at no cost to the leaseholder.
- III. Ask the boroughs and districts, in conjunction with Surrey Fire and Rescue Service as a matter of urgency and if they have not already done so, to perform an audit and consultation to establish the potential scope of the cladding, EWS1 and snagging issues of all habitable buildings.

- IV. Urge the County's boroughs and districts to explore ways to delay approving planning applications where the applicant has outstanding snagging or EWS1 certification issues and include a condition to be discharged on all future planning applications to provide an EWS1 form before first occupation.
- V. Sign Surrey County Council up to the End Our Cladding Scandal campaign.

Recommendations I-III were supported by the Cabinet.

**238/21 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]**

Decisions taken since the last meeting were noted.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**Reason for decision:**

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

**239/21 COVID-19 DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN [Item 7]**

There were no decisions to note.

**240/21 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 8]**

It was agreed that the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health's report would be deferred to January and an update on the current covid situation would be considered instead.

The Cabinet Member explained that in Surrey in the last seven days there had been an additional 15,214 cases of COVID as a result of the new Omicron variant. This meant a 77% increase in cases in the past seven days. There was a rise in cases across all ages and this was becoming the dominant strain in Surrey. The Cabinet Member emphasised the importance of getting vaccinated and encouraging safe behaviour to limit the spread of the virus. A thank you was given to residents who had been vaccinated and continue to get vaccinated. The vaccination remained the best defence against the virus.

**RESOLVED:**

The Cabinet Member of the Month report was deferred to January and an update on the current Covid situation was provided by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health.

## 241/21 SURREY FORUM AND DELIVERING THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS [Item 9]

The report was introduced by the Leader who explained that the report provided an overview of the framework of the strategic partnerships that we have across Surrey and their governance. The report sets out how a number of county-wide strategic partnership boards (the Health and Wellbeing Board, the One Surrey Growth Board and the Greener Futures Board) that oversee and respond to issues of major significance in Surrey, come together to contribute towards delivery of Surrey County Council's four priority objectives: i) Growing a sustainable economy so everyone can benefit, ii) Enabling a greener future, iii) Tackling health inequality and iv) Empowered and thriving communities. In order to better align and co-ordinate the work of these boards, strengthen collaboration between partners, an overarching Surrey Forum had been established. This formalises previously informal arrangements bringing together a range of leaders from the public, private and voluntary, community and faith sectors. The Surrey Forum will be guided by intelligence, expertise, and best practice through shared data and insights capabilities, underpinned by the Surrey Office for Data Analytics (SODA), it will analyse county-wide issues to identify and act on key areas of focus.

It was queried what the difference between a combined authority and the Surrey Forum was. The Leader explained that the Forum was an informal board with various partners sitting on it. A combined authority would require local government reorganisation with specific powers granted by central government.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet note the convening and facilitating role Surrey County Council has played in developing co-ordinated and aligned Surrey-wide collaborative leadership.
2. That Cabinet endorse the establishment of the Surrey Forum and its place in a wider framework of county-wide strategic partnership boards.
3. That Cabinet agree that the multi-agency Surrey Forum partnership lead an inclusive, comprehensive refresh of the Community Vision 2030 to 2050

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

Building on the strong partnerships already in existence across the county, the response to the Covid-19 pandemic across the county has highlighted the benefits and need for improved alignment, coordination and collaboration between communities and the public, private and voluntary, community and faith sectors, to collectively deliver for residents. The Surrey Forum will play a key role in overseeing progress towards delivering a single shared vision for the county and ensuring alignment of partners' strategic priorities, decisions and resources.

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

## 242/21 AGILE OFFICE PROGRAMME [Item 10]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste who explained that the council was working towards ensuring it had a sustainable office estate. As we emerged from the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, the council continues to recognise the increased need to evolve towards becoming an agile organisation, to help support achieving a sustainable future for Surrey County Council. A member commented that the council ignored building repairs and had a track record of not looking after buildings. The Cabinet Member responded by saying that the new programme will solve the back log of building repairs and the council was striving towards making sure the estate is fit for purpose. The Leader added that the council did undertake repairs to its buildings and have a dedicated team and contractors who undertook this work.

### RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves the recommended programme of activity (see paragraph 15) to deliver a reduced office estate footprint alongside essential transformational investment to deliver workspaces across the county that support the Council's agile organisation objectives. Further details are set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet agrees a total capital budget envelop of up to £21.8m to fit out the remaining core facilities and priority localised workspaces, to the Council's Agile workspace standards.
3. That Cabinet approves immediate allocation (from the £21.8m envelop) of £4.7m to drive forwards the programme activity (noting that further work will be undertaken to test the scope and available options for provision of core workspace in the North West quadrant – an additional paper will then be brought back to Cabinet in Q2 2022 with a recommended option and draw down from the remaining £17m capital funding).
4. That Cabinet approves the use of the Budget Equalisation Reserve to finance the £7.2m of one-off revenue costs of change to enable delivery of the estate transformation programme from 2021-2025 and deliver revenue efficiencies of approximately £2.2m per annum from 2024/25 onwards.
5. That Cabinet approves the arrangements by which a variation of up to 10% and maximum of £500k of total capital value may be agreed by the Director of Land & Property in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Property, the Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources, and the Executive Director of Resources. If the variance exceeds £500k, a further Cabinet report will be submitted to seek approval for additional capital funds.
6. That Cabinet delegates the procurement of appropriate supply chain partners to enable delivery of all services associated with the above recommendation, in accordance with the Council's Procurement and

Contract Standing Orders, to the Executive Director of Resources and the Director of Land and Property.

### Reasons for Decisions:

**January 2021:** Cabinet approved the outline Agile Office Estate Strategy which made the broad case for change, setting out key drivers and key targets. Specifically, the current corporate office estate was deemed to be:

- Of generally low quality, that does not efficiently support the adoption of Agile modern working practices.
- Expensive compared to industry benchmarks and expensive to maintain.
- High in its carbon output with poor energy efficiency.
- Relatively poorly located and under-utilised.

The strategy set out the components of a new office estate for Surrey County Council based on the evidence from a review of the existing estate and of the opportunities for new ways of working. Whilst the outline strategy was approved, it concluded that further analysis was required before the volume and location of space could be finalised (refer to Table 1 below).

Following January's paper, agile workforce analysis has enabled detailed option reviews to meet demand and the development of a detailed five year programme of rationalisation and modernisation which will deliver an office estate that is flexible enough to support Services as they change office-based working practises to adopt agile ways of working; provides modern, healthy, accessible space to meet the needs of Surrey County Council and its partners; financially sustainable; and more energy efficient. Specifically, the following benefits will then be realised:

- i. Revenue savings of circa £2.2m per annum from 2025/26.
- ii. Flexibility for future increase/decrease workspace without acquiring additional assets.
- iii. Improved quality for healthy, accessible space for staff, partners, and residents.
- iv. Increased value of estate, mitigation against spiralling maintenance costs, leasable unused space, generating revenue or supporting partners to deliver.
- v. Balanced geographical coverage across Surrey (aligns to greener travel plan).
- vi. Support Net Zero ambition by 2030, by improved median energy efficiency and efficient operation.
- vii. A network of modernised touchdown/delivery facilities, developed via a place-based approach to meet Service needs, develop partnership opportunities, and deliver maximum benefit to local communities.

*(This item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

### **243/21 ANNUAL PROCUREMENT FORWARD PLAN 2022/23 [Item 11]**

The report was introduced by the Leader who explained that Cabinet were being asked to Approve to Procure the projects listed in Annex 1 in

accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders. Projects highlighted in grey in the Annex would require sign off from the Cabinet or the Strategic Investment Board. All Cabinet Member had the opportunity to review the projects due for procurement.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet gives approval to Procure for the projects listed in Annex 1 – "Annual Procurement Forward Plan for 2022/23" in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
2. That Cabinet agrees that where the first ranked tender for any projects listed in Annex 1 is within the +/-5% budgetary tolerance level, the relevant Executive Director, Director or Head of Service (as appropriate) is authorised to award such contracts.
3. That Cabinet agrees the procurement activity that will be returned to Cabinet prior to going out to market.
4. That Cabinet notes projects that will be presented to Cabinet or the Strategic Investment Board for approval of the business case (highlighted in grey).

**Reasons for Decisions:**

- To comply with the Procurement and Contract Standing Orders agreed by Council in May 2019.
- To provide Cabinet with strategic oversight of planned procurement projects for 2022/23.
- To ensure Cabinet oversight is focussed on the most significant procurements.
- To avoid the need to submit multiple individual requests for Approval to Procure as well as individual contract award approvals for work taking place in 2022/23.

*(This item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**244/21 MAKING OF A COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER AND SIDE ROADS ORDER IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE A320 ROAD IMPROVEMENT SCHEME [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure explained that in July 2021 Cabinet agreed to proceed with the A320 Housing Infrastructure Fund scheme and resolved to make compulsory purchase orders to require the necessary land. In the course of preparing the order documentation it had become apparent that, in addition to the making of a compulsory purchase order, the Council will also need one or more technical roads orders: a side roads order (identifying new highways to be provided, highways to be improved, existing highway to be stopped up and private means of access to be closed); and, depending on the final views of National Highways (formerly

Highways England), a possible line order. The report sets out the various road orders and acts needed to be implemented to carry out was agreed in July.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet resolve to authorise the making of a compulsory purchase order and a side roads order, line order and/or other similar roads order (together referred to as "the Order") under the provisions of sections 6, 8, 14, 125, 239, 240, 246, 249, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980 (and any associated provisions) and section 40 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (and any associated provisions) to acquire land for the construction of the A320 HIF Scheme (the Order Land); the Council being satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the making of the Order to facilitate the carrying out of the A320 HIF Scheme.
2. That Cabinet resolve that recommendation 1 above shall be read in substitution for paragraph 1 of the recommendations set out in the July 2021 Cabinet Report.

#### **Reasons for Decisions:**

In September 2020 the Cabinet confirmed acceptance of the HIF funding award of £41.8 million (see Cabinet Paper at item 13).

As at the Cabinet decision date of September 2020 the Scheme had not been fully designed, thus the final land take was not known, and a further authority to pursue a compulsory purchase order was sought from Cabinet in July 2021.

Following Public Consultation further design alterations were made and this paper seeks additional authority to make a compulsory purchase order and a side roads order, line order and/or other similar roads order (together referred to as "the Order") under the provisions of sections 6, 8, 14, 125, 239, 240, 246, 249, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980 (and any associated provisions) and section 40 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (and any associated provisions) and to seek confirmation by the Secretary of State.

The decision as recommended by this report will enable the Council, with funding for its Infrastructure Fund Forward Funding scheme from the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) to construct the necessary infrastructure improvements described above.

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

#### **245/21 AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE SUPPLY, INSTALLATION, COMMISSIONING, INSPECTION, AND MAINTENANCE OF INTELLIGENT TRAFFIC SYSTEMS IN THE COUNTY OF SURREY [Item 13]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure who explained that the report provided an update following a procurement exercise for the Contract for the Supply, Installation, Commissioning, Inspection, and Maintenance of Intelligent Traffic Systems

in the County of Surrey (Intelligent Traffic Systems), and it proposes a recommendation to award the contract to the successful bidder. The pre market engagement exercise started in March 2021 and a number of bidders had bid for the contract. As a result a contract had been awarded for a minimum of six years with an optional two year extension. Both social value and environment commitments are built into the award.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approve the award of the Intelligent Traffic Systems contract to the successful bidder.
2. That Cabinet delegate authority to finalise and enter into contract with the successful bidder to the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure in consultation with the Executive Director for Resources and the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

Surrey County Council has a general 'Network Management Duty' under the Traffic Management Act 2004, and the County's Traffic System Assets play a key role in delivering this Duty. The award of the Intelligent Traffic Systems (ITS) contract will enable Surrey County Council to continue to inspect, maintain and improve traffic control systems on its highway network across the county.

Following approval of the Procurement Strategy in September 2020, officers from Highways and Transport supported by officers from across the Council including Procurement, Legal Finance and Strategic Commissioning have conducted an "Open Procedure" procurement exercise to identify the next Intelligent Traffic Systems contractor.

Following the recent completion of that procurement process, officers are now able to recommend the contract be awarded to the "most economically advantageous tenderer" as explained in the Part 2 report.

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

**246/21 DIGITAL BUSINESS & INSIGHTS PROGRAMME RE-PLANNING [Item 14]**

The report introduced by the Leader and asked the Cabinet to approve a funding request to complete the remaining stages of the implementation programme to replace the council's existing corporate (enterprise resource planning or ERP) system and go-live in April 2022. The Leader explained the two phases of the project and highlighted that the delay to the programme was due to the quality of the data being migrated and updates and change requirements from HR. A member commented that the project had gone significantly wrong and an overspend had been incurred. The Leader stated that there were lessons to be learnt but did not agree that the project had gone wrong. There could have been greater clarity between the Council and the contractor in terms of who had responsibility for parts of the project. A member commented that the project had been scrutinised by the Resources and Performance Select Committee and

risks identified. The project would be reviewed by the Select Committee again in January 2021.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approve the £1.25m revenue and £1.91m capital funding required for the project extension to complete go-live of the new Unit4 ERP system in April 2022.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The recommendation to approve the funding request will enable the programme to complete the implementation of the Unit4 ERP system and deliver its benefits. This includes addressing urgent technical drivers for change, while also enabling the council to achieve its ambitions to transform services, drive efficiencies, improve management decision making and to fully enable a flexible and mobile workforce.

*(This item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]*

**247/21 CHILDREN'S IMPROVEMENT UPDATE [Item 15]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children and Families who explained the detailed work undertaken by children's services including the feedback from the last Ofsted monitoring visit. The report also detailed the work that the service was doing to address the response for children who were experiencing neglect in their families and the work being done to strengthen the practice in our children with disabilities teams. The report also touches on the recruitment and retention of social care staff. Members commented that it was clear that real and tangible progress was being made as stated in the letter from Ofsted. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning stated that children services had been reviewed and evaluated by peer review and peer challenge and partners had fed back that they can see and feel the strength of practice. The family safeguarding model has been recognised and commended.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet reviews the findings from the September 2021 Ofsted Monitoring Visit (focused on services for care leavers) and the updated improvement plan and priorities as set out by children's services in response to feedback received.
2. That Cabinet notes the progress made delivering the children's services 'Getting to Good' plan, the improvement priorities resulting from the Ofsted Focused Visit in March 2021 and the services' preparedness for a full Ofsted ILACS inspection.
3. That Cabinet agrees to receive a further update on the progress made delivering the children's services 'Getting to Good' plan and the overall inspection readiness in Spring 2022 (unless such an inspection has already taken place).

### Reasons for Decisions:

Children's services improvement is a high priority for the Council. It is important that Cabinet is aware of the evidence of progress made to improve services so far, as determined by both internal and external scrutiny and of the ongoing, ambitious and innovative improvement plan which is driven by a focus on improving outcomes for children and families and goes well beyond resolving only the issues highlighted by Ofsted, the Department for Education (DfE) and the Commissioner.

The routine national inspection activity resumed in May 2021 and Ofsted are continuing to carry out the 'Inspecting Local Authority Children's Services' (ILACS) programme. Although the timetable for inspection is not notified in advance, we are anticipating a full re-inspection of Surrey's children's services between Spring and Summer 2022.

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee)*

### 248/21 MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING- 2021/22 MONTH 7 [Item 16]

The report introduced by the Leader provided details of the County Council's 2021/22 financial position as at 31 October 2021 (M7) for revenue and capital budgets, and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year. At M7, the Council was forecasting a full year £17m deficit against the revenue budget. This represented a £1.5m improvement from M6. The year would end with a balanced budget and directorates were encouraged to focus on their original budgets and delivering against that.

#### RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet note the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions.
2. That Cabinet approve the introduction of a new Highways Section 171 fee of £143 to recover the administrative cost involved in issuing licences for customers to undertake private works where access is required from the highway as outlined in paragraph 14.

### Reasons for Decisions:

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

*(This item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

### 249/21 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 the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**250/21 AGILE OFFICE PROGRAMME [Item 18]**

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

**RESOLVED:**

See Minute 242/21

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 242/21

*(This item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**251/21 ANNUAL PROCUREMENT FORWARD PLAN 2022/23 [Item 19]**

The Leader introduced a Part 2 report containing information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

**RESOLVED:**

See Minute 243/21

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 243/21

*(This item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)*

**252/21 AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE SUPPLY, INSTALLATION, COMMISSIONING, INSPECTION, AND MAINTENANCE OF INTELLIGENT TRAFFIC SYSTEMS IN THE COUNTY OF SURREY [Item 20]**

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

**RESOLVED:**

See Minute 245/21

**Reasons for Decisions:**

See Minute 245/21

*(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee)*

**253/21 DIGITAL BUSINESS & INSIGHTS PROGRAMME RE-PLANNING [Item 21]**

The Leader introduced a Part 2 report containing information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

**RESOLVED:**

See Exempt Minute [E-21-21]

**Reason for Decisions:**

See Minute 246/21

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

**254/21 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 22]**

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

Meeting closed at 15:48

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank