

COUNTY COUNCIL**COUNCIL MEETING – 23 MARCH 2010**

MINUTES of the meeting of the County Council held at the County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on Tuesday 23 March 2010 commencing at 10:30am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mr Marlow – Chairman
Mrs Sealy – Vice-Chairman

	Mr Agarwal	Mr Ivison (left 3.30pm)
*	Mr Amin	Mrs King
	Mrs Angell	Mr Kington
	Mr Barker OBE (left 3.30pm)	Mr Lake
	Mr Beardsmore	Mr Lambell
	Mr Bennison (left 3pm)	Mrs Lay
	Mrs Bowes (left 3.30pm)	Ms Le Gal (left 3.30pm)
	Mr Brett-Warburton (left 3pm)	Mr Lord
*	Mr Butcher	Mr MacLeod
	Mr Carasco	Mr Mallett (left 3.40pm)
	Mr Chapman	Mrs Marks (left 3.30pm)
	Mrs Clack	Mr Martin
	Mrs Coleman	Mrs Mason
	Mrs Compton	Mrs Moseley
	Mr Cooksey	Mr Munro
	Mr Cooper (left 3.40pm)	* Mr Nevins
	Mr Cosser	Mrs Nichols
*	Mrs Curran	Mr Norman
	Mr Elias	Mr Orrick
	Mr Ellwood (left 3.30pm)	Mr Phelps-Penry (left 3.30pm)
	Mr Few	Mr Pitt
	Mr Forster	Dr Povey
	Mrs Fraser DL (left 3.30pm)	Mr Renshaw (left 3pm)
	Mr Frost	Mr Rooth
	Mrs Frost	Mrs Ross-Tomlin
	Mr Fuller	Mrs Saliagopoulos
*	Mr Furey	Mrs Searle
	Mr Goodwin (left 3.15pm)	Mr Skellett CBE
	Mr Gosling (left 3pm)	Mrs Smith
	Dr Grant-Duff	* Mr Sydney
	Dr Hack	Mr Colin Taylor
	Mr Hall	Mr Keith Taylor
	Mrs Hammond	Mr Townsend
	Mr Harmer	Mrs Turner-Stewart
	Mr Harrison	Mr Walsh (left 3pm)
	Ms Heath	Mrs Watson
	Mr Hickman	Mrs White
	Mrs Hicks	Mr Wood (left 3.30pm)
	Mr Hodge	

*absent

15/10 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Amin, Mr Butcher, Mrs Curran, Mr Furey, Mr Nevins and Mr Sydney.

16/10 **MINUTES (ITEM 2)**

The Minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 9 February 2010 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

17/10 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (ITEM 3)**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- That Mr Roy Taylor, County Councillor for Walton South and Oatlands had resigned his seat. The by-election would be held on 6 May 2010.
- He congratulated Mr Peter Lambell on his recent selection as the prospective parliamentary candidate for the Liberal Democrat Party in Croydon Central.
- He also congratulated the Royal Logistics Corp on the award of two George Crosses but expressed sorrow at one of the awards being posthumous. He informed Members that he had written to their commanding officer.

18/10 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 4)**

- (i) Mrs Bowes declared a prejudicial interest in the Report of the Cabinet (item 12, part B) because she worked at Woking College. She withdrew from the meeting for the consideration of this item and took no part in the discussion and decision thereon.
- (ii) Mr Cosser declared a personal interest in the Report of the Cabinet (item 12, part A) because he was a school governor at both Broadwater and Loseley Fields Primary School.
- (iii) Mr Colin Taylor declared a personal interest in the Report of the Cabinet (item 12, part A) because he was a school governor at three Epsom Primary Schools.
- (iv) Mr Rooth, Mrs Moseley, Mr Keith Taylor, Mr Goodwin, Mrs Searle and Mrs White all declared personal interests in the Original Motion – item 11(iv) because they were Members of Guildford Borough Council.

LEADER'S STATEMENT (ITEM 5)

The Leader of the Council made a verbal statement, in which he informed Members of the following:

- That the economy was fundamental to the wealth and prosperity of the country and he believed that the County Council should work with businesses to help create jobs and increase the growth of the economy.
- He announced, as a member of the South East Strategic Leaders (SESL), that a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed with the regional CBI.
- That a tremendous amount of work was on going to repair the highways and that he would review the progress in the next two months.
- There was a strong commitment towards the Environment. He cited the world class waste solutions and also mentioned the 17 bids received from local committees for local schemes for reducing CO2 emissions.
- He considered openness and transparency was important and said that the webcasting of meetings would be extended to Cabinet and Planning & Regulatory meetings, that the Budget process had been more open this year and that he would be asking officers to publish a list of payments to suppliers on-line.
- He also informed Members that he had started a blog and that the 'Have your Say' event at Dorking Halls on Thursday 25 March would be an opportunity for the public to ask questions.
- That Value for Money was running through all activities. He stressed the importance of working together with districts and boroughs to promote the localism agenda.
- He considered that existing governance levels should be used and that the first collective action would be to understand all public expenditure, how it interacts and how more effective use of resources could be made.
- That local councillors should be overseeing a wider range of services.
- He said that there had been agreement, through the Surrey Strategic Partnership, for 2 pilot areas (Woking and Mole Valley) and 2 mini-pilot areas (Waverley and Reigate & Banstead). He also said that, constitutionally, it would be possible to have a District / Borough vice-chairman.
- Finally, he said that his desire was to serve all Surrey residents and he announced that £200k in 2010/11, from the policy initiatives budget, would be available to help disadvantaged areas. Local committees were invited to bid for the funds and preference would be given to those committees that had made most progress on the localism and total place agenda.

Members had the opportunity to ask questions.

20/10 **MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**

Notice of 13 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix A.

A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below:

(Q1) Mr Hickman said that this was the first time that he had seen this reply and thought that the Cabinet Member for Transport may have been misled by officers about the extent of his discussion with them. He asked the Cabinet Member whether he would confirm that replacement trees would be planted along the Hampton Court Way. Due to the current budgetary constraints, the Cabinet Member was unable to provide a guarantee.

(Q2) Mr Orrick requested that the appropriate select committee conducted a further investigation into the number of claims paid and asked the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services for the administration costs of processing the claims. He also considered that the im-balance between the East and West areas would benefit from further analysis. The Cabinet Member disputed the im-balance and drew Mr Orrick's attention to Waverley. He also praised the efforts of the officers working in this area and said that they had worked hard to reduce insurance costs by £800K.

(Q3) Mrs Smith asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning if, following the JAR report, the Local Authority was close to getting the balance right with its reformed Short Stay Schools and Surrey Alternative Learning Programme. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that there would always be room for improvement but confirmed that this preventative programme with schools had resulted in a reduction of permanent and short term exclusions.

(Q4) Mrs Watson considered that the response had not addressed all the points made in her question and requested a further report. The Deputy Leader disagreed and said that the 10 questions in the report 'Putting the Frontline First' had all been addressed.

(Q6) Mr Cooksey asked the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services what was the total cost of responding to FOI requests. He also asked whether the Cabinet Member could provide an explanation for the increased number of FOI requests and also whether he could consider publishing a list of the questions that the County Council had refused to answer. The Cabinet Member responded by stating that the increased number of FOI requests had been received from media enquiries and pressure groups, not from members of the public. He also agreed to publish a table setting out the reasons why requests were refused.

(Q9) Mrs Nichols considered that the response did not fully answer her question and asked the Cabinet Member for Environment how the decision to process food waste at the Charlton Lane site had arisen. The Cabinet Member made reference to the report (17/02/09) to the Executive, which clearly showed that the position would be reviewed in 2010 when there would be more certainty over the collection of food waste. She also said that the select committee had also considered this issue.

(Q12) Mr Lord requested that the Health Scrutiny Committee continued to monitor the Cranleigh Community Hospital issue. Assurance was given by the Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee that they would monitor the provision at Cranleigh. He also said that, since the response had been written, he had received 2 replies which officers were analysing and would report to the committee meeting on 8 April 2010.

(Also, Q12) Mr Forster asked whether the community hospital beds at Woking Community Hospital were being used for acute cases. The Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee confirmed that the status of Woking hospital would be considered by the committee on 8 April 2010, when they would be seeking assurance that the facilities there would be retained.

(Also, Q12) Mr Cooper considered that there was a campaign against local community hospitals and cited the Molesey Hospital where the number of beds had been reduced by half. He said that this was a cost cutting exercise. The Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee responded by stating that he had requested that NHS provided specific examples to the committee where beds had been 'flexed down' and he also asked Members to provide the committee with specific examples so that they could re-examine the evidence.

21/10 **SURREY POLICE AUTHORITY (ITEM 7)**

No questions had been received for the Surrey Police Authority.

22/10 **REPORT OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE (ITEM 8)**

The Chairman of the Standards Committee presented the report of the Standards Committee. He highlighted some of the issues that the committee had dealt with over the last nine months.

With reference to the recommendation, relating to the Review of the Local Standards Framework, set out in the Standards Committee report, Mr David Hodge proposed and Mrs Hazel Watson formally seconded that it be considered further by the Standards Committee. The recommendation of the Standards Committee was not accepted and therefore, it was:

RESOLVED (with no Member voting against this proposal):

That it be referred back to the Standards Committee for further consideration and brought back to a future County Council meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meeting of the Standards Committee be adopted.

23/10 **REPORT OF THE SURREY POLICE AUTHORITY (ITEM 9)**

A written statement on the work of the Surrey Police Authority had been included in the agenda.

24/10 **STATEMENT BY MEMBERS (ITEM 10)**

There were no statements from Members.

ORIGINAL MOTIONS (ITEM 11)

25/10 **ITEM 11 (i)**

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 11, Mr Ian Lake moved the motion standing in his name, which was formally seconded by Mr David Ivison, as follows:

‘That this Council:

- a) Recognises that the severe snow and ice during December and January was the worst for 30 years and that as result of this the County Council has been left with a major challenge as regards repairing the road network;
- b) Congratulates the staff in Surrey Highways and other departments who worked tirelessly over this period to keep as much of the road network, and other County services, as operational as possible;
- c) Calls on the Government for substantial additional funding to allow Surrey County Council to keep the road network in a sustainable condition in order that our residents and businesses can travel around the county and continue to contribute to the national economy;

- d) Notes that one fifth of all vehicles on the roads in Surrey are from outside of the County; and
- e) Acknowledges the work of Surrey Highways who have attended to the 20,000 repairs required following the winter weather conditions.'

Mr David Goodwin proposed an amendment, standing in his name (circulated at the meeting) and formally seconded by Mrs Fiona White, which was as follows:

At (a) after 'for 30 years and that' delete 'as result of this'

At (c) after 'Government' insert 'and any Government elected later this year'

After (e) add new paragraph '(f) Improve and increase the planning and resourcing of road maintenance by transferring money from non-frontline budgets'

After new (f) add new paragraph '(g) Ensure that the quality of road repairs is improved by increasing the monitoring of the quality of the highway contractors' work.'

Therefore, the amended motion would read as follows:

'That this Council:

- (a) Recognises that the severe snow and ice during December and January was the worst for 30 years and that the County Council has been left with a major challenge as regards repairing the road network;
- (b) Congratulates the staff in Surrey Highways and other departments who worked tirelessly over this period to keep as much of the road network, and other County services, as operational as possible;
- (c) Calls on the Government, and any Government elected later this year, for substantial additional funding to allow Surrey County Council to keep the road network in a sustainable condition in order that our residents and businesses can travel around the county and continue to contribute to the national economy;
- (d) Notes that one fifth of all vehicles on the roads in Surrey are from outside of the County; and

- (e) Acknowledges the work of Surrey Highways who have attended to the 20,000 repairs required following the winter weather conditions.
- (f) Improve and increase the planning and resourcing of road maintenance by transferring money from non-frontline budgets
- (g) Ensure that the quality of road repairs is improved by increasing the monitoring of the quality of the highway contractors' work.'

The amendment to the original motion was put to the vote with 22 Members voting for it and 47 Members voting against it. There was 1 abstention. Therefore, the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, a further 5 Members spoke before, Mr Hodge moved:

'That the question be now put'

The Chairman agreed to put this motion to the vote and 20 Members supported it. The original motion was put to the vote.

47 Members voted for the motion and 19 Members voted against it. There were 4 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

'That this Council:

- (a) Recognises that the severe snow and ice during December and January was the worst for 30 years and that as result of this the County Council has been left with a major challenge as regards repairing the road network;
- (b) Congratulates the staff in Surrey Highways and other departments who worked tirelessly over this period to keep as much of the road network, and other County services, as operational as possible;
- (c) Calls on the Government for substantial additional funding to allow Surrey County Council to keep the road network in a sustainable condition in order that our residents and businesses can travel around the county and continue to contribute to the national economy;
- (d) Notes that one fifth of all vehicles on the roads in Surrey are from outside of the County; and

- (e) Acknowledges the work of Surrey Highways who have attended to the 20,000 repairs required following the winter weather conditions.'

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45pm and resumed at 2.00pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mr Agarwal, Mr Chapman, Mr Elias, Mr Lord, Mrs Moseley, Mr Pitt, Mr Skellett and Mrs Turner-Stewart.

26/10 ITEM 11 (ii)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 11, Mr Tim Hall moved the motion standing in his name, which was formally seconded by Ms Le Gal, as follows:

'That this Council:

- a) Welcomes the culture of openness and transparency operating in Surrey County Council that has been demonstrated by:
 - a. The webcasting of Council, Cabinet and Planning & Regulatory Committee meetings;
 - b. Opening up Local Committees to questions from local businesses;
 - c. The 'Have Your Say' event on 25 March 2010 in Dorking; and
 - d. Increased interaction with the local and national media as well as trade publications;
- b) Believes that openness and transparency are essential in reconnecting with the public at a time when rebuilding public trust in politicians and politics is essential; and
- c) Endorses the concept of making the financial affairs of the Council less opaque initially by pledging to publish a list of payments to suppliers.'

Mrs Hazel Watson proposed an amendment, standing in her name (circulated at the meeting) and formally seconded by Mrs Diana Smith, which was as follows:

At (a) delete 'the culture of openness and transparency operating in Surrey County Council that has been demonstrated by'

At (b) after 'essential' insert 'and therefore agrees to introduce public petitions and public question time at the meetings of full Council.'

At (c) after 'opaque' insert ' for example'

Therefore, the amended motion would read as follows:

'That this Council:

(a) Welcomes:

- a. The webcasting of Council, Cabinet and Planning & Regulatory Committee meetings;
- b. Opening up Local Committees to questions from local businesses;
- c. The 'Have Your Say' event on 25 March 2010 in Dorking; and
- d. Increased interaction with the local and national media as well as trade publications;

(b) Believes that openness and transparency are essential in reconnecting with the public at a time when rebuilding public trust in politicians and politics is essential; and therefore agrees to introduce public petitions and public question time at the meetings of the full Council.

(c) Endorses the concept of making the financial affairs of the council less opaque, for example by pledging to publish a list of payments to suppliers.'

After 7 Members had spoken on the amendment, it was put to the vote with 12 Members voting for and 49 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions. Therefore, the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, a further 4 Members spoke before it was put to the vote. 41 Members voted for and 12 Members voted against it. There were 10 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

'That this Council:

(a) Welcomes the culture of openness and transparency operating in Surrey County Council that has been demonstrated by:

- a. The webcasting of Council, Cabinet and Planning & Regulatory Committee meetings;
- b. Opening up Local Committees to questions from local businesses;

- c. The 'Have Your Say' event on 25 March 2010 in Dorking;
and
 - d. Increased interaction with the local and national media as well as trade publications;
- (b) Believes that openness and transparency are essential in reconnecting with the public at a time when rebuilding public trust in politicians and politics is essential; and
- (c) Endorses the concept of making the financial affairs of the Council less opaque initially by pledging to publish a list of payments to suppliers.'

27/10 **ITEM 11 (iii)**

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council decided it wished to hear further before agreeing whether or not to debate this motion.

Mr Stephen Cooksey made a short statement giving the reasons why the motion should not be referred.

Dr Andrew Povey made a short statement setting out the reasons for referral.

The Council agreed not to debate this motion.

It was:

RESOLVED:

That this motion be referred to the Transportation and Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committees for consideration. Under Standing Order 12.6, the select committees must report back to the County Council at the earliest possible meeting.

28/10 **ITEM 11 (iv)**

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council agreed to debate this motion.

Under Standing Order 11, Mr Will Forster moved the motion standing in his name, which was formally seconded by Mr Ian Beardsmore, as follows:

'This Council is deeply concerned that many households in Surrey have no access to mainstream financial services such as bank accounts, therefore are at serious risk from loan sharks who are preying on the vulnerable during the economic downturn. By offering much needed financial services to a wider section of

society than traditional banking organisations, Credit Unions have a strong track record of curtailing the influence of loan sharks.

This Council welcomes the cross political party moves by Guildford, Mole Valley, Waverley and Woking Councils to support the proposed Surrey Save Credit Union. The proposal for Surrey follows recent moves by the Conservative and Liberal Democrat administration at Birmingham City Council to establish a local authority run municipal banking service and the financial backing that Conservative Kent County Council gave to their county-wide Credit Union.

To protect people in Surrey this Council will consider:

- A) Working with relevant partners to support the establishment of the proposed Surrey Save Credit Union. Consideration will be given to offering premises, training staff and volunteers, sharing facilities and assisting with marketing to ensure a viable future.
- B) Investing a proportion of its savings with the Surrey Save Credit Union.
- C) Making a subordinated loan to the Surrey Save Credit Union.

Considering the need to act urgently to counter the effects of the downturn, this Council resolves to refer the above resolution to Cabinet with the intention of reporting the decision made back to the Council at the Annual General Meeting on Tuesday 11 May 2010.'

After the debate on the motion, in which 8 Members spoke, it was put to the vote.

14 Members voted for the motion and 39 Members voted against it. There were 2 abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

29/10 **REPORT OF THE CABINET (ITEM 12)**

Dr Povey presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 2 March 2010.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

- Cabinet Member for Transport on Streetlighting
- Cabinet Member for Community Safety on the Fire Authority Position Statement

- Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games on Progress on Surrey's Channel Strategy

Copies of all Cabinet Member statements are attached as Appendix B.

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

(a) Surrey's Admissions Arrangements for September 2011 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools

After a short debate in which 5 Members spoke. It was:

RESOLVED:

That the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2011 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools be agreed:

(1) Given that there were no overwhelming objections to maintaining the proposed admission arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2011 as outlined in Annex 1A to the report submitted, these arrangements remain unchanged to those agreed for September 2010, with the exception of those arrangements for Hamsey Green Junior and Warlingham Schools. It should also be noted that the governing body of The Howard of Effingham Secondary School will determine its own arrangements for September 2011.

(2) The secondary coordinated scheme be agreed as outlined in the revised Annex 1B to the report submitted, which changes the closing date to 31 October; and the date by which appeals have to be lodged from 22 March to 16 March 2011, in order to enable the School Appeals Service to hear all appeals within the statutory timeframe.

(3) The admission arrangements for Hamsey Green Junior and Warlingham Secondary Schools be changed in response to the request during the consultation as outlined in paragraph 14 of the report submitted. The new proposed arrangements for Warlingham School would be as follows:

1. Looked after children
2. Exceptional arrangements
3. Siblings

4. Children attending Hamsey Green Junior School
5. Children who live within the catchment area
6. Any other applicant

(4) The change to the definition of 'siblings' in Section A of Annex 2 to the report submitted, be agreed as follows since there was no major objection to this proposed change:

It is proposed that the word "older" is deleted which would mean that a child would be given sibling priority if he/she had a brother or sister still at the school concerned or at an infant/junior school on an adjoining or shared site at the time of the sibling's admission regardless of whether they were older or younger. This would apply both at the initial allocation of places and also when prioritising the waiting list. It would have the effect of maximising the opportunity for children in the same family to be educated at the same school or at a school on a shared or adjoining site.

(5) The proposed change to the admission arrangements for Esher CofE High School, as outlined in Section B, paragraph 8 of Annex 2 to the report submitted, be agreed, providing the other Secondary Foundation schools in Elmbridge also introduce fixed catchment areas subsequent to their consultations.

(6) The introduction of urban and rural catchment areas for Godalming and villages south of Godalming as outlined in Section C (A2/SC/2 and A2/SC/3) of Annex 2 to the report submitted, not be implemented for September 2011. However, this proposal should be reviewed for future admission arrangements in this area.

(7) The proposed changes to the list of Foundation/Voluntary Aided schools that give priority to local children and should therefore be considered when assessing the nearest school to the home address be agreed. The list of these schools is set out below:

Elmbridge

St Lawrence CE (A) Junior School

Mole Valley

Scott-Broadwood CE (A) Infant School

Reigate & Banstead
St Matthew's CE Primary School

Runnymede
Christ Church CE (A) Infant School

Spelthorne
Ashford CE (A) Primary School

Tandridge
St Mary's CE Junior School
St Stephen's CE Primary School

Waverley
Busbridge CE (A) Junior School
Green Oak CE Primary School
St Mary's CE (A) Infant School

(8) That the new dates for the Primary Coordinated Scheme (Annex 2, Section F, A2/SF/4) be revised as follows:

- (i) bringing forward the offer date to 27 April 2011; and
- (ii) changing the date by which appeals must be lodged to 13 May 2011.

(b) Abolition of the Learning and Skills Council and new roles for Surrey County Council in commissioning 16-19 Education and Training and Planning Adult Learning in Surrey

RESOLVED:

That the remit of the Schools and Learning Select Committee be extended to include '16-19 education and training' be approved.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 2 March 2010 be adopted.

30/10 **APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN (ITEM 13)**

Two nominations were received for the post of Chairman of Planning and Regulatory Committee – Mr Ian Beardsmore and Mr Stuart MacLeod.

It was agreed to put these nominations to the vote.
12 Members voted for Mr Ian Beardsmore and 29 Members voted for Mr Stuart MacLeod.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That Mr Stuart MacLeod be appointed as Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee for the remainder of the 2009/10 Council Year.

31/10 **REPORT OF COMMITTEES (ITEM 14)**

(a) School and Learning Select Committee

The Chairman of the Schools and Learning Select Committee presented the report of the Schools and Learning Select Committee held on 28 January 2010.

RESOLVED:

That the name of the Schools and Learning Select Committee be changed to the Education, Learning and Development Select Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meeting of the Schools and Learning Select Committee held on 28 January 2010 be adopted.

(b) Adults and Community Care Select Committee

The Vice-Chairman of the Adults and Community Care Select Committee presented the report of the Adults and Community Care Select Committee held on 4 March 2010.

RESOLVED:

That the name of the Adults and Community Care Select Committee be changed to the Adult Social Care Select Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meeting of the Adults and Community Care Select Committee held on 4 March 2010 be adopted.

[The meeting ended at 3.55 pm]

Chairman