

## COUNTY COUNCIL

### COUNCIL MEETING – 22 MARCH 2011

**MINUTES** of the Meeting of the County Council held at the County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on Tuesday 22 March 2011 commencing at 10:30am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mr Marlow – Chairman  
Mrs Sealy – Vice-Chairman

*	Mr Agarwal	Mr Hodge
	Mr Amin	Mr Ivison
	Mrs Angell	Mrs King
	Mr Barker OBE	Mr Kington
	Mr Beardsmore	Mr Lake
	Mr Bennison	Mr Lambell
	Mrs Bowes	Mrs Lay
	Mr Brett-Warburton	Ms Le Gal
	Mr Butcher	* Mr MacLeod
	Mr Carasco	Mr Mallett
	Mr Chapman	Mrs Marks
	Mrs Clack	Mr Martin
	Mrs Coleman	Mrs Mason
*	Mrs Compton	* Mrs Moseley
	Mr Cooksey	Mr Munro
	Mr Cooper	Mrs Nichols
*	Mr Cosser	Mr Norman
*	Mrs Curran	Mr Orrick
*	Mr Elias	Mr Phelps-Penry
	Mr Ellwood	Mr Pitt
	Mr Few	Dr Povey
	Mr Forster	Mr Renshaw
	Mrs Fraser DL	Mrs Ross-Tomlin
	Mr Frost	Mrs Saliagopoulos
	Mrs Frost	Mr Samuels
	Mr Fuller	Mrs Searle
	Mr Furey	* Mr Skellett CBE
	Mr Goodwin	Mrs Smith
	Mr Gosling	* Mr Sutcliffe
	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
	Ms Heath	Mrs Watson
	Mr Hickman	Mrs White
	Mrs Hicks	Mr Wood

\*absent

14/11 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Agarwal, Mrs Compton, Mr Cosser, Mrs Curran, Mr Elias, Mrs Moseley and Mr Skellett.

15/11 **MINUTES (ITEM 2)**

The Minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 8 February 2011 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

16/11 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (ITEM 3)**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) The death of Mr David Timms, former County Councillor for Dorking South from 1997 to 2005. Members stood in silent tribute.
- (ii) That Phil Walker, Head of Finance would be leaving Surrey County Council at the end of March, after 36 years in Local Government. Members agreed that their thanks to Phil for his hard work and dedication be formally recorded.

17/11 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 4)**

Mrs Bowes declared a prejudicial interest in Members' Question Time, question 23 (item 6) because Rydens Way was in her division and her son was supporting and representing residents for the village green.

18/11 **LEADER'S STATEMENT (ITEM 5)**

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

- He endorsed the Chairman's thanks to Phil Walker who had joined Surrey County Council in 1992, becoming Head of Finance and Section 151 officer in 2006.
- He updated Members on the progress made in the following areas:
  - (i) Council tax – there would be a zero increase this year.
  - (ii) Olympics – two major events would be staged in Surrey – the cycle road race and the cycle time trials.
  - (iii) Broadband – the budget was now in place for Super Fast Broadband and he hoped that there would be 100% coverage across Surrey by the end of 2013. He also said that a procurement plan was in place for a bid to Broadband UK.

- (iv) Highways – the extra funding in this budget would help to address the maintenance backlog.
  - (v) Jobs in Surrey – the Council would be promoting tourism in Surrey, giving support to ‘Visit Surrey’ and encouraging the Zibo China Ceramics Exhibition due to take place in Woking in the Autumn. It will also actively examine ways to provide continued support for the Future Jobs Fund.
  - (vi) Heritage – there would be continued support for Surrey Historic Buildings Trust. However, he would be asking the Trust to extend its role and to have a Service Level Agreement with the Council.
- He said that there was a tremendous need to invest in the infrastructure of Surrey and made reference to partnership working and a report commissioned and published last week.
  - That the County Council had received the first payment of the New Homes Bonus.
  - Work with SE7 was beginning to yield results with the Deputy Leader leading on benchmarking of Highways work. He also said that SE7 were also looking at Special Educational Needs expenditure.
  - That the launch of the Local Enterprise Partnership would take place next week.
  - That 2 recommendations had emerged from the awayday with Surrey Strategic Partnership last November: (i) to set up a Big Society fund for small business throughout the county, and (ii) to double the number of volunteers from 2 to 4 for each paid person in the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector.

Members had the opportunity to make comments and ask questions in respect of this statement.

## 19/11 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)

Notice of 24 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:

(N.B. Under standing order 10.11, Members' Question Time was limited to 45 minutes and it was not possible to take supplementary questions relating to questions 16 - 24):

**(Q1) Mr Orrick** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport if a business case that took into account the economic impact and local economy had been put together for the pay and display parking proposals. The Cabinet Member said that the proposals were currently out for consultation and that draft proposals were currently being formulated.

**(Q2) Mr Cooksey** had two supplementary questions and asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games to confirm whether it was the Council's intention to only have a core network of 22 libraries and that all other libraries would be at risk and therefore where community partnerships could not be re-negotiated, they would close. The Cabinet Member confirmed that this was not the intention per se, her response had highlighted this and that following the consultation, all proposals would be considered by the Cabinet in September.

**(Q4) Mrs Watson** requested that Surrey County Council provided the necessary subsidy to save the sawmill at Norbury Park from threatened closure. The Cabinet Member for Environment said that the sawmill was managed by Surrey Wildlife Trust and staff there were currently preparing a bid for funding, which SCC officers were assisting them with, so that they could operate as a Community Interest Company, which she considered was the best option.

**(Q5) Mrs Nichols** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment whether all correspondence concerning the EcoPark and the Health and Safety Executive's response could be put into the public domain. The Cabinet Member confirmed that as part of the planning application for the EcoPark, this information would be in the public domain. She also informed Members that the letter from the Health and Safety Executive(HSE), referred to in the last paragraph of her response had now been received and the HSE had no objection to the granting of planning consent for the EcoPark.

**(Also Q5) Mr Beardsmore** considered that the response was pre-empting the decision of the Planning and Regulatory Committee and wished to dissociate himself from that implication. The Cabinet Member for Environment considered that it referred to HSE and not Members of Surrey County Council.

**(Q6) Mr Colin Taylor** asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety to clarify the last sentence of paragraph 1 of her response. He also asked about proposed cover at Epsom Fire Station. The Cabinet Member said that as retained firefighters have other primary employment, their availability is limited by 07:00hrs. However, the draft Public Safety Plan (PSP) was trying to address these issues. She also said that this Plan was for the whole county and stressed the need for equity of provision across Surrey.

**(Also, Q6) Mrs Mason** made reference to Epsom and Ewell's informal local committee meeting in which the draft PSP was discussed and said that they had requested an extension of the busiest period from 07:00 – 19:00 to 07:00 – 21:00. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety said that the consultation period was now finished but informed her that a change to timings would be

considered. She also made reference to personal responsibility and the prevention agenda.

**(Q7) Mrs Searle** asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families for assurance that the assessment criteria for the in-house residential provision for overnight respite care for disabled children was applied consistently across the County. This was confirmed.

**(Q8) Mr Forster** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport to confirm that all Boroughs / Districts would be involved in the bid for the Government's Local Sustainable Transport Fund. The Cabinet Member said that this was currently an outline bid – timescales for submission were tight but he hoped, should it be successful that any funding and measures for it to be delivered would roll out across the County over the next five years.

**(Also, Q8) Mrs White** referred to the proposed Highways scheme for the Guildford Business Park area and asked the Cabinet Member if some of this funding would be made available for this project. She was advised that a bid had been made to the Re-generation Fund for this scheme because the Sustainable Transport Fund was not available to fund brand new road schemes.

**(Also, Q8) Mrs Coleman** considered that consultation with local people and local committees should have taken place to determine which schemes should be funded. The Cabinet Member for Transport reiterated the tight timescales and said it was currently only an outline bid and there hadn't been time to consult locally. However, there would be ample opportunity in the future for consultation.

**(Q9) Mr Harrison** referred to a similar Member's question asked at the County Council meeting on 14 December 2010 and asked why an answer had not been provided at that stage. He also asked the Cabinet Member for Transport if there had been a change in policy. The Cabinet Member said that he would provide a response outside the meeting.

**(Also, Q9) Mr Ellwood** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport if the Council would be trying to obtain a percentage of the additional funding for potholes, announced by the Government. He was advised that the Council was anticipating receiving an additional £1m, funds dedicated for potholes and patching, as a result of the winter weather.

**(Q10) Mrs White** asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games if she considered that it was better to refer items that generated much public interest, such as the Public Value Review of Library Services, to select committees so that the public could take part in the debate. The Cabinet Member

responded by stating that she considered that the County Council had gone to great lengths to provide a solution to enable continued provision of the library service. She hoped that the community option proposed for some libraries would enable them to remain open.

**(Also, Q10) Mr Sydney** said that the County Council was trying to produce a long term solution for libraries. However, he considered that the new changes should cease. The Cabinet Member agreed that this County Council has set out in a direction that would provide longterm solutions in attempting to keep all Surrey static libraries open, whilst cementing the role of community partnerships as an imaginative solution and also confirmed that the published PVR data would not be further altered.

In addition, the Deputy Leader confirmed that Lingfield Library and Museum would be the subject of a meeting between himself and the Divisional County Councillor.

**(Q11) Mr Barker** considered that the response from the Cabinet Member for Environment was unsatisfactory. He said that BOATS were assessed annually but safety wasn't a factor and referred to Guildford Local Committee and the desire to have some BOATS closed on safety grounds. The Cabinet Member said she would consult with officers and if safety was an issue for this particular BOAT, it would be closed temporarily.

**(Q12) Mrs Mason** said that in view of the comments from the Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games, did she agree that the Conservative Administration wished to avoid public scrutiny of its policies?

The Chairman of the Safer and Stronger Communities Select Committee expanded on her written response and said that she had huge regard for select committees and the work undertaken by them. She also said that she had considered that one recommendation agreed at the end of the select committee meeting, where Members had been considering the Cabinet decision on the PVR of Library Services, did not adequately reflect the debate that had taken place. However, the select committee report subsequently submitted to Cabinet had captured some of the detail.

**(Q13) Mr Hickman** said that Elmbridge Borough Council and Elmbridge Local Committee had put forward new proposals for on-street parking charges in Thames Ditton and said that these charges had not been reflected in the response. He requested a response with reworked figures. **Mr Bennison** also requested reworked figures for Claygate. The Cabinet Member for Transport

confirmed that the proposals were still out for consultation but agreed to provide reworked figures to both Members.

**(Also, Q13) Mr Goodwin** stressed the need for care because some areas of Surrey already had on-street parking and said it would be difficult to have a 'level playing field' across the County. The Cabinet Member for Transport said that no decisions had yet been made.

**(Also, Q13) Mr Ellwood** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport if there would be a free period of parking? He also asked if staff working at local shops would be exempt from the proposed parking charges? The Cabinet Member said that all options were being considered as part of the consultation process and referred to the Transportation Select Committee's task group report currently being compiled.

**(Q15) Mr Mallett** referred to the response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and said that it indicated that decisions had already been taken, in advance of the consultation period. The Cabinet Member said that the Public Value Review of the Countryside Service had set out the principles by which decisions would be made and said that the County was currently consulting various bodies but would be unable to be as generous as in the past.

**(Also, Q15) Mrs Mason** made reference to the Lower Mole Project whose work she considered strategic. The Cabinet Member for Environment referred to her response to Mr Mallett's question. However, she said that she hoped this work would continue using local volunteers and local Member allocations.

## 20/11 **SURREY POLICE AUTHORITY (ITEM 7)**

One question had been received for the Surrey Police Authority. The question and reply is attached as Appendix A.

Mr Harrison asked the Representative from the Surrey Police Authority a supplementary question concerning the savings made from police station closures. She explained that the Surrey Police Authority had been working hard to achieve a sustainable Police Service and that slimming down top management posts, together with the sale of properties and working with Borough / Districts on co-location, had enabled the Police Force to recruit additional police officers.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety also congratulated Surrey Police on their re-organisation, which had been a tremendous achievement and would benefit Surrey residents.

21/11 **REPORT OF THE SURREY POLICE AUTHORITY (ITEM 8)**

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

22/11 **STATEMENT BY MEMBERS (ITEM 9)**

There was one statement from Mrs Nichols on the proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton.

A copy is attached as Appendix B.

**ORIGINAL MOTIONS**

23/11 **ITEM 10(i)**

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council decided that 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. He said that Members had not been given the opportunity to indicate whether or not they supported the introduction of on-street parking charges. He also made reference to the e-petition, which currently had over 20,000 signatures on it.

Dr Andrew Povey made a short statement setting out the reasons for referral. He said that the Council would have a debate on this topic, at a future Council meeting, but after the consultation had concluded, the deadline for the e-petition had closed and the task group had completed its work.

Mr Cooksey requested a recorded vote and 10 Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted for the motion to be debated today:

Mr Amin, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Cooksey, Mr Cooper, Mr Forster, Mr Frost, Mr Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Hickman, Mr Kington, Mr Lambell, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mrs Nichols, Mr Orrick, Mr Phelps-Penry, Mrs Searle, Mrs Smith, Mr Colin Taylor, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson, Mrs White and Mr Wood.

The following Members voted for the motion to be referred to the Transportation Select Committee:

Mrs Angell, Mr Barker, Mr Bennison, Ms Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Butcher, Mr Carasco, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mrs Coleman, Mr Ellwood, Mr Few, Mrs Fraser, Mrs Frost,



Mr Fuller, Mr Furey, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Dr Hack, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Ms Heath, Mrs Hicks, Mr Hodge, Mr Ivison, Mrs King, Mr Lake, Mrs Lay, Ms Le Gal, Mr Marlow, Mr Martin, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Mr Pitt, Dr Povey, Mr Renshaw, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mrs Sealy, Mr Sydney, Mr Keith Taylor, Mrs Turner-Stewart, Mr Walsh

The council agreed not to debate this motion.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

That this motion be referred to the Transportation Select Committee for consideration. Under Standing Order 12.6, the select committee must report back to the County Council at the earliest possible meeting.

24/11 **ITEM 10(ii)**

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

Mr Eber Kington made a short statement giving the reasons why the motion should not be referred. He said that he was concerned that the introduction of on-street parking charges would drive customers away from local shops. He also mentioned the large number of signatures objecting to the proposals on petitions across the county.

Dr Andrew Povey reiterated the reasons for referral as detailed in item 10(i).

Mr Kington also requested a recorded vote and 10 Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted for the motion to be debated today:

Mr Amin, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Cooksey, Mr Cooper, Mr Forster, Mr Frost, Mr Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Hickman, Mr Kington, Mr Lambell, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mrs Nichols, Mr Orrick, Mr Phelps-Penry, Mrs Searle, Mrs Smith, Mr Colin Taylor, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson, Mrs White and Mr Wood.

The following Members voted for the motion to be referred to the Transportation Select Committee:

Mrs Angell, Mr Barker, Mr Bennison, Ms Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Butcher, Mr Carasco, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mrs Coleman, Mr Ellwood, Mr Few, Mrs Fraser, Mrs Frost,

Mr Fuller, Mr Furey, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Dr Hack, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Ms Heath, Mrs Hicks, Mr Hodge, Mr Ivison, Mrs King, Mr Lake, Mrs Lay, Ms Le Gal, Mrs Marks, Mr Marlow, Mr Martin, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Mr Pitt, Dr Povey, Mr Renshaw, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mrs Sealy, Mr Sydney, Mr Keith Taylor, Mrs Turner-Stewart, Mr Walsh

The council agreed not to debate this motion.

It was:

**RESOLVED:**

That this motion be referred to the Transportation Select Committee for consideration. Under Standing Order 12.6, the select committee must report back to the County Council at the earliest possible meeting.

25/11 **REPORT OF THE CABINET (ITEM 11)**

Dr Povey presented the reports of the Cabinet's meetings held on 1 February and 1 March 2011.

**(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members**

There were none.

**(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents and the Council's Constitution**

**(A) Consultation on Surrey's Admissions Arrangements for September 2012 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools**

After a short debate in which 6 Members spoke. The recommendations were put to the vote with 53 Members voting for and 6 Members voting against them. There were 2 abstentions.

**Therefore, it was:**

**RESOLVED:**

That the following Admission Arrangements for September 2012 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools be agreed.

- (1) That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Thames Ditton Infants Schools be agreed for September 2012.

- (2) That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Thames Ditton Infant and Junior schools be agreed for September 2012 so that priority for admission to Thames Ditton Junior School will be as follows:
1. Looked After Children
  2. Exceptional arrangements
  3. Siblings
  4. Children attending Thames Ditton Infant School
  5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
  6. Any other applicant
- (3) That a reciprocal sibling link be agreed between Merrow Church of England (Controlled) School and Bushy Hill Junior School for September 2012.
- (4) That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Eastwick Infant and Junior schools is not implemented for September 2012.
- (5) That the introduction of feeder school criterion between Earlswood Infant School and Brambletye Junior School and associated reciprocal sibling link be agreed for September 2012 so that priority for admission to Brambletye Junior School will be as follows:
1. Looked After Children
  2. Exceptional arrangements
  3. Children attending Earlswood Infant School
  4. Siblings
  5. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
  6. Any other applicant
- (6) That the proposed changes to PANs for September 2012 be agreed as follows:
- i) \*Oatlands School to increase its PAN from 60 to 90
  - ii) St Andrew's CofE Primary to increase its PAN from 52 to 60
  - iii) \*Boxgrove Primary School to increase its PAN from 60 to 90
  - iv) Eastwick Infant School to increase its PAN from 75 to 82 to allow for 7 children within the school's Special Needs Support Centre
  - v) Banstead Junior School to increase its PAN from 70 to 80

- vi) \*Shortwood Infant School to increase its PAN from 27 to 30
  - vii) \*Spelthorne Junior School to increase its PAN from 70 to 60
  - viii) Hale School to decrease its Junior PAN from 20 to 2
  - ix) \*Maybury Infant School to decrease its PAN from 40 to 30
- (7) That the number of preferences under Surrey's coordinated scheme for secondary admissions 2012/13 be increased from three to six.
- (8) That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2012/13 be agreed as set out in Annex 2e of the submitted report.
- (9) That Surrey's Relevant Area for admissions be agreed as set out in Annex 3 of the submitted report.
- (10) That the admission arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2012 be agreed with the exception of:
- (i) **Annex 2a**, Section 8, Paragraph c) i) - the admission arrangements for George Abbot School (see Recommendation 11)
  - (ii) **Annex 2a**, Section 11 – amendment to how reverse sibling will apply when a parent is applying for a Reception and a Junior school place (see Recommendation 12)
  - (iii) **Annex 2b** - the sibling link for Downsway with St Mary's CofE Junior School (see Recommendation 13)
- (11) That the admission arrangements for George Abbot School for September 2012 be changed to those that applied prior to the Schools Adjudicator's determination in October 2010 so that priority for admission to George Abbot School will be as follows:
- 1. Looked After Children
  - 2. Exceptional arrangements
  - 3. Siblings
  - 4. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
  - 5. Any other applicant
- (12) That the wording on how the reverse sibling criteria will apply when a parent is applying for a Reception and a Junior school place be amended from:

‘At the initial allocation for these schools the Year 3 applicants will be dealt with first, before the Reception applicants’;

to:

‘At the initial allocation, when a parent is applying for both a Reception and a Junior school place, neither child will be treated as a sibling under the sibling criterion until after the offer day. At that time, if a place has been offered to only one child, the waiting list position for the other child will be adjusted to reflect the fact that they expect to have a sibling in the school or a school on a shared or adjoining site at the time of admission’.

- (13) That the sibling link for Downsway with St Mary’s CofE Junior School be removed for September 2012.
- (14) That no changes be made to the admission arrangements of the following schools, but that a further analysis be carried out ahead of consultation on admission arrangements for 2013 to identify if changes are necessary in the light of the comments that were received:
  - Farnham Heath End
  - Rodborough School
  - Warlingham School

## **(B) Surrey Transport Plan**

The recommendations were put to the vote with no Member voting against them. However, there were 2 abstentions.

### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Surrey Transport Plan be approved, for publication on the Surrey web site on 1 April 2011.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Strategy, Transport and Planning, in discussion with the Cabinet Member for Transport, to make any final changes that may be necessary to allow publication of the plan on 1 April 2011.
- (3) That the next stages of work on the Plan as outlined in paragraph 3 of the submitted report, which will include additional necessary strategies and developing options for future levels of integrated transport expenditure for the financial year 2012/13 and beyond, be noted.

- (4) That the Members of the Surrey Transport Plan Task Group be thanked for their work in developing the Plan thus far.
- (5) That the retention of the Task Group to steer development of the remainder of the plan and the implementation programmes be agreed.

**(3) Reports for Information / Discussion**

The following report was received and noted:

- Cabinet Decisions called in – Public Value Review of Library Services
- Cabinet Decisions called in – Surrey Voluntary Action Network Contract

Mr Hickman raised a question in relation to the Cabinet minutes (item no. 26/11), the Public Value Review of the Countryside Service. He referred to the funding for Thames Landscape Strategy, which will cease in 2012 prior to the Olympic Cycle Race being staged in Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games agreed to address this point with the representative from the Local Organising Committee of the Olympic Games.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 1 February and 1 March 2011 be adopted.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.50pm and resumed at 2.00pm, with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Coleman, Mr Furey, Mrs Lay, Mr Mallett, Mr Phelps-Penry and Mr Townsend.

26/11

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND – ELECTORAL REVIEW OF SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL (ITEM 12)**

The Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency, as Chairman of the Working Group, introduced the report on behalf of the working group. He thanked Member and officer colleagues of the cross-party working group for their work. He explained that the rules for the Electoral Review of Surrey County Council had been set by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and that 'no change' was not an option. He said that the report in the agenda was the County Council's response to Stage One of the Local

Boundary Commission for England's consultation and that there had been wide consultation with all Members via local committees. He also advised Members that they could submit individual representations to the Commission.

Mrs Sally Marks proposed an amendment to the recommendation, which was formally seconded by Mr Michael Sydney, which was:

**'It is recommended that the Stage One Response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, attached at Appendix 1, be approved except for Tandridge where the current arrangement should be continued i.e.: the status quo. This is on the basis that the current arrangements recognise clearly defined communities and topographical features which mark out the boundaries of the existing Divisions.'**

**(Amendments shown in bold)**

After a short debate, this amendment was put to the vote with 11 Members voting for and the majority of Members voting against it. Therefore, the amendment was lost.

Mr David Ivison proposed a second amendment, which was formally seconded by Mr Chris Pitt, which was replacing 'Tandridge' with 'Surrey Heath' in Mrs Marks' amendment.

The second amendment was put to the vote with 8 Members voting for and the majority of Members voting against it. Therefore, the amendment was lost.

Mr Kington proposed changing the name of the 'Epsom and Ewell West' Division to 'West Ewell and Epsom'. This was formally seconded by Mrs Jan Mason and accepted by the Chairman of the Working Group.

After a further debate on the response and the original recommendation, as amended, it was put to the vote with the majority of Members voting for it. 8 Members voted against the response and there were 4 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

That the Stage One Response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (as amended), attached at Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be approved.

Whilst the appendices were included in the agenda, the strategy document was missed out in error and circulated separately to Members (Appendix C).

The Deputy Leader, as Chairman of the Member Development Steering Group, introduced the report and stressed the vital role that elected Members had in establishing and maintaining the strategic direction of Surrey County Council. He also said that he hoped the Council would achieve the South East Elected Member Development Charter by July 2011 and publicly thanked the Senior Manager, Leadership team in Democratic Services for her work in developing this strategy.

The Deputy Leader proposed an amendment to the Member Role Description for the Chairman of Audit and Governance Committee so that it read: 'This role **may** be filled by a Member from one of the minority groups' rather than 'will'.

A vote on this amendment was requested, with 18 Members voting **not** to agree to the amendment and the majority of Members agreeing to the change. Therefore, the amendment was agreed.

Mrs Frost also drew Members attention to the Member Role Description for Chairman of a Local Committee and said that the last two bullet points of the under 'specific tasks' would need to be amended. This was agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Elected Member Development Strategy, attached at Appendix 1, as amended, to the submitted report, be approved.

28/11

**MEMBER ROLE PROFILES – AMENDMENTS TO APPENDIX TO MEMBER / OFFICER PROTOCOL (ITEM 14)**

The Deputy Leader, as Chairman of the Member Development Steering Group, provided an explanation for the inclusion of these additional Member Role profiles.

The Chairman of Change and Efficiency Select Committee confirmed that these roles had been considered and approved by this committee.

**RESOLVED:**

That the additional Member role profiles, be approved for inclusion in the Member / officer protocol at Part 6 of the Council's Constitution



29/11 **AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION – DESIGNATED SCRUTINY OFFICER (ITEM 15)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Council designates the Senior Manager for Scrutiny as Surrey County Council's Scrutiny Officer to be responsible for the statutory functions set out in paragraph 2 of the submitted report, with immediate effect.

That the Constitution be amended accordingly as attached at Appendix A of the submitted report.

30/11 **AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION – THE EXERCISE OF EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS (ITEM 16)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the amendments to the Scheme of Delegation in relation to executive functions agreed by the Leader, as detailed in the submitted report, be noted

[The meeting ended at 2.50pm]

---

Chairman