

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 20 MARCH 2012

MINUTES of the Meeting of the County Council held at the County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on Tuesday 20 March 2012 commencing at 10:30am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mrs Sealy – Chairman
Mr Munro – Vice-Chairman

	Mr Agarwal		Mr Ivison
*	Mr Amin		Mrs Kemeny
	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 Marlow
	Mrs Coleman		Mr Martin
	Mr Cooksey		Mrs Mason
	Mr Cooper		Mrs Moseley
	Mr Cosser		Mrs Nichols
	Mrs Curran		Mr Norman
*	Mr Elias		Mr Orrick
	Mr Ellwood		Mr Phelps-Penry
	Mr Few		Mr Pitt
	Mr Forster	*	Dr Povey
	Mrs Fraser DL		Mr Renshaw
	Mr Frost		Mrs Ross-Tomlin
*	Mrs Frost		Mrs Saliagopoulos
	Mr Fuller	*	Mr Samuels
	Mr Furey		Mrs Searle
	Mr Gimson		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
	Mr Hodge		Mr Young

*absent

13/12 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM 1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Amin, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Elias, Mrs Frost, Dr Hack, Mr Lake and Mr Samuels.

14/12 **MINUTES (ITEM 2)**

The Minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 7 February 2012 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

15/12 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (ITEM 3)**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) The Community Covenant with the military that she, Dame Sarah Goad - the Lord Lieutenant, Brigadier Simon P Wolsey, OBE. - Regional Brigade Commander 2 (South East) Brigade, NHS Surrey, the Chamber of Commerce and Voluntary Sector representatives had recently signed at Pirbright. She hoped that this first step would have tangible benefits for the armed forces in Surrey. She said that the first Board meeting would be in May. She requested that Members spread the word and give feedback to Mr Ivison, James Painter or herself.
- (ii) Toast of Surrey Business Awards – she had sponsored one of the awards for apprenticeships and hoped to do it again next year. This had been a successful process, raising the profile of the County Council with businesses and the media in Surrey.
- (iii) Representatives from the CBI, Surrey Connects and Connect 2 Innovation had been invited to speak today at their lunch, with the aim of connecting all Members with the business world.
- (iv) She had continued to hold meetings with the Leaders of the minority parties.
- (v) Since the last Council meeting, she had continued to make visits to Members' divisions when invited and had enjoyed visits to Epsom Phab at the Lintons Centre and also to HM Send Prison. She would be inviting Members for expressions of interest to mentor and help prisoners when they leave prison.

16/12 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM 4)**

Mr Colin Taylor declared a personal interest in the Report of the Cabinet – Consultation on Surrey's Admission Arrangements for September 2013 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools

and Coordinated Schemes (item 12) because he was a school governor at his local schools.

17/12 **LEADER'S STATEMENT (ITEM 5)**

The Leader made a statement in which he announced a £70K investment, allocated to joint Telecare Demonstrator and Wellbeing sites.

He also drew attention to the Localism Act 2011, which would abolish the 'Standards Board regime' and replace it with a more locally focussed process for regulating Member conduct.

A detailed copy of his statement is attached as Appendix A.

Members had an opportunity to make comments and ask questions.

Mrs White asked if the whole range of potential telecare help would be on view at the Demonstration Centres and how long it would take to roll it out across the county?

Mr Agarwal asked where the centres would be situated and what would be the cost to the end-users?

The Leader said that he hoped that there would be a centre in each District and Borough. He also said that he would find out the timeline and also the cost of the service to the end-user and advise Members.

18/12 **MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME (ITEM 6)**

Notice of 14 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

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

(Q1) Mr Orrick said that he had asked a similar question in 2010 and that the numbers given in this answer differed so he requested, and the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency agreed, that the figures were re-checked.

He also said that three boroughs / districts accounted for 50% of the claims and suggested using new technology to enable the public to report potholes quickly. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment confirmed that he would discuss this suggestion with officers and May Gurney, the Highways contractors.

(Q3) Mr Lambell asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services and 2012 Games if she considered that the money spent

on special edition library cards would have been better spent on staffing the libraries. The Cabinet Member disagreed and drew attention to the success of the 'Surrey Hills' range of tickets last year.

(Q4) Mrs Smith requested details from the Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency of the comparative salary ratios analysis between Surrey and similar sized local authorities when it became available.

(Q7) Mr Mallett considered streetlights being on during the day was also an issue and asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment what arrangements were in place for 'scouting' for faults during the day. He was advised that, none was currently in place and that the website should be used to report faults.

(Q8) Mr Kington said that there were two officers in Epsom and Ewell diverted to Olympic duties and Members in these divisions were unhappy with the delay in filling these highway officers' vacancies. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment assured him that appointments would be made as soon as possible.

(Q9/10) The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning apologised for not having a written answer but said that, following a meeting held the previous afternoon with local Members and Headteachers, the position had changed and that he would be proposing an amendment to the Admission arrangements for 2013 (item 12) later in the agenda. Both **Mr Frost** and **Mr Colin Taylor** thanked the Cabinet Member for his part in resolving this issue. However, Mr Taylor said that the Headteachers of three primary schools in Epsom did not present a unified position.

(Q11) Mr Ellwood said that he had been unable to find the containers for re-cycling inkjet and toner cartridges at the Slyfield Re-cycling Facility and requested that the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, together with officers, accompanied him on a visit to the site. This was agreed.

(Q12) Mrs Mason requested that reconsideration was given to dimming streetlights in areas close to railway stations because the dimmed lights made these areas very dark for late night commuters. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment agreed to consider the request and report back to the Member outside the meeting.

19/12 **SURREY POLICE AUTHORITY (ITEM 7)**

No questions had been received for the Surrey Police Authority.

20/12 **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.

21/12 **REPORT OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE (ITEM 9)**

The Chairman said that, following discussions with the minority Group Leaders, she had agreed with the Chairman of the Standards Committee to defer this item to allow for further amendments to be made to the Member / Officer Protocol and the report would be brought back to a future council meeting.

22/12 **STATEMENT BY MEMBERS (ITEM 10)**

There was two local Member statements:

- Mr Gimson on Watts Gallery (Appendix C)
- Mrs Nichols on the Ecopark

23/12 **ORIGINAL MOTIONS (ITEM 11(i))**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr John Orrick moved the motion standing in his name which was:

‘This Council agrees that owing to an ageing population, a large number of older people will need care and support, and that:

- More support should be provided to enable Surrey's older people to live in their own homes for as long as possible
- Older people with high or complex needs require support in residential care homes and these should continue to be provided directly by the County Council. This would guarantee that the number of high quality places will be maintained given the instability within the private home care sector.’

Mr Orrick began by saying that he was pleased that the Leader had announced funding for the telecare package. He explained that he had proposed the motion following the Adult Social Care Select Committee's meeting on 22 February where a review of in-house older people's residential homes was discussed in part 2.

He considered that it was important that this review was conducted in an open and transparent manner and that any decision needed to

undergo a proper consultation process. He said that he had proposed the motion to reaffirm the County Council's commitment to the highest possible support for Surrey's older people so that they could remain in their homes for as long as possible.

He also made reference to falling standards, as indicated by the spot checks undertaken by the Care Quality Commission, the collapse of some private care homes and that the Local Authority only commissioned care for critical cases.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Hazel Watson.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health proposed an amendment, which was seconded by Mrs Sally Marks.

The amendment was tabled at the meeting and stated:

'This Council agrees that, owing to an ageing population, a large number of older people will need care and support, and that:

- Surrey County Council will continue to provide support, including the introduction of new technology, to enable Surrey's older people to live in their own homes.
- Surrey County Council will ensure that there is adequate provision of residential care, when appropriate, for older people with high or complex needs.

In presenting his amendment, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health said that protecting vulnerable children and adults were key priorities for the County Council. He made reference to the initiative announced by the Leader concerning telecare, which would help older people remain in their homes. However, he stressed the importance of residential care for people with high end needs and said that the Council would continue to support those people for which it had a responsibility.

He also said that the Council's residential homes were inspected and made reference to the problems of provision last year due to the collapse of some private provision. He said that no decision would be made until there was a clear plan setting out the way forward for adult residential care in Surrey. Finally, he drew Members attention to the Public Value Review of Services for People with Learning Disabilities which was being considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on 27 March 2012.

Other points made in the debate were:

- The original motion was unnecessary and confusing .
- Support for the best care for Surrey residents, irrespective of who is the provider.
- Recognition for the work that the Council, in partnership with Districts and Boroughs, was doing to support older people to remain in their homes.
- Districts, Boroughs and the Voluntary Sector also provided other critical services e.g. sheltered housing.
- Support for telecare because this service helped to alleviate other family members' concerns.
- Adult Social Care Select Committee members had visited Council residential homes in December and confirmed the high standard of care provided.
- A disparity in funding and the difference in fee levels between public and private provision. National figures were quoted.
- The Council needs to operate its care homes so that there is continued provision for people with high and complex needs.
- The Council had a duty to provide good quality care for all people that need our care and support and there should be an aim to provide the best care for those who need it.

After the debate on the amendment in which 13 Members spoke, it was put to the vote. 55 Members voted for and 12 Members voted against it. Therefore, the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Mr Colin Taylor proposed a further amendment to the substantive motion. He suggested replacing the word 'adequate' with 'good quality'. This further amendment was not agreed.

The substantive motion was put to the vote, with 56 Members voting for and 10 Members voting against it.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this Council agrees that, owing to an ageing population, a large number of older people will need care and support, and that:

- Surrey County Council will continue to provide support, including the introduction of new technology, to enable Surrey's older people to live in their own homes.

- Surrey County Council will ensure that there is adequate provision of residential care, when appropriate, for older people with high or complex needs.

24/12 **REPORT OF THE CABINET (ITEM 12)**

Mr Hodge presented the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 28 February 2012.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

- Mr Gosling, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health on Public Health in Local Government (Appendix Di)
- Mrs Hammond, Cabinet Member for Community Safety on the outcome of a prosecution by the Trading Standards (Appendix Dii)

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A: Consultation on Surrey's Admission Arrangements for September 2013 for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools and Co-ordinated Schemes

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning moved an amendment to recommendations 3, 4 and 5, which was tabled. He said that further information had been received since the recommendations had been considered at Cabinet. Following a meeting between local Members, the Assistant Director for Schools and Learning, the Principal Manager for Admissions and Transport (Strategy) and himself, he was proposing the following amendments:

Replacing recommendations 3, 4 & 5 as follows:

Recommendation 3

That the admission arrangements for Thames Ditton Infant School are not altered and remain as they were determined for September 2012, so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address

- e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- f) Any other applicant

Recommendation 4

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Wallace Fields Infant School is agreed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- f) Any other applicant

Recommendation 5

That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Wallace Fields Junior School is agreed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:

- a) Looked After Children
- b) Exceptional social/medical need
- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- c) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- d) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
- e) Any other applicant

Mr Frost, the local Member for Epsom and Ewell South West thanked the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning for his assistance and confirmed his support for the changes now recommended at Wallace Fields infant and Junior Schools.

After a short debate, the recommendations, as amended, were put to the vote with 65 Members voting for and no Member voting against them. There was one abstention.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Hinchley Wood Primary School is agreed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:
- a) Looked After Children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
 - f) Any other applicant
- (2) That the Tiered Sibling criterion for North Downs Primary School is removed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:
- a) Looked After Children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings
 - d) Children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
 - e) Any other applicant according to straight line distance from their home address
- (3) That the admission arrangements for Thames Ditton Infant School are not altered and remain as they were determined for September 2012, so that the admission criteria would be as follows:
- a) Looked After Children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
 - f) Any other applicant
- (4) That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Wallace Fields Infant School is agreed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:
- a) Looked After Children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need

- c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
 - f) Any other applicant
- (5) That the Tiered Sibling criterion for Wallace Fields Junior School is agreed for September 2013 so that the admission criteria would be as follows:
- a) Looked After Children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - d) Non-siblings for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
 - e) Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest to their home address
 - f) Any other applicant
- (6) That Hamsey Green is removed as a feeder school to Warlingham School so that the admission arrangements for Warlingham School would be as follows:
- a) Looked after children
 - b) Exceptional social/medical need
 - c) Siblings
 - d) Children who live within the fixed catchment area (as shown on the map Annex 9)
 - e) Any other applicant
- (7) That the proposed changes to PANs for September 2013 be agreed as follows:
- i) Cranmere Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60
 - ii) Thames Ditton Junior to increase its PAN from 90 to 120 for one year only
 - iii) Cuddington Croft Primary to introduce a Junior PAN of 6
 - iv) Banstead Junior to increase its PAN from 80 to 90
 - v) Horley Infant to increase its PAN from 80 to 90
 - vi) Windlesham Village Infant to increase its PAN from 40 to 60
 - vii) Hillcroft Primary to increase its PAN from 45 to 60
 - viii) Potters Gate Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60
 - ix) Beaufort Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60
 - x) Westfield Primary to increase its PAN from 30 to 60
- (8) That a sibling link between between Long Ditton Infant School and Long Ditton St Mary's CofE (Aided) Junior School, for the purposes

of admissions to the infant school, is deferred until 2014 when agreement might be reached with the junior school ahead of their consultation.

- (9) That a sibling link is introduced between Meath Green Infant and Meath Green Junior School so that children receive sibling priority for either school if they have a sibling attending either school.
- (10) That the list of schools considered to admit local children remain as it existed for 2012, other than for the removal of St Lawrence C of E Primary School (Surrey Heath) and St Peter's C of E Primary School (Waverley) from the Year 3 list.
- (11) That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2013/14 are agreed as set out in Annex 10 of the Cabinet report, which includes the proposed change to the policy regarding adding names to waiting lists.
- (12) That the Nursery admission criteria for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for 2013/14 are agreed as follows:
 - a) Looked After Children
 - b) Where there is a social or medical need for a place at that school
 - c) Where a child is expected to have a sibling attending the nursery or the main school at the time of admission
 - d) Children who will turn 4 years old between 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014 (this is to give priority to older children who will be due to transfer to Reception in the next academic year and hence only have one year left to attend nursery)
 - e) Children who will be 3 years old between 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2014 (these children will be able to stay on in nursery for another year in 2014/15 as they will not be due to start Reception until September 2015)
- (13) That the admission arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for September 2013 are agreed with the following amendments:
 - That paragraph 14 of the Cabinet report is re-worded to reflect the intention that, subject to there being physical capacity within the school, in the case of multiple births where only one place remains, each child would be offered a place as long as they are ranked consecutively in their order of priority for the school.
 - That a statement on transport is included within the published admission arrangements which confirms that eligibility for transport will be assessed in accordance with Surrey's Home to School Transport policy, that feeder links do not confer an automatic right to transport and that if applications are not made

for nearer schools (whether in or outside the County) then transport will not be provided to a school that is further away if the child would have been eligible for a place at a nearer school had they applied.

RESOLVED:

That the reports of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 28 February 2012 (as amended) be adopted.

25/12

SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2012/13 (ITEM 13)

The Leader introduced the report. It was:

RESOLVED:

- (i) The attached Pay Policy Statement to be published on Surrey County Council's external website, as detailed above, with effect from 1 April 2012 be approved.
- (ii) The first sentence in the Governance section, at the beginning of the Statement, to be added to the document (already published on the website) clarifying the role of the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) be approved.

26/12

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN (ITEM 14)

(a) Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

It was:

RESOLVED:

That Mr Few and Mr Harmer be appointed as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively on the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the council year 2011/12.

(b) Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Adult Social Care Select Committee

It was:

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Marks and Mrs Kemeny be appointed as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively on the Adult Social Care Committee for the remainder of the council year 2011/12.

[The meeting ended at 12.30 pm]

Chairman