

COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING - 6 MAY 2014

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 6 May 2014 commencing at 10.30 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

David Munro (Chairman)
Sally Marks (Vice-Chairman)

Mary Angell		David Ivison
W D Barker OBE		Daniel Jenkins
Nikki Barton		George Johnson
Ian Beardsmore		Linda Kemeny
John Beckett		Colin Kemp
Mike Bennison		Eber Kington
Liz Bowes		Rachael I Lake
Natalie Bramhall		Stella Lallement
Mark Brett-Warburton	*	Yvonna Lay
Ben Carasco		Denise Le Gal
Bill Chapman		Mary Lewis
Helyn Clack		Christian Mahne
Carol Coleman		Ernest Mallett MBE
Stephen Cooksey		Peter Martin
Steve Cossier		Jan Mason
Clare Curran		Marsha Moseley
Graham Ellwood		Tina Mountain
Jonathan Essex		Christopher Norman
Robert Evans	*	John Orrick
Tim Evans		Adrian Page
Mel Few		Chris Pitt
Will Forster		Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Pat Frost		Denise Saliagopoulos
Denis Fuller	*	Tony Samuels
John Furey		Pauline Searle
Bob Gardner		Stuart Selleck
Mike Goodman		Nick Skellett CBE
David Goodwin		Michael Sydney
Michael Gosling		Keith Taylor
Zully Grant-Duff		Barbara Thomson
Ken Gulati		Chris Townsend
Tim Hall		Richard Walsh
Kay Hammond		Hazel Watson
David Harmer		Fiona White
Nick Harrison		Richard Wilson
Marisa Heath		Helena Windsor
Peter Hickman		Keith Witham
Margaret Hicks		Alan Young
David Hodge	*	Victoria Young
Saj Hussain		

*absent

24/14 CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

Under the motion of Mrs Sally Marks, seconded by Mr Chris Townsend, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED:

That Mr David Munro be elected Chairman of the Council for the council year 2014/15.

DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE

Mr Munro made the statutory declaration of office and took the Chair. The newly elected Chairman expressed his thanks to the Members of the Council for electing him as Chairman, for a second year.

25/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Lay, Mr Orrick, Mr Samuels and Mrs Young.

26/14 MINUTES [Item 3]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 18 March 2014 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

27/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (1) He presented Mrs Margaret Hicks with a long service certificate because she had been a County Councillor for 25 years.
- (2) Queen's Award for Voluntary Services: He highlighted this award to Members and asked them to consider nominating any worthy community organisations in Surrey.
- (3) He informed Members that Rachel Crossley, Lead Manager of Democratic Services would be taking a two year secondment to work on the New Models of Delivery for Surrey.
- (4) He drew Members' attention to the display boards in the Grand Hall which highlighted the achievements of the Services for Young People during the last twelve months.
- (5) The lunchtime speaker was Peter Lee, the High Sheriff.
- (6) Finally, he said that he would be re-ordering the agenda and taking the Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel (item 14) before item 10.

28/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

Mr Forster declared a pecuniary interest in the Original Motion standing in the name of George Johnson (item 13iv) because he was employed by a member of the European Union. He said that he would take no part in the discussion or vote on this item.

29/14 VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 6]

Upon the motion of Mr Richard Walsh, seconded by Mrs Helyn Clack, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Sally Marks be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council for the Council year 2014/15.

DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE

Mrs Marks was invested by Mr Munro with the Vice-Chairman's badge. She made the statutory declaration of office and expressed thanks to the Members of the Council for electing her as Vice-Chairman, for a second year.

30/14 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 7]

The Leader made a statement. A copy of his statement is attached as Appendix A.

He also tabled the Cabinet Portfolios for 2014/15, as detailed below:

Cabinet Members

Leader (and Cabinet lead for Statutory Responsibilities) – David Hodge

Deputy Leader (and Cabinet lead for the Economy and Prosperous Places) – Peter Martin

Adult Social Care – Mel Few

Business Services (and Cabinet lead for New Models of Delivery) – Denise Le Gal

Children and Families – Mary Angell

Community Services (and Cabinet lead for Continuous Improvement) – Helyn Clack

Environment and Planning – Mike Goodman

Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery – John Furey

Public Health and Health and Wellbeing Board – Michael Gosling

Schools and Learning – Linda Kemeny

Cabinet Associate Members

Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care – Steve Cosser

Cabinet Associate for Assets and Regeneration – Tony Samuels

Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families – Clare Curran

Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services – Kay Hammond

Members were invited to make comments and ask questions. They made the following points:

- That the additional investment for Highways / Roads was welcomed but clarification was requested in relation to how it would be funded.
- The increase in the number of young people starting apprenticeships.
- Staff appraisals and what steps he would be taking to increase the number of staff, and particularly those working in the front line, receiving appraisals.
- A request for feedback on the difference that the Supporting Families Programme had made and also that Central Government should be asked to extend the time taken for working with troubled families.
- The success of projects funded from the Community Improvement Fund.
- Concern about the planning for school place expansion in the Ashted area.
- Prioritisation of Council motions.
- Parking issues in Haslemere on Bank Holidays, when community events were taking place.
- The strategy of helping elderly people to live independently versus voluntary organisations saying that suffering from loneliness was a big issue for this group of people.

31/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 8]

Notice of four 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 Robert Evans did not consider that the residents of Stanwell Moor would not agree that the new arrangements for the bus service in this area was satisfactory and invited the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment, who accepted his invite, to visit the area. The Cabinet Member did say that changes to the bus service would have been considered at the local committee.

(Q2) Mrs Watson referred to the County Council's press release (26 March 2014) in relation to the use of the Runnymede Centre for a new secondary school and asked the Leader of the Council if he would make this a formal Council decision so that it could be scrutinised. The Leader said that he had nothing further to add to his tabled response.

(Q4) Mrs Watson asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services what happened to the data from the complaints feedback survey. The Cabinet Member said that she would provide a response to Mrs Watson outside the meeting.

32/14 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 9]

Mr Ian Beardsmore made a statement relating to Highways issues in his division.

N.B. The agenda was re-ordered and the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel was taken next.

33/14 REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 14]

The Council was asked to consider the report and the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel and agree a Scheme of Allowances.

The Leader of the Council moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting (Appendix C).

Mr Hodge made the following points:

- The basic allowance had remained unchanged since 2008 and that Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) for Cabinet Members had not increased since 2006.
- The Panel had used Hay Evaluation Methodology for determining SRAs, which he considered inappropriate because it failed to take into account the political responsibility of Members.
- He would be asking the Chief Executive to review the terms of reference of future Independent Remuneration Panels.
- His amendment proposed significant changes to the SRAs for Cabinet Associates, Select Committee Chairmen and the Pension Fund Board Chairman.
- He also proposed allowances for opposition group leaders, where their party had a minimum of 10% of the elected Members of the Council.
- He believed that it was the intention that the amended scheme should take effect from May 2013, the start of this administration and therefore he proposed a one-off payment to any increase that the Member would have been eligible for.
- That all allowances would be index linked and adjusted annually, in accordance with the Consumer Price Index.
- Finally, he referred to the Members of the Adoption and Fostering Panels and proposed a SRA of £1000 for them.

This amendment was formally seconded by Mr Skellett who said that the level of political responsibility for each role had been carefully considered and benchmarked against comparative data from other authorities in the South East area. Surrey's allowances had fallen significantly behind these authorities. He also said that the Leader and Deputy Leader had taken no part in the discussion concerning the allowances proposed for their roles.

Six Members spoke on this amendment, making the following points:

- The Leader / Deputy Leader had overall responsibility for the County Council's annual budget of approximately £1.7billion. Also, since they had been in their respective roles, significant savings had been made to the Budget.
- The SRAs were not out of proportion to their level of responsibility.
- The IRP report said that the basic allowance was not supposed to be a financial incentive. However, the same could not be said for the SRAs.
- Most of the SRAs were awarded to Conservative councillors.
- It was unacceptable for Members to award large increases to the Leader / Deputy Leader when some residents struggled to pay their council tax.
- It was outrageous that Members considered awarding these increases when services were being cut and many residents were not receiving pay rises.

- That the IRP's approach was logical and an element of 'catchup' was accepted.
- The proposed allowances for the Cabinet team were significant.
- Surrey staff had only received small pay increases in recent years.
- Member Allocations had been reduced this year.
- There were four new allowances proposed which had not been through the IRP.
- Councillors who only received the basic allowance of approximately £12K per annum, most of them non-Conservatives, would need other sources of income to make ends meet.

Mr Essex then moved a further amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans), which was as follows:

- (i) That the increase in Members' Basic Allowances be capped at 2.7%
- (ii) That the increase in Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) be capped at 2.7%, where there is headroom against the Independent Remuneration Panel's recommendations
- (iii) That there should be no Special Responsibility allowance for Vice-Chairmen of Local Committees

Mr Essex said that it was not appropriate to award increases to Members' Allowances that were higher than staff pay awards. He also said that there had not been a proportional approach to the SRA increases and that the number of SRAs was increasing.

Four Members spoke on this amendment, making the following points:

- That Members' Allowances had not been increased for four years and should not be compared with staff pay.
- SRAs were different in Surrey because many of the comparator authorities did not have Local Committees.
- This amendment did not address the excessive number of SRAs.
- The proposals appeared to devalue the scrutiny process.
- It would be difficult to defend the increases to the Surrey electorate.
- As the motion was tabled at the meeting, there was little democratic accountability.

The amendment was put to the vote with 10 Members voting for and 56 Members voting against it. There were 8 abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, seven Members spoke and made the following points:

- The increased cost of these allowances would be met by the Surrey council taxpayers and residents would remember this when casting their votes at the forthcoming borough / district elections.
- Concern re. the number of multiple SRAs.
- Members must be paid in accordance with their responsibility, otherwise the Council would only attract people with independent means, who could afford to serve on the Council.

- The Leader / Deputy Leader represented the County Council at Central Government level.

After the debate, Mrs Watson requested a recorded vote and 10 Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted for:

Mrs Angell, Ms Bowes, Mrs Bramhall, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Carasco, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mr Cosser, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Few, Mrs Frost, Mr Fuller, Mr Furey, Mr Gardner, Mr Goodman, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Gulati, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mrs Hicks, Mr Hodge, Mr Hussain, Mr Ivison, Mrs Kemeny, Mr Kemp, Ms Le Gal, Mr Mahne, Mrs Marks, Mr Martin, Mr Norman, Mr Page, Mr Pitt, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Skellett, Mr Sydney, Mr Keith Taylor, Ms Thomson, Mr Walsh, Mr Wilson, Mr Witham, Mr Young

And these Members voted against:

Mrs Barton, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Beckett, Mrs Coleman, Mr Cooksey, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mr Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Hickman, Mr Jenkins, Mr Johnson, Mr Kington, Mrs Lallement, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mrs Moseley, Mrs Searle, Mr Selleck, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson, Mrs White, Mrs Windsor

And there were 4 abstentions: Mr Barker, Mrs Lewis, Mrs Mountain and Mr Munro.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the following allowances be approved:**

BASIC AND SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES

ANNUAL ALLOWANCES (and number of recipients)	
Basic Allowance (81)	£12,418
Leader of the Council (1)	£43,000
Deputy Leader (1)	£31,250
Cabinet Member (8)	£22,500
Cabinet Associate (4)*	£12,500
Select Committee Chairmen (including Health Scrutiny) (5)	£10,000
Planning & Regulatory	£12,000

Committee Chairman (1) & Council Overview & Scrutiny (1)	
Audit & Governance Chairman (1)	£9,000
Lead Member for Scrutiny of the Police & Crime Commissioner (1)	£8,000
Local Committee Chairmen (11)	£8,000
Pension Fund Board Chairman (1)	£8,000
Pension Fund Board Vice-Chairman (1)	£1,500
Committee Vice- Chairmen (Select Committees (including Council Overview & Scrutiny and Health Scrutiny), Planning and Audit) (8)	£1,500
Local Committee Vice- Chairmen (11)	£1,500
Chairman of Council (1)	£18,000
Vice-Chairman of Council (1)	£8,000
Officers of Political Groups	£170 per Member
Members of the Adoption and Fostering Panels (2)	£1,000
Opposition Group Leader (2)**	£5,000

* Cabinet Associates received an interim payment of £5,000 in 2013/2014.

**Any Group with a minimum of 10% of the elected members of the Council.

- (b) That, the following arrangements for implementation of the changes to the Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances be approved:
- (i) the amended scheme takes effect from 1 April 2014.
 - (ii) for the next two financial years, the scheme will be adjusted annually in accordance with the Consumer Price Index.
 - (iii) In recognition of the clear intention that the amended scheme should take effect from 21 May 2013, a one-off payment, equivalent to any increase that the Member would have been eligible for, be made to each Member.
- (c) That other allowances within the Scheme be set as follows:

OTHER ALLOWANCES

Travel (cycles/motorcycles/ cars)	20p/24p/45p per mile
Passenger rate	5p per mile
Subsistence (breakfast, lunch, tea and evening meal)	£5.30/£7.25/£2.90/ £9.00
Overnight (outside London/ London)	£85.80/£97.85
Co-optees	None
Childcare	Up to a maximum of £8.00 per hour (per child)
Care of Dependants	<i>Up to a maximum of</i> £14.50 per hour

- (d) That the increase to the Childcare Allowance to a maximum of £8.00 per hour be effective from 6 May 2014.
- (e) That the requirement for Members to use registered childminders for the care of their child or children whilst carrying out an approved duty be amended as follows:
- ‘that payments for the care of children under eight are restricted to registered childminders and other statutory approved childcare providers, unless the childcare takes place in the Members’ own home.’
- (f) That the agreed Scheme of Allowances remain in place until May 2017, subject to review by the Independent Remuneration Panel as necessary to take account of any changes to roles and responsibilities.

[NOTE: Under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances)(England) Regulations 2003, the Council is required to have regard to the recommendations of its Independent Remuneration Panel before any changes can be made to the Scheme of Allowances.]

- (g) That the Independent Remuneration Panel be thanked for its hard-work and diligence over the years.
- (h) That, in light of the Scheme of Allowances being set until 2017, the Chief Executive be asked to review the Terms of Reference of the IRP and, upon completion of this work, make appointments to the newly constituted IRP.

34/14 ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY 2014/15 [Item 10]

RESOLVED (with no Member voting against):

That the Committee sizes and scheme of proportionality for 2014/15 as set out in the scheme, attached at Annex 1 of the submitted report, be adopted.

35/14 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES [Item 11]

The proposals for the appointment of committees were tabled at the meeting and are attached as Appendix D.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the Members, as set out in Appendix D, be appointed to serve on the Committees of the Council for the Council Year 2014/15 in accordance with the wishes of political groups.
- (2) That the Chief Executive be authorised to make changes to the membership of any of the Council's Committees as necessary during the Council Year in accordance with the wishes of political groups.
- (3) That the County Councillors representing divisions in the Woking borough area be appointed to serve on the Woking Joint Committee for the Council Year 2014/15.
- (4) That the remaining County Councillors for each district/borough area be appointed to serve on the appropriate Local Committee for the Council Year 2014/15, and to authorise the Chief Executive to appoint an equal number of district/borough councillors to the Local Committees following nominations by the district and borough councils, which they should be requested to make politically proportional to their Membership.
- (5) That the Council's representative be appointed to the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for the Council Year 2014/15.
- (6) That the Chief Executive be authorised to appoint the co-opted Members of the Surrey Pension Fund Board, following nominations from each stakeholder group, for the rest of the Council term until 2017.

36/14 ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN 2014/15 [Item 12]

The proposals for the Committee Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen were tabled at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Members listed below be elected as Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees, as shown, for the Council Year 2014/15.
- (2) That the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, to appoint the Borough's nominated Member as Vice-Chairman of Guildford Local Committee once the co-opted Members are appointed.

SELECT COMMITTEES		
	Chairman	Vice-Chairman
Council Overview & Scrutiny	Nick Skellett	Eber Kington
Adult Social Care	Keith Witham	Margaret Hicks
Children & Education	Zully Grant-Duff	Denis Fuller
Communities	Denise Saliagopoulos	Chris Norman
Environment & Transport	David Harmer	Mike Bennison
Health Scrutiny	Bill Chapman	Ben Carasco
PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE		
	Keith Taylor	Tim Hall
AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE		
	Nick Harrison	Bill Barker
PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE		
	David Hodge	Peter Martin
SURREY PENSION FUND BOARD		
	Denise LeGal	Nick Skellett

LOCAL COMMITTEES		
DISTRICT	CHAIRMAN	VICE-CHAIRMAN
Elmbridge	Margaret Hicks	Mary Lewis
Epsom & Ewell	Eber Kington	John Beckett
Guildford	Mark Brett-Warburton	Borough to appoint
Mole Valley	Tim Hall	Clare Curran
Reigate & Banstead	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin	Bob Gardner
Runnymede	Chris Norman	Yvonna Lay
Spelthorne	Richard Walsh	Denise Saliagopoulos
Surrey Heath	David Ivison	Chris Pitt
Tandridge	Michael Sydney	Nick Skellett
Waverley	Pat Frost	David Harmer

Woking Joint Committee	Liz Bowes	Borough to appoint
-------------------------------	-----------	--------------------

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45pm and resumed at 2.15pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Barton, Mr Bennison, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Carasco, Mr Ellwood, Mr Tim Evans, Miss Heath, Mr Hickman, Rachael I Lake, Mrs Mason, Mrs Moseley, Mr Page, Mr Skellett, Mr Sydney and Mr Townsend.

[Note: The Chairman decided that there was a need to suspend the webcast for the debate on the four motions.]

37/14 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 13]

Item 13(i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Robert Evans moved the motion, which was:

'This Council welcomes the initiatives by towns and local authorities across Surrey to encourage the use of fair trade goods by achieving Fairtrade status.

Furthermore this Council believes that Surrey County Council, as an important consumer and opinion leader, should research, develop and support a strategy to facilitate fair trade wherever appropriate.

Council therefore resolves, wherever possible:

- To promote awareness of fair trade issues and the opportunities for supporting fair trade across the County.
- To work with Surrey Fairtrade and those towns who already have Fairtrade Status to widely publicise the worldwide impact of unfair trade and the opportunities that fair trade provides to sustainable development.
- To encourage the use of fair trade goods, for example products carrying the Fairtrade Mark and products in vending machines.
- To request the Council's venues to stock Fairtrade products in addition to other brands.
- To concentrate on making Council employees, the Surrey public and local businesses aware of the Council's resolution on fair trade.'

Mr Robert Evans made the following points:

- Many towns in Surrey already have Fairtrade Status but there was a need to encourage others to take this step.
- A need to work towards everyone achieving a dignified livelihood.
- The Fairtrade Mark could make a real difference for some farmers, in distant parts of the world – it can ensure that they receive a fair price for their crops.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Essex who said that he was pleased that Members would be given a free vote on this motion, it was a non-party political motion. He also said that the Fairtrade mark was mostly about those products that could not be produced in the UK – the motion was not asking for exclusivity, it was seeking to promote fairtrade towns across Surrey.

Other Members spoke, making the following points:

- Statistics indicated that Fairtrade businesses were doing well.
- The importance of choice in shops.
- Fairtrade was an impressive organisation and its initiatives were strongly endorsed.
- Fairtrade needed to be encouraged but its exclusive use was not supported.
- If Fairtrade status enabled some overseas countries to become more stable, that was a good thing.
- The Fairtrade logo raised awareness and encouraged people to think about the origin of the produce / food.

After the debate, in which 8 Members spoke, the motion was put to the vote with 51 Members voting for and 8 Members voting against it. There were 4 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

This Council welcomes the initiatives by towns and local authorities across Surrey to encourage the use of fair trade goods by achieving Fairtrade status.

Furthermore this Council believes that Surrey County Council, as an important consumer and opinion leader, should research, develop and support a strategy to facilitate fair trade wherever appropriate.

Council therefore resolves, wherever possible:

- To promote awareness of fair trade issues and the opportunities for supporting fair trade across the County.
- To work with Surrey Fairtrade and those towns who already have Fairtrade Status to widely publicise the worldwide impact of unfair trade and the opportunities that fair trade provides to sustainable development.
- To encourage the use of fair trade goods, for example products carrying the Fairtrade Mark and products in vending machines.
- To request the Council's venues to stock Fairtrade products in addition to other brands.
- To concentrate on making Council employees, the Surrey public and local businesses aware of the Council's resolution on fair trade.

Item 13 (ii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Hazel Watson moved the motion, which was:

'This Council notes the recent publication of the House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee report *More complaints please!*

In the light of this report, Council agrees to fundamentally change its policy and the implementation of its approach to complaints in order to welcome complaints as a way of engaging with residents to improve services, making the complaints process more user friendly by making it simpler, more accessible and with speedier outcomes.'

Mrs Watson made the following points:

- That the motion was asking for the County Council to make it easier for Surrey residents to complain and that they would receive a speedier outcome to their complaint.
- It was difficult to navigate the Surrey County Council website to find out how to complain.
- She alleged that many complaints re. Adult Social Care were valid.
- There was a low response to feedback.
- Complaints were currently buried in Council bureaucracy.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

Seven Members spoke, making the following points:

- That the Communities Select Committee received regular updates in relation to complaints data.
- It was Council policy to listen and that the County Council had a complaints procedure which had been in place for many years.
- The Council had a key strategy to comply with Ombudsman guidance.
- Officers in the Contact Centre actively encouraged people to make complaints if they were dissatisfied – either on-line, by phone or in writing.
- Complaints were actively investigated and may be escalated if appropriate.
- The Council was always looking to improve the process and complaints procedures were regularly reviewed.
- In 2013, 91% (excluding Children Services and Adult Social Care complaints, which had separate procedures determined by Government) were responded to in 20 working days.
- The Audit and Government Committee receive reports re. complaints.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 9 Members voting for it. 49 Members voted against it and there were 3 abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

Item 13(iii)

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

Mr Forster made a short statement giving reasons why the motion should not be referred. He referred to the invaluable role of young carers and the importance of helping them. He also said that young carers were twice as likely to be NEETS (Not in Education, Employment or Training) and lived in households where no adult was in work. He believed that changing the eligibility to Pupil Premium would give these children the best possible start in life.

The Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care made a short statement stating that whilst he agreed that the County Council needed to support young carers, he was not convinced that changing the eligibility for Pupil Premium was the best or the only way to help young carers. He considered that the motion should be referred to the Children and Education and Adult Social Care Select Committees so that it could be considered in more detail.

10 Members voted for debating the motion today but 42 Members voted against debating it today.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this motion be referred to the Children and Education and the Adult Social Care Select Committees. Under Standing Order 12.6, the committees must report back to County Council at the earliest appropriate meeting.

Item 13(iv)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr George Johnson moved the motion, which was:

'The Council believes that the true cost of Britain's membership of the European Union affects all levels of trade, industry and government.

It is considered by many that up to 75% of UK laws now originate in Brussels although determining the full extent to which EU law has supplanted UK law is complicated by the fact that, in addition to the direct, and therefore immediately visible, implementation of EU regulations, EU directives are transposed into UK Statutory Instruments.

The House of Commons has estimated that, in 2009, 53% of UK law originated from Brussels and the LGA has estimated that around half of all new UK laws affecting local authorities in England have their origins in EU law. Thus it is inevitable that Surrey County Council has and will incur additional costs as a consequence of complying with EU derived laws. For example, whilst the Government predicted that the 2004 EU Public Procurement Directive would not add new costs or administrative burdens to the public sector, an LGA survey in 2010 revealed that 66% of local authority procurement managers felt that the directive had increased procurement costs and created a more complex procedure.

In common with other local councils, Surrey County Council has been and continues to be under severe budgetary restraint, but will still have to deliver new EU obligations across a broad range of functions and could be liable for hefty fines for failure to comply. While we continue to ask our residents to accept annual increases in their council tax whilst being unable to deliver the level of services and highway maintenance that they would like, it is important that they are kept fully informed of those costs that are beyond the control of their elected representatives.

Therefore this Council:

- calls for the publication of the administrative cost to Surrey County Council of complying with EU Regulations
- agrees, in the interests of the transparency to which it is committed, to publish the figures on its website and in its annual Council Tax Demand.
- agrees to publish any cost savings which accrue from complying with EU regulations.'

Mr Johnson made the following points:

- That the County Council was legally bound to obey EU law.
- The public had a right to know the effect of EU legislation.
- Transparency was important, plus the need for Surrey residents to have an understanding of how their money was being spent.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Windsor who said that this motion was about trying to dispel the myths surrounding United Kingdom's membership of the EU and promote transparency concerning the cost of complying with EU regulations.

The Deputy Leader made the following points:

- He disputed some of the facts set out in the motion.
- That EU legislation was an integral part of UK laws.
- He highlighted two areas – waste and procurement and the EU Directives relating to waste / landfill plus the implications for the UK if we left the EU.
- That the UK should re-negotiate its terms with the EU and then hold a referendum.

Mrs Watson moved an amendment at the meeting, which was formally seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

The motion, as amended, read:

'This Council believes that the true benefit and cost of Britain's membership of the European Union affects all levels of trade, industry and government.

Therefore this Council:

- calls for the publication of the administrative cost to Surrey County Council of complying with EU Regulations.
- agrees, in the interests of the transparency to which it is committed, to publish the figures on its website and in its annual Council Tax Demand.
- agrees to publish any cost savings which accrue from complying with EU regulations.
- calls for a report to the Cabinet highlighting the benefits to Surrey residents and businesses of EU membership including tourism, the financial sector, manufacturing, education, the environment and employment.'

Mrs Watson said:

- Bureaucracy should be reduced at all levels of Government.
- A reference to tourism had been included in the amendment because it formed the background to Surrey's economy.
- Many global businesses, including McLaren, had based themselves in Surrey, thereby creating thousands of jobs.
- Surrey's 'success story' was based on EU Membership.
- The EU could be a major contributor to the flooding recovery plans for the county.

After 2 Members spoke, the amendment was put to the vote with 9 Members voting for and 43 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, Mr Hodge moved, under Standing Order 23.1:

'That the question be now put'

20 Members stood in support of this request. The Chairman considered that there had been adequate debate and agreed to the request.

The motion was put to the vote with 3 Members voting for and 46 Members voting against it. There were three abstentions.

Therefore the motion was lost.

38/14 REPORT BACK FROM CABINET ON REFERRED MOTION [Item 15]

The Chairman reported that the motion from the Council meeting on 10 December 2013, standing in the name of Mr Cooksey, and which was referred to Cabinet for consideration was lost, as detailed in the report set out in the agenda.

Mr Cooksey was given the opportunity to address the Council and asked if the process for referral of motions would be reviewed by the Constitution Review Group. The Chairman of the Council said that he would ask the Vice-Chairman of the Council to include its review as part of the Group's work.

39/14 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 16]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 25 March and 22 April 2014.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning tabled a statement relating to School Improvement (Appendix E).

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A School Organisation Plan

RESOLVED:

That the School Organisation Plan 2013/14 – 2022/23 be approved.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Home to School Transport Policy 2015
- Joint Working through Guildford Local Committee
- Quarterly report on decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 January – 31 March 2014

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 25 March and 22 April 2014 be adopted.

40/14 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION [Item 17]

RESOLVED:

That the amendments to the Scheme of Delegation, agreed by the Leader of the Council, and as set out in the submitted report, be noted.

41/14 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 18]

No notification had been received from Members wishing to raise a question or make a statement on any of the matters in the minutes, by the deadline.

[Meeting ended at:3.45pm]

Chairman

Leader's Speech to County Council – 6 May 2014

Today's Annual General Meeting marks the start of this Council's second municipal year. I'm sure many Members, like me, are wondering just where the last year has gone! It is hard to believe that we are already **a year** into this new Council.

That it is **a year** since this Conservative administration's decisive election win and **a year** since we bucked the national trend and **increased** the number of seats we hold on this Council! I want to take this opportunity to say thank you to the residents of Surrey who have put their faith in us once again. I am sure everyone on this side of the chamber will agree with me when I say – we **have not** and **we will not** let you down.

Chairman, our election win was **an endorsement** of the direction and progress this Council has achieved between 2009 and 2013. It was a **seal of approval** for our continued focus on delivering value for money and **it was a sign** that we are investing in the things that matter most to Surrey residents.

Our election success was **recognition** of just how far this Council has come since 2009. I know that when we were re-elected, some people questioned whether we could keep up this momentum. How could we keep on improving - with all the factors that were operating against us?

Well Chairman, we have proved those doubters wrong!

Despite all the challenges we face and the continual reductions to our funding, I am delighted to announce that this Council continues to improve! It is difficult to think of an area that demonstrates how we are improving more than our services for young people.

Thanks to the introduction of a new commissioning model, this service has:

- **Achieved a 4% increase** in young people aged 16 – 18 starting apprenticeships since 2011. This is in comparison to an 11% decline across the UK as a whole.
- **Achieved a huge 59% reduction** in young people who are NEET – that is Not in Education, Employment and Training.
- **Achieved a staggering 90% reduction** in the number of first time entrants of young people into the criminal justice system from 2009 to 2013.
- **On top of that** 290 homeless young people have been placed in safe accommodation since November 2012.

These fantastic achievements mean that more than ever before, this Council is providing young people with the opportunity to create a good start in life. For example, young people like Thomas, who was in care who had a dream to join the army and we supported him through the rigorous assessment process and were delighted when he passed with flying colours! I am pleased to say that Thomas is now 22, serving in Germany and training to be a dog handler.

Not long ago, his efforts were rewarded in the Surrey Care Leaver's 'Celebrating You' event where he was rightly recognised for his personal and professional success.

It is not just Services for Young People where we are seeing improvements. We know that older people want to stay in their own homes for as long as possible. We are helping them to do that. That is why there has been a 9% drop in the numbers of older people in residential and nursing homes in the last year.

At the same time our adult social services teams have supported almost **2,000 adults** to lead independent lives, by installing **over 4,000** items of telecare equipment and **more than 2,400** community alarms in their homes.

Chairman, this Council is helping more people to live independently than ever before.

People like Anton Brown. At 12, Anton was diagnosed with ataxia – a condition which causes damage to the brain and central nervous system. This meant that by the age of 14, regrettably, Anton became a permanent wheel chair user.

This left Anton feeling embarrassed and different, and he began to withdraw from everyday activities. At the age of 18, Anton was introduced to Employability – our employment service which supports people with disabilities to find work.

Employability discovered that Anton had a passion for personal fitness and supported him to find a specialist fitness training course. I'm delighted to say that Anton is now fulfilling his dream of training to be a fitness instructor and has a work placement at his local gym in Shepperton.

Stories like Anton's and Thomas's fill me with pride and remind me of why I became a Councillor – I wanted to make a difference.

And they are just two of many case studies that will be detailed in the Chief Executive's next six month report. This report will form part of the papers of our next Council meeting and includes many more service achievements – there is simply not enough time to list them today.

Chairman, Members can be assured that this Council is performing strongly. We are ensuring residents receive high quality and value for money services. We are listening and working with residents and are making a positive difference to people's lives – **day in, day out.**

But, we all know that we need to do more. I have spoken time and time again about the challenges we face, about the huge pressures on our budget, the relentless demand for school places and the need to find new care solutions for our increasing elderly population.

These challenges are **NOT** going to go away. In fact, the scale of the challenge simply gets greater by the day. **Long-term challenges require joined-up solutions.**

Tomorrow's public services will need to be leaner, smarter and less constrained by organisational boundaries. Put simply – if we want to continue to support residents like Thomas or Anton, we need to continue **changing** and **improving** the way we do things.

That's why, ever since I became Leader, I've been advocating the One Team approach and we have proved that we can do it!

In September 2013, we delivered an additional 2,852 school places – that’s the equivalent of 7 new primary schools. An incredible achievement – one that would not have been possible if our Estates, School Commissioning, Planning, Highways, Legal and Finance teams had not come together as One Team. Our Supporting Families Programme has also mobilised teams from across the council and our partners to work together and it is achieving real success as a result. So far 412 families have been helped to turn their lives around as part of this programme.

Perhaps our greatest example of One Team working is the recent response to the flooding in Surrey, when a host of partners pulled together to support residents through some of the worst weather this county has ever faced. We have proved that we can work as One Team when it matters but we need to do more.

One Team can no longer just exist in pockets of the organisation or when a Government initiative encourages us too or because of the personalities in place. Nor can it just exist in times of emergency. We now need to embed One Team working throughout the organisation.

That is why I am today announcing a number of additional Cabinet roles, to help mobilise One Team action around some of our biggest challenges.

- My Deputy Leader, Peter Martin, will become the Cabinet lead for the ‘Economy and Prosperous places’ – to help ensure that our economy continues to grow and Surrey remains an attractive place to live, work, and visit
- Denise Le Gal will become the Cabinet lead for ‘New Models of Delivery’ – helping ensure that we continue to develop new and creative responses to the ever-increasing demands on our services.
- Helyn Clack will become the Cabinet lead for Continuous Improvement across the council. This role will ensure that despite the day-to-day pressures of delivering services, we continue to strive for excellence and improve year-on-year.
- And I will take on the lead for statutory responsibilities – ensuring that we continue to meet all our financial and statutory obligations.

The Chief Executive will appoint a Strategic lead to support this policy direction and ensure that Officers from across the organisation come together as networks to support the delivery of these key objectives. These networks will ensure that we pool our resources on the challenges that need it most.

Chairman, Members can find the details of all the new Cabinet posts on their chairs this morning. I do not intend to run through them all now.

However, I do want to highlight a change which I believe will be of particular interest to Surrey residents. You may recall that when we were elected, almost a year ago, Officers asked us to complete a simple questionnaire. The questionnaire asked us what were the top three issues that we had encountered on the doorstep as part of our election campaigns.

Well, I'm sure it would not surprise anyone in this chamber when I tell you that there was a **unanimous winner - Roads, Mr Chairman** are undoubtedly the biggest concern for many Surrey residents.

That's why this Conservative administration agreed last year to invest £100m over 5 years into improving roads as part of our Operation Horizon road programme. I am delighted to announce to today that this programme is now ahead of schedule. Over the past year we have repaired over 131km of some of the county's worst roads – above and beyond our target of 100km. However, despite all this good work, we are all aware that the recent flooding has taken its toll on our road network. In fact, it is estimated that at least 2,500 roads have been damaged as a result of the severe weather. We know that residents will want these roads fixed as soon as possible.

That's why this Council will be investing an extra £23 million into:

- resurfacing 160 Km of roads,
- removing an extra 20,000 potholes,
- repairing footpaths,
- improving highway drainage systems,
- fixing approximately 30 damaged bridges.

This will include the complete replacement of Flanchford Bridge which was swept away by the River Mole and will be **on top** of the significant investment we are making to Surrey roads as part of Operation Horizon – which I can assure residents will not be compromised by this additional work. This extensive programme of road improvement will of course require commitment, drive and focus to complete.

That is why I have asked John Furey to take on a new role as Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery. Mike Goodman will take on a new role as the Cabinet Member for the Environment and Planning.

I hope this assures residents that roads are a key priority of this Council and that we will do everything we can to repair the damage caused by the wettest winter on record!

I would like to end by saying, once again, of how grateful I am for the team here at Surrey - not only for the Cabinet team, who have worked tirelessly over the last year to make a difference. But to **all** the Members in this chamber – who give up their time to sit on Select and Local Committees – as well as being dedicated to doing all they can to serve the people of their divisions.

I feel equally fortunate to have thousands of dedicated, committed and conscientious staff, who work incredibly hard for the residents of this county.

But my biggest thanks go to the residents of Surrey, especially those who give up their time to help others - the volunteers and the carers, the school governors and the community groups.

You all make Surrey really special. There is no simple recipe to this Council's success. However, I am confident that with these key ingredients in place – 2014/15 can be our best year yet. Working as One Team we can make a difference and **we will** make a difference, to prove to the residents of Surrey that they made the right choice at the ballot box last year!

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 6 MAY 2014

**QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1**

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT

**(1) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO
ASK:**

The private bus operator Abellio recently made crucial changes to the 441 bus route that serves Stanwell Moor. These changes all adversely affect the residents, young and old, reducing the connections between the village and the neighbouring areas, Staines, Stanwell and Ashford.

Has the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment had any discussions with Abellio on this matter? Would the Cabinet support me in trying to get these changes reversed?

Reply:

Bus service 441 (Heathrow Airport-Staines-Englefield Green) is run by Abellio, without a contractual obligation to, or financial support from Surrey County Council. Current national bus legislation gives Abellio the prerogative to make such decisions on route in respect of its own non-contracted services, having given The Office of the Traffic Commissioner the statutory 56 day period of notice. The 441 service has not served Stanwell Moor since 5 April and the company informed the Council that the time saved would contribute to a more reliable timetable for the service overall and would provide a more attractive facility for the greater majority of their customers. County Council officers did question Abellio on the essential need, or otherwise, of omitting Stanwell Moor and have expressed their concerns to Abellio. The County Council is unable to insist that Abellio reverse its decision.

However, by way of mitigation, the County Council has allowed the diversion by Abellio of existing contracted bus service 557, so that it serves Stanwell Moor village and links the area to Ashford, Stanwell and Heathrow Terminal 5. From Terminal 5, onward connections are available to other parts of the airport, within the free travel zone. This change has been secured at no additional cost.

To provide a continued link from Stanwell Moor village to Staines, the County Council has introduced additional supported journeys on Monday-Friday bus service 590/591, together with a limited number of journeys on Saturdays.

Therefore, given the circumstances that I have described, the Council has achieved the most satisfactory solution for local residents.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(2) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:

In response to a question by me at the Cabinet meeting on 22 April 2014, I asked the Leader of the Council who made the decision and on which date the decision was made to use the Runnymede Centre for a new secondary school, to which the Leader responded in writing:

‘During the week commencing 3 March 2014 colleagues in CLT, after discussion with myself and the Deputy Leader began the process of moving to temporary types of occupancy so that the site could be prepared to be available for secondary school provision’.

Whilst I very much welcome the County Council planning for providing additional school places, why was the decision, which is a “key decision” according to the Council’s Constitution, not made in a formal meeting with a proper record of who made the decision and why in accordance with the Council’s Constitution so that the decision could be scrutinised? Or, is the Cabinet now exempt from complying with the Constitution if it so wishes?

Reply:

As an experienced member of this Council, I would have expected Mrs Watson to be well aware that a decision to move staff out of accommodation is NOT a key decision.

CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING

(3) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (2nd question)

How many of the additional classrooms to be provided in the Autumn Term of 2014 will be demountables?

Reply:

The County moved away from the use of demountables at the end of the 2012/13 academic year and no longer procure these.

A new modular building solution was developed in 2012/13 for use in the Autumn Term of 2013. The benefits of this are:

- Long life expectancy, value for money and low maintenance costs

- Flexibility to attain full planning, through a range of external finishes and roof solutions
- Enhanced energy and acoustic efficiency
- Flexibility to readily change internal specifications to meet the full pupil age range and teaching requirements
- Speedy installations, saving on programme time and cost
- Modules can be readily relocated, when no longer required on site

The new units have been very positively received by users.

In 2014, we will be delivering modular units at 7 school sites to meet bulge classes and at 8 school sites with permanent expansions.

CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

(4) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (3rd question)

In the 2013 calendar year, how many Surrey residents returned completed complaints feedback surveys and how many of them were satisfied with the way in which their complaint was handled by the County Council?

Reply:

Surrey follows the Local Government Ombudsman's (LGO) good practice guidance and customer satisfaction is measured through the escalation process for the majority of complaints. If a customer is dissatisfied with the response to their complaint they are invited to escalate their complaint to the next stage.

For Adult Social Care complaints, stages are not allowed by the Department of Health therefore the Service undertakes random sampling of its complainants. In 2013/14 Adult Social Care sent out 65 dip samples surveys of which 9 were returned. Of the 9 surveys returned: 6 people said the process was easy, 2 people said it was hard and 1 person did not comment.

The escalation process for each Service includes a final stage to the LGO if required. The following table shows the number of complaints escalated by stage and where the LGO has found fault in 2013/14.

Area	Complaints received at stage 1	Complaints escalated to:			Fault found by LGO with investigation
		Stage 2	Stage 3	LGO	
Business Services	28	2	N/A	3	0
Chief Executives	47	6		1	0
Customer &	181	16		3	0

Communities					
Environment & Infrastructure	625	141		18	0
Adults Social Care	119	N/A		12	5
Schools and Learning	79	7		10	1
Children's Social Care	338	15	0	21	1

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(a) That the Council approves the following allowances:

BASIC AND SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES

ANNUAL ALLOWANCES (and number of recipients)	Present Allowance	Recommended Allowance
Basic Allowance (81)	£11,791	£12,418
Leader of the Council (1)	£27,000	£43,000
Deputy Leader (1)	£19,500	£31,250
Cabinet Member (8)	£16,500	£22,500
Cabinet Associate (4)	-*	£12,500
Select Committee Chairmen (including Health Scrutiny) (5)	£10,000	£10,000
Planning & Regulatory Committee Chairman (1) & Council Overview & Scrutiny (1)	£10,000	£12,000
Audit & Governance Chairman (1)	£9,000	£9,000
Lead Member for Scrutiny of the Police & Crime Commissioner (1)	-	£8,000
Local Committee Chairmen (11)	£6,000	£8,000

ANNUAL ALLOWANCES (and number of recipients)	Present Allowance	Recommended Allowance
Pension Fund Board Chairman (1)	-	£8,000
Pension Fund Board Vice-Chairman (1)	-	£1,500
Committee Vice-Chairmen (Select Committees (including Council Overview & Scrutiny and Health Scrutiny), Planning and Audit) (8)	£3,000	£1,500
Local Committee Vice-Chairmen (11)	-	£1,500
Chairman of Council (1)	£15,000	£18,000
Vice-Chairman of Council (1)	£5,000	£8,000
Officers of Political Groups	£170 per Member	No Change
Members of the Adoption and Fostering Panels (2)		£1,000
Opposition Group Leader (2)**		£5,000

* Cabinet Associates received an interim payment of £5,000 in 2013/2014.

**Any Group with a minimum of 10% of the elected members of the Council.

- (b) That, the Council agrees the following arrangements for implementation of the changes to the Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances:**
- (i) the amended scheme takes effect from 1 April 2014.**
 - (ii) for the next two financial years, the scheme will be adjusted annually in accordance with the Consumer Price Index.**

(iii) In recognition of the clear intention that the amended scheme should take effect from 21 May 2013, a one-off payment, equivalent to any increase that the Member would have been eligible for, be made to each Member.

(c) That other allowances within the Scheme be set as follows:

OTHER ALLOWANCES

	Present	Recommended
Travel (cycles/motorcycles/ cars)	20p/24p/45p per mile	No change, based on maintaining link to HM Revenue & Customs maxima
Passenger rate	5p per mile	
Subsistence (breakfast, lunch, tea and evening meal)	£5.30/£7.25/£2.90/ £9.00	No Change
Overnight (outside London/ London)	£85.80/£97.85	No Change
Co-optees	None	No Change
Childcare	£6.75 per hour	Up to a maximum of £8.00 per hour (per child)
Care of Dependants	£14.50 per hour	Up to a maximum of £14.50 per hour

(d) That the increase to the Childcare Allowance to a maximum of £8.00 per hour be effective from 6 May 2014.

(e) That the requirement for Members to use registered childminders for the care of their child or children whilst carrying out an approved duty be amended as follows:

'that payments for the care of children under eight are restricted to registered childminders and other statutory approved childcare providers, **unless the childcare takes place in the Members' own home.**'

- (f) That the agreed Scheme of Allowances remain in place until May 2017, subject to review by the Independent Remuneration Panel as necessary to take account of any changes to roles and responsibilities.**

[NOTE: Under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances)(England) Regulations 2003, the Council is required to have regard to the recommendations of its Independent Remuneration Panel before any changes can be made to the Scheme of Allowances.]

- (g) That the Independent Remuneration Panel be thanked for its hard-work and diligence over the years.**
- (h) That, in light of the Scheme of Allowances being set until 2017, the Chief Executive be asked to review the Terms of Reference of the IRP and, upon completion of this work, make appointments to the newly constituted IRP.**

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL: 6 May 2014

ITEM 11: APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

COUNCIL OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

<p><i>Conservative (11)</i></p> <p>Mark Brett-Warburton Bill Chapman Zully Grant-Duff Bob Gardner David Harmer David Ivison Denise Saliagopolous Richard Walsh Keith Witham Nick Skellett Victoria Young</p>	<p><i>Residents' Association & Independent (2)</i></p> <p>Eber Kington Chris Townsend</p>
<p><i>Liberal Democrats (2)</i></p> <p>Stephen Cooksey Hazel Watson</p>	

ADULT SOCIAL CARE

<p><i>Conservative (9)</i></p> <p>Graham Ellwood Marisa Heath Margaret Hicks Saj Hussain Colin Kemp Rachael I Lake Barbara Thomson Richard Walsh Keith Witham</p>	<p><i>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</i></p> <p>Ernest Mallett</p>
	<p><i>Liberal Democrats (1)</i></p> <p>Fiona White</p>
	<p><i>UK Independence Party (1)</i></p> <p>George Johnson</p>

CHILDREN & EDUCATION

<p>Conservative (9)</p> <p>Liz Bowes Ben Carasco Denis Fuller Zully Grant-Duff Ken Gulati Margaret Hicks Colin Kemp Mary Lewis Marsha Moseley</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Chris Townsend</p>
	<p>Liberal Democrats (1)</p> <p>David Goodwin</p>
	<p>Other (1)</p> <p>Robert Evans</p>

COMMUNITIES

<p>Conservative (9)</p> <p>Mike Bennison Saj Hussain Yvonna Lay Mary Lewis Chris Norman Chris Pitt Denise Saliagopoulos Barbara Thomson Alan Young</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Jan Mason</p>
	<p>Liberal Democrats (1)</p> <p>John Orrick</p>
	<p>Other (1)</p> <p>Robert Evans</p>

ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT

<p>Conservative (10)</p> <p>Mike Bennison Natalie Bramhall Mark Brett-Warburton Pat Frost Ken Gulati David Harmer Adrian Page Michael Sydney Richard Wilson Victoria Young</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (2)</p> <p>Nikki Barton Peter Hickman</p>
	<p>Liberal Democrats (2)</p> <p>Stephen Cooksey David Goodwin</p>
	<p>UK Independence Party (1)</p> <p>George Johnson</p>

HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

<p>Conservative (9)</p> <p>Bill Barker Ben Carasco Bill Chapman Tim Evans Bob Gardner Tim Hall Rachael I Lake Tina Mountain Chris Pitt</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Graham Ellwood Pat Frost Marsha Moseley Chris Norman Keith Taylor Alan Young Victoria Young</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Peter Hickman</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Nick Harrison</p>
<p>Liberal Democrats (1)</p> <p>Pauline Searle</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>David Goodwin Stella Lallement</p>	<p>UK Independence Party (1)</p> <p>Helena Windsor</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 2):-</p> <p>Daniel Jenkins George Johnson</p>

PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE

<p>Conservative (8)</p> <p>Natalie Bramhall Carol Coleman Tim Hall Margaret Hicks Christian Mahne Michael Sydney Keith Taylor Richard Wilson</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Mike Bennison Tim Evans Denis Fuller David Ivison Adrian Page Chris Pitt vacancy</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Ernest Mallett</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Nick Harrison Peter Hickman Chris Townsend</p>
<p>Liberal Democrats (1)</p> <p>Ian Beardsmore</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Stephen Cooksey Will Forster Stella Lallement John Orrick Fiona White</p>	<p>UK Independence Party (1)</p> <p>George Johnson</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 2):-</p> <p>Daniel Jenkins Helena Windsor</p>
<p>Other (1)</p> <p>Jonathan Essex</p>	

AUDIT & GOVERNANCE

<p>Conservative (4)</p> <p>Bill Barker Tim Evans Denis Fuller Tim Hall</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Nick Harrison</p>
<p>Liberal Democrats (1)</p> <p>Will Forster</p>	

PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

<p>Conservative (4)</p> <p>David Hodge Peter Martin Denise Le Gal Richard Walsh</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7 Cabinet Members):-</p> <p>Mary Angell Helyn Clack Mel Few John Furey Michael Gosling Linda Kemeny Tony Samuels</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Stuart Selleck</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Nick Harrison</p>
<p>Liberal Democrats (1)</p> <p>Hazel Watson</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>David Goodwin John Orrick</p>	

SURREY PENSION FUND BOARD

Conservative (4) Bill Barker Tim Evans Denise Le Gal Nick Skellett	Liberal Democrats (1) John Orrick
	Residents' Association & Independent (1) Stuart Selleck
Co-opted Members (4)* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – One representative (trade union) from employee members of the Fund – Two representatives from Districts and Boroughs of the Fund; – One representative from all other employers in the Fund. 	

* Authorise the Chief Executive to appoint the co-opted Members of the Surrey Pension Fund Board following nominations from each stakeholder group listed above.

MEMBER CONDUCT PANEL*

Conservative (7) Mark Brett-Warburton David Harmer David Ivison Sally Marks David Munro Dorothy Ross-Tomlin Nick Skellett	Residents' Association & Independent (2) Nick Harrison Eber Kington
Liberal Democrats (1) Fiona White	

**Must include Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council*

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (1)

Nominations received:	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
------------------------------	---------------------

County Council Meeting – 6 May 2014

CABINET MEMBER STATEMENT

I would like to make a statement concerning the role of local councils in general and of Surrey County Council in particular in school improvement.

For more than a century, Surrey County Council has been responsible for providing schools for the county's children. It is a substantial and critical responsibility which continues today, and one in which we should all be very proud of the work we do in educating our children and young people who will be Surrey's citizens and business leaders of tomorrow. Every councillor here will be aware of the work we do and the huge funds we are currently deploying to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet the needs of our rapidly rising population.

Much has changed in education in recent years. We have seen grant maintained schools, foundation schools and city technology colleges come and go. More recently we have seen the rise of academies and of free schools. These schools have been promoted as constituting alternatives to local authority provision. Through all these changes, Surrey County Council has tried to adopt a pragmatic approach, centred on meeting the needs of our children and young people. What we support are good schools, and we support them all irrespective of what type of school they may be. Provided schools serve local needs, take their fair share of resources and help resolve local challenges we have not wanted to get too heavily involved in their particular organisational structure. We have excellent schools that are academies and excellent schools that are local authority maintained, and I must admit we have some less than excellent schools in both categories too. What we aspire to is a Surrey family of schools working together to offer the highest possible standards to our residents.

Recent Governments have been much concerned with school performance. Commendably, the current Government has particularly focused on how well schools perform with those pupils who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. The Chief Inspector of Ofsted, Sir Michael Wilshaw, recently suggested that no school can really be outstanding unless it delivers outstanding education to its most disadvantaged pupils.

We applaud this approach, and we do so in the knowledge that the records of the big Home County authorities – including Surrey – are often criticised from precisely this angle. Surrey has served the mass of its residents well in terms of schools, but we have to acknowledge that, like most Home Counties authorities, the results obtained by children from disadvantage backgrounds do lag behind national averages. The Government and Ofsted have set us a challenge, and it is a challenge we are rising to meet it.

Since I took over the brief for Education I have been pleased to support the unfolding of our new School Improvement Strategy "Every School a Good School" and our work on disadvantaged children under the slogan "No Pupil Left Behind – Everyone's Responsibility". Work here has been led by our Chief Adviser and Head of School Effectiveness, Maria Dawes, supported by staff from both Babcock 4S and from our own Schools and Learning Division. Building on the foundations laid by my predecessors and taking advantage of the extra £10 million invested in school improvement by the Cabinet, last year we delivered our best ever secondary results, very strong Ofsted outcomes in secondary schools, nurseries, special schools and

pupil referral units, and improved performances for disadvantaged children at both primary and secondary phases.

We still face challenges however. Our primary results, though up, did not improve as far or as fast as I had hoped and we are still not obtaining consistently strong primary Ofsted outcomes. And I also hope to see further improvement, at both primary and secondary phases, in the performance of those children who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. I see this as a challenge for every school, not just those who, by Surrey's standards, have relatively large numbers of such children. I am passionate about education for all our children, as I know are many in this Chamber, and I feel hugely privileged and proud to do the job I do in which I get to meet so many bright and articulate schoolchildren and young people, as well as some inspirational school leaders we have across Surrey.

In addressing the challenges we face, I am very pleased with the praise we have recently received from Ofsted at national level for our school improvement work, and from the very solid support schools have expressed for our difficult and demanding strategy. Surrey and its schools are capable of providing some of the very best education in the country, and we are working together to deliver this.

But I do want to make specific reference to the role of local authorities in school improvement. Recently the instinct of central government has been to downplay this role. In particular, the Department for Education has told us that "The local authority's statutory functions do not require a highly resource intensive school improvement service" and "It is the Secretary of State, not local authorities, who holds academies to account for their performance". By way of contrast, Sir Michael Wilshaw has written that "leadership [from local authorities] is vital in securing good provision in education and childcare. ... Good local authorities realise that they have a duty to secure the right of every child to go to a good school and that poverty or other features of a child's background should not be a barrier to this opportunity". The Chief Inspector recently told the House of Commons Education Select Committee that "local authorities should be able to 'identify underperformance in academies' and 'They have a powerful part to play in local authority schools, those schools they control, and those outside their direct control' ".

I want to emphasise how much we in this County Council agree with Her Majesty's Chief Inspector for Schools. We will always be interested in the education of our children and always concerned with promoting and maintaining high standards. Through our good relationship with the Department for Education, I look forward to the Department giving more fulsome support for this important objective going forward.

Linda Kemeny
Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning
6 May 2014