

## COUNTY COUNCIL

### COUNCIL MEETING - 14 OCTOBER 2014

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 14 October 2014 commencing at 10.30 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mr D Munro (Chairman)  
Sally Marks (Vice-Chairman)

Mary Angell		David Ivison
W D Barker OBE		Daniel Jenkins
Mrs N 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		Ms D Le Gal
Bill Chapman		Mary Lewis
* Helyn Clack		Christian Mahne
Carol Coleman		Ernest Mallett MBE
Stephen Cooksey		Mr P J Martin
Mr S Cosser		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
Mrs P 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
Mr D Harmer		Fiona White
Nick Harrison		Richard Wilson
* Marisa Heath		Helena Windsor
Peter Hickman	*	Keith Witham
Margaret Hicks		Mr A Young
David Hodge		Mrs V Young
Saj Hussain		

\*absent

#### **57/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Clack, Miss Heath, Mr Kemp, Mrs Moseley, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mrs Searle and Mr Witham.

#### **58/14 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 15 July 2014 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

#### **59/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- There were three presentations made:
  - (i) Mr Du Bois, Chairman of SATRO presented a 'Thank You' certificate to the Chairman, to mark 30 years of successive Surrey County Council chairmen giving their support to this voluntary organisation.
  - (ii) The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery informed Members that the County Council had won the Best Practice award from the British Construction Industry for the A244 Walton Bridge project. James Young, Principal Design Engineer for this highways project presented the award to the Chairman.
  - (iii) The Cabinet Member for Business Services congratulated the officers within the Shared Services Centre who worked on the Local Assistance Scheme within My Helpdesk for winning the '2014 Peer Award for Excellence'. They had entered the category for Corporate Responsibility - Giving to the Community.
- He also mentioned attending the World War 1 commemoration Service held on 4 August 2014 in Guildford Cathedral.
- He drew Members attention to the charity wine tasting event, to be held at the Living Planet Centre in Woking, in aid of the Guildford Cathedral 'Make your Mark' fund raising campaign.
- He also advised Members that he would be abseiling down Guildford Cathedral tower on 24 October 2014.
- Finally, he said that Members were invited to view the beautiful display and demonstration of lace work in the Grand Hall today.

#### **60/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

There were none.

#### **61/14 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]**

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

Members raised the following topics:

- The impact of any increased infrastructure for any proposed expansion at Gatwick or Heathrow airports, on the provision of school places in Surrey.
- Support for the Environment and Transport Select Committee's flooding task group.
- The fairer funding settlement for schools and that forecasting and planning for school places was critical, along with lobbying the Government for adequate funding for elderly care.

## **62/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]**

Notice of 17 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** asked whether it was acceptable for the Council to enter into this project without a cost benefit analysis and budget. He also expressed concerns relating to the increased response times for 999 calls to Surrey Fire and Rescue. In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Community Services, the Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services was invited to respond. She said that commercial sensitivity was critical when purchasing property or land and therefore, any details would be confidential. However, Members were able to contact officers directly to obtain that information. She also confirmed that funding for the new fire station in Spelthorne was included within the Surrey Fire and Rescue budget. Finally, she said that 'community' risk was constantly monitored, looked at across the county and that the proposed location for the new fire station in Spelthorne would be able to meet the response times for emergency incidents.

**(Q2) Mr Forster** said, as the Cabinet Member for Community Services was not at the meeting, he would take his supplementary question outside the meeting.

**(Q4) Mrs Watson** asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery why the quality issues concerning Bailey Road and Ashley Road had not been addressed. The Cabinet Member explained that the solution was dependent on weather conditions and the work could only be undertaken between May – September. However, he confirmed that the improvements would be included in the programme for next year.

**(Q6) Mr Beardsmore** asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning to provide re-assurance, which she did, that the new commissioning model for youth provision would still ensure good provision at Spelthorne Youth Centre.

**(Q7) Mr Cooksey** expressed concern about the rate of progress to date in reducing the number of wetspots across the county. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery said that Mr Cooksey was aware of the wetspots programme and its' progress – he hoped that the county would continue to reduce the number. However, progress was subject to availability of resources.

**(Q8) Mr Jenkins** asked if it was the case that SITA's design failed to meet Ofgem criteria for Renewable Obligation Certificates (ROC) and why had it failed to be

accredited to date. Also, was the County Council going back on a previous statement that the Plant would not be accepted as a gasifier if it failed to qualify for Ofgem accreditation.

**Mr Beardsmore** made three points: (i) it is Ofgem's opinion that counts because they were a determining factor on whether or not the plant was a gasification plan, (ii) that 'pre-accreditation' and 'accreditation proper' were different things so the reference to 'accreditation power' was irrelevant, and (iii) it was not essential to have the revenue from ROCs for the plant to run but it probably would not run as a profit without it.

**Mr Essex** asked for confirmation on whether the financial impact had been included or excluded from the 'Value for Money' analysis on the different options in the previous Cabinet report on the Eco park.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning said that, apart from agreeing to provide a response outside the meeting in relation to the financial implications, he had nothing further to add to his written response, other than to say that there would be a report to Cabinet on 25 November which would provide additional information.

**(Q9) Mr Ivison** referred to the offer from the Ministry of Defence for resources and support to help towards promoting the knowledge and awareness on WW1 in schools. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning thanked him for bringing this information to her attention and said that she would advise the relevant officer of this resource. She also confirmed that awareness of the origins of WW1 did form part of the history curriculum for schools.

**(Q10) Mr Mallett** referred to the School Transport Policy and asked whether it could be further amended from September 2015 to alleviate the issues in his division concerning free transport to Esher High School rather than to a nearer out-county school. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that any change could not be implemented from September 2015 because the policy for that academic year had already been published.

**(Q11)** The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning said that she would discuss any possible plans for the Manor school site in Byfleet with **Mr Forster** outside the meeting.

**(Q13) Mr Cooksey** said that the new gully cleaning programme had resulted in a reduction of gully cleaning and therefore a considerable number of gullies remained blocked. He asked for a guarantee that the new programme would result in an improvement. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery said that he was unable to provide a guarantee but that the new programme would be an improvement.

**(Q14) Mr Jenkins** considered that he had not received an answer to his question relating to whether Surrey County Council had made any of its officers available to potential developers of this site to undertake work. **Mr Essex** said that the issue was wider than Highways issues and asked about the effect that any development would have on school place provision. **Mr Beardsmore** asked if the County Council was able to have access to data gathered – whatever happened to any development proposals. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning confirmed that he thought that the County Council would have access to the collated data, also provision of school places would be factored into any proposed development. However, he said that both the Leader and the Chief Executive of Spelthorne Borough Council had confirmed that no planning application had currently been received for this site.

**(Q15) Mr Mallett** asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning to request that Babcock 4S were asked to advise schools to include a statement on Schools' Governing Body agendas relating to the new statutory requirements to all Governing Bodies for maintained schools to reconstitute by September 2015. The Cabinet Member said that she would check with Babcock FourS, however, there was a task group set up and information was also disseminated via the Schools Bulletin. Mrs Hicks referred to the fact that the County Council was no longer going to nominate governors. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning confirmed that this was being considered as part of the reconstitution and that the local authority was reviewing this but no decision had yet been taken.

**(Q16) Mrs Watson** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, and was given, the name of the contact officer with responsibility for the Surrey Road Verges Action Plan – John Edwards.

**(Q17) As Mrs Watson** had asked questions at a previous Cabinet meeting and at this Council meeting relating to Superfast Broadband, the Deputy Leader suggested that if she had any further questions, that she approached the team directly for a response to her concerns.

#### **63/14 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]**

There were no statements from Members.

#### **64/14 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]**

##### **Item 8(i)**

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

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

'This Council notes that, underlying the extensive funding and overall provision of school places in Surrey, fundamental problems still exist in the planning and delivery of school places.

2014 has again seen failures in forecasting based on birth rates, the planning of school places, the early phase co-ordination of planning, education and highway, and the promotion of sustainable transport and travel options.

As a result:

- parents seeking school places have experienced unnecessary concerns about their children's opportunities to both attend their local schools, but also to arrive at that school safely and
- residents living close to schools have seen their concerns in relation to planning and highways ignored.

This Council therefore calls upon the Cabinet Members for Schools & Learning, Highways, Transport & Flooding Recovery, Environment & Planning and Business Services to work together to produce an Action Plan which tackles the current problems related to forecasting, the early coordination of teams responsible for the

expansion of schools, late planning applications, and travel arrangements to schools, to be in place by the end of 2014.

This Council further agrees that the Action Plan be subjected to scrutiny by a joint meeting of Members of the relevant Select Committees.'

Mr Townsend made the following points:

- That planning for school places should have started earlier.
- It was difficult for parents to find out information re. school places in their local areas.
- School expansions – parents of pupils attending the schools were consulted. However, the consultation process did not necessarily extend to local residents.
- Proper consultation and communication was key to the success of school expansions.
- The importance of addressing traffic issues around schools and ensuring pupil safety.
- A need to look at school place planning for secondary schools now.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Kington.

Thirteen Members spoke, making the following points:

- The Leader's statement, which had been about the rising demand for school places in Surrey, and the actions taken by the Council, was welcomed.
- In order that all Surrey children could have a school place, no one in the Chamber was against the expansion of schools, but concern was expressed about the consultation process and communication issues, particularly with local residents – it was considered that the key issue was to ensure that Highways officers worked more closely with local residents.
- Pupil forecasting was not an exact science, due in part to some children crossing borders and coming into Surrey for education. The Plan needed to be constantly updated. Also, the exact figures for primary schools would only be known in January each year for the following September.
- More land was needed to build new schools.
- Frustration and lack of confidence, in relation to the Council's plans to deliver school places in some Members' divisions.
- That the Council was doing its best for Surrey residents and that this motion was an attack on officers.
- The Council was proud that a school place had been offered to every Surrey child.
- That the Authority did have a 10 year forecasting plan, which was revised each year – this year the forecast was 98% accurate.
- A request for a joined up service with Education, Highways, Police and Cabinet to deliver school expansions.
- Acknowledgement that some traffic disruption was inevitable but measures should be in place to mitigate disruption, particularly where new schools were being built.

- Teachers parking in residential roads was also an issue in some areas and the Council needs to work together with local residents and schools to address this.
- The importance of early planning was stressed - building work should not commence until planning permission had been granted and a school travel plan was in place.
- Reference to the significantly increased birth rate in Surrey.
- That the County was in the process of building 5 new schools.
- Predicting demand for school places was a complex process but the Authority had recently acquired a new forecasting tool which should help.
- An offer for the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning to visit local areas where residents were concerned with school expansion.
- The key to the way forward was co-operation, co-ordination and clear communication.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote, with 22 Members voting for it and 52 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore the motion was lost.

#### **Item 8(ii)**

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

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

‘This Council welcomes the statement made by the Prime Minister following the No vote in the Scottish Referendum and in particular welcomes the formation of a Cabinet sub-committee to examine English constitutional change and the continuing commitment that “power can and must be devolved more locally.”

This Council commends the One Place, One Budget initiative taken by the County Councils Network and chaired by the Leader of Surrey County Council, which creates an ambitious vision for public services to be more closely controlled by local people. This envisages a new devolution settlement between Whitehall and the Counties to move decisions about how all local services are delivered closer to the people affected by those decisions. This would deliver better public services, reverse decades of centralisation and revitalise UK democracy.

This Council urges the Government to take the opportunity now for a radical English Devolution settlement devolving power to both the counties and the cities of England.’

Mr Martin made the following points in support of his motion:

- That following the Scottish Referendum, he welcomed the clear decision of the Scottish people to remain with the United Kingdom and believed that now was the time for a radical English Devolution settlement, which he believed had cross party consensus.
- That it was important that Surrey’s voice was heard by members of the Government’s new sub-committee looking at Constitutional Change.

- The Prime Minister had mentioned devolving some powers to cities but counties should also be included in the process.
- Surrey had a vibrant economy and the County's Plan for future devolvement of some powers and increased local decision making had already been sent to Government.
- Surrey County Council had a strong track record for partnership working plus the ambition to deliver.

The motion was formally seconded by Ms Le Gal.

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

A copy of the amendment was attached as Appendix C.

Speaking to her amendment, Mrs Watson made the following points:

- The amendment improved the original motion and provided the background as to why devolution was necessary because England needed to make more local decisions.
- It also referred to Boroughs and Districts and requested that Surrey MPs and the Council's Cabinet lobbied for urgent devolution of power.
- That this was a 'Once in a Lifetime' opportunity that would benefit Surrey's businesses and residents.
- Westminster should not continue to micro-manage Surrey County Council's affairs.

Speaking to the amendment, Members made the following points:

- The points made in the original motion relating to the County Councils' Network (CCN) were missing.
- It was contradictory and the language used in the amendment was aggressive
- The omission of combining with other counties to petition government.
- Agreement that the amendment was complementary and did make the original motion stronger.
- More powers for Local Government would be beneficial.
- The amendment was urging more radical change.
- More devolution to English cities and counties was the way forward.
- The importance of an in-depth discussion re. devolvement of more powers to local areas.
- There didn't appear to be any real objections to the amendment.
- Concern that the original motion was not sufficiently radical.

The amendment was put to the vote with 16 Members voting for and 46 Members voting against it. There was 1 abstention.

Therefore, the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, 9 Members spoke, making the following points:



- Devolution for English counties and cities was welcomed by all levels of Local Government.
- The increased need to use voluntary organisations as Central Government reduced costs and therefore, the importance of increasing the public's confidence in Local Government.
- The best way to achieve success for increasing devolved powers to local areas was through the LGA and CCN.
- Suggest focussing on one area, for example – Health and Social Services so that savings could be made by these services working together.
- Support for the motion, as it is going in the right direction.
- No further review of county boundaries - stability was essential.
- Promotion of the opportunity and benefits of increased local decision making, for Surrey residents.
- Confidence that the County Council could meet and address the challenges of more devolved powers.
- The excellent record to date of the County Council efficiency savings and sharing services to provide more effective services

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote and agreed, with no Member voting against it.

Therefore it was:

#### **RESOLVED:**

This Council welcomes the statement made by the Prime Minister following the No vote in the Scottish Referendum and in particular welcomes the formation of a Cabinet sub-committee to examine English constitutional change and the continuing commitment that “power can and must be devolved more locally.”

This Council commends the One Place, One Budget initiative taken by the County Councils Network and chaired by the Leader of Surrey County Council, which creates an ambitious vision for public services to be more closely controlled by local people. This envisages a new devolution settlement between Whitehall and the Counties to move decisions about how all local services are delivered closer to the people affected by those decisions. This would deliver better public services, reverse decades of centralisation and revitalise UK democracy.

This Council urges the Government to take the opportunity now for a radical English Devolution settlement devolving power to both the counties and the cities of England.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45pm, part way through the debate on the motion standing in Mr Martin's name, and resumed at 1.30pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Angell, Mr Barker, Mrs Bowes, Mrs Bramhall, Mrs Coleman, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mrs Frost, Mrs Hicks, Mr Hussain and Mrs Thomson.

**Item 8(iii)**

Mrs Watson agreed to withdraw her motion.

**Item 8(iv)**

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:

‘In the light of the recent referendum in Scotland and the widely held view that constitutional changes are essential in order to restore public confidence in the nation’s democratic structures, this Council agrees to investigate the extent to which the unitary authority model could now better deliver quality services and efficiency savings.

Furthermore, this Council resolves that any future reorganisation of local government must ensure that Surrey retains a significant influence on the regional and national agenda.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Essex.

Mr Robert Evans made the following points:

- He referred to negotiations between the proposers of the previous two motions and the possibility of merging the motions. However, it was agreed that they should remain as separate motions.
- Residents in his division did not consider that a two tier Surrey was a good idea – they wanted a unitary model.
- That there were about 600 councillors across Surrey, all receiving allowances and he considered that this was a costly and confusing way to provide local democracy.
- It was essential that Surrey County Council was part of any future debate on the nation’s democratic structures.
- Surrey could be a unitary authority because he considered that single local authorities, responsible for all local services had greater democratic accountability and this viewpoint crossed all political boundaries.

Mr Jenkins moved an amendment at the meeting, which was formally seconded by Mr Johnson.

The motion, as amended read:

(Note: additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)

‘In the light of the recent referendum in Scotland and the widely held view that constitutional changes are essential in order to restore public confidence in the nation’s democratic structures, this Council agrees to investigate the extent to which the unitary authority model could now better deliver quality services and efficiency savings.

Any unitary authority model proposed in this investigation must include an equitable level of democratic local representation.

Furthermore, this Council resolves that any future reorganisation of local government must ensure that Surrey and its local communities retains a significant influence on the ~~regional and~~ national agenda.'

The amendment to the original motion was accepted by Mr Robert Evans and Mr Essex and therefore became the substantive motion.

11 Members spoke making the following points:

- There should be a focus on cost effective and efficient government and not the proposal for a re-run of the unitary issue - this would incur set up and transition costs.
- Continued co-operation and working with partners was the way forward.
- Stop complaining that this County Council was underfunded and examine other options that may be available.
- Reducing the number of borough and districts may save costs.
- The motion was not asking Members to vote for the unitary authority model but only to investigate it as a possible option.
- That any consideration of a unitary model for Surrey was premature and that residents may want a debate on this issue first.
- The current two tier arrangement worked well, with Borough / Districts dealing with local issues and the County Council dealing with wider, more strategic issues.
- Stability of borough boundaries was essential.
- Spelthorne Borough Council did support the unitary option in the 1990s but times have moved on and it was acknowledged that some decisions needed to be made at County level.
- The current arrangements were not perfect but any unitary alternative would not save money or result in improved funding for Surrey.
- Surrey County Council did a significant piece of work on the unitary option in the 1990s, and this demonstrated that having three / four unitary authorities across Surrey would cost more. There was a 76% vote to keep the two tier option.
- Continue the working in partnership with other local authorities and bodies, as 'One Team', to ensure efficient and effective working.
- The Council should be concentrating its efforts to obtain more devolved power from Central Government.
- This motion was only asking the Council to consider how devolved powers were organised locally and it was important to re-consider and investigate the unitary option in 2014.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 7 Members voting for and 51 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

### **Item 8(v)**

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

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

'This Council notes that the Local Government 2000 Act recommended that it is good practice for the Chairs of Scrutiny and Select Committees to be occupied by councillors from outside of the ruling party. Such an arrangement would support and enhance the transparency and accountability of decision making of the Council. It would also assert and protect the public interest on the issue of decision making.

Therefore, the Council agrees:

- That the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should not be a member of the ruling group; and
- That the Chairs and Deputy Chairs of all Select Committees, and other committees of Surrey County Council with a scrutiny function will, in future, be allocated and distributed in proportion to the representation of councillors elected by the different groups.'

Mr Essex made the following points:

- That this motion was about democracy and that Chairmen of Scrutiny Committees may be more effective if selected from opposition parties because scrutiny should be representative of the Council's backbenchers.
- He highlighted the number of Special Responsibility Allowances held by the Administration, as opposed to the opposition parties.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans.

Six Members spoke on the motion, making the following points:

- Reference to the Local Government Act 2000 and the Central Government model, where their select committees did have opposition chairmen.
- That there had been select committee chairmen from the opposition in previous Surrey County Council Administrations.
- That this Administration had considered senior scrutiny roles for opposition Members.
- Using opposition Members for scrutiny roles was good practice and would strengthen the structure of the County Council.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 20 Members voting for it and 34 members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

## **65/14 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 22 July and 23 September 2014.

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

There were none.

### **(2) Reports for Information / Discussion**

The following reports were received and noted:

- Local Government Ombudsman Report with a finding of maladministration

Mr Goodwin asked the Leader of the Council, who agreed to provide a response outside the meeting, for the timeframe for Members to receive the response to the Monitoring Officer and the Ombudsman's report.

- Developing the first University Technical College in Surrey

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning informed Members that since the report had been submitted, Babcock / FourS had joined the Academy Trust.

- National Autistic Society / Cullum Autism Centres in Surrey Schools
- Quarterly report on decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 July – 30 September 2014

### **RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 22 July and 23 September 2014 be adopted.

## **66/14 REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION REVIEW GROUP [Item 10]**

Mrs Marks, Chairman of the Constitution Review Group introduced the report and thanked Rachel Crossley and Katie Booth for their officer support to the Group.

She explained the objectives for the review and the consultation that had been undertaken, including the survey results, all of which had contributed to the final recommendations of the task group.

She highlighted the following key points from the review:

- The offer of training to Members, if required and, particularly for new Members who joined the Council mid-term.
- Improvements to the Council Chamber, including webcasting and the electronic voting system.

- Inclusion of Cabinet Member briefings within the Member Question Time item.
- Limiting the number of motions at each meeting.
- Reducing the number of signatures required on a petition which would trigger a debate at Council.

Finally, she drew attention to the recommendations and said that recommendations (1) to (6) had the unanimous support of the Review Group but a further two recommendations, set out on page 25 of the agenda had the support of the majority of the task group. However, she hoped that Council would support the report in its entirety.

Mrs Lewis formally seconded the recommendations of the task group and made the following points:

- Reinforcement of the points made by Mrs Marks and emphasis of the spirit of the task group and the proposals put together by the group.
- Adjustment to the start time would help those Members with carer responsibilities.
- The ability to question Cabinet Members would make Surrey a better Council.
- The proposed changes for motions and the reasons for them.
- That the recommendations were a package which could be reviewed again in future years.

Other Members of the task group were invited to speak.

Mr Harrison focussed on the two recommendations that had been agreed by the majority of the task group. He considered that the proposed changes to time limits would give more opportunity for backbenchers to speak and hoped they would avoid a cap on the number of motions for each meeting, which if exceeded could be a difficult decision for the Chairman to make. On petitions, he considered that it was unlikely that a petition would receive 10,000 signatures to enable it to be debated at Council.

Mrs Watson also had concerns in relation to limiting the number of motions to three per meeting, with none permitted at the Budget meeting. She considered that these restrictions would limit the democratic debate. She also strongly opposed the proposed threshold of 10,000 signatures for petitions to be debated at Council and proposed amending this figure to 3,000, which she considered achievable.

Mr Skellett said that the purpose of the full Council meetings was for the Administration to report the business of the Council and for the opposition to challenge it and put down motions. He referred to the key issues of concern raised during the task group's review, including the increased number of motions at recent Council meetings. He said that many Members wanted morning only meetings, which was one of the reasons that the group had proposed a limit of three motions. He also hoped that amending the time limit for speakers would enable more Members to participate in the debates.

Mr Kington moved an amendment at the meeting, which was formally seconded by Mr Mallett. A copy is attached as Appendix D.

Speaking to his amendment, Mr Kington made the following points:

- Motions should be allowed at the Budget and AGM Council meetings.
- That a limit on motions was morally and politically flawed and that this proposal could not guarantee fairness.
- The time limit for speeches could enable the debate to flow better.
- The perception that some Members considered full Council meetings a time-consuming inconvenience.
- The Chairman already had the power to curtail debates.
- If necessary, Members would find other ways to raise issues.

Three Members, including Mr Mallett, the seconder, spoke in support of the amendment before the Chairman agreed a short adjournment at 3.55pm, with Members returning at 4pm.

The Leader of the Council informed Members that the Administration was minded to accept Mr Kington's amendment.

Therefore, it was put to the vote and agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

1. Council meetings start at 10am (with prayers at 9:50am for those wishing to attend).
2. Where it is necessary to continue the meeting after lunch, the expectation should be that the lunch break will last no longer than one hour.
3. The AGM meeting should include a formal lunch with a speaker but for the other meetings, there is no need for special arrangements.
4. Standing Orders be amended in relation to:
  - i. the procedure to be followed for the election of the Leader of the Council;
  - ii. the Leader's statement;
  - iii. the inclusion within the Members' Question Time item of Cabinet Member briefings, for which a time limit of 15 minutes will be applied. in line with the processes outlined in the report (detailed changes attached at appendix 1.)
5. Changes to the Council Chamber and Ashcombe be considered to ensure that:
  - i. the audio and webcast systems are more reliable and of higher quality;
  - ii. the electronic voting system in the Chamber enables a record to be kept of each individual's vote;

- iii. the Chamber is fit for purpose, with space to store papers, ports to recharge equipment and comfortable seating.
6. The 'Guide to County Council Meetings' should:
- i. be revised and reissued on an annual basis; and
  - ii. remind Members on the requirement to act with courtesy during meetings.
7. That the Council refers back to the Constitution Review Task Group all those recommendations upon which the Constitution Review Group could not agree for further discussion, with the remit to produce recommendations that more clearly reflect a consensus amongst all groups and political parties represented on the Council.

Mr Martin proposed three further amendments, with additional words underlined, as follows:

Amendment 1: Page 31, Standing Order 6.8:

The Deputy Leader and other Members of the Cabinet will be appointed by the Leader of the Council and reported to the Council at the AGM or at the next appropriate meeting of the Council.

Amendment 2: Page 36, Standing Order 11.5:

In the event of the submission of more than three motions for a meeting of the Council, a meeting between the Chairman and the Group Leaders will determine which motions will be considered at the meeting and the order in which they are to be taken, with an assumption of a cap of three to be taken at any one meeting. In the event of no agreement being reached on the matter, the Chairman will have the discretion to take the decision on which motions will be taken and in what order, taking into account the political balance of the Council and the need for fair representation for all political groups and parties.

Amendment 3: Page 40, (ii)

Leaders speaking in the debate on the Budget. (5 minutes) – change to 10 minutes

However, the Chairman ruled that amendments (2) and (3) were out of order because the Council had already agreed to refer back to the Constitution Review Group, the element of the report that referred to those amendments, for further discussion. However the first amendment was agreed:

**RESOLVED:**

Page 31, Standing Order 6.8:

The Deputy Leader and other Members of the Cabinet will be appointed by the Leader of the Council and reported to the Council at the AGM or at the next appropriate meeting of the Council.

Mr Robert Evans proposed ending County Council meetings by 2pm and therefore recommendations (2) and (3) could be deleted. This proposal was not supported.



**67/14 THE OPENNESS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BODIES REGULATIONS 2014  
[Item 11]**

A report from the Democratic Services Lead Manager was included in the agenda asking the Council agree amendments to the Constitution to reflect requirements of the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations, which came into effect on 6 August 2014.

Mr Kington referred to the Chairman's right to suspend webcasting of any meeting held in public if the need arose and said that the requirements of the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, could enable members of the public to have and circulate an electronic version of a debate where the webcasting of a meeting had been suspended. He requested that any amendments required to the Constitution, arising from these regulations would have Member input. The Leader of the Council confirmed that he would discuss it further outside the meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

That the relevant changes to its Constitution, as set out in the Annex to the submitted report, be approved, to ensure that the requirements of the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 are met.

**68/14 REPORT OF THE PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE [Item 12]**

As Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee, the Leader of the Council introduced the report.

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposed revisions to the Officer Code of Conduct and Use of Social Media guidance to Council be approved, for inclusion in the Constitution.

**69/14 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 13]**

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee said that his committee had undertaken a review of its effectiveness and he commended the minor changes which reflected the actual work of the committee to Council.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Audit and Governance Committee's terms of reference be amended as follows:

- i. A brief Statement of Purpose to be included: "The Council recognises the importance of undertaking scrutiny of the management of the internal control systems and the Audit & Governance Committee provides an independent and high-level focus on audit, governance and financial accounts matters".
- ii. To amend section (b) under Regulatory Framework to read: To monitor the effectiveness of the councils' anti-fraud and anti-corruption strategy, *including by reviewing the assessment of fraud risks*".

- iii. To add “To approve the Internal Audit Charter” under Audit Activity, following section (b).
- iv. To amend section (b) under Audit Activity to read: “To approve the annual Internal Audit Plan & Inspection Plan *and monitor its implementation*”.
- v. To add “To provide oversight to the Annual Report of the Council” under Regulatory Framework, following section (e).
- vi. To add “That the Chairman (or in his/her absence, the Vice-Chairman) be consulted upon the appointment or removal of the Chief Internal Auditor” under Audit Activity, following section (d).

#### **70/14 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION [Item 14]**

This report outlined the changes to the Scheme of Delegation relating to section 106 agreements, pensions functions and Rights of Way orders.

Also, included in this report were the executive functions brought to Council for information. These referred to revised decision making arrangements regarding youth services, changes to delegations on adopting roads and streets, and new delegations regarding local transport schemes.

New Financial Regulations which proposed the amendment of approval thresholds for virements and changes to the review process for fees and charges were included as Annex A to this report. The Council was also asked to agree a further deletion on page 86 of the agenda, namely: ‘Over £500,000, £250,000 (full year effect) and within a portfolio directorate – relevant Cabinet Member’

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the relevant changes to the Constitution be approved, regarding:
  - i) the extension of delegations in relation to Section 106 agreements to Senior Managers in the School Commissioning and Libraries services;
  - ii) the new division of responsibilities regarding pensions functions and the Internal Disputes Resolution process;
  - iii) the reinstatement of the provision to enable officers to make rights of way orders where no significant objections are made and related updates to wording;
  - iv) revised Financial Regulations.
2. That the amendments agreed by the Cabinet to the Scheme of Delegation be noted.

**71/14 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET [Item 15]**

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.

[Note: there was a typo on P.104 – first bullet point in the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery’s response – ‘not’ should be deleted.]

[Meeting ended at: 4.15pm]

---

**Chairman**

**Leader's Speech to County Council – 14 October 2014**

Chairman, since I became Leader, I have spoken many times in this chamber about the rising demand for school places in Surrey. Keen to share success – I have stood at this lectern, describing how we have worked against the odds to find increasing numbers of school places each year.

This year is no different – in September we provided 4,138 additional school places – a huge number and ten times what was needed just five years ago. I am keen that we all recognise the immense efforts of colleagues from many services who have acted as One Team to deliver these achievements.

Yet today – my speech will strike a different tone. Although every Surrey child got their school place this year, it was tougher than ever – and I'm not ashamed to say we made it by the skin of our teeth. In truth – I am worried about the future. I am worried about how we ensure that all 3,000 Surrey children will be guaranteed a place next September.

All Members will be aware that this huge increase in pressure for school places comes as a result of Surrey's highest ever birth rate. To make things even trickier – this rise has not been consistent across the county – meaning that the pressure in some areas is even greater. Overall, we predict that 13,000 extra school places are needed over the next five years. That is the equivalent of 30 new primary schools.

Although, in reality, it is not just Primary schools we need. We are starting to feel pressure in every part of the system – from nursery schools to sixth form. In fact in 2015, you'll notice the growth in demand really beginning to hit our Secondary Schools. And of course - as if building extra classrooms wasn't hard enough – with the secondary sector we also need to think about expanding science labs, IT rooms and gym facilities too. All of which makes expanding a secondary school far more complex, not to mention expensive, than expanding a primary school.

**So - what are we doing about it?**

Up until now, we've been accommodating most of this increased demand by expanding our existing schools. But space around school sites, particularly in more urban areas such as Woking, is quickly becoming saturated. Put simply – we are running out of room. What we now need is new schools, not just new classrooms.

Members can be assured that our Property Officers are working flat out to try to identify sites we can acquire for new schools. However, this is proving to be a challenge, given the high cost and low availability of suitable land in Surrey. Even when we do find a good site, we still need to obtain the relevant planning permission. I know that you won't need me to tell you that this can be a long and complex process.

**And it doesn't even end there!**

Because even when we can acquire a suitable site, in the right location and even when we do obtain the right planning permission – We are faced with yet another challenge! When it comes to building schools, rising construction costs combined with limited skills capacity in the UK construction industry is hitting Surrey hard.

In the last few years we have seen some quite eye-watering increases in the cost of building materials and labour, in fact, since September 2011:

- the cost of plasterwork has risen by 41%,
- the cost of blockwork has risen by 50%
- whilst the cost of brickwork has risen by an enormous 96%.

At the same time, in a market where demand currently outstrips supply, skilled labourers such as bricklayers, are becoming increasingly hard to come by. This means we are constantly competing with a commercial sector that has greater ability to pay more – we've even had instances where labourers have been poached from the school sites themselves by contractors on neighbouring building projects.

So the challenges remain - rising demand, complex builds, a shortage of sites, lack of skills labour and spiralling construction costs. It is clear that when it comes to meeting the demand for school places – our task is getting tougher and tougher. So what can we do? How can we continue to fulfil our statutory duty of ensuring that every Surrey child has a school place, despite all the challenges that stand in our way?

Well firstly, we need to have the right team in place – one that can work under pressure and to incredibly tight deadlines. I am confident that we have that team here in Surrey.

In fact, I have been impressed by the way that officers from School Commissioning, Property, Planning, Finance, Legal and Procurement, have come together as 'One Team' to implement Surrey's largest ever school expansion programme. I know that this is a huge challenge but thanks to their expertise, professionalism and commitment – not a single Surrey child went without a school place this year.

I am sure that everyone in this Chamber will want to join me in formally thanking all the officers that were involved in this enormous effort. However, despite my confidence in our fantastic team – alone, they are not enough. No matter how good the team is, and no matter how well we work with schools – without a fairer funding settlement for school places in Surrey we are in an unsustainable position.

**Chairman, let me clearly set out the financial implications Surrey is facing.**

The grant funding we've received to date has just about enabled the delivery of school places, but it is no longer enough. In 2014/15, the County Council has had to invest an additional £30m to ensure that 4,138 Surrey Children had a school place in September.

Based on our projections for 2015/16, we will need to invest £84m to deliver an additional 3,000 schools places for September 2015 intake, yet the Council is scheduled only to receive £30m in government grant funding! This means the County Council needs a fairer funding settlement from Government of a further £54m to ensure that every Surrey child has a school place in September 2015. Regrettably, without that £54m of fairer funding we may not be able to guarantee every Surrey child a school place in September 2015.

**So Chairman, my ask of Government is simple.**

Surrey County Council has made every effort to keep the cost of school places as low as possible. We have an expert team in place – one that has proved themselves against tight deadlines and significant pressure. However, the scale of demand

means that our funding is simply no longer enough. We need Government funding for school places to reflect the actual costs of meeting this demand. For 2015/16 – this would mean £84m.

£84m - this isn't about Surrey asking for extra money or special treatment. No – this is about asking for what is actually needed - our fair share of the pot. Let it not be forgotten that Surrey taxpayers are the largest contributor to the Exchequer of any region outside the City of London yet despite this contribution Surrey continues to receive £66m a year less than the average County Council. Is it really too much to expect to see some of that investment back in Surrey?

As the Prime Minister himself said in his recent conference speech, *“If you work hard and do the right thing....we say you should keep more of your money to spend as you choose.”*

I couldn't agree more!

Let me assure Members that as Leader, supported by my Cabinet, I am doing everything I can to ensure that Surrey receives its fair share of funding for school places. Over the past few months, I have had positive discussions with a number of Surrey MPs on this important issue – and I am confident that they understand the difficulties we are facing. I was also able to secure a meeting with the Secretary of State for Education, Nicky Morgan, to make our case. Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning and our Chief Executive attended with me – and I am sure they will agree with me when I say it was an encouraging and constructive meeting. Whilst it is not yet known what the outcome of the meeting will be, it is encouraging that Government is starting to listen and opening doors to us and taking Surrey's case seriously. It is important that we keep up this momentum – but Linda and I can't do it alone.

This isn't about the Leader or Cabinet – this is about all 81 Councillors making a difference. I need the support of each and every one of you to make Surrey's case. Whether it is through the local media or through meetings with your local MP – it is absolutely vital that we all keep banging the same drum, to ensure our voice is heard. With your support, I am hopeful that Government will acknowledge the pressure we are under and fund us accordingly for school places. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that – no matter what happens between now and February 2015, there will be no easy choices when setting next year's budget. Even if we receive fairer funding for school places – we will still be left with significant pressures in other areas – such as elderly care, roads maintenance or replacing damage from flooding.

We need to acknowledge that we simply won't be able to continue delivering services in the same way that we do today. Again – I hope that I can count on your support and understanding as we try to tackle some of these difficult decisions in our budget discussions over the next few months. Select Committees, as always, will be vital to the process of helping shape the budget - so let me stress, once again, how much I value the time and effort that Members dedicate to their scrutiny roles.

To conclude, I am sure that Members will agree with me, when I say that it is a great privilege and a great honour to represent our communities as a County Councillor but with this privilege also comes a great sense of responsibility and duty to the residents we represent. As Leader, I take this duty incredibly seriously – that's why I wanted to clearly set out my concerns today regarding the significant and unsustainable shortfalls in our funding for school places.

With my Cabinet, I will continue to do all I can to lobby Government for a fairer funding settlement for school places in Surrey. I trust that I can count on the support of every Member in this chamber – as well as the continuing support of our Surrey MPs, to ensure that every Surrey Child can have a school place in September 2015.

Working as One Team I am hopeful that we can achieve a positive outcome for Surrey residents. To ensure that each and every child in Surrey continues to have a place in school and the opportunity to a first class Surrey education. The residents of Surrey are, and will always be, my number one priority.

**David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**14 October 2014**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY 14 OCTOBER 2014**

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

**CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES**

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

With respect to the proposed reorganisation of fire cover in Spelthorne, will the Council disclose:

- The cost of the land and the estimated cost of the building the new fire station?
- How many firefighters jobs will be lost?
- What the increased level of risks are for local people in terms of the safety of property and lives?
- How the Council feels it is maintaining its responsibility to protect its citizens?

**Reply:**

The acquisition of the land from Spelthorne Borough Council is not yet completed and therefore the information requested is confidential because this is a commercial property transaction. The estimated cost of the new fire station will be dependent upon the building design, specification, facilities, layouts and associated due diligence, which are yet to be completed. The decision arising from the Cabinet paper of the 4 February 2014: Changes to fire deployment in the Borough of Spelthorne, included: "That the amended proposal Option 5 and the commissioning of a new fire station in an appropriate location be agreed subject to a further business case setting out the delivery costs of a new station returning to Cabinet in due course". The business case will be partly predicated upon the financial information requested, as and when it becomes available, having been through the various process designed to ensure good value for money is secured.

We do not anticipate any firefighter jobs will be lost directly as a result of the changes in Spelthorne, especially as there will be sufficient leavers over the period before the new station is due to open. Firefighters at Sunbury and Staines will be asked if they wish to work at the new station or transfer to another Surrey station.

Community risk is constantly monitored and managed by the Fire and Rescue Service Surrey-wide - adjustments to response tactics are made



dynamically and in accordance with circumstances. Prevention and protection activity are likely to have a greater impact on life safety than the attendance time of a second fire engine and as a result we will continue to invest in these areas. However, it is anticipated that two fire engines will operate from the new Spelthorne fire station, one crewed by full time professional firefighters, one crewed by on-call professional firefighters. Approximately two thirds of all incidents attended by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service are resolved with only one fire engine in attendance. The Service proactively manages its operational risks on a constant basis implementing contingency plans and other mitigations where necessary.

Following the proposed changes in Spelthorne, attendance times to emergency incidents are predicted to remain within the Surrey emergency response standard that applies throughout the County. We will continue to work with the community to continue to reduce the numbers of and impacts of incidents. Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority's Statement of Assurance 2013-2014 detailing comprehensively how it meets the requirements of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 and other legislative obligations across locally, regionally and nationally, is found at this link: [SFRA Statement of Assurance 2013-2014](#).

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES**

### **(2) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:**

Please can the Cabinet Member confirm how much money the Council spends on buying newspapers for Surrey's libraries?

#### **Reply:**

##### **Spend on newspaper**

The total spend on newspaper provision in libraries for the financial year April 2013 to March 2014 was £54,437.85.

The newspaper provision at each library is by library banding and is as follows:

**BAND A LIBRARIES** (Camberley, Epsom, Guildford, Redhill, Woking, Dorking, Farnham, Godalming, Staines, Walton):

- 3 Broadsheets
- 1 Tabloid
- 1 Financial Times
- Up to 2 local papers

**BAND B1 LIBRARIES** (Ashford, Banstead, Dittons, Ewell, Horley, Oxted, Weybridge):

- 2 Broadsheets

- 1 Tabloid
- Up to 2 local papers

**BAND B2, C1, C2, C3 LIBRARIES** (Addlestone, Cranleigh, Caterham Valley, Egham, Esher, Haslemere, Leatherhead, Molesey, Ash, Ashtead, Bookham, Cobham, Frimley Green, Hersham, Horsley, Knaphill, Reigate, Sunbury, Chertsey, Shepperton, West Byfleet, Byfleet, Caterham Hill, Merstham, Lightwater, Lingfield, Stanwell):

- 1 Broadsheet
- 1 Tabloid
- Up to 2 local papers

Surrey libraries invest a significant amount of its resources budget (c 200K) in online resources which includes free access to online newspapers. These are accessible from a library member's home computer or via a public access computer in all of Surrey's libraries.

The online newspaper resources currently available are: -

#### **Custom Newspapers**

- Access to 2,500 titles (including The Daily Telegraph, The Economist, Financial Times, The Guardian, Independent, Daily Mail, The Mirror, The Times and The Observer) in the library and from home.

#### **Newsstand**

- Search national and regional newspapers online for news events and up-to-date information.

#### **PressDisplay**

- Today's papers including the Independent, Guardian, Telegraph, Daily Mail, Daily Express. Also regional papers and newspapers from around the world.

#### **Zinio**

- View digital copies of a wide range of magazines in UK and worldwide.

#### **Summary**

We will continue to review and develop the range of newspaper resources we provide in both electronic and physical format to Surrey libraries.

## **LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

### **(3) MR IAN BEARDSMORE (SUNBURY COMMON AND ASHFORD COMMON (TO ASK):**

Would the Leader agree that whilst the Surrey Planning Group fulfils a useful role, Surrey County Council has an absolute right to make any decision on behalf of Surrey residents it considers correct, even when this runs counter to a decision made by the Surrey Planning Group?

#### **Reply:**

I believe that Mr Beardsmore is referring to the Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership, the setting up of which is due to be discussed under item 13 of the next Cabinet meeting on 21 October 2014.

The Localism Act (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) require public bodies to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries. At a Local Plan Examination, local planning authorities are expected to demonstrate evidence that they have complied with this legal 'Duty to Cooperate'.

Surrey Leaders have agreed to meet as the Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Board to provide a vehicle for cooperation and joint working to help districts and boroughs in Surrey meet the challenging requirements of the duty. They have agreed a Memorandum of Understanding on how the local authorities in Surrey will work together to prepare a Local Strategic Statement setting out common priorities on strategic planning matters and actions. The partnership will also facilitate a co-ordinated approach to engaging with neighbouring authorities, particularly London and its potential growth impacts on Surrey.

Paragraph 11 of that report confirms that the Memorandum of Understanding to be signed by Surrey Leaders 'does not seek to restrict or fetter the discretion of any of the authorities in the exercise of its statutory functions and powers or in its response to consultation or determining planning applications'. The Annexes to the report include copies of the Memorandum of Understanding and the Terms of Reference and the latter also makes it clear that the Signatories cannot exercise any of the functions of a planning authority or competent authorities, including setting formal planning policy or exerting control over planning decisions.

I am sure that when Mr Beardsmore reads the Cabinet Paper he will agree that this is the right course of action for Surrey residents.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY**

### **(4) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:**

A number of roads in my Division have been resurfaced to an unsatisfactory standard, leaving an uneven road surface and areas where the surface underneath is visible. When I have raised these issues with Highways I have not been reassured that action will be taken but have been informed that the roads will be monitored by the County Council at the end of the 2 year guarantee period. In view of this, when Surrey's roads are resurfaced, what quality control is carried out by the County Council of the resurfacing work and why is no action taken when the work is unsatisfactory for example by getting the contractors to resurface the road at no cost to the County Council?

### **Reply:**

All highway maintenance works are monitored and inspected by Surrey Highway engineers to ensure that the works are undertaken to the design specification. This includes pre, during and post testing of materials by the county's laboratory. Works are then only paid when the SCC engineer approves a Completion Certificate, confirming the road meets SCC strict requirements.

This provides:

- (1) Surface treatment – two year warranty at Contractors' cost
- (2) Project horizon reconstructions – 10 year warranty

Surface Treatment is a lower cost scheme and is consequently not classed as major maintenance, it will not resolve all underlying structural issues, but will provide a new thin surface to remove any potholes or major effects and can extend a road life by 5-7 years, however, it is not intended to provide the same level of standard as a reconstruction scheme.

There has been four roads out of nearly 30 schemes in your division which we aware have caused some local concern. All four roads were delivered as part of Surface Treatment programme and approved at the time via Completion Certificate with no quality issues identified. However, since completion of the works in 2012, residents have raised a number of concerns and we have therefore completed further inspections and monitoring. Following this quality review we can now confirm:

- Bailey Rd & Ashley Rd – there are no contractor quality issues with these schemes. The primary issue is the level of car users using the roads for turning and/or parking, this is creating scuffing and general wear and tear on specific small sections of the road. The only method to completely remove these minor issues would be to reconstruct the road, which was outside the

scope of the original surface treatment solution, however, the overall solution has delivered improvement to over 98% of the road.

- Wathen Rd & Hard Rd - highway monitoring over the last 12 months has identified a number of contractor quality issues, and remedial work has been agreed with contractor at no cost to the county council. Officers will contact the councillor to provide further details on specific remedial areas and expected time for works to be completed.

In the previous 24 months Surrey Highways have delivered over 300Kms of resurfacing, and despite this significant programme only approximately 5% has been identified as having quality issues, which is fully in line with industry standards and best practice. While any quality failures have been addressed at no cost to the council. This demonstrates that our quality controls are working, however, despite success to date highways will continue to strive for a 0% quality failure.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

### **(5) MRS FIONA WHITE (GUILDFORD WEST) TO ASK:**

What monitoring does the County Council undertake to ensure that agency staff providing care services to Surrey residents are providing the full amount of time that they are contracted to provide to individuals in need of care?

#### **Reply:**

The provision of domiciliary care is commissioned and delivered through the recently awarded Home Based Care contract which went live on 1 October 2014.

Providers now have a contractual requirement to have electronic monitoring in place and will submit electronic monitoring and invoicing data as required in the terms and conditions and in the correct format as specified in the contract, which also allow Surrey County Council to audit and verify the performance data.

For providers where electronic monitoring is not currently in effect, the expectation is that they will be working towards having electronic monitoring systems in place to provide that added assurance.

A list of all providers will be made available on Surrey information point web site, which will clearly indicate all providers using these systems.

The performance monitoring framework collects the following information from Providers:

- Total number of visits actually made (scheduled and unscheduled) and the number of visits that were cut short – this will be recorded using pre-allocated length of visit bandings.
- Number of calls delivered later than the planned start
- Number of calls that were not delivered (missed/ cancelled)
- Number of calls which were rescheduled

A customer satisfaction survey will be conducted regularly as part of the contract monitoring process.

Providers are required to complete a self assessment which mirrors the customer satisfaction survey and will enable direct comparisons between responses from customers and providers to be made at contract review meetings.

In addition, the quality assurance managers regularly work with home based care providers checking daily care records for entries of times logged in and out of service user's homes, should this not reflect the care plan, then the agency are asked to address this.

Quality assurance managers also visit service users homes to test the service provided.

Monitoring information will now be collated and reviewed regularly at monthly Home Based Care Contract Monitoring meetings

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

### **(6) MR DAVID GOODWIN (GUILDFORD SOUTH WEST) TO ASK:**

A few years ago the County Council transferred the management of its Youth Centres to a number of voluntary organisations that were required to provide matched funding to increase the funding, activities and opening hours of the youth centres. Following the decision by the Cabinet on 23 September 2014, to bring the management of the County Council's Youth Centres in-house to be run by the County Council, what assurances can be given that the funding, activities and opening hours will not reduce following this decision?

### **Reply:**

In April 2012 Surrey County Council transferred the management of Centre Based Youth Work to Managing Agents from the voluntary, community and faith sector. The management of the youth centres, which are also shared by the Youth Support Service, was retained by the Council. Centre Based Youth Work has operated as part of a commissioning model which has achieved the lowest rates of young people who enter the criminal justice system or who are not in education, employment or training in England.

On 23 September 2014, Cabinet agreed a new commissioning model for 2015 to 2020. This adapted model builds on achievements to date and responds to changes in the needs of young people. The limitations of the current model for Centre Based Youth Work are:

- Additional costs incurred by the duplication of management capacity between Managing Agents and Surrey County Council to manage the seconded staff;
- Confusion in relation to roles and responsibilities with lack of clear leadership;
- Large inconsistencies in performance and quality including Woking Youth Centre where the contract was terminated by mutual agreement in September 2013.

The strengths of the new model include:

- Streamlined management bringing a back office saving to Surrey County Council;
- Performance more closely managed through one single service;
- Retention of the National Youth Agency Quality Mark to maintain and improve quality;
- Increased delegation to Local Area Committees.

Funding for front line youth work will be maintained, subject to budget settlement and Council agreement to the current Medium Term Financial Plan. External income from grants will also be generated. As an indication of what is possible under direct management, Woking Youth Centre generated £21,000 of matched funding in the first seven months from September 2013. This makes Woking the second highest performing youth centre for matched funding for that period.

'Matched provision' from the community is still expected as a key feature of this model. Again, using Woking Youth Centre as an example, 486 hours of community matched provision were delivered in the first seven months of direct management. This is 265% more than the next highest performing youth centre for hours of matched provision for that period.

Opening hours will vary locally in response to local needs and priorities set by Youth Task Groups and Local Area Committees. The model opens up opportunities to increase opening hours in areas of highest need, and develop voluntary, community and faith sector provision in areas where communities are stronger. Whilst the model allows local flexibility, it is also designed to maintain and potentially increase the total number of youth work hours delivered across Surrey through this 'hub and spoke' approach.

Overall the new model will improve flexibility to respond to local needs and priorities, increase local decision making, drive improvements in performance and deliver greater value for money.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY**

**(7) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK:**

How many of the 1105 wetspots listed on the Surrey County Council website does the County Council plan to resolve by implementing flood prevention schemes in the current financial year to the end of March 2015?

**Reply:**

We expect to reduce the risk of flooding across 68 wetspots this financial year by implementing flood prevention schemes. The schemes vary in complexity and further works may be required in subsequent years before the full benefits are realised. In addition to these schemes, we are also progressing minor drainage schemes to address more localised issues across Surrey and expect to complete approximately 300 by the end of the financial year.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

**(8) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:**

The status for the SITA design for the Charlton Lane Eco Park as a gasifier is fundamental to Surrey County Council's acceptance SITA's proposal and was essential to the planning permission granted on 24 September 2014.

Surrey County Council has stated that the plant will only be accepted as a gasifier if it meets the quality required to qualify for ROC's (Renewable Obligation Certificates) awarded by Ofgem. ROC's pre accreditation has not yet been awarded by Ofgem.

Will this Council allow works to commence at the Charlton Lane site before SITA's design receives pre accreditation by Ofgem as a gasifier?

If so, is it responsible for this Council to allow a plant to proceed which has failed to demonstrate it qualifies to meet the council's own fundamental criteria for approval, or the projects underpinning justification for its 'Eco Park' branding, when so many concerns have been raised regarding the negative impact upon local residents in terms of; health, environment, finance and quality of life?

**Reply:**

Gasification can be proven by the production of a Synthesis gas (Syngas) which is generated by heating waste with reduced levels of oxygen.



The Outotec technology plant, proposed for the Eco Park is designed to operate as a gasification plant with the production of Syngas from the waste within the fluidised sand bed in the lower part of the gasification chamber. This Syngas can be sampled and measured before being combusted in the upper part of the chamber.

Operators can apply for Ofgem accreditation for payment of Renewables Obligation Certificates if the Syngas from a gasification plant meets a certain calorific value. However, the determining factor on whether or not a plant is a gasification plant is its ability to produce a Syngas and not whether the plant is accredited by Ofgem.

SITA have applied for Ofgem pre-accreditation but accreditation proper cannot take place until the plant is operating. The EPC contractor has provided a guarantee that the plant will produce a Syngas which is of sufficient quality to meet the criteria for Ofgem accreditation for Renewables Obligations Certificates.

The revenue from Renewables Obligations Certificates would benefit the Council and reduce the Council's costs but it is not so essential that the project could not proceed without it.

Local concerns about environmental, health and amenity impacts were taken into account and carefully assessed by the County Planning Authority through the planning application process and the value for money aspects of the project have been fully demonstrated following extensive analysis by the council's financial advisors.

I therefore see no benefit in delaying this project until the Ofgem pre-accreditation process has been completed.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

### **(9) MR DAVID IVISON (HEATHERSIDE AND PARKSIDE) TO ASK:**

May I ask what steps are being taken in our Primary and Secondary Schools to promote knowledge and awareness of the origins and conduct of World War 1 in this centenary year? Is the Cabinet Member aware of the resources and support available from the Ministry of Defence to help towards this initiative?

### **Reply:**

Commemoration of the Great War centenary has been discussed on several occasions this year and last in the termly primary and secondary history network meetings held for leaders of the subject and organised by the Babcock 4S Consultant for Humanities. Staff from Surrey Heritage have been invited to attend these meetings to share with teachers how they may support their efforts in the classroom and to talk to them about the Surrey

Heritage WWI project, 'A County Remembers: Surrey in the Great War' for which they hope to be awarded Heritage Lottery Funding early in 2015 for a commemoration project which will run until 2018. Surrey Heritage staff have also shared their 'World War One in Surrey Archive resource pack' with Surrey schools at these meetings and a taster pack has been sent to all Surrey schools.

Some Surrey teachers attended the 'Schools & the Great War Centenary: How Schools Should Best Prepare' conference at Wellington College.

History leaders have been sent links to resources designed to help them teach about World War 1, such as those from the British Library, the Imperial War Museum, the British Legion, Commonwealth War Graves Commission, Europeana 1914-1918 and Exploring Surrey's Past. They are aware of many resources and sources of support available to them.

Teachers in Surrey schools see the commemorations around WW1 Centenary as an unmissable opportunity to engage students in historical studies and help them to understand why knowing about the past is so important in understanding the present and how society has evolved at a local as well as a national level. It would be challenging to find a school not doing anything to commemorate the Great War.

To give a flavour of what is going on in Surrey schools:  
Lyne and Longcross C of E (Aided) Infant School with Nursery

- The Year 2 class is studying WW1 this term and will be particularly focussing on:
  - Life in the trenches;
  - Life for soldiers;
  - Weapons;
  - Life back home with the men gone;
  - Remembrance;
  - Development of women's roles;
  - This learning will be shared with the rest of the infant school through a class assembly.

Puttenham Church of England School

- The Great War has been a focus in assemblies and taught as year 2 short topic lessons;
- Children have sown poppy seeds on the Hogsback with the Parish Council;
- Children are making terracotta poppies with Watts Gallery to be on display in Compton in November;
- A few children will take part in the memorial service in Farnham;
- Children are learning a confederation-wide school song which all will sing on special assembly on 11 November.

### St. Ann's Heath Junior School

- A focused week looking at WW1. Each year group is looking at the causes of the war and then will focus on a certain part:
  - Year 3 uniforms, conscription posters; Year 4 women's role and the home front; Year 5 life in the trenches and weaponry; Year 6 life in the trenches and famous battles;
  - In year 5 and 6 they will be writing poems and looking at famous WW1 poetry;
  - Across the school, year groups will be sending letters to other year groups, in role, as if they were family at home or soldiers in the trenches, to tell them about what they have learnt/ experienced;
  - Every adult and child is making a paper poppy to display in the school entrance hall, along with selected pieces of work, to recreate the art installation at Tower of London;
  - They are also having an extended service on the 11<sup>th</sup> November where children across the school will discuss and reflect on what they have learnt.

### Northmead Junior School

- A WWI week at the start of term during which children:
  - Visited the local war memorial to find out the name of the fallen from their local area;
  - With help from a local historian researched the fallen men;
  - Each made a 3D poppy which was then dedicated to the local fallen and they are creating a display of these (along the lines of the Tower of London) in the school grounds;
  - Learnt songs from WWI and sang at the opening of the local commemoration at Cardwell Keep in Stoughton.

### Woodfield School

- Writing a Christmas production based around the Christmas day football match in no-man's land;
- Observing the 2 min silence on Remembrance Day;
- The art teacher has each pupil at the school making a clay poppy to be fired in a kiln and to be placed in the grounds;
- The DT teacher is organising the pupils to each make a paper poppy to be made into a wreath to be placed at the war memorial in Merstham;
- School assembly where a representative from the British legion attends and talks to the pupils;
- The year 9 pupils study WW1 this term during History lessons.

### The Magna Carta School

- Year 9 students will study World War One after October half term to coincide with Remembrance Day – this module is a complete study of the long and short term reasons behind the conflict, as well as the

horrors of the trenches and the politics behind the Armistice Agreement;

- They will complete an extended investigation into the resolution of World War One and compare it to other conflicts such as World War Two and the Vietnam War;
- House assemblies leading up to Remembrance Day focus on a key issue to help students reflect on what the day really means. This year they will explore the impact of World War One on Europe.

#### St Bede's School

- A focus on WW1 in year 9 and a trip to Ypres;
- Trip to see War Horse;
- A theatre group in school which performed a drama for the whole of year 8 and year 9;
- An event focusing on the Christmas Truce linked with the national scheme, 'Football Remembers';
- A noticeboard especially for things to do with the centenary.

#### Thamesmead School

- A WW1 day to mark the centenary during which all subjects are delivering lessons related to WW1, e.g:
  - In science, they are teaching about scientific advances stimulated by the war;
  - In English, they are focusing on war poetry;
  - In history they are considering the causes, consequences and events of the war.

#### Kings College Guildford

- An entire term on the First World War in Year 8 (one module on origins/causes and another on the major battles, conduct, home front, etc.);
- In Year 8 English they are reading Private Peaceful and doing a lot of work on historical context (recruitment, trench warfare, shell-shock, 'conchies', etc.);
- GCSE students are completing a Depth Study on the British Home Front during the First World War;
- History trips to the Imperial War Museum for their new WWI exhibit and a battlefields trip;
- English Department creating a poppy display where students write the name of a friend or family member they've lost due to war/conflict and want them to be remembered.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

### **(10) MR ERNEST MALLETT (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:**

My constituents are being refused help with school transport to the normal and preferred feeder secondary school for Molesey pupils, namely Esher High School. The grounds for this refusal are that Hampton Academy in the Borough of Richmond-on-Thames, should have been selected as their first choice for their child. Whilst Hampton Academy may be nearer on mileage, it is difficult to access via Hampton Court Bridge and is clearly not a Surrey school.

My constituents consider that these grounds for non-help are unreasonable and are discriminating against parents who want their child to be educated in a Surrey school. Will the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning agree that this policy is not in the best interests of Surrey parents and pupils and change this policy?

### **Reply:**

The local authority has a statutory duty to provide transport for secondary aged children, if they:

- Attend a school which is their nearest suitable school and which is more than 3 miles from their home
- Are in receipt of free school meals or their parents receive the maximum amount of Working Tax Credit and they attend one of their three nearest schools between 2 and 6 miles from their home
- Are in receipt of free school meals or their parents receive the maximum amount of Working Tax Credit and they attend a school on the grounds of their religion or belief which is between 2 and 15 miles from their home

The shortest distance between home and school is measured according to the shortest available walking route that a child, accompanied as necessary, can walk with reasonable safety to school. However, where a different school is nearest by straight line distance then transport will normally be provided to either school as long as the walking distance threshold has still been met. In this way, children who attend Esher High School would not be eligible to free home to school transport if Hampton Academy was nearest by both shortest walking route and straight line distance and if they would have been offered a place at that school had they applied.

Eligibility to transport is not linked to the admission criteria of a school. Whilst some schools, such as Esher High School, give priority to children who live within a catchment, living within catchment does not confer an automatic right to transport. Whilst a parent has the right to apply for a school of their preference, the local authority has no duty to provide transport to that school if there is another school which is nearer which could have offered a place had the parent applied, whether or not that school is inside or outside the County boundary. Any extension of policy would be discretionary and the

County Council would need to identify additional resource in order to fund an increase in eligibility.

However in April 2014, following a consultation on Surrey's home to school transport policy, the Cabinet did agree to amend its policy so that, with effect from September 2015, eligibility to free home to school transport for Surrey children would be extended to children who attend their nearest geographical Surrey school (measured by the shortest walking route):

- If it is over the statutory walking distance; and
- If their nearest school is out of County and the distance or safety of route to that school would mean that transport would still need to be provided.

This extension of policy was supported as it:

- Enables parents who would otherwise receive transport to their nearest out of County school, to send their children to their nearest Surrey school and still receive transport, thus potentially increasing their 'choice' of schools
- Ensures that the cost of transport would not be a barrier for children to attend their nearest Surrey school
- Can be applied consistently across the County
- Demonstrates support to Surrey schools by offering families an incentive to apply for their nearest Surrey school, even if they have an out of County school which is nearer
- Helps to support the financial viability of undersubscribed Surrey schools and in turn may reduce the likelihood of County Council funding being needed to support the recovery of an undersubscribed school
- May cost less to transport a child to a Surrey school than to an out of County school

Depending on where families live, it is possible that this extension of policy from September 2015 will benefit children who attend Esher High School but who have a nearer school which is out of County.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**(11) MR WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

Please can the Cabinet Member confirm what plans, if any it has for the unused Manor School site in Byfleet?

**Reply:**

Looking at the pupil forecasts in the Byfleet planning area, there is no case to re-open the former Manor School for education provision at the present time,

particularly as the site is only of the appropriate size for infant provision.

However, the position will be constantly monitored and should an education use for the site become viable, the matter will be reviewed again. At the present time the council has no plans to dispose of the former Manor School site.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY**

### **(12) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

The enforcement of weight restricted bridges was carried out by the County Council's Trading Standards Service until about 2006 when the work ceased due to cost cutting. In view of the lack of enforcement by the County Council of weight restricted bridges, what assurances can be given to Surrey residents that Surrey's bridges are not being put at risk of damage and/ or collapse as inevitably significant numbers of vehicles in excess of weight limits will be using bridges without any fear of any action being taken?

### **Reply:**

Trading Standards, part of Customers and Communities Directorate, carried out investigations of frequent abuse of weight limits on bridges, with the Police. The Police still carry out enforcement subject to the necessary evidence being available. Any bridge with an assessment requiring a 3T weight limit has a width restriction already installed. The Police prefer there to be a physical 6' 6" width restriction at vulnerable bridges to enforce the legal restriction. However, this width restriction can usually only be installed with an associated 3T weight limit.

All of Surrey County Council owned bridges are managed via a process of bridge inspections, maintenance and strengthening in accordance with national standards and the Code of Practice for the Management of Highway Structures. All bridges have a General Inspection every 2 years and a Principle Inspection every 6 years. County Bridges, that have a weight restriction, have additional inspections to ensure structural safety.

Other owners of bridges that carry the highway network, such as Network Rail, also carry out routine inspections and maintenance of their bridges. There is regular liaison with third parties to ensure network safety. All third party bridge owners should be implementing the Code of Practice for the Management of Highway Structures and also have a duty of care for public safety.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING RECOVERY**

**(13) MR STEPHEN COOKSEY (DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS) TO ASK:**  
**(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

The most recent proposals for gully cleaning significantly reduce the overall number of gullies cleaned each year and reduce the frequency of cleaning for 48% of gullies to once every two years. Can the Cabinet Member indicate when the large number of gullies throughout Surrey which do not appear to have had any attention for a considerable period of time and remain blocked will be cleared?

### **Reply:**

Surrey has over 169,000 gullies which are all programmed to be cleaned to prevent them getting blocked. The recently introduced programme is designed to clean those gullies prone to blockages more frequently and provides an appropriate level of cleaning to those gullies that do not get blocked, thereby using resources efficiently. Whilst we are confident that the vast majority of the gully asset is known to us and included on the cleaning programme, it is perhaps un-surprising on an asset of this scale that we continue to identify new gullies on the highway network that haven't previously been cleaned. We are taking measures to address gaps in our knowledge however this is not a quick survey exercise and is likely to take several years to complete. In the meanwhile, Members are reminded that they can raise concerns over blocked gullies with their local highway team who will be able to ensure that they are added to the cleaning programme at the next convenient opportunity.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

**(14) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK:**  
**(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

Surrey County Council in its motion of March 2013 recommitted itself to defending the County's green belt land.

The site at Kempton Park Racecourse of approximately 90 acres is one of the few remaining open space areas of green belt land in Spelthorne.

It has been noted by residents that a lot of preliminary planning work appears to be occurring in and around the area of the site including approximately 64 CCTV cameras, 23 car counting cables and air quality diffusion cables.

Has Surrey County Council made any of its officers available to potential developers of the site to undertake work that could be used to support a plan



to develop the site or been in discussions with interested parties to the same effect?

If so, why has Surrey County Council allowed this to occur in defiance of its own stated policy of defending Surreys Greenbelt?

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council as Highway Authority has a statutory duty to engage in pre-planning discussions when requested by developers. Although officers have had very early discussions in respect of the highways and transport matters, no observations have been made about the acceptability or otherwise of development at Kempton Park. Spelthorne Borough Council is the planning authority in this instance and they will determine whether development should take place or not.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

**(15) MR ERNEST MALLETT (WEST MOLESEY) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

It has become clear that the County's policy on school governors is that lay persons and parents are now not preferred as school governors and only professional or ex-professional educationists are preferred. Further, it is clear that the County is seeking to parachute its own selected Chairmen of Governors into schools and that lay persons or parent governors are definitely not wanted for these positions and are being excluded.

In view of these requirements, is it the Schools and Learning Service's view that all lay persons and parents who are governors, should resign and leave governing bodies entirely free for County to appoint education professionals?

**Reply:**

There is a new statutory requirement for all governing bodies of maintained schools to reconstitute by September 2015. For the last 14 years, Surrey/Babcock 4S's school improvement and effectiveness strategy has involved the deployment of Additional Skills Governors (ASGs) as an effective method of intervention. This can be summarised as follows:

- The requirement for reconstitution is predicated on the coalition government's policy of improving the effectiveness of governance in schools through ensuring governing bodies are constituted with governors who possess the appropriate skills. This in no way precludes parents, local authority or any other governors holding office. The expectation now is that both elections and appointments are informed by the electorate and appointing governing bodies knowing the skills set requirements of the individual governing bodies. The governance team have spent a considerable amount of time and

communicated in a variety of ways to ensure that both clerks and governors understand the new expectation.

- The Local Authority has had powers of intervention where governance is a cause for concern in a school for many years. Current powers are enshrined in the 2006 Education Act. One of the interventions is that we have very successfully utilised since 2000, has been to deploy ASGs to governing bodies which do not demonstrate the capacity to improve without this support. This intervention is very significant as Surrey's expectations are that schools Requiring Improvement achieve good within two years, which necessitates that governing bodies need to evidence a robust and time-bonded approach to school improvement.
- The appointment of an ASG is not exercised lightly as ASGs are a valuable source of expertise and not in plentiful supply. The deployment of an ASG is only used where governance is judged to be weak and in particular where there is no evidence of appropriate and robust succession planning in place.
- ASG appointments are not permanent and are over and above the constitution of the governing body and the ASG's brief is to supply support and development until such time that the governing body can demonstrate it possesses the capacity for sustained improvement. There are occasions where the expectation of the authority is to appoint an ASG as a chair of governors, but this is to support the school and avoid the need for the issue of a formal warning notice or an application to the Secretary of State for an Interim Executive Board.
- Our practice in Surrey has been acknowledged by the DfE and recognised by the National College as the basis for the creation of their National Leaders of Governance programme, which is highly acclaimed as being an effective support to school improvement.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

### **(16) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (3<sup>rd</sup> question)**

The County Council has a Surrey Road Verge Habitats Action Plan, has identified a list of Conservation Verges to protect habitats and species and has purchased Conservation marker posts to progress this initiative. However, since then the project has stalled as there is no member of staff with responsibility for this Habitat Action Plan. When will responsibility for the Surrey Road Verges Action Plan be given to a member of staff so that it can be implemented?

## **Reply:**

Restructures within both the Countryside and Highways Teams that deal with road verges have required a reassessment of the way we deliver this piece of work. Marker posts are available in the depot and plans have been drawn up showing the location of the important habitats. The contractors should have those plans, however the markers will now be installed to ensure the sites are marked on the ground for the mower operators. Maintenance of the verges is carried out in a variety of ways including by Districts and Boroughs and by Parish Councils. The contracts for maintenance of the verges are due to be re-procured in the next year giving us a further opportunity to ensure any new management arrangements will also allow for roadside habitats to be properly managed.

## **LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

### **(17) MRS HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK: (4<sup>th</sup> question)**

Peter Martin, in his response to my question on superfast broadband at Cabinet on 23 September 2014 stated: "The principal factor determining the distribution of the slower speeds is the length of the telephone line between the cabinet and the end user premises. This has resulted in a slightly higher proportion of slower speeds in the more rural Boroughs and Districts". In light of this response, does the Leader of the Council believe that discrimination against the more rural areas of the county through the provision of a lower level of broadband service in these areas is acceptable?

Furthermore, can the Leader of the Council confirm:

(i) how many properties within the Dorking Hills division have been identified at the outset of the project as outside the 94% expected to get Superfast speeds

(ii) how the County Council intends to address broadband provision in village centres, such as Mickleham within the Dorking Hills, which are within the commercial roll-out but which cannot get a 15Mbps download speed from the commercial roll-out of broadband provision thereby making it difficult, if not impossible, for the county to achieve the anticipated level of superfast broadband provision across the county

(iii) how many properties within the IA within the Dorking Hills division now have access to fibre-based technology and how many have connected to it

(iv) how many properties within the IA within the Dorking Hills division have been identified as sub 15 Mbps premises

(v) which postcodes within the Dorking Hills division have proven Superfast premises and which postcodes have sub 15 Mbps premises and

(vi) what improvements are being considered to address the low speeds in the sub 15Mbps premises?

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council established the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme in 2012 to address the situation of residents in the County that were excluded from any fibre broadband coverage roll-out plans by commercial providers. As a result of the Superfast Surrey Programme, more than 75,000 premises out of the 84,000 premises in the Intervention Area (the IA), many of whom are in the rural communities, are now already able to access download speeds of at least 15mbps with the majority accessing much higher speeds. The limitation relating to speeds that can be accessed is currently an inevitable consequence of the technology available at this time and occurs in both rural and suburban areas. However, Surrey County Council believes that it is crucial to drive fibre coverage as close as possible to homes and businesses in Surrey. This is a technology which will continue to evolve over the coming years, and by extending the fibre network as far as possible we are ensuring that our residents will have access to new technologies and services when they become available. No deliberate discrimination is involved. It is, rather, a question of available technology versus cost. The public purse is not infinite. The position is a little similar to the way that many living in rural communities live without a mains gas supply or without being connected to mains sewage. The technology available can get the service there but the cost is too great.

**Question (i) response:**

Surrey County Council is unable to determine the percentage of properties within the Dorking Hills Division that will be unable to achieve speeds of 15mbps or more. This is because the Superfast Surrey team has no oversight over speeds served by infrastructure upgraded as part of the commercial rollout. The programme contract that was signed in 2012 had a target to achieve download speeds of 15mbps or more to 93.9% of premises across the IA and this was not broken down into specific geographic areas.

**Question(ii) response:**

Surrey County Council has no oversight over the commercial rollout but is continuing to escalate the concerns of residents in the commercial areas to senior management in BT, Openreach and Broadband Delivery UK.

**Question (iii) response:**

At the end of June 2014, fibre broadband coverage had been extended to more than 2,200 residents in the Dorking Hills Division as part of the Superfast Surrey IA. We do not hold take-up information at such a localised level.

**Questions (iv), (v) and (vi) responses:**

The delivery of fibre-based broadband infrastructure to the Dorking Hills Division is on-going and a review of the premises in the Superfast Surrey IA with slow speeds (less than 15mbps) is currently underway by Openreach to identify what, if any, improvements can be achieved within the constraints of cost and technical feasibility (Fibre to the Cabinet (FTTC), Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) and re-parenting (connecting a premises to a different cabinet). It is therefore not possible at this stage to advise which premises and postcodes will be unable to access 15mbps download speeds until the end of our programme.

**AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION STANDING IN THE NAME OF MR PETER MARTIN**

**Proposed by Mrs Hazel Watson**

**(additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)**

'Council welcomes the statement made by the Prime Minister following the No vote in the Scottish Referendum and in particular welcomes the formation of a Cabinet sub-committee to examine English constitutional change and the continuing commitment that "power can and must be devolved more locally."

~~This Council commends the One Place, One Budget initiative taken by the County Councils Network and chaired by the Leader of Surrey County Council, which creates an ambitious vision for public services to be more closely controlled by local people. This envisages a new devolution settlement between Whitehall and the Counties to move decisions about how all local services are delivered closer to the people affected by those decisions. This would deliver better public services, reverse decades of centralisation and revitalise UK democracy.~~

~~This Council urges the Government to take the opportunity now for a radical English Devolution settlement devolving power to both the Counties and the Cities of England.~~

Council notes:

- The strong and enthusiastic participation shown by the people of Scotland in a remarkable democratic process leading to the Referendum on 18 September;
- The resulting increased discussion on the devolution of powers from central government in Westminster and Whitehall.

Council believes:

- That there should be a new devolution settlement between Whitehall and the Counties to move decisions about how all local services are delivered closer to the people affected by those decisions. This would deliver better public services, reverse decades of centralisation and revitalise UK democracy.
- That England is currently ruled by an over-centralised state that fails to reflect localities and regions;
- That concentrating more power to English MPs in Westminster is not the answer for English devolution and that passing power down to local areas of England is essential.

Council therefore calls for:

Surrey's MPs, the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to lobby for urgent major devolution of power, including tax raising and spending, from central government to the regions, counties, boroughs and districts and cities of England.

And that such lobbying should emphasise:

That the devolution of powers and finance to English councils be carried out in ways that enhance and strengthen local democratic bodies. This must include agreement that it shall be for local people and communities to decide their form of democratic leadership without having a specific model imposed (for example directly elected Mayors) in return for more powers;

A recognition that English devolution must include both large cities and county areas, as the many councils not within city regions must also gain greater powers and finance in order to build successful and prosperous futures.'

**AMENDMENT TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CONSTITUTION  
REVIEW GROUP**

**Proposed by Mr Eber Kington**

**(additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)**

- 1) Council meetings start at 10am (with prayers at 9:50am for those wishing to attend)
- 2) Where it is necessary to continue the meeting after lunch, the expectation should be that the lunch break will last no longer than one hour
- 3) The AGM meeting should include a formal lunch with a speaker but for the other meetings, there is no need for special arrangements.
- 4) Standing Orders be amended in relation to:
  - i. the procedure to be followed for the election of the Leader of the Council;
  - ii. the Leader's statement;
  - iii. the inclusion within the Members' Question Time item of Cabinet Member briefings, for which a time limit of 15 minutes will be applied.  
in line with the processes outlined in the report (detailed changes attached at appendix 1.)
- 5) Changes to the Council Chamber and Ashcombe be considered to ensure that:
  - i. the audio and webcast systems are more reliable and of higher quality;
  - ii. the electronic voting system in the Chamber enables a record to be kept of each individual's vote;
  - iii. the Chamber is fit for purpose, with space to store papers, ports to recharge equipment and comfortable seating.
- 6) The 'Guide to County Council Meetings' should:
  - i. be revised and reissued on an annual basis; and
  - ii. remind Members on the requirement to act with courtesy during meetings.

**~~The majority of the Constitution Review task group made the following recommendations:~~**

- ~~1) Standing Orders be amended in relation to:~~



- ~~i. the presumption that no motions are included on the agendas of the County Council's budget meeting or annual meeting;~~
  - ~~ii. the introduction of a limit of three motions for any other Council meeting;~~
  - ~~iii. the revised time limits to apply to speeches.~~
- ~~in line with the processes outlined in the report (detailed changes attached at appendix 1).~~
- ~~2) The Council's Petition Scheme be amended to set the threshold for a petition to trigger a debate at council at 10,000 signatures.~~

That the Council refers back to the Constitution Review Task Group all those recommendations upon which the Constitution Review Group could not agree for further discussion, with the remit to produce recommendations that more clearly reflect a consensus amongst all groups and political parties represented on the Council.

