

**COUNTY COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL MEETING - 17 MARCH 2015**

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 17 March 2015 commencing at 10.00 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

### **11/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Few, Mr Gardner, Mr Hussain, Mr Ivison and Mrs Moseley.

### **12/15 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The following amendments were noted:

- (i) Mr Robert Evans voted against the budget recommendations
- (ii) Mr Kington abstained from the budget vote
- (iii) The Mole Valley figures in recommendation (6) on the Budget report should read: £49,846,761.76

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 10 February 2015, as amended, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

### **13/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) He presented a Fellowship Award from the Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply to Laura Langstaff, Head of Procurement across Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council. Ms Le Gal, Cabinet Member for Business Services was invited to say a few words in support of this achievement.
- (ii) Related Party Disclosures- he reminded Members that it was a legal requirement to complete their forms and return them to Finance by the end of March.
- (iii) He reminded Members about the charity concert on 18 March 2015 for Keepout and the Yehudi Menuhin School and thanked those Members who had already bought tickets or made a contribution.
- (iv) He said that his most notable engagement since the last County Council meeting had been the Royal visit by HRH, the Earl of Wessex to the Surrey Youth Support Service. This had taken place at High Ashurst and had been a wonderful occasion and he expressed thanks to those staff who had organised the event.

### **14/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

Mr Page and Mr Skellett declared a pecuniary interest in Item 8(i), the original motion standing in the name of Mr Ian Beardsmore and relating to Heathrow and Gatwick airports and did not participate in that part of the meeting.

The following Members declared non-pecuniary interests in Item 8(i), the original motion standing in the name of Mr Ian Beardsmore and relating to Heathrow and Gatwick airports:

Mr Bennison, Mrs Clack, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Marks, Mr Page, Mr Skellett, Mr Walsh, Mr Wilson.

## 15/15 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:

- Reference to the proposed cuts for Services to Young People and whether part of the £4.6m extra funding received from Government could be used to mitigate this reduction.
- Issues concerning the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) funding allocated for improvements to Epsom town centre and the consultation that had taken place and whether the scheme had the support of the local committee.
- Concern about the possible closure of up to 10 Children's Centres and the effect on the health and wellbeing of their users.
- Partnership working between SCC Highways officers with Boroughs / Districts, to ensure that sufficient infrastructure was in place for new housing developments.

## 16/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

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

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

**(Q2) Mr Robert Evans** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning if he considered that having two similar incinerators within 10 miles of each other was unwise and would he like an incinerator in his area. The Cabinet Member said that the decision on the Eco Park at Charlton Lane would be taken by Cabinet in April 2015, after full consideration of the Value for Money information.

**(Q3) Mr Cooksey** said that he was seeking assurance from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding that Members be consulted on all new major schemes coming through Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). The Cabinet Member said that, as stated in his written response, the timetable for bidding could be changed by Government at short notice and in these cases it was not possible to share the details of the schemes with Members. However, future opportunities would allow for greater levels of engagement with local committees.

**(Q4) Mrs Watson** asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families what measures would be in place to raise the awareness of Surrey residents in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation. The Cabinet Member provided Members with a detailed verbal response, stating that the County Council was working closely with partners, including Surrey Police, to raise awareness of this issue.

**(Q5) Mr Mallett** queried whether the restructure of staff within Surrey libraries should have been considered by the Communities Select Committee. The Cabinet Member for Community Services confirmed her support for Surrey libraries but said that staff re-organisation was an operational issue and not a Member issue.

**(Q6) Mr Jenkins** asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding why Surrey County Council had not conducted a specific investigation into the flooding of the River Ash in February 2014. Both the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member consider that this supplementary question had been answered in the written response.

**(Q7) Mr Harrison** said that the Local Committee Chairmen met in private and requested that the minutes of the meeting where the part of the capital maintenance budget under the control of local committees was discussed, were published.

**Mr Kington** asked when the decision to reduce the Member Allocations was made and whether it had been published.

**Mr Mallett** expressed concern about the reduction in these allocations and considered that the decision should have been printed in the Budget papers.

**The Leader of the Council** advised Members that the details were in the Medium Term Financial Plan report, which had been published as part of the Cabinet agenda papers and would be considered at its meeting on 24 March 2015.

**(Q9) Mr Beardsmore** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning for clarification on whether the internal officers were Spelthorne BC or Surrey CC officers and was informed that it was Surrey CC officers only.

**(Q10) Mr Robert Evans** said that the candidate concerned had not yet received a reply to his 4 February communication and requested that this could be expedited as soon as possible. The Leader of the Council agreed.

**(Q11) Mr Cooksey** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to clarify two points (i) how was the County Council going to consult with residents about the proposed changes for Community Recycling Centres (CRCs), and (ii) following comments from the Secretary of State, whether charging at CRCs would be permitted. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the County Council would adhere to the proper consultation process for advising residents of any changes and with reference to charging, that he would write to Mr Cooksey outside the meeting.

**(Q12) Mr Jenkins** asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding why it had taken over a year to correct the omission of the Thames Water Aqueduct on the Asset Register. The Cabinet Member said that this was the responsibility of Thames Water.

**(Q14) Mr Beardsmore** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning for an explanation of restoration and quoted examples in Spelthorne. The Cabinet Member agreed to check the details and respond to him outside the meeting.

#### **Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios are attached as Appendix C.**

Members made the following comments:

**CM Environment and Planning** – On the Rural Surrey LEADER programme – clarification on how businesses would benefit from the programme and apply for grants. The Cabinet Member encouraged all Members to promote this programme which would be of benefit to Surrey.

He was also questioned on the Eco Park and the new Waste Management Strategy, which no longer included mention of Energy from Waste.

**Deputy Leader** – Superfast Broadband - the Deputy Leader agreed, that as part of the Open Market Review, he would seek as much advice and guidance from all sources, including residents and Members.

Also, consideration on whether the programme review of Superfast Broadband and the Open Market Review should be a future item on the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee (COSC) agenda. The Deputy Leader agreed that he would attend, if invited.

**CM Schools and Learning** – Support for the new Guildford University Technical College (UTC), which would support the regeneration of this area.

**CM Community Services** – The Cabinet Member was asked to confirm that the budget for the Magna Carta event had increased. However, she said that it had not. She also said that the Magna Carta was the ‘heart and soul’ of freedom and democracy and that she was proud that it had been sealed in Runnymede and that all Members would be invited to the celebration on 15 June 2015.

[Mr Kington has received further clarification of an increase in the budget from the Cabinet Member since the meeting.]

**CM Adult Social Care** – That the Care Act was the biggest change to Adult Social Care law in over 60 years and that the changes must be communicated to residents. In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, the Leader of the Council confirmed that plans were in place to advise residents of the new caps on care costs from April 2016 and the requirement to apply for an assessment. He was also asked why there was no reference to the decision taken by Cabinet on 10 March 2015 to close six Surrey County Council Care Homes for Older People. The Leader of the Council said that it had been carefully considered by Cabinet and he considered that the right decision had been made and that the minutes of this meeting would be included as part of the Cabinet minutes item for the next County Council meeting in May.

## **17/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]**

There were no local Member statements.

## **18/15 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 Ian Beardsmore moved the motion, which was:

‘This Council agrees to:

(i) oppose additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick in view of the adverse impact this additional capacity will have on Surrey residents, on Surrey’s already congested roads and on Surrey’s environment and Green Belt;

and

(ii) call on the Leader of the Council to lobby all Surrey MPs, the current and future Governments regarding the Council's opposition to additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Watson.

Mr Beardsmore said that:

- This motion was about logistics and expansion and whether Surrey and the South East could absorb any further expansion at these airports
- He referred to an advertisement that he had seen on a bus stop stating that expansion at Heathrow would create 120K jobs, however, additional housing and infrastructure would be required
- Passenger numbers would increase at Heathrow and Gatwick regardless of any expansion due to larger planes
- He acknowledged that 10% of his division depended on employment opportunities at the airport and supported Heathrow as it was now
- He considered that Heathrow and Gatwick would continue to be successful, whether they expanded further or not.

Mr Johnson moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This was formally seconded by Mrs Windsor.

The amendment was as follows (**with additional words underlined**):

'This Council agrees to:

(i) oppose additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick in view of the adverse impact this additional capacity will have on Surrey residents, on Surrey's already congested roads and on Surrey's environment and Green Belt, without detriment to the already stated position of the Council, that these two airports retain their role as the nation's hubs.

and

(ii) call on the Leader of the Council to lobby all Surrey MPs, the current and future Governments regarding the Council's opposition to additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick.'

Both Mr Beardsmore and Mrs Watson agreed to accept the amendment to this motion and therefore it became the substantive motion.

Twelve Members spoke on the substantive motion, with the following points being made:

- The County Council had debated the expansion of Heathrow and Gatwick two years ago and had agreed to say no to expansion without the required infrastructure in place
- This was the wrong time to debate this issue because submissions to the Davies Commission had now closed and their findings would not be reported until later this year
- Support for expansion at both airports
- Issue of alternative development for the Heathrow site if the airport closed and an estuary airport was developed

- The County Council had a duty to residents already employed at Heathrow and Gatwick
- It was regrettable that the decision on the future for Heathrow and Gatwick would be made public after the general election
- Heathrow had been allowed to evolve in a densely built up area and the country should be looking at innovative ways for airport expansion, such as options for Luton, Stansted, Southampton or Birmingham
- Questioned whether air travel would continue to increase as more people use Eurostar / trains as alternative options
- Continued increase in economic growth was only in the South East
- Additional housing would be required and there would be infrastructure problems if the airports expanded
- Aviation was the fastest growing cause of climate change
- This motion altered the County Council's position, agreed in 2013.
- Since agreement of that resolution, there had been 3 Member seminars on airport expansion, which had been well attended and Members views had been submitted as part of the response to the Davies Commission
- Without the outcome of the Davies Commission being known, the County Council could not depart from its agreed 2013 position because it would need to consider the package of mitigating measures, for the recommendations proposed by the Commission
- Some Surrey residents would welcome further airport expansion
- Hub status at Heathrow could not be retained unless the airport expanded
- The airport authority's for Heathrow and Gatwick were meeting and engaging with Surrey County Council
- A need to protect Surrey residents – concern about the effect on residents of increased noise and blocked roads which could worsen if the expansion of these airports were agreed
- This was the right time to debate this issue.

After the debate, the substantive motion was put to the vote with 15 Members voting for it. 47 Members voted against it and there were 7 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 Will Forster moved the motion, which was:

'In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies are conducted to preserve bus services throughout Surrey.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey.

Mr Forster said that, as the fall in oil prices was likely to last for some time, this benefit should be used to help preserve Surrey's bus services because the Council should be able to get a better deal from its operators. He did accept that changes were needed but said that bus services were key to many residents' daily lives.

Mr Johnson moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

The amendment was as follows **(with additional words underlined)**:

'In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies are conducted to preserve and expand bus services throughout Surrey.'

Both Mr Beardsmore and Mr Cooksey agreed to accept the amendment to this motion and therefore it became the substantive motion.

Mr Goodman moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This was formally seconded by Mrs Frost.

The amendment was as follows **(additional words underlined and deletions crossed through)**:

'In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies ~~are conducted to preserve bus services throughout Surrey.~~ include this factor in developing proposals to meet the objectives of the Review.'

This amendment was not accepted by Mr Forster and therefore Mr Goodman spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- That oil prices were discussed when bus contracts were re-negotiated – contract price could only be changed at contract renewal date
- He was pleased to report that the bus review had attracted 6800 responses
- Stakeholder events had been organised and there had been a comprehensive approach to communicating with residents
- Officers were currently analysing the response and he assured Members that they would listen to their comments
- Whilst the County Council spent £8.9m annually on bus subsidies, there was a need to produce a £2m saving to public transport costs, as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan
- That the detailed consultation report would be on the website within the next few days and all Members would be sent the link to the report
- The outcome and decisions following the Bus Review would be considered at the Cabinet meeting on 26 May.

Six Members spoke on the amendment and made the following points:

- That the amendment was weak, unspecific and failed to protect Surrey's bus services
- That the Bus Transport Review had been discussed at the last Environment and Transport Select Committee meeting
- The oil price was a small part of the overall cost of providing bus services
- Examples of new services were given i.e. a commuter service to and from rural areas of Mole Valley to Dorking railway station and the Chatterbus in the Cobham area
- The review had been extensive and included responses from Borough / District and Parish Councils, and local committees
- The County Council had a good record of supporting bus companies

- The importance of working together with SCC officers and other partners and also using matched funding to ensure that bus services that suited the needs of residents were provided
- This had been an excellent review of the bus provision and had been conducted in a sensitive way
- In many rural areas, buses provided a vital community service
- There was a need to improve the viability of Surrey's bus services and preserve and expand them and the use of community transport was important and could improve the service provision

After which, under Standing Order 23.1, the Leader of the Council moved:

'That the question be now put'

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

The amendment was put to the vote with 56 Members voting for and 14 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

After which, under Standing Order 23.1, the Deputy Leader moved:

'That the question be now put'

Twenty Members stood in support of this request. The Chairman agreed to this request and the substantive motion was put to the vote, with 53 Members voting for and 11 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies include this factor in developing proposals to meet the objectives of the Review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45pm and resumed at 1.30pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Angell, Mrs Barton, Mrs Bramhall, Mrs Coleman, Mr Ellwood, Mrs Frost, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mr Johnson, Mr Kington, Mr Mahne, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mrs Thomson and Mr Townsend.

**19/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 24 February 2015.

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

There were none.

**(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents**

**A Admission Arrangements for September 2016 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools, Co-ordinated Schemes and Relevant Area**

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning was invited to present the report.

**RESOLVED:**

That the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2016 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools, Co-ordinated Schemes and Relevant Area be approved:

(1) That, subject to Connaught Junior School also agreeing to introduce a reciprocal sibling link with Bagshot Infant School, a reciprocal sibling link for Bagshot Infant School be introduced with Connaught Junior School so that Bagshot Infant School would be described as operating shared sibling priority with Connaught Junior School for 2016 admission.

(2) That a new criterion for Hammond Community Junior School be introduced for September 2016 to provide priority for children attending either Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Children attending Lightwater Village School
- d. Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e. Children attending either Valley End CofE Infant School or Windlesham Village Infant School
- f. Any other children

(3) That a feeder link from Meath Green Infant to Meath Green Junior School be introduced for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Children attending Meath Green Infant School
- d. Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e. Any other children

(4) That, in line with the tiered arrangements that currently exist at both schools, a tiered feeder link be introduced from Wallace Fields Infant School to Wallace Fields Junior School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- d. Children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address

- e. Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- f. Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- g. Other children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- h. Any other children

(5) That admission criteria be introduced for Year 3 entry to Worplesdon Primary School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings
- d. Children attending Wood Street Infant School
- e. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- f. Any other children

(6) That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for Cranleigh Primary School be removed for September 2016.

(7) That the own admission authority schools to be included in the assessment of nearest school be decided each year according to the policy set out in Section 12 of Enclosure 1, to the Cabinet report.

(8) That following consultation, the start date to the primary admissions round remains as 1 September for 2016 admission rather than 1 November as proposed.

(9) That Surrey's Relevant Area be agreed as set out in Enclosure 2, to the Cabinet report.

(10) That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2016 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools be determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1, to the Cabinet report, which included the following changes:

- i. Ashford Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ii. Bishop David Brown Secondary – increase in Year 7 PAN from 150 to 180
- iii. Cranmere Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- iv. Farncombe CofE Infant School - increase in Reception PAN from 40 to 50
- v. The Greville Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- vi. Hinchley Wood Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- vii. Hurst Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- viii. Manby Lodge Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix. Milford School – increase Reception PAN from 50 to 60
- x. North Downs Primary School – introduction of Year 3 PAN of 4
- xi. South Camberley Primary – increase in PAN from 110 to 120
- xii. Stoughton Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiii. West Byfleet Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiv. Worplesdon Primary – introduction of a junior PAN of 30

(11) That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2016, for which no consultation was required, be agreed as set out in Enclosure 1 and its Appendices, to the Cabinet report.

(12) That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2016/17 be agreed as set out in Appendix 4 of Enclosure 1, to the Cabinet report.

## **B Surrey Waste Strategy**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning presented the Surrey Waste Strategy to Members. He was asked about the large number of actions set out within the Strategy and confirmed that the County Council would continue to work with its partners to improve and develop actions and their outcomes. He was also asked if the methodology for calculating the Strategy's performance indicators was an exclusive list and to clarify whether 'Reprocessor' mentioned in the Glossary included the Eco park. He agreed to respond to these questions outside the meeting.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the new version of Surrey Waste Management Partnership's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Revision 2 (2015), as set out in Appendix 2 to the submitted report, be approved.

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

That the report in relation to Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council Partnership was received and noted:

### **RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24 February 2015 be adopted.

## **20/15 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015 - 2016 [Item 10]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report by stating that, in line with the Localism Act, the County Council was required to approve a Pay Policy Statement for publication on the Council's website.

Mr Young asked if future Surrey Pay Policy Statements could also include mean figures as well as median. The Leader of the Council said that, providing the Regulations stated that it should be included, he would consider the request.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the Pay Policy Statement, Annex A to the submitted report, to be published on Surrey County Council's external website with effect from 1 April 2015.

## **21/15 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 11]**

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report and highlighted the following points:

- Working with select committees
- The Strategic Risk Register

- The New Models of Delivery projects, including any joint arrangements with other counties
- The obligations of Statutory Officers

Finally, he thanked Members of the committee for their work, this was reiterated by the Leader of the Council.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Audit and Governance Annual Report 2014, as attached as an Annex to the submitted report, be approved.

**22/15 FORMATION OF A NEW SURREY LOCAL PENSION BOARD [Item 12]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services was invited to introduce this report and began by drawing Members attention to the tabled amendments to this report. (Appendix D), which were formally seconded by Mr Tim Evans.

She said that full Council had approved the formation of a Surrey Pension Fund Board on 19 March 2013 and since then, the Local Government Pension Scheme had produced a revised set of regulations, including the recommendation that the scrutiny function was undertaken by a separate body.

She confirmed that this Board would not have any decision making powers and would only have the powers to assist the Surrey Pension Fund Board in the exercise of its functions. She also drew attention to the new Governance Structure, as at 1 April 2015, as set out in the submitted report.

Mr Pitt proposed including the word 'nominated' in paragraph 4.6, Annex 1 so that it read 'nominated substitutes will be permitted to attend...' and the Cabinet Member for Business Services agreed to consider this request outside the meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Local Pension Board be established, in accordance with the Public Services Pensions Act 2013 and the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 (as amended), with the Terms of Reference, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, with effect from 1 April 2015.
2. That authority be delegated to an appointment panel of officers and Members as set out in the submitted report, to oversee the Local Pension Board recruitment process and for the People, Performance and Development Committee to appoint members of the Local Pension Board, following recommendations from the appointment panel.
3. That the Terms of Reference, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved for adoption by the Local Pension Board.
4. That authority be delegated to the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Chairman of the Pension Board to create such policies and documents to assist the Local Pension Board.
5. That the Local Pension Board receive committee support from the Council's Democratic Services team.

6. That any consequential amendments be made to the Council's Constitution as required.

### **23/15 FORMATION OF A NEW LOCAL PENSION BOARD FOR THE FIREFIGHTERS PENSION SCHEME [Item 13]**

The Cabinet Member for Business Services also introduced this report and confirmed that the establishment of a Surrey Local Pension Board for the Firefighters Scheme was a statutory obligation and that the Board must be established no later than 1 April 2015. She confirmed that this was a statutory unfunded public service pension scheme, unlike the Surrey Local Pension Board (item 12 on the agenda) and it would not have any decision making powers, it would only have the power to assist the Scheme Manager in an advisory capacity.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Surrey Local Firefighters' Pension Board be established, in accordance with the Public Services Pensions Act 2013 and the Firefighters' Pension Scheme Regulations 2014 (as amended), with all matters as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, as its terms of reference with effect from 1 April 2015.
2. That authority be delegated to an appointment panel of officers and Members, as set out in the report to oversee the Local Pension Board recruitment process and for the People, Performance and Development Committee to appoint members of the Local Pension Board following recommendations from the appointment panel.
3. That the Terms of Reference, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved for adoption by the Local Pension Board.
4. That authority be delegated to the Director of Finance in consultation with the Chairman of People, Performance and Development Committee to create such policies and documents to assist the Local Pension Board.
5. That the Local Pension Board receive committee support from the Council's Democratic Services team.
6. That any consequential amendments be made to the Council's Constitution, as required.

### **24/15 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 14]**

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

[Meeting ended at: 1.55pm]

---

**Chairman**

**Leader's Speech to County Council – Tuesday 17 March 2015**

Whichever way you look at it, Surrey is a county of size and scale and when you consider the breadth and depth of this Council's work, it can be too easy to focus on the 'big picture', and lose sight of the important work we do on the ground.

That's why today I want my Leader's statement to focus on just that. I want to highlight examples where we have really made a difference locally. I want us to remember that behind all the facts and figures, it is our resident's lives where we want to make a real difference.

Last month I set out the three goals in our new corporate strategy:

- Improving the **wellbeing** of our residents,
- Enhancing Surrey's **economic prosperity**
- And improving **resident's experience** when using our services.

I am going to base my examples around these.

Let me start with Becky - last year Becky was not in education, employment or training. She had a challenging relationship with her parents and was getting into fights. Her future was looking troubled. **This Council wanted to make a difference.** One year on, Becky has transformed her life and is on track to become a boxing coach with Guildford City Boxing Club. Becky was supported on the path to her dream career by the County Council youth services, in partnership with Catch 22 – a social business that helps people turn their lives around. Becky is now working towards formal coaching qualifications - and one day hopes to compete as a boxer.

Just one example of how this Council is improving the **wellbeing of our resident's** by helping to give young people the best start in life.

Mr Chairman and Members, supporting young people is an important way in which we can all help in our local communities and there are many more Beckys out there who we can work with.

However, there are many more ways that this Council makes a difference - take our roads.

Whether it is due to winter damage or traffic jams – roads are vitally important to our residents - residents such as those in and around Redhill. As Members will know, Redhill's location near Gatwick and major roads means it offers great potential for economic growth – with big businesses such as Lombard and Balfour Beatty based in the town. However, at the same time its location means that congestion is a major issue – causing hold ups and headaches for local residents.

**This council wanted to make a difference.**

That's why, working jointly with Reigate and Banstead Council, we are investing over £4m to improve the town centre and just a few weeks ago Redhill's one way system was opened up to two-way traffic – which will speed up people's journeys through the town centre and over the next few months we will make even more improvements. To roundabouts, bus stops, bike facilities and pedestrian crossings.

These changes will help unlock Redhill's economic potential– making the town an even better place to live, work and do business. Just one example of how this Council is enhancing **economic prosperity**.

Maintaining and improving the County's roads is one of this Council's biggest jobs. However, we also deliver a whole host of smaller services – which may not be as visible as major road schemes, but are just as vitally important to people's lives. Services such as those provided by our County Coroner – responsible for investigating any violent, sudden or unexplained death. In recent years, our Coroner has struggled to find the right space to perform his important duties.

**This Council wanted to make a difference.** Rather than develop new facilities from scratch, we bought the old Woking Magistrates Court – which had sat empty since 2011. We have fully refurbished the building, turning it into a modern facility that meets the needs of those that use it. There are private family rooms and meeting facilities – which provide a sympathetic space for those who have lost loved ones. There is a 'remote witness room' – which allows vulnerable witnesses to give evidence, without having to be in the courtroom itself. This new facility means the Coroner will no longer have to struggle to find suitable venues to hold inquests – which means savings for Surrey taxpayers but more importantly, the new Coroners Court will undoubtedly improve people's experience at a very difficult and challenging time in their lives.

Just one example of how this Council is improving **resident's experience** of our services.

Supporting young people like Becky, improving Redhill town centre and improving facilities for people at the new Coroner's Court - three very different examples of the important work that we do.

And what do they have in common? They show that, despite the huge increase in demand for our services and despite our very difficult financial position, that we can still make a huge difference to the lives of Surrey residents – especially when we work as One Team with our partners.

Chairman, before I close I want to highlight one last example.

Surrey is blessed with assets that are truly special in world terms. Assets like the Brooklands Race Track – the oldest racing track in Britain, home of the first ever British Grand Prix in 1907. I am delighted to confirm that Brooklands Museum will undergo a significant redevelopment – thanks to support from donors, including the County Council and £4.8m from the Heritage Lottery Fund.

These improvements will allow the Museum to attract many more visitors each year than ever before but they will also bring significant benefits to Surrey residents. The number of school visits will increase by 100% - allowing future generations to be inspired by the past, giving children the opportunity to embrace science, technology and engineering – the skills Surrey businesses need and a new training programme will teach conservation skills to local volunteers, adding to the nearly 800 people already volunteering at Brooklands.

Chairman and Members, I have been personally inspired by the vision and ambition of the Brooklands project – and I hope you have too.

So let us take a moment to forget the national politics dominating our daily lives and the news bulletins each day. Let us look for more ways we can work together, and with our partners make a real difference at a local level.

I am sure that if we keep our *foot firmly on the pedal*, we can continue to *drive through change* and together to ensure sure Surrey residents *are first to the chequered flag*.

**David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**17 March 2015**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY 17 MARCH 2015**

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

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

**(1) MR GRAHAM ELLWOOD (GUILDFORD EAST) TO ASK:**

In acknowledging the sterling work being done by Kier at a time of such draconian Central Government cuts to our budget, many of my residents are regularly complaining about the deteriorating state of many of the concrete based roads in my ward.

Whilst temporary repairs are effected promptly, the techniques necessary on this type of surface have caused problems of which we are all aware and which are being addressed.

Nonetheless, would it be feasible, given the proliferation of such roads in urban areas to have a separate "Project Horizon" type repair list just for concrete surfaces to reassure residents (especially in my ward) that long term repairs are planned when budget permits?

I do appreciate there is no instant fix but separate identification of these roads (which carry huge volumes of traffic in Guildford) would, I feel sure, give some reassurance to my residents.

**Reply:**

Surrey Highway's asset strategy confirms that roads requiring highway maintenance are prioritised based upon need rather than material type. Therefore regardless of the road material, if the road is deemed to be structurally deficient or in need of repair then Surrey Highways will prioritise road programmes based upon need and available budget. Indeed under Project Horizon we are repairing a large number of concrete roads in Guildford, such as Cabel Road.

However, it is recognised that concrete roads provide a unique problem, in that their condition may not warrant a maintenance intervention as defined by the asset strategy, but that their overall appearance can cause concern to local community, in other words the road might be structurally sound (and safe) but the top surface has been exposed leaving blemishes, poor ride quality and increased noise for local residents.

There are available techniques that can be deployed on specific concrete surfaces where their appearance has deteriorated however Surrey Highways does not have a specific programme dedicated for these type of roads. Surrey Highways advises that if a councillor has any specific safety concerns regarding a concrete road then they should speak to their Area Highway Manager for the engineering assessment and its location on the prioritised maintenance list, while we will continue to deliver, where possible a discreet general repair service to concrete roads as part of the wider surface treatment programme.

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

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

The County Council has, controversially, approved Charlton Lane as a site for a future incinerator. There is already another incinerator sited less than ten miles away at Colnbrook, in effect the other side of Spelthorne.

The Borough is the most heavily developed area in Surrey and is already surrounded by the M25 and the M3.

What guarantees can the Council give as regards the health of Spelthorne residents who feel threatened by pollution?

### **Reply:**

The potential impact of the Eco Park on human health was considered extensively in the various officer reports to the council's Planning and Regulatory Committee. A detailed, health risk assessment was submitted as part of the planning application and concluded that the emissions from the plant would have a negligible effect on human health.

This conclusion is consistent with the advice from Public Health England.

The Eco Park would be regulated by the Environment Agency under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010, and preventing harm to health and the environment from emissions, including those to air, is the main purpose of the permitting process.

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

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

#### LEP Projects

Would the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding indicate what opportunities will be provided for Members to discuss and influence LEP funded projects within their divisions before final decisions are taken about the implementation of these projects?

#### **Reply:**

The Government has been clear that it sees Local Enterprise Partnerships - business led partnerships of which local authorities are members - as their significant vehicle for promoting economic growth. In practice this means that rather than dealing directly with Government, councils now bid to the relevant LEPs for funds which the Government has made available to them to support capital expenditure on projects that would improve the economic performance of their area. In total the Government has identified £10 billion for such projects. However, at local level the process for identifying schemes and for the involvement of members is very largely as it was before the establishment of LEPs.

Each LEP set out their ambitions in Strategic Economic Plans submitted to Government in March 2014 which identified the local economic priorities for the area and the programmes and projects that would help to achieve them. Surrey County Council was heavily involved in the development of the plans for both Coast to Capital which covers the eastern part of Surrey and Enterprise M3 which covers the west, ensuring that priority projects from 2015 - 2020 were represented in the plans. An additional round of bidding was announced in mid-November 2014, with final bids to be submitted to Government by the middle of December 2014.

The Surrey schemes put forward had already been developed and agreed with our district and borough partners and by Local Committees and were identified through the agreed and interim Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes. The programme of transport schemes on which the Council is working has been set out in reports to Cabinet. These are listed below:-

- 27 November 2012 Supporting the Economy through Investment in Transport and Infrastructure 2012-2019
- 25 February 2014 Supporting Economic Growth
- 23 September 2014 Supporting Economic Growth through Investment in Highways Infrastructure
- 16 December 2014 Supporting Economic Growth through Investment in Transport Infrastructure

- 24 March 2015 Cabinet, Surrey Transport Plan - Local transport strategies and forward programmes (tranche 1 & 2)

Governance structures have also been developed to ensure democratic oversight and input in the selection of schemes, through the creation of a Joint Committee in Coast to Capital and a Joint Leaders Board in Enterprise M3. Representatives from the County Council and the Leaders of all district and borough councils were involved in these structures, which had a responsibility to agree the final plans before they were submitted to Government.

The Local Growth Deals were announced in July 2014, with over £50m of funding allocated to support projects in Surrey with additional funding to come from unallocated LEP funding pots, such as sustainable transport and resilience schemes. These schemes are currently progressing through the assurance structures in both LEPs, with a view to early implementation starting in April 2015.

The timescales for this first round were inevitably very tight. Future opportunities will allow for greater levels of engagement with Local Committees and Surrey County Council is developing a future programme for bids.

The County Council is now working with individual district and borough councils to develop a pipeline of schemes which are ready for bidding rounds in the future. There will be consultation with Members.

Local committees will be consulted at the feasibility and detailed design stages and would steer public consultation processes suitable for the type of scheme.

LEPs may carry out their own consultation process on business cases for schemes that have been submitted for funding.

The timetable for bidding can be changed by Government at short notice and given that the processes are still evolving our programme needs to be flexible enough so that it can be adjusted if required to access funding. Accordingly, the Council needs to be able to respond to calls for expressions of interest at short notice. In these cases it is sometimes not possible to have developed and shared the detail of schemes with Members. In this situation the Leader and relevant Cabinet Member's views will be sought on whether a bid is made or not.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

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

#### Child Sexual Exploitation

The Local Government Association (LGA) advises that all councillors should ask questions and ensure that plans are in place to raise awareness of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), develop a strategic response, support victims and help to facilitate policing and prosecutions. To help with this process has the County Council actioned the advice contained in the LGA's publication "Tackling child sexual exploitation - a resource pack for councils"?

What further work needs to be done to prevent CSE in Surrey?

#### **Reply:**

The Council has taken into account a range of reports that have been published recently, including the LGA report, the Ofsted Thematic Inspection report and the Rotherham report. These have been used to inform the plans and strategy for tackling CSE in Surrey. The Local Authority is working proactively with partners to ensure that we are doing all we can to prevent CSE in the county.

We are working to improve the awareness of all staff and Members who support and who work with children so that they will be sufficiently skilled to recognise CSE; we are working closely with partners to ensure that services they commission have the most rigorous and robust recruitment and vetting procedures and we have reviewed our operational procedures to ensure that they incorporate best practice.

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES**

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

The Friends of Molesey Library report that reorganisation of library staffing is taking place with all library staff having to re-apply for their jobs and that cost saving of 4% is expected by redundancy. Library managers are being expected to rotate around a cluster of libraries causing fears about future management and continuity of some libraries. No details of this re-organisation, affecting whole clusters of libraries with volunteers, have been reported or considered by the Communities Select Committee. It is reported that the morale and enthusiasm of library staff is being affected negatively and some staff are already leaving because of expectation of no future in working in the library service.

Would the Cabinet Member for Community Services clarify what is happening, what is the objective and why has whatever is happening, has not been first considered by the Communities Select Committee?

**Reply:**

In its search for continuous improvement and to meet its obligations to support the County Council in reducing costs, the library service has recently completed a service-led review which commenced with a substantial staff engagement exercise in which staff were able to feed back their views on the current service and staffing structure and how it should change. Within the review actions, a staffing budget reduction of £227,000 for 2015-16 has been put in place. The new operational arrangements will take effect from 1 May 2015.

One of the key outcomes of the review was greater efficiencies in the workforce - by grouping libraries into clusters with each cluster managed by a team of library managers who work across a number of libraries staff cover can be provided more flexibly and efficiently. Additionally, staff will gain wider experience and development and library managers will have improved support and training.

Redistribution of staffing will ensure the service is well placed to deliver on SCC's future priorities, including helping people to live and age well and help increase volunteering within communities. The restructure also includes new roles for staff and provides a better career ladder.

The restructure is being handled through the county's managing change procedures, and although it is recognised restructures are a difficult time, and a few people may choose to leave for a variety of reasons, it is also a period of opportunity for staff and the filling of posts is moving forward well. The service is very aware of the high regard library users have for their local staff but within the teams and clusters arrangements are being put in place to ensure both operational stability and continuity of contact for users, partners and stakeholders, so that the good relationships currently in place with local staff are maintained. As the review outcomes are operational and with no reduction in services this matter has not been put before the Select Committee.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING****(6) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST)  
TO ASK:**

In February 2014 hundreds of homes in Staines upon Thames were affected by flooding from the River Ash. It is known that the flooding emanated from the privately owned River Ash Aqueduct. The flooding of the River Ash was apparently the consequence of the failure of man made infrastructure. This event was therefore unique in the many events of flooding that occurred in Surrey.

Under section 19 of the Flood Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010, Surrey County Council has a duty to investigate. However according to the Cabinet

Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, this council has limited its investigation to:

"who the Risk Management Authorities are in relation to the flooding, what duties they have under the FWMA and their actions or proposed actions in relation to those duties."

(a) Will this Surrey County Council extend its very limited investigation to include a full and thorough investigation into the circumstances and causes of the flooding of the River Ash?

(b) If the Council is refusing to conduct an investigation that examines the circumstances and causes of the flooding of the River Ash February 2014, could the Council explain for the benefit of the residents affected why this is the case?

(c) Has Surrey's investigation so far been able to establish who the Risk Management Authorities are in relation to the flooding and what duties they have? Or is the Council still in a state of ignorance and confusion over these points after more than a year?

**Reply:**

As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Surrey County Council has a duty to undertake an investigation under S19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. The Act defines the scope and extent of the investigation in that its main purpose is to identify the risk management authorities and what their functions are.

In partnership with Spelthorne Borough Council, the investigation has been completed and report has been published. The report covers the requirements under the Act and complies with the duties imposed upon the Council.

Furthermore the Environment Agency has also undertaken their own investigations into the flooding and the River Ash is covered under two separate reports for the West Thames, and Lower Colne and Ash Catchment. Those reports have already established that the aqueduct is the responsibility of Thames Water to manage. Environment Agency and Thames Water have agreed on an updated operational agreement/management of the aqueduct at times of flooding. The aqueduct will be solely operated by Thames Water.

It is not proposed to undertake any further investigation into the flooding that affected that area. Last winter's flooding saw an estimated 1800 properties flooded across the county, with over 290 road closures due to flooding, spread over 900 different locations. In delivering its duties, the Council has to take account of available resources and prioritise where action is undertaken. In this case, there are already three reports covering the River Ash area, the

risk management authorities are known and there is agreed action going forward.

## **LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

### **(7) MR NICK HARRISON (NORK AND TATTENHAMS) TO ASK:**

In the Leader's speech on the budget in February he was insistent that councillors were voting on the "budget envelope" and the proposed increase in council tax. He said it was well established that the Cabinet would approve the detailed budgets for each service in March, and he urged select committees to get involved in reviewing the specifics and providing comments to the Cabinet.

In the light of this, does he agree that the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding was jumping the gun and usurping the democratic process by writing to councillors that "it has been determined that 25% of the capital maintenance budget under the control of Local Committees must be used to assist with drainage issues"?

### **Reply:**

The Cabinet Member was simply reminding Members of an agreement that had already been made by Local Committee Chairman during the budget planning process.

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

### **(8) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

1. Please can you confirm who from Surrey County Council (SCC) advised the chairman in August 2013 to get The Howard Partnership to run the school.
2. In particular, could you please also confirm whether, including during conversations between SCC and Oxted School or Oxted School governors, were any guarantees given or understandings made that the school would be seeking academy status in the future?
3. Please can you confirm what advice the trustees sought from SCC before they started the process. Did they ask whether the status quo was an acceptable alternative. To what extent has this option been considered by Surrey CC, and if so, how?
4. Could you also confirm who in SCC authorised the transfer of Oxted School to become a foundation trust, and when this occurred.

5. It appears that statements made by the governors suggest that the transfer to: (a) a foundation trust, and (b) to an academy will not affect the funding that the school receives from (and/or via) SCC. Please could you confirm whether this is the case or not and what advice has been given to Oxted School and/or Oxted School governors on this matter.

**Reply:**

The response to your questions are as follows:

1. Peter-John Wilkinson, Assistant Director of Schools, following consultation with me (Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning).
2. There was no discussion or agreement on this subject.
3. The Howard Partnership Trust agreed terms with Oxted School to work with it for 2 years. No further terms were discussed.
4. The Governing Body of Oxted School consulted on Foundation status. Following the consultation, the transfer was announced with effect from 1 March 2015. No authorisation by SCC was required.
5. Oxted School will continue to be funded as a state school.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

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

As part of its review of bus services, Surrey produced a map – *'Surrey Transport Review - Commercial/TFL, Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Bus Routes: Spelthorne'*

Following a Freedom of Information request, the map is now in the public domain.

It shows Spelthorne and parts of neighbouring boroughs and includes several sites of possible large scale development, both in and around Spelthorne which is sensible when planning future bus provision.

One site at Kempton Park clearly shows the possible provision for 1500 new houses. Who supplied the evidence to Surrey that led to the inclusion of this particular site and figure on the map?

**Reply:**

"Evidence" is a misleading term to use for the provision of information that led to the inclusion of marking of the green belt land at Kempton Park as a possible provision for 1500 new houses. The information came from internal officer to officer discussions on the potential locations where there might just be an additional demand for future bus services. The map was only used for illustrative purposes to show the current bus network and the types of land uses / development proposals that the County's bus planners need to take into consideration when reviewing service provision. It will not be used for any decision making, and has absolutely no weight as Surrey has no planning function when it comes to housing allocations. The site has many planning constraints, which would all need to be taken into consideration were housing to be considered there at any time in the future.

**LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**(10) MR ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

At the beginning of February a Surrey County Council officer advised the Labour parliamentary candidate for SW Surrey, in writing, that it is Surrey's policy not to allow any party political street campaigning in Surrey.

Could the Council clarify on what basis this statement was made, how and where it will enforce it or alternatively, confirm that the officer was mistaken.

**Reply:**

It seems that the candidate was initially given mistaken advice. Fortunately, this was brought to our attention and the matter was speedily clarified with the candidate concerned.

**CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

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

Community Recycling Centres

At the Council meeting held on 9 December 2014 the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning in a written statement said:

*'In order to make further savings, more changes need to be considered, including charging for certain materials and rationalising opening times.'*

Proposals have subsequently been considered by the Cabinet.

Would the Cabinet Member explain how charging and reducing hours of operation will help improve recycling rates and how the resultant fly tipping problems will be tackled?

**Reply:**

The current financial situation means that the Council must look for additional savings across all services, including the community recycling centres. Some of these savings, such as extracting additional recycling from black bag waste already provide considerable savings.

We realise that there might be implications from some of the other potential changes and as a result, we plan to consult with residents and other stakeholders such as the District and Borough Councils prior to any proposals being implemented.

We would then work closely with residents and other stakeholders to reduce and mitigate any implications that might result from a change in service. The type of proposals outlined do not set a precedent and are being considered, or have already been adopted by many other authorities facing similar financial pressures.

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

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

Surrey County Council has refused to list the Thames Water Aqueduct in Staines on its own compulsory asset register of potential flood features, despite being fully aware of it, until its owners Thames Water, nominated it themselves an action that may be perceived as against their own vested interest.

In January 2015 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, Mr Furey wrote to a resident claiming he would be writing to Thames Water "with a view to adding the aqueduct to the register".

Could the Cabinet Member inform the Council how successful he has been and has the aqueduct now been placed on the asset register of flood features?

**Reply:**

As indicated in the letter from Mr Furey, Thames Water's asset, in this instance the aqueduct, has been added to the Asset Register, at the request of Thames Water. The public facing version of the asset register has not

been updated yet and this is scheduled to be completed by end of March 2015.

To recall, adding the aqueduct to the asset register does neither impose a duty upon Thames Water to undertake works or manage the aqueduct in any particular fashion, nor does it impose any other duty on Surrey County Council in relation to the aqueduct.

## **CHAIRMAN OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

### **(13) MR JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK: (2<sup>nd</sup> question)**

On Thursday 5 March 2015 Surrey County Council published the agenda for a planning meeting to be held at 2pm on Friday 13 March. Please can you confirm when the full papers were published and when the public was notified as to the changed time for the meeting, which was due to be held at 11am on Friday 13 March 2015.

Please can you confirm how the announcement of the timing, the subsequent change of timing and publishing of the full agenda for the meeting in public complies with the Local Government Act 1972, clause S100B requirements for sufficient public notice for scheduling meetings.

### **Reply:**

A special meeting of the Planning and Regulatory Committee was convened by the Chief Executive for 13 March 2015 in accordance with Standing Order 45.1 of the Council's Constitution. Five clear days' notice was given for this in accordance with Standing Order 45.2 which included details of the agenda and the items to be considered.

The Council's Constitution reflects the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972 S100B, both of these make it clear that copies of the reports for the meeting do not need to be available for inspection by the public until they have been made available to members.

Reports were made available to the Committee members and hence to the public on 9 March 2015. The Council has complied with the requirements, first to give adequate notice of the items which are to be debated at the special meeting and secondly as soon as reports were available for Members, published those reports on the Council's website.

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

### **(14) MR DANIEL JENKINS (STAINES SOUTH AND ASHFORD WEST) TO ASK: (3<sup>rd</sup> question)**

Surrey County Council is a member of RESTORE, a project funded by the European Union, Interrag IVB North West Europe Fund. An organisation largely focused on the Low Countries that provides funding for the restoration of mineral extraction sites predominantly to wetlands.

- (a) To what extent has Surrey's mineral restoration plan with its heavy emphasis on wet restoration been influenced by the Council's membership of RESTORE?
- (b) How much funding has Surrey County Council received through the RESTORE since Surrey joined this organisation either directly by way of restoration grants or indirectly?
- (c) How much funding will Surrey County Council receive either directly or indirectly from RESTORE, for the wet restoration of the Manor Farm gravel extraction site managed by Brett's Aggregates, approved on 7 January 2015?
- (d) Why was membership of the EU's North West European Fund project group RESTORE never explicitly mentioned as part of the consultation and process leading up to the decision to approve Brett's Aggregates application for gravel extraction at the Manor Farm site with a wet restoration, when the nature of the restoration had become a point of contention?

### **Reply:**

RESTORE is a project - as opposed to an organisation - funded by the Interreg IVB North West Europe programme. The focus of the programme extends beyond the Low Countries and indeed in this case the project is led by the RSPB from the UK.

The RESTORE project looks at best practice in the restoration of mineral sites in different parts of NW Europe. This, of course, includes wet restoration, since it will be best practice in many situations, but it also includes a full range of infill options and potential after uses and management regimes. Surrey County Council's participation in the RESTORE project is a reflection of our leading position and reputation in promoting best practice in mineral site restoration.

Turning to the individual questions:

- (a) Surrey's Minerals Plan does not have an emphasis on wet restoration. In fact the majority of sites are being dealt with by dry restoration using infill.
- (b) Up to the end of 2014 Surrey County Council had submitted claims for €117,849.08 in funding. This funding is not a restoration grant – hence it is not used to fund the restoration of individual sites being undertaken by operators as a requirement of their planning permissions
- (c) No funding from RESTORE, either directly or indirectly, will be used in the wet restoration of the Manor Farm gravel extraction site managed by Brett's Aggregates. This restoration will need to be completely funded by the site operator.
- (d) Participation in the RESTORE project was not mentioned because it was not relevant to the assessment of the planning application relating to Manor Farm including its future restoration. The approach to restoration proposed in the current planning application is not new and is set out in the Surrey Minerals Plan Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document adopted by the County Council in July 2011. It is a response to a number of specific factors relevant to the site and its surroundings, including access constraints.

**COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING – 17 MARCH 2015**

**MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

**CABINET MEMBER UPDATES TO FULL COUNCIL**

**NAME: MARY ANGELL**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

A paper presented to the Surrey Safeguarding Children Board (SSCB) and Youth Justice Board (YJB) explored the complex issue of safeguarding adolescents along with potential good practice approaches implemented in Surrey through the Youth Support Service (YSS).

Young people face a wider range of risks than younger children due to their lifestyles and increasing independence, e.g. Teen Partner Violence, sexual exploitation, substance misuse, offending behaviour, gang issues, forced marriage and honour based violence. Young people may fear disclosure and be powerless within abusive relationships. Tensions may arise with parent's new partners and families, leading to young people running away. Parental substance abuse and mental ill-health may also have different impacts on young people as they grow older, with young people taking on a caring role within the family.

Surrey Youth Support Service is a specialist adolescent service that offers an integrated, multi-agency response to a range of vulnerable young people. The service comprises local teams, one in each of the county's eleven boroughs and districts, that deliver services to young people who are homeless, who are deemed Children in Need (CiN) who are open to but not engaged with CAMHS, who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) and / or are in the criminal justice system.

The service offer is a holistic, person centered response to young people's needs, marked by restorative practices with relationships being seen as the dynamo of change. Thus the case worker will both coordinate the package of support and deliver many of its components, pulling in co-workers as and where required.

YSS currently works with approximately 1100 young people at any one time, with approximately 250 being CiN or within our homelessness prevention cohort, 180 being within the youth justice system and the remainder having less complex needs but nonetheless requiring targeted services to support them through adolescence.

In 2013 the YSS took responsibility for its first cohort of CIN, aged fifteen plus. These are young people who meet the threshold for services under section 17 of the Children Act 1989. Previously, the work had been undertaken by Children's Services Child in Need teams.

What was most notable in terms of YSS involvement was that establishing stability and persuading young people to take up the support offered often takes time, and there are often setbacks along the way. This is challenging when dealing with young people who have strong views as to their own competence and right to make their own decisions, but are making choices which put them at risk.

Alongside the YSS, Child in Need work sits with our homelessness prevention service which discharges the duties of both the local housing authority and Children's Services in relation to homeless 16/17 year olds. It has been possible within YSS homelessness prevention services to support the majority of young people without the need for them to become Looked After Children (LAC). This is positive, as we have been able to avoid a more intrusive intervention than that of becoming LAC and for young people moving towards independence we have offered an intervention that is arguably a better bridge to adulthood than that of becoming Looked After at this late stage. This is in keeping with our findings that most 16/17 yr olds don't really want to be "in care" or "looked after" at a point when they are trying to achieve independence and become adult.

The YSS continues to work with additional young people at the lower age limit of 14. The current challenges include dealing with the perception of others and the belief, in some quarters, that Children's Services is the only site for - and solution to - safeguarding under 18s. Whilst YSS has worked increasingly closely with colleagues, it is arguable that the very fact of being a different agency in many cases increases the effectiveness of the work undertaken.

**NAME: HELYN CLACK**

**PORTFOLIO: COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CABINET LEAD FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

On 21 October 2014, the Cabinet supported the creation of a new shared Trading Standards service in partnership with Buckinghamshire County Council. I am delighted to confirm that the 1 April 2015 will see the launch of the new service. A new Joint Committee will provide oversight and strategic direction.

The current Buckinghamshire staff are transferring to become Surrey employees to create a single team. We will retain the same local presence with the new service continuing to be based in both Redhill and Aylesbury.

The new service priorities are focused on enhancing Wellbeing, Economic Prosperity, and the experience of residents in both counties and will help us deliver both our Corporate Strategies.

The new team will:

- Provide additional expertise and capacity and create a stronger, more resilient and more effective service, building on the recognised strengths and successes of the current teams
- Be able to offer an improved service for both residents and businesses
- Have greater impact and influence locally, regionally and nationally
- Increase income and reduce service costs

The new service is an excellent example of innovation in action. It creates a new shared front line service in a new partnership model of delivery. It will enable us to enhance services and we will be well positioned to grow and develop in future years.

**NAME: MELVILLE FEW**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

The Care Act is the biggest change to adult social care law in over 60 years. The Act aims to:

- Create a legal framework that is clear and easy to navigate
- Bring the law up to date to reflect a focus on the outcomes that people want and to help put individuals in control of their lives
- Address areas of unfairness in adult social care support

The majority of the changes contained within the Act come in to effect on 1 April 2015, with significant funding reforms (including a new 'cap' on care costs) coming into effect from April 2016.

The Council has played a proactive role in the development of the new legislation. This has included participation in national Department of Health working groups, and in national bodies influencing the Government on the changes (including the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services and the County Council's Network).

The Council is in a strong position to respond to the Act, thanks to the rollout of personalisation and more recently our family, friends and community support approach.

However, the Act still presents some key challenges for the Council. These include:

- A renewed focus on providing an information and advice service to all our residents, including carers and people who fund their own care
- A new national set of eligibility criteria for receiving adult social care support
- New duties to assess and support vulnerable prisoners
- From April 2016, the new cap on care costs could place significant pressure on the Council's capacity to manage assessment demand

A project group working closely alongside Members, and in consultation with partners, residents and carers, has been planning the Council's response to these challenges since autumn 2013, and we are on track to meet the new legal requirements from April 2015.

The Act presents significant financial challenges for the Council. Although we anticipate we will receive sufficient funding to meet the 2015/16 changes, the funding reforms due to be introduced next year could cost the Council £147m by 2019/20 with no indication at the present time as to how this will be funded.

More information on the impact of the Care Act on Surrey and the Council's response is available at: [www.surreycc.gov.uk/careact](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/careact). Any queries should be emailed to the Care Act Project Team at [careact@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:careact@surreycc.gov.uk).

**NAME: JOHN FUREY**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING**

Our highways, transport and flooding services face a number of challenges, including securing funding for and implementing flood alleviation schemes and transport infrastructure, as well as supporting resilience in our communities and increasing local decision making.

I am pleased that we have been able to build into our budget local contribution that will enable flood alleviation schemes, including the River Thames Scheme, to progress, and will make it possible for us to secure funding from the local growth fund for new transport infrastructure. In 15/16 we have also been able to maintain the Capital allocation to local committees at £4m, and we have asked local committees to work with officers to use 500k of this for surface water drainage improvements. We will also be increasing capability on programme communications and management, to address concerns raised in these areas by Members.

This new investment will help to improve highway services in Surrey, whilst at the same time the service is confident that it will be able to achieve the savings targets set out in the MTFP.

High quality highway services understand and respond to local concerns and issues. For that reason, as part of changes to our highways service, we will be transferring more highway activities to our area teams, along with the resources needed to manage them effectively. This will ensure that decision-making reflects the priorities of Members and local committees, so we can be responsive to the needs of our communities.

**NAME: MICHAEL GOSLING**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (normally known as the JSNA) is a public document, the production of which is a statutory requirement for top tier local authorities. It is an assessment of the current and future health and social care needs of the local community. It is intended to feed into commissioning and decision making processes within SCC as well as a range of partner organisations such as CCGs, voluntary groups and Districts & Boroughs.

The JSNA and the issues raised were reviewed by the Health and Wellbeing Board and formed the basis for the Joint Health Strategy subsequently endorsed and is now being implemented.

In 2014, Surrey undertook a review of its JSNA in order to assess the extent to which it was still providing the information our partners required, the extent to which it was still being used by them and whether it was currently fit for purpose. This review found that making a number of changes to the structure and content of the JSNA would increase its influence and encourage partner organisations to make more use of it.

The opinion of many of those who took part in the review of the JSNA was that it had not kept up with key developments in the area of health and wellbeing over the last few years and that significant parts of it were no longer fit for purpose because they were either too long and complex or out of date. This highlighted the need for SCC to adopt a continuous development approach the JSNA in the future, to keep it relevant.

The Public Health Team have made improvements based on the review's findings, including:

- Clearer, shorter chapters through the creation of a new chapter template for authors which includes an executive summary for each chapter and puts an emphasis on sign-posting and the use of plain English
- Improved consistency across the JSNA by providing guidance for authors on the creation of standardised charts and tables for inclusion in the chapters
- Increased use of infographics to ensure evidence is presented in an accessible format and supported with in-house training on how to produce these
- Making sure that the evidence that supports the JSNA stays current by updating the data held on Surrey as new data becomes available and highlighting any relevant new evidence in an 'updates' section in each chapter.

### **Going forward**

While the review has already implemented changes which have been useful in making the JSNA more appropriate to its current audience, we need to do more to keep it relevant. We will be looking to refresh the existing list of chapters to make sure they cover the areas most important to Surrey and its partners. We will create content (e.g. infographics) that will make it easier for everyone to access and understand the evidence used in the JSNA. Finally, we will create an overarching summary, formed primarily from the sum of the chapters' executive summaries,

which will be delivered over the next 12 months as the entire suite of chapters is updated. I hope that in due course by making JSNA more accessible it will assist partners across the County in the decision making process in the coming years.

**NAME: DENISE LE GAL**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES AND LEAD MEMBER FOR NEW MODELS OF DELIVERY**

2015/16 is a significant year for IMT with a number of major initiatives being delivered that fully support the achievement of the council's three corporate strategy goals of *wellbeing, economic prosperity and resident experience*.

Our priorities for the coming year are to:

1. Maintain and continually improve IMT services to our users to improve productivity
2. Deliver key projects that enable the council and partners to modernise services to the public whilst also responding to budget pressures. This will include the rollout of new desktops and laptops (up to 7,000), replacing our Blackberry mobile devices (up to 3,000 devices), replacing our printer estate (up to 400 multi-functional devices), moving to a cloud based email system (10,000+ users) and introducing a revised security programme with fewer restrictions
3. Further develop partnership working to ensure that IMT and our infrastructure supports the council's local and regional partnership arrangements to work successfully and deliver efficiencies

The purpose of the IMT Service is to provide innovative, effective and reliable information technology services. We are responsible for:

- enabling the council and partners to use information and digital technology to modernise services to the public whilst also responding to budget pressures
- supporting approximately 10,000 users to ensure they can work effectively and efficiently
- managing all elements of technical infrastructure to fully support users whilst ensuring we fully comply with Government Security Standards
- maintaining excellent relationships with customers and partners and ensuring IMT projects are delivered successfully

Technology is changing quickly - residents rightly expect easy online access to public service information and services which match the best products they can get elsewhere on their phones and computers. Similarly the workforce needs modern IMT tools to be productive.

Our services are therefore critical to delivering public services better and saving money. This has understandably increased demand for IMT services – our user base continues to grow, having increased by more than 40% over the last two years.

We currently have in excess of 100 projects in progress at any one time. We see this as a great opportunity to support the council and its partners to both run the

day-to-day business of service delivery and identify innovative new models of delivery. We are committed to modernising our skills and approaches so we can provide the very best service.

**NAME: MIKE GOODMAN**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

**Waste**

- **Eco Park**

Pre-commencement planning schemes are being considered by the County Planning Authority. Vegetation and tree removal has been completed to enable development to proceed. Revised pricing, value for money and affordability assessments are scheduled for reporting to Cabinet in April 2015.

**New Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy**

The Cabinet has recommended that the County Council adopts the revised Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy at its meeting on 10 March. The strategy is currently being considered by all 12 partner authorities for formal adoption by the Surrey Waste Partnership in June. The new strategy will provide a framework for greater collaboration across the county in order to become the leading county area in England for waste management.

**Local Transport Review**

The consultation process has now completed, and over 6,800 responses were received informing detailed planning of impact on routes. Member groups, and the Environment and Transport Select Committee, will consider detailed route by route proposals prior to a report to Cabinet in May.

**Rural Surrey LEADER Programme**

The new Rural Surrey LEADER Programme, which runs from 2015 to 2020, has now received confirmation of its funding allocation from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). We have been allocated 2.05m Euros, approximately £1.64m (depending on the exchange rate). This is a slight increase on the last programme. Rural Surrey LEADER will focus on small rural businesses, offering grants of £2,500 - £50,000 to provide up to 40% of project costs.

Business as diverse as woodfuel, local food producers, village shops and diversification on farms can benefit from the programme. In the 2008-2014 Programme the grant of £1.4m, over the whole period, generated a project spend in excess of £5.6m. We want to build on this work to keep the rural economy of Surrey thriving for the benefit of small businesses, residents and visitors.

The second LEADER programme covers the whole of rural Surrey this time and we look forward to some interesting projects coming forward. The programme will be officially launched in June/July.

**NAME: LINDA KEMENY**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS AND LEARNING**

### **Guildford University Technical College**

Formal approval for a new University Technical College (UTC) in Guildford to open in September 2017 with a grant of up to £10 million was announced by Lord Nash, Secretary of State for Schools, at Guildford College on Wednesday 11 March. It has taken more than 2 years for Surrey officers to achieve this milestone, working in partnership with Royal Holloway College (University of London), Guildford College, Guildford Education Partnership (led by George Abbott School) and global IT company, CGI, who, with Surrey County Council, are all founding members of the new UTC Trust. UTCs are government funded schools that have been developed in response to demands from employers for well educated engineers, scientists and technicians. The Guildford UTC will educate and train up to 720 14-19 year olds in cyber security, computer science and engineering, with students gaining valuable technical qualifications alongside studying core academic GCSEs and A-levels including English and Maths. By providing more secondary places, it will also help address the basic need requirements which are forecast in Guildford.

The UTC proposal was also developed with lead employer sponsors Air Products, Babcock International, and BAE Systems. The lead employer sponsors have shaped the specialisms and have made significant commitments to support the UTC both pre and post opening, and sit on the Project Steering Group. Significant offers of support have also come from other employers including Surrey Satellite Technologies, BOC, Siemens, as well as many Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) and employer groups including Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), Surrey Chambers of Commerce, SATRO, and the Surrey Institute of Directors. It is expected that students and their parents will see a variety of engineering skills that are sought by employers locally and it will encourage more to pursue an engineering study pathway. The impact of this will be that UTC leavers will be well prepared for entry to employment. A Curriculum Advisory Body is being set up as part of the overall governance structure, reporting to the Board of Trustees. This will involve all founding members, Trustees, and representatives from employer partners who will provide continuous advice on the design and operation of the UTC. This will include informing the curriculum and opportunities for employer projects to support students to develop the key skills needed by employers. Employers have confirmed that the UTC would give them greater confidence in the future skills of young people and support their development plans for future growth in Surrey.

Work will now continue on securing the site and finalising development plans.

**NAME: PETER MARTIN**

**PORTFOLIO: CABINET MEMBER FOR THE ECONOMY AND PROSPEROUS PLACES**

I am pleased to report that the County Council has finished the main phase of its Superfast Surrey Broadband programme to bring fibre broadband to those areas in the county not included in commercial roll outs. Since I spoke you at the December Council meeting the programme has extended the technology to an additional 4,000 premises, bringing high-speed fibre coverage to more than 82,000 homes and businesses across the county. This roll out has been delivered at an amazing rate of nearly 200 homes and businesses per working day – transforming lives across the county, and according to BT Openreach figures, making Surrey the best connected county in Great Britain.

As well as a high proportion of businesses and residents throughout Surrey being able to achieve superfast speeds as part of our programme, pushing the fibre broadband network out as far as possible across the county will enable local communities, residents and businesses to take advantage of future innovations, technology developments and enhancements as they become available.

Whilst celebrating this achievement and the success of the programme, I recognise that there is still work going on as part of this contract to reach those remaining premises located in the more technically challenging and harder to reach places of the county. This is not, therefore, the end of the story and as a Council we would like to do more.

I advised you in December that I had asked the Superfast Surrey team to undertake a programme review. As this has progressed and alongside feedback from key stakeholders, I have been made very well aware of the small percentage of premises still unable to access a fibre broadband service. This review, and the ongoing Openreach analysis of residents experiencing slower speeds due to long line lengths, has highlighted that these premises are based not only in our original Superfast Surrey programme intervention area, but also in areas extending across parts of Surrey which were originally included in commercial providers' plans.

As a result, and to understand the full scope of the remaining challenge, we intend to run a further investigation known as an Open Market Review (OMR). This is the only way that Surrey County Council can establish a clear understanding of the latest position regarding existing and planned commercial services, alongside the investment in fibre broadband services that has been achieved through our own programme. The results will enable us to identify how to prioritise the use of any remaining funds to address issues of broadband coverage and speed across the county.

The OMR has to follow a strict government timetable which is not within our control. This process involves commercial consultation, public consultation, analysis and mapping whilst taking into account EU State Aid regulations. Consequently, it is unlikely that I will be able to come back to this Council before early autumn with an update.

With limited budgets combined with high demand for council funded services across the county, we are conscious that there is no quick fix solution. However, we remain committed to working towards extending fibre broadband services to as many residents and businesses as economically possible.

County Council meeting – 17 March 2015

## FORMATION OF A NEW SURREY LOCAL PENSION BOARD

### Amendments to report and Annex 1

Below is an extract of the report and Annex 1 with amendments shown crossed through and /or in Bold:

#### **Appointment of Members, Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Local Pension Board**

- 4.8 It is recommended that the Local Pension ~~Fund~~ Board, totalling ten members consist of:
- Four employee representatives
  - Four employer representatives
  - Two other members
- 4.9 It is recommended that the Local Pension Board be constituted as follows:
- Employer representatives
    - ~~4~~ 2 x Surrey County Councillors
    - ~~3~~ 2 x other employer representatives to come from nominations from other employers in the fund (e.g. District, Borough and Parish Councils, Academies, Police and other scheduled or admitted body employers in the Surrey Pension Fund).
  - Member representatives
    - ~~1~~ **1 x Surrey County Councillor**
    - 1 x GMB nominated representative
    - 1 x Unison nominated representative
    - ~~4~~ 2 x other member representatives
  - Other members
    - 2 x members from an external source (to be recommended by the appointment panel).
- 7.2 Such responsibilities will include:
- ensuring that the process for the appointment and termination of members of the Local Pension Board;
  - ensuring that the Local Pension Board consider the appropriateness of the strategies approved by the Surrey Pension Fund Board and have the capacity to evolve if required;
  - having a clear idea of and being responsible for the items of business that are taken to the Local Pension Board;
  - management of the Local Pension ~~Fund~~ Board business;
  - ensuring those on the Local Pension Board have the appropriate knowledge and skills;

- ensuring the effectiveness of the Surrey Pension Fund Board is measured, and recommendations for improvements by the Local Pension Board are communicated properly where necessary;
- ensuring Local Pension Board members are properly and effectively trained;
- ensuring risk assessments are undertaken and considered by the Local Pension Board on a regular basis;
- ensuring that a budget is allocated and managed for the Local Pension Board.

### **And in Annex 1**

- 4.2 The Local Pension Board shall be constituted as follows:
- Employer representatives
    - ~~4~~ 2 x Surrey County Councillors
    - ~~3~~ 2 x other employer representatives to come from nominations from other employers in the fund (e.g. District, Borough and Parish Councils, Academies, Police and other scheduled or admitted body employers in the Surrey Pension Fund).
  - Member representatives
    - ~~1~~ x ~~Surrey County Councillor~~
    - 1 x GMB nominated representative
    - 1 x Unison nominated representative
    - ~~4~~ 2 x other member representatives
  - Other members
    - 2 x members from an external source (to be recommended by the appointment panel).
- 4.3 Scheme member and employer representatives shall be appointed in equal number and shall together form the majority of the Local Pension Board membership.
- 4.4 No officer or elected member of the Administering Authority who is responsible for the discharge of any function of the Administering Authority under the Regulations may serve as a member of the Local Pension Board.
- 4.5 Each Local Pension Board member so appointed shall serve for the life of the current Surrey County Council, a defined, fixed period which can be extended for further periods subject to re-nomination.
- 4.6 Each Local Pension Board member should endeavour to attend all Board meetings during the year. **No** Substitutes will be permitted to attend on behalf of absent Local Pension ~~Fund~~ Board members.