

**COUNTY COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL MEETING - 19 MAY 2015**

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 19 May 2015 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

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

\*absent

## **25/15 CHAIRMAN [Item 1]**

Under the motion of Mrs Clack, seconded by Mr Harrison, it was unanimously:

### **RESOLVED:**

That Mrs Sally Marks be elected Chairman of the Council for the Council Year 2015/16.

### **DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE**

Mrs Marks made the statutory declaration of office and took the Chair. The newly elected Chairman expressed her thanks to the Members of the Council for electing her as Chairman.

## **26/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Beardsmore, Miss Heath, Mr Hickman, Mrs Lallement, Mrs Ross-Tomlin and Mrs Young.

## **27/15 MINUTES [Item 3]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 17 March 2015 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

## **28/15 ELECTION OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR [Item 4]**

The Chief Executive, formally reported that Mr Ramon Gray was duly elected as the new County Councillor for the Weybridge division following the by-election held on 7 May 2015.

## **29/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 5]**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) She informed Members that Mrs Cecelia Garrard, former County Councillor, who was Chairman of the County Council from 1993 – 1996 and also a Deputy Lieutenant for Surrey had passed away. Members stood in silent tribute.
- (ii) On behalf of Surrey County Council, she congratulated their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge on the birth of their daughter, Princess Charlotte.
- (iii) Magna Carta – that the celebrations relating to the 800<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta would culminate on 15 June 2015, when the County Council in partnership with the National Trust would be hosting an event on the Runnymede meadows. Senior Members of the Royal Family will be attending.

- (iv) The fire at Clandon Park – she thanked Members of Surrey County Council staff, and in particular staff from the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and the Registration Service who worked tirelessly during this incident and the following days to mitigate its effect.
- (v) Freedom Game – she informed Members that a new community opera commissioned by Surrey County Council through Surrey Arts had been performed for the first time at the Royal Albert Hall on Tuesday 12 May.
- (vi) Dame Sarah Goad DCVO JP – that there would be an opportunity to thank her for 18 years of service as Lord Lieutenant of Surrey at the AGM Ceremonial lunch.
- (vii) Finally, she said that the new High Sheriff, Mrs Elizabeth Kennedy had been appointed at a ceremony at Guildford Cathedral on 20 March 2015.

### **30/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 6]**

There were none.

### **31/15 VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 7]**

Upon the motion of Mrs Frost, seconded by Mr Walsh, it was unanimously:

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Mr Nicholas Skellett CBE be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council for the council year 2015/16.

#### **DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE**

Mr Skellett was invested by Mrs Marks with the Vice-Chairman's badge. He made the statutory declaration of office and expressed thanks to the Members of the Council for electing him as Vice-Chairman.

### **32/15 MOTION OF THANKS TO RETIRING CHAIRMAN [Item 8]**

The newly elected Chairman moved a formal motion of thanks to Mr Munro for his services as Chairman of the Council during the last two years. This was formally seconded by Mrs Watson.

There were also congratulatory speeches from the Leader of the Council, who asked Mr Munro to become the County Council's Armed Forces Champion, the Leader of the Residents' Association and Independent Group, the Leader of UKIP, the Deputy Leader, Mrs Frost and Mr Skellett.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That we, the Chairman and Members of the Surrey County Council, record our warm appreciation of the distinguished services given to the County and its inhabitants by Mr David Munro during his tenure of office as Chairman of the Council from 21 May 2013 to 19 May 2015.

The Chairman then presented Mr Munro with an inscribed copy of the motion together with an ex-Chairman's badge and a gift, funded privately by Members' subscription.

Mr Munro made a farewell speech.

### **33/15 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 9]**

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Support for Devolution and a fairer deal for funding for Surrey and whether, if Surrey goes down the Devolution route, the County Council would have an elected mayor.
- The importance of services for local residents and a request not to close any Children's Centres in Surrey
- Confirmation that the Medium Term Financial Plan would be refreshed in July 2015

### **34/15 AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL'S SCRUTINY FUNCTION - ARTICLE 7: SELECT COMMITTEES [Item 10]**

The Chairman explained that Cabinet portfolios had been revised to align with the three strategic goals in the Corporate Strategy and it was now proposed to amend select committee remits to reflect these and to enable effective scrutiny of the work of Cabinet and services.

Mr Harrison welcomed many of the changes but expressed concern in relation to the merging of Children's and Adults into one Social Care Services Board. He asked that this change was reviewed in twelve months and reported back to Council.

Mr Robert Evans considered that the new titles of the Boards did not clearly reflect the work of each Board and residents would have difficulty in understanding their roles. However, the Leader of the Council provided an explanation for the changes and said that 'Resident Experience' was at the heart of all services provided by the County Council.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the Council approves the following recommendations with immediate effect:

1. the merger of the Adult Social Care and Children Social Care remits to form a Social Care Services Board and the formation of a new Education and Skills Board;
2. that the Council's select committees will be known as:
  - Council Overview Board
  - Social Care Services Board

- Wellbeing Board (Health Scrutiny)
- Education and Skills Board
- Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board
- Resident Experience Board

3. the revised Article 7 of the Constitution, as set out in Annex 1 and the detailed remits of the Boards in Annex 1a, of the submitted report.

### **35/15 UPDATE REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION REVIEW GROUP [Item 11]**

As part of the Constitution Review Group and as the newly elected Vice-Chairman of the Council, Mr Skellett introduced the report. He explained that the Council had last reviewed its council and committee processes at the County Council meeting in October 2014, when it was agreed that the Review Group would re-consider how to handle the number and timing of motions and also the number of signatures required, in the Council's Petition Scheme, to trigger a debate at full Council.

He drew attention to the recommendations set out in the Update Report as set out on pages 43 – 45 of the Council agenda and expanded on the reasoning for them.

Mr Harrison tabled an amendment to the recommendations – amending recommendations (2) and (6) as set out below:

- (2) There is a presumption that original motions will normally be taken in the order in which they are received. ~~However, in the event that the number of motions received deems it unlikely that they can be debated within the time limit, or for example, where an excessive number of motions had been received or a number of motions from one Group which might prohibit a balance of debate across the Council, the Chairman has the discretion to determine the order in which they are debated following consultation with Group Leaders and others as appropriate. ,~~ but second motions submitted by any Group will be added to the end of the end of the list of first motions submitted by each Group or by an individual Member, in a similar manner to which the Council deals with Member questions. Third motions will follow and so on.
- (6) The Chairman's role is to ensure that the debate on motions is fully heard ~~but that the debate is not prolonged unnecessarily to prevent later motions and debates being given sufficient consideration. but is not unduly repetitive and the debate is not prolonged unnecessarily.~~ but is not unduly repetitive and the debate is not prolonged unnecessarily.

The remaining recommendations were unchanged in his amendment.

He said that the Residents Association / Independent Group would prefer an overall time limit rather than a restriction on the number of motions and he also considered adopting a similar approach as Members' questions was a good approach, so that any second / third motion would be added to the list after all first motions submitted by each Group, because he disagreed with the Chairman using his/her discretion in determining the order of the motions.

He referred to the option, already available to Council, to defer motions to select committees / Cabinet and also said that as the Constitution Review Group was continuing its work for a further year, there would be a further opportunity to review changes and therefore urged Members to support his amendments.

Mr Skellett did not accept Mr Harrison's amendment to the recommendations of the Constitution Review Group because he considered that it removed from the Chairman, the option to determine the order of the motions and therefore, proposed his own amendment to recommendation (2) by adding the following to Mr Harrison's amendment:

'However, in the event that the number of motions received deems it unlikely that they can be debated within the time limit the Chairman has the discretion to determine the order in which they are debated following consultation with Group Leaders and others as appropriate, being mindful of the political balance of the Council and the need to ensure fair representation for all political groups.'

So that recommendation (2) now read:

'There is a presumption that original motions will normally be taken in the order in which they are received but second motions submitted by any Group will be added to the end of the list of first motions submitted by each Group or by an individual Member, in a similar manner to which the Council deals with Member questions. Third motions will follow and so on. However, in the event that the number of motions received deems it unlikely that they can be debated within the time limit the Chairman has the discretion to determine the order in which they are debated following consultation with Group Leaders and others as appropriate, being mindful of the political balance of the Council and the need to ensure fair representation for all political groups.'

The remaining recommendations remained unchanged.

Mr Harrison did not accept the amendment as proposed by Mr Skellett.

The Chairman said that Members would debate the amendment, as further amended by Mr Skellett and vote on this amendment. However if Members voted against this amendment, they would return to Mr Harrison's amendment and vote on that one.

During the debate on the amendment, the following points were made:

- Mrs Watson said that these amendments indicated how complicated this review had become and informed Members that she had a further amendment, which she would table after this amendment had been decided
- Concern that the Chairman would not be impartial
- The original amendment was simple and logical and the further amendment should be rejected
- A request for cross-party support for the original amendment
- That the majority of motions usually came from the opposition and that Mr Harrison's amendment was too prescriptive
- Acknowledgement of the option to refer motions, however, using this option created a 'back-up' of business for later council meetings
- The proposed recommendations agreed that there should be no cap on the number of motions but that there should be a time limit
- The importance of retaining the Chairman's discretion.

After the debate on Mr Skellett's amendment, the recommendations of the Constitution Review Group were put to the vote with 56 Members voting for and 15 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was carried.

Mrs Watson's amendment was tabled. She proposed deleting recommendations (1) to (4) and to reducing the number of signatures required to trigger a debate in the Council's Petition Scheme from 10,000 to 3,000.

Mrs Watson said that she considered that the threshold for signatures in the Council Petition Scheme was still too high and would continue to prevent residents part-taking in County Council meetings. She also considered that the role of the full County Council meetings was for cross-party debate and to share ideas, which would be curtailed if the new recommendations were agreed.

This amendment was ruled as not valid.

Therefore, Members were asked to vote on the revised recommendations, as agreed after Mr Skellett's amendment, with 56 Members voting for and 15 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

That the following recommendations to be effective from the next ordinary meeting of the Council:

1. There should be no cap on the number of motions set down for debate at Council meetings but a limit of one and a half hours for the total debate on motions, subject to the Chairman's discretion to waive the time limit if it is deemed the matter is of particular importance.
2. There is a presumption that original motions will normally be taken in the order in which they are received but second motions submitted by any Group will be added to the end of the end of the list of first motions submitted by each Group or by an individual Member, in a similar manner to which the Council deals with Member questions. Third motions will follow and so on. However, in the event that the number of motions received deems it unlikely that they can be debated within the time limit the Chairman has the discretion to determine the order in which they are debated following consultation with Group Leaders and others as appropriate, being mindful of the political balance of the Council and the need to ensure fair representation for all political groups.
3. There is a presumption against having original motions at the statutory Annual General Meeting (May) and the Annual Budget Council Meeting (February). Motions may be accepted at the Chairman's discretion however, discussions must be contained within an indicative time limit of 45 minutes in total. This is to take account of any emerging or urgent issues deemed to be of sufficient importance to discuss at these two Council meetings.
4. That the Council's Standing Orders are updated to reflect revised time limits to apply to speeches, as detailed in Annex B of the submitted report.
5. The Council's Petition Scheme be amended to set the threshold for a petition to trigger a debate at Council at 10,000 signatures, as set out in Annex C of the submitted report.

6. The Chairman's role is to ensure that the debate on motions is fully heard but is not unduly repetitive and the debate is not prolonged unnecessarily.
7. That the new arrangements for motions should be reviewed after one year to judge their effectiveness.
8. That a full review of Standing Orders is undertaken in relation to accuracy and 'points of order' by the end of 2015.
9. That the Council's Standing Orders are updated to reflect the change in legislation to state that a recorded vote must be undertaken when the vote is taken for setting the annual budget.
10. That the Constitution Review Group continues its work for a further year under the chairmanship of the new County Council Vice-Chairman, once elected.
11. That the Member Development Steering Group considers further training for Members on the procedural aspects of the Constitution.

### **36/15 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION [Item 12]**

A revised page 83, with the correct numbers for the Boards and Committees was tabled at the meeting and is attached as Appendix B.

Also, an addition to recommendation 1 was proposed, this was:

1(iii) changes in the length of speeches, as set out in item 11, recommendation (4) – page 44 of the agenda.

The Leader of the Council confirmed that these amendments to the Constitution had been endorsed at the People, Performance and Development Committee held on 12 May 2015.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the County Council agrees to the relevant changes to its Standing Orders regarding:
  - (i) the role of Cabinet Associates at County Council meetings
  - (ii) the removal of the statutory protection in respect of disciplinary action for the Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer
  - (iii) changes in the length of speeches, as set out in item 11, recommendation (4) – page 44 of the agenda.
2. That the amendments to the Officer Code of Conduct be approved.

### **37/15 ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY 2015/16 [Item 13]**

The annual review of the Scheme of Political Proportionality 2015/16 was circulated separately to Members and is attached as Appendix C to these minutes.

**RESOLVED** (with no Member voting against):

That the committee sizes and scheme of proportionality, as set out in Annex 1 of the submitted report, be adopted for 2015/16.

**38/15 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES [Item 14]**

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Members, as set out in Appendix D, be appointed to serve on the Boards and Committees of the Council for the Council Year 2015/16, in accordance with the wishes of political groups.
2. That the Chief Executive be authorised to make changes to the membership of any of the Council's Committees as necessary during the Council Year, in accordance with the wishes of political groups.
3. That the County Councillors representing divisions in the Woking borough area be appointed to serve on the Woking Joint Committee for the Council Year 2015/16.
4. That the remaining County Councillors for each district/borough area be appointed to serve on the appropriate Local Committee for the Council Year 2015/16, and to authorise the Chief Executive to appoint an equal number of district/borough councillors to the Local Committees following nominations by the district and borough councils, which they should be requested to make politically proportional to their Membership.
5. That the Council's representative be appointed to the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for the Council Year 2015/16.

**39/15 ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN 2015/16 [Item 15]**

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Members listed below be duly elected as Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen respectively for the Boards and Committees, as shown for the Council Year 2015/16.
2. That the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, to appoint the Borough's nominated Member as Vice-Chairman of Guildford Local Committee once the co-opted Members are appointed.

<b>BOARDS</b>		
	<b>Chairman</b>	<b>Vice-Chairman</b>
<b>Council Overview</b>	David Munro	Eber Kington
<b>Social Care Services</b>	Keith Witham	Margaret Hicks
<b>Education and Skills</b>	Mark Brett-Warburton	Mary Lewis
<b>Resident Experience</b>	Colin Kemp	Rachael I Lake
<b>Economic Prosperity, Environment &amp; Highways</b>	David Harmer	Bob Gardner
<b>Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny</b>	Bill Chapman	Ben Carasco
<b>PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE</b>		
	Tim Hall	Keith Taylor
<b>AUDIT &amp; GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE</b>		
	Stuart Selleck	Denis Fuller
<b>PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE &amp; DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE</b>		
	David Hodge	Peter Martin
<b>SURREY PENSION FUND BOARD</b>		
	Denise Le Gal	Alan Young

<b>LOCAL COMMITTEES</b>		
<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>CHAIRMAN</b>	<b>VICE-CHAIRMAN</b>
<b>Elmbridge</b>	Margaret Hicks	Mike Bennison
<b>Epsom &amp; Ewell</b>	Eber Kington	John Beckett
<b>Guildford</b>	Keith Taylor	Borough to Appoint
<b>Mole Valley</b>	Tim Hall	Clare Curran
<b>Reigate &amp; Banstead</b>	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin	Barbara Thomson
<b>Runnymede</b>	Yvonna Lay	Mary Angell
<b>Spelthorne</b>	Denise Saliagopoulos	Tim Evans
<b>Surrey Heath</b>	David Ivison	Chris Pitt
<b>Tandridge</b>	Nick Skellett	Michael Sydney
<b>Waverley</b>	Pat Frost	Victoria Young

<b>Woking Joint Committee</b>	Liz Bowes	Borough to appoint
-------------------------------	-----------	--------------------

#### **40/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 16]**

Notice of 3 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix E.

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

**(Q1) Mrs Coleman** considered that the second part of her question had not been answered and asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services to confirm that the Surrey Disability Register was a valuable tool and whether there were any plans for changes to it. The Cabinet Member confirmed that there were no plans to change how this register was administered and that the County Council was taking proactive steps to look at whether any improvements could be made to the process.

**(Q2) Mr Robert Evans** said that he had put this question today because he had not received a response to his 'chase up' email, sent at the beginning of March 2015, requesting an update on any actions following agreement of his 'Fair Trade' motion in May 2014. He asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services to investigate and report back to him – she agreed to his request.

**(Q3) Mr Robert Evans** invited the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to visit Stanwell Moor to meet those residents whose bus service was under threat, as part of the Local Transport Review. The Cabinet Member agreed to this request and said that the County Council had been unable to announce any proposed changes to bus services during the pre-election period.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.15pm and resumed at 2.00pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Coleman, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Goodwin, Mr Hall, Mrs Lay, Mrs Moseley, Mrs Mountain, Mr Munro and Mr Selleck.

### **41/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 17]**

There was one local Member statement from Mr John Beckett concerning the Meadow Sure Start Centre. A copy is attached as Appendix F.

### **42/15 ORIGINAL MOTION [Item 18]**

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

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

“This Council notes that Members’ Allocations are a key element of localism and an important means by which individual County Councillors are able to support local voluntary groups and valuable community initiatives.

This Council further notes that the recent cut in Member Allocations:

- was agreed without any detailed public scrutiny
- has reduced each Local Committee’s Member Allocation by £35,000 and
- has led to a reduction in the both the range and amount of support Members are able to give to local good causes at a time when there is an even greater demand for assistance from the voluntary, community and faith sectors.

This Council therefore calls upon the Cabinet to review this decision and to restore Member Allocations to its 2014/2015 level.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Beckett.

Mr Kington said that:

- That local committees were one of this County Council’s successes
- Member allocations were valued which enabled Members’ to respond to individual requests for funding and therefore the reduction of each local committee Member allocation by £35,000 was disappointing
- None of the Residents Association / Independent Members had been made aware of this reduction. Also, there had been no opportunity to scrutinise this proposal
- It was the Residents Association / Independent Group’s belief that the Conservative Group’s priorities were wrong

- That the funding for the Leader of the Council's Community Improvement Fund remained unchanged
- All Epsom & Ewell County Councillors had spent their Member Allocation in full
- Local committees were better placed to make informed decisions in relation to local issues.
- As the proposals for devolved funding were being discussed by Central Government, he asked the Leader of the Council when these Member Allocations would be reinstated so that Members could make a difference to their residents.

Seven Members spoke, making the following points:

- That the motion was factually incorrect because the reduction related to local capital funding, as set out in the February 2015 Cabinet / Council Budget papers and this motion had resulted in a misleading story being printed in the local press
- There had been no changes to Members' allocation in the revenue budget – this had remained at £10,300 for this financial year
- Reduction in the local capital funding for the next two years had been re-directed to fund the increased number of school places required - £3.4m had already been spent in the Epsom & Ewell area, with a further £19.1m earmarked for future expenditure in this area
- That the diminished funding available for local committees to spend risked damaging the reputation of the County Council and there should be a return to the status quo
- Fund raising initiatives should be encouraged as an alternative
- Local committees now have less funding to support worthwhile causes in their areas

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 15 Members voting for it and 46 Members voted against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

#### **43/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 19]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 10 and 24 March and 28 April 2015.

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

There were two statements from Cabinet Members:

- (i) Mrs Angell, in relation to the overview of the Looked After Children Bursary Fund. This statement was included within the agenda papers. She highlighted key points from the statement and thanked all Members who had contributed, from their allocations, to the fund and said that she would be asking for a similar commitment in the new council year.
- (ii) Mr Gosling tabled a statement in relation to the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board. (Appendix G)

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

**A Surrey Transport Plan – Borough / District Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes (Tranche 1&2)**

**RESOLVED:**

That Tranche 1 & 2 of the Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes and their suggested objectives be approved for:

- Elmbridge
- Epsom and Ewell
- Mole Valley
- Reigate and Banstead
- Spelthorne
- Surrey Heath
- Tandridge
- Woking

And, that as part of the Surrey Transport Plan, the Local Transport Strategies and Forward Programmes endorsed by Cabinet, be approved by County Council.

**B Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2015 – 2020**

Mrs Angell presented the Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2015 – 2020 and informed Members that the refreshed Plan covered a five year period which would be refreshed annually, reflecting any changes to the national and local youth justice landscape that would impact on the strategic priorities. She highlighted them as:

- Preventing youth crime
- Reducing re-offending
- Safeguarding young people
- Protecting the public from harm

**RESOLVED:**

That the Youth Justice Strategic Plan for 2015 – 2020, attached as Appendix 1, to the submitted report, be approved.

**C Revised Statement of Community Involvement**

**RESOLVED:**

That the revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), attached as Appendix 2 to the submitted report, be approved.

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

That the following reports were received and noted:

- Customer Promise – the Council's Commitment to delivering Excellent Service
- Quarterly Report on Decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements (January – March 2015)

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 10 and 24 March and 28 April 2015 be adopted.

#### **44/15 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 20]**

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: 2.50pm]

---

**Chairman**

**LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S SPEECH TO COUNTY COUNCIL AGM MEETING:  
19 MAY 2015**

Madam Chairman, first of all, can I congratulate you on behalf of the whole Council on becoming Chairman of the County Council.

This is an important year for Surrey...

As you mentioned earlier, it marks the 800<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Magna Carta, which we will celebrate in June in the presence of Her Majesty the Queen. I know you will represent the County Council in this, and in all your duties, with distinction.

Can I also welcome back Members after the recent election campaign. As well as campaigning in the national election, I know a number of Members also contested District and Borough seats and in particular, can I welcome **Mr Gray** to the Council Chamber -

a great Conservative win, with over 50 per cent of the vote! I look forward to him making a real contribution on behalf of the residents of Weybridge.

Madam Chairman, can I draw Members' attention to the changes to my Cabinet, which I announce this morning.

I am delighted to welcome:

- **Clare Curran** as the new Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing
- **Richard Walsh** as the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing
- **Tim Evans** as the Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

I am also very pleased that **Mary Angell** will continue to serve as a Cabinet Associate.

These changes strengthen a great team.

And can I thank my whole Cabinet and Associate team, but particularly those who are retiring - **Michael Gosling** and **Steve Cosser**.

**General Election**

Elections and door to door campaigning act as a real wake up call to all politicians. They remind us of why we are here - to make a difference for the residents we serve, on the issues that matter most to them and the terrific General Election result has set the national picture that the Council will have to operate in. We have a majority Conservative Government – the first since 1997, with an ambitious plan of action for the benefit of the whole country.

I am pleased to report that I have already had a chance to meet Greg Clark, the new Secretary of State, and his ministerial team and I was very encouraged by the positive discussion and how he wants to work with Local Government.

We have already had some Government announcements, but we will have to wait and see the details of the new policies and what will be in the Queen's Speech next week.

We also await the Government's spending plans and what will be in the Chancellor's Summer budget in July but what we do know is that the financial pressures on local government will continue - and if anything, will increase. So too will the demands on the vital services we provide as more and more children and older people require those services.

### **Delivering savings**

This Council has always believed that we must provide the best value for every pound that we receive from Surrey residents. Six years ago we started our Public Value Review, a comprehensive look at every Council service and every Council department, to ensure we deliver both quality and value for money for Surrey residents and we have made substantial efficiencies and cut out waste year on year.

Like the deal we agreed a few weeks ago to buy energy as part of a consortium of local authorities, which will save up to £3.5m over the next five years for Surrey residents.

Despite demand for services continually increasing, we have reduced the unit cost of delivering many of those key services. For example, between 2010 and 2014, the number of people with learning difficulties who were helped by the Council increased by 538 but we have reduced the cost of providing this support by more than two thousand pounds per person, while also improving the quality of service.

We have improved services. We have met higher demand for services and we have brought costs down! Over the last five years this Council has achieved significant savings of £329m - all while delivering high quality services that matter to residents.

Services such as Adult Social Care - an extra 2,000 elderly and vulnerable people will need our help over the next three years, at a cost of £50m to the Council, and this is before the additional costs of the Care Act.

### **Partnership working**

Partnership working plays a key role in delivering local services. By collaborating with our partners in the Districts and Boroughs and with other local authorities across the South East, we are driving ever more efficiencies through continued innovation and co-operation.

Collaboration such as Orbis, our shared services partnership with East Sussex County Council, which could save £8m annually within four years for Surrey and Sussex residents.

Also, by working together with our partners across the wider public sector on public service transformation, like the Family Support Programme. Working with our

Boroughs, our Districts, our schools, the police and the National Health Service we have improved the lives of over one thousand Surrey families.

Or the closer work between our emergency services - for example, where the fire service is helping ambulance crews gain access to locked properties, saving vital minutes in life threatening emergencies.

Examples of One Team, working for the residents of Surrey. This partnership approach has encouraged us to think differently about the services that we provide:

*What are the services that residents want and how can we design services to prevent the problems in the first place?*

We can think differently with things like the Healthy Surrey campaigns promoting healthy eating, drinking, and active lifestyles.

*How do we deliver services in the way that residents want to use them today?*

We can by making better use of new technology to access information and services, this means more joined up services, co-designed with service users, to provide better outcomes and better value for Surrey residents.

And this is at the heart of this Council's approach and how we plan to deliver services in the future, working together with our partners, with the needs and aspirations of residents at the heart of everything we do.

### **Challenge ahead**

There are many challenges ahead. We all know that the financial pressures over the last few years have been immense. However, I believe Local Government in this country has been the most successful part of the public sector in how it has responded to this challenge, and Surrey has led the way.

But we all know that the challenges ahead will be greater still, we already know that we have to save another £67m this year alone - that's over £180,000 each and every day, and that is before any further savings that Government may yet ask us to make for them.

The independent Office of Budget Responsibility predicts that over the next two years there will be a much sharper squeeze on public spending than anything we have seen in the past five years.

So in order to meet that challenge we will refresh our Medium Term Financial Plan this summer this will ensure that our plans remain sound and reflect what we know about the Government's public expenditure plans and it will test the assumptions we made when we set the budget in February.

### **Devolution**

I believe we can only meet the challenges ahead if we are bold in our thinking. The Scottish referendum last year opened the door for devolution for England. In the last Parliament we saw devolution deals for Manchester, Sheffield and Leeds and we know that devolution plays a key part of the Government's programme. The Chancellor made this clear when he spoke in Manchester last week about City

Devolution Deals and I am delighted that he also opened the door for County Growth Deals.

I believe devolution is the greatest opportunity to decentralise power from Westminster and Whitehall to all councils and local communities, including counties!

Devolution means greater influence and control on the decisions about local services:

- To create the jobs and the infrastructure to grow the local economy and secure Surrey's economic success
- To allow us to continue contributing to the nation's recovery
- To make our communities great places to live and work.

The business case for devolution could not be clearer. With greater responsibility for local public finances, we can better meet the financial challenges of providing the services that residents want. We can deliver local solutions to meet local priorities, can focus funding where it matters most and where it will make the biggest difference and local partners can work together to better coordinate, plan and deliver the critical services that residents need.

It's what I call One Place, One Budget. local public services, working together, shared responsibility for achieving what our residents want, with increased transparency and accountability and a common aim - to make a real difference for our communities.

### **Message to Government**

So Madam Chairman and Members, I believe:

- Devolution must extend to County areas as well as City regions
- There can be no 'one size fits all' approach to devolution
- Top down centrally imposed solutions will not work
- Instead we must develop the right solutions for Surrey that will allow Surrey's economy to continue to grow strongly
- Supporting the wider region, London, and the UK as a whole
- And to deliver the services that our residents need.

And my message to Government is simple:

- The residents and business community of Surrey are ready for devolution
- A prosperous and expanding Surrey economy is good for the UK
- It's good for jobs, it's good for apprenticeships and it's really good for the Treasury

- So, trust us....we are ready – and we will deliver!

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion Madam Chairman, I believe devolution is the next step on the change journey that this Council started several years ago. I hope Members, Government, Surrey MPs and other partners will work with me to seize this opportunity and make it work.

To make a difference for our residents and our communities, we must be ambitious and confident.

I am confident in Surrey's Future and this Conservative Group is confident in Surrey's Future and I believe the whole Council can be confident in Surrey's Future.

**David Hodge**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**19 May 2015**

**PART 2 OF STANDING ORDERS  
CONSTITUTION AND APPOINTMENT OF  
CABINET AND COMMITTEES**

**CONSTITUTION OF CABINET – replacement page 83 of agenda**

31. The Cabinet will comprise the Leader of the Council, who will be its Chairman, the Deputy Leader and such other Members (up to a maximum of 8) as the Leader agrees. The Deputy Leader as Vice-Chairman of the Cabinet will preside if the Chairman is absent.

**CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEES**

32. The constitution of the committees of the Council is as follows:

<b>Name of Committee</b>	<b>Members of the Council</b>	<b>Ex-officio Members</b>	<b>Other Members</b>	<b>Total</b>
Cabinet	Leader, Deputy Leader +up to 8	-	-	up to 10
Select Committees:				
Council Overview Board	15	2	-	17
Adult Social Care Social Care Services Board	12 15	2	-	14 17
Children & Education Education and Skills	12	2	-	14
Communities Resident Experience Board	12	2	-	14
Environment & Transport Economic Prosperity, Environment & Highways Board	15	2	-	17
Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board	12	2	3	15 17
Audit and Governance	6	4	-	10
People, Performance and Development Committee	6	2	-	8
Planning & Regulatory	12	4	-	15 16
Surrey Pension Fund Board	6	-	4	10
Local Committees:				
One for each district/borough area	Between 5 and 10		Between 5 and 10	Between 10 and 20

## ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY – 2015/16

### Report of the Chief Executive

1. The Council is asked to formally review the proportional political allocation of places on committees and to adopt a scheme of proportionality for the Council year 2015/16.
2. The Local Government and Housing Act 1989 requires local authorities to review committee membership and political representation annually.
3. By law, seats on committees must be allocated in proportion to the political composition of the Council. An authority can only decide that it wishes to adopt an arrangement other than a proportional one if no Member votes against it.
4. The number of seats of each group on the Council and the resulting percentages are as follows:

Conservative	Liberal Democrat	Residents' Association & Independent	UKIP	Other*
58	9	9	3	2
71.6%	11.11%	11.11%	3.7%	2.47%

\* The Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 require a constituted political group to be two or more members.

5. In determining the allocation of seats on ordinary committees, the proportion that each political group forms of the total membership of the Council is applied to the total number of elected Member seats on each committee. Fractional entitlements of less than one half are rounded down and entitlements of one half or more are rounded up. So that this process of rounding does not result in advantage to one political group, the aggregate membership of all the ordinary committees must also be in line with the proportions on the County Council.
6. With that in mind a scheme of proportionality for 2015/16 is attached at Annex 1.

### RECOMMENDATION

That the committee sizes and scheme of proportionality as set out in Annex 1 be adopted for 2015/16.

---

**CONTACT**

Liz Mills  
Democratic Services Lead Manager

**TEL NO:**

020 8541 7608

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

Local Government and Housing Act 1989  
Proportional Representation Table  
Constitution of the Council

---

## ANNEX 1

## SCHEME OF PROPORTIONALITY 2015/16

	CON	LIB DEM	RA& IND	UKIP	Other	Total
SCRUTINY BOARDS						
Council Overview	11	2	2	0	0	15
Social Care Services	10	2	2	1	0	15
Education and Skills	9	1	1	0	1	12
Resident Experience	9	1	1	0	1	12
Economic Prosperity, Environment & Highways	10	2	2	1	0	15
Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny	9	1	1	1	0	12
PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE	8	1	1	1	1	12
AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE	4	1	1	0	0	6
PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	4	1	1	0	0	6
SURREY PENSION FUND BOARD	4	1	1	0	0	6
	78	13	13	4	3	111
<u>NON-PROPORTIONAL BODIES</u>						
MEMBER CONDUCT PANEL	7	1	2	0	0	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>121</b>

**Note:** Local Committees comprise the County Councillors for the electoral divisions within each Borough/District area and are not therefore required to be politically proportional.

**ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL: 19 May 2015**

**ITEM 14: APPOINTMENT OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES**

**COUNCIL OVERVIEW**

<p><b><i>Conservative (11)</i></b></p> <p>Mark Brett-Warburton          Bill Chapman          Bob Gardner          Michael Gosling          Zully Grant-Duff          David Harmer          David Ivison          Colin Kemp          David Munro          Denise Saliagopoulos          Keith Witham</p>	<p><b><i>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (2)</i></b></p> <p>Nick Harrison          Eber Kington</p>
<p><b><i>Liberal Democrats (2)</i></b></p> <p>Stephen Cooksey          Hazel Watson</p>	

**SOCIAL CARE SERVICES**

<p><b><i>Conservative (10)</i></b></p> <p>Ramon Gray          Ken Gulati          Marisa Heath          Margaret Hicks          Saj Hussain          Yvonna Lay          Adrian Page          Dorothy Ross-Tomlin          Barbara Thomson          Keith Witham</p>	<p><b><i>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (2)</i></b></p> <p>Ernest Mallett          Chris Townsend</p>
	<p><b><i>Liberal Democrats (2)</i></b></p> <p>Pauline Searle          Fiona White</p>

	<p><b><i>UK Independence Party (1)</i></b></p> <p>Daniel Jenkins</p>
--	--

**EDUCATION AND SKILLS**

<p><b><i>Conservative (9)</i></b></p> <p>Liz Bowes Mark Brett-Warburton Ben Carasco Denis Fuller Margaret Hicks Colin Kemp Mary Lewis Marsha Moseley Chris Norman</p>	<p><b><i>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (1)</i></b></p> <p>Chris Townsend</p>
	<p><b><i>Liberal Democrats (1)</i></b></p> <p>David Goodwin</p>
	<p><b><i>Other (1)</i></b></p> <p>Robert Evans</p>

**RESIDENT EXPERIENCE**

<p><b><i>Conservative (9)</i></b></p> <p>Mike Bennison Marisa Heath Colin Kemp Rachael I Lake Yvonna Lay Mary Lewis Chris Pitt Barbara Thomson Alan Young</p>	<p><b><i>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (1)</i></b></p> <p>Jan Mason</p>
	<p><b><i>Liberal Democrats (1)</i></b></p> <p>John Orrick</p>
	<p><b><i>Other (1)</i></b></p> <p>Robert Evans</p>

## ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT & HIGHWAYS

<p><b>Conservative (10)</b></p> <p>Mike Bennison Natalie Bramhall Steve Cosser Pat Frost Bob Gardner Zully Grant-Duff Ken Gulati David Harmer Richard Wilson Victoria Young</p>	<p><b>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (2)</b></p> <p>Nikki Barton Peter Hickman</p>
	<p><b>Liberal Democrats (2)</b></p> <p>Stephen Cooksey David Goodwin</p>
	<p><b>UK Independence Party (1)</b></p> <p>George Johnson</p>

## WELLBEING AND HEALTH SCRUTINY

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

<p><b>Substitutes (up to 7):-</b></p> <p>David Goodwin Stella Lallement</p>	<p><b>Substitutes (up to 2):-</b></p> <p>Daniel Jenkins George Johnson</p>
---	--

**PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

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

**AUDIT & GOVERNANCE**

<p><b>Conservative (4)</b></p> <p>Bill Barker          Denis Fuller          Tim Hall          Saj Hussain</p>	<p><b>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (1)</b></p> <p>Stuart Selleck</p>
<p><b>Liberal Democrats (1)</b></p> <p>Will Forster</p>	

**PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

<p><b>Conservative (4)</b></p> <p>Ken Gulati          David Hodge          Denise Le Gal          Peter Martin</p> <p><b>Substitutes (up to 7 Cabinet Members):-</b></p> <p>Clare Curran          Helyn Clack          Mel Few          John Furey          Mike Goodman          Linda Kemeny          Richard Walsh</p>	<p><b>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (1)</b></p> <p>Nick Harrison</p> <p><b>Substitutes (up to 7):-</b></p> <p>Ernest Mallett          Stuart Selleck</p>
<p><b>Liberal Democrats (1)</b></p> <p>Hazel Watson</p> <p><b>Substitutes (up to 7):-</b></p> <p>David Goodwin          John Orrick</p>	

## SURREY PENSION FUND BOARD

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

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

## MEMBER CONDUCT PANEL\*

<b>Conservative (7)</b> Mark Brett-Warburton Michael Gosling David Harmer David Ivison Sally Marks Dorothy Ross-Tomlin Nick Skellett	<b>Residents' Association &amp; Independent (2)</b> Nick Harrison Eber Kington
<b>Liberal Democrats (1)</b> John Orrick	

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

## **POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (1)**

<b><i>Nominations received:</i></b>	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
-------------------------------------	---------------------

### **Recommendations:**

- (1) To appoint Members to serve on the Committees of the Council for the Council year 2015/16 in accordance with the wishes of political groups.**
- (2) To authorise the Chief Executive to make changes to the membership of any of the Council's Committees as necessary during the Council year in accordance with the wishes of political groups.**
- (3) To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Woking borough area to serve on the Woking Joint Committee for the Council year 2015/16.**
- (4) To appoint the remaining County Councillors for each district/borough area to serve on the appropriate Local Committee for the Council year 2015/16, and to authorise the Chief Executive to appoint an equal number of district/borough councillors to the Local Committees following nominations by the district and borough councils, which they should be requested to make politically proportional to their Membership.**
- (5) To appoint the Council's representative to the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for the Council year 2015/16.**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY 19 MAY 2015**

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

**MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES**

**(1) MRS CAROL COLEMAN (ASHFORD) TO ASK:**

The Surrey County Council apprenticeship scheme has helped many young people into employment, and is to be applauded.

But what is Surrey County Council doing to help the many disabled people in the county into employment. Disabled people would rather earn money and pay tax, then have to claim benefits, but do need support to find employment and to stay in work. If Access to Work is to be cut by the Government, it will be more difficult for those disabled people to work.

The Surrey Disability Register is a valuable tool for Surrey's disabled people, how many people are on the register, and are there any plans for changes to it or the way it is administered?

**Reply:**

I am pleased to inform you that the County Council has been taking very positive and active steps towards this.

One of the four priorities in the Fairness and Respect Strategy is to "reflect the population we serve, in particular disabled and younger people." The Council has set two aspirational targets for disabled and younger people. A series of leadership workshops across the Council has produced a set of actions each service has committed to take, to ensure we become a "disability friendly" employer. This plan was approved by the People, Performance & Development Committee in March 2014.

We also have a community engagement programme, working in partnership with the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People and Sight for Surrey. We have identified and delivered various activities, including:

- Employment promotional presentations in the eight Surrey Community Hubs to try and attract local people with a disability to consider applying for Surrey's jobs
- Working with partners on the procurement of Talentlink (our recruitment system) to make sure the system is as accessible as possible

- Delivered a workshop on becoming a disability friendly organisation at the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People's AGM and
- Carried out a comprehensive Access Audit/building tour of County Hall to help inform improvements to access for building users with a disability. This audit will set common access standards for all of our main buildings.

In relation to Access to Work, the County Council will continue its practice of supporting and developing staff with the help they need to do their jobs. Where required, this involves directly funding adjustments, many of which are not accommodated via Access To Work. For example, we have pre-purchased licenses for support software, like JAWS and Dragon, to help visually impaired staff. This is so that we are able to be responsive and flexible to requests. We are currently developing detailed, practical guidance to assist colleagues in applying to Access To Work, to be presented at a workshop facilitated by the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People.

In relation to apprenticeships, the County Council's existing apprenticeship scheme is open to all and we currently have some young people with disabilities in our scheme. We have also piloted a traineeship scheme which we hope to roll out further. A traineeship scheme gives access to those who do not have the qualifications to pursue an apprenticeship. We also help with work experience and training in employability skills. The traineeship, together with the mix of work experience and training, brings the young person up to the level where they can work towards an apprenticeship qualification. We were successful with 3 out of 5 young people with disabilities moving them from a traineeship to an apprenticeship with our pilot and hope to replicate this further for those young people with disabilities who cannot currently access apprenticeships.

Overall, the Council has made some promising progress, however we are aware that we still have a lot of challenges and meaningful and sustained progress will take time to be realised.

## **MS DENISE LE GAL, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS SERVICES**

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

On 6 May 2014, Full Council adopted my motion that Surrey move towards being a Fair Trade county. Could the Council please update Members on what progress has been made towards achieving this goal?

### **Reply:**

I am pleased to take this opportunity to advise Members of the progress that has been made so far, and our plans to further develop our commitment to Fair Trade.

The Fairtrade towns already gaining, or have gained, an accreditation in the county of Surrey are Addlestone, Dorking, Godalming, Guildford, Haslemere, Leatherhead, Lingfield and Dormansland, Rushmoor, Tatsfield and Woking. This is a fantastic achievement in which all my colleagues should be proud.

We have further developed our approach to procurement, in response to the Public Services (Social Values) Act 2012, and now ensure that we are giving consideration to Fair Trade products when awarding new contracts. This further supports the Council's commitment to the overall wellbeing of our County, and in using our procurement processes to support the delivery of our Corporate Strategy.

We are beginning to plan how we can further work with District and Boroughs, Surrey Businesses, Voluntary & Community Sector (VCS) and Community and Resident groups in order to continue our move towards being a Fair Trade county. Our plans include how we can use existing networks and media channels with the public to highlight the Council's commitments and publicise Fair Trade events to the residents of Surrey.

**MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

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

Could the Council say how and why Friday 8 May was chosen as the most suitable day for announcing the proposed changes to local bus services in the County?

**Reply:**

On Monday 11 May 2015, Surrey County Council launched a public consultation on proposed changes to local bus services. The proposed changes and consultation were announced to Members and stakeholders on Friday 8 May to give a few days' notice ahead of the public launch.

*County Council meeting – 19 May 2015*

**Statements by Members**

I am taking this opportunity to speak today because of the concerns which have been raised with me by my residents, by users of the Meadow Sure Start Service, by local Borough Councillors and staff at the Centre.

After a dismal start to the proceedings as the Divisional Member for this Meadow Sure Start Centre, I was not consulted on the plans, omitted from emails and had to be told of the potential closure by staff members, it looked like we had a way forward. Recent communications from the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning indicated that a recommendation was going to go to Cabinet and consultation with parents and interested parties was going to happen.

On the strength of that information, in April, I invited an officer to our Local committee who updated all Epsom and Ewell Local Committee Members on the current situation, and outlined the plans to bring this matter to some form of conclusion. Parents, staff and residents were determining their response and strategy based on information given by Surrey County Council only for those plans to be called to a halt three weeks later by the email of 6 May from the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning.

The email stated that "Officers will continue to develop the option of other centres offering their services to affected families, if a decision to close centres is made". Surely this type of investigative analysis should have been undertaken and known well in advance of any centre being identified for closure and should have been one of the selection criteria?

The email also states "We will continue to engage with children's centres and health partners that could be affected, as well as the schools and organisations that manage the children's centres". Once again, no mention of affected Divisional Members being kept in the loop.

And finally the most disturbing and the most worrying comment of the email said "If a consultation goes ahead". Sure Start Centres which were originally targeted for potential closure are now even more uncertain about what the future holds.

Targeting Centres before detailed analysis, setting dates for consultation which may never happen. This is no way to treat a key local service, let alone the staff of the of the Sure Start Centres as well as the parents and children who have gained much from the work undertaken at these locations.

My residents and those connected to the Meadow Sure Start Centre feel that the time has come for this administration to lay out a clear plan with timescales and a vision for the Sure Start Centres in Surrey so we can all be clear about what the future holds for our local children.

**Mr John Beckett  
County Councillor for Ewell  
19 May 2015**

**CABINET MEMBER UPDATE TO FULL COUNCIL**

**Name: Michael Gosling**

**Portfolio: Public Health and Health and Wellbeing**

The board believes it is appropriate two years after the establishment of the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) following 2 years of a shadow existence to establish our progress to date. The Board was set up in accordance with the Health and Social Care Act 2012. This brought a fundamental difference to the commissioning of healthcare with the closure of the Primary Care Trust and the taking over of the commissioning role by the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) in a more localised format. The CCGs are led by Doctors although they have a management team alongside.

It is appropriate here to have a quick snapshot of the situation in Surrey before April 2013, when the implementation of the provisions of the Act took place. Until that time under the previous system the relationships between Surrey County Council and the medical care community had been difficult at the best of times. The members of the HWB by learning to understand the complexities of the service delivery, the financial pressures on either side have been able to change the environment in which care is commissioned and provided. This change of relationship and therefore delivery has been to the benefit of the residents/patients in Surrey. In the Boards view this is the best outcome that we could have hoped for. We now have an environment in which service improvement can progress even when delivery pressures can cause friction and concern. We have learning to resolve our differences.

The Act and the pre-ceding White Papers place an obligation on all of the health community to integrate. This along with the then Director of Adult Social Care we understood from the outset. The Act itself has been little understood in the media which at times has not been helpful. The case can be demonstrated that in Surrey the system has led to improvements. There are of course those who will blame any perceived problem on a change but it should be noted that six large organisations, the CCGs have been set up without any negative reaction in the press. The meetings in public have been formatted to allow comment where ever possible.

The Health & Wellbeing Board is unusual in its membership as it includes not only councillors but also council directors, each of the CCG Chairs (all practicing GPs), representatives of the boroughs and districts, the Chief Constable and representative of NHS England. The current list of the HWB is attached. The Board represents all the commissioners for Health and Social Care in the county and therefore cannot claim that they are not in some way responsible for the outcomes of the system. But it is not a commissioning board in itself, it is a board of commissioners not a commissioning board. The board has a number of functions, the delivery of the joint strategic needs assessment, the joint health strategy and is charged with the integration agenda. Health watch has the patients champion is there to ensure their voice is heard.

Using the JSNA, whilst in shadow form in July 2012, the board developed a health strategy for Surrey and this was published with five priorities:

- Improving children's health and wellbeing

- Developing a preventive approach
- Promoting emotional wellbeing and mental health
- Improving older adults' health and wellbeing
- Safeguarding the population

Through a mixture of formal and informal meetings the board developed a strategy for each of the identified priorities which were established on the slogan of "what can we do better together". There being many health matters which are a worry to Surrey's residents but are mainly a medical matter, eg cancer or heart disease. However there is still a need for social support by individuals. We would like to briefly describe the progress to date.

### **Promoting emotional wellbeing and mental health**

The system that we had although well meaning was not joined up and over a period of a year of debate and consultation we arrived at a new joined up commissioning structure and strategy for delivery accepted by all sides and we hope that it will lead to better outcomes for Surrey resident patients.

This can be found at <http://www.healthysurrey.org.uk/a/7364897-7972953>

### **Improving older adults' health and wellbeing**

Work commenced on the older peoples strategy following the formal establishment of the board. This work served as a template for the introduction of the Better Care Fund.

The Better Care Fund is based on the work that the board carried out across the county as to how it was possible to look after both medically and socially the increase in number of frail elderly. The introduction of the Better Care Fund brought an unexpected format to the matter; the submission accepted by the Department of Health is one of the longest and most complex documents in the Council's recent history. The alignment of the health and social care to deliver the priorities should lead to a more comprehensive service for residents/patients.

The full document can be found at <http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/Resource>.

### **Improving children's health & wellbeing**

There is no single resolution to this matter but a change of approach to what in the words of the director for the Children's Service, has this described "as a new normality" ie that both sides, medical and social, work together in a way that should happen but was missing in the past. This is leading to better outcomes for children.

### **Developing a preventative approach**

The transfer of public health to the local authority has meant that this matter can now be approached in a comprehensive manner both at county and local level, the wider determinants of health can be tackled and the priorities are encapsulated in the Director of Public Health's Annual Report:

1. Tobacco
2. Alcohol
3. Diet

4. Seasonal Health
5. Physical Activity
6. Air Quality
7. Unintentional Injuries

The need is to fulfil the life expectations of every individual and reduce the postcode lottery that affects many individuals. The Surrey Prevention Strategy can be found in the work of the County Council, the Boroughs and Districts and the Clinical Commissioning Groups strategies.

For progress on this work please see  
[http://members.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/g3601/Agenda%20frontsheet%20Thursday%2012-Mar-2015%](http://members.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/g3601/Agenda%20frontsheet%20Thursday%2012-Mar-2015%20)

### **Safeguarding the Population**

All commissioners have to recognise that the decisions taken need to ensure the safeguarding of every adult and child is at all times paramount. Responsibility for the safeguarding issues lies initially with the safeguarding boards but the Health and Wellbeing Board recognises its responsibilities in this direction.

The Board's agenda now needs to recognise that the progress to date although substantive is a job just begun and there is a process to ensure that the decisions and recommendations accepted by all parties are carrying out the intentions of the Board. If needs be making amendments and/or corrections to achieve the required effect.

There is in hand a review of the joint strategy using a revised JSNA to look at where working together our health system in Surrey can be further improved. This will be a never ending requirement, both as people live longer and as medical science changes the way in which care can be provided. For progress on the revision of the JSNA please see Cabinet Statement below:



CABINET MEMBER  
UPDATE TO FULL COI

If asked what the greatest achievement of the HWB was then we think that members of the Board could answer that we have learnt to work together to survive our disagreements and to be responsive to the needs of our resident patients. The Board belongs to all its members.

**19 May 2015**

## **Cabinet Statement Annex**

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

