

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 9 OCTOBER 2018 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

	Mary Angell		Julie Iles
*	Ayesha Azad		Naz Islam
	John Beckett		Colin Kemp
	Mike Bennison		Eber Kington
	Chris Botten		Graham Knight
	Liz Bowes		Rachael I Lake
	Natalie Bramhall		Yvonna Lay
*	Mark Brett-Warburton		David Lee
	Ben Carasco		Mary Lewis
	Bill Chapman		Andy MacLeod
	Helyn Clack	*	Ernest Mallett MBE
	Stephen Cooksey		David Mansfield
	Clare Curran		Peter Martin
	Nick Darby		Jan Mason
	Paul Deach		Cameron McIntosh
*	Graham Ellwood		Sinead Mooney
	Jonathan Essex		Charlotte Morley
	Robert Evans		Marsha Moseley
	Tim Evans		Tina Mountain
	Mel Few		Bernie Muir
	Will Forster		Mark Nuti
	John Furey		John O'Reilly
	Matt Furniss		Tim Oliver
	Bob Gardner		Andrew Povey
	Mike Goodman	*	Wyatt Ramsdale
	Angela Goodwin	*	Penny Rivers
	David Goodwin		Tony Samuels
*	Zully Grant-Duff		Stephen Spence
	Alison Griffiths		Lesley Steeds
	Ken Gulati		Peter Szanto
	Tim Hall		Keith Taylor
	Kay Hammond		Barbara Thomson
	Richard Hampson		Rose Thorn
	David Harmer		Chris Townsend
	Jeffrey Harris		Denise Turner-Stewart
	Nick Harrison		Richard Walsh
	Edward Hawkins		Hazel Watson
*	Marisa Heath		Fiona White
	David Hodge CBE	*	Keith Witham
	Saj Hussain		Victoria Young

\*absent

## **62/18 CHAIRMAN [Item 1]**

The Chief Executive Officer introduced the meeting and announce that item 1, Part 2 would be considered before Item 1, Part 1.

### 2. Election of Temporary Chairman

Under the motion proposed by Mr Hodge, seconded by Mr Hall, it was unanimously:

#### **RESOLVED:**

that Mr David Harmer be elected temporary Chairman of the Council to oversee the election of the Chairman for the remainder of the council year 2018/19.

### 1. Amendment of Article 4

The Leader of the Council introduced the report. It was unanimously

#### **RESOLVED:**

- a. That Council approved the amendment of Article 4.03 of the County Council's Constitution regarding the arrangements for Chairing the Council to include the following wording: 'In the event of an in-year vacancy in either role, an election will be held for a replacement to serve until the next Annual General Meeting of the Council.'
- b. That these changes be incorporated into the Council's Constitution and published on the Council's website.

### 3. Election of Chairman for the remainder of the Council year 2018/19.

Under the motion proposed by Mr Hodge, seconded by Mr Harrison, it was unanimously:

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Mr Anthony David Samuels be elected Chairman of the Council for the remainder of the council year 2018/19.

### 4. Declaration of Acceptance of Office

Mr Samuels made the statutory declaration of office and took the chair.

The newly elected Chairman expressed his thanks to the Members of the Council for electing him as Chairman.

## **63/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]**

Apologies for absence have been received from Keith Witham, Wyatt Ramsdale, Ernest Mallett, Marisa Heath, Ayesha Azad, Graham Ellwood, Penny River, Mark Brett-Warburton and Zully Grant-Duff.

### **64/18 MINUTES [Item 3]**

Members were notified of a correction in minute 56/18, item 8 (iii), where it should read 'nitrogen dioxide' rather than 'carbon dioxide'.

The amended minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 22 May 2018 were confirmed and signed.

### **65/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

There were none.

### **66/18 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 5]**

The Chairman:

- led a silent tribute in remembrance for Richard Wilson, former Council Councillor.
- congratulated the Surrey County Cricket team on winning the County Championship.
- informed Members that he had attended the RAF 100 Aircraft tour to celebrate their official 100<sup>th</sup> birthday.
- congratulated the Surrey Pensions Team and Cllr Tim Evans, chairman of the Surrey Pension Fund Committee, on receiving the Scheme Governance Award from the Local Authority Pension Fund for the second year in a row.

### **67/18 VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 6]**

Upon the motion of Mrs Lewis, seconded by Mr Botten, it was:

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Mrs Helyn Clack be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council for the remainder of the council year 2018/19.

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

Mrs Clack was invested by Mr Samuels with the Vice-Chairman's badge. she made the statutory declaration of office and expressed thanks to the Members of the Council for electing her as Vice-Chairman.

### **68/18 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 7]**

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

Members raised the following topics:

- That they shared the Leader of the Council's concern with the lack of funding for Council services.
- That the lack of funding should not lead to a rise of victimhood culture in the Council.

- That 'Deals' should be fair and not one sided.
- The Council should continue to provide services to the most vulnerable.
- Raised concern with the relationship between local and Central Government
- That Local Authorities should not be forced to cut services to residents due to unfair funding.
- That they supported the Councils approach to invest to save.
- They hoped that the budget puts the residents first.
- That the Council should considering renaming the approach of 'deals'.

## 69/18 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 8]

### Questions:

Notice of 9 questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in a supplementary agenda on 8 October 2018.

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

**(Q1) Mrs Hazel Watson** asked the Cabinet Lead Member for Place if he felt it was appropriate to have a 60mph speed limit on Abinger Lane in Abinger Common, Surrey. The Cabinet Member stated that he was unable to comment on specific cases but that he would speak to Cllr Watson outside the meeting.

**(Q2) Mr Robert Evans** asked the Leader of the Council if he agreed that Central Government had not supported Northamptonshire County Council sufficiently and further asked if he felt Surrey County Council was being supported appropriately.

The Leader of the Council stated that he was aware that the Local Government Authority (LGA) had provided Northamptonshire County Council with advice on their situation but that he was unable to comment on the actions of Central Government. He suggested that closer links with its District and Borough partners might have proved beneficial for Northamptonshire County Council.

**(Q3) Mr Chris Botten** requested greater transparency from the Leader of the Council regarding the appointment and retention of consultants on the transformation programme and for the People, Performance and Development Committee to be given information about their terms and conditions. The Leader confirmed that PPDC had certain responsibilities regarding officers' appointments and would bring information to it to ensure control and transparency.

**(Q4) Mr Jonathan Essex** asked the Cabinet Member for Children for confirmation that the vacant dedicated Youth and Community Worker posts would be reinstated and whether they would be in post to run open-access youth club sessions in District and Boroughs. The Leader of the Council stated that this was not an appropriate question for a Cabinet Member and agreed to provide a response outside of the meeting.

**(Q6) Mr Jonathan Essex** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for confirmation that the Council would continue to invest to save to cut waste disposal and increase recycling rates. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the Council would continue to work with Boroughs and District to

increase curb-side recycling and recycling at Community Recycling Centres. The Cabinet Member further highlighted that Surrey had the second highest recycling rate in the country for two tier authorities.

**(Q7) Mrs Hazel Watson** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for confirmation that the risk management policy would be revised to protect residents from diseased falling Ash Trees. The Cabinet Member confirmed that officers were aware of the situation and were doing all they can do to keep the public safe. It was highlighted to Members that it was expected that 95% of Ash Trees in the country would be lost over the next few years.

**(Q8) Mr Jonathan Essex** highlighted a recent parliamentary report on cycling and asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport if the Council would increase its investment in cycling to promote clean transport in Surrey. The Cabinet Member said the Council had demonstrated that it was committed to reducing emissions and to increasing the health of the public by promoting cycling. He added that although the Council had promoted cycling in various ways it was still the responsibility of the public to actually cycle.

**Cabinet Member Briefings:** these were also published with the supplementary on 8 October 2018.

Members made the following comments:

**Cabinet Member for Community Services:** on the level of fire cover there will be at the new Fire Station in Spelthorne and what assurances the Cabinet could give on the level of cover going forward. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the fire service was being remodelled and that the integrated risk management plan was being refreshed to look at what was required to deliver community protection in the fire service. She further stated that the fire cover in Spelthorne would remain until the remodel was completed.

**Cabinet Member for Children:** was asked for clarification on the detail in her update as it suggested that there was no longer a waiting list for Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS). The Cabinet Member apologised for any misunderstanding and informed Members that the update stated that a target outlined in the interim plan to eliminate a back log in the service had been met. She further stated that she was aware that the service still faced issues with long waiting times for service users and that work was being done to find solutions.

Members also made comments about the transformation of the children's service and if it was time for a new Cabinet Member to see the changes to a conclusion. The Cabinet Member confirmed to Members that she was confident that the Director of Children's Services and his team could execute the transformation of the service effectively. The Cabinet Member further emphasised that she strongly believed she could lead a successful transformation of the service.

**Cabinet Lead Member for Place:** on the work he had done to address the need for road repairs throughout Surrey.

## 70/18 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 9]

There were none.

## 71/18 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 10]

### Item 8(i)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.  
Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr David Hodge moved the motion, which was:

‘This Council recognises Surrey residents’ concerns about the condition of the county’s roads and the need to ensure they are well-maintained and fit for purpose.

In order to draw Parliament’s attention to the unfair formula applied by Government to the funding of road maintenance and improvement, county councillor Edward Hawkins earlier this year launched the following petition:

*“We call upon the Government to reform the Fairer Funding Formula to ensure there is enough money for road repair and up-keep. The current method for calculating the grant for such work unfairly penalises Surrey. The calculation should give more weight to traffic flow and level of usage.*

*Surrey has almost 3,500 miles of roads with over 4.8 million miles travelled on those roads per year. The grant received by Surrey from the Government is about £4,000 per million vehicle miles travelled. A Neighbouring county has a figure of £5,500 per million vehicle miles travelled.*

*The recent Pothole Fund announced by the Government which uses the same formula saw Surrey get £1.8m, whereas one of our neighbouring counties received £2.9m, and a quiet west country area was given £4.4m.”*

I call upon all Members of this Council to support the petition and do all within their power to help it reach 100,000 signatures, thus enabling this vital issue to be debated in Parliament.’

Mr Hodge made the following points:

- That it was time for Central Government to support Surrey.
- That Surrey had some of the busiest roads and traffic flows in the country.
- That it was important for parliament to debate and be aware of the current situation for roads in Surrey.
- That a message should be sent to all road and transportation users to sign the petition.

The motion was formally seconded by Edward Hawkins who reserved the right to speak.

Mr Cooksey moved an amendment which was formally seconded by Mrs White.

The amendment was as follows (with additional words in bold and deletions crossed through):

This Council recognises Surrey residents' concerns about the condition of the county's roads and the need to ensure they are well-maintained and fit for purpose.

**The Council notes that:**

1. In order to draw Parliament's attention to the unfair formula applied by Government to the funding of road maintenance and improvement, county councillor Edward Hawkins earlier this year launched the following petition:

*"We call upon the Government to reform the Fairer Funding Formula to ensure there is enough money for road repair and up-keep. The current method for calculating the grant for such work unfairly penalises Surrey. The calculation should give more weight to traffic flow and level of usage.*

*Surrey has almost 3,500 miles of roads with over 4.8 million miles travelled on those roads per year. The grant received by Surrey from the Government is about £4,000 per million vehicle miles travelled. A Neighbouring county has a figure of £5,500 per million vehicle miles travelled.*

*The recent Pothole Fund announced by the Government which uses the same formula saw Surrey get £1.8m, whereas one of our neighbouring counties received £2.9m, and a quiet west country area was given £4.4m."*

2. **The petition, which has been circulating for some months, had collected only 7,256 signatures by 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2018 but requires 100,000 to ensure a Parliamentary debate;**
3. **It seems unlikely that a Parliamentary debate would achieve any useful purpose given that it is the Conservative government, supported by Surrey's Conservative Ministers and MPs, that is responsible for devising and implementing the funding formula that has created this situation.**

**This Council resolves:**

- 1, **To instruct the Leader of the Council to intensify pressure on his Conservative Parliamentary colleagues, particularly Surrey's Conservative Ministers and MPs, to seek to provide a funding formula that would ensure that adequate resources are made available for essential county services including roads, social care, children and the environment;**
2. **To call upon all Conservative county councillors to campaign vigorously to change national Conservative policies on local government funding in order to protect Surrey residents from savage cuts in services.**

~~I call upon all Members of this Council to support the petition and do all within their power to help it reach 100,000 signatures, thus enabling this vital issue to be debated in Parliament.~~

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

- That this was a desperate attempt by the Leader of the Council to try to influence the national Government
- The number of signatures needed was unrealistic for the timeframe.
- The petition had not received more support because it was irrelevant.
- That the issues were due to Conservative government policy.
- Asked if Members felt roads were more important than front line services.
- A parliamentary debate would not fix the issues on roads.
- That it was the responsibility of Conservative Members to speak to their colleagues in parliament.

Mrs White, as seconder to the amendment, reserved her right to speak.

Five Members spoke on the amendment and made the following comments:

- That the amendment turned the motion into a game of political football.
- That the original motion was to help the residents of Surrey.
- That the Liberal Democrat Party had previously opposed the budget which provided more funding to services.
- That it was the duty of every Member to contact Members of Parliament (MPs) to highlight the need for additional funding in Surrey.
- That the motion was specifically about funding for roads.

Mrs White, seconder of the amendment, made the following points:

- That she did contact her MP but felt she was not being listened to.
- That funding was needed for all services
- That more detail was needed in the budget
- Members need to accept that it is a Conservative Government who are underfunding the council

The amendment was put to the vote with 16 Members voting for, 51 voting against and 1 abstention.

Therefore, the amendment to the substantive motion was lost.

Returning to the substantive motion, Mr Hawkins, as seconder, made the following comments:

- Provided Members with statistics on the locations of those who had signed the petition.
- That the petition was not political and was for the benefit of all Surrey residents.
- The Transport Select Committee in Central Government were aware of the petition.
- That there was still time to obtain the signatures required.
- All Members should support the petition.

The motion was put to a vote with 61 members voting for, 0 against and 9 abstentions.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council recognises Surrey residents' concerns about the condition of the county's roads and the need to ensure they are well-maintained and fit for purpose.

In order to draw Parliament's attention to the unfair formula applied by Government to the funding of road maintenance and improvement, county councillor Edward Hawkins earlier this year launched the following petition:

*"We call upon the Government to reform the Fairer Funding Formula to ensure there is enough money for road repair and up-keep. The current method for calculating the grant for such work unfairly penalises Surrey. The calculation should give more weight to traffic flow and level of usage.*

*Surrey has almost 3,500 miles of roads with over 4.8 million miles travelled on those roads per year. The grant received by Surrey from the Government is about £4,000 per million vehicle miles travelled. A Neighbouring county has a figure of £5,500 per million vehicle miles travelled.*

*The recent Pothole Fund announced by the Government which uses the same formula saw Surrey get £1.8m, whereas one of our neighbouring counties received £2.9m, and a quiet west country area was given £4.4m."*

I call upon all Members of this Council to support the petition and do all within their power to help it reach 100,000 signatures, thus enabling this vital issue to be debated in Parliament.

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

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

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

'Government has set out – in the Airports National Policy Statement - the policy framework and specific principles that will be used to assess any application to construct a northwest runway at Heathrow. In the light of these developments it is timely for this Council to reaffirm its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in December 2016 and to make clear its position on Heathrow's expansion.

This Council:

1. Recognises the crucial role of Heathrow in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment for the Surrey economy and attracting major businesses.
2. Urges that the environmental and infrastructure issues associated with expansion are satisfactorily addressed.
3. Continues to engage with Heathrow management, alongside other local authorities, Local Enterprise Partnerships and other organisations as part of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group, on its expansion plans in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey, its residents and businesses.
4. Continues to press for proper compensation for residents who are affected by the expansion plans.
5. Emphasises that the necessary infrastructure should be in place before any new runway comes into operation together with appropriate

mitigation measures and commitments to address environmental impacts.

6. Calls on the Government to prioritise a southern rail access scheme, which supports strategic transport and economic objectives and contributes to addressing environmental impacts, to be in operation before any new runway comes into service.'

Mr Goodman made the following points:

- That parliament have now supported the expansion of Heathrow Airport
- Listed various organisations who are based in Surrey and the benefits the expansion would bring to jobs and apprenticeships.
- That Surrey needed to have the right infrastructure in place to support the third runway at Heathrow Airport.
- Air pollution issues needed to be addressed with sustainable solutions.
- That it was essential for the Council to implement funding effectively and appropriately.
- The Council must continue to work in partnership with Heathrow Airport.

The motion was formally seconded by Nick Darby, who reserved the right to speak.

Seven Members made the following points:

- That they supported the expansion due to its economic impacts but acknowledged that it will impact residents' lives.
- That Surrey needed to have the correct infrastructure.
- That the expansion and car parking area would have great an impact on Spelthorne.
- Highlighted a recently published report by climate scientists and raised air quality concerns relating to the expansion.
- Stressed that Surrey residents would be negatively affected by the expansion.
- That the appropriate Select Committee could explore further options for preparing for the expansion.
- Residents will suffer due to congestion on the M25.
- Asked that the County Council worked closely with the Spelthorne Joint Committee to find solutions.
- Highlighted the importance of Members understanding the impact of the expansion on Surrey.

Mr Darby, as seconder, made the following comments:

- Stated that Surrey needed to be fully prepared before the expansion.
- Raised concerns about the impact on air quality.
- Felt that a car park of 25,000 spaces was not sensible.
- Stressed the need for Members to be informed of what was happening.

The motion was put to a vote with 68 members voting for, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

Government has set out – in the Airports National Policy Statement - the policy framework and specific principles that will be used to assess any application to

construct a northwest runway at Heathrow. In the light of these developments it is timely for this Council to reaffirm its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in December 2016 and to make clear its position on Heathrow's expansion.

This Council:

1. Recognises the crucial role of Heathrow in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment for the Surrey economy and attracting major businesses.
2. Urges that the environmental and infrastructure issues associated with expansion are satisfactorily addressed.
3. Continues to engage with Heathrow management, alongside other local authorities, Local Enterprise Partnerships and other organisations as part of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group, on its expansion plans in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey, its residents and businesses.
4. Continues to press for proper compensation for residents who are affected by the expansion plans.
5. Emphasises that the necessary infrastructure should be in place before any new runway comes into operation together with appropriate mitigation measures and commitments to address environmental impacts.
6. Calls on the Government to prioritise a southern rail access scheme, which supports strategic transport and economic objectives and contributes to addressing environmental impacts, to be in operation before any new runway comes into service.'

### **Item 8(iii)**

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.  
Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Robert Evans moved

an amendment to the motion set out in the agenda for this meeting in his own name, as follows: (with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

Since 1 November 2015, when the Conservative Government's Modern Slavery Act came into force, Surrey County Council has a duty to notify the Secretary of State of any individual encountered in Surrey who they believe is a suspected victim of slavery or human trafficking.

The government states this duty is intended to gather statistics and help build a more comprehensive picture of the nature and scale of modern slavery.

Council welcomes the recent decision by Surrey Police to crack down on such offences and notes that the force secured their first modern slavery conviction in April 2018, with arrests in Elmbridge, Spelthorne and Tandridge amongst the 49 offences reported in 2017.

Modern Slavery occurs across Surrey's towns and villages. From nail bars in our towns, to car washes, farms, factories and restaurants up and down the county, thousands of people in Surrey could be victims.

Council notes that the annual reports of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board, considered and noted by the cabinet at their meetings in June 2017 and July 2018 both draw attention to this issue.

Surrey Adult Safeguarding Board observes that the term 'modern slavery' captures a whole range of types of exploitation, many of which could occur together in Surrey and elsewhere. These include:

- Human trafficking
- sexual exploitation
- forced labour and domestic servitude
- criminal exploitation
- other forms of exploitation include: forced begging; forced benefit fraud; forced marriage and illegal adoption.

Mindful of its legal responsibilities and moral duties, Surrey County Council therefore agrees to

1. Ensure its corporate procurement team have appropriate training to understand modern slavery.
2. Require its contractors to comply fully with the Modern Slavery Act 2015, wherever it applies, with contract termination as a potential sanction for non-compliance.
3. ~~Highlight to its suppliers~~ **Note** that contracted workers are free to join a trade union and are not to be treated unfairly for belonging to one.
4. Publicise its whistle-blowing system for staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
5. Require its tendered contractors to adopt a whistle-blowing policy which enables their staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
6. **Ensure that quality assurance safeguards are in place to protect its contractual spending and** ~~Review its contractual spending regularly to identify any potential issues with modern slavery.~~
7. Highlight for its suppliers any risks identified concerning modern slavery and refer them to the relevant agencies to be addressed.
8. Refer for investigation via the National Crime Agency's national referral mechanism any of its contractors identified as a cause for concern regarding modern slavery.
9. Report publicly on the implementation of this policy annually.

Members agreed to accept the amendment and therefore it became a substantive motion.

Mr Evans made the following points:

- That slavery was not an issue of the past as more people were now in slavery than ever before.

- That there was no typical victim but it was prevalent in the most vulnerable.
- Many do not realise that modern slavery happens in Surrey.
- It is estimated there are 40 million people worldwide who are victims of modern slavery.
- It was important to report any possible victims
- Asked Members to support the motion to make Surrey better.

The motion was formally seconded by Jonathan Essex who reserved the right to speak.

Three Members made the following points:

- That they supported every part of the motion.
- That every individual deserved to be treated with dignity and be allowed to work in proper establishments.
- Paid tribute to the Government for the introduction of the Modern Slavery Act 2015.
- Informed Members of examples where people have been used for modern slavery.
- Highlighted that vulnerable children in care have been used for modern slavery.

Mr Essex, the seconder of the motion, made the following comments:

- Highlighted that modern slavery was an issue throughout the country, including in Surrey.
- Urged Members to support the motion.

The motion was put to a vote and received unanimous support.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

Since 1 November 2015, when the Conservative Government's Modern Slavery Act came into force, Surrey County Council has a duty to notify the Secretary of State of any individual encountered in Surrey who they believe is a suspected victim of slavery or human trafficking.

The government states this duty is intended to gather statistics and help build a more comprehensive picture of the nature and scale of modern slavery.

Council welcomes the recent decision by Surrey Police to crack down on such offences and notes that the force secured their first modern slavery conviction in April 2018, with arrests in Elmbridge, Spelthorne and Tandridge amongst the 49 offences reported in 2017.

Modern Slavery occurs across Surrey's towns and villages. From nail bars in our towns, to car washes, farms, factories and restaurants up and down the county, thousands of people in Surrey could be victims.

Council notes that the annual reports of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board, considered and noted by the cabinet at their meetings in June 2017 and July 2018 both draw attention to this issue.

Surrey Adult Safeguarding Board observes that the term ‘modern slavery’ captures a whole range of types of exploitation, many of which could occur together in Surrey and elsewhere. These include:

- Human trafficking
- sexual exploitation
- forced labour and domestic servitude
- criminal exploitation
- other forms of exploitation include: forced begging; forced benefit fraud; forced marriage and illegal adoption.

Mindful of its legal responsibilities and moral duties, Surrey County Council therefore agrees to

1. Ensure its corporate procurement team have appropriate training to understand modern slavery.
2. Require its contractors to comply fully with the Modern Slavery Act 2015, wherever it applies, with contract termination as a potential sanction for non-compliance.
3. Note that contracted workers are free to join a trade union and are not to be treated unfairly for belonging to one.
4. Publicise its whistle-blowing system for staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
5. Require its tendered contractors to adopt a whistle-blowing policy which enables their staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
6. Ensure that quality assurance safeguards are in place to protect its contractual spending and to identify any potential issues with modern slavery.
7. Highlight for its suppliers any risks identified concerning modern slavery and refer them to the relevant agencies to be addressed.
8. Refer for investigation via the National Crime Agency’s national referral mechanism any of its contractors identified as a cause for concern regarding modern slavery.
9. Report publicly on the implementation of this policy annually.

#### **Item 8(iv)**

The Leader of the Council proposed that this motion be referred to the Planning and Regulatory Committee as he felt it was not appropriate to discuss at the present meeting.

Mr Essex, as proposer of the original motion, was invited to speak to the Council on why it should not be referred. .

The proposal to refer the motion was put to the vote, with 62 voting in favour, 1 against and 5 abstentions.

Therefore it was:

**RESOLVED**

To refer the motion to the Planning and Regulatory Committee meeting on 17 October 2018.

**72/18 A COMMUNITY VISION FOR SURREY IN 2030 [Item 11]**

The Chairman drew Members' attention to recommendation D of the report, on pages 41 and 42 of the agenda, which should refer to paragraphs 25 and 26, rather than 28 and 29.

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and provided Members with a brief summary. He stated that the Vision recognised both the positives and issues raised by residents in Surrey. It was noted that the Vision was able to inform a starting point and give a focus to the transformation. The Leader further stated that he recognised that partnership working was essential to bring the Vision to life.

Members made the following comments:

- That it was essential to have a vision to have a positive journey.
- Asked if there was still a need for a Strategic Stakeholder Board of key partners.
- Suggested that the title 'Deals' is reconsidered.
- That more enforcement was needed on contracts that do not deliver what was expected.
- That a deal needs to be fair for both parties.
- That the statements in the report were unlike what was expected from the Conservative Party.
- That residents should be given realistic expectations on the future of services.
- Residents should have been consulted directly on the future of services.
- The response to the Vision questionnaire was lower than expected.
- The Vision should include detail on how it is intended to deliver the transformation.
- That the transformation should have been completed five years before.

**Recommendation A**

53 Members voted for, 7 against and 7 abstentions.

**Recommendation B**

59 Members voted for, 0 against and 7 abstentions.

**Recommendation C**

Unanimous.

## **Recommendation D**

Unanimous.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED**:

That Council:

- a. Approves the revised Community Vision for Surrey 2030 and notes the extensive engagement activities with residents, staff, members, partners and businesses carried out over the summer that has informed this revision.
- b. Approves the proposal to develop a new approach to partnership working in Surrey by engaging all partners in the development of a partnership commitment
- c. Approves the proposal to explore, collectively with partners in the public and VCF sectors, the development of a new relationship with residents, including engaging with residents to establish what they can do to help themselves and each other more.
- d. Notes the timeline for future work and SCC's associated activity to support the achievement of the vision, outlined in paragraphs 25 and 26.

### **73/18 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2018/2019 [Item 12]**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the updated Pay Policy Statement for 2018/2019 be agreed.

### **74/18 APPOINTMENT OF AN INTERIM STATUTORY S151 OFFICER [Item 13]**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Leigh Whitehouse be appointed as Interim s151 Officer from the date of this meeting.

### **75/18 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION [Item 14]**

#### **RESOLVED:**

- A. That the changes to the 'call in' procedure be approved as follows:
  - 'A decision can be called in by:
    - Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the relevant Select Committee or;
    - Two Members of the relevant Select Committee comprising of more than one political group.'
- B. That the change in Membership for the Shareholder Board be approved as set out in the Terms of Reference at Annex A of the report.
- C. That these changes be incorporated into the Council's Constitution and published on the Council's website.

**76/18 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 15]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 17 July and 25 September 2018.

**Reports for Information/ Discussion**

- A. Annual Report of the Shareholder Board
- B. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 July – 28 September 2018

**RESOLVED:**

- a) That the Annual Report of the Shareholder Board be noted;
- b) That it be noted that there had been no urgent items in this quarter; and
- c) That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 17 July and 25 September 2018 be adopted.

**77/18 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 16]**

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.43 pm]

---

**Chairman**