

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 8 OCTOBER 2019 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

Tony Samuels (Chairman)  
Helyn Clack (Vice-Chairman)

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

\*absent

### **58/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies have been received from Mr Beckett, Amanda Boote, Mr Ellwood, Mr Furey, Mrs Moseley, Mrs Rivers, Mr Szanto, Mrs Thorn, Mrs White and Mrs Young.

### **59/19 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 9 July 2019 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

### **60/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Dr Andrew Povey declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a trustee for the Surrey Hills Society.

### **61/19 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

The Chairman:

- Highlighted to Members that the Chairman's Announcements were located in the agenda front sheet.
- Welcomed Paul Evans, the new Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer to his first Council meeting and on behalf of the Council thanked Geoff Wild for his work as Monitoring Officer.

### **62/19 PUBLIC PETITION [Item 5]**

The petition regarding Surrey County Council's plans to leave seven major fire appliances un-crewed at night had received 13,048 signatures via the Council's e-petition facility and on behalf of the lead petitioner Mr Paul Couchman, Mr Lee Belsten from the Fire Brigades Union and Save Our Services in Surrey, was invited to address the meeting.

He made the following points:

- Asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire and Resilience to explain why the petition was dismissed as having a 'narrow focus'.
- The petition was not 'out of context' as it was based on question six of the consultation which stated 'to what extent do you disagree/agree with the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service maintain the number of fire stations and fire engines in Surrey but changing how Banstead, Egham, Camberley are crewed at night?'. To which only 18% of the 1,687 respondents agreed with the question.
- Not one on-call fire engine could consistently achieve the response standard that the Cabinet Member had outlined previously. The current average across all on-call fire stations was 49% compared to the targeted response standard of 80%.
- The low response figures was due to many on-call firefighters being mobilised from their homes which took an average of 6-8 minutes to get to stations before deployment.
- The average response standard was 75% across the County based on twenty wholtime fire engines, two variably crewed fire engines and up

to ten on-call fire engines. The response standard could not be maintained nor improved with seven less fire appliances and the plans would not make Surrey safer.

In addition to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire and Resilience's response in the supplementary agenda, she made the following comments:

- Thanked Mr Couchman and Mr Belsten for the petition.
- Praised the work of the cross-party Surrey Fire and Rescue Service Transformation Working Group and the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee on the Making Surrey Safer Plan – the Council's Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) which was approved by Cabinet
- The petition focussed on a small part of plan, not taking into consideration the increase in community and business safety activities through ensuring live saving prevention work.
- As the fire authority, the Council was required by law to produce an IRMP, the last was published in 2016 and risks have since changed. Surrey's roads were carrying double the national average of traffic, there was an increased risk of flooding, an ageing population, drug and alcohol dependency and around 85,000 premises were covered by Surrey's fire legislation - including care homes.
- The new risks were included in the Community Risk Profile (CRP) based on ten years of predicted and five years of current data, towards a more accurate model of risks within the Making Surrey Safer Plan. The CRP was externally and rigorously verified by the National Fire Chief's Council through an assurance panel with a wide range of stakeholders and organisations.
- The Council removed £6 million of savings targets in autumn 2018, following the appointment of Surrey's Chief Fire Officer to re-model the service and to address the findings of the 2018 HMICFRS inspection to meet new legislation following the Grenfell tragedy and to work on prevention and protection.
- Approximately £1 million of additional funding was provided by the Council to support the transformation of the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service.
- A twelve-week public consultation on the service which ended in May 2019 and of the 1,800 respondents many were broadly supportive of the proposals.
- The Council would maintain and meet the response standard, with the first appliance responding to incidents within ten minutes and the second within fifteen minutes for 80% of the time.
- Resources were re-aligned to cover greater risks in the day-time, shifting capacity from the night-time and Surrey's current fire stations would be maintained. Detailed modelling showed that twenty fire engines were needed in the day and sixteen at night; instead the Council would have twenty-five in the day, thirty on weekend days and twenty-three at night.
- Crew availability would be increased at Haslemere and Walton, cover would be changed at Camberley, Fordbridge, Guildford and Woking to one appliance at night from two. Egham, Banstead and Painshill where cover would come from a neighbouring station.
- An increased number of on-call firefighters would be achieved through enlarging the qualifying catchment area and making the role more

accessible. Some incidents would be charged for, such as false fire alarms and animal incidents.

- New work practices, continually evolving technology and increased training since March 2019, saw improved day-time response rates by fifty to sixty-four seconds and night-time responses by fifty-five to eighty-eight seconds. Lastly, 82 new firefighters had been employed since September 2018.
- Urged the Council to support the recommendation as follows: That the Council notes that Cabinet approved the Making Surrey Safer Plan and that Members will continue working with the Fire and Rescue Service during its implementation.

Members made the following points:

- Greater public safety information was welcomed but would not mitigate the risks of having reduced cover and many residents were not broadly supportive of the reduction.
- If the changes were not financially driven, the Council should listen to the firefighters and professionals on the frontline, - as Members were not experts on fire matters - that increasing the response time after an emergency and the reduction in fire appliances would increase the risks to lives.
- The Council was not dismissive of residents' concerns and it must note the HMICFRS report in 2018 which outlined concerns over the ability of the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service in keeping people safe and the efficient use of its resources.
- The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service Transformation Working Group noted the decline by a third in the number of firefighters since 2011 and produce a unanimously agreed report recommending that more firefighters were recruited by 2020 and performance would be rigorously monitored.
- The removal of the seven fire appliances would be a saving of £2 million and it was queried where that money would be spent.
- Removing those fire appliances would increase the time it would take to respond to the average fire in Surrey, increasing the risks to lives and the damage caused. A Member asked that the ratio between prevention time and risks be quantified.

In accordance with Standing Order 28.1, Mr Robert Evans requested a recorded vote to be taken on the recommendation within the Cabinet Member's response to the petition. The Chairman agreed to Mr Evans' request.

The following Members voted for it:

Mrs Angell, Ms Azad, Mrs Bramhall, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Carasco, Dr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mrs Curran, Mr Deach, Mr Tim Evans, Mr Few, Mr Furniss, Mr Goodman, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Gulati, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Mr Harris, Mr Hawkins, Miss Heath, Mr Hussain, Mrs Iles, Mr Islam, Mr Kemp, Mr Knight, Rachael I. Lake, Mrs Lay, Mrs Lewis, Mr McIntosh, Mr Mansfield, Mr Martin, Mrs Mooney, Ms Morley, Mrs Muir, Mr Nuti, Mr Oliver, Mr O'Reilly, Dr Povey, Mr Ramsdale, Mr Samuels, Mrs Steeds, Mr Taylor, Ms Thomson, Ms Turner-Stewart, Mr Walsh, Mr Witham.

And the following Members voted against it:

Mr Bennison, Mr Cooksey, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mr Goodwin, Mrs Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Lee, Mr MacLeod, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mr Spence, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson.

The following Members abstained:

Mr Botten, Mr Darby, Mr Gardner, Mr Kington.

Therefore the recommendation was supported by 47 votes to 15 against and 4 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Council noted that Cabinet approved the Making Surrey Safer Plan and that Members would continue working with the Fire and Rescue Service during its implementation.

**63/19 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 6]**

*10:36am Mrs Barton arrived*

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Praised the Council's work in establishing the new extended bus route for secondary school pupils in the Dittons which saved children an extra walk and this had been achieved through partnership work.
- Highlighted 'inadequate' ratings by Ofsted concerning Children's Services and the adverse Value for Money (VfM) judgement issued by the Council's external auditors over the Council's inefficient use of resources across services for the year ending in March 2019.
- The Council must ensure the Nolan Principles were upheld, it would be useful to see how transparency was implemented by the Council in its governance changes.
- School place planning was the Council's weakest approach to infrastructure delivery, but the new approach to the commissioning of SEND services and the roll out of the Family Centres programme was welcomed.
- The Council's property portfolio remained underutilised and the Council must address the planned expansion of Gatwick and Heathrow airports more holistically to address residents' concerns.
- The surplus land used to help communities to overcome challenges, must be reconciled with housing developers evicting social enterprises and community clubs.
- Was supportive of the Council's move out of County Hall and into Surrey, and noted that the retention of all Community Recycling Centres was positive.
- With regards to the 'Climate Emergency', there had been productive discussions by Highways and the Deputy Leader on reducing air pollution in Farnham. Farnham Herald's 'Cut the Pollution' campaign

taking place on the 25 October 2019 with Jeremy Hunt, Member of Parliament, was highlighted to Members.

- Sought clarification on whether the move towards an agile workforce could be delivered through the Council's current IT system.
- That mental health was an important part of the Council's transformation programme and required greater integration across the portfolios. The recent launch of the 'Every Mind Matters' campaign by Public Health England was welcomed and it would be a useful tool within the Council's transformation programme if its stakeholders, service providers, charities and those needing mental health support were consulted.

## **64/19 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

### **Questions:**

Notice of eleven questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in a supplementary agenda on 7 October 2019.

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

**(Q1) Mr Chris Townsend** asked the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families for greater accuracy of the six month time frame for the process of ensuring 'open access' youth services. He also wanted more information with regards to the recommissioning of the level 2 Early Help 0-19 area of need.

Mr Harrison asked whether by making buildings available to voluntary sectors, it was the Council's intention to charge rent as voluntary sectors could use that money to fund youth workers instead.

Mr Harris stated that despite turbulent times for youth services, a new youth group called MYTI was formed by passionate people in his local division. He asked whether the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families shared his belief of the need to create a 'field of dreams' through partnerships. That is was also important to encourage interim officers to take advantage of the knowledge of local Members on youth services and to get involved.

Dr Povey questioned whether youth buildings would be subsidised where the County Council did not own the buildings and it had to pay rent to local parish councils for their use.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families thanked the Members for their questions and informed the Council that they were only four of fourteen Members on the briefing on youth services in Easter. Officers worked on a restructure to get the Targeted Youth Support and Specialist Safeguarding Adolescents Teams right, before the Universal Youth Work and Early Help 0-19 areas of need and statutory obligation of the Council were addressed. The report on the recommissioning of Early Help 0-19 was recently passed through Cabinet, lead providers across districts and boroughs would provide greater coherence and clarity as outlined by the previous Ofsted report. A consultation on Universal Youth Work would run in parallel with the Libraries consultation. This would be held within multiple districts and boroughs and would incorporate many sectors and organisations, to review how the Council's

buildings could be given free of charge. The consultation will be done area by area from November and a formal decision would be made in May on the local based provisions, with current short-term solutions in different youth centres.

**(Q2) Mr Eber Kington** was disappointed with the response not touching upon the specific issue of urban trees and asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste if he was aware that Highways officers at the September 2019 Epsom and Ewell Local Committee were not proactive or positive as to explaining why more trees could not be planted in Surrey's urban areas.

Mr Essex asked whether a draft of the Council's tree planting policy could be circulated earlier than December, to ensure that the right trees could be ordered.

Mr MacLeod asked what could be done about the cutting of ailing trees to one metre high and whether there could be a commitment by housing developers to plant a tree for every house built.

As Cabinet Member for Highways, Mr Furniss asked the Cabinet Member whether he agreed that the Council's partnership work with the Royal Horticultural Society on the best species of trees to plant was an alternative to direct engineering methods.

Mr Harmer asked the Cabinet Member whether he agreed that the strength of the carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) was concentrated in urban areas so trees should be planted there. He also asked whether he planned to acquire saplings for urban areas, as rural areas were oversaturated with those saplings.

Mr Hawkins asked that from a planning perspective, careful regard for what is planted and where would be considered going forward and that there was a problem in his division to mitigate uprooted pavements.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste stated that a strategy for finding the right trees for the future took time and the Council were working with Kew Gardens on this. He would also look at including the encouragement of developers to plant more trees into the strategy. Trees were being planted, the Leader of the Council and Chairman of the Council recently planted a tree at the Surrey Hills Wood Fair – at the Cranleigh Showground. Last weekend 611 trees were given to Surrey residents to plant. He hoped that the draft tree planting strategy would be available by November and noted that after forty years each tree would sequester one tonne of carbon dioxide.

**(Q3) Mr Nick Darby** asked the Leader of the Council how rent would be considered on the question of net savings to the Council when it moves from County Hall.

Mr Bennison queried what would happen to the paintings and furniture with the move from County Hall.

Mr Harrison questioned whether the Council were looking into freehold sites as a long-term solution.

The Leader of the Council stated that the building the Council was currently in negotiations for would be freehold and that the Council were paying business

rates to Kingston Council – which would be eliminated with the move back into Surrey. The moveable assets would be taken.

**(Q5) Mr Will Forster** asked the Leader of the Council to back the Vehicle Emissions (Idling Penalties) Bill as soon as possible to improve air quality now.

The Leader of the Council replied that the Council were currently working on improving air quality and noted that there was a public health initiative in schools last year on that. He commented that presently, the Bill was short of detail but may include potential fines for vehicle idling outside schools. However, the Leader noted that the Bill must focus on the causes of atmospheric pollution and promote education, rather than being a revenue raising exercise.

**(Q6) Mrs Nikki Barton** asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire and Resilience about how the Making Surrey Safer Plan for 2020 – 2023 strategy, could be reconciled with there being ‘no guarantee of the availability of either whole time or on-call staff’. It would take over two years to train on-call staff and there was already a shortage of resources.

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire and Resilience stated that she had given a detailed account of recruitment earlier in her petition response. The number of on-call firefighters would be increased through the two on-call new starter courses before April 2020, as outlined in the written question response. There would also be an upcoming independent evaluation led by the previous Chief Fire and Rescue Adviser for England, Sir Ken Knight.

**(Q7) Mr Stephen Cooksey** asked the Cabinet Member for Finance if a contract had been awarded for the work on the further education building in Dorking and if there was a start date.

The Cabinet Member for Finance stated that there would be work on the site by the end of December 2019.

**(Q8) Mr Eber Kington** asked the Leader of the Council if he would ensure that emails sent by Cabinet Members reporting the details of inspection reports would be an unedited list of progress made and that areas of continuing concern would be highlighted with no exclusions. Furthermore, if he could advise Members of the service areas that would be of significant concern if inspected that day.

Mrs Lewis asked if the Leader of the Council would agree that one way that Members could be better informed was to attend the member briefings held regularly, as attendance had been low for recent briefings concerning both children’s and youth services. She noted that when letters went out on substantial progress made, - such as the Children’s Single Point of Access (C-SPA) - they acted as enablers for change across services. She also asked whether there was a good balance between praising officers on their work - through the positive feedback from one monitoring visit - and being realistic about future areas for improvement concerning children’s services.

The Leader of the Council stated that the Cabinet regularly updated Members on the current work in progress, there was a Transformation Programme and the four select committees, working groups and member briefings ensured transparency and facilitated Member engagement.

**(Q10) Mr Eber Kington** asked the Leader of the Council why he was reluctant to have the senior management paid cost centre monitored annually by a specific committee.

Mr Essex asked if the Leader of the Council could confirm the senior posts were full-time, or if not how many were interim.

The Leader of the Council stated that there was no lack of transparency as the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) was responsible for determining the policy on pay, contractual terms and the conditions of employment for all staff. It was not the place of elected Members to instruct the Chief Executive on the employment or expenditure of her offices and senior salaries were published on the Council's website. The Council ensured that a commercial rate was paid to attract good quality staff. There was a significant reduction of interim senior posts, but he would come back to the Member with an accurate answer.

#### **Cabinet Member Briefings:**

These were also published with the supplementary on 7 October 2019.

There were no comments made by Members.

#### **65/19 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]**

There were none.

#### **66/19 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]**

##### **Item 9 (i)**

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.  
Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Chris Botten moved:

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

##### **This council notes:**

With concern that, **owing to Government policy**, Surrey residents who pay for their own elderly care significantly subsidise the residents who rely on County to pay for their care. This is a result of an unjust and inequitable funding regime which is itself a result of inadequate government funding. It further notes with concern that the proposal for the coming financial year in the local government funding settlement appears to allow councils to raise a precept on residents to cover the funding gap.

This approach is deeply flawed; it perpetuates the injustice of the current system, asking those who have savings to subsidise the care of those who don't, and it is a sticking plaster to cover up the failure of successive governments to bring forward a sustainable and equitable solution to the problem of social care funding.

**Therefore resolves that:**

- I. This council accordingly calls on the government to bring forward urgently a sustainable solution so that councils can restore equity and enable a sustainable market for social care provision in Surrey and across the country.
- II. The Cabinet is ~~called upon to publish the business case it promised in February~~ **asked to consider examining the possibility of in-house provision and/or new approaches to commissioning adult social care which can manage the market more effectively** ~~the possibility of the Council entering the market as a provider of adult social care, since that move could stabilise a fragile market,~~ **to** potentially re-balance some of the inequities of a for profit environment, and secure quality against the significant risk of the impact of Brexit on the local workforce.
- III. This Council further requests that Cllr Sinead Mooney, the cabinet member for adults and public health, seek an urgent meeting with Caroline Dinanage MP, the minister of state in the department for Health and Social Care.

Members agreed to debate the amended motion and therefore it became a substantive motion.

Mr Botten made the following points:

- He thanked Mrs Mooney, the Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health for her support in the reformulation of the amendment.
- He commented that there was a shortage of money in the country and county for support in adult social care; that placed providers and service-users at risk. He praised officers despite the challenging market and noted staffing was vulnerable due to Brexit uncertainty.
- The iniquity of the rationing of the National Health Service (NHS) continuing care was scandalous and often hidden. It was wrong that the Council and residents had to face the consequences of that rationing.
- He highlighted the 'triple bereavement' as a result of the ageing population - the loss of a loved one to dementia, the loss of the loved one and the loss of their home.
- He called upon the Government with support of the Council to enact significant policy changes regarding the care of ageing populations for the long-term. The 2% precept rise would not address the inequities and the inequities in adult social care.
- It was wrong that the ease of getting packages of continuing care was geographically determined.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Goodwin, who made the following comments:

- She outlined a recent visit to a care home where she was informed by a gentleman that the process of securing care for a loved one was traumatic. It was financially focussed without empathy.

- That the Government must have the courage to provide an equitable social care policy and stop short-term funding to allow local authorities to plan for future care provision.

Two Members made the following points:

- That there was an injustice in the funding of adult social care as the Council subsidised care by a third less for those who could not afford it, compared to those who could self-fund it.
- When social care was contracted out of the Council the cost per hour halved, noting that services brought in-house were not always less expensive.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

**This council notes:**

With concern that, owing to Government policy, Surrey residents who pay for their own elderly care significantly subsidise the residents who rely on County to pay for their care. This is a result of an unjust and inequitable funding regime which is itself a result of inadequate government funding. It further notes with concern that the proposal for the coming financial year in the local government funding settlement appears to allow councils to raise a precept on residents to cover the funding gap.

This approach is deeply flawed; it perpetuates the injustice of the current system, asking those who have savings to subsidise the care of those who don't, and it is a sticking plaster to cover up the failure of successive governments to bring forward a sustainable and equitable solution to the problem of social care funding.

**Therefore resolves that:**

- I. This council accordingly calls on the government to bring forward urgently a sustainable solution so that councils can restore equity and enable a sustainable market for social care provision in Surrey and across the country.
- II. The Cabinet is asked to consider examining the possibility of in-house provision and/or new approaches to commissioning adult social care which can manage the market more effectively, to potentially re-balance some of the inequities of a for profit environment, and secure quality against the significant risk of the impact of Brexit on the local workforce.
- III. This Council further requests that Cllr Sinead Mooney, the cabinet member for adults and public health, seek an urgent meeting with Caroline Dinenage MP, the minister of state in the department for Health and Social Care.

## **Item 9 (ii)**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Robert Evans moved:

### **This council notes:**

This Council has previously noted that both Heathrow and Gatwick airports make vital contributions to the continuing success of Surrey's economy and Surrey County Council now takes note of Heathrow's Airport Expansion document, dated June 2019 and the associated community consultations events.

Council welcomes Councillor Kemp's letter to Heathrow dated 9 September 2019, highlighting the many serious concerns and discrepancies in Heathrow's latest position.

Surrey County Council also notes the serious reservations on airport expansion now being registered by an increasing number of councils, around Heathrow airport, in particular Spelthorne Council which recently voted to send a strong message to Heathrow Airport Limited, stating that its masterplan for expansion now presents "significant issues" for residents of Spelthorne, concluding that it could only support the expansion and third runway if the council's 15 demands laid out last year are met, including compensation for those people whose properties are worst affected.

Council is dismayed that neither the Government nor the aviation industry have shown any intention to invest in road or rail connections and that far from reducing congestion, the current proposals will inevitably increase overcrowding on Surrey's roads and put undue pressure on communities, especially those near Heathrow. Council believes that unless and until the surface access links, delivering improved public and active transport links to the airport are implemented, there must be no increase in the current 480,000 flights a year.

Furthermore Council is concerned that large areas of Green Belt in the north of Spelthorne, proposed to include around 220 Hectares of green space, will be sacrificed. Heathrow Airport Limited, by their own admission, set out that the proposed Heathrow plan will adversely affect many people's health by a deterioration in air quality due to 'dust and vehicle emissions' as well as totally unacceptable increases in noise pollution.

Finally, the proposed expansion, without any curbs on flying elsewhere, will exceed the carbon budget for aviation set out in the 2015 final report from the Government's Airports Commission, let alone the more stringent targets now committed to by the Government, Surrey County Council and many other local authorities.

At its meeting on 16 July 2013, Surrey County Council agreed that 'expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.' Council called on 'Government and the aviation industry to prioritise investment in road and rail connections to the airports to reduce congestion and overcrowding.'

On 6 December 2016 Council reiterated its view that any expansion 'requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be

satisfactorily addressed,' adding that the Council 'considers that the proposals and commitments, including on surface access, that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be prioritised nor that adequate funding will be committed.'

**This council therefore agrees:**

- I. To suspend its unqualified support for Heathrow expansion and seek meetings with the Secretary of State for Transport and Heathrow Airport Limited to register these concerns and demand that plans are finalised and funding secured for vastly improved surface access to the airport and sufficient safeguards on air quality, noise pollution, night flights, protection of the Green Belt and compensation for residents, most seriously affected.
- II. That expansion of Heathrow is not consistent with either the Council or the Government's declaration of a climate emergency, and the need to now reduce carbon emissions to zero.
- III. And additionally agrees to support Hillingdon, Wandsworth, Richmond, Hammersmith & Fulham and Windsor & Maidenhead councils in seeking a judicial review of these plans on the grounds of air quality, climate change, noise pollution and surface transport access.

Mr R Evans made the following points:

- The motion concerned the lives of Surrey's residents and future generations and if supported would be a bold stance by the Council signalling its commitment against airport expansion.
- The Heathrow Airport Expansion document of June 2019, ignored the Council's requests over expansion. It had not taken into consideration the Council's long-standing concerns over its expansion, with reference to previous motions in July 2013 and December 2016, a recent member briefing in July 2019 and at road shows on the matter.
- Heathrow's expansion would see years of disruption up till 2050. There would be increased congestion, vehicle pollution, and construction traffic in surrounding boroughs and districts such as Spelthorne.
- The largest car park in the world would be built at Stanwell with 24,000 car spaces, having a knock on effect to the M25, open spaces would be lost, rivers diverted and residents were not to be compensated.
- The Heathrow Airport Expansion document did not include the provision of modern and direct rail links - bypassing London - and both the Government and Heathrow must be held to account on that.

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

Seven Members made the following points:

- The Council's position had not changed since it last debated Heathrow expansion in a motion in October 2018. A key part of the motion focused

on the need for the Government to prioritise infrastructure before a third runway was built – primarily a Southern Rail link.

- On behalf of the Council, the Deputy Leader had submitted the comprehensive response – outlining ten concerns of the Council – to Heathrow Airport Limited, on the Statutory Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation.
- The Leader of the Council had recently met the Secretary of State for Transport, Grant Shapps and with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste, he will meet the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Paul Maynard who had responsibility for Aviation.
- The Council was still awaiting the modelling information from Heathrow on its expansion and both the provision of Southern Rail and the removal of the 220 hectares of green belt to the north of Spelthorne were still to be resolved.
- The Council had declared a 'Climate Emergency', reflecting the Government's target of net zero carbon emissions by 2050 which was challenging but achievable.
- The Council was awaiting the results of the judicial review sent to the Court of Appeal challenging the Government's support of Heathrow expansion.
- The Council will continue to challenge and engage with Heathrow directly and through the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG).
- A further motion would have to be considered in the future if the Council's concerns within its response to the Statutory Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation were not satisfactorily addressed.
- Residents' ability to cope with expansion had not been taken into consideration especially concerning minor roads in rural areas, where small villages received substantial vehicle movements funnelled through to Gatwick Airport.
- Contrary to the motion, the Council had never had 'unqualified support' for Heathrow expansion nor Gatwick. The Council since July 2013 had not supported expansion and had called for the right infrastructure beforehand.
- That Heathrow expansion was an ill-thought-out expensive project which would cause environmental damage and exacerbate existing issues such as the high cost and shortage of housing and road congestion.
- If Southern Rail access was proposed by Heathrow, there would need to be consideration over the change in capacity that would affect the current commuter lines in Guildford and Woking to London.
- That the right place for airport expansion was in the Thames Estuary. Although a substantial number of Surrey residents were employed at Heathrow, expansion was not sustainable in the centre of populations.

Mr Botten moved an amendment, which was formally seconded by Mr Harmer.

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

**This council notes:**

This Council has previously noted that both Heathrow and Gatwick airports make vital contributions to the continuing success of Surrey's economy and Surrey County Council now takes note of Heathrow's Airport Expansion

document, dated June 2019 and the associated community consultations events.

Council welcomes Councillor Kemp's letter to Heathrow dated 9 September 2019, highlighting the many serious concerns and discrepancies in Heathrow's latest position.

Surrey County Council also notes the serious reservations on airport expansion now being registered by an increasing number of councils, around Heathrow airport, in particular Spelthorne Council which recently voted to send a strong message to Heathrow Airport Limited, stating that its masterplan for expansion now presents "significant issues" for residents of Spelthorne, concluding that it could only support the expansion and third runway if the council's 15 demands laid out last year are met, including compensation for those people whose properties are worst affected.

Council is dismayed that neither the Government nor the aviation industry have shown any intention to invest in road or rail connections and that far from reducing congestion, the current proposals will inevitably increase overcrowding on Surrey's roads and put undue pressure on communities, especially those near Heathrow. Council believes that unless and until the surface access links, delivering improved public and active transport links to the airport are implemented, there must be no increase in the current 480,000 flights a year.

Furthermore Council is concerned that large areas of Green Belt in the north of Spelthorne, proposed to include around 220 Hectares of green space, will be sacrificed. Heathrow Airport Limited, by their own admission, set out that the proposed Heathrow plan will adversely affect many people's health by a deterioration in air quality due to 'dust and vehicle emissions' as well as totally unacceptable increases in noise pollution.

Finally, the proposed expansion, without any curbs on flying elsewhere, will exceed the carbon budget for aviation set out in the 2015 final report from the Government's Airports Commission, let alone the more stringent targets now committed to by the Government, Surrey County Council and many other local authorities.

At its meeting on 16 July 2013, Surrey County Council agreed that 'expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.' Council called on 'Government and the aviation industry to prioritise investment in road and rail connections to the airports to reduce congestion and overcrowding.'

On 6 December 2016 Council reiterated its view that any expansion 'requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed,' adding that the Council 'considers that the proposals and commitments, including on surface access, that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be prioritised nor that adequate funding will be committed.'

**This council therefore agrees:**

- I. ~~To suspend its unqualified support for Heathrow expansion and seek meetings with the Secretary of State for Transport and Heathrow Airport Limited to register these concerns and demand that plans are finalised and funding secured for vastly improved surface access to the airport and sufficient safeguards on air quality, noise pollution, night flights, protection of the Green Belt and compensation for residents, most seriously affected.~~
- II. That expansion of Heathrow is not consistent with either the Council or the Government's declaration of a climate emergency, and the need to now reduce carbon emissions to zero.
- III. ~~And additionally agrees to support Hillingdon, Wandsworth, Richmond, Hammersmith & Fulham and Windsor & Maidenhead councils in seeking a judicial review of these plans on the grounds of air quality, climate change, noise pollution and surface transport access.~~

*The Leader of the Council called for the meeting to be adjourned to discuss the amendment. It was adjourned at 12:15pm*

*The meeting reconvened at 12:23pm*

Mr R Evans accepted the amendment and therefore it became the substantive motion.

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

- The Council's response to Heathrow Airport Limited pandered towards their rhetoric of building the runway first and then having the infrastructure and transport links implemented later.
- The Council must be more firm than its response to the Statutory Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation. One condition within the response called for the Development Consent Order (DCO) to limit air traffic movements to no more than 600,000 a year until both the Western and Southern Rail infrastructures were in place. That meant 120,000 flights a year would occur before the public transport bet.
- Since last debate on this in October 2018, the Council had declared a 'Climate Emergency', but the Council's position on Heathrow was to wait. The Council must avoid 'constructive ambiguity' and have a clear strategy to act on the emergency.
- Noted the Government's Committee on Climate which called for the halving of the Government's aviation growth plans.

The Chairman asked Mr R Evans, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate.

- At a Meeting with Heathrow on their road show where he challenged a representative on the rail links, he stated that the third runway should be built first before rail links were discussed/built.
- The Council must not be ambiguous on their position for its demand on better transport links in Surrey to ease congestion and therefore pollution addressing climate change.

The Leader of the Council called for a separate vote on each point of the substantive motion and the Chairman agreed.

The first point of the amended motion was put to a vote and received unanimous support.

The second point of the amended motion was put to a vote with 18 Members voting for, 38 against and 8 abstentions.

Mr Bennison declared a non-pecuniary interest as some members of his family worked at Heathrow Airport.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

**This council notes:**

This Council has previously noted that both Heathrow and Gatwick airports make vital contributions to the continuing success of Surrey's economy and Surrey County Council now takes note of Heathrow's Airport Expansion document, dated June 2019 and the associated community consultations events.

Council welcomes Councillor Kemp's letter to Heathrow dated 9 September 2019, highlighting the many serious concerns and discrepancies in Heathrow's latest position.

Surrey County Council also notes the serious reservations on airport expansion now being registered by an increasing number of councils, around Heathrow airport, in particular Spelthorne Council which recently voted to send a strong message to Heathrow Airport Limited, stating that its masterplan for expansion now presents "significant issues" for residents of Spelthorne, concluding that it could only support the expansion and third runway if the council's 15 demands laid out last year are met, including compensation for those people whose properties are worst affected.

Council is dismayed that neither the Government nor the aviation industry have shown any intention to invest in road or rail connections and that far from reducing congestion, the current proposals will inevitably increase overcrowding on Surrey's roads and put undue pressure on communities, especially those near Heathrow. Council believes that unless and until the surface access links, delivering improved public and active transport links to the airport are implemented, there must be no increase in the current 480,000 flights a year.

Furthermore Council is concerned that large areas of Green Belt in the north of Spelthorne, proposed to include around 220 Hectares of green space, will be sacrificed. Heathrow Airport Limited, by their own admission, set out that the proposed Heathrow plan will adversely affect many people's health by a deterioration in air quality due to 'dust and vehicle emissions' as well as totally unacceptable increases in noise pollution.

Finally, the proposed expansion, without any curbs on flying elsewhere, will exceed the carbon budget for aviation set out in the 2015 final report from the Government's Airports Commission, let alone the more stringent targets now committed to by the Government, Surrey County Council and many other local authorities.

At its meeting on 16 July 2013, Surrey County Council agreed that 'expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.' Council called on 'Government and the aviation industry to prioritise investment in road and rail connections to the airports to reduce congestion and overcrowding.'

On 6 December 2016 Council reiterated its view that any expansion 'requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed,' adding that the Council 'considers that the proposals and commitments, including on surface access, that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be prioritised nor that adequate funding will be committed.'

**This council therefore agrees:**

- I. To seek meetings with the Secretary of State for Transport and Heathrow Airport Limited to register these concerns and demand that plans are finalised and funding secured for vastly improved surface access to the airport and sufficient safeguards on air quality, noise pollution, night flights, protection of the Green Belt and compensation for residents, most seriously affected.
- II. That expansion of Heathrow is not consistent with either the Council or the Government's declaration of a climate emergency, and the need to now reduce carbon emissions to zero.

**Item 9 (iii)**

Mr Hall agreed to withdraw his motion.

**67/19 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 10]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Council ratified the appointments of the Independent Remuneration Panel members for a three year term.
2. That the Council ratified the remuneration of the Independent Remuneration Panel members.
3. That the Council reviewed and approved the Terms of Reference of the Independent Remuneration Panel.

**68/19 APPOINTMENT OF LOCAL COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 11]**

The Leader introduced the report and stated the change was due to Mr Bennison no longer being a Conservative Party member.

Mr Bennison made a statement.

**RESOLVED:**

That Rachael I. Lake was duly elected as the Vice-Chairman of the Elmbridge Local Committee for 2019/20.

**69/19 UPDATES TO THE CONSTITUTION [Item 12]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and in response to Mr Botten's earlier call for transparency, he would ensure that changes to the Council's constitution would be clearly articulated to Council.

Mr Kington noted the rapid change of the increase in the Council's financial 'key decision' threshold which was doubled to £1 million and was concerned that the rationale was due to taking decisions at an increasing pace. He asked the Leader of the Council to submit a report at the end of the financial year to the relevant scrutiny committee outlining the frequency of use of taking key decisions above the current £500,000 threshold.

In response, the Leader stated that the decision to change the threshold was not done in isolation from the relevant Cabinet Member. He agreed to provide information to the relevant select committees on an annual basis listing the decisions taken between £500,000 and the £1 million threshold level.

**RESOLVED:**

1. that the County Council agrees to increase the Council's financial 'key decision' threshold to £1,000,000;
2. that the amendments agreed by the Leader to the Scheme of Delegation be noted.
3. That the Director of Law and Governance be authorised to make the necessary changes to the Council's Scheme of Delegation and the Constitution be updated accordingly.

**70/19 CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS [Item 13]**

The Leader of the Council thanked Mr McIntosh and Mr Ramsdale for their contributions as Deputy Cabinet Members. He noted that Mr Nuti had joined as a Deputy Cabinet Member. The changes were to balance out the workload across portfolios, in particular the Environment and Waste portfolio.

**RESOLVED:**

The Council noted the Leader's changes to the Cabinet Portfolios.

**71/19 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 14]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 16 July 2019 and 24 September 2019.

**Reports for Decision:**

- A. Updated Statement of Community Involvement.

**Reports for Information/Discussion:**

- B. Proposal to charge maintained schools for the cost of conversion to become an academy school
- C. Creation of a new specialist centre at Worplesdon Primary School in partnership with Freemantles School
- D. Proposal to enter into a Local Education Partnership with Schools Alliance for Excellence
- E. Children's Improvement Update
- F. Providing Council Tax Relief for Surrey's Care Leavers
- G. Making Surrey Safer – Our Plan 2020-2023
- H. School Place Planning: Strategy for Specialist Placements
- I. Surrey County Council's response to statutory consultation on Heathrow Airport expansion

In response to Mr R Evans' question, the Leader of the Council agreed that the response to the Statutory Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation would be reported to Council.

- J. Quarterly report on decisions taken under special urgency arrangements: 29 June to 27 September 2019

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 16 July 2019 and 24 September 2019 be adopted.
2. That Council adopted the revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
3. County Council noted that there had been two urgent decisions in that quarter.

**72/19 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 15]**

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: 12.38 pm]

---

**Chairman**

No one can deny that we are in the midst of unprecedented uncertainty on a national level in this country.

However, here in Surrey, after some years of huge challenge, upheaval and difficult decisions, we are looking to the future with renewed optimism and energy.

We have set ourselves an ambitious programme of transformational change within this County Council that both reflects the challenges and opportunities of the modern age, and that will allow us to make better choices and to invest for the future generations of this great County.

### **MCTR**

We are on course to fulfil our ambition of moving closer to residents in the coming year, and I expect to be in a position to announce the new location of County Hall later this month; this will enable us to operate as a true civic heart within the County of Surrey.

This will enable us to drive our modernisation agenda, for all us within the organisation to be more efficient, effective and tech-savvy for the benefit of our residents and set us on course to be one of the leading councils in the country.

### **RAISING THE BAR**

We have moved quickly and effectively to address the historic poor performance of this organisation.

We are now raising the bar.

Our transformation programme is ambitious. At Cabinet later this month we will report back on what has been achieved to

date as well as setting out what we will doing in the next phase. Whilst there is more to do, key services have already had plans effectively agreed and delivered and they are making a real difference to people's lives.

Children's Services has shown some genuine improvements and although we are by no means there yet, we are hopeful that 'inadequate' ratings will be a thing of the past when we re-inspected by OFSTED next year.

Just last month Cabinet agreed plans to modernise the Surrey Fire & Rescue service to make it fit for the future, including investing more money and recruiting more firefighters, upscaling prevention work and delivering a more mobile and dynamic response.

Her Majesty's inspectorate, who identified much of the service as inadequate nearly a year ago, have been impressed with our plans and I'm confident the next inspection will be altogether more positive.

## **GREENER FUTURE**

We are now starting to put detail around our vision for a Greener Future.

Committing to leading by example in reducing our carbon emissions, protecting and enhancing our countryside, improving air quality and working in partnership to face the climate emergency head on will be a positive contribution from this County to what is a global issue.

Let's address and implement things that we can do locally but let's all take on the challenge together; the future of the planet is everybody's collective responsibility and we must all do more.

Part of this Greener Future work is of course recycling and I was pleased to confirm at Cabinet last month that all of our CRCs will remain open and accessible for residents.

Although we are the third best performing council of our kind in the whole country that is still not good enough. We must do even more.

Small changes can make the biggest difference.

As an organisation we must make it as easy as possible for residents to recycle more of their waste, and residents must step up and take every opportunity to make a difference.

## **BUDGET**

Mr Chairman, over the coming weeks we will be finalising detailed proposals around our budget for 2020-21 and I will be presenting a budget statement at the November council meeting.

We have had to take some difficult decisions over the past couple of years to address the budget deficit but with a clear focus on efficiency, innovative thinking and dedication of our staff, I believe we can now consider ourselves a stable and sustainable council, ready for the future.

This will enable us to make better choices; to invest in our residents as well as the next generation.

Even with constrained funding we have still been able to carry out more than 50,000 road repairs a year, create hundreds of apprenticeships, reduce the amount of council tax paid by care leavers, secure hundreds of millions of pounds in funding from government and other stakeholders for infrastructure and housing across the county, as well as continuing to deliver the services that residents depend on day in, day out.

Looking forward, as our services modernise and reach more and more people in different ways, we are determined to invest in the county's future. That is why:

- We will be committing hundreds of millions of pounds to protecting homes from flooding as we start the Surrey Flood alleviation scheme next year
- We will be investing even more in our 3000 thousand miles of roads and pavements to ensure people can get around smoothly and safely
- We will be announcing a series of initiatives to tackle the climate emergency and to protect our environment for future generations as the work of the Environment Commission we established starts to mature.

Alongside all of this, we must remember that the majority of council tax goes on protecting and supporting the most vulnerable residents of Surrey, through Adult Social Care, Looked After Children and those with Special educational needs and disabilities.

Surrey County Council spends over £1 million every single day looking after our adult residents that need our support and half a million each day on our children.

The government's proposed 2% precept on council tax for Adult Social Care will go some way to helping meet those ever increasing costs, however it is a tiny fraction of the costs involved.

We should never forget that it is our legal and more particularly our moral duty, to care for the most vulnerable in society and I will not let down those residents who need us most.

As a transparent and responsible authority we must share with our residents what we are doing on their behalf and with their money.

So going forward we will set out a series of commitments - a guarantee to do things that are relevant to residents and by which they can judge our performance.

We will build up these commitments over time - and indeed I would welcome any **realistic** suggestions from any member - but these will include:-

- planting at least one tree for every one of our 1.2 million residents and I was very pleased to plant the first Oak with the Chairman last Saturday
- boosting our local economy by setting up a £50m community grant fund to improve our High Streets

- providing surplus space in Surrey County Council buildings for free use by voluntary and charitable organisations
- considering conversion of any surplus council owned land to public allotments to produce food for foodbanks
- and, as mentioned earlier, delivering the budget savings we need to enable this council to remain on a sound financial footing so that we can meet the challenges of the future

The full list will be set out in the Cabinet paper later this month.

Finally Mr Chairman, I completely recognise that there is still much to do to improve the way in which we support our residents.

However, we are creating a solid foundation on which to build a prosperous and exciting future.

Stabilising our finances.

Driving out inefficiencies.

Creating a more agile workforce.

Improving our partnership with key organisations across the County.

Being more transparent with our residents.

Supporting communities to overcome challenges and grasp opportunities.

I believe, and I am sure all members will agree, we are making swift and effective progress, that enables us to deliver great quality services, to support those who need our help the most, whilst delivering value for money for Surrey residents now and well into the future.

This page is intentionally left blank