



We're on Twitter:
[@SCCdemocracy](https://twitter.com/SCCdemocracy)



Agenda and Reports
for the meeting of
THE COUNTY COUNCIL
to be held on
13 OCTOBER 2020

County Hall
Kingston upon Thames
Surrey

Friday, 2 October 2020

TO THE MEMBERS OF SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

SUMMONS TO MEETING

You are hereby summoned to attend the meeting of the Council to be held remotely via Microsoft Teams, on Tuesday, 13 October 2020, beginning at 10.00 am, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda set out overleaf.

JOANNA KILLIAN
Chief Executive

Please note that due to the COVID-19 situation this meeting will take place remotely.

Please be aware that a link to view a live recording of the meeting will be available on the Council page on the Surrey County Council website. This page can be accessed by following the link below:

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=121&Year=0>

If you have any queries relating to accessing this agenda please email amelia.christopher@surreycc.gov.uk

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chairman to report apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES

(Pages
11 - 40)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 7 July 2020.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

4 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Welcome everyone to today's Council Meeting – I hope you and your loved ones are all safe and well.

John Pincham

It is with great sadness that, since we last met, we said goodbye to former County Councillor John Pincham, who passed away in his home in August, aged 88.

John was a County Councillor from 1993-2005 and I had the pleasure of running against him for election in Cobham & Oxshott in 1993. He was a lovely man, a real character, and his passing is a great loss to many.

I am sure that Members will join me in expressing our sadness at this news and passing on our sincere condolences to John's family.

Black History Month

October is Black History Month and I had the honour of launching Surrey County Council's celebrations, as we recognise and celebrate the culture and contributions the people of African and Caribbean descent have made to our county and country.

Across October and beyond, we aim to promote knowledge of Black culture, history and heritage, through numerous activities and events, which have been kindly organised and led by our new staff network – Surrey MEGA (Minority Ethnic Group and Allies). We hope in doing this, we will all come to a renewed knowledge of the invaluable contributions individuals from this community and culture have made to British society.

Events and activities are announced on and available through the MEGA Network page on Jive. Please do visit the page and join in as many activities and events that you can.

Thank You

Once again, I would like to offer my heartfelt thanks to the fantastic people of this Council as they continue to do their utmost to serve and protect the residents of our county.

It has been a tough few months – and the difficulties look set to continue at least into the winter, which always brings its own set of challenges. Nevertheless, our staff continue to put our residents at the heart and soul of all that they do.

A huge and sincere ‘thank you’ to all our staff for the immeasurable difference you are making to so many lives. Please keep up the tremendous work.

5 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader to make a statement.

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions and/or make comments.

6 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

1. The Leader of the Council or the appropriate Member of the Cabinet or the Chairman of a Committee to answer any questions on any matter relating to the powers and duties of the County Council, or which affects the county.

(Note: Notice of questions in respect of the above item on the agenda must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Democratic Services by 12 noon on 7 October 2020).

2. Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios

These will be circulated by email to all Members prior to the County Council meeting, together with the Members' questions and responses.

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions.

7 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Any Member may make a statement at the meeting on a local issue of current or future concern.

(Note: Notice of statements must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Democratic Services by 12 noon on 12 October 2020).

8 ORIGINAL MOTIONS

Item 8 (i)

Mr Nick Darby (The Dittons) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes:

The unsuccessful attempt by the Leader of the Council and Cabinet to submit a case to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) to create a Surrey Single Unitary Council.

That the potential bid has caused reputational damage to Surrey County Council.

Therefore resolves that:

In order to understand the reasons behind the bid, the decision not to consult from the start with Borough and District Councils, and the cost to the council taxpayer, this Council calls upon the Leader and Cabinet to provide a full public written Report on this unsuccessful bid, to include the following:

- I. The process used to launch the bid and authorise expenditure on the bid.
- II. The rationale for developing a bid before the Government's White Paper has been published.
- III. The full costs of the bid including the costs of the initial research and financial analysis, preparation of a comprehensive business case, consultants fees, Public Affairs support, the Telephone and Focus Group Survey, any Surrey-wide leaflets which included material in support of a bid for a Single Surrey Unitary, and officer time.
- IV. Other relevant information.

Item 8 (ii)

Mr Chris Botten (Caterham Hill) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes:

That it recognises that the future of Surrey's local government may well be with appropriately sized and proportioned unitary authorities.

Therefore resolves that:

- I. In future to ensure it works inclusively with Boroughs and Districts and their communities to establish a consensus on the way forward, including ensuring that funding can be devolved to elected bodies as close to communities as possible.
- II. It minimises the use of public funds and resources in exploring and developing future models to put to Surrey residents, mindful of the fact that ALL councils in Surrey have very limited resources and that any move to Unitary bodies would be predicated on the need for greater efficiency and stewardship of public funds.

Item 8 (iii)

Mr Will Forster (Woking South) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes:

- As people are being instructed to return to school, the national Government is encouraging everyone to walk or cycle where possible instead of taking public transport or returning to their cars.
- The Government has announced a £250 million “Emergency Active Travel Fund” for temporary infrastructure to enable safe cycling and walking – of which, Surrey County Council received £848,000 (and provided match funding) as part of phase 1. It has subsequently submitted a £7.8m bid for phase 2.
- The Transport Secretary issued new Statutory Guidance on 9 May to all Highways Authorities, requiring them to deliver “transformative change” within an urgent timeframe.
- Measures listed under the Statutory Guidance include (but are not limited to) ‘pop-up’ cycle facilities, widening footways, “school streets” schemes, and reducing speed limits.
- The guidance further states that “measures should be taken as swiftly as possible, and in any event within weeks, given the urgent need to change travel habits before the restart takes full effect”.
- “School streets” schemes, which close the roads outside schools during drop-off and pick-up times, have the multiple aims of: improving road safety for pupils, encouraging active travel to school/ modal shift out of cars, and improving the air quality and environment at the school gates, and are very effective for enabling social distancing outside schools.

This Council further notes that:

- Prior to Covid-19 related changes, “school streets” schemes were successfully introduced or were being trialled at multiple local authorities across the UK.
- Since the announcement, enthusiasm for “school streets” has skyrocketed, with many more councils introducing these schemes before schools reopened and multiple NGOs calling for the introduction of “school streets” to manage social distancing at the school gate.
- Some councils are introducing the measures under their own considerable statutory powers, making experimental traffic orders where necessary.

- Now is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to positively impact travel choices, including the associated benefits on health, air quality and road safety.

This Council resolves to request that Cabinet:

- I. Works with county councillors, Districts and Boroughs, schools and local partners to swiftly identify those schools in the county that could put a “school streets” scheme in place.
- II. Works with county councillors, Districts and Boroughs, schools and local partners to enable all schools that wish to take part in the “school streets” scheme to do so – taking advantage of experimental traffic orders and new statutory guidance over fast-tracked Traffic Regulation Orders where necessary.
- III. In the long term, continue to work with all schools in the county to develop accredited Travel Plans, which could include enforceable No-Idling Zones and “school streets” schemes.
- IV. Measures air quality around a sample of schools in all eleven districts/boroughs at child-head height to identify the level of air pollution children are being exposed to at school drop-off and pick-up.
- V. Pilots additional measures to improve air quality near schools in 2020/21, such as “living green walls” and tree planting, working with local businesses to sponsor these initiatives.
- VI. Establishes a cross party group of members to work with officers in order to identify suitable measures, prioritise locations and oversee implementation of the scheme.

Item 8 (iv)

Mrs Helyn Clack (Dorking Rural) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes:

In Surrey, we are committed to enabling our residents, communities and local businesses to have a greater say over the issues that truly matter to them.

Surrey has a strong track record of partnership working and innate strengths and capacity within our communities and we wish to build on this.

This Council fully supports the enhanced local engagement work currently underway to ensure our residents have more influence over what happens in their local communities.

Therefore resolves that:

- I. It supports residents to have a greater role in determining the priorities for the future of their communities.
- II. It enables enhanced resident engagement through the creation of a number of Local Community Networks, drawing partners together with the Council at a local level and giving Surrey residents and communities a greater say in the issues that affect them.
- III. Through the Local Community Networks to work in partnership with local bodies and organisations to ensure effective and joined-up local approaches to addressing local issues and service provision.
- IV. It enables residents to take greater local control by the potential devolution of local assets and services.

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------|
| 9 | SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL - CIVIC HEART MOVE TO WOODHATCH | (Pages
41 - 42) |
| | For Council to consider the move of the Civic Heart from County Hall to the Canon site, Woodhatch, Reigate, Surrey from 1 January 2021. | |
| 10 | REVIEW OF COVID RELATED CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES | (Pages
43 - 46) |
| | Council is asked to review the recommendations made and to remove the previous delegations agreed at its meeting on 17 March 2020, due to the Remote Meeting Regulations legislation. | |
| 11 | MEMBERS ALLOWANCES - FOLLOW UP FROM INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL REPORT | (Pages
47 - 56) |
| | The report follows up on recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) which were approved by Council in July 2020. Council is asked to approve two new role profiles and a new parental leave policy for Members. | |
| 12 | CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES | |

Recommendations:

1. Council to note Mr Edward Hawkins' appointment by the Leader as a Deputy Cabinet Member supporting the property portfolio area on 29 September 2020.
2. As a result of the above, appointments are to be made to the Planning and Regulatory (including the vice-chairmanship) and Audit and Governance Committees for the remainder of the 2020/21 Council Year:

Report to follow.

13 REPORT OF THE CABINET

To receive the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 21 July 2020 and 29 September 2020.

Report to follow.

14 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS

(Pages
57 - 68)

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to Democratic Services by 12 noon on Monday 12 October 2020.

Report to follow - minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 29 September 2020.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD REMOTELY ON MICROSOFT TEAMS ON 7 JULY 2020 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

25/20 CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

Under the motion of Mr Gardner, seconded by Mr Botten, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED:

That Mr Anthony Samuels be elected Chairman of the Council for the Council Year 2020/21.

STATUTORY DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE:

Mr Samuels made the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

The newly elected Chairman expressed his thanks to the Members of the Council for electing him as Chairman and gave a short speech, attached as Appendix A.

The Chairman led a one-minute silence for the Executive Director of Children, Lifelong Learning and Culture, Dave Hill CBE who recently passed away

26/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]

Apologies were received from Mrs Mason, Mr Nuti and Mrs Rush.

27/20 MINUTES [Item 3]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 17 March 2020 were submitted and confirmed.

28/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

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

29/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 5]

The Chairman:

- Highlighted to Members that the Chairman's Announcements were located in the agenda front sheet.

30/20 VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 6]

Under the motion of Mr Darby, seconded by Mrs Muir, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Helyn Clack be elected Vice-Chairman of the Council for the Council Year 2020/21.

STATUTORY DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE:

Mrs Clack made the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

The newly elected Vice-Chairman expressed her thanks to the Members of the Council for electing her as Vice-Chairman and gave a short speech.

31/20 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 7]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Paid tribute to Dave Hill CBE, Executive Director of Children, Lifelong Learning and Culture:
 - What he had achieved was truly transformational during a time of crisis in Children's Services, he was a pillar to the Council committed to improving the lives of children.
 - He identified talented people who could help Children's Services and it was vital to continue to strive alongside the officer team that he created.
 - That school leaders reflected on the strong foundations that he laid to transform Children's Services and were determined to build on them.
- Praised the Council's leadership and thanked staff for their work and response to the pandemic, noting that partnership work with residents through employing local knowledge and solutions remained effective.
- Welcomed the recent statement by the head of NHS England that the pandemic was a catalyst to drive improvements and reform in adult social care.
- That the Council and local government needed to work closely with central Government to ensure that they were supported financially during the pandemic.
- Welcomed the recommencement of services such as road repairs and the reopening of facilities such as high streets, Community Recycling Centres (CRCs), with libraries forthcoming.
- Noted that the transformation plan regarding the provision of extra care places and units for those with autism and learning difficulties to get people back into community was behind schedule.
- Noted that there had not been any updates on the detailed review of Surrey property that had been undertaken eighteen months ago.
- Welcomed the Leader of the Council outlining the proposals for Surrey's future concerning the devolution White Paper which was to be published in the autumn and welcomed the opportunity to scrutinise the Council's options.
- Concerned that future options for Surrey on devolution, were a consuming distraction for the Council which was dealing with a number of crises regarding the care home sector, the vulnerability of the county's children including the prevalence of domestic abuse; and the impact the pandemic was having on the airline, retail and hospitality sector and the Council's future prosperity - suggesting the establishment of a business development board.
- Highlighted the gaps in schools concerning children with Special Educational needs and Disability (SEND) and families without IT or broadband. A recovery plan including input from headteachers and specialists should be developed.
- Welcomed the Leader of the Council's statement outlining the opportunities and challenges ahead, highlighting that the Council's ambition had not dimmed and its transformation work had not stopped.
- Supported the Leader of the Council's exploration into the Council's future options in advance of the White Paper on devolution and asked what additional powers he would like to see for Surrey; noting that a new unitary system could provide savings for services and be good for business due to less bureaucracy.

- Noted that Members must be consulted on the matter of devolution before plans were shared with the media and raised concerns if the Council was looking to establish a single unitary authority.
- Asked what the Council would do to proactively listen and reach out to the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) community so that individuals were empowered to share their views and if the Council had identified statues or street names in the county that bore past commemoration to slave traders.
- That if the Council would use its budget to review what has worked at ground level and to reflect on its experiences of Covid-19 as part of the work regarding the Local Outbreak Control Plan.
- Commended the volunteers and charities in Surrey for their work, particularly in relation to mental health and homelessness during the pandemic. Noting the invaluable support from the Community Foundation for Surrey who had raised £1.5 million with approximately half of that sum being distributed to 140 charities - in addition to the Council's Voluntary, Community & Faith sector (VCFS) Hardship Fund in which £250,000 was awarded to local organisations.
- That the pandemic had highlighted the excellent work of the Voluntary, Community & Faith sector (VCFS) and the service to communities by inspirational individuals.
- Praised the temporary traffic measures in Farnham town centre during the pandemic but called for a review on banning HGV trucks in the centre.
- Asked when the Leader of the Council would speak to all political leaders in the borough and district councils on devolution and if the Leader would consider holding a Member Briefing on the matter to ensure constructive dialogue.
- Thanked all staff in the county for delivering key services and support during the pandemic.
- Noted that it was not the right time to debate the proposed local government reorganisation and devolution, as the final form of the UK's departure from the EU and the progression of Covid-19 was unknown. The priority for the Council should be to improve service delivery without major upheaval.
- Shared concerns about the children who had missed out on schooling as a result of Covid-19, providing reassurance that the matter was being addressed. Highlighting the work of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee Task and Finish Group on SEND provision, RAG (Red-Amber-Green) ratings and risk assessments carried out by the Education and SEND teams on children with SEND, the Council's work with school leaders and partnership work with the Schools Alliance for Excellence to support remote learning during the pandemic and the application for funding from the Government's £650 million allocated for catch-up provision to support disadvantaged pupils.
- Paid tribute to Terry Dicks a former county councillor who passed away in mid-June.

32/20 ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY [Item 8]

The report was introduced by the Leader of the Council.

RESOLVED (with no Members voting Against):

That the scheme of proportionality and committees seat allocations be adopted for 2020/21.

33/20 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES [Item 9]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report.

The following correction was made at the meeting:

- People, Performance and Development Committee: Natalie Bramhall to replace Mike Goodman under Substitutes - Cabinet Members.

Noting the above amendment, the report was agreed. A copy of the finalised version is attached as Appendix C.

RESOLVED (with no Members voting Against):

The Council agreed:

1. To appoint Members to serve on the Committees of the Council for the Council year 2020/21 in accordance with the wishes of political groups.
2. To authorise the Chief Executive to make changes to the membership of any of the Council's Committees as necessary during the Council year in accordance with the wishes of political groups.
3. To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Woking borough area to serve on the Woking Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.
4. To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Spelthorne borough area to serve on the Spelthorne Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.
5. To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Runnymede borough area to serve on the Runnymede Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.
6. To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Guildford borough area to serve on the Guildford Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.
7. To appoint the remaining County Councillors for each district/borough area to serve on the appropriate Local Committee for the Council year 2020/21, and to authorise the Chief Executive to appoint an equal number of district/borough councillors to the Local Committees following nominations by the district and borough councils, which they should be requested to make politically proportional to their Membership.
8. To appoint the Council's representative to the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for the Council year 2020/21.
9. To appoint four Members (one of whom must be a Cabinet Member and the others County Councillors representing divisions that include the Basingstoke Canal) to the Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee.
10. To appoint up to two Members to the Buckinghamshire County Council and Surrey County Council Joint Trading Standards Service Committee, one of whom must be a Cabinet Member; the other in an advisory non-voting role.
11. To note the Leader's appointments to the Council's Executive Committees as outlined above.

34/20 ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN [Item 10]

The updated proposals for the appointment of Committee Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen were published in the supplementary agenda on 6 July 2020.

The appointment to the role of Chairman of the Epsom and Ewell Local Committee was subject to a contested election, with 55 Members voting For Tina Mountain and 15 For John Beckett, and 6 Abstentions. A copy of the finalised version is attached as Appendix D.

RESOLVED:

That the Members listed are duly elected as Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen respectively of the Committees as shown for 2020/21.

35/20 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 11]

Member Questions:

Notice of thirteen questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in a supplementary agenda on 6 July 2020.

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

(Q1) Mrs Hazel Watson asked if the Leader of the Council would formally write to the event organisers London Marathon Events, stating that the Council finds it unacceptable for them not to have addressed the serious accident and to discuss the measures going forward to protect local residents within one year of accident.

Rachael I. Lake asked if the Leader would organise a meeting with all Members whose division the Prudential RideLondon cycle event goes through.

The Leader of the Council responded that he was happy to write to London Marathon Events to ask them to confirm that there would be suitable safety measures in place, it was not however appropriate to involve the Council with an individual claim as the insurers of London Marathon Events were dealing with the matter. He encouraged Members with any specific issues to liaise with him and commented that the Cabinet Member for Communities was in discussion with the event organisers to discuss the event post 2021.

(Q2) Mr Robert Evans noted that the response was confusing and asked if the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health had received any indication from the Government that they would offer to reimburse schools or other organisations for the costs incurred from adhering to the two metre rule and the subsequent change to one metre plus.

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health responded that she was not aware of any Government commitment to reimburse schools or other organisations at present.

(Q5) Mr Stephen Cooksey asked the Cabinet Member for Transport about the timetable for both the first tranche and second tranche of the Active Travel funding, particularly when there might be implementation on the first tranche and further detail provided on the second tranche.

Mr Jonathan Essex if the Council would confirm that plans were in place to employ a full-time cycle planner and that sufficient walking and cycling skills would be sought externally if needed to ensure that the full amount from the phase one bid could be secured. He also asked if the cost breakdown for the measures funded or not in phase one.

Mr David Harmer noted the money set aside for verge vegetation control in rural areas, explaining that allowing the vegetation to grow in certain areas was a good traffic calming measure, it protected endangered species and was less costly. He asked if local parish councils could be invited to nominate areas where verge vegetation could be left to grow.

Mr Will Forster commented that the answer noted that Sustrans and Create Streets were involved in the second tranche, asking if they were also involved in tranche one and if the relevant divisional councillors would be consulted before the second tranche bids were submitted.

Mr Nick Harrison asked if the Epsom Banstead Sustainable Transport Package (STP) could be reviewed.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport commented that the timeframe for implementation of the first phase was for completion as quickly as possible. His team were contacting all divisional councillors for their feedback before the submission of a bid for the second tranche. A project manager had been employed who was working on the prioritisation of the measures in tranche one. A cost breakdown could be provided for the measures funded in phase one. He noted that he was only proposing areas where vegetation was to be cut back in order to improve walking and cycling, not on rural roads unless there was a pavement. He explained that Sustrans and Create Streets were not involved in the bid, Create Streets were involved in the pilots to provide feedback on improvements and both partners were to be involved going forward. He noted if the Epsom Banstead Sustainable Transport Package (STP) was submitted as part of Active Travel funding proposals it would be considered as part of phase two.

(Q6) Mr Will Forster asked the Cabinet Member for Transport if the Woking Local Committee should have been consulted on Woking's Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan before it was published.

The Cabinet Member for Transport replied that officers and councillors from Woking Borough Council, Surrey County Council and the and the Department of Transport were fully involved. He added that his aim was to have more Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plans across the county.

(Q7) Mr Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Transport if Members could join the briefing tomorrow of interest contractors on the procurement of the future highway maintenance contract. He asked what was planned for Members to enable them to review the 14 to 20 year contract period and if he would consider separating out routine maintenance so Members could scrutinise contracts before inviting contractors to express interest.

Mr John O'Reilly asked if the Cabinet would agree on the importance of reconvening the Member Reference Group which followed the highway maintenance contract process and if the whole Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee could be given the opportunity to express its views on the matter before decisions were taken.

Dr Andrew Povey noted that in some cases it would be beneficial within the new contract to have a certain level below which permitted parish councils and local contractors to undertake small amounts of work on the highways, who were often more cost-effective.

The Cabinet Member for Transport noted that the briefing tomorrow was an expression of interest session with parties from the industry, with no Member involvement at present. Members would be fully involved in due course with the resumption of the Member Reference Group and feedback from the select committee. His team was looking to ensure the contract and approach to climate change and carbon zero was innovative and flexible, alongside the Rethinking Transport project. He would speak to the Member outside the meeting regarding better value for money through using smaller local contractors such as residents' associations, community groups and

parish councils to undertake work such as litter picking or verge trimming in some cases; whilst taking into consideration of who was properly insured to work on the highway.

(Q8) Mr Robert Evans commented that he hoped the Leader would provide Members with regular updates concerning the financial implications from Covid-19.

(Q10) Mr Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change if the Air Quality Modelling report, the HIF Business case and the ecological screening review could be shared.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change responded that the above reports would be shared.

(Q11) Mr Robert Evans asked if the Leader would consider setting up a working group to look at sharing best practice and experiences concerning incidents of traveller sites setting up on both public and private land in the county as well as unauthorised encampments (UEs), ensuring future preparedness.

The Leader of the Council responded that there was a working group within the Surrey Leader's Group focusing on matters relating to travellers, he noted that the main issue was the need to identify a location for a transit site and stopover points to which he had offered up some land. He welcomed the support of the Member and would speak to him outside of the meeting.

(Q12) Mr Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning if the work on identifying temporary classrooms or empty buildings spaces for schools by the Council's Land and Property team, be continued in case of a second Covid-19 peak enabling schools with less on-site space in the county to remain open.

In response, the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning noted that the Land and Property team were working closely with schools on identifying additional on-site premises where possible. The preferred option was to look at business as usual and continuity plans around home education and learning in response to a second peak, rather than schools managing across multiple sites.

(Q13) Mr Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change to confirm the membership and the frequency of the Climate Change Strategic Board.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change responded that the Board had been newly constituted and had met once so far. Additional detail including its membership would be provided to the Member outside of the meeting.

36/20 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 12]

There were none.

37/20 REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 13]

The Leader of the Council thanked the Chairman and members of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) as well as the Member Services Manager for their work in producing the comprehensive report and conducting an extensive set of interviews.

The Leader noted that discussions around Member remunerations was a sensitive issue and recognised the personal and financial sacrifices made by Members when undertaking their civic duties. He noted that his preferred approach was to consider the

report and its recommendations in its entirety, which would deliver a three per cent reduction in the total allowances resulting in a net saving to the Council.

Members made the following comments:

- That the Leader of the Council rightly emphasised the sensitivity of the matter, but it was vital to residents that Members' remunerations were scrutinised particularly as the pandemic had highlighted the socio-economic difficulties faced by many residents.
- Thanked the IRP for its work in producing the final report, noting that the removal of the twenty-two per cent planned uplift for select committee chairmen and the introduction of the new Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) for the Select Committee Task Group leads (interim title) was welcome as the resultant saving to the Council was a three per cent or £38,000 net reduction.
- Disagreed with the proposed abolition of the SRA for committee Vice-Chairmen, as for instance there was a large amount of work required for the Planning and Regulatory Committee which often took decisions that had a dramatic impact on local communities.
- That the allowances for committee Vice-Chairmen had not been looked into properly as second to committee Chairmen, they put in additional hours compared to ordinary committee members.
- The IRP should look to encourage a greater diversity of Members with a salary to match the work undertaken.
- That positions that had their SRA abolished were devalued as they had the same responsibilities without the allowance. Members had differing financial circumstances so to some Members the SRA was vital.
- That it was not appropriate for Members to vote on their remunerations as beneficiaries of the SRAs and a freeze in allowances was suggested in light of Covid-19 and the economic crises.
- Proposed that recommendation eight was amended to state 'that the role description, title and remuneration for the Deputy Cabinet Member role is updated' in order that it was clearer.
- That it was important that allowances were to keep pace with the Consumer Prices Index (CPI) and the level of responsibility involved.
- Stressed that it was important that Members were paid adequately and incentivised so the Council could attract people from less wealthy backgrounds in order to have a mix of diverse Members.
- That it did cost to be a Member, urging caution to avoid putting Members in embarrassing positions where depending on their financial circumstances they accepted or could reject their allowance. The Council and IRP must be practical especially considering how much Members used to get and the continuous reduction in pensions.

RESOLVED:

Relating to the Basic Allowance (65 Members voted For, 6 Against and 6 Abstentions):

1. Following the application of all other recommendations in this report, all allowances are rounded up to nearest £10 to avoid allowances being stated to the nearest pence.
2. That the basic allowance is increased from its current level by 1.7 per cent to **£12,660** from the date of the 2020 AGM in line with CPI from September 2019.
3. That the basic allowance is adjusted annually on 1 April thereafter in line with the CPI from the previous September. This recommendation will apply for a maximum of four years at which point the Panel must revisit the allowance.

Relating to Special Responsibility Allowances (52 Members voted For, 8 Against and 17 Abstentions):

4. Each Member may only receive one Special Responsibility Allowance.
5. That all special responsibility allowances are increased from their current level by 1.7 per cent from the date of the 2020 AGM in line with CPI from September 2019. This recommendation does not apply to those allowances covered by recommendations 13 and 14.
6. That all special responsibility allowances are adjusted annually on 1 April thereafter in line with the CPI from the previous September. This recommendation will apply for a maximum of four years at which point the Panel must revisit the allowances.
7. That there are no changes, other than the indexation adjustment in recommendation 5, to the following allowances: Chairman of the Council, Vice-Chairman of the Council, Leader, Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member, Deputy Cabinet Members, Select Committee Chairmen, Planning Committee Chairman, Audit and Governance Committee Chairman, Pension Fund Committee Chairman, Local and Joint Committee Chairmen (where chaired by a Surrey Member), and Opposition Leaders.
8. That the role description for the Deputy Cabinet Member role is updated.
9. That a limit is placed on the number of Deputy Cabinet Members in post at any one time, the Panel recommends four but accepts this is a matter for the Leader.
10. That the governance arrangements for select committees and their task groups or sub committees are clarified, including a role description prepared setting out the responsibilities assumed by Members currently designated as select committee Vice-Chairmen.
11. The eight Members currently designated as select committee Vice-Chairmen receive a new SRA. The role attracting this new SRA will be known as Select Committee Task Group leads and will be interim pending the formal review. These Members will receive an SRA of £1,530 effective from the date of the AGM.
12. Once governance arrangements and role descriptions have been confirmed, the Panel is asked to assess the role for an SRA against the requirements of the Regulations.
13. That the SRA for all committee Vice-Chairmen is abolished.
14. That the SRA for the office holders of political groups is abolished.

Relating to Inclusivity (74 Members voted For, 0 Against and 2 Abstentions):

15. The hourly cap on childcare allowance is abolished. Members may claim actual costs incurred in performing approved duties.
16. Members can claim any additional costs incurred by them where they can demonstrate that the cost was wholly and necessarily incurred in order to participate in approved duties. Individual claims under this provision to be scrutinised as usual by Democratic Services.
17. The hourly cap on dependent carers allowance is abolished. Members may claim actual costs incurred in performing approved duties.
18. That the Council introduces a shared parental leave policy for Members.
19. Democratic Services to be proactive about raising awareness that these costs are claimable with both existing and potential new Members.
20. Members to act as role models by claiming what they are entitled to, and thereby demonstrating to new Members that they will not be financially disadvantaged due to personal circumstances.

Relating to Expenses and Approved Duties (with no Members voting Against):

- 21. That mileage rates are linked with officer rates, apart from fully electric car rates.
- 22. That Members may claim 45p per mile for using fully electric cars to perform approved duties.

38/20 AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION [Item 14]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report. Regarding the establishment of the Surrey Local Outbreak Engagement Board, he noted that the Surrey Local Outbreak Control Plan and the NHS Test and Trace Communications Plan for Surrey had been circulated to Members.

A Member commented that the Surrey Local Firefighters' Pension Board had sought to assign and clarify the responsibilities concerning the Firefighters' Pension Scheme for some time. The identification of a specific person to take on the Scheme Manager responsibilities which had previously alternated between different individuals and services was welcomed and the Board looked forward to working with Sally Wilson. The Member's comments were endorsed by another Member and he was thanked for pursuing the identification of the Scheme Manager.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the County Council agreed to approve the new officer delegated functions relating to the Firefighters' Pension Scheme.
- 2. That the County Council approved the changes to Standing Order 41 (g), permitting the delegation of attendance to substitutes to the Surrey Local Firefighters' Pension Board.
- 3. That scrutiny of the Coroner's Service moves to sit within the remit of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee.
- 4. That Council noted the establishment of the Surrey Local Outbreak Engagement Board and its terms of reference.
- 5. 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.

39/20 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 15]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 31 March 2020 (Leader Decisions with Cabinet Members - acting as Cabinet), 28 April 2020, 26 May 2020 and 23 June 2020.

Reports for Information/Discussion:

31 March 2020:

- A. Returning the Countryside to Residents
- B. Digital Strategy 2025

A Member commented that Members had been forgotten regarding their role in taking the lead on connecting their communities and their ability to access the data needed that the Council held. In response, the Leader noted that Members were a central part of the Digital Strategy 2025 and he would clarify any unclear areas with the Member.

28 April 2020:

- C. Surrey Climate Change Strategy
- D. New Tree Strategy

26 May 2020:

- E. Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) Capital Strategy

23 June 2020:

- F. Housing Infrastructure Fund Forward Funding – Funding Allocation of £41.8 Million to the A320 North of Woking
- G. Rethinking Waste - Surrey County Council's Waste Commissioning Strategy
- H. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 March – 23 June 2020

RESOLVED:

1. That Council noted that there had been two urgent decision in that quarter.
2. That the reports of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 31 March 2020 (Leader Decisions with Cabinet Members - acting as Cabinet), 28 April 2020, 26 May 2020 and 23 June 2020 be adopted.

40/20 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: 12.36 pm]

Chairman

Annual County Council – 7 July 2020

Chairman's Election Speech

- First of all, I would like to say an enormous 'thank you' to you for voting me in for another year as Chairman of Surrey County Council.
- It is my honour and privilege to serve the county of Surrey and its residents – particularly during the challenging times that lay ahead of us.
- I will do my utmost to serve and help our great county and all those who live here.

Dave Hill

- It is with enormous sadness that we have had to say goodbye to our great friend and colleague, Dave Hill, who so sadly and unexpectedly passed away last month.
- David did a sterling job transforming our Children's Service over a short period of time; the positive impact he had on the council and the vulnerable children in our care can never be underestimated.
- It has been heart-warming to hear all the wonderful sentiments and stories about Dave. His many colleagues recall Dave with much affection and the utmost respect. He was thoughtful, inspirational and committed. He also had a passion for justice and fairness, not accepting discrimination in any form.
- He will be much missed by everyone here at the council, and we will work to ensure his legacy lives on by delivering the very best support for Surrey's young people. I'd now like to invite the council to join me in a minute of silence and quiet reflection for our great colleague and friend.

Tony Pidgley

- We have also had to say goodbye far too prematurely to another great friend of Surrey – Tony Pidgley, Chairman of Berkeley Homes.
- A former Barnardos boy, Tony's early years were very humble – yet, thanks to his sheer hard work and determination – Tony went on to become one of the country's most successful housebuilders, providing much-needed housing to many.
- He was the ultimate 'success story'.
- Tony leaves behind his wife Sarah and his four children. He will be very sorely missed.

Thank You

- Before we move on to the business of our AGM, I would like to say a huge 'thank you' to the many, many people who have been supporting Surrey residents during the covid pandemic.
- Thank you to our key workers, Surrey officers, our wonderful Voluntary Community and Faith sector groups and every resident who has pulled together throughout the few difficult months. I'd also like to put on record my thanks to our Leader and Chief Executive, their hard work and dedication has been plain for all to see.
- I've always known that Surrey was a special place – but wow, the last few months have shown us what we can do when we all stand together.

Chairman's Theme, 2020-21

- Which brings me onto announcing my theme for the forthcoming year. It is **Surrey Stands Together** – recognising staff and volunteers who have pulled together to support Surrey residents during the Covid-19 outbreak.
- I will pay particular focus to those staff and volunteers working with Surrey's youth. We have a responsibility to the next generation and COVID-19 has disproportionately hit young people.
- I'd like to take this opportunity to announce that Surrey's Young Mayor, Jacob Wrenn, has successfully been appointed for another year. I intend to work closely with the Vice-Chairman to ensure that we support Surrey's Young Mayor and Cabinet and enable young people's voice to be heard louder than ever.
- I'm sure you will agree that we have plenty to focus our efforts on - and as Surrey Stands Together, we will come out the other side of this pandemic stronger than ever before.

Thank you.

Leader's Statement – 7 July 2020

Mr Chairman

As you have already touched upon, it was with the greatest of sadness that just two weeks ago, we suddenly and tragically lost Dave Hill, our Executive Director for Children, Lifelong Learning and Culture.

Dave was a key member of the senior leadership team, a team that has worked so hard to raise the bar in the delivery of our services. Words really cannot express our sense of loss, both personally and professionally, but all our thoughts continue to be with Dave's wife Jo and his two daughters Laurel and Lydia.

Dave was a tower of a man who was held both in respect and affection by those who worked with him not just at Surrey but across the whole of children's services. He was thoughtful, inspirational, committed and self-deprecating. He will be irreplaceable.

We will work tirelessly to ensure his legacy lives on in delivering the very best support for Surrey's young people.

One of Dave's final acts here was to play a critical role in securing more emergency refuge accommodation for families escaping domestic abuse.

It is a fitting tribute to him, that this safe space is now available that will ultimately provide sanctuary and safety for some of Surrey's most vulnerable families. It is a symbol of everything he stood for.

As Joanna Killian, our Chief Executive, stated, Dave's passion for justice and fairness also made him the natural choice to sponsor our renewed efforts towards equality, diversity and inclusion at the council.

He would not tolerate discrimination of any kind and was determined we would be a better council.

Dave was in tune with our staff very recently, as the Black Lives Matter movement gathered momentum and brought into focus the experiences and discrimination black people are subjected to - even now, even here in the UK.

It is abundantly clear that the anger and frustration expressed by the black community across the world is not just about the single incident in America some weeks ago, with the killing of George Floyd.

We have made great strides in the equality agenda in this country, transformative progress has unquestionably been made over the last two decades.

However, it is important that we recognise racial bias in our country still exists. We undoubtedly still have some way to go.

Mr Chairman, members, we must **listen** to the experiences of black and other ethnic minority members of our communities.

Without giving these communities a voice - without listening - we cannot pretend to know how the lives of BAME people are affected day in day out by racial prejudice, bias and discrimination.

We recognise that more must be done to break down the barriers facing the BAME community, tackle conscious and unconscious bias and empower those who may feel restricted or unheard.

Please speak up, we **will** listen.

We are challenging ourselves to put equality of opportunity at the forefront of our policy and decision making.

We will test this, we will listen to our minority communities and we will work together to ensure that Surrey is a place where everybody can flourish, and that not one single person is discriminated against.

Mr Chairman, we convene again as full council, still in uncertain times.

But we are re-emerging, albeit cautiously, from a lockdown that has been hugely challenging for many in our communities.

Surrey County Council and its partners across the county have done a phenomenal job over the last four months in responding to the COVID crisis.

Our response with our partners has shown the power of working together - coordinated, aligned and striving for a shared purpose. Delivering food parcels, supporting our shielded residents and visiting our 4000 extremely vulnerable residents.

Much of that response work is ongoing; we are not out of the woods yet.

Moving into the next phase, Surrey is also leading the way in delivering our Local Outbreak Control Plan.

We have been one of 11 authorities in England chosen as part of a Good Practice Network of councils, sharing best practice in how we manage local cases and outbreaks and restrict the spread of COVID-19 in our communities.

We are proving that we are a trusted authority, who is there for its residents and who can be relied upon to deliver.

I must pay tribute to our Public Health Team here at Surrey County Council, led by Ruth Hutchinson, who have been working non-stop on developing this plan alongside other colleagues within the council, as well as our NHS partners, district and boroughs and military planners.

It is a comprehensive document which will evolve as we continue to learn, and it will stand us in good stead to do everything we can to keep the situation under control here in Surrey.

Everything we have done, and everything we are doing, is aimed at keeping the people of Surrey safe, allowing them to get back to work, giving them back their freedoms and seeing loved ones again. In order to do so, we need everyone to **play their part** and **Keep Surrey Safe**.

We cannot emphasise these messages enough, and I urge all members to carry that message out to your communities:

Everybody must keep following the basic public health guidance to restrict the spread – we are back to the mantra of ‘wash your hands’, keep social distancing and be alert to symptoms.

People must get tested and isolate if they have any of the symptoms, and comply with NHS contact tracers.

If you are contacted by those tracers, please do as instructed and isolate.

If we all play our part, we can Keep Surrey Safe, and keep Surrey open.

Mr Chairman, as I’ve already mentioned, we are seeing our communities, our high streets and our businesses opening up again.

But this restart is not without trepidation, and challenges that must be overcome.

We are engaging with communities about the best ways to open up high streets safely and get people moving around, increasing active travel and boosting footfall for retail businesses as they reopen.

We are working with our colleagues from Surrey Heartlands to ensure people have access to the health services they need, and supporting our care sector.

It is vital that we continue to support, and listen to, Surrey’s Community, Voluntary and Faith sector who have stepped up, as always, during the response with an overwhelming number of volunteers in action, helping those people most in need.

Indeed, it is important, as you have already done Mr Chairman, to thank all those who have played their part and recognise their contribution, that has not only brought comfort and relief, but also undoubtedly saved lives.

But that sector is struggling – their income has been hit with the lack of fundraising, while demand for their support has increased.

They have never been more needed.

It is here, in supporting our voluntary sector, connecting our communities, boosting our local economy, enhancing our place, where our recovery work will really pay dividends.

Mr Chairman, we continue to push forward as an organisation, striving to make Surrey the best place it can be.

We recently held the first meeting of our ‘One Surrey Growth Board’ – a strategic partnership to ensure improvements in Surrey’s economy, homes, infrastructure and quality of life. We will work closely with all partners to deliver those ambitions.

Over the coming months we will go live with our Community Projects Fund - £100m for groundbreaking projects sparked by engagement with our communities, delivering real benefits for our residents and turbo charging Surrey’s recovery.

Our library transformation programme is gathering pace, again with important input from our communities.

The delivery of our Climate Change Strategy and our Tree Strategy, finalised in May, is underway.

We are still delivering major projects like the Surrey Flood Alleviation Scheme, a masterplan for Farnham Town Centre, and multi-million-pound road, cycle and pedestrian improvements on the A320 between Chertsey and Ottershaw.

Surrey Fire & Rescue Service continues to modernise with the next phase of the Making Surrey Safer Plan put into action.

Our transformation of services for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities is already making a positive difference to families.

As part of this progress, Mr Chairman, and in line with the government agenda, we must now take a fundamental look at the future of local government.

Those of you who attended – virtually – the LGA conference last week will know that the government are pressing ahead with the planned Devolution White Paper in the autumn.

We must explore the potential for Surrey.

We must build on our track record here at Surrey County Council.

We have transformed this council, from financial instability and failing services into one of the leading authorities in the country, with a positive economic outlook and services that are fit for the future. Over the last four months we have led a robust, coordinated and effective response to COVID-19.

But we can do even more.

By working with government ahead of this White Paper, I believe we can secure greater powers and responsibility, and we can examine what the right structure of government is for Surrey's future - to tackle the challenges we face and take the opportunities that are coming our way.

With the right combination of devolved powers and structural reform, alongside our strategic vision and leadership, we can not only recover from COVID-19, but unleash growth and fulfil this county's potential.

We can reduce inequality. We can deliver new models of health and social care. We can support the high street. We can plan a sustainable, greener future. We can ensure the skills needed for our local economy are met through opportunities for our young people. We can better empower and connect our communities. We can lead a digital future.

There are huge financial savings to be made and a more productive and resilient economy to be harnessed.

This is a huge opportunity for Surrey, and one we must get right.

We will continue our work in exploring the options, and engage our partners across Surrey, with a view to coming back to Council in early autumn.

Mr Chairman. Our ambition has not dimmed. Our transformation has not stopped.

We continue to raise the bar for public service.

We remain innovative in our thinking, determined in our attitude and bold in our actions.

This page is intentionally left blank

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL: 7 JULY 2020

APPOINTMENT OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

ADULTS AND HEALTH SELECT COMMITTEE (12)

<p>Conservative (8)</p> <p>Bill Chapman Clare Curran Bob Gardner Jeff Harris Tina Mountain Bernie Muir Marsha Moseley David Mansfield</p>	<p>Surrey Opposition Forum (2)</p> <p>Angela Goodwin Fiona White</p> <hr/> <p>Residents' Association & Independent (2)</p> <p>Nick Darby Ernest Mallet</p>
--	--

SOUTH WEST LONDON AND SURREY JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (2)

Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Statutory Health Scrutiny function

Bill Chapman and Nick Darby

SOUTH WEST LONDON AND SURREY JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE SUB-COMMITTEE (1)

Chairman of Statutory Health Scrutiny function

Bill Chapman

CHILDREN, FAMILIES, LIFELONG LEARNING AND CULTURE SELECT COMMITTEE (12)

<p>Conservative (8)</p> <p>Liz Bowes Kay Hammond Yvonna Lay</p>	<p>Surrey Opposition Forum (1)</p> <p>Chris Botten</p>
--	---

Peter Martin Andrew Povey Lesley Steeds Barbara Thomson Richard Walsh	<i>Residents' Association & Independent (2)</i> Amanda Boote Chris Townsend
	<i>Labour (1)</i> Robert Evans

COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE (12)

<i>Conservative (7)</i> Paul Deach John Furey Mike Goodman Ken Gulati Saj Hussain John O'Reilly Keith Witham	<i>Surrey Opposition Forum (2)</i> Jonathan Essex Fiona White
<i>Brexit (1)</i> Mike Bennison	<i>Residents' Association & Independent (2)</i> Andy MacLeod Jan Mason

RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE SELECT COMMITTEE (12)

<i>Conservative (8)</i> Ayesha Azad Mark Brett-Warburton Graham Ellwood Tim Hall Naz Islam Graham Knight Rachael Lake Peter Szanto	<i>Surrey Opposition Forum (2)</i> Will Forster Hazel Watson
	<i>Residents' Association & Independent (2)</i> Nick Harrison

	Chris Townsend
--	----------------

PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE

<p>Conservative (8)</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Mary Angell Tim Hall Edward Hawkins Saj Hussain Bernie Muir Andrew Povey Keith Taylor Rose Thorn</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Tim Evans Yvonna Lay Barbara Thomson Richard Walsh</p>	<p>Surrey Opposition Forum (2)</p> <p>Stephen Cooksey Penny Rivers</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Jonathan Essex Will Forster David Goodwin</p>
	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Ernest Mallet</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Amanda Boote Chris Botten Nick Darby Nick Harrison Chris Townsend</p>

AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

<p>Conservative (4)</p> <p>David Harmer Edward Hawkins Peter Szanto Keith Witham</p>	<p>Surrey Opposition Forum (1)</p> <p>Stephen Cooksey</p>
	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Stephen Spence</p>

PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

<p>Conservative (4)</p> <p>Ken Gulati Colin Kemp Tim Oliver Denise Turner-Stewart</p>	<p>Surrey Opposition Forum (1)</p> <p>Chris Botten</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Will Forster</p>
<p>Substitutes (up to 7 Cabinet Members):-</p> <p>Mel Few Natalie Bramhall Zully Grant-Duff Julie Iles Mary Lewis Sinead Mooney Matt Furniss</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>Eber Kington</p> <p>Substitutes (up to 7):-</p> <p>Nick Harrison Ernest Mallet Chris Townsend</p>

SURREY PENSION FUND COMMITTEE

<p>Conservative (3)</p> <p>Ben Carasco Tim Evans David Mansfield</p>	<p>Surrey Opposition Forum (1)</p> <p>Hazel Watson</p>
<p>Other (1)</p> <p>Charlotte Morley</p>	<p>Residents' Association & Independent (1)</p> <p>John Beckett</p>
<p>Co-opted Members (4)*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – One representative (trade union) from employee members of the Fund – Two representatives from Districts and Boroughs of the Fund; – One representative from all other employers in the Fund. 	

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

MEMBER CONDUCT PANEL*

<i>Conservative (7)</i> Mary Angell Mark Brett Warburton Helyn Clack Ken Gulati Tim Hall David Harmer Tony Samuels	<i>Surrey Opposition Forum (1)</i> Hazel Watson
<i>Residents' Association & Independent (2)</i> Eber Kington Chris Townsend	

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

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL (1)

<i>Nominations received:</i>	Andrew Povey
-------------------------------------	--------------

**BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL AND SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
JOINT TRADING STANDARDS SERVICE COMMITTEE (2)***

<i>Nominations received:</i>	Denise Turner-Stewart David Harmer
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

**One County Councillor, who must be a Cabinet Member. In addition, the County Council can appoint one county councillor to undertake a non-voting advisory role.*

BASINGSTOKE CANAL JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (4)*

<i>Nominations received:</i>	Natalie Bramhall, Ben Carasco, Paul Deach, Saj Hussain
-------------------------------------	--

**Must include a Cabinet Member and three Members representing divisions which include the Basingstoke Canal in their area.*

The County Council is asked to note the following Committee Appointments made by the Leader of the Council:

STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD (4)*

Appointment:	Tim Oliver Colin Kemp Mel Few Zully Grant-Duff
---------------------	---

**Up to five Cabinet Members including the Leader and Deputy Leader and the portfolio holders for Property, Finance and Corporate Support.*

ORBIS JOINT COMMITTEE (2)*

Appointment:	Mel Few Zully Grant-Duff
---------------------	-----------------------------

**Two Cabinet Members.*

SURREY-WIDE COMMISSIONING COMMITTEES IN COMMON (3)*

Appointment:	Tim Oliver Mary Lewis Sinead Mooney
---------------------	---

**The Leader, Cabinet Member for Adults and Health and the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families*

RESOLVED:

The Council agreed:

- (1) To appoint Members to serve on the Committees of the Council for the Council year 2020/21 in accordance with the wishes of political groups.**
- (2) To authorise the Chief Executive to make changes to the membership of any of the Council's Committees as necessary during the Council year in accordance with the wishes of political groups.**
- (3) To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Woking borough area to serve on the Woking Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.**

- (4) To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Spelthorne borough area to serve on the Spelthorne Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.**
- (5) To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Runnymede borough area to serve on the Runnymede Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.**
- (6) To appoint the County Councillors representing divisions in the Guildford borough area to serve on the Guildford Joint Committee for the Council year 2020/21.**
- (7) To appoint the remaining County Councillors for each district/borough area to serve on the appropriate Local Committee for the Council year 2020/21, and to authorise the Chief Executive to appoint an equal number of district/borough councillors to the Local Committees following nominations by the district and borough councils, which they should be requested to make politically proportional to their Membership.**
- (8) To appoint the Council's representative to the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for the Council year 2020/21.**
- (9) To appoint four Members (one of whom must be a Cabinet Member and the others County Councillors representing divisions that include the Basingstoke Canal) to the Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee.**
- (10) To appoint up to two Members to the Buckinghamshire County Council and Surrey County Council Joint Trading Standards Service Committee, one of whom must be a Cabinet Member; the other in an advisory non-voting role.**
- (11) To note the Leader's appointments to the Council's Executive Committees as outlined above.**

This page is intentionally left blank

<p align="center">ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL: 7 JULY 2020</p> <p align="center">ELECTION OF CHAIRMEN AND VICE CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES</p> <p align="center">2020/21</p>
--

SELECT COMMITTEES		
	Chairman	Vice-Chairmen
Adults and Health	Bernie Muir	1. Bill Chapman 2. Nick Darby
Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture	Kay Hammond	1. Lesley Steeds 2. Chris Botten
Communities, Environment and Highways	John O'Reilly	1. Saj Hussain 2. Andy MacLeod
Resources and Performance	Nick Harrison	1. Graham Knight 2. Will Forster
REGULATORY COMMITTEES		
	Chairman	Vice-Chairman
PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE		
	Tim Oliver	Colin Kemp
AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE		
	David Harmer	Keith Witham
PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE		
	Tim Hall	Edward Hawkins
SURREY PENSION FUND COMMITTEE		
	Tim Evans	Ben Carasco

LOCAL COMMITTEES		
DISTRICT	CHAIRMAN	VICE-CHAIRMAN
Elmbridge	Peter Szanto	Rachael I Lake
Epsom & Ewell	Tina Mountain	Jan Mason
Mole Valley	Tim Hall	Stephen Cooksey
Reigate & Banstead	Barbara Thomson	Ken Gulati
Surrey Heath	Paul Deach	Mike Goodman
Tandridge	Cameron McIntosh	Rose Thorn
Waverley	Victoria Young	David Harmer

JOINT COMMITTEES		
Guildford	Borough to appoint	Keith Taylor
Runnymede Joint Committee	Borough to appoint	Mark Nuti
Spelthorne Joint Committee	Richard Walsh	Borough to appoint
Woking Joint Committee	Ayesha Azad	Borough to appoint

RESOLVED:

That the Members listed are duly elected as Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen respectively of the Committees as shown for 2020/21.

**OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL****SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL - CIVIC HEART MOVE TO WOODHATCH****KEY ISSUE/DECISION:**

For Council to consider the move of the Civic Heart from County Hall to the Canon site, Woodhatch, Reigate, Surrey from 1 January 2021.

BACKGROUND:

1. The Council has a commitment to be closer to residents in all that it does and to enable new, modern ways of working for the organisation. The Moving Closer to Residents programme of rolling out agile working across the council was underpinned and advanced by confirmation of a desire to have a new Civic Heart located in Surrey.
2. At its meeting on 10 December 2019, Council agreed to move the Civic Heart from County Hall to Midas House, Woking, subject to the purchase of the property. Following the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic, the purchase of Midas House was reviewed and did not go ahead due in large part to the impact on timescales of the pandemic and uncertainty on the office space requirements for the future. At that time, the search for an alternative Civic Heart was paused. The plans to dispose of County Hall are progressing with the site being marketed, the submission of a change of use application and an intention of seeking planning permission for a mixed-use site early in the new year.
3. In the summer 2020, the Council purchased the Canon site at Woodhatch, Reigate, which presented a strategic opportunity to develop the site for corporate and service needs and rationalise the organisation's medium term office requirements. The site will form one of four potential "hubs" throughout the County offering multifunctional and flexible workspace, enabling the delivery of a broad range of public services for the benefit of Surrey's residents.
4. In addition to the principal service uses proposed for the site, the existing office accommodation presents the opportunity to relocate the Civic Heart to within the County of Surrey. The buildings offer multipurpose workspaces which can be used as a Council Chamber, public committee rooms and meeting spaces with residents when

required. Accommodation also exists for the Chairman's office, civic office functions, and support to councillors and political groups.

5. The cross party Member Task Group formed by Council to support the planning and design of Civic spaces and functions, including for full Council meetings and associated Member facilities, has been considering how best to design and use the available space to provide members with a modern and agile working environment. The Council Chamber and Committee rooms will not be fixed spaces ensuring they can be to put multiple uses when not needed for formal meetings and give members the ability to meet in person at other venues in the County to best serve residents and engage with the public.
6. It is proposed that the Civic Heart facilities will enable remote and hybrid meetings to offer a much more flexible way for members and the public to engage, both in the coming months when public meetings may not be held in person, and in the future to be time and travel efficient. The buildings are currently being fitted out with the necessary facilities to support a fully agile operating environment with light touch refurbishment works, acquisition of new furniture to support an agile workforce and the necessary IT infrastructure. The cost of the Civic Heart facilities will be met from these approved budgets.

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS:</u>

That Council agrees that the Council's Civic Heart be based at Woodhatch, Reigate, Surrey from 1 January 2021.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Paul Evans, Director of Law and Governance
Email: paul.evans@surreycc.gov.uk tel: 02082132584

Sources/background papers:

None.



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

REVIEW OF COVID RELATED CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

The Council's Constitution sets out the rules and procedures for both executive (Cabinet) and non-executive (Council) decision making. In light of the national situation around coronavirus and prior to any emergency legislation being put in place, Council approved a number of recommendations and delegations at its meeting on 17 March 2020 in preparation for any special arrangements that may be required in order to allow council business to continue.

It was agreed that these recommendations would be reviewed at the 13 October 2020 Council meeting and it is proposed that due to the Remote Meeting Regulations legislation, that the previous delegations be removed.

DECISION MAKING:

Remote meeting legislation

1. Under the Coronavirus Act 2020 new regulations (The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 were created enabling local authorities to hold meetings remotely before 7 May 2021. The Remote Meeting Regulations came into force from 4 April 2020.
2. These regulations removed obstacles to local decision-making being done remotely. Before this, it was not possible and the reason why the Council took the decision in March to operate through the executive powers of the Leader and delegate non-executive powers to the relevant Proper Officer on an interim basis.

Executive (Cabinet) decision making and Scrutiny

3. The Leader has authority to make any executive decision and may delegate to Cabinet, individual Cabinet Members or officers as the Leader considers necessary for the proper management of council business.

4. While the Leader is able to amend the delegations with the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, the Council's Financial Regulations and Procurement Standing Orders set out the thresholds for decision making and provide that some decisions need to be made collectively by Cabinet.
5. The 17 March 2020 Council report agreed to amend the Financial Regulations and other rules so that any reference to Cabinet requires either a formal Cabinet meeting or the Leader or nominated Cabinet Member individually making a decision in consultation with two other Cabinet Members (a quorum of Cabinet).
6. In line with the Remote Meetings legislation it is recommended that this definition reverts back and that any reference to Cabinet will be referring to a formal Cabinet meeting.

Non-executive decision making

7. Council has responsibility for non-executive decision making and has delegated some function to committees and officers e.g. planning and regulatory committee and audit and governance committee.
8. In the 17 March report, it was agreed that all non-executive decision making would be delegated to officers (as far as the law allows) and that these delegations would only be used on a case by case basis and following agreement of the chairman or nominated member of the relevant regulatory committee.
9. Now the Remote Meeting legislation is in place, all committees are now able to meet and take decisions lawfully in remote meeting therefore it is proposed that the Council agrees to remove the delegation for all non-executive decision making to officers and for this decision making to be undertaken in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation and Responsibility for Functions within the Constitution.

Decisions taken under the 17 March 2020 delegations (agendas published up to 4 April 2020)

10. As the Remote Meeting Regulations came into force on 4 April the Council only needed to use the delegations that Council agreed on 17 March for decisions that were taken on 31 March and 7 April. Records of these decisions were published on the Council's website. The Audit and Governance Committee reviewed these decisions alongside the Remote Meetings Protocol at its meeting on 22 May 2020 to ensure transparency around decision-making.

Urgent decisions

11. The Council already has arrangements in place for decisions that need to be made in cases of special urgency. Standing orders enable the

Chief Executive to act on behalf of the organisation in consultation with the Section 151 Officer and Monitoring Officer and Cabinet Members as appropriate. These arrangements will remain in place should urgent decision making need to take place.

Non-attendance at council meetings

12. Section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 states that all councillors must attend a committee meeting of the council within a six-month period unless the failure was due to a reason approved by the local authority.
13. On 17 March 2020, Council resolved that special dispensation would be granted to all members for any non-attendance at meetings for virus related reasons to the end of December 2020 and that this should be reviewed at its October meeting.
14. It is proposed that this dispensation is removed from December 2020 as all councillors are now able to attend and participate in remote meetings.

Remote Meetings Protocol

15. The Council developed a Remote Meetings Protocol in consultation with the Chairman of the Council and Group Leaders setting out how remote meeting will operate alongside meeting processes and procedures. All Surrey County Council committees have been operating using this protocol and will continue to do so whilst remote meetings continue.

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS:</u>

Council agrees:

1. To redefine the definition within the Council's Constitution to define Cabinet as a formal meeting of Cabinet.
2. To remove the delegation for all non-executive decision making to be delegated to the Proper Officer in consultation with the relevant committee chairman and for any non-executive decision making to be undertaken in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.
3. To remove the dispensation for virus-related non-attendance at meetings in relation to the six-month rule as set out in section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.
4. To note that the Council has a Remote Meetings Protocol in place and that this will continue to be in operation for all formal remote committee meetings.

5. To note that the Audit and Governance Committee reviewed the use of original delegations that Council made on 17 March 2020 and the use of the Remote Meetings Protocol to ensure that Members remained informed in relation to council decision making.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Paul Evans, Director of Law and Governance
Email: paul.evans@surreycc.gov.uk tel: 02082132584

Sources/background papers:

Constitution of the Council



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

MEMBERS ALLOWANCES – FOLLOW UP FROM INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL REPORT

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

The report follows up on recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) which were approved by Council in July 2020. Council is asked to approve two new role profiles and a new parental leave policy for Members.

BACKGROUND:

1. At its meeting on 7 July 2020, Council approved all of the IRP's recommendations in relation to Member Allowances.
2. After the meeting, the Member Allowances Policy and associated guidance was updated and circulated to all Members. Four recommendations required further action, which Council is asked to consider today.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL REQUIRING FOLLOW UP:

3. The recommendations from the previous report that required further consideration by Council are listed below in bold, alongside details of the action taken:

- **That the role description for the Deputy Cabinet Member role is updated.**

This role description has been updated with input from the Cabinet and consideration from the cross-party Member Development Steering Group. It is attached to this report as **appendix A**.

- **That the governance arrangements for select committees and their task groups or sub committees are clarified, including a role description prepared setting out the responsibilities assumed by Members currently designated as select committee Vice-Chairs.**

A new role description for select committee Vice-Chairmen has been developed and is attached to this report as **appendix B**. This role description has been developed with the input of Select Committee Chairmen and the input of the cross-party Member Development

Steering Group. The updated role profile makes clear that the work of task groups should be governed by clear scoping reports and project plans.

- **The eight Members currently designated as select committee Vice-Chairs receive a new SRA. The role attracting this new SRA will be known as Select Committee Task Group leads and will be interim pending the formal review. These Members will receive an SRA of £1,530 effective from the date of the AGM.**

It is suggested that the IRP performs this review in 6 months time – when a number of task groups led by the new Select Committee Task Group leads will have completed.

- **That the Council introduces a shared parental leave policy for Members.**

A new Parental Leave policy for Members has been developed, with input from HR and the Local Government Association. The policy has been reviewed by the cross-party Member Development Steering Group and is attached to this report as **appendix C**.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. The updated Deputy Cabinet Member Role Profile is approved and adopted by Council.
2. The new Select Committee Task Group Lead Role Profile is approved and adopted by Council.
3. The new Parental Leave Policy is approved and adopted by Council.
4. The IRP is invited to review the operation of the Select Committee Task Group Lead, and it's associated SRA, in six months time.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Rachel Basham, Member Services Manager, Democratic Services
rachel.basham@surreycc.gov.uk / 020 8541 9133

Sources/background papers:

None.

Deputy Cabinet Member

Purpose:

- To support the Cabinet Members within their designated portfolio area (People, Place, Organisation)
- To take a lead on agreed projects on behalf of the Cabinet that contribute towards the overall objectives of the portfolio area they are assigned
- Enhance the capacity and capability of the political leadership of the council

Key Duties and Responsibilities:

- a) Provide support and assistance to a specific Cabinet portfolio area (People, Place or Organisation);
- b) Act as a deputy for assigned Cabinet Members on an ad hoc basis – attending meetings and completing tasks as requested;
- c) Provide additional capacity and leadership to support the overall portfolio, leading on designated policy areas and projects with cross-cutting impact;
- d) Take responsibility for the direction of key projects or policy areas, as requested by the appropriate Cabinet Member, and report on progress;
- e) Develop a broad understanding and knowledge of the relevant portfolio area;
- f) Contribute to informal Cabinet discussions, providing input and challenge that assists with effective policy development and decision making.

Key Personal Attributes, Skills and knowledge:

- Leadership skills
- The ability to work as part of an effective team
- A good understanding of the Council, and the ability to develop an excellent understanding of their relevant portfolio
- An understanding of the Council budget, particularly that of the relevant portfolio.
- Political knowledge and awareness
- The ability to work effectively with Council officers, the public, the media and outside organisations
- The flexibility and capacity to take on work on behalf on the Cabinet – it is estimated that this role will be the equivalent of approximately two days a week

This page is intentionally left blank

Select Committee Task Group Lead (Vice-Chairman)

Purpose:

- To lead Select Committee task group work and act as a spokesperson
- To ensure task groups complete their task and report their findings
- To encourage broad participation from Select Committee Members
- To lead robust evidence gathering work using appropriate methods to produce recommendations

Key Duties and Responsibilities:

- a) To support the Chairmen and Committee in the identification and prioritisation of relevant scrutiny topics;
- b) To uphold principles of good scrutiny: critical friend challenge, independence, service improvement and amplifying local voice;
- c) To lead the development of task group scoping, project plans and key lines of enquiry;
- d) To ensure task groups employ a robust methodology for gathering evidence;
- e) To act as spokesperson for the task group in reporting to the Select Committee and Cabinet where appropriate;
- f) To take responsibility for the delivery of the task group's work including a final report and SMART recommendations;
- g) To promote the role and impact of scrutiny at the council and beyond.

Key Personal Attributes, Skills and knowledge:

- A clear understanding of the role of scrutiny and what 'good scrutiny' looks like
- Effective leadership skills
- The ability to chair meetings and facilitate open discussion
- The ability to analyse and grasp complex issues
- Political knowledge and awareness
- A clear understanding of the operation of the Council and its partner organisations
- The ability to work effectively with Council officers, the public, the media and outside organisations
- The flexibility and capacity to drive and lead task group work – this is estimated to be the equivalent of at least one day per week

This page is intentionally left blank

Parental Leave Policy for Members

Introduction

This Policy sets out Members' entitlement to maternity, paternity, shared parental and adoption leave and relevant allowances.

The objective of the policy is to ensure that Members are able to take appropriate leave at the time of birth or adoption and that reasonable and adequate arrangements are in place to provide cover for portfolio-holders and others in receipt of Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA) during any period of leave taken.

Improved provision for new parents will contribute towards increasing the diversity of experience, age and background of local authority councillors. It will also assist with retaining experienced councillors – particularly women – and making public office more accessible to individuals who might otherwise feel excluded from it.

1. Leave Periods

- 1.1 Members giving birth are entitled to up to 6 months maternity leave from the due date, with the option to extend up to 52 weeks by agreement if required.
- 1.2 In addition, where the birth is premature, the Member is entitled to take leave during the period between the date of the birth and the due date in addition to the 6 months' period. In such cases any leave taken to cover prematurity of 28 days or less shall be deducted from any extension beyond the initial 6 months.
- 1.3 In exceptional circumstances, and only in cases of prematurity of 29 days or more, additional leave may be taken by agreement, and such exceptional leave shall not be deducted from the total 52-week entitlement.
- 1.4 Members shall be entitled to take a minimum of 2 weeks paternity leave if they are the biological father or nominated carer of their partner/spouse following the birth of their child(ren).
- 1.5 A Member who has made Shared Parental Leave arrangements through their employment is requested to advise the Council of these at the earliest possible opportunity. Every effort will be made to replicate such arrangements in terms of leave from Council.
- 1.6 Where both parents are Members leave may be shared up to a maximum of 24 weeks for the first six months and 26 weeks for any leave agreed thereafter, up to a maximum of 50 weeks. Special and exceptional arrangements may be made in cases of prematurity.
- 1.7 A Member who adopts a child through an approved adoption agency shall be entitled to take up to six months adoption leave from the date of placement, with the option to extend up to 52 weeks by agreement if required.

- 1.8 Any Member who takes maternity, shared parental or adoption leave retains their legal duty under the Local Government Act 1972 to attend a meeting of the Council within a six-month period unless the Council Meeting agrees to an extended leave of absence prior to the expiration of that six-month period.
- 1.9 Any Member intending to take maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoption leave will be responsible for ensuring that they comply with the relevant notice requirements of the Council, both in terms of the point at which the leave starts and the point at which they return.
- 1.10 Any Member taking leave should put in place arrangements for a neighbouring member to cover local casework. Democratic Services should be advised of these arrangements so that the website can be updated.
- 1.11 Any Member taking leave should ensure that they respond to reasonable requests for information as promptly as possible, and that they keep officers and colleagues informed and updated in relation to intended dates of return and requests for extension of leave.

2. Basic Allowance

- 2.1 All Members shall continue to receive their Basic Allowance in full whilst on maternity, paternity or adoption leave.

3. Special Responsibility Allowances

- 3.1 Members entitled to a Special Responsibility Allowance shall continue to receive their allowance in full in the case of maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoption leave.
- 3.2 Where a replacement is appointed to cover the period of absence that person shall receive an SRA on a pro rata basis for the period of the temporary appointment.
- 3.3 The payment of Special Responsibility Allowances, whether to the primary SRA holder or a replacement, during a period of maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoption leave shall continue for a period of six months, or until the date of the next Annual Meeting of the Council, or until the date when the member taking leave is up for election (whichever is soonest). At such a point, the position will be reviewed, and will be subject to a possible extension for a further six-month period.
- 3.4 Should a Member appointed to replace the member on maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoption leave already hold a remunerated position, the ordinary rules relating to payment of more than one Special Responsibility Allowances shall apply.
- 3.5 Unless the Member taking leave is removed from their post at an Annual General Meeting of the Council whilst on leave, or unless the Party to which they belong loses control of the Council during their leave period, they shall return at the end of their leave period to the same post, or to an alternative post with equivalent status and remuneration which they held before the leave began.

4. Resigning from Office and Elections

- 4.1 If a Member decides not to return at the end of their maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoption leave they must notify the Council at the earliest possible opportunity. All allowances will cease from the effective resignation date.
- 4.2 If an election is held during the Member's maternity, paternity, shared parental or adoption leave and they are not re-elected, or decide not to stand for re-election, their basic allowance and SRA if appropriate will cease from the Monday after the election date when they would technically leave office.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 21 JULY 2020 AT 2.00 PM
REMOTE MEETING.**

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Cabinet at its next meeting.

Members:

*Mr Tim Oliver (Chairman)	*Mrs Natalie Bramhall
*Mr Colin Kemp (Vice-Chairman)	*Mrs Mary Lewis
*Dr Zully Grant-Duff	*Mrs Julie Iles
*Mrs Sinead Mooney	*Mr Matt Furniss
*Mr Mel Few	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Mrs Becky Rush	*Miss Alison Griffiths
*Mr Mark Nuti	*Miss Marisa Heath

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr John O'Reilly, Chairman of Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee
Ms Bernie Muir, Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee
Mr Jonathan Essex, Redhill East

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

100/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were no apologies.

101/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: (23 JUNE 2020) [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June were approved as a correct record.

102/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

103/20 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There was one Member question from Mr Jonathan Essex. The question and response were published as a supplement to the agenda. A supplementary question was asked by Mr Essex, restated his original questions. Mr Essex asked the Cabinet to confirm what the market value and expected capital receipts from the Surrey County Council owned property lots were rather than the 132 listed lots and also asked for Cabinet to provide a schedule of ground rents where Surrey County Council has ownership of freeholds for other residential properties.

The Cabinet Member for Resources responded to the questions stating that there were no properties on the market on sale under auction. The schedule for ground rents would be provided in due course subject to confidentiality.

104/20 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were no public questions.

105/20 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were no petitions.

106/20 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

107/20 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

Cabinet considered the Community Projects Fund task and finish group report and Adults and Health Select Committee: Scrutiny of the Decision on the Change of Route to Market for two Extra Care Housing Sites report.

The Community Projects Fund task and finish group report was considered alongside Item 10: Community Projects Fund. The task group recommendations were agreed by Cabinet.

The Chairman of the Adults and Health Select Committee introduced the Select Committee report explaining that the Select Committee was supportive of the work undertaken by the council to provide extra care and independent living facilities. The Select Committee accepted the change of route to market for two extra care housing sites and going forward sought to be included in various stages of the project including project update reports. The Cabinet for Adults and Health thanked the Select Committee for the report and stated the feedback from members was helpful. The Cabinet Member accepted the committees view that the pace of the programme had been slow but provided reassurance that future schemes would be forthcoming with updates being provided to the Select Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the Community Projects Fund task and finish group report and Adults and Health Select Committee: Scrutiny of the Decision on the Change of Route to Market for two Extra Care Housing Sites report be noted and recommendations considered.

108/20 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

There were two decisions for noting. The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning explained that the fair access protocol was in place to ensure that unplaced children, especially the most vulnerable are offered a place in a suitable school as soon as possible. There were no changes to the protocol

due to the covid-19 situation. With regards to the maintained schools deficit decision, Cabinet Member approval is required where schools seek a licensed deficit in excess of 5% of the school's budget share. There were two schools that required this approval.

RESOLVED:

That the delegated decisions taken since the last meeting of the Cabinet be noted.

Reason for decision:

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken by Cabinet Members, Strategic Investment Board and the Committee in Common subcommittee under delegated authority.

109/20 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member update was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults Social Care and Public Health, Sinead Mooney. The Cabinet Member stated that staff and partners across Heartlands, CSH Surrey, the ICSs, Surrey Choices and others had risen to the occasion and supported the council in its desire to meet head on the challenges of COVID-19. Surrey County Council had worked with partners to develop additional refuge provision within the county, which has helped provide further support to survivors of Domestic Abuse. Although plans for recovery continue at pace, it is important that any Surrey resident experiencing symptoms should access a COVID-19 test. The Leader reminded residents of the importance of washing hands and using face coverings where appropriate to ensure Surrey is kept safe and open. The Leader thanked residents for complying with the rules and asked that any residents tested positive comply with test and trace systems.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member update be noted.

110/20 COVID- 19 DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN [Item 8]

The Cabinet Member for Communities explained that the hardship fund had run for 12 weeks with £273k been given to 20 organisations which benefited vulnerable groups. An additional £300k was given to partners, Community Foundation for Surrey, this was matched by generous public donations. The Cabinet Member thanked the public for their generous donations. The hardship fund has now closed and the council has aligned priorities closely with the Community Foundation for Surrey whom will continue this work.

RESOLVED:

That the three decisions taken by officers since the last meeting be noted.

Reason for decision:

To inform the Cabinet of decisions taken officers under delegated authority.

[This decision is subject to call-in by the relevant Select Committee Chairman dependent on the recommendation.]

111/20 DECISION ON THE CHANGE OF ROUTE TO MARKET FOR TWO EXTRA CARE HOUSING SITES [Item 9]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member Adult Social Care and Public Health who explained that the report sets out Surrey County Council's necessary and recommended change of delivery approach for two Council owned sites; the former Pinehurst Resource Centre (Camberley) and the former Brockhurst Care Home (Ottershaw). She explained that on 20 July 2020, the Council had gone live with the Pond Meadow (Guildford) tender. This had proven more difficult with the Pinehurst Resource Centre and Brockhurst Care Home and hence a decision to bring a paper to Cabinet to change the route to market for these two sites. There is a concern around the pace of delivery for the ambitious programme and the Cabinet Member urged colleagues to approve the recommendations with a view for the tenders for both sites to go live in a few weeks.

The Deputy Cabinet Member for People echoed what the Cabinet Member stated around the need to accelerate the pace for the programme . Independent living was the future for the council and it was important to expedite this programme. The security and assurance provided to residents in extra care and independent living housing was greatly supported by members.

RESOLVED:

1. That the recommended approach (Option 1) for the delivery of Extra Care Housing at the former Brockhurst Care Home and former Pinehurst Resource Centre sites be approved. The approach recommended is to tender for a development and housing management strategic partner(s) for Extra Care Housing schemes on Council owned land on a design, build, finance and operate (DBFO) basis with up to a 125 year lease.
2. That grants approval to procure in order to enable a full tender process to identify an Extra Care Housing development and housing management strategic partner(s) for the former Brockhurst Care Home and former Pinehurst Resource Centre sites set out in this paper be approved.
3. Work to review the feasibility of further sites owned by the Council for the development of Extra Care Housing be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

The development of Extra Care Housing on the two sites set out in this paper will represent a substantial contribution towards the Council's strategic objective to expand affordable Extra Care Housing provision by 2030.

The development of Extra Care Housing through this delivery model is in line with previous decisions made by Cabinet. In October 2019 Cabinet agreed to identify a strategic partner for the development and housing management of

Extra Care Housing at the former Pond Meadow School site through a tender process.

This is consistent with our ASC vision for development of Extra Care Housing, which has been clearly communicated through market and stakeholder engagement.

Through developing Extra Care Housing via this delivery model, the Council will have evidence and experience with which to benchmark future developments against and make informed decisions regarding future sites and approaches.

The Council received positive feedback following its market engagement on the tender for Extra Care Housing at the former Pond Meadow School site. In their feedback, a number of providers sought clarification on whether further sites will be offered to the market through a tender.

A tender will be published in the Summer 2020 for an Extra Care Housing development and housing management strategic partner at the former Pond Meadow School site. This process will provide the Council with learning and a template to inform any future tenders for further Extra Care Housing schemes.

The financial case that underpins the recommended delivery model for these sites is set out in the Part 2 paper.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults and Health Select Committee]

112/20 COMMUNITY PROJECTS FUND [Item 10]

The Chairman of the Community Projects Fund task and finish group explained that a cross party task and finish group had been set up to oversee the development of the Community Project Fund. Over the course of four meetings the group met with the Executive Director – ETI and colleagues to put forward ideas and offer challenge on proposals. The Task Group thanked those who contributed evidence to its review, informing the conclusions and six recommendations regarding the design and implementation of the Community Projects Fund. The task and finish group endorsed the recommendations in the Cabinet report and emphasised the importance of ensuring and encouraging all community groups and residents within Surrey to apply for the Fund.

The Cabinet report was introduced by the Deputy Cabinet Member to the Leader who set out the aims of the Fund which was to bring community-led place-making or place-improving projects to life at a scale to make a significant impact and deliver a real legacy in communities. The development of the Community Project Fund represents a significant opportunity to invest in a meaningful and lasting way in communities with £100m of capital funding to be allocated to community projects over a five-year period. It was explained that the report and recommendations were developed alongside the cross party task and finish group. Design work on the Community Project Fund would be progressed and a further report would be presented to Cabinet in September. The Deputy Cabinet Member to the Leader thanked the Leader and the Executive Director - ETI for their ongoing support.

There was recognition that many communities in Surrey would welcome the opportunities presented with the Community Project Fund whilst some communities did not have the experience to properly engage with the administrative processes involved. It was explained that the scheme was flexible and an officer team would be set up to support residents and groups submit applications to the Fund.

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposed process, criteria and governance for managing the Community Projects Fund (CPF) be approved;
2. That the role of the Member Task Group in helping to shape the CPF be noted;
3. That £300k of revenue funding in 2020/21 from the Corporate Feasibility budget is approved, to help establish a core CPF team to manage the delivery of the fund as well as other set up costs, on the understanding that the ongoing cost of managing the Fund will be built into the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) from 2021/22;
4. Delegated authority to approve funding awards, including the ability to transfer appropriate amounts from the capital pipeline to the capital programme, as well as to make funding awards to successful applicants in the following three bands is approved, on the understanding that the named decision maker will make such decisions after receiving and giving due consideration to the recommendations from the CPF Panel:
 - Projects up to £100K – delegated to the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure
 - Projects between £100K and 500K – delegated to the appropriate Cabinet Member as determined by the Leader
 - Projects over £500K – decision taken by Cabinet
5. An initial phase of community co-development to test key aspects of the CPF as set out in this report prior to the formal launch of the Fund in the Autumn is approved;
6. A further report in September confirming the outcome of the co-development phase and the final details of the Fund is supported.

Reasons for Decisions:

The development of the Community Project Fund (CPF) represents a significant opportunity for Surrey County Council (SCC) to invest in a meaningful and lasting way in communities. The recommendations in the report will enable the Fund to be developed in a way that ensures that the right level of due diligence and ensuring value for money is achieved from the Fund's investments, while at the same time ensuring that the Fund is as accessible as possible.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee]

113/20 DIGITAL BUSINESS & INSIGHT PROGRAMME FULL BUSINESS CASE [Item 11]

The Cabinet for Corporate Support introduced the report. The report presents the full business case for awarding a contract to the preferred supplier and progressing an implementation project to replace the council's existing corporate (enterprise resource planning or ERP) system. The system is critical to the council's business management which is used to administer Finance, HR, Payroll and Procurement processes. The procurement process was commenced following Cabinet approval of the Digital Business & Insights (DB&I) outline business case in October 2019. The procurement process has taken place and has been successfully completed. Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) solution has been chosen as it addresses urgent technical drivers for change, while also enabling the council to achieve its ambitions to transform services, drive efficiencies, improve management decision making and to fully enable a flexible and mobile workforce. The system will deliver digital self-service, increased automation and enhanced reporting and analytical capabilities.

The Cabinet Member for Resources explained that the officer team were challenged on the need for the system and the suggested provider for the new system. Both Cabinet Members supported the proposals. The Cabinet Member thanked the team that put the proposals together.

RESOLVED:

That subject to the agreement of the detailed financial information for the project as set out in Part 2 of this agenda, the full business case for the implementation of the new corporate system and the award of the contract to the preferred bidder be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

The recommendation to award the contract to the preferred supplier and deliver the project will enable the council to implement a modern Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) solution, which will address urgent technical drivers for change, while also enabling the council to achieve its ambitions to transform services, drive efficiencies, improve management decision making and to fully enable a flexible and mobile workforce.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]

114/20 2020/21 MONTH 2 (MAY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Resources provided Cabinet with details of the County Council's 2020/21 financial position as at 31st May 2020 (M2) for revenue and capital budgets, and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year, as well as proposing a budget reset to take account of COVID-19 pressures. The key messages included within the report were that the Council is forecasting a Business as Usual (BAU) deficit of £4.7m, against the budget approved by Council in February 2020 and a deficit of c£5.8m is being forecast against the Government COVID-19 funding. The Cabinet were updated on the forecast revenue budget outturn for the year for each Service.

Since the publication of the report the council had received a further tranche of funding from government amounting to £6.4m.

RESOLVED:

That the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year is noted; and the reset of the 2020/21 revenue budget envelopes to reflect the additional costs and lost income related to COVID-19 be approved.

Reasons for Decisions:

This report is to comply with the agreed policy of providing a monthly budget monitoring report to Cabinet for approval of any necessary actions.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]

115/20 LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN PROPERTY PROJECTS - NEW CHILDREN'S HOMES AND SHAW FAMILY CENTRE [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families gave a detailed summary of the report explaining that the report seeks Cabinet's approval to progress the delivery of two children's homes and the re-provision of the Shaw Family Contact Centre, in support of the Looked After and Adopted Children's (LAAC) Service strategy for children growing up in the care of the council. In order to improve outcomes for children and young people, the report would be seeking approval to transfer the capital of £5.5m from the pipeline budget for the 3 proposed schemes.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families requested the following change to Recommendation 4 in the report which was agreed:

4. agree that ~~subject to final approval of capital spend on each project,~~ delegated authority is given to the Cabinet Member for Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children Young People and Families, the Executive Director of Children, Families and Learning and the Executive Director for Resources **to give final approval of capital spend on each project.**

It was explained that the project was a key priority of the Corporate Parenting Board to ensure we provide comfortable and safe homes for children in care. Some of the council's residential homes are very out of date and rather institutionalised. It was agreed that children should grow up in family sized units as per Ofsted's recommendations. The Cabinet Member clarified that the council had a duty to ensure that children and young people remain in touch with their birth families and friends when they are placed in care- called 'contact'. For many children their 'contact' is restricted to four to six times a year. It is therefore essential that the quality of this contact provides children with the best possible experience. The proposed re-provision of Faircroft and Karibu Children homes will provide one new Children's Home with 4 beds and one new Children's Home with 4 beds, and 2 'No Wrong Door' places located on the same site. Two sites had been identified for these sites. One site in Epsom and the other in Walton on Thames. There was an intention to build a

third Children's home which would come forward at a later date. The concept of 'no wrong door' was introduced to Cabinet and helps keep teenagers with their families.

The report was welcomed by Cabinet and the benefits it would deliver for children and young people through the provision of better services was recognised.

RESOLVED:

1. That the transfer of £5.5m capital from the pipeline budget for the 3 proposed schemes be approved.
2. To develop/replace the Shaw Family Contact Centre and two new Community Children's Homes at the capital costs set out in the report be approved.
3. That the tender for the above projects, carried out by the service be approved.
4. That delegated authority to approve final capital spend on each project is given to the Cabinet Member for Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, the Executive Director of Children, Families and Learning and the Executive Director for Resources.

Reasons for Decisions:

To ensure the two new children's homes and the new Shaw Family Contact Centre can be delivered on time and within budget.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee and/ or the Children's, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee]

116/20 RECOVERY AND DEVOLUTION WHITE PAPER: OPPORTUNITIES AND BENEFITS FOR SURREY [Item 14]

The report was introduced by the Leader whom explained that the paper signified the start of a very important conversation with residents. The Government had recently announced its intention to publish a Recovery and Devolution White Paper in the autumn, setting out its plans to review the way in which local government operates. It was important the right local government structure was in place which simplified processes for residents and delivered value for money. The council had delivered £200m of efficiency savings in the last two years by transforming the way services were delivered. Local government was last reviewed in 1974. The white paper would allow the council to deliver services more effectively and efficiently, empowering residents. It was important young people were engaged with the process.

The Leader explained that he had written to the Secretary of State to start the engagement process. The engagement process with stakeholders would start in the autumn. A business case would be submitted to Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) by the end of September.

The Deputy Leader supported the report and stated the report presents us with a great opportunity in rethinking how the council engages with residents.

RESOLVED:

That the preparations in hand to respond to the Government's anticipated Recovery and Devolution White Paper, due to be published in autumn 2020 be noted.

Reasons for Decisions:

To ensure Cabinet are aware of the preparations being made in readiness for the publication of the anticipated Recovery and Devolution White Paper in the autumn.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources & Performance Select Committee]

117/20 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 15]

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

118/20 DECISION ON THE CHANGE OF ROUTE TO MARKET FOR TWO EXTRA CARE HOUSING SITES [Item 16]

RESOLVED:

1. That the financial modelling set out in the Part 2 paper which demonstrates that the recommended option in Part 1 to tender for a development and strategic housing management partner(s) for Extra Care Housing schemes on the sites delivers the highest financial benefit for the Council, be noted.
2. That [Exempt minute E-5-20] of capital investment in the development of Extra Care Housing at the former Pinehurst Resource Centre site be approved, should investment up to this level be required by the Council when the tender for a development and strategic housing management partner(s) is conducted.
3. That [Exempt minute E-5-20] of capital investment in the development of Extra Care Housing at the former Brockhurst Care Home site be approved, should investment up to this level be required by the Council when the tender for a development and strategic housing management partner(s) is conducted.

Reason for Decision:

This paper sets out the case underpinning the recommended change in delivery approach, demonstrating why tendering for a development and strategic housing management partner is expected to achieve the highest financial return for the Council.

Cabinet is asked to approve capital investment by the Council of up to [Exempt minute E-5-20] in the development of Extra Care Housing at the former Pinehurst Resource Centre site and [Exempt minute E-5-20] at the former Brockhurst Care Home site. The aim will be to avoid or limit as far as possible any capital investment by the Council. Capital investment will only be considered if the winning bidder in the tender for each site requires it as part of their tendered proposal for the development of Extra Care Housing at a site. The level of capital investment Cabinet is being asked to approve here has been capped at the value for each site that means that the modelled financial benefits of developing Extra Care Housing on each site would be no less than the opportunity cost of selling the land. If a higher level of capital investment is required following the outcome of the tender, then the Extra Care project team will consider whether this is financially viable and acceptable to the Council. A further report would then be brought back to Cabinet if appropriate to request approval for additional capital investment above the levels approved in this paper.

If Cabinet approves the capital investment requested for the two sites in this paper, then this potential capital investment will not initially be added to the Council's capital programme. This is because the intention, if possible, is to avoid any capital investment. Once the tender has been conducted and preferred bidder(s) secured, then any capital investment required within the limits approved by Cabinet will be added to the capital programme at that point.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Adults and Health Select Committee]

119/20 DIGITAL BUSINESS & INSIGHT PROGRAMME FULL BUSINESS CASE

[Item 17]

RESOLVED:

1. That the recommendation to award the contract to [Exempt minute E-6-20] and implement the new corporate system at a total capital cost of [Exempt minute E-6-20], and total revenue cost of [Exempt minute E-6-20] to run the system for the full 15-year life of the contract be approved.
2. That the indicative costs of a Data Archiving Solution which have been included in this business case for completeness be noted and that this solution does not form part of the scope of the project to implement the new corporate system.
3. That a separate delegated officer decision will be made to progress a Data Archiving Solution procurement by the Executive Director of Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Support and Cabinet Member for Resources.

Reason for Decision:

See Minute 113/20

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee]

120/20 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 18]

It was agreed that non-exempt information may be made available to the press and public, where appropriate.

Meeting closed at 15:24

Chairman