



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



Agenda and Reports

for the Annual meeting of

THE COUNTY COUNCIL

to be held on

25 MAY 2021

(i)

Woodhatch Place
Reigate
Surrey

Monday, 17 May 2021

TO THE MEMBERS OF SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

SUMMONS TO MEETING

You are hereby summoned to attend the meeting of the Council to be held at Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF, on Tuesday, 25 May 2021, beginning at 10.00 am, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda set out overleaf.

JOANNA KILLIAN
Chief Executive

Note 1: *This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.*

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the representative of Legal and Democratic Services at the meeting.

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print or braille, or another language please either call Democratic Services on 020 8541 9122, or write to Democratic Services, Surrey County Council at Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF, Minicom 020 8541 9698, fax 020 8541 9009, or email amelia.christopher@surreycc.gov.uk

This meeting will be held in public, however numbers will be limited in order to adhere to Covid-19 social distancing requirements. If you would like to attend, please contact Amelia Christopher on 020 8213 2838 or via the email address above in advance of the meeting.

1 CHAIRMAN

1. To elect a Chairman for the Council Year 2021/22.
2. The Chairman to make the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

2 MINUTES

(Pages 7
- 48)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 16 March 2021.

(Note: the Minutes, including the appendices, will be laid on the table half an hour before the start of the meeting).

3 ELECTION OF COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Pages
49 - 52)

The Chief Executive, as County Returning Officer, formally to report the return of County Councillors at the Elections held on 6 May 2021 for each of the 81 County Electoral Divisions in the County.

4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chairman to report apologies for absence.

5 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman to report.

6 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.

7 VICE-CHAIRMAN

1. To elect a Vice-Chairman for the Council Year 2021/22.
2. The Vice-Chairman to make the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

8 MOTION OF THANKS TO RETIRING CHAIRMAN

The newly elected Chairman to move a formal motion of thanks to Mr Tony Samuels, the retiring Chairman of the Council.

9 ELECTION OF LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

To elect a Leader of the Council for a four-year term, expiring on the day of the post-election annual meeting which follows his / her election as Leader.

10 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader to make a statement, including reporting on the appointment of the Deputy Leader and Members of the Cabinet.

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions.

(Note: report to follow).

11 ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORIONALITY

To formally review the proportional political allocation of places on committees and to adopt a scheme of proportionality for the Council Year 2021/22.

(Note: report to follow).

12 APPOINTMENTS OF COMMITTEES

To appoint Members of the various Boards / Committees of the Council for the Council Year 2021/22 subject to any changes of membership to be reported to the meeting by Group Leaders.

(Note: report to follow).

13 ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN

To elect Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees for the Council Year 2021/22.

(Note: report to follow).

14 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2021/2022

(Pages
53 - 74)

Council is asked to approve the Pay Policy Statement for the period 2021/2022.

15 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Pages
75 - 80)

To receive the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 30 March 2021 and 27 April 2021.

16 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS

(Pages
81 - 104)

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's 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 24 May 2021.

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, Woodhatch Place has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD REMOTELY ON MICROSOFT TEAMS ON 16 MARCH 2021 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
Jonathan Essex	Marsha Moseley
Robert Evans	Tina Mountain
Tim Evans	Bernie Muir
Mel Few	Mark Nuti
Will Forster	John O'Reilly
John Furey	Tim Oliver
Matt Furniss	Andrew Povey
Bob Gardner	Wyatt Ramsdale
Mike Goodman	Penny Rivers
Angela Goodwin	Becky Rush
David Goodwin	Stephen Spence
Zully Grant-Duff	Lesley Steeds
Alison Griffiths	Peter Szanto
Ken Gulati	Keith Taylor
Tim Hall	Barbara Thomson
Kay Hammond	Rose Thorn
David Harmer	Chris Townsend
Jeffrey Harris	Denise Turner-Stewart
Nick Harrison	Richard Walsh
Edward Hawkins	Hazel Watson
Marisa Heath	Fiona White
Saj Hussain	Keith Witham
Julie Iles OBE	Victoria Young

*absent

13/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [ITEM 1]

Apologies were received from Mr Kemp.

The Chairman wished Mr Kemp well.

14/21 MINUTES [ITEM 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 9 February 2021 were submitted and confirmed.

15/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [ITEM 3]

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

16/21 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [ITEM 4]

The Chairman:

- Highlighted to Members that the Chairman's Announcements were located in the agenda front sheet.
- On behalf of the Council, thanked those Members who would not be standing in the forthcoming local elections, for their service and hard work.

17/21 LEADER'S STATEMENT [ITEM 5]

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

Mrs Mountain left the meeting at 10.09 am

Rachael I Lake joined the meeting at 10.11 am

Members raised the following topics:

- Looked forward to the future and the focus on Covid-19 recovery.
- Highlighted the continued focus and scrutiny needed on Children's Services, for those with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), the commissioning of the Children's Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Contract (EWMH) ensuring the right transition arrangements from children's to adult services, on mental health noting the Task Group and the Summit, the continued rollout of the mental health practitioners through the GPiMHS (General Practise integrated Mental Health Service) and the trial of Woking's Safe Haven.
- That the focus for Land and Property Services must be on using the Council's assets more productively by looking towards affordable housing, delivering care homes, growing in-house expertise, working with the District and Borough Councils to ensure Surrey-wide strategic planning, and learning lessons from the joint venture with Places for People.
- Noted the need to address the funding challenges in Adult Social Care.
- Welcomed a Member's suggestion of a cabinet of all the talents, noting the importance of taking advantage of all Members' skills and experience, and paid tribute to Mr Spence.

- Noted the need to address the issues of climate change including issues around Heathrow and Gatwick; and diversity both of which were easy to ignore.
- Thanked the Chairman for his service, the Leader of the Council for the undoubted improvements to the Council's overview and scrutiny function, senior officers and all staff for their immense hard work noting the assistance from Democratic Services, and all Members whether stepping down or seeking re-election.
- Paid tribute to the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families who would be stepping down, noting her outstanding leadership and improvements made within Children's Services.
- Praised the Chief Executive who had been outstanding in her management of Covid-19 alongside the continued improvements made to the Council.
- Regretted that the discourse which had been focussed on scrutiny, challenge and a carefully observed journey of improvement; was overshadowed by self-congratulation.
- That whilst significant progress had been made, good governance relied upon effective challenge by the opposition and offering a choice to residents.
- That there was much to improve on the funding of SEND noting the overspend in the High Needs block and recruitment of an Assistant Director - SEND Transformation.
- Suggested that regarding the Safer Streets Campaign, the Council apply for Government funding to reverse the policy on part-night street lighting.
- Wished retiring Members the very best for the future, paying tribute to Mrs Hammond who had demonstrated an outstanding contribution to public life over many years and thanked the Chairman for his service.
- That by working co-operatively with Members on a range of issues concerning Farnham, the political leadership developed a joint plan including the creation of the Farnham Board, the Infrastructure Programme and £139m for Farnham infrastructure projects in the 2021/22 Budget.
- Thanked colleagues on the Farnham Board including its Programme Director for the Farnham Infrastructure Programme as well as the Leader of the Council and hoped that the work would continue.
- Thanked the Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, his Residents Association and Independent colleagues including its Group Leader, the Council's Chief Executive, officers, the trade unions and the Chairman.
- Regarding the local elections, hoped that there would be a wider cross-party spectrum of Members with a continued commitment to work cooperatively for all residents.

18/21 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [ITEM 6]

Questions:

Notice of twenty questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in the supplementary agenda on 15 March 2021.

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

(Q3) Mr Paul Deach asked for further detail on the exact breakdown of spend of the additional £739,000 that was not finalised at the time of writing the response.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support explained that the Winter Support Grant totalled £2.1 million had to be spent by 31 March, however officers had engaged with the Department for Work and Pensions who confirmed that the money could be used to fund the food vouchers for free school meals for the Easter holidays and the additional £739,000 funding received in March had an extended deadline of 16 April. The Council was looking to use that additional money to provide extra vouchers equating to an additional £20 above the original £30 for children entitled to free school meals during the Easter holidays which could be used either for breakfast, a hot meal or it could be held over for a few weeks into May. The Council was also looking at a £50 voucher for Care Leavers to support them over Easter. The deadline for finalising the spend was today and would be discussed at March's Cabinet meeting.

The Cabinet Member for All Age Learning provided reassurance that the Council was looking further ahead than the Easter holidays, noting the Holiday Activities and Food programme in 2021 in which the Council reported back to the Department of Education enabling it to work with Active Surrey as a provider for activity packs for primary age children who were eligible for free school meals. There was also a programme website including physical activity and arts and craft resources as well as two free healthy lifestyle parenting workshops about practical advice and tips on nutrition. There were pilot cohorts mapped to the areas of deprivation for both primary and secondary ages and it was estimated that the Council would be offering in excess of five hundred places to those in receipt of free school meals throughout Easter. Applications were open for the summer programme and so the Council continued to deliver for its most vulnerable residents.

(Q4) Ms Ayesha Azad thanked the Leader of the Council for his commitment to eradicating inequality from across the county.

In response, the Leader of the Council provided the latest figures on the gender pay gap which in 2019 was 16.8% and had dropped to 12.75% as at March 2020, so noted good progress on that but that there was more work to be done.

(Q8) Dr Peter Szanto had no supplementary question.

Dr Zully Grant-Duff asked whether the Leader of the Council agreed that digital inclusion was key to access to health provision, education, and employment opportunities and whether he would confirm his commitment to developing a digital infrastructure strategy to support the Council's ambition that no one would be left behind and Surrey would be prosperous for all.

In response, the Leader of the Council gave that commitment and confirmation noting that the matter was in the remit of the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Infrastructure. That in terms of digital inclusion, he noted that 200,000 of Surrey's approximately 1.2 million residents were digitally excluded so a digital inclusion plan was vital, as the Council must ensure that it could effectively communicate with its residents.

Mrs Morley left the meeting at 10.45 am

Mrs Mountain rejoined the meeting at 10.46 am

(Q9) Mr John O'Reilly noted that by 2025 the Council was planning for a 46% reduction in carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, he asked whether the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change agreed that in order to achieve that reduction,

bold and exciting initiatives were required to reach the Council's ultimate goal of zero CO₂ emissions by 2050.

Mr Jonathan Essex highlighted the challenge of the Council needing to invest over £13 billion by 2030 as well as the challenge of meeting the 2025 target, he asked what the Council would do to ensure that the Government provided Surrey with the leverage to bring forward that money both from the public and the private sector.

The Cabinet Member for Highways noted that yesterday the Council was awarded £660,000 for rural mobility funding and that would be used for a planned pilot project in Mole Valley for on-demand rural transport improvements which would revolutionise connectivity across the county, including electric vehicle provision through small minibuses and would be rolled out further if successful.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change noted that the Surrey Climate Change Delivery Plan would go to June's Cabinet meeting where plans would be finalised.

She stated that more Government funding was needed, noting that the Council received £6 million for Green Jump Surrey with a further £3 million received, there was some funding coming through for schools concerning the decarbonisation of their buildings. Officers were working continually to deliver more funding from Government to help the Council deliver its projects going forward.

(Q12) Mrs Penny Rivers asked when the matter would be corrected regarding on-call firefighters who worked between 1 July 2000 and 5 April 2006 who were eligible for, but who had not been included in the Local Government Association Firefighters Pension Scheme Special Members of the 2006 Scheme by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS).

In response, the Cabinet Member for Community Protection noted that following the discovery that an options exercise for retained firefighters to join the Modified Scheme (2006) had not taken place, an internal audit was undertaken. As a result, two hundred and one cases were identified and ninety-eight forms were returned, with twenty-six registering interest and two declining and there had been further subsequent enquiries. SFRS was awaiting external guidance and she was considering arranging a second options exercise.

(Q13) Mr Robert Evans noted that the response provided regarding the ratio of firefighters to Surrey's population compared to other fire and rescue services was evasive. He sought clarification as to why his invitation to the SFRS Working Group had been withdrawn and who had made that decision.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Community Protection noted that the membership of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee's SFRS Working Group on the 'Making Surrey Safer Plan' was the responsibility of the Chairman of that Select Committee and Working Group.

Regarding the ratio of firefighters, the Cabinet Member for Community Protection explained that it was important to understand that SFRS' response model was based exclusively on Surrey's needs, which determined the number of firefighters needed to man appliances and the ways of working; there was no value in comparing the figures to other fire and rescue services. She noted that SFRS' Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) was tailored to Surrey and over the past ten years new technology had been introduced and information was shared with Members on a regular basis

regarding changes, transformation successes including the dynamic cover tool, degradation procedures and the joint fire control in which East Sussex was due to join soon, and that SFRS was ahead in many areas nationally. She noted the upcoming Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Fire & Rescue Services' (HMICFRS) inspection and thanked the Member for his continued interest in SFRS.

(Q14) Mr Stephen Cooksey noted that residents in his division were keen to know why the Council spent £246,000 on a PWC report that the Leader of the Council was not prepared to share with residents. He asked the Leader of the Council to comment on his statement made about not receiving a formal request to disclose the report, as the Chairman of the Surrey Leaders' Group - Leader of Runnymede Borough Council - had asked the Leader of the Council to provide that report and he had declined to accept that request.

In response, the Leader of the Council explained that he had spoken with the Chairman of the Surrey Leaders' Group who noted that the matter would be raised at a Group meeting. He explained that he had never received a formal letter requesting the disclosure of the PWC report and had asked the Member to forward that. He noted that the PWC report was prepared for the Council's internal use to assist with the preparation of a business plan and information from that was fed into the Council's transformation work. He noted that the point was out of date, highlighting the current work on the Community Impact Assessment (CIA) which provided a good understanding of Surrey's communities and informed the work on empowering communities. He noted that Surrey's District and Borough Councils had spent in excess of £300,000 commissioning a report by KPMG which made various proposals on ways to improve efficiency and collaboration.

(Q15) Mr Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change to confirm whether as noted in the written response, that the development proposals for the site would take into consideration local planning policy and guidance. Regarding February's Cabinet report on the Woodhatch Masterplan, he asked whether it would be in line with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council's (RBBC) commitment that affordable housing should be at 'social' rent and in line with the RBBC Local Plan which did not promote building on urban open land.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change said that the Council would adhere to all of the current plans with RBBC and as twin-hatted Members any RBBC planning applications in respect of the Council would be scrutinised.

(Q17) Mr Robert Evans noted that he was sure that all Members were experiencing additional queries from residents regarding potholes and damaged roads due to the recent rain and snow. Referring to the written response in which the Government was not giving any indication of additional money to address the situation, he queried that as Surrey had eleven Conservative Members of Parliament (MPs), whether the Cabinet Member for Highways or the Council had or would engage with the Government to provide such additional funding to repair the roads.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Highways explained that the Council had been engaging with Surrey's eleven MPs and with the Department for Transport about a fairer funding formula on roads as the current one did not take into account usage and included a set payment per structure irrelevant of its size. The response back was in line with the Government's belief that there would be no changes to the current formula as a majority of local councils were supportive of it. Locally however, the Council's increased funding was producing good results, for example highways

complaints had decreased considerably as had the number of reports from residents. The Council was also trialling Artificial Intelligence cameras which could identify potholes proactively, noting the continued innovation on Surrey's highways.

(Q18) Mr Stephen Cooksey noted that the written response indicated that the Leader of the Council was struggling to find any justification for his misrepresentation of the conclusions of the KPMG report. He asked the Leader of the Council whether he believed that it was helpful to the Council's relationship with Surrey's District and Borough Councils to promote implications that might suit his political agenda but were not factual.

In response, the Leader of the Council explained that Surrey's District and Borough Councils commissioned the KPMG report to counter the Council's position in relation to potential unitary structure which was pursued with the encouragement of the Government. He added that the Council would pursue its transformation agenda and would focus on delivering better quality services to its residents that it was responsible for and suggested that Surrey's District and Borough Councils should do the same.

(Q19) Mr Jonathan Essex asked that in addition to the work done by the teams across the Council in ensuring value for money, whether there was a plan to include value for money in the work carried out by internal and external auditors going forward. He noted the importance of using lessons learnt from current and recent contracts to make sure that value for money was maximised before finalising contracts.

In response, the Leader of the Council recognised that the contracts were significant and needed to be well scrutinised both during the procurement process and subsequently. He noted that he was happy if the audit function could add to that as it was vital to get contracts right, to get value for money and to ensure that the Council had independent evidence to substantiate that. He added that robust contract management was equally important, and the Council was focussing on that stringent process to ensure that contracts were well procured and managed.

(Q20) Mr Jonathan Essex referred to the staff travel survey noting that it was the case that many of those staff who would be travelling to work post Covid-19 would be travelling further and longer to Woodhatch Place. He asked whether some of the savings in officer's travel expenses over the last year could be used to incentivise staff to choose public transport over private transport. He was concerned that in the absence of that financial incentive the proposed new local bus service may benefit the residents of Redhill and Reigate, but not those travelling from further away.

In response, the Leader of the Council agreed that it was vital to increase the uptake of public transport by both residents and staff. He noted the need to invest in good quality public transport, starting with the £50 million for low emission buses and the Government's £3 billion in funding for a new bus strategy, which the Council could bid for next year. He reiterated the point made by the Cabinet Member for Highways on the planned pilot project in Mole Valley for on-demand rural transport improvements. He emphasised that it was vital to increase the use of public transport through measures including incentives and investing in the public transport network across the county.

Cabinet Member Briefings:

These were also published in the supplementary agenda on 15 March 2021.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change: on the Eco Park, a Member noted that the legal proceedings were to be expected when the Council removed the £42 million asset of the Eco Park from its accounts. The Member asked for assurance that the legal proceedings with Suez would not impact the Council's Waste Infrastructure Grants that it received from the Government as it was still expecting £63 million from that.

In response, the Cabinet Member noted that owing to legal privilege a full reply could not be given.

Cabinet Member for Communities: on libraries, a Member noted the positive comments on the situation and changes during lockdown. The Member made reference to the challenging budget situation in relation to re-establishing the revenue lost in cultural services and asked the Cabinet Member to provide reassurance that his plans to realise those savings would not include the closure of any community libraries.

In response, the Cabinet Member said that as previously stated, he confirmed that the fifty-two current library services would remain, the buildings and positions may change, but every area with a current library service would continue to have one. The Council was doing its best to ensure that the provision was fit for purpose and flexible for future use whilst working within financial constraints. He noted that he was confident in the progress towards transforming library services into something that Surrey residents would be proud of.

19/21 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [ITEM 7]

Mrs Tina Mountain made a statement on Epsom's response to Covid-19 which had become an amazing hub for administering the vaccine and paid tribute to all the doctors, nurses, administrators and volunteers.

20/21 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [ITEM 8]

Item 8 (i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Dr Andrew Povey moved:

This Council notes that:

Given the number of residents volunteering during the current pandemic, Surrey County Council will build on this and the previous Government's work on the Big Society.

It further recognises the importance of encouraging the ongoing volunteering by residents in a range of activities of benefit to our communities.

The Council resolves to:

- I. Work with other public sector bodies to promote volunteering and its benefits.
- II. Work with the voluntary, community and faith organisations and employers as an element of our 'no-one left behind strategy' to encourage volunteering.

III. Publicise the benefits of volunteering to the individual, society and our local communities.

Dr Povey made the following points:

- That throughout the last challenging year people had come together, noting the volunteers that helped to deliver food, visited the isolated and helped the vulnerable as well as providing assistance to the vaccination programme.
- It was a good opportunity to build upon the one million plus people who had signed up for more formal volunteering roles with the NHS and other public bodies.
- The motion sought to recognise and thank Surrey's residents for their efforts as volunteers and hard work over the last year.
- That it was vital to retain the community spirit generated through the pandemic for the future. The Government could not do everything in terms of looking after its citizens so volunteers played a crucial role.
- There had been previous attempts nationally to encourage volunteering such as the Big Society. In November 2010 the Surrey Strategic Partnership hosted a Big Society conference and the conclusion was that Surrey already had its own Big Society through the significant amount of volunteering and community activity that already took place.
- That looking to the future it would be good for the Council to build on the momentum gained through the pandemic by continuing to encourage residents to volunteer, which brought benefits to communities as well to the individual as it was character-building and helped those less fortunate.

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

- That over the past year people had discovered the joys and fulfilment of volunteering with many first time volunteers learning a lot about their local community and themselves, whether working alone, in a team, part-time or full-time.
- That in helping others, volunteers benefitted themselves, their health wellbeing and happiness. Volunteers could make new friends to combat isolation, acquire new skills, develop and advance employment opportunities, build their confidence and a sense of purpose, strengthen ties with the community which would improve neighbourhoods, broaden their support network by working with others with common interests and gain a new outlook on life and enhance causes important to them.
- In addition to supporting people as seen through the pandemic, there were an array of volunteering opportunities such as supporting theatres and museums, in heritage conservation, sports, faith groups and across neighbourhoods teaching skills to others.
- That children learnt from their parents the benefits of volunteering.
- That research had shown that adults with disabilities, health conditions, learning disabilities and conditions such as autism had shown improvement after volunteering.
- Highlighted the Old Moat Garden Centre in Epsom run by the Richmond Fellowship Charity, which offered bespoke support to those with mental health issues through work-based therapies.

- That more employers needed to see the benefits of volunteering, highlighting Surrey Choices' EmployAbility programme, in which individuals were carefully matched to an employer.
- That with the increase in agile working, volunteering would be a good way to increase engagement and tackle the isolation of working from home.
- The Council must assist in every possible way to help people to help others and in so doing to help themselves.

Nine Members made the following points:

- Thanked all those volunteers across the county that had offered their help and services and would do so after hearing the motion. Volunteering was rewarding both for the individual's mental wellbeing and to the benefit of communities.
- Noted that in Guildford and Waverley in the first fifty-two minutes of the vaccination programme roll out being announced, eight hundred and fifty volunteers stepped forward and there was a waiting list of volunteers in Runnymede.
- Hoped that the surge in volunteering would continue, noting that the work in customer services for communities in libraries was about empowering communities. The Council was working to solidify its partnerships to strengthen the community spirit and resident's empowerment.
- Noted that the promotion of volunteering was not consistent with the recent history as it was not long ago that approximately eighty volunteers in total from Elmbridge, and Epsom and Ewell were dismissed by the Council from running a previous contract for carers which they had been running successfully and were trained to do so, the contract was awarded to a company with little previous carers experience.
- Supported the motion, noting a life of voluntary service and in the first lockdown along with two other residents a cross-party initiative was established to encourage voluntary work and that generated over three thousand volunteers.
- That the lockdowns had changed the demographics of volunteers as many elderly residents had to shield and that befriending services were invaluable.
- Regarding a previous Member comment on volunteers having to queue due to the high demand to help with the vaccination programme, noted that more work needed to be done behind the scenes through customer relationship management software to coordinate the effort.
- That although there was no shortage of volunteers in Britain, welcomed the motion as it encouraged more volunteers and praised the effort of the local Knaphill St Johns Brookwood Volunteers Group stood up in response to the pandemic and thanked the Council's leadership and support of volunteers.
- Thanked all the volunteers across the county and it was important to recognise their service and to support them.
- Noted the huge volunteering effort throughout the pandemic, but that going forward there were many that did not appreciate what places there were for volunteering.
- Highlighted Voluntary Action Elmbridge and Voluntary Action services across Surrey and the country which registered organisations looking for volunteers, so it was vital to signpost residents to available services.
- Highlighted the contribution made by the governing bodies at Surrey's schools; 94% of schools in Surrey were rated Good or Outstanding by Ofsted and Surrey in a recent survey was rated as the second-best place to live in the UK. The role of school governors was voluntary, they had a responsibility for making sure

that schools were performing, early interventions and education were vital for children particularly vulnerable learners and so commended the work of school governors.

- Noted the deprivation in their local division with many residents who did not feel that they could engage, however the challenge of the pandemic had driven an increase in the local voluntary sector which had been a positive experience as it helped with wellbeing, education and employment opportunities.
- Noted a personal experience of volunteering which had been life-changing, encouraged residents to volunteer and thanked the Council for welcoming her over the past four years.
- Welcomed those organisations which had a well-organised use of volunteers, noted however some organisations which needed to have more of an open mind regarding volunteering such as the police. Regarding Surrey Police he noted the use of volunteers including Special Constables - however they needed to be relatively fit alongside regular Police Constables - and Community Speed Watch - however the work was not followed through; and so called on Surrey Police to make better use of volunteers.
- Echoed a previous Member comment on the greater use of software by the Council and support in terms of communications and advertising around the opportunities available.
- Noted a personal volunteering experience over the past five years as an independent visitor with Croydon Council with a young person in care and had utilised social media to attract younger people to those roles.
- That in order to keep the level of volunteers up, the Council needed a different approach, through utilising social media to attract younger people and more that could be done through the Surrey Youth Cabinet.

The Chairman asked Dr Povey, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate:

- Thanked all Members who had commented, noting the interesting suggestions and experiences of Members in terms of volunteering.
- Welcomed the summary by the seconder on the benefits of volunteering.
- Would look into the ideas raised in the discussion such as on the Surrey Youth Cabinet, on software and on Community Speed Watch - which he would take back to the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner as the Council's representative on the Surrey Police and Crime Panel.
- That there was always a role for volunteers, noting plenty of opportunities.
- Hoped that the Council seized the opportunity with the momentum gained take the matter forward.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

Given the number of residents volunteering during the current pandemic, Surrey County Council will build on this and the previous Government's work on the Big Society.

It further recognises the importance of encouraging the ongoing volunteering by residents in a range of activities of benefit to our communities.

The Council resolves to:

- I. Work with other public sector bodies to promote volunteering and its benefits.
- II. Work with the voluntary, community and faith organisations and employers as an element of our 'no-one left behind strategy' to encourage volunteering.
- III. Publicise the benefits of volunteering to the individual, society and our local communities.

Item 8 (ii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Robert Evans moved:

This Council notes that:

It formally places on record its sincere thanks to all those workers, directly and indirectly employed by Surrey for their extraordinary efforts during the current COVID-19 crisis.

From the Council's own dedicated employees to the hard-working teachers and other staff in schools, Surrey recognises that many people have worked very long hours, not just to continue their existing role but to diversify and innovate.

Health service staff are at the forefront of saving lives, but care home workers, the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and countless other people, including many community volunteers, are displaying remarkable courage in the face of great adversity and unforeseen challenges.

The Council resolves that:

- I. It hereby applauds and thanks each one for their remarkable contribution in this year of crisis.

Mr R Evans made the following points:

- That the motion echoed the words of the Leader in his statement and built on the previous motion and Members' comments.
- That the motion was a formal statement from the Council that it sincerely appreciated and thanked all workers and public services in Surrey, including volunteers, for their extraordinary efforts during the Covid-19 crisis who kept the county and country going.
- That the NHS had been saving lives daily so the 1% pay rise was disappointing.
- Praised the community spirit witnessed in his division, noting the Local Conversation initiative which provided activities and support, faith and community groups, and Stanwell Events, the Stanwell Food Bank which had provided hundreds of meals with support from local companies.
- That the motion thanked the scientists and the NHS which had excelled themselves with the vaccination programme.

- That the motion thanked parents who had been home schooling and others who had simply looked in on their neighbours.
- Hoped that the Council would be able to thank all workers in Surrey in some formal way once normality returned, in the meantime, that as a mark of the Council's appreciation that the motion be passed.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Jonathan Essex, who made the following comments:

- Was astounded from the start of the first lockdown by the increase in volunteering in Surrey's communities, noting the surge in volunteers for a local volunteer centre with street support teams and food bank collection points set up, as well as the demand to crew vaccination centres and litter picking had become fashionable.
- That just like the Big Society should not be a cover for austerity, those workers who put themselves at risk should be thanked highlighting a personal example. Staying local had highlighted those who we relied on the most such as teachers, recycling collectors, delivery drivers and the NHS.
- That as local politicians, more than just declaring thanks was needed as Members were held accountable for their actions not just their words.
- In supporting the motion, let the Council signal its desire for more than the 1% pay rise to NHS workers and signal its frustration in the repeated delays in putting social care on the stable footing that it deserved. To commit to change how the Council valued those whose jobs it was to care for Surrey's most vulnerable in society going forward.

Ten Members made the following points:

- Highlighted that Surrey Police and its officers were missed out so would like to add that group to the list, noting their continuous hard work.
- Welcomed the proposer's remarks particularly in relation to teachers, noting that the response of Surrey's schools to the pandemic had been phenomenal and thanked Council officers for their support. Schools had stayed open to support the most vulnerable pupils, teachers and support staff had adapted to remote learning and had set up testing facilities to enable all pupils to return to their studies.
- Thanked the proposer for highlighting the significant contribution made to Surrey's response to the pandemic by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service. Which as a key public protection service within the Community Protection Group it had been on the frontline ensuring that the impacts of the pandemic were lessened particularly for the most vulnerable.
- Noted sincere thanks to SFRS for its outstanding work over the last year, its willingness to go above and beyond, and its unfailing commitment to protect and safeguard Surrey's residents.
- Added the Council's thanks to the Surrey Local Resilience Forum (SLRF) chaired by SFRS' Chief Fire Officer and led by the Chief Executive. The Forum brought together Council staff, the NHS, the Surrey Police, Surrey's District and Borough Councils, SFRS, schools, volunteers, and the military who had collectively done a remarkable job in helping to protect residents.
- That after sixteen years as a Member, paid tribute to the work of all the county's officers during the last year and past years noted that enjoyment over the years as a Member had been made possible by the terrific effort of all officers.

- Highlighted that it was World Social Work Day 2021 and so thanked all Surrey's social workers who had continued to visit families face to face and provide personal care for older adults during the pandemic.
- Noted that as Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families she and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Domestic Abuse had recorded a message for social workers online on Surrey Matters and that it would be good if Members could share that through social media channels as it would indicate the Council's support.
- Echoed the previous Member's comments regarding World Social Work Day 2021, asking Members to join in celebrating the courage and resilience that many of Surrey's frontline social workers had shown during the challenging time; thanking all frontline social workers and staff within Adult Social Care.
- The Leader endorsed the motion noting that there was an endless list of people that deserved thanks and praise for their remarkable contributions.
- That the motion as drafted should not be confused with the Member comments made in relation to the sensitive pay negotiations in relation to the 1% pay rise to NHS workers.
- Highlighted that it was also Young Carers Action Day 2021, thanking the over 14,000 young carers in Surrey.
- Urged all to visit the Action for Carers website: <https://www.actionforcarers.org.uk>, to see how Surrey's young carers could be supported and how Members could get involved.
- Noted no hesitation in supporting the motion, Members' comments in support and thanked the proposer for the motion.
- Welcomed the motion's sentiment of paying tribute to the remarkable contribution made during the last year of crisis.
- Noted the honour of being a Member for the last twelve years, and of being a Cabinet Member. Paid tribute to the actions of Chief Executive as well as the team of officers working behind her who were professional, had acted with alacrity and integrity, and worked in partnership with key services across the Council and the Surrey LRF to protect the most vulnerable in the county.

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

- Thanked all the Members that had responded and welcomed the cross-party support and the Leader's endorsement.
- That although not explicitly mentioned in the motion he thanked Surrey Police and the Police Community Support Officers.
- That as a school governor he recognised how all teachers had gone beyond the call of duty.
- That he recognised the work of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service whose firefighters put themselves on the frontline.
- Shared his thanks to the military and the SLRF.
- Thanked the Cabinet Members for highlighting World Social Work Day and for the work done across Adult Social Care and Children's Services.
- Hoped that at some stage the Council could recognise the efforts undertaken in the last year during the pandemic.
- That whether explicitly mentioned or not in the motion the thanks expressed encompassed all workers and volunteers at whatever level who helped during the last year and would continue to do so.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

It formally places on record its sincere thanks to all those workers, directly and indirectly employed by Surrey for their extraordinary efforts during the current COVID-19 crisis.

From the Council's own dedicated employees to the hard-working teachers and other staff in schools, Surrey recognises that many people have worked very long hours, not just to continue their existing role but to diversify and innovate.

Health service staff are at the forefront of saving lives, but care home workers, the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and countless other people, including many community volunteers, are displaying remarkable courage in the face of great adversity and unforeseen challenges.

The Council resolves that:

- I. It hereby applauds and thanks each one for their remarkable contribution in this year of crisis.

Item 8 (iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Matt Furniss moved:

This Council notes that:

Following the last Council meeting, I wrote to the Mayor of London on behalf of this Council to express our strong feelings against the proposed new Greater London Boundary Charge that would penalise Surrey and other counties' residents bordering London.

London is not an island and must take into consideration the impact on its neighbours. Surrey County Council and the Mayor of London need to work together to tackle congestion, to move toward net zero carbon and to enhance the prosperity of the region by working together.

However, it is clear from the response that Transport for London (TfL) is initially looking at a £3.50 daily charge, with a possible higher charge (£5.50) for the most polluting vehicles.

This charge would impact between 57,000 and 61,000 residents on a typical working day based on 2011 and 2019 data. Whilst this levy, as the Mayor's Office says, could be earmarked to support sustainable travel in boundary borough, there is no mention that this money would be invested in cross-border improvements.

Surrey residents and taxpayers have already bailed out London's TfL for the second time through the Government's generous settlements in 2020. Surrey and other bordering counties' residents should not have to bear extra financial penalties for the London Mayor's mismanagement of TfL's finances.

The Council resolves to:

- I. Oppose any Greater London Boundary Charge or charge on entering London to work that targets non-London residents.

Mr Furniss made the following points:

- Following February's Council meeting, he wrote to the Mayor of London for confirmation on whether he was considering a Greater London Boundary Charge, following suggestions from several media reports.
- That the correspondences with the Mayor's office were less than positive, highlighting the lack of cross-border working and the London-centric attitude.
- That he had sought the Mayor's reassurance to the Council that Surrey's businesses and our residents that the boundary charge was not a serious or active proposition which would impact potentially more than 61,000 Surrey residents on the typical working day travelling across the border.
- Called for greater cooperation by the Mayor of London and Transport for London (TfL) to improve sustainable transport in and out of London, Surrey remained committed to working with TfL as a key partner to tackle congestion in the move forward to net zero carbon.
- Opposed any Greater London Boundary Charge or any charge to enter London to work that targeted non-London residents as Surrey and other bordering counties' residents should not have to bear extra financial penalties for the London Mayor's mismanagement of TfL's finances.

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

- Noted concern about the proposal for the Greater London Boundary Charge particularly for those Surrey boroughs that bordered London as a considerable portion of the working population and residents were reliant on services crossing into London.
- That the proposed charge showed no cooperation between London and the counties impacted, there was no suggestion of any of potential funds being distributed to mitigate the negative impact faced by Surrey's residents.
- That business owners, professions and services that depended on road vehicles crossing the border would be adversely affected.
- Noted that taxpayers had already bailed out TfL twice, to the tune of at least £3.4 billion, and the proposed Greater London Boundary Charge was an ill-conceived quick fix in the absence of a clear and workable strategy would never be justified.
- That in the midst of the pandemic the Mayor of London was asking the residents of Surrey and the bordering counties for funding to mitigate the Mayor's failed policies and mismanagement of TfL.

Mr Jonathan Essex moved an amendment which had been published in the supplementary agenda (15 March 2021), which was formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans.

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

This Council notes that:

Following the last Council meeting, I wrote to the Mayor of London on behalf of this Council to express our strong feelings against the proposed new Greater London Boundary Charge that would penalise Surrey and other counties' residents bordering London.

There are many TfL bus routes serving parts of Surrey and the Government this week announced funding for bus lanes and measures to encourage the increased use of public transport.

Surrey County Council's Climate Change Strategy commits that greenhouse gas emissions from Surrey should be reduced by two thirds by 2030 and to zero by 2050.

London is not an island and must take into consideration the impact on its neighbours. Surrey County Council and the Mayor of London need to work together to tackle congestion, to move toward net zero carbon and to enhance the prosperity of the region by working together.

However, it is clear from the response that Transport for London (TfL) is initially looking at a £3.50 daily charge, with a possible higher charge (£5.50) for the most polluting vehicles.

This charge would impact between 57,000 and 61,000 residents on a typical working day based on 2011 and 2019 data. Whilst this levy, as the Mayor's Office says, could be earmarked to support sustainable travel in boundary borough, there is no mention that this money would be invested in cross-border improvements.

~~Surrey residents and taxpayers have already bailed out London's TfL for the second time through the Government's generous settlements in 2020. Surrey and other bordering counties' residents should not have to bear extra financial penalties for the London Mayor's mismanagement of TfL's finances.~~

The Council resolves to:

- ~~I. Oppose any Greater London Boundary Charge or charge on entering London to work that targets non-London residents.~~
- I. **Urge the Government to provide long-term sustainable financial support to TfL and encourage whoever is elected Mayor in 2021 to work closely with Surrey County Council to make public transport a more economically viable option in Surrey, just as it is in London, and additionally, to ensure any new charges are mutually beneficial to London and Surrey.**

Mr Essex spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- That the amendment ensured that the motion reflected the challenge of improving public transport between London and Surrey.
- That the motion encouraged private car journeys, whilst the amendment ensured that the motion matched the Council's commitment to addressing climate change in-keeping with Surrey's Climate Change Strategy which was committed to a 67% reduction in transport emissions by 2030.
- That the amendment included reference to TfL's bus routes travelling into and out of Surrey, and such proposals by the Mayor of London would fund bus lanes and public transport in the absence of money during the pandemic or from Government.
- That the amendment clarified that a new direction of travel was needed, including policies and incentives that reduced the need to travel and encouraged staying locally as well as electrifying public transport.
- Emphasised that investment was needed to deliver such changes regarding reducing congestion, improving road safety and air quality, noting that air quality action areas still existed in many parts of Surrey.
- That the amendment was intended to be constructive, calling on the future leadership of Surrey and London to work together.

The amendment was formally seconded by Mr R Evans, who made the following comments:

- That the amendment both strengthened and updated the motion by removing inaccuracies and ambiguities in order to ensure honesty with Surrey's residents.
- Contrary to the wording of the motion, the Council had not taken a position on the Greater London Boundary Charge and asked whether the Cabinet Member for Highways could publish his correspondence with TfL and the Mayor of London's office.
- That TfL bus routes cross-border between Surrey and London benefitted passengers.
- That Surrey taxpayers had not bailed out London, Surrey benefitted from London services and the subsidies were financed from the whole country via the Government as fare revenue made up 70% of TfL funding.
- Questioned whether the Cabinet Member for Highways or Members had read the Mayor of London and TfL's Financial Sustainability Plan - 11 January 2021, which stated that passenger numbers were down 95% in the first lockdown, costs had risen as buses had to be adapted with more staff needed and Personal Protective Equipment. The Government had contributed over £3 billion in emergency funding for TfL, noting certain conditions such as the suspension of concessionary fares for schoolchildren and over 60s.
- That the Leader noted earlier that no one should be left behind, but it was not the Mayor of London nor TfL who would make that decision, noting that a future motion on the issue be directed towards the Secretary of State for Transport and that all political parties write to the Government regarding fair funding.
- That there were hundreds of stations in Surrey and many rail lines leading into London, the Prime Minister yesterday encouraged more people to use buses.
- That the motion ignored the fact that there was an election for Mayor of London on 6 May 2021, it gave the impression that the result was a foregone conclusion, which the amendment rectified.

Mr Furniss did not accept the amendment and he made the following comments:

- Noted that the London-centric attitude had been clear throughout the correspondence with the Mayor of London's office which was also asking the Secretary of State for Transport to devolve vehicle Excise Duty to London.
- That there should be cross-border working for the benefit of all, rather than putting up a wall around London and penalising anyone who crossed over whether it was for personal, business, or medical reasons; particularly during the pandemic.
- That more sustainable transport should be prioritised rather than introducing the Greater London Boundary Charge.

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

- Was in favour of reducing emissions and greater cooperation between all interested parties but noted the unintended consequences of the amendment.
- Challenged the practicalities of calling for an increased use of public transport such as buses; noting the difficulties in distance travelling.
- That the Greater London Boundary Charge was a threat to businesses which relied on cross-border travel, would redirect residents on the London border to further local recycling centres which may increase carbon emissions, and would penalise those residents attending Kingston Hospital.
- Opposed the amendment so as not to support Surrey's residents funding the Greater London strategy, whilst in relation to the original motion noted that their division bordered Greater London so many residents travelled into London daily for work, school pick-ups, shopping and going to the doctors and the Council must continue to put pressure on the Mayor of London's office to object to the selfish proposition and to push for clarity for residents.
- That it diluted the original motion by focussing on divergent issues around public transport and utilising bus lanes.
- Supported the principle of the amendment which was about requesting long-term financial support for more sustainable transport.
- Noted concern that in order for Surrey to reach its target of a 46% drop in CO₂ emissions by 2025, innovative thinking was vital, it was a good opportunity during Covid-19 recovery to assess how travel had changed.
- Supported the amendment as stressed that the business as usual concept was not possible if the Council was ever going to address the declared climate emergency.
- Opposed the amendment as the Mayor of London and TfL did not understand the amount of cross-border traffic into London, noting divisional examples of travel into London for medical, education, work purposes.
- That TfL may run buses in Surrey but they have had a policy in recent years of demanding money from Surrey to fund them, TfL was in financial difficulty but some of its troubles were down to its mismanagement.
- The proposed charge needed to be opposed and a pan-regional approach was needed rather than a London-first approach.
- Noted a divisional example of a borough bordering Greater London and that local residents were opposed to the Mayor of London's proposal. Whilst sharing the objectives to reduce emissions, that must be done in a planned manner, rather than a knee jerk reaction which would potentially impact those who could least afford it.

The Chairman asked Mr Essex, as proposer of the amendment to conclude the debate:

- Noted that he had no further comments to add.

The amendment was put to the vote with 10 Members voting For, 61 voting Against and 2 Abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the substantive motion, nine Members made the following comments:

- Noted that TfL had many years to work more closely with Surrey but repeatedly had acted in an isolationist way, noting no consideration by TfL of the charge in relation to cross-border travel and discussions over the new Epsom and St Helier Hospital serving the residents of north Surrey and south London.
- That a robust partnership was needed as well as the Council ensuring that it set out what was needed for Surrey's residents.
- Noted a divisional example highlighting the use of Kingston Hospital by Epsom and Ewell residents as well as the shopping facilities in Kingston. Suggested that the charge worked both ways, from London into Surrey noting the cross-border travel and use of Chessington Road.
- That the charge was the wrong way to plug the gap in TfL's budget, noting divisional examples in which there was not an adequate supply of buses going into and out of it from London and that the new Epsom and St Helier Hospital at Sutton would be costly to Surrey's residents if the charge would be brought in.
- Noted that the proposed charge was absurd, due to the extensive cross-border travel and that the charge would impose a hard border.
- That cross-border travel was a daily occurrence, highlighting the importance of opposing the charge which was potentially a forerunner of sweeping a large part of north Surrey into Greater London area by extending the London boroughs right out to the M25.
- That the proposed charge was an idea stemming from the London Congestion Charge but was misleading to compare it as the Congestion Charge was intended to reduce the amount of traffic into London and was successful as it was served well by public transport links.
- Whilst the proposed charge was a revenue raising exercise which would affect many thousands if not millions of people bordering or travelling into London for work, shopping and leisure facilities; and would backfire on London creating enormous chaos and inconvenience.
- Noted surprise regarding contributions from Members who had not read the Mayor of London and TfL's Financial Sustainability Plan - 11 January 2021 nor understood the amendment, reiterating the earlier point that if Surrey wanted to have an impact on what was decided by whoever would be Mayor of London following the elections, Surrey had to work with them.
- That the proposed charge was not a decision for the Mayor of London but for the Secretary of State for Transport, noting pages 99-100 of the Mayor of London and TfL's Financial Sustainability Plan - 11 January 2021 which detailed the exemptions and proposed charge.

- Noted opposition to the proposed charge, which referred to daily cross-border traffic as opposed to occasional travel.
- That the vehicle Excise Duty as an alternative system of funding was opposed by the proposer of the motion, but that was a proposal from the previous Mayor of London, now Prime Minister and was supported by all of Surrey's political parties.
- That the motion highlighted the ineptitude of the current Mayor of London, lack of collaborative working and financial mismanagement; opposed the proposed charge in order to protect Surrey's residents and businesses.
- That having written to the Cabinet Member for Highways in January highlighting the issues that would affect his local division noting several busy roads travelling between Surrey and London; the response was to wait and see, and his offer to work with the Cabinet Member on the issue had been ignored.
- Welcomed the motion but noted that it did not go far enough, noting that in his correspondence to the Cabinet Member he indicated that if TfL was to introduce the proposed charge, then Surrey should do the same in order to compensate for the lack of funding for its highways.
- Noted a divisional example in which Surrey residents down the road from Sutton in Greater London would face the proposed charge, which was sabre-rattling between the Mayor of London and Government with Surrey's residents being caught in the middle.
- Sought assurance from the Cabinet Member for Highways that in the absence of countermeasures to the proposed charge, that the Council was prepared to do whatever was necessary to protect Surrey residents and would call upon the eleven Surrey MP's to support their constituents.

The Chairman asked Mr Furniss, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate:

- Thanked Members for their contributions to the debate noting that it was vital to protect Surrey's residents from unfair charges.
- That irrespective of the future Mayor of London and upcoming elections, the Council needed to make a firm stance that it did not support a charge that targeted non-London residents in order to bailout TfL's failing finances and compensate for the lack of Government funding.
- That Surrey's MPs had been written to since February's Council, he was happy to share the initial correspondence with the Mayor of London, response and subsequent letter with all Members.

The motion was put to the vote with 66 Members voting For, 2 voting Against and 4 Abstentions.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

Following the last Council meeting, I wrote to the Mayor of London on behalf of this Council to express our strong feelings against the proposed new Greater London Boundary Charge that would penalise Surrey and other counties' residents bordering London.

London is not an island and must take into consideration the impact on its neighbours. Surrey County Council and the Mayor of London need to work together to tackle congestion, to move toward net zero carbon and to enhance the prosperity of the region by working together.

However, it is clear from the response that Transport for London (TfL) is initially looking at a £3.50 daily charge, with a possible higher charge (£5.50) for the most polluting vehicles.

This charge would impact between 57,000 and 61,000 residents on a typical working day based on 2011 and 2019 data. Whilst this levy, as the Mayor's Office says, could be earmarked to support sustainable travel in boundary borough, there is no mention that this money would be invested in cross-border improvements.

Surrey residents and taxpayers have already bailed out London's TfL for the second time through the Government's generous settlements in 2020. Surrey and other bordering counties' residents should not have to bear extra financial penalties for the London Mayor's mismanagement of TfL's finances.

The Council resolves to:

- I. Oppose any Greater London Boundary Charge or charge on entering London to work that targets non-London residents.

Item 8 (iv)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Will Forster moved:

This Council notes that:

The shift to Microsoft Teams meetings has enabled Council business to continue during the pandemic and that Members and staff have adapted admirably to this change in practice.

There are some definite advantages to holding remote meetings such as increased participation from the public and members and reduced road congestion and carbon emissions. It also saves the council money and enables those with caring responsibilities to attend when travelling a distance would have been an obstacle. It would therefore be beneficial to have the choice to continue to hold these remote meetings where appropriate, after the current temporary measures have lapsed.

Some Members may prefer meeting in person whilst acknowledging that remote meetings do have their place.

It is essential for Members to understand their obligations with regard to meeting attendance be it in person or online.

The Council resolves to:

- I. Write to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) urging that the temporary change to the meeting rules set out in the Local Government Act 1972 be made permanent so that after May we have the flexibility to hold meetings remotely or in person or by using a combination of the two.
- II. Write to Surrey's Members of Parliament, as well as Surrey's Borough, District, Town and Parish Councils asking for support for this flexible approach to council meetings.
- III. Request that the members of the Audit and Governance Committee assess the pros and cons of holding remote/hybrid/in person meetings and make recommendations as appropriate to which Council/committee meetings must be held in person and which could continue to be held remotely.
- IV. Once our request is successful, to explore the use of technology to develop remote meetings in order to attract an even wider audience.

Mr Forster made the following points:

- That the motion called on the Council to lobby the Government to extend local authorities' powers to hold remote meetings both in the short-term post 7 May and also into the long-term after the pandemic.
- That it was frustrating that the Government seemed reluctant to extend remote meetings often citing the lack of parliamentary and ministerial time; hoped that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government would review the matter urgently.
- That the flexibility to hold remote meetings brought advantages such as the £2 million reduction in Member expenses over the last year, reducing travel also reduced congestion on Surrey's roads and carbon emissions, Member and public engagement in meetings had increased.
- That should there be an extension to the powers granted under legislation, the Audit and Governance Committee would lead on agreeing which meetings should be remote, in person, or hybrid.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Angela Goodwin, who reserved the right to speak.

Eight Members made the following points:

- Noted that there was a huge loss in terms of getting a feel for a committee and for interactions with colleagues as well as officers; remote meetings were useful for smaller meetings such as working groups.
- Noted the difficulties of remote meetings including technical limitations, that 200,000 residents in Surrey were digitally excluded and cost of IT equipment.
- Supported the motion because it included a resolution for the Audit and Governance Committee making recommendations as to which Council or committee meetings could be held in person or remotely.
- The Leader reassured the proposer noting that he along with many other council leaders across the country had raised the issue with the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government through the Local Government Association and the County Councils Network.

- Highlighted support for resolution point I in that the Council would urge the Government to continue with the temporary change to the meeting rules, in order to have the flexibility to hold meetings remotely, in person, or using a combination of the two.
- Urged that the Audit and Governance Committee take into account the work the Chief Executive and officers were doing in relation to the Remote Meetings Protocol as further guidance around virtual meetings would be useful - such as not setting up back to back meetings - and recognising concerns expressed by staff around hybrid meetings which potentially disadvantaged those attending a meeting remotely.
- That although the motion called for greater flexibility, noted unease against the blanket use of remote meetings going forward.
- That although remote meetings saved time and travel, the key disadvantage regarded the difficulty in interacting with Members and officers.
- Noted actions already underway by the Council for example regarding flexibility, that was reflected in the Council's agile working principles.
- That emerging from lockdown, it was a good opportunity for the Council's refinement of the Remote Meetings Protocol and that it was important that Council refer future considerations directly to Members via the Audit and Governance Committee.
- That in a short space of time over the course of the pandemic, the Council had progressed for the better, noting the ease of public participation and increase as well as Member participation.
- That it was vital to have the flexibility of hybrid meetings, noting the importance of inclusivity for both Members and residents. Adding that it would enable more prospective councillors to step forward who were previously prevented from being Members.
- Supported greater flexibility through remote and hybrid meetings as it allowed the continued participation for those Members elsewhere in the country or abroad, or with health problems noting the increased attendance at remote meetings.
- Welcomed the flexibility to hold meetings remotely, in person or a hybrid between the two and that a downside of remote meetings was the lengthy voting system compared to voting in person.
- Echoed the importance of inclusivity as hybrid meetings enabled a whole new portfolio of prospective councillors to become Members including those working or who were parents.

Mrs Goodwin, the seconder of the motion, made the following comments:

- Noted the variety of Member comments most of which had been in favour of the motion and commended the motion.

The Chairman asked Mr Forster, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate:

- Thanked Members for the broadly supportive comments and experiences shared.
- Concerning meetings with perspective councillors, noted that remote meetings enabled greater inclusivity as Members could engage fully whilst undertaking caring responsibilities, looking after children and working.

- That following agreement and continued flexibility granted by the Government, the Audit and Governance Committee's monitoring of the Remote Meetings Protocol would be useful.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

The shift to Microsoft Teams meetings has enabled Council business to continue during the pandemic and that Members and staff have adapted admirably to this change in practice.

There are some definite advantages to holding remote meetings such as increased participation from the public and members and reduced road congestion and carbon emissions. It also saves the council money and enables those with caring responsibilities to attend when travelling a distance would have been an obstacle. It would therefore be beneficial to have the choice to continue to hold these remote meetings where appropriate, after the current temporary measures have lapsed.

Some Members may prefer meeting in person whilst acknowledging that remote meetings do have their place.

It is essential for Members to understand their obligations with regard to meeting attendance be it in person or online.

The Council resolves to:

- I. Write to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) urging that the temporary change to the meeting rules set out in the Local Government Act 1972 be made permanent so that after May we have the flexibility to hold meetings remotely or in person or by using a combination of the two.
- II. Write to Surrey's Members of Parliament, as well as Surrey's Borough, District, Town and Parish Councils asking for support for this flexible approach to council meetings.
- III. Request that the members of the Audit and Governance Committee assess the pros and cons of holding remote/hybrid/in person meetings and make recommendations as appropriate to which Council/committee meetings must be held in person and which could continue to be held remotely.
- IV. Once our request is successful, to explore the use of technology to develop remote meetings in order to attract an even wider audience.

Item 8 (v)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Leader of the Council, Mr Tim Oliver, moved a proposal. The proposal was as follows:

That the motion below by Mr Chris Botten be referred to the Cabinet for more detailed consideration.

This Council notes that:

The economy of Surrey relies significantly on workers from the European Union (EU) in the care and health sectors, in construction and hospitality and other areas vital to our communities.

EU nationals from the 27 EU member states are part of our shared communities alongside United Kingdom (UK) citizens. They are our husbands, wives, partners, parents, friends, neighbours and colleagues.

This Council further notes that:

Since 2016 EU nationals have been promised again and again that "there will be no change for EU citizens already lawfully resident in the UK and [they...] will be treated no less favourably than they are at present".

Home Office figures (as of Dec 2020) reveal that 4,800 people in Surrey are still waiting for a decision on their Settled Status application.

27,320 people in Surrey have only been granted temporary 'Pre-Settled Status'. That means a total of 32,120 applicants in Surrey have still not been given the permanent right to stay.

The Council resolves to:

- I. Recognise the valuable contribution EU citizens make to Surrey, acknowledging that they are an integral part of our community and without them the Council would struggle to deliver its services.
- II. Write to the Home Office and Surrey's Members of Parliament urging them to grant EU citizens living locally the automatic right to stay in the UK.

In speaking to his proposal the Leader of the Council:

- Noted that the Council recognised the valuable contribution that European Union (EU) citizens made to the United Kingdom and Surrey.
- Noted that there were approximately 4.6 million people who had been granted the right to remain in the UK post Brexit under the EU Settlement Scheme and those applications were being progressed.
- Noted that of those 4.6 million people, 2.5 million people had been being granted permanent leave to remain, 2 million had been granted pre-settled status and only 3% were refused, withdrawn, voided or invalid.
- Noted that it would be helpful for Members to have more detail on the matter to understand whether there were difficulties for Surrey residents on their settled status applications.
- That the Minister for Future Borders and Immigration recently urged people to apply to receive the status they deserved in UK law; the Government was supportive of EU citizens seeking settled status with support available seven days a week on the phone and by email, as well as seventy-two grant funded organisations across the UK to help EU citizens with their applications.
- Noted that applications for settled status must be submitted by 30 June 2021.

Mr Chris Botten agreed to the referral of the motion.

The proposal to refer the motion was put to the vote and received unanimous support.

Therefore it was:

RESOLVED:

That the motion be referred to the Cabinet.

21/21 REVIEW OF SELECT COMMITTEE TASK GROUP LEAD ROLE - REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [ITEM 9]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report. He noted that he was pleased to see that the Independent Remuneration Panel recognised the considerable improvements that the Council had made to the scrutiny function. He thanked the chairmen of the select committees and Members for their input, he welcomed the earlier engagement on policy matters and the contribution of the task groups which gave a smaller group of Members the opportunity to deep dive into areas of focus.

RESOLVED:

That the SRA for the Task Group Lead is retained at its current level and subject to annual inflationary adjustment in line with other Members' Allowances.

22/21 ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL - MEMBER DEVELOPMENT [ITEM 10]

The Vice-Chairman introduced the report and noted that:

- She had been chairing the Member Development Steering Group (MDSG) on behalf of the Deputy Leader.
- The MDSG was responsible for overseeing Member training and support, it was cross-party and she thanked its members for their constructive challenges and input.
- Despite the challenges of Covid-19 and it being the last year of the current Council election term, she noted that attendance at Member seminars and training events had been higher than ever. That was partly due to the mixture of online and in person learning which would reduce time and travel commitments for Members, alongside a reduction of costs for the Council.
- One of the key tasks of the MDSG over the last year had been to feed into the plans for democratic and Member spaces at the Council's new civic heart, Woodhatch Place, which would facilitate the Council's democratic requirements whilst providing a modern agile working space.
- She hoped that Members would support the report and the amendment, noting the importance of the current approach to Member development as being 'sufficient, equitable, and effective'.

Mrs Mary Lewis moved an amendment to the recommendations which had been published in the supplementary agenda (15 March 2021), which was formally seconded by Mrs Clare Curran.

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

That Council endorses **notes**: ~~the current approach to Member development and agrees that it is sufficient, equitable and effective.~~

- I. **the Annual Report on Member Development;**
- II. **the Decision of the Audit and Governance Committee Member Code of Conduct Task Group not to make Corporate Parenting Training Mandatory in the Code of Conduct; it is listed as 'Essential' training as part of member induction;**
- III. **the 'Corporate Parenting Principles' introduced in the Children and Social Work Act 2017 and the 'Statutory Guidance to Local Authorities on Applying Corporate Parenting Principles to Looked After Children and Care Leavers' 2018.**

That Council resolves: to work with Officers through the Member Development Steering Group to develop an enhanced Corporate Parenting training offer which is included in ALL Member training, including training sessions of all Scrutiny and Regulatory and Local/Joint Committees of the Council, so that they are assured that Statutory Corporate Parenting principles are being embedded in all aspects of the Council's and Members' work.

That Council agrees: to reconsider the Member Training offer on Corporate Parenting after six months of the new Council, to monitor uptake of the 'Essential' induction training and the introduction of 'Applying Corporate Parenting Principles' training in every part of Members' work as Councillors.

Mrs Lewis spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- Thanked the officer for the report and the MDSG for its work.
- That although Members would generally agree that the current approach to Member development was 'sufficient, equitable and effective', she noted that the Corporate Parenting Board supported mandatory training on Corporate Parenting.
- That local authorities had a duty to apply the seven Corporate Parenting Principles introduced in the Children, and Social Work Act 2017, further clarified in the Statutory Guidance to Local Authorities on Applying Corporate Parenting Principles to Looked After Children and Care Leavers 2018.
- Highlighted Principles (a) - (g) in the Children, and Social Work Act 2017 which local authorities had regard to, noting that over the last few years the Corporate Parenting Board had not seen evidence that such Principles permeated the Council's work.
- Highlighted point 2.2 in the Statutory Guidance to Local Authorities on Applying Corporate Parenting Principles to Looked After Children and Care Leavers 2018, in which 'the corporate parenting principles do not exist in a vacuum. They should shape the mind-set and culture of every part of a local authority in how it carries out all of its functions in relation to looked-after children and care leavers.'
- That in January 2020 the Corporate Parenting Board and the Executive Director of Children, Families and Lifelong Learning wrote to the five hundred plus elected councillors in Surrey challenging them on how they were applying their Corporate Parenting Principles - there had been little change from the Council following that.

- That without the assurance that Members had understood fully and had signed up to their statutory duties, that as Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, and Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Board it was difficult to ask that of external partners.
- That only 38% of Members took up Corporate Parenting training after the 2017 election, noting the reluctance by some to support initiatives that had been started by the Corporate Parenting Board.
- That the Member Services Manager made strong representations for mandatory training on behalf of the Corporate Parenting Board at the Audit and Governance Committee Member Code of Conduct Task Group, which the Committee decided against.
- The amended recommendations were a compromise in that it was proposed that training on Corporate Parenting principles would be essential.
- Hoped that Members would support the amendment towards an enhanced Corporate Parenting ethos across the new Council.

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

- Paid tribute to Mrs Lewis for the outstanding work that she had done on behalf of the Council as Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families.
- That she found it reasonable to expect Members to be fully up to speed on the statutory guidance which applied to Members, following their duties by attending appropriate and tailored training opportunities which would be presented to all in the new Council following the elections.
- Noted that just as there was a shared aspiration for excellence through the Council's improvement work going forward, there should be a shared aspiration about the way in which the Council thought about its children and young people.
- That it was vital to ensure that all Members of the new Council irrespective of division or political party, had access to a full training offer to embed in the Council's strong ethos of Corporate Parenting.
- That it was vital that Members shared a sense of vision and responsibility for its children and young people ensuring that they were at the forefront of its actions, the Council's Corporate Parenting responsibility must not stand apart from the Council's regular duties and nor could the responsibility be delegated solely to the Corporate Parenting Board.
- Asked Members to support the amendment, appealing to Members to model the behaviour and attitude of any good parent by welcoming the training and opportunities to support, to encourage and to guide children and young people.

Twelve Members made the following points:

- As Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee a Member sought clarification from the proposer of the amendment on the wording, whether the training was proposed as mandatory, or essential. He noted concern if the training was to be mandatory as it was a matter of judgement by each elected Member and did not breach the Member Code of Conduct.
- In response the proposer of the amendment confirmed that as published in the supplementary agenda the compromise by the Corporate Parenting Board was for an essential training on Corporate Parenting Principles.
- Noted that the amendment summed up the Council's Conservative Party administration, which had been using its majority to impose conditions on all Members over and above that which the law and local political consensus required.

- That the proposal for Council to monitor the uptake in training after six months was unacceptable as it treated Members as incapable of making their own rational decisions as to how they fulfilled their role, independence was fundamental.
- That the proposals were an attempt to highlight to Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) that the Council was taking action, when in fact the administration had failed to protect its children and its leadership did not take responsibility regarding the 2018 Ofsted report.
- Made a plea for the Council to support the amendment in reflecting that passion that all Members had for their own children, noting the importance as Members to understand the needs and to support all those children and young people that the Council cared for.
- That over the last twenty-four years as a Member, it was clear from the 'Every Child Matters' agenda in which education and social care services were merged, that Members' responsibility and role was in caring for its children and young people so having that training was important.
- Noted that there was no full programme of formal Member training twenty-four years ago and was proud as chairman of a working group which looked at cross services performance, to bring in staff development and Member training.
- That it took enthusiasm, passion and real commitment to be a Member to carry out the work needed so supported the enhanced training offer and noted the importance of refresher training.
- Applauded the Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Board and its members who were passionate about Surrey's Looked After Children and Care Leavers.
- Noted disappointment that the matter had been turned into a political issue, stressed that the training needed to be essential because all Members had a responsibility as Corporate Parents.
- Noted that the amendment was an emotional plea, it was another example of regulation and bureaucracy. Although granted the title of Corporate Parents, most Members were not involved in the work around Looked After Children or Care Leavers on a day-to-day basis.
- Although not explicitly stated, the implication was that the training was mandatory and noted caution against creeping towards that.
- Noted anger in response to some comments which demonstrated why such training needed to be essential. Looked After Children and Care Leavers were important to the Council and should be to all Members irrespective of day-to-day input.
- That the amendment would help to emphasise to Members their responsibilities around their role as Corporate Parents.
- Pointed out that the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee was a scrutiny body unlike the Corporate Parenting Board, so stressed that it needed to have up-to-date information.
- Echoed previous comments in which residents were the judge of whether Members were doing a good job, that in addition to Member attendance, the completion of critical training modules should be made public so residents could decide whether Members were fulfilling their responsibilities.
- That the amendment was proposed on behalf of the Corporate Parenting Board which was cross-party and not by Cabinet. As essential training, it would highlight the Corporate Parenting responsibility held by all Members.
- The Vice-Chairman noted that it was an emotional topic as emotion was vital to understanding the experiences of Looked After Children and Care Leavers.
- The MDSG had developed a training guide for post the May local elections, which included a wide range of essential training such as: Corporate Parenting, the Member Code of Conduct, local government finance, an introduction to

equalities, diversity and inclusion. Such principles were necessary to be a modern Member.

The amendment was put to the vote with 69 Members voting For, 1 voting Against and 1 Abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

The motion was put to the vote with Members voting unanimously.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED**:

That Council noted:

- I. the Annual Report on Member Development;
- II. the Decision of the Audit and Governance Committee Member Code of Conduct Task Group not to make Corporate Parenting Training Mandatory in the Code of Conduct; it is listed as 'Essential' training as part of member induction;
- III. the 'Corporate Parenting Principles' introduced in the Children and Social Work Act 2017 and the 'Statutory Guidance to Local Authorities on Applying Corporate Parenting Principles to Looked After Children and Care Leavers' 2018.

That Council resolved: to work with Officers through the Member Development Steering Group to develop an enhanced Corporate Parenting training offer which is included in ALL Member training, including training sessions of all Scrutiny and Regulatory and Local/Joint Committees of the Council, so that they are assured that Statutory Corporate Parenting principles are being embedded in all aspects of the Council's and Members' work.

That Council agreed: to reconsider the Member Training offer on Corporate Parenting after six months of the new Council, to monitor uptake of the 'Essential' induction training and the introduction of 'Applying Corporate Parenting Principles' training in every part of Members' work as Councillors.

23/21 CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES - REMOTE MEETINGS [ITEM 11]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report, which followed on from item 8 original motion (iv). He hoped that the Government would put in arrangements to allow local authorities to carry on with remote formal committee meetings. In the event that the Regulations were not extended or new legislation did not come into force post 7 May, the recommendations sought to reinstate the arrangements previously in place regarding executive (Cabinet) and non-executive decision-making. If still in force by 31 July 2021 or as soon as practicable thereafter, the measures were to be reviewed. He added that unless there was a change in the Regulations, the Council's Annual General Meeting (AGM) in May would have to be held in person and quorum adhered to.

A Member suggested that regarding the Council's AGM a hybrid meeting would be beneficial if feasible.

RESOLVED:

That, in the absence of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 being extended beyond 7 May 2021, or other regulations being in force, Council agreed:

1. To amend the definition within the Council's Constitution (as far as the law allows) to define Cabinet as a formal meeting of Cabinet or the Leader or nominated Cabinet Member making a decision in consultation with at least two other Cabinet Members.
2. To delegate all non-executive decisions (as far as the law allows) to the relevant proper officer in consultation with the relevant chairman or member nominated by the chairman.
3. To agree that all members unable to attend a council meeting for a period greater than six months receives a dispensation further to section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 to 31 October 2021.
4. To resolve that, in the absence of legislation to allow remote meetings to take place, that all decision making will take place in line with the Surrey County Council Remote Meetings Protocol (Annex A).
5. To agree that the Audit and Governance Committee will monitor the use of the delegations in line with the Remote Meetings Protocol (Annex A) and as required, make recommendations on any required amendments to the protocol to ensure that Members remain informed in relation to council decision making.
6. To authorise the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Chairman of the Council and group leaders to incorporate any legislative changes issued by Government into council business processes.
7. To agree that all the above measures will automatically terminate on the coming into force of any regulations which permit remote attendance at Council meetings.
8. To review these measures (if still in force) by 31 July 2021 or as soon as practicable thereafter as determined by the Audit and Governance Committee.

24/21 REVISED COUNCILLOR CODE OF CONDUCT - AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE: REPORT OF THE MEMBER CODE OF CONDUCT TASK GROUP [ITEM 12]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report. He noted that it was a further revised iteration from what the Council received at its past two meetings, as the Local Government Association (LGA) had made small amendments to the Model Councillor Code of Conduct 2020.

RESOLVED:

That Council approved the revised Councillor Code of Conduct.

25/21 REPORT OF THE CABINET [ITEM 13]

The Leader of the Council presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 23 February 2021.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents:

- A. School Organisation Plan
- B. Strategic Investment Board Annual Report - Financial Year 2019/20

A Member noted that regarding Halsey Garton Property Limited delivering income and efficiencies, the Council invested £327 million and the value of that investment was £267 million which was a book loss of £60 million - although not a realised loss, it was disappointing. The Council and other councils swept up available assets across the market and 40% of Surrey's investments were in the retail sector which although was diversification it had not worked for Surrey. Regarding the recommendation to endorse the Strategic Investment Board's Annual Report, he noted that Council should express its concern in relation to the returns and activities of Halsey Garton Property Limited.

In response, the Leader reiterated that the book valuations were not crystallised losses and expected that following the pandemic those valuations would recover over time as the Council is a long-term property investor. The Council was running at 85% for rent collections which was good under the current circumstances. The Council did not sweep up all that was available on the market, it was a balanced portfolio of investments. There was a detailed matrix for deciding whether or not a property was suitable to be invested in and the portfolio would continue to be managed with advice from external providers.

Reports for Information/Discussion:

- C. Setting a Radical Agenda for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in Surrey and Surrey County Council
- D. Improving Mental Health Outcomes, Experiences and Services in Surrey
- E. Surrey Infrastructure Prioritisation

- F. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 10 February 2021 - 16 March 2021

RESOLVED:

1. That Council approved the School Organisation Plan 2020-2030.
2. That Council endorsed the Annual Report of the Strategic Investment Board.
3. That Council noted that there had been no urgent decision in the last month.
4. That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 23 February 2021 be adopted.

26/21 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [ITEM 14]

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.

Miss Heath paid tribute to the Chairman for his service and thanked Members for their service including those who would not be seeking re-election.

[Meeting ended at: 14.18 pm]

Chairman

Leader's Statement – County Council, 16 March 2021

Mr Chairman, this is the final council meeting and final council speech of this electoral cycle.

As all Members are only too aware, we have an election in May, which gives our residents the opportunity to reflect on the work carried out by this administration, the progress we have made together, and the direction of travel in which we are heading.

And ultimately, decide whether we continue that journey.

I, for one, welcome that chance to take stock and assess, because I'm immensely proud of this organisation that I – and we as elected Members – lead, and the progress we have made and continue to make together.

Mr Chairman, I will take some time to reflect on that in a moment, but first I wanted to focus on the significance of this next week in the calendar.

A week from today – 23 March – signifies exactly one year since the UK first went into lockdown in response to COVID-19 although in Surrey we were responding earlier than March, with the first UK-contracted case in Haslemere.

This week also marks a year since our Chief Executive Joanna Killian declared a major incident and immediately put into place the structures of the Local Resilience Forum to formally coordinate the response across Surrey.

We have not stepped back from that major incident in the whole 12 months.

Next Tuesday will be a poignant day, reflecting on the many people who have very sadly died as a result of this pandemic – the emotional impact on families right across Surrey, loved ones lost, families unable to see each other, businesses lost, individuals scarred by isolation, our fundamental freedoms and way of life disrupted like never before.

We will be marking this date as an organisation, with an event of reflection for staff to come together – still virtually – to share memories of the year that has passed and pay tributes to those that we have lost.

It is an important moment for us to take stock.

It is also important to again recognise the incredible work that has been undertaken by us as a council, alongside other partners of the Local Resilience Forum, to keep people safe, to support our vulnerable residents and to help our communities through this challenging time.

I couldn't be more proud of the work that the people of this organisation have carried out over the last year.

Whether it has been staff manning our community helpline, sourcing and delivering PPE, sorting food boxes, helping provide extra refuge space for families fleeing a violent lockdown, advising schools how to open safely, delivering various COVID testing streams, warning and informing our residents, keeping services running, moving some services to virtual, helping to manage increased deaths sensitively, or providing more support to care homes.

Our people have been adaptable, willing, skilled, and dedicated.

It has been harrowing at times, tiring, difficult, and certainly out of our comfort zone, but we should be so proud of every single person who has contributed to this effort.

Mr Chairman, Members – I'm sure you will want to join me in saying a huge 'Thank You'.

Last week we celebrated International Women's Day – an incredibly important occasion not only to celebrate women and gender equality but to take a step back and ensure we are doing everything possible to pursue further equality – embracing diversity of all forms, in everything we do.

At Cabinet in February, we reported on our Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan and Policy Statement.

It confirms that we, as a council, will take a zero-tolerance approach to bullying, harassment, and discrimination.

We must also recognise that other forms of bias are more covert. To tackle these, myself and my Cabinet colleagues have attended unconscious bias and race discrimination training – useful in demonstrating how unconscious biases can affect the daily experiences of all of us across the council.

We will take this forward in all our future decision making and structures.

I am serious about this issue, which is fundamental to our guiding principle in Surrey that no-one is left behind.

While we recognise International Women's Day, I want to pay particular tribute to two incredibly strong, inspiring women that have helped drive Surrey forward over recent years.

The first is Mary Lewis – our Cabinet Member for Children's Services who is – to my great sadness – standing down at this forthcoming election.

Mary is both compassionate and incredibly strong willed – which has made her the perfect person to lead this county's Children's Services during huge challenge and transformation.

It is very easy to try and make cheap political shots about historical failures of this service – some Members present may want to catch up a little bit on the very real progress we have made - but it is much more difficult to grab hold of that challenge and tackle it head on.

But Mary has done just that, working tirelessly alongside the late Dave Hill and now Rachael Wardell and the service, to deliver what Ofsted has described as 'substantial and sustainable improvements'.

It is a shame she won't be in post when the full inspection team return later this year and deliver their official verdict and what we are confident will be an improved rating.

The improvement in that service is there for all to see – there is some way to go, it has been difficult at times but we are confident we know what we need to do and indeed will do over the coming months.

But Mary has helped get us into a much better place than we were a couple of years ago.

She has been an incredible servant to this County, particularly our young people, and she leaves a hugely positive legacy.

Mary, you will be missed – not least for your sharp wit and never being shy in keeping me in check.

The second woman who I want to pay tribute to is Joanna Killian, who has been our Chief Executive now for three years and has driven forward the most remarkable transformation at Surrey County Council.

As I've said previously, if COVID had hit three or four years ago, it may well have pushed Surrey County Council to the brink. Indeed, we only need to look around to see other local authorities who are struggling financially.

But not here. Not now.

From 2014/15 to 2017/18 every budget used reserves to plug the gaps – for the last three years we have set a balanced budget and begun to start building those reserves back up.

Tough choices have been made – they have had to be - but overwhelmingly that stable financial picture has come about through clear vision, innovation, and bravery to do things differently which has made our services better, not just more efficient.

We have also become a forward-thinking organisation – fiercely ambitious to make Surrey a place fit for the future.

The financial stability that we have overseen over the last few years – led by Joanna and the team she has put in place – and supported by this Council, has been the bedrock to enable us to start delivering this vision.

This is not just rhetoric. This is making a real difference to the lives of our residents:

- More school places
- More in-County places for Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
- Substantial and sustainable improvement in Children's Services
- On track for a net-zero-carbon council by 2030
- Council offices finally back in the County for the first time in 50 years
- Hundreds more supported living homes so older people can keep their independence for longer
- The biggest investment in flood defence and alleviation this County has ever seen
- £100m Fund for Surrey's local communities to deliver projects they want and need
- A modern, agile fire service working to prevent fires happening in the first place
- Vulnerable children supported with Free School Meals, technology and activities through lockdown and school holidays
- Surrey's Growth Board laying the foundations for a buoyant local economy
- New electric busses
- Planting trees
- Replacing streetlights with LEDs
- Teaching more children to ride a bike
- Massive investment in big infrastructure projects that will revolutionise our town centres and our highways
- New training to frontline care staff

- More social workers recruited
- A top-class library service
- 94% of schools rated good or outstanding
- A new foster caring model giving greater support to carers
- Greater long-term investment in our roads and pavements
- More power to local communities and residents

These are not just empty promises – this is real action, real progress, real achievement.

I have been Leader of this council now for two and half years. I take responsibility for the direction of travel – you can agree with it or not - but I'm glad our residents can now have their say.

I will always stand up and be counted – when things go wrong, and when things go well - I will always be honest with our residents.

I will not stand here and say one thing, and then say another when the situation suits.

Whether we're in an election campaign or not, I'd encourage the other political Leaders present to stay true to what they know and be straight with residents about the progress this organisation has unquestionably made over the last three years.

It is progress that all of us should be proud of.

Mr Chairman, I'd like to say thank you to you too, for the important role you have played over the last couple of years – representing this council and this county during the most difficult of times

So Members, as we set off on the election trail lets be honest with our residents; lets recognise the areas where we have seen improvements and progress, lets acknowledge the areas where there is more to do and lets reassure our residents that we are an authority that does care about them and are making genuine attempts to make their lives better. Above all lets not distance ourselves from acknowledging our individual role on that journey as all 81 Members of this council have played their part in transforming the council for the benefit of our residents.

No one can pretend that this is an easy challenge but equally no one can or should pretend that we aren't meeting that challenge. It will be for the new council to set the tone for the next 4 years but for my own part I hope it stays true to the principles that have been guiding us; to have a county of equal opportunity, of equal access to healthcare systems, where we address the issues that affect life expectancy but above all that we genuinely mean it when we say that we must ensure no one in this county is left behind.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

County Council Meeting – 25 May 2021

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**ELECTIONS – 6 MAY 2021**

Electoral Division	Elected – May 2021	Party
<i>Elmbridge Borough</i>		
Cobham	David Lewis	Conservative
East Molesey and Esher	Steve Bax	Conservative
Hersham	John O'Reilly	Conservative
Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott	Mark Sugden	Conservative
The Dittons	Nick Darby	Dittons and Weston Green Residents
Walton	Rachael Lake	Conservative
Walton South and Oatlands	Tony Samuels	Conservative
West Molesey	Ernest Mallett	The Molesey Residents Association
Weybridge	Tim Oliver	Conservative
<i>Epsom and Ewell Borough</i>		
Epsom Town and Downs	Steven McCormick	Residents Associations of Epsom and Ewell
Epsom West	Bernie Muir	Conservative
Ewell	John Beckett	Residents Associations of Epsom and Ewell
Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington	Eber Kington	Residents Associations of Epsom and Ewell
West Ewell	Jan Mason	Residents Associations of Epsom and Ewell
<i>Guildford Borough</i>		
Ash	Carla Morson	Liberal Democrats
Guildford East	George Potter	Liberal Democrats
Guildford North	Julia McShane	Liberal Democrats
Guildford South East	Fiona Davidson	Residents for Guildford and Villages
Guildford South West	Angela Goodwin	Liberal Democrats
Guildford West	Fiona White	Liberal Democrats

Horsleys	Colin Cross	Residents for Guildford and Villages
Shalford	Matt Furniss	Conservative
Shere	Robert Hughes	Conservative
Worplesdon	Keith Witham	Conservative
<i>Mole Valley</i>		
Ashtead	Chris Townsend	Ashtead Independent, working with Ashtead Residents
Bookham and Fetcham West	Clare Curran	Conservative
Dorking Hills	Hazel Watson	Liberal Democrats
Dorking Rural	Helyn Clack	Conservative
Dorking South and the Holmwoods	Stephen Cooksey	Liberal Democrats
Leatherhead and Fetcham East	Tim Hall	Conservative
<i>Reigate and Banstead</i>		
Banstead, Woodmansterne & Chipstead	Luke Bennett	Conservative
Earlswood and Reigate South	Catherine Baart	The Green Party
Horley East	Jordan Beech	Conservative
Horley West, Salfords and Sidlow	Andy Lynch	Conservative
Merstham and Banstead South	Frank Kelly	Conservative
Nork and Tattenhams	Nick Harrison	Nork and Tattenhams Residents' Association
Redhill East	Jonathan Essex	The Green Party
Redhill West and Meadvale	Natalie Bramhall	Conservative
Reigate	Victor Lewanski	Conservative
Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Rebecca Paul	Conservative
<i>Runnymede</i>		
Addlestone	John Furey	Conservative
Chertsey	Mark Nuti	Conservative
Egham	Robert King	Labour and Co-operative

Englefield Green	Marisa Heath	Conservative
Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water	Jonathan Hulley	Conservative
Woodham and New Haw	Scott Lewis	Conservative
Spelthorne		
Ashford	Joanne Sexton	Independent
Laleham and Shepperton	Maureen Attewell	Conservative
Lower Sunbury and Halliford	Buddhi Weerasinghe	Conservative
Staines	Sinead Mooney	Conservative
Staines South and Ashford West	Denise Turner-Stewart	Conservative
Stanwell and Stanwell Moor	Robert Evans	Labour
Sunbury Common and Ashford Common	Alison Griffiths	Conservative
Surrey Heath		
Bagshot, Windlesham and Chobham	Richard Tear	Conservative
Camberley East	Trefor Hogg	Conservative
Camberley West	David Lewis	Conservative
Frimley Green and Mychett	Paul Deach	Conservative
Heatherside and Parkside	Edward Hawkins	Conservative
Lightwater, West End and Bisley	Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Conservative
Tandridge		
Caterham Hill	Jeremy Webster	Conservative
Caterham Valley	Jeffrey Gray	Liberal Democrats
Godstone	Chris Farr	Independent
Lingfield	Lesley Steeds	Conservative
Oxted	Cameron McIntosh	Conservative
Warlingham	Becky Rush	Conservative
Waverley		
Cranleigh and Ewhurst	Liz Townsend	Liberal Democrats

Farnham Central	Andy Macleod	Farnham Residents
Farnham North	Catherine Powell	Farnham Residents
Farnham South	Michaela Martin	Farnham Residents
Godalming North	Penny Rivers	Liberal Democrats
Godalming South, Milford and Witley	Paul Follows	Liberal Democrats
Haslemere	John Robini	Liberal Democrats
Waverley Eastern Villages	Kevin Neil Deanus	Conservative
Waverley Western Villages	David Harmer	Conservative
Woking		
Goldsworth East and Horsell Village	Lance Spencer	Liberal Democrats
Knaphill and Goldsworth West	Saj Hussain	Conservative
The Byfleets	Amanda Boote	Independent
Woking North	Riasat Khan	Conservative
Woking South	Will Forster	Liberal Democrats
Woking South East	Liz Bowes	Conservative
Woking South West	Ayesha Azad	Conservative



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2021/2022

KEY ISSUE / DECISION:

The approval of the Pay Policy Statement for the period 2021/2022.

BACKGROUND:

1. To comply with Section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011 and related guidance under Section 40 provided by the Secretary of State, all local authorities are required to publish a Pay Policy Statement, approved through decision by the Council with effect from 1 April each year.
2. A copy of the Pay Policy Statement which reflects the 2021/2022 Surrey Pay settlement effective from 1 April 2021 is attached as Annex 1.

The main points that must be covered include:-

- the remuneration of Chief Officers.
 - the responsibilities of Surrey County Council's (SCC) remuneration committee (the People, Performance and Development Committee) for determining the terms on which Chief Officers are employed; and
 - the Council's current policies on equal pay, redundancy, and severance.
3. Please note that this has been updated following the Surrey Pay review for 2021/2022 and has been written as though it has already been agreed by the Council.

Governance

4. The People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) acts as the County Council's Remuneration Committee under delegated powers, in accordance with the constitution of the County Council. All Surrey Pay terms and conditions are determined by the PPDC, including the remuneration of Chief Officers.

Publication of the Pay Policy Statement

5. The Statement has been drafted to reflect the requirements of the Local Government Transparency Code 2014 as well as guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government on Openness and Accountability in Local Pay 2012, to comply with Section 40 of the Localism Act 2011. Account has also been taken of the final report and the recommendations made in the Hutton Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector 2011.
6. This updated Pay Policy Statement reflects the outcome of the recent negotiations with UNISON and GMB in respect of Surrey Pay, pay, terms and conditions. Negotiations with the Trades Unions have been difficult and protracted this year, largely due to the change in the council's position following the Government's announcement in the 2021 Autumn Spending Review in respect of public sector pay.
7. The changes outlined in the Pay Policy Statement are relevant to all staff on Surrey Pay terms and conditions, both in schools and non-schools.

Pay Award and Progression

8. Responses to the ballots undertaken by UNISON and GMB following the council's final Surrey Pay offer for 2021/22 were very low (UNISON 20% return and GMB 13%). However, the outcome of both ballots resulted in Trades Union members rejecting the council's offer, (UNISON 90% and GMB 53% in favour of rejection). In light of this, the Trades Unions have confirmed they are unable to enter into a Collective Agreement in respect of Surrey Pay 2021/22 on the basis on which the council's final offer was made.
9. Staff have been kept informed of the revised offer throughout formal negotiations with the Trades Unions, with minimal negative feedback received from staff.
10. The Council's People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC), at its meeting on 31 March did not recommend the council reconsiders its proposals in respect of the main pay award. The 2021/22 pay award has therefore been applied in the absence of a Collective Agreement as set out in the Pay Policy Statement annexed to this report, i.e. an increase of £376 to grade PS1/2 and an increase of £350 to grades PS3 to PS7 (point 4). This is in line with the Government's announcement during the Autumn Spending Review that public sector pay for 2021/22 should be restricted to the lowest paid, aside from NHS staff.
11. It is important to note that incremental pay progression continued with effect from 1 April 2021 for all eligible staff, (57% of staff across grades PS1/2 to PS14 had headroom within their grade to receive an incremental increase, with the average value of an increment being 2.9%)
12. Most staff on Surrey Pay grades PS1/2 to PS7 (i.e. those eligible to receive a pay award) are in the social care sector (54%).

13. When taking into account pay progression for those staff entitled to both a pay award and incremental increase, the majority (86%) received a total increase in pay of at least 2.49%.

Honoraria

14. The definition of honoraria payments within the council's Reward Policy has been expanded to include the ability to apply a financial recognition payment to reward:
- Excellent, exceptional achievement over a sustained period, or throughout the year in which performance is being assessed.
 - Excellent exceptional achievement for a particular task or project.
 - Innovation that significantly enhances productivity or that notably contributes to organisational effectiveness.
15. Any financial reward is limited to a maximum of £1,000 per person per annum and mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the recognition award is managed consistently and fairly across the council.

Professional Fees

16. The ability to reimburse payment of professional fees has been reinstated for roles where an essential requirement of the post is to hold a professional qualification and be a member of a relevant professional institution.
17. Mechanisms have been put in place to recover the cost of professional fees reimbursed for staff who leave the council's employment part-way through the year to which the fees relate.

Pay Multiple

18. The independent review of public sector pay by Will Hutton in 2010 recommended that all organisations delivering public services should be required to 'track, publish and explain their pay multiples over time'. This approach aims to hold public sector organisations to account for their remuneration policy and, how that policy applies to the highest paid director and to be able to demonstrate a fair and effective reward strategy.
19. Hutton's interim report suggested the need for a fixed limit on pay variations in the public sector in which no manager could earn more than twenty times the lowest paid person in the organisation. However, in his final report Hutton concluded that a hard cap would not be workable across a diverse public sector workforce and would go against the principle of 'fair' pay (i.e. People at the top of very large and complex organisations, but with low paid workers, could earn less than people running simpler bodies but whose bottom workers were better paid).

SCC Pay Multiple

20. As a result of the Hutton review, every public body is required to publish (and monitor) the multiple of top to median pay; median earnings are a more representative measure of the pay of the whole workforce.
21. Table 1 shows the data available for SCC over the last few years, showing a ratio of 8:1 for 2020/2021. This table will be updated following implementation of the 2021/22 pay award in May 2021 and then published on the Council's public website.

Table 1: SCC Pay Multiple: Median salary to higher salary

Year	Median Salary	Highest Salary	Ratio
2020/2021	£29,333	£234,600	8:1
2019/2020	£27,099	£220,000	8.1:1
2018/2019	£25,821	£220,000	8.5:1
2017/2018	£22,872	£232,683	10:1
2016/2017	£25,328	£232,683	9.19:1

22. The published Pay Policy Statement will include hyperlinks to:
- (i) documents already published on the Council's website:
 - Councillors and Committees (which sets out the role of the PPDC as the Council's remuneration committee).
 - Statement of Accounts, which relates to salaries for senior staff.
 - (ii) Additional documents on the Council's website including:
 - Equal Pay Statement.
 - Gender Pay Gap report,
 - Surrey Pay rates; and
 - Pay Multiple
23. Once approved by the Council, this Pay Policy Statement will be published on Surrey County Council's website.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council agree the Pay Policy Statement for 2021/2022.

Lead Officer: Jackie Foglietta, Director of HR & Organisational Development.

Contact details: 07976 112409

Email: jackie.foglietta@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources / Background papers:

Surrey County Council Pay Policy Statement 2021/2022



Surrey County Council

Pay Policy Statement 2021-2022

Contents

Surrey County Council	1
Pay Policy Statement 2021-2022.....	1
1. Introduction.....	2
2. Further Details.....	2
3. Governance.....	3
4. Definitions.....	3
5. Salary Transparency.....	3
6. Equal Pay	4
7. Remuneration for Chief Officers.....	4
8. Remuneration for employees who are not Chief Officers	4
9. Other elements of remuneration	7
10. Pension Benefits	8
11. Remuneration - Contract for Services	8
12. Salary Protection	8
13. Early Retirement and Severance	9
14. Termination of Employment of Chief Officer	9

1. Introduction

This Pay Policy Statement was approved by a meeting of the full County Council on 25 May 2021 and is effective from 1 April 2021. It is published to comply with the requirements of Section 38(1) of the Localism Act, 2011 and related guidance under Section 40 provided by the Secretary of State.

This Statement includes information relating to the terms and conditions that are determined locally by the council and are referred to as 'Surrey Pay'. The Council's reward strategy is based on the local negotiation of Surrey Pay terms and conditions of service. Pay, including terms and conditions, are reviewed annually with any changes agreed by the People, Performance and Development Committee, (PPDC). The Council recognises two Trade Unions, the GMB and UNISON, for the purposes of negotiating Surrey Pay and collective bargaining.

In addition, there are a number of National Agreements produced through collective bargaining arrangements for different groups of local government staff. The main negotiating bodies relevant to the council's workforce and their scope are listed below. Surrey County Council operates these national conditions as amended by local agreements. A separate Pay Policy Statement is published for centrally employed teachers.

Terms and conditions determined on a national basis by independent organisations or arrangements include:

- Fire fighters; whose pay and conditions are determined by the National Joint Committee for Local Authorities Fire and Rescue Service.
- Teachers; whose terms and conditions are determined by the Department for Education and governing bodies.
- Educational psychologists; whose terms and conditions are determined by the Soulbury Committee.
- Youth and community workers whose terms and conditions are determined by the Joint Negotiating Committee (JNC).

This Statement does not include details of the terms and conditions of council employees that have retained terms and conditions following a transfer under Transfer of Undertakings and Protection of Employment Regulations.

This Pay Policy Statement will be updated as soon as possible following any pay changes and at least annually.

2. Further Details

Specific details may be accessed via the links indicated below. Full details of 2021/2022 pay bands can be found in Annex 1, attached.

The council publishes details of staff earnings in accordance with legal requirements on transparency. Further information is contained in the [Annual Report and Accounts](#) in accordance with the Audit of Accounts legislation, as well as within the Transparency section of Surrey-I (see section 5 of this Statement).

3. Governance

[The People, Performance and Development Committee](#) (PPDC) acts as the County Council's Remuneration Committee under delegated powers in accordance with the Constitution of the County Council. Pay, terms and conditions for all employees except Centrally Employed Teachers and those employed on Soulbury and national Committees are determined by the PPDC including the remuneration of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers.

4. Definitions

For the purpose of this Pay Policy Statement the following definitions will apply:

i. Lowest paid employees

Surrey County Council defines its lowest paid employees as those who are paid on the lowest Surrey Pay grade, PS 1/2. As at 1 April 2021 this equates to £17,833 per annum for full time staff.

ii. Full time

A full-time post is based on a 36 hour working week for staff on main Surrey Pay and 37 hours per week for staff employed in South East Shared Services who are aligned more closely to national NJC terms and conditions.

iii. Chief Officers

The majority of statutory and non-statutory Chief Officers of the County Council report directly to the Chief Executive as the Head of the Authority's paid service. In addition, for the purposes of this Pay Policy Statement, this group also includes the majority of posts who report to a Chief Officer, (Deputy Chief Officers).

iv. Surrey Pay salary ratios

The publication of the pay multiple as a determinant of the relationship between the pay of Chief Officers and that of the rest of the workforce was recommended by the Hutton report on Fair pay. This is a calculation in the form of a ratio between the median earnings across the organisation and the highest paid employee. [The pay multiple](#) is published separately on the County Council website and monitored annually.

5. Salary Transparency

Surrey County Council is committed to openness and transparency in order to demonstrate to its residents and local taxpayers that it delivers value for money. As part of the national and local government transparency agenda it publishes information on its website detailing Surrey Pay ranges, expenditure over £500 and contracts with a value of £50,000 or more.

To continue this commitment, and in line with the Local Government Transparency Code 2014, the Council has published details of salaries paid to senior staff on its website since 31 March 2016. This information is updated on an annual basis and covers senior positions with annual salaries of £50,000 and above.

In addition, the 'pay multiple' will be calculated each year and will be published on the County Council's website. Historical information will be retained in order to monitor the pay multiple over time.

6. Equal Pay

The Council is committed to ensuring that its employment policies and practices comply with the requirements of the Equal Pay Act 1970. This includes the application of a robust job evaluation process to ensure that all staff receive equal pay for work of equal value.

i. Grading Structure

The allocation of Surrey Pay grades to jobs is determined by (HAY) job evaluation or in accordance with a job family underpinned by (HAY) job evaluation. The Surrey Pay grading structure covers all jobs from the lowest grade to Chief Officers, including the Chief Executive, on the highest grades.

ii Remuneration on Appointment

Newly appointed or promoted staff are normally appointed to the minimum salary on a grade unless there is clear business reason to appoint at a higher salary within the grade range.

Where it is necessary for a newly appointed employee to relocate in order to take up a post, the Council may make a contribution towards the reimbursement of relocation expenses in line with the Relocation Policy.

ii. Supplements

Managers may make a business case for an additional supplement to be paid above the maximum for the particular grade under specific circumstances or if it proves exceptionally difficult to recruit at the rate advertised. Such supplements must be supported by a business case, approved by the Director of HR & Organisational Development in conjunction with the Chair of the PPD Committee in the case of Chief Officers, or by the Director of HR & Organisational Development under delegated powers for all other staff.

7. Remuneration for Chief Officers

Chief Officers are appointed within the leadership pay model at a spot salary within the appropriate pay band range.

Annual salary reviews for Chief Officers will take into account any generally agreed adjustments to senior management pay rates (if any) as determined by PPDC and the JNC pay award for Chief Officers pay for local authorities. Details of the remuneration paid to all members of the Council's Leadership Team are available in the Council's Annual Statement of Accounts.

8. Remuneration for employees who are not Chief Officers

Apart from the differences in pay scales and pay models, there are minimal differences in entitlement to remuneration between Chief Officers, Deputy Chief Officers, and the rest of the workforce as the county council is working towards harmonisation of terms and conditions of service between staff groups.

i. Surrey Pay staff

Surrey Pay comprises pay bands PS1/2 to PS14 and pay bands for senior managers PS15 to Chief Executive.

Surrey Pay roles are aligned to a defined pay model as follows:

- Spot Salary Pay model
- Job Family Pay Model
- Career Pay Model
- Leadership Pay Model

Surrey Pay is reviewed annually to come into effect from 1 April each year and staff will progress through the fixed pay points for their grade until the maximum of the grade is reached.

Any increases to the pay points for Surrey Pay grades PS1/2 to PS14 as part of the annual pay review will take into account the NJC pay award for local government employees.

Annual individual pay progression will be subject to:

- Staff being in post at their current grade level on 1 October (or the first working day of the week) in the previous year. Staff appointed between October and March will receive their first increment after six months in role and will then fall in line with the April annual review.
- Performance in the role, and
- Scope being available within the individual pay grade until the top of the grade is reached.

Employees subject to career grade schemes will progress in line with the arrangements for that position.

ii. Apprentices

Apprenticeship pay is closely aligned to the main Surrey Pay rates as follows:

- The salary for level 2/3 apprenticeships is 85% of grade PS1/2 in year one, rising to the full rate of pay in year two.
- The salary for level 4/5 apprenticeships is at Surrey Pay grade PS3.
- Apprenticeships at level 6 and above will be paid the rate for the role as evaluated.

iii. Commercial Services Education Catering

PPDC has approved entry salary levels for Commercial Services staff above the grade minimum.

iv. Regional Surrey Pay bands

In February 2013 (as a result of the creation of the then South East Shared Services), PPDC agreed that a Regional Surrey Pay band should be established for Surrey County Council staff based in East Sussex. The pay arrangements reflect the local wage market.

v. Former Buckinghamshire County Council Trading Standards staff

On 1 April 2015, staff from Buckinghamshire County Council's Trading Standards Service were transferred into the employment of Surrey County Council under the Transfer of Undertakings Protection of Employment Regulations.

There is no adjustment made to the pay bands for 2021/2022. A two percent performance-related pay progression will be applied to staff employed on Buckinghamshire County Council terms and conditions with effect from 1 July 2021, subject to successful performance and available headroom with the pay range.

In addition, in accordance with their terms and conditions:

- For an "exceeding" performance rating a contribution-based pay increase applies, based on 35% of the difference between the top two pay points: and
- For an "outstanding" performance rating a contribution-based pay increase applies, based on 70% of the difference between the top two pay points.

vi. Tutors - Surrey Arts and Community Learning & Skills

Tutors within Surrey Arts and Community Learning & Skills are paid a spot salary. There is no pay progression within this pay model. Salary increases are aligned to the annual review of Surrey Pay and pay changes are implemented from 1 September each year.

vii. Political Assistants

SCC employs Political Assistants on Surrey Pay contracts to support political groups. These Assistants work directly for the political groups rather than as mainstream officers within the officer structure of the Council. These are unique posts and have a set maximum salary determined by The Local Government (Assistants for Political Groups) (Remuneration) (England) Order 2006. This is currently set at £34,986 per annum.

viii. Staff Employed on National Conditions

Annual pay awards for centrally employed teachers and those on Soulbury or JNC Committee conditions will be in accordance with those agreed by the respective national bodies.

- **Centrally Employed Teachers'**

Details of the national pay scales for Centrally Employed Teachers are available on the [Department for Education's website](#).

A locally agreed pay policy is in place from 1 September 2020, which sets out the pay progression arrangements for centrally employed teachers.

- **Soulbury and JNC Employees**

Employees covered by the Soulbury and JNC Agreements are eligible to receive annual increments on the 1 September each year until they reach the maximum for the grade of their position.

9. Other elements of remuneration

A copy of the School Teachers Pay and Conditions Document is available on the [Department for Education's website](#). Copies of the conditions of service for all other employees covered by this statement can be obtained from [the Local Government Employers](#).

The following details apply to Surrey Pay employees and in the absence of any national agreement have been adopted by other employee groups:

i. **Employee Benefits**

The Council does not provide any grade related benefits in kind, such as annual leave, private medical insurance, or lease cars. Chief Officers receive the same allowances as other members of staff and have access to the same voluntary benefits scheme.

ii. **Additional Payments**

In order to ensure sufficient flexibility to reward staff who are undertaking additional responsibilities the Council's reward policy provides for acting-up payments or a one-off honorarium payment to be made in specific circumstances.

From 1 April 2021, the definition of honoraria payments has been expanded to include the ability to apply a financial recognition payment of up to £1,000 per person per annum in order to reward:

- excellent, exceptional achievement over a sustained period, or throughout the year in which performance is being assessed
- excellent exceptional achievement for a particular task or project
- innovation that significantly enhances productivity or that notably contributes to organisational effectiveness

The decision to award a recognition payment to a Chief Officer is taken by the Chief Executive and in the case of the Chief Executive, the Leader of the Council.

For employees required to be on-call, the Council operates a corporate on-call scheme up to Surrey Pay grade PS13. Payments are either processed monthly or on an ad-hoc basis depending on the requirement to be on-call. Additional hours and overtime are paid at plain time, and an allowance is paid per shift to employees who are required to "sleep in" on the premises as part of their duties. Details of these provisions are set out in the Councils Reward Policy.

iii. **Travel and Expenses**

Where authorised to do so, employees are entitled to be reimbursed for additional mileage they incur whilst discharging their official duties. The rate of reimbursement will depend on the mileage incurred. Employees who have to use public transport to travel for business travel are entitled to reclaim the additional costs of the transport under the council's expenses policy. Any expenditure on business travel is reimbursed at the same rates for all grades.

Out of pocket expenses incurred during the course of employment will be met by the

council provided that the expenses are directly related to employment and are approved as reasonable.

iv. Professional Fees

From 1 April 2021 the council will reimburse the cost of professional fees for roles where there is an essential requirement to hold a professional qualification and be a member of a relevant professional institution.

Employees will be required to repay a proportion of the cost of professional fees should they leave Surrey County Council employment during the period covered by the payment. Repayment will be managed via payroll from final salaries, however where an employee leaves the council's employment due to redundancy or ill health, repayment will not be required.

v. First Aid Allowance

Employees who are designated 'first aiders' are eligible to receive an allowance.

10. Pension Benefits

- **Centrally Employed Teachers.**

All Centrally Employed Teachers are eligible to join the Teachers' Pension Scheme. Employees within Surrey Arts and Adult Learning Service may also join if their role gives eligibility to join the scheme. The scheme is a statutory scheme with contributions from employees and employers. Details of the scheme can be found on the [Teachers' Pension Scheme website](#).

- **Other Employees**

All employees under the age of 75 are eligible to join the Local Government Pension Scheme. The scheme is a statutory scheme with contributions from employees and employers. Details of the scheme can be found on [Surrey Pension Fund website](#).

11. Remuneration - Contract for Services

The council encourages the direct employment of staff and pays them via the payroll system. In circumstances where it is more appropriate to engage people on a contract for services the council follows HMRC guidelines to ensure that the correct employment status is identified.

When a need arises for an 'interim' appointment, recruitment is normally secured via the council's temporary staffing agency frameworks. Individuals contracted via an agency will in most instances be paid at a rate consistent with the pay of directly employed staff performing a comparable role. The council will consider any relevant market factors to support payment of a premium rate necessary to secure appropriate levels of skills and expertise.

12. Salary Protection

Details of the Council's salary protection provisions that apply to employees who are redeployed into a new post as a result of organisational change can be found in the Council's Organisational Change Policy and Procedure.

The provisions relating to safeguarding (pay protection) set out in the School Teachers Pay and Conditions Document apply to centrally employed teachers. Other Council employees are eligible to receive salary protection for a period of up to one year if they are redeployed into a lower-graded post, with the amount of protection depending on the difference between the grades of their former job and new job.

13. Early Retirement and Severance

The Council's terms for granting redundancy or severance, including access to benefits under the Local Government and Teachers' Pension Schemes, are the same for all staff on Surrey Pay contracts including Chief Officers, as well as for teachers working in maintained schools across Surrey.

In cases of redundancy, an employee will not be entitled to a redundancy payment or a severance payment if, before leaving the Council, they accept an offer of employment with another local authority or associated employer contained in the Redundancy Payments (Modification) Order 1999 and commence the new employment within four weeks of their last day of service as the employment would be deemed to be continuous.

Normally the council will not re-employ or re-engage employees who have been made redundant with an enhanced severance payment for a period of 12 months following their leaving date. However, in exceptional circumstances and subject to a business case and Chief Officer approval, employees may be re-employed by the council. Re-engagement includes contracts of employment, consultancy arrangements or through an agency.

14. Termination of Employment of Chief Officer

Any compensation payments made to Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers on ceasing to hold office or to be employed by the authority will be made on the same basis as any other employee in line with the council's Early Retirement and Severance policies.

In the event of an employee being made redundant or applying for voluntary severance, the council's Managing Change Policy contains details of the circumstances in which a redundancy payment is payable. The Local Government Pension Scheme regulations provide for access to pension benefits without reduction from the age of 55 in the event of an employee being made redundant.

This page is intentionally left blank

Surrey Pay Bands 2021/2022



Contents

Surrey Pay

Table 1: Job Family Pay Bands – effective from 1 April 2021	2
Table 2: Social Wellbeing* – effective from 1 April 2021.....	3
Table 3: Finance CIPFA Trainee Scheme – effective from 1 April 2021	3
Table 4: Community protection, Transport and Environment – effective from 1 April 2021	4
Table 5: Twelve 15 Education Catering - effective from 1 April 2021.....	5
Table 6: South East Shared Services (SESS) regional Surrey Pay bands effective from 1 April 2021	5
Table 7: Political Assistants	5
Table 8: Trainee Social Workers - effective from 1 April 2021	5
Table 9: Surrey Adult Learning Tutors – 1 September 2020 – 31 August 2021	6
Table 10: Surrey Arts Tutors – 1 September 2020 – 31 August 2021.....	7
Table 11: Apprenticeship and internship pay rates – effective from 1 April 2021.....	8
Table 12: Kickstarter Pay Rates – effective from 01 April 2021	8
Table 13: Former Buckinghamshire County Council trading standards pay settlement – effective from 1 July 2021	8

This Issue	1 April 2021 – 31 March 2022
Approval	PPDC
Date Published	April 2021
Review Date	March 2022

Surrey Pay

Applies to all schools and non-schools based Surrey Pay staff.

Table 1: Job Family Pay Bands – effective from 1 April 2021

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade Name	Salary Range					
			Minimum Point 1	Point 2	Point 3	Point 4	Point 5	Maximum Point 6
Business Functions Public Engagement Regulation & Technical Operational Services Personal Care & Support Children Learning & Educational Support (CLES)	Job Family Pay Model	PS1/2	£17,833					
		PS3	£18,013	£18,485	£18,957			
		PS4	£19,422	£19,803	£20,193	£20,589	£20,994	£21,416
		PS5	£21,943	£22,375	£22,815	£23,264	£23,723	£24,184
		PS6	£24,780	£25,269	£25,767	£26,276	£26,794	£27,317
		PS7	£27,991	£28,544	£29,108	£29,683	£29,919	£30,510
		PS8	£31,273	£31,898	£32,536	£33,187	£33,851	£34,519
		PS9	£35,382	£36,089	£36,811	£37,547	£38,298	£39,246
		PS10	£40,227	£41,031	£41,852	£42,689	£43,543	£44,619
		PS11	£45,734	£46,878	£48,050	£49,251	£50,482	£51,725
		PS12	£53,018	£54,344	£55,702	£57,095	£58,522	£59,964
		PS13	£61,463	£62,999	£64,574	£66,189	£67,843	£69,514
		PS14	£71,252	£73,033	£74,859	£76,730	£78,649	£80,586
		Leadership Job Family	Leadership Pay Model	PS15	£80,977			
PS16	£92,279							£114,404
PS17	£114,405							£137,286
PS18	£137,287							£164,744
CEX	£214,184							£237,337

Career Pay Bands

Table 2: Social Wellbeing* – effective from 1 April 2021

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade Name	Pay Point	Salary
Social Wellbeing	Career Pay Model	PS8SC		£32,896
		PS9SC	Point 1	£35,382
			Point 2	£36,670
			Point 3	£37,957
			Point 4	£39,246
		PS10SC	Point 1	£40,227
			Point 2	£41,691
			Point 3	£43,155
			Point 4	£44,619
		PS11SC	Point 1	£45,734
			Point 2	£47,732
			Point 3	£49,729
			Point 4	£51,725
		PS12SC	Point 1	£53,018
			Point 2	£54,501
			Point 3	£56,816
	Point 4	£59,964		

*Applies to all Social Workers and Occupational Therapists.

Table 3: Finance CIPFA Trainee Scheme – effective from 1 April 2021

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade Name	Pay Point	Salary
Finance Trainee	Career Pay Model	PS7F	Point 1	£27,991
		PS8F	Point 1	£31,273
		PS9F	Point 1	£34,688
			Point 2	£35,382
	Point 3		£36,089	
	Point 4		£36,811	
	Job Family Pay Model	Point 5	£37,547	
		Point 6	£38,476	

Career Pay Bands

Table 4: Community protection, Transport and Environment – effective from 1 April 2021

Scheme 1: PS5HT - PS7*

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade	Point	Salary
Regulation and Technical	CT&E Career Pay Model	PS5HT	Point 1	£21,943
			Point 2	£23,064
		PS6HT	Point 1	£24,780
			Point 2	£26,049
	Job Family Pay Model	PS7	Point 1	£27,991
			Point 2	£28,544
			Point 3	£29,108
			Point 4	£29,683
			Point 5	£29,919
			Point 6	£30,510

Scheme 2: PS6HT – PS8*

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade	Point	Salary
Regulation and Technical	CT&E Career Pay Model	PS6HT	Point 1	£24,780
			Point 2	£26,049
		PS7HT	Point 1	£27,991
			Point 2	£29,426
	Job Family Pay Model	PS8	Point 1	£31,273
			Point 2	£31,898
			Point 3	£32,536
			Point 4	£33,187
			Point 5	£33,851
			Point 6	£34,519

Scheme 3 PS7HT - PS9*

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade	Point	Salary
Regulation and Technical	CT&E Career Pay Model	PS7HT	Point 1	£27,991
			Point 2	£29,426
		PS8HT	Point 1	£31,273
			Point 2	£32,896
	Job Family Pay Model	PS9	Point 1	£35,382
			Point 2	£36,089
			Point 3	£36,811
			Point 4	£37,547
			Point 5	£38,298
			Point 6	£39,246

*Applies to staff on the CT&E Professional Development Programme (PDP)

Table 5: Twelve 15 Education Catering - effective from 1 April 2021

Position	Grade	Pay Point	Starting Salary
Catering / Servery Assistant	PS 1/2	N/A	£17,833
Cook - Primary / Secondary & Smart			
Caterer - Primary Small	PS 3	Point 1	£18,013
Caterer - Primary Medium	PS 3	Point 2	£18,485
Deputy Caterer - Primary / Secondary Large			
Caterer - Primary Large	PS 3	Point 3	£18,957
Caterer (Secondary Small)	PS 4	Point 2	£19,803
Caterer Primary - Very Complex	PS 4	Point 3	£20,193

Table 6: South East Shared Services (SESS) regional Surrey Pay bands effective from 1 April 2021

Grade	Title	Point 1	Point 2	Point 3	Point 4	Point 5
SE 5	Administrator Level 1	£18,592	£18,933	£19,273	£19,614	£19,954
SE 6	Administrator Level 2	£19,329	£20,139	£20,948	£21,758	£22,567
SE 7	Senior Administrator	£22,703	£23,813	£24,923	£26,033	£27,143
SE 8	Hub Leader	£24,005	£24,895	£25,785	£26,674	£27,564
SE 9	Team Leader	£26,842	£27,374	£27,905	£28,437	£28,968
SE 10	Team Manager	£29,666	£30,261	£30,856	£31,450	£32,045
SE 11	Manager	£37,217	£37,658	£38,098	£38,539	£38,979
SE 12	Senior Manager	£44,809	£45,850	£46,891	£47,931	£48,972

Table 7: Political Assistants

Grade	Salary
PS9(PA)	£34,986

Table 8: Trainee Social Workers - effective from 1 April 2021

Trainee Social Worker	Salary
Fixed salary	£19,000

Table 9: Surrey Adult Learning Tutors – 1 September 2020 – 31 August 2021

Role Level	Surrey Grade equivalent	Surrey Adult Learning Tutor Grade	Basic Hourly Rate	Total incl. hourly rate & preparation allowance ¹	Total Hourly Rate Inclusive of Holiday Pay ²		
					Less than 2 years service (15%)	More than 2, and less than 5 years service (16%)	More than 5 years service (17%)
Adult Learning Standard (ALS) Community courses which are non-qualification based	PS7	ALS A	£15.10	£21.36	£24.56		
		ALS B				£24.78	
		ALS C					£24.99
Adult Learning Higher (ALH) Accredited courses which are qualification based	PS8	ALH A	£18.12	£25.63	£29.47		
		ALH B				£29.73	
		ALH C					£29.99
Adult Learning Top (ALT) Highly specialist subject areas	PS9	ALT A	£19.62	£27.77	£31.94		
		ALT B				£32.21	
		ALT C					£32.49

¹ Preparation allowance is 41.5% of the basic hourly rate.

² Percentage uplift of basic hourly rate & preparation allowance to reflect annual leave entitlement.

Table 10: Surrey Arts Tutors – 1 September 2020 – 31 August 2021

Role Level	Surrey Grade equivalent	Surrey Arts Tutor Grade	Basic Hourly Rate	Basic hourly rate plus preparation & travel allowances ¹	Total Hourly Rate Inclusive of Holiday Pay ²		
					Less than 2 years service (15%)	More than 2, and less than 5 years service (16%)	More than 5 years service (17%)
Unqualified Instrumental Music Teacher; Qualified Instrumental Music Teacher.	PS7	SA1 A	£15.01	£21.92	£25.11		
		SA1 B				£25.32	
		SA1 C					£25.53
Assistant Teacher for the whole class; Team Support Teacher; Curriculum Lead.	PS8	SA2 A	£15.80	£23.07	£26.42		
		SA2 B				£26.65	
		SA2 C					£26.87
		SA3 A	£16.52	£24.12	£27.62		
		SA3 B				£27.86	
		SA3 C					£28.09
		SA4 A	£17.50	£25.55	£29.26		
		SA4 B				£29.51	
SA4 C					£29.76		
Group/Ensemble Conductor/Director; Lead Teacher for the whole class.	PS9	SA5 A	£18.67	£27.27	£31.23		
		SA5 B				£31.50	
		SA5 C					£31.76
		SA6 A	£20.63	£30.12	£34.50		
		SA6 B				£34.79	
		SA6 C					£35.08

¹ Travel allowance of 4.5% & preparation allowance of 41.5% applied to basic hourly rate.

² Percentage uplift of basic hourly rate & preparation allowance to reflect annual leave entitlement.

Table 11: Apprenticeship and internship pay rates – effective from 1 April 2021

Apprenticeship	Apprenticeship Level	Year	Annual Salary
Intermediate and Advanced	2	Year 1	£15,158
		Year 2	£17,833
	3	Year 1	£15,158
		Year 2	£17,833
Higher	4	N/A	£18,013
	5	N/A	£18,013
	6	N/A	£18,013
Internship	N/A	N/A	£18,013

*An Apprentice in their second year of an Apprenticeship is entitled to the National Minimum Wage/National Living Wage (where applicable) in accordance with their age.

Table 12: Kickstarter Pay Rates – effective from 01 April 2021

Kickstarter's Age	Kickstarter's Pay Grade	National Minimum/Living Wage Hourly Rate	Annual Salary (based on 25hrs per week only)
Under 18	KS1	£4.62	£6,022
18 – 20 inclusive	KS2	£6.56	£8,551
21 – 22 inclusive	KS3	£8.36	£10,897
23 and over	KS4	£8.91	£11,614

*A Kickstarter is entitled to the National Minimum Wage/National Living Wage (where applicable) in accordance with their age.

Local (Non-Surrey) Pay Terms & Conditions

Table 13: Former Buckinghamshire County Council trading standards pay settlement – effective from 1 July 2021

Grade	Entry Point	Competent Point	Advanced Point
R4 CBP	£ 22,853	£24,110	£25,367
R6 CBP	£ 28,468	£30,034	£31,599
R8 CBP	£ 37,151	£39,194	£41,237

County Council Meeting – 25 May 2021

REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Cabinet met on 30 March and 27 April 2021.

In accordance with the Constitution, Members can ask questions of the appropriate Cabinet Member, seek clarification or make a statement on any of these issues without giving notice.

The minutes containing the individual decisions for the meetings above have been included within the original agenda at Item 16. Any Cabinet responses to Committee reports are included in or appended to the minutes. If any Member wishes to raise a question or make a statement on any of the matters in the minutes, notice must be given to Democratic Services by 12 noon on the last working day before the County Council meeting (Monday 24 May 2021).

For members of the public all non-confidential reports are available on the web site (www.surreycc.gov.uk) or on request from Democratic Services.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

There were no reports with recommendations for Council.

REPORTS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

At its meeting on 30 March 2021 Cabinet considered:

A. ALTERNATIVE CURRICULUM PATHWAYS AND REINTEGRATION SUPPORT

The report sought endorsement of the strategic direction for Alternative Provision and to enable the work on renewing the Pupil Referral Unit estate.

Cabinet AGREED:

1. That the vision and principles of the Alternative Provision strategy are endorsed,
2. That the developments in the previously agreed capital works to upgrade the county's Pupil Referral Units are noted,
3. That delegated authority to agree individual projects and resources is given to the Cabinet Member for All Age Learning and Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support, subject to a detailed business case for each scheme passing through Property Panel and Capital Programme Panel is approved,
4. That an amount of £0.5m is transferred from the current pipeline budget to begin the development of more detailed plans for individual sites.

Reasons for decisions:

The proposed strategy will provide a shared ambition for children, vision, and a set of principles to develop a consistent high-quality countywide AP offer. The implementation of these proposals will provide an integrated system of alternative

provision focussed on supporting children and young people at an earlier stage and enabling them to remain more often in their local school provision with their friends and siblings. The systemic approach will drive improvements in outcomes for children and young people accessing alternative provision, returning them more quickly and successfully to full time education. The investment proposals will ensure that all facilities meet the minimum standards required and go further to provide environments that ensure children feel valued, support children with a broad curriculum and ensure that their emotional health and wellbeing is a priority.

B. MANAGEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT OF HGV WEIGHT RESTRICTIONS- 'HGV WATCH'

Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) weight restriction orders are made by the council as part of Surrey's network management responsibilities. This report set out the challenges involved with the current enforcement process and seeks agreement for a new HGV Weight Restriction Enforcement Policy 'HGV Watch' that will empower local communities and make the best use of the resources available for this task within the police and council services.

Cabinet AGREED:

1. That the HGV Weight Restriction Enforcement Policy in the form of the 'Surrey HGV watch' is adopted;
2. That agreement of the detailed operational policy is delegated to the Director for Highways and Transport in consultation with Surrey Police and the Cabinet Member for Highways;
3. That twice yearly progress reports are provided to the Cabinet Member for Highways;
4. That support for a change in Government policy to allow councils outside London to enforce moving traffic offences by camera to help improve road safety, reduce congestion and protect the environment is endorsed.

Reasons for decisions:

The recommendations above will enable the council to help achieve some of its Community Vision 2030 objectives, including that:

- Residents live in clean, safe and green communities, where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities; and
- Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer.

In addition, as part of our organisational strategy, Surrey County Council wants to work in partnership with residents, businesses, partners and communities to collectively meet challenges and grasp opportunities. A new HGV Watch policy that helps enforce HGV weight restrictions could encourage residents to be proactive in their local areas in working with the council and the police in tackling the environmental impacts that inappropriate HGV movements have on our communities.

An HGV watch scheme will help focus the resources available to the police and council for the enforcement of HGV restrictions in the most effective way and in a way that will have the greatest impact on driver awareness and potentially compliance.

C. A NEW RAIL STRATEGY FOR SURREY 2021

The report presented the 'New Rail Strategy for Surrey', setting out the council's future ambition and priorities for rail across the county. It updates the original Rail Strategy published in 2013 and the partial update of 2016.

Cabinet AGREED:

1. That the New Rail Strategy for Surrey is adopted and the strategic aims, strategic responses and the future priorities identified are welcomed;
2. That the New Rail Strategy for Surrey is used as a framework to support local economic and spatial development decisions and as an advocacy document to lobby Government, the rail industry and others to assist in delivering the strategic aims;
3. That the development of a future work programme that will set out the council's involvement in the interventions identified in New Rail Strategy for Surrey, led by the Cabinet Member for Highways, the objective being to create an implementation plan that is integrated with the emerging Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 and the Surrey Infrastructure Plan is agreed.

Reasons for decisions:

Good rail services with supporting infrastructure are vital for maintaining and growing Surrey's economy. They provide efficient and sustainable links to jobs, education and leisure, they reduce the number of car journeys on our roads and they support our climate change agenda. The rail network is also a key factor in the decisions made by business and residents choosing to live and work in the county. Although uncertainties around the long-term economic impacts of Covid19 remain, particularly in terms of how businesses will respond and how commuting patterns will adapt, the importance of rail in Surrey will remain high.

Therefore, whilst the council has no statutory role in planning or delivering rail services or projects, we must continue to actively engage with the rail industry and Government to ensure that our priorities are reflected in rail service delivery, infrastructure investment and in planning for the future.

To ensure we succeed in doing so, it is crucial that the council has a relevant and coherent rail strategy, which can be used as an advocacy document and to support partnership work and future investment with the rail industry. The New Rail Strategy for Surrey encompasses a clear set of strategic aims, strategic responses and the future priorities. It will provide a platform to deliver our ambitions in rail. Moreover, our New Rail Strategy for Surrey will enable the council to take advantage of other opportunities as they arise to support our 2030 Community Vision and our 2050 Place Ambition.

At its meeting on 27 April 2021 Cabinet considered:

D. SURREY'S ECONOMIC FUTURE: PROGRESS UPDATE

The report set out the emerging priority actions within the Delivery Programme, highlights areas where action has already begun and proposes a further update in six months. Recognising that the strategy is being developed in an uncertain and changeable economic environment, it has been designed to be adaptive, ensuring that it is able to accommodate the economic circumstances and national policy changes which are out-with the Council's control.

Cabinet AGREED:

1. That the progress being made in delivering on the ambitions of Surrey's Economic Future Strategy be noted.
2. That a progress update be received in six months.

Reason for decision:

Work to deliver on Surrey's economic ambitions is underway and progress is central to Surrey's economic recovery as we emerge from the constraints and impacts of the COVID 19 Pandemic. The actions being taken will drive economic recovery and embed resilience for Surrey businesses and residents, with a particular emphasis on ensuring that everyone is able to benefit from economic growth and therefore it is important that Cabinet have oversight of progress.

E. ACQUISITION OF LAND IN SUPPORT OF THE RIVER THAMES SCHEME

The report asked Cabinet for approval to acquire freehold lands off Chertsey Road in Spelthorne for the purposes of the River Thames Scheme which is being jointly promoted by the Environment Agency and Surrey County Council. The purchase will safeguard the land required for construction of a length of the proposed flood channel and provide additional land to support habitat creation in accordance with the Council's wider green agenda.

Cabinet AGREED:

1. That the freehold purchase of land off Chertsey Road, Shepperton, as outlined in the Part 2 of this paper for the purposes of the River Thames Scheme be approved.

Reason for decision:

The decision recommended by this report will contribute to enabling the Council, in partnership with the Environment Agency, to progress the River Thames Scheme – a major infrastructure project that will reduce the risk of flooding from the Thames for communities in Runnymede and Spelthorne. It will achieve this through the construction of two new channel sections to divert water away from the Thames and additional capacity improvements to Sunbury, Molesey and Teddington weirs.

To construct the channel sections, it will be necessary to purchase land and to formalise agreements with third party landowners.

A forward purchase of land, in advance of submission of a Development Consent Order (DCO) application provides the opportunity for Surrey County Council and the Environment Agency to obtain land through agreement for the scheme. Forward purchasing also averts the risk of land disposal by current landowners possibly into small parcels that would make future purchase potentially more complex and expensive.

In addition, the purchase of this land provides an opportunity to provide green infrastructure for the enjoyment of residents in Spelthorne, which is underserved by the Council's Countryside Estate which provides 10,000 acres of high-quality landscape and recreational space across the county but in Spelthorne, is limited to Sheepwalk Lake. The area known as Chertsey Meads on the opposite side of the river, complements the site linked on both sides to the Thames Path, a 184 mile long national walking trail, which provides an opportunity for a circular route within the site and an additional attraction for visitors to explore along the river.

Since the landscape quality of the site is currently low, there is a high net biodiversity value to be gained from managing the site to maximise value delivered by new wetland, woodland and grasslands.

Approving the purchase of the land will allow Surrey County Council to support both the River Thames Scheme project and the Greener Futures priority objective.

F. QUARTERLY REPORT ON DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER SPECIAL URGENCY ARRANGEMENTS: 17 March 2021- 25 May 2021

The Cabinet is required under the Constitution to report to Council on a quarterly basis the details of decisions taken by the Cabinet and Cabinet Members under the special urgency arrangements set out in Standing Order 57 of the Constitution. This occurs where a decision is required on a matter that is not contained within the Leader's Forward Plan (Notice of Decisions), nor available 5 clear days before the meeting. Where a decision on such matters could not reasonably be delayed, the agreement of the Chairman of the appropriate Select Committee, or in his/her absence the Chairman of the Council, must be sought to enable the decision to be made.

At its meeting on 30 March 2021 Cabinet considered:

a) COVID- 19: DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN: Introduction of Additional Waste Materials at Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking and Cranleigh Community Recycling Centres

This report was dealt with under the Special Urgency procedure (SO56) as it had not had the required 28 days' notice on the Forward Plan.

Cabinet was asked to decide whether to re-introduce containers for non-recyclable waste at Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking and Cranleigh community recycling centres for a twelve- month period with immediate effect.

Cabinet AGREED:

1. That the reintroduction of services for non-recyclable wastes at Bagshot, Warlingham, Cranleigh and Dorking community recycling centres for a twelve month period be agreed and delegated authority be given to the Cabinet

Member for Environment and Climate Change in consultation with the Leader to decide on when to reintroduce the exclusion of non- recyclable materials at these sites following the removal of COVID controls.

Reason for decision:

To mitigate issues of queuing on the highway as a result of reduced throughput at our community recycling centres caused by the introduction of controls to make the sites COVID secure. The reason for urgency is to enable changes to be put in place as soon as possible over the busy Easter period. The changes should reduce overall queuing times and provide a more convenient service for residents.

The Cabinet RECOMMENDS that the County Council notes that there has been ONE urgent decision in the last two months.

**Mr Tim Oliver, Leader of the Council
25 May 2021**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 30 MARCH 2021 AT 2.00 PM
VIA MS TEAMS, 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
*Mr Mark Nuti	*Mrs Julie Iles
*Mrs Sinead Mooney	*Mr Matt Furniss
*Mrs Becky Rush	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Mr Edward Hawkins	*Miss Alison Griffiths
*Miss Marisa Heath	

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr Jonathan Essex, Local Member for Redhill East
Mr Will Forster, Local Member for Woking South

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

57/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Colin Kemp.

58/21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 23 FEBRUARY 2021 [Item 2]

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 23 February 2021 were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

59/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

60/21 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

The Leader made a short announcement before the start of the formal meeting agenda. The following key points were made:

- The Leader thanked staff in educational settings for all their hard work over the last year and for getting schools re- opened.
- Staff at the council were thanked for keeping Surrey safe and going above and beyond.
- Surrey County Council (SCC) had been a lead agency with the Surrey Local Resilience Forum leading with PPE and food parcel deliveries.

- With the lifting of restrictions, residents were reminded of ‘hands, face and space’ ensuring people met outside only and followed guidance. The infection rate in Surrey was decreasing and the sacrifices of residents was recognised.
- The Leader explained that four of the Community Recycling Centres (CRC’s) would be re-opened for non-recyclable waste in order to relieve pressure on the other CRCs in the county.
- A further contribution of £500k would be given to Community Foundation for Surrey which would be matched by the organisation and then shared with local groups.
- The communications team at the council were congratulated as they had received a global award for the best use of Facebook for the keeping Surrey safe campaign.

60/211 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were three member questions. The questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda.

With regards to Mr Essex’s third question, Mr Essex stated that the response referred to ‘mechanisms for review of the highways contract going forward’ and queried if this included scrutiny by the relevant Select Committee. Mr Essex queried if external audits for the places for people contract and the current highways contract had been carried out, and if not, why. The Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support explained that places for people was not included in the external audit because it was below materiality for scope of the audit. The National Audit Office had issued a new code in relation to value for money which would therefore probably also include the current highways contract in future audits. The Cabinet Member for Highways stated that the highways contract was followed by a robust audit exercise. The lighting contract had brought significant financial benefits to the authority and was constantly being reviewed. The Member was welcome to take any questions and concerns off line with the Cabinet Member.

Mr Essex stated that he would welcome more scrutiny of the highways area by the new council administration in May.

61/21 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were no public questions.

62/21 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

One petition with 4,252 signatures had been received. It requests that SCC preserve and protect Norbury Park Sawmill and Workshop. The response to the petition was published as part of the supplementary agenda. Mr Anthony Bainbridge presented the petition. Mr Bainbridge stated that he would like SCC to extend the Sawmill’s period of operation until a suitable alternative could be found adding that the products from the Sawmill and Norbury Park wood products were the same. The Sawmill was a commercial profitable enterprise and closing down the Sawmill would mean losing a number of personnel with a high skill set. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change responded to the petition, included in the supplementary agenda.

The Leader stated that there was a difference in interpretation of the financial information regarding the Sawmill between the council and petitioner. This was a Surrey Wildlife Trust business and the council needed to consider the use of public funds to take on liabilities especially in the current climate. The Leader stated that discussions were ongoing with Surrey Wildlife Trust to extend the time for closure of the Sawmill in the hope that someone could be found to take the business on.

63/21 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

64/21 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

The task group report was introduced by Mr Will Forster who thanked the Cabinet for the response to the recommendations. Members and officers were thanked for their support with the task groups work. With regards to virtual meeting regulations and the government's decision not to extend powers for remote meetings beyond 6 May 2021, it was queried whether the council would take legal action against the government. The Leader stated that there had always been an expectation that the government would extend the virtual meeting regulations powers beyond 6 May 2021. Hertfordshire County Council would be leading on legal action and the Leader stated that he had expressed support for this. There was cross party support for the extension of the virtual meeting regulations.

The Leader announced that the sale of County Hall had been completed and the sale of the Bittoms car park was being progressed.

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning announced that three teams at the council had been selected as finalists in the Public Sector Transformation Awards. This included the digital programme team, agile working team and transformation team.

Mr Will Forster introduced the motion referred from the 16 March council meeting. Mr Forster introduced the motion explaining that the Liberal Democrat group would like the council to lobby the government and MPs to grant EU nationals living in Surrey the automatic right to stay in the UK. Many EU nationals were living under uncertainty around their right to stay in the UK and are concerned about their futures.

The Leader stated that there was no evidence that the current process in place by the Home Office was not working. From August 2018 to December 2020, 75,760 applications in Surrey had been made of which 93.66% have already been concluded with 55% been given settled status and 36% pre-settled status. The numbers of people not getting any status was very small but the Leader agreed to write to the Home Office asking them to ensure Surrey residents applications were dealt with expeditiously. The Leader did not feel the process for dealing with applications was flawed and stated that any lobbying of government around this issue should be taken up by the national parties.

RESOLVED:

1. That the County Hall Move and Agile Programme Task Group Report be noted and recommendations agreed.
2. That the Leader write to the Home Office urging them to expedite the processing of applications for EU citizens living in Surrey applying for settled status in the UK.

65/21 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

Each of the decisions taken since the last Cabinet meeting were briefly covered.

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.

66/21 COVID- 19: DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning briefly introduced the officer delegated decision on the Covid winter support grant explaining how the grant had been allocated and services it would support.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decision taken by officers since the last meeting be noted.

Reason for decision:

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

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

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change introduced the emergency report to Cabinet explaining that in order to reduce the risk of COVID transmission, it has been necessary to introduce social distancing controls at community recycling centres. This has resulted in a reduction in capacity and throughput of the sites which in turn had given rise to problems with queuing at a number of community recycling centres. As a result, to mitigate the queuing at larger sites Cabinet were being asked to reintroduce containers for non-recyclable waste at the four sites which currently only accept recyclable materials. The sites include Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking

and Cranleigh CRCs. The changes should reduce overall queuing times and provide a more convenient service for residents.

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support stated that this was great news for residents and as the local member for Warlingham it would be greatly appreciated.

RESOLVED:

2. That the reintroduction of services for non-recyclable wastes at Bagshot, Warlingham, Cranleigh and Dorking community recycling centres for a twelve month period be agreed and delegated authority be given to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change in consultation with the Leader to decide on when to reintroduce the exclusion of non- recyclable materials at these sites following the removal of COVID controls.

Reason for decision:

To mitigate issues of queuing on the highway as a result of reduced throughput at our community recycling centres caused by the introduction of controls to make the sites COVID secure. The reason for urgency is to enable changes to be put in place as soon as possible over the busy Easter period. The changes should reduce overall queuing times and provide a more convenient service for residents

67/21 COVID- 19: SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL UPDATE [Item 8]

The update was introduced by the Leader who thanked schools for setting up Covid testing processes for children and young people and re-opening the schools. The vaccination programme was progressing well and to date, over 90% of all eligible citizens over the age of 70 have been given at least one vaccination. Vaccinations amongst the Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) population was still low and members were asked to encourage residents to take up the vaccine.

The Cabinet Member for Communities explained that an allocation of a £500,000 grant had been given to Community Foundation for Surrey, of which a half of the funding would be placed into an endowment to create a lasting legacy for groups working on priorities for the county. The volunteer sector was thanked for all the support provided during the pandemic.

RESOLVED:

1. That the latest public health situation with regard to Covid-19, nationally and in Surrey be noted;
2. That the actions being delivered through Surrey's Local Outbreak Control Plan, including the vaccination roll out, and the ongoing support to vulnerable residents, including through the council's Community Helpline and the Covid Winter Support Grant scheme be noted and endorsed;

3. That the latest impacts on Adult Social Care and Children's, Families, Lifelong learning services be noted;
4. That the ongoing preparation for the local elections in May 2021 and associated risks be noted and endorsed;
5. That the work and planning going on in respect of the transition into recovery from the pandemic be noted and endorsed;
6. That the allocation of a £500,000 grant to Community Foundation for Surrey, of which a half of the funding will be placed into an endowment to create a lasting legacy for groups working on priorities for the county be endorsed.

Reason for decision:

The county and council continue to face unprecedented challenges due to the Covid-19 crisis. We are simultaneously managing response activity and work with our partners to enable recovery within the county, looking ahead to a return to day-to-day life for communities following the end of national lockdown.

The recommendations set out in this report ensure Cabinet are appraised of the most recent work going on across the council to protect, sustain and support residents and communities and the economy of Surrey.

[Where necessary a waiver for call-in will be sought from the relevant Select Committee Chairman]

68/21 ALTERNATIVE CURRICULUM PATHWAYS AND REINTEGRATION SUPPORT [Item 9]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning who explained that Alternative Provision (AP) was "education outside school, arranged by local authorities or schools, for pupils who do not attend mainstream school for reasons such as exclusion, behaviour issues, school refusal, short or long term illness". This report seeks endorsement of the strategic direction for AP and to enable the work on renewing the Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) estate to commence. Extensive consultation had been undertaken as described in paragraph 22 of the report and the investment proposals would ensure all facilities meet the minimum standards required. The implementation of these proposals would provide an integrated system of alternative provision focussed on supporting children and young people at an earlier stage and enabling them to remain more often in their local school provision with their friends and siblings.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families commented that this report was very positive for children and young people but required everyone within the system to work closely together. The report encourages an inclusive and personalised approach to education.

RESOLVED:

1. That the vision and principles of the Alternative Provision strategy are endorsed,
2. That the developments in the previously agreed capital works to upgrade the county's Pupil Referral Units are noted,
3. That delegated authority to agree individual projects and resources is given to the Cabinet Member for All Age Learning and Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support, subject to a detailed business case for each scheme passing through Property Panel and Capital Programme Panel is approved,
4. That an amount of £0.5m is transferred from the current pipeline budget to begin the development of more detailed plans for individual sites.

Reason for decision:

The proposed strategy will provide a shared ambition for children, vision, and a set of principles to develop a consistent high-quality countywide AP offer. The implementation of these proposals will provide an integrated system of alternative provision focussed on supporting children and young people at an earlier stage and enabling them to remain more often in their local school provision with their friends and siblings. The systemic approach will drive improvements in outcomes for children and young people accessing alternative provision, returning them more quickly and successfully to full time education. The investment proposals will ensure that all facilities meet the minimum standards required and go further to provide environments that ensure children feel valued, support children with a broad curriculum and ensure that their emotional health and wellbeing is a priority.

[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee]

69/21 MANAGEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT OF HGV WEIGHT RESTRICTIONS- 'HGV WATCH' [Item 10]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Highways stating that the report set out the challenges that were involved with the current enforcement of HGVs and the proposal to set up a new enforcement policy called 'HGV watch' which would allow local communities to feel empowered and make best use of resources within the council and police. The HGV watch scheme would help focus the resources available to the police and council for the enforcement of HGV restrictions in the most effective way and in a way that would have the greatest impact on driver awareness and compliance. The Cabinet Member described how the enforcement would work with offences being committed. There were 29 structural and 62 environmental HGV weight restriction on the Surrey road network. Both Trading Standards and Surrey Police were supportive of the new policy. It was explained that Chobham Parish Council had established a HGV Watch

scheme in September 2020 which had been very successful and had seen lower reoffending rates.

Cabinet Members welcomed the new policy commenting that it would empower local communities and that there were many residents who would look forward to taking part in this. Both the Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning and Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support welcomed the scheme, explaining that they represented rural areas with smaller roads and know of residents who would like to be involved with the scheme.

RESOLVED:

1. That the HGV Weight Restriction Enforcement Policy in the form of the 'Surrey HGV watch' is adopted;
2. That agreement of the detailed operational policy is delegated to the Director for Highways and Transport in consultation with Surrey Police and the Cabinet Member for Highways;
3. That twice yearly progress reports are provided to the Cabinet Member for Highways;
4. That support for a change in Government policy to allow councils outside London to enforce moving traffic offences by camera to help improve road safety, reduce congestion and protect the environment is endorsed.

Reason for decision:

The recommendations above will enable the council to help achieve some of its Community Vision 2030 objectives, including that:

- Residents live in clean, safe and green communities, where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities; and
- Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer.

In addition, as part of our organisational strategy, Surrey County Council wants to work in partnership with residents, businesses, partners and communities to collectively meet challenges and grasp opportunities. A new HGV Watch policy that helps enforce HGV weight restrictions could encourage residents to be proactive in their local areas in working with the council and the police in tackling the environmental impacts that inappropriate HGV movements have on our communities.

An HGV watch scheme will help focus the resources available to the police and council for the enforcement of HGV restrictions in the most effective way and in a way that will have the greatest impact on driver awareness and potentially compliance.

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

70/21 A NEW RAIL STRATEGY FOR SURREY 2021 [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member for Highways introduced the new Rail Strategy for Surrey, setting out the future ambition and priorities for rail across Surrey. It updated the original Rail Strategy published in 2013 and the partial update of 2016. It was important that the council had an up to date rail strategy that fully reflected the objectives of the council as articulated through the 2030 Community Vision and the 2050 Place Ambition. The strategy would be used as a powerful advocacy document to support local economic and spatial development decisions that would maximise the potential impact of improvements and investments in the county, alongside partnership work and leveraging future investment from the rail industry and others. The New Rail Strategy for Surrey also supports the council's priority objective of enabling a greener future with net zero carbon as a strong feature throughout the new strategy.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change welcomed the strategy adding that it supported the councils climate change agenda and would reduce the number of car journeys in Surrey. The Leader stated that the strategy would support the broader public transport strategy giving people a choice of the transport they used.

The meeting adjourned at 3.19pm due to audio issues with the live webcast and resumed at 3.25pm.

RESOLVED:

1. That the New Rail Strategy for Surrey is adopted and the strategic aims, strategic responses and the future priorities identified are welcomed;
2. That the New Rail Strategy for Surrey is used as a framework to support local economic and spatial development decisions and as an advocacy document to lobby Government, the rail industry and others to assist in delivering the strategic aims;
3. That the development of a future work programme that will set out the council's involvement in the interventions identified in New Rail Strategy for Surrey, led by the Cabinet Member for Highways, the objective being to create an implementation plan that is integrated with the emerging Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 and the Surrey Infrastructure Plan is agreed.

Reason for decision:

Good rail services with supporting infrastructure are vital for maintaining and growing Surrey's economy. They provide efficient and sustainable links to jobs, education and leisure, they reduce the number of car journeys on our roads and they support our climate change agenda. The rail network is also a key factor in the decisions made by business and residents choosing to live and work in the county. Although uncertainties around the long-term economic impacts of Covid19 remain, particularly in terms of how businesses will respond and how commuting patterns will adapt, the importance of rail in Surrey will remain high.

Therefore, whilst the council has no statutory role in planning or delivering rail services or projects, we must continue to actively engage with the rail industry and Government to ensure that our priorities are reflected in rail service delivery, infrastructure investment and in planning for the future.

To ensure we succeed in doing so, it is crucial that the council has a relevant and coherent rail strategy, which can be used as an advocacy document and to support partnership work and future investment with the rail industry. The New Rail Strategy for Surrey encompasses a clear set of strategic aims, strategic responses and the future priorities. It will provide a platform to deliver our ambitions in rail. Moreover, our New Rail Strategy for Surrey will enable the council to take advantage of other opportunities as they arise to support our 2030 Community Vision and our 2050 Place Ambition.

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

71/21 ACTIVE TRAVEL PROGRAMME UPDATE [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Highways introduced the report highlighting that the council was keen to support the ability of residents to make sustainable choices in how they travel, and to this end, had been awarded funding from the Department of Transport of £6.45m to deliver Active Travel schemes by April 2022. The programme would run alongside the 11 walking and cycling infrastructure plans across Surrey with district and borough partners. A consultation process would be undertaken and details were given on how this would work. It was proposed, in order to meet timescales approval for the final programme would be delegated to officers and the divisional member would be consulted on this.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Domestic Abuse stated that as the divisional member for Staines she felt well briefed on the schemes being undertaken in her division.

RESOLVED:

1. That the prioritisation process so a final programme of schemes can be determined and can proceed to construction be agreed;
2. That approval of the final programme as well as authorisation to advertise and consider any relevant Traffic Regulation Orders be delegated to the Director of Highways & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and the relevant Divisional Member, once agreed by the Capital Programme Panel;
3. That local and joint committees are provided regular updates of progress of the relevant schemes within their areas.

Reason for decision:

Increasing residents' choices on travel and accessibility of travel is important for our residents and as such is reflected in our ambitions and community vision. Active travel has also been a key area of government policy with the publication of the Department for Transport's *Gear Change* plan which set out the ambition for the UK to become a walking and cycling nation.

SCC want to ensure that the active travel schemes being delivered for residents align with our own ambitions and objectives as well as ensuring that the grant is directed to the priority schemes in the time required and with the right local engagement

On this basis, consideration has been given to the prioritisation process required to achieve this aim. It is anticipated this will include the following aspects;

- Consultation outcomes
- Contribution to sustainable travel choices for commuting and leisure
- Contribution to a reduction in carbon emission
- Improvement in air quality through reduction in congestion
- Links to health, education, and jobs

We are taking a consultation approach that provides robust evidence. This consultative approach is not only important in helping us to prioritise but also in meeting the Government's expectations in the second round of schemes.

It is imperative that the consultation is representative of the communities that live around the proposed active travel schemes as well as the wider population across Surrey. The work will extend beyond the groups that typically participate in consultation exercises to reach those who, for whatever reason, do not typically engage in traditional consultation exercises but are nonetheless affected by the proposed changes.

Once the consultation has concluded, the schemes will be prioritised based on the results of the consultation and the factors explained later in this report. Those schemes that are unsuccessful in being prioritised for delivery will remain on list for future funding opportunities and review through the Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) programme.

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

72/21 APPROVAL TO PROCURE SCHOOL PROJECTS NOT APPEARING ON THE 2020/21 ANNUAL PROCUREMENT FORWARD PLAN [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning explained that the Annual Procurement Forward Plan was approved by Cabinet on 15 December 2020 and did not include individual capital projects. The report details these projects at Annex 1. By approving this recommendation, the council would avoid the need to submit multiple individual requests for Approval to Procure the school projects, as well as individual contract award approvals for work taking place in 2021/22.

RESOLVED:

1. That approval is given to Procure the 2021/22 projects listed in Annex 1; specifically the Priority Schools Building Programme (PSBP2), Schools Basic Needs (SBN) and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in accordance with Surrey County Council's (the Council) Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.

2. That within the +/-5% budgetary tolerance level, the Executive Director of Resources and Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member.

Reason for decision:

By approving this recommendation Surrey County Council will avoid the need to submit multiple individual requests for Approval to Procure the school projects, as well as individual contract award approvals for work taking place in 2021/22.

Enable the delivery of the Capital schools programme approved in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

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

73/21 2020/21 MONTH 10 (JANUARY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 14]

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support provided details of the County Council's 2020/21 financial position as at Month 10 (M10) 31 January 2021 for revenue and capital budgets. As at January 2021 (M10); the council was forecasting a full-year £2.2m underspend, an improvement of £2.4m from the previous month. The council was on track for a balanced budget at year end. The £2.2m underspend consists of a projected £3.8m overspend on CV-19 and a projected £6.0m underspend on Business as Usual (BAU). The capital forecast stands at £232.0m against a budget of £244.0m; slippage of £12.0m. The forecast slippage has increased by £6.3m from a projected underspend of £6.7m at M9.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year be noted.

Reason for Decision:

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]

74/21 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.

75/21 APPROVAL TO PROCURE SCHOOL PROJECTS NOT APPEARING ON THE 2020/21 ANNUAL PROCUREMENT FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning introduced a Part 2 report that contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

RESOLVED:

See Minute 72/21

Reason for Decision:

See Minute 72/21

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

76/21 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 17]

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

Meeting closed at 03:42pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 27 APRIL 2021 AT 2.00 PM
VIA MS TEAMS, REMOTE MEETING.**

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

Members:

(* present)

*Mr Tim Oliver (Chairman)	*Mrs Natalie Bramhall
*Mr Colin Kemp (Vice-Chairman)	*Mrs Mary Lewis
*Mr Mark Nuti	*Mrs Julie Iles
*Mrs Sinead Mooney	*Mr Matt Furniss
*Mrs Becky Rush	*Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Miss Alison Griffiths	
*Mr Edward Hawkins	*Miss Marisa Heath

* = Present

Members in attendance:

Mr Will Forster, Local Member for Woking South

PART ONE
IN PUBLIC

77/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were none.

78/21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 30 MARCH 2021 [Item 2]

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 30 March 2021 were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

79/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

80/21 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

The Leader made a short announcement before the start of the formal meeting agenda. The following key points were made:

- Explained that this would be the final Cabinet meeting before the elections on 6 May.
- The Leader recognised the incredible work undertaken by staff and partners to keep people safe through such challenging times.

- With the lifting of restrictions, residents were reminded of 'hands, face and space' ensuring people followed guidance. Over 600,000 people in Surrey had received their first dose of the vaccine.
- It was explained that a number of members would not be seeking re-election. The Leader thanked all members for their contributions to their local communities. A special thanks was paid to Mary Lewis, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families who was standing down and had delivered many positive changes for children and young people in Surrey.
- It was expected that Ofsted would be re-visiting Surrey at the end of the year for a full inspection and had confirmed improvements during their recent visits.
- Some key highlights from the council term included more in county places for children and young people with special education needs and disabilities, more supported living places for older people, 94% of schools in Surrey being rated as good or outstanding and a modern agile fire service.

80/211 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There was one member question. The question and response were published as a supplement to the agenda.

Mr Forster thanked the Cabinet Member for the response to his question and queried that if the booking system at Epsom CRC had worked well why it had not been rolled out across all the CRC's in Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change explained that although the booking system had worked well at Epsom there were a number of no shows when the booking system was being used. The situation with bookings at CRC's across Surrey would be reviewed once lockdown had been lifted. The Cabinet Member added that there had been a reduction in visits to CRC's since the lifting of restrictions on 12 April.

81/21 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were no public questions.

82/21 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were no petitions.

83/21 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

84/21 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There were no reports to consider.

85/21 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

There were two decisions for noting.

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.

86/21 COVID- 19: DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning explained that the Covid Winter Support Grant had been extended. The original scheme was due to end on the 31 March 2021 and had been extended to 16 April 2021.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decision taken by officers since the last meeting be noted.

Reason for decision:

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

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

87/21 COVID 19: SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL UPDATE [Item 8]

The Leader introduced the report explaining that now the immediacy of the Covid crisis had started to recede, the Recovery Coordinating Group (RCG) had worked with the Strategic Coordinating Group (SCG) to look at how the remaining work could either be stopped or transitioned to business as usual/new business, to enable the major incident and the SCG to be stood down. It was the intention that the major incident would be stood down at the end of April 2021, although the CMG will meet in line with the national lockdown easing stages. The Local Outbreak Control Plan for Surrey had been updated and republished to reflect the Covid 19 response, local progress and developments. In Surrey over 500,000 people had received their first dose of the vaccine and 150,000 had received their second dose. The Leader highlighted that the number of children subject to Child Protection Plans continued to rise for the ninth consecutive month to 901 at the end of March. This compares with 693 at the same time last year. There was hope that this number would reduce as lockdown eased and restrictions lifted.

The Cabinet Member for Communities thanked volunteers for their energy, enthusiasm and support during the pandemic, explaining that there were lots of volunteering opportunities available especially within the vaccine centres.

RESOLVED:

1. That the latest public health situation with regard to Covid-19, nationally and in Surrey be noted.
2. That the actions being delivered through Surrey's Local Outbreak Control Plan, including the vaccination roll out, and the ongoing support to vulnerable residents, including through the council's Community Helpline and the Covid Winter Support Grant scheme be noted and endorsed.
3. That the latest impacts on Adult Social Care and Children, Families, Lifelong learning services be noted.
4. That the ongoing preparation for the local elections in May 2021 and associated risks be noted.
5. That the work and planning going on in respect of the transition into recovery from the pandemic be noted and endorsed.
6. That the intention to stand down the Major Incident from the end of April 2021 be endorsed.
7. That the continued use of Covid Bus Service Support Grant to support contracted bus services which have continued to operate through the pandemic be noted and endorsed.

Reasons for Decision:

The county and council continue to face unprecedented challenges due to the Covid-19 crisis. We are simultaneously managing response activity and work with our partners to enable recovery within the county, looking ahead to a return to day-to-day life for communities following the end of national lockdown.

The recommendations set out in this report ensure Cabinet are appraised of the most recent work going on across the council to protect, sustain and support residents and communities and the economy of Surrey.

[Where necessary a waiver for call-in will be sought from the relevant Select Committee Chairman]

88/21 DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY AND DELIVERY UPDATE [Item 9]

The report was introduced by the Deputy Leader who explained that the report provided an update on the Council's Digital Infrastructure strategy and plans for delivery. It sets out the objectives of the next phase of the strategy and highlights the multiple investors and influences involved in digital deployment across the region. The report introduces an initial set of projects to be included in an emerging programme plan and identifies associated resourcing options. In light of the timing of national developments and opportunities, it proposes that Cabinet receive a further update in the Autumn.

Members were supportive of the proposals highlighted in the report recognising the positive impacts of digital infrastructure in a virtual and digital

world. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Domestic Abuse welcomed the report and the drive for increased digital connectivity which would support a number of council services including adult social care and childrens services. It was agreed that it would be useful for both these services to be involved in the Council' s Digital Infrastructure Steering Group.

RESOLVED:

1. That the update on Surrey's Digital Infrastructure strategy, the external drivers and different investments and influences be noted.
2. That the steps being taken to accelerate delivery of certain key and relevant 'enabling' projects and to identify associated resourcing options be noted.
3. That an update be brought to Cabinet in the Autumn to include:
 - Assessment of Building Digital UK (BDUK) plans, aligned to commercial rollout
 - Update on delivery against the Digital Infrastructure strategy programme plan 'immediate actions'
 - Identification of gaps (geographical and funding) and possible measures to address them

Reason for decision:

Achieving the Council's objectives around digital deployment and connectivity is critical to the well-being and prosperity of Surrey's residents and businesses. A digitally connected Surrey will ensure that our residents and businesses can benefit from new and emerging technology enablers, i.e. virtual and augmented reality (VR & AR) which will drive the next generation of innovation at home and in the workplace; for example, autonomous electric vehicles and transport, hyper-automation, drone delivery services and digital healthcare provision. Delivering these benefits for Council service outcomes requires a step change in digital capability and connectivity. Surrey's economic growth also requires a hyper-connected environment to facilitate its innovation eco-system.

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

89/21 SURREY'S ECONOMIC FUTURE: PROGRESS UPDATE [Item 10]

The Leader stated that work to deliver on Surrey's economic ambitions was underway and progress was central to Surrey's economic recovery as we emerged from the constraints and impacts of the COVID 19 Pandemic. The report sets out the emerging priority actions within the Delivery Programme, highlights areas where action has already begun and proposes a further update, including performance indicators, is brought back to Cabinet in six months. It was important to upskill people with a clear focus on youth unemployment. Going forward there would be job opportunities in the green

economy and health and social care sector. The report sets building blocks for reimagining the high street and Surrey's towns for the future.

A member commented that even though there had been a decline and closures on the high street smaller traders had seen an increase in business because of this.

RESOLVED:

1. That the progress being made in delivering on the ambitions of Surrey's Economic Future Strategy be noted.
2. That a progress update be received in six months.

Reason for decision:

Work to deliver on Surrey's economic ambitions is underway and progress is central to Surrey's economic recovery as we emerge from the constraints and impacts of the COVID 19 Pandemic. The actions being taken will drive economic recovery and embed resilience for Surrey businesses and residents, with a particular emphasis on ensuring that everyone is able to benefit from economic growth and therefore it is important that Cabinet have oversight of progress.

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

**90/21 SURREY STREET DESIGN GUIDE: HEALTHY STREETS FOR SURREY
[Item 11]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Highways who explained that the Council has commissioned 'Create Streets' to refresh and update the Council's street design guidance. The existing guidance is incorporated as one of the chapters and Technical Appendix of 'Surrey Design', which was produced to promote the high-quality design of new developments in the County. The new guidance will primarily be used to notify the Council's street design expectations in respect of new developments; however, it will also be used to guide works on existing highway infrastructure, where relevant. The report consists of a progress update in respect of the ongoing work and also seeks permission from the Cabinet to undertake stakeholder engagement. The refreshed approach to street design will support active travel and movement, seek to enrich the County's biodiversity and to support happy, healthy and sustainable lives. In doing so, this work will help to deliver the 'tackling health inequality' and 'enabling a greener future' dial up areas.

RESOLVED:

1. That the work undertaken by Create Streets - the latest draft of 'Healthy Streets for Surrey' be noted.
2. That the aims and objectives of the draft guidance be supported.
3. That stakeholder engagement be authorised.

Reason for decision:

Surrey County Council has a significant role in the design and implementation of new development, particularly in respect of streets specifically and transportation in general. As such, the County Council as the local Highway Authority advises the county's Boroughs and Districts on the transportation implications of applications for planning permission. The Surrey Street Design Guide, 'Healthy Streets for Surrey,' is being produced in order to assist developers, the Boroughs and Districts and the community to understand what the County Council will be seeking when considering proposals. The aim is to deliver high quality, attractive, safe, accessible and sustainable development.

Before the County Council finalises this approach, it wishes to share it with stakeholders to give them the opportunity to comment on and to influence the guide, with the ultimate aim of achieving well-designed places.

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

91/21 ACQUISITION OF LAND IN SUPPORT OF THE RIVER THAMES SCHEME [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change explained that the decision recommended in the report would contribute to enabling the Council, in partnership with the Environment Agency, to progress the River Thames Scheme. A financial contribution of £237m had been invested in the scheme. The purchase of the land in advance of submission of a Development Consent Order (DCO) application provides the opportunity for Surrey County Council and the Environment Agency to obtain land through agreement for the scheme. Forward purchasing also averts the risk of land disposal by current landowners possibly into small parcels that would make future purchase potentially more complex and expensive. The purchase of this land provides an opportunity to provide green infrastructure for the enjoyment of residents in Spelthorne, which is underserved by the Council's Countryside Estate.

The impacts from the flooding in Surrey in 2014 had been devastating so the proposals in the report were strongly supported. Members were in support of the purchase of the land adding that the Scheme would not only benefit people living close to the river but also have wider benefits for all Surrey residents. The Leader added that the investment in the Scheme had been the single largest investment the council had made.

RESOLVED:

1. That the freehold purchase of land off Chertsey Road, Shepperton, as outlined in the Part 2 of this paper for the purposes of the River Thames Scheme be approved.

Reason for decision:

The decision recommended by this report will contribute to enabling the Council, in partnership with the Environment Agency, to progress the River Thames Scheme – a major infrastructure project that will reduce the risk of flooding from the Thames for communities in Runnymede and Spelthorne. It will achieve this through the construction of two new channel sections to divert water away from the Thames and additional capacity improvements to Sunbury, Molesey and Teddington weirs.

To construct the channel sections, it will be necessary to purchase land and to formalise agreements with third party landowners.

A forward purchase of land, in advance of submission of a Development Consent Order (DCO) application provides the opportunity for Surrey County Council and the Environment Agency to obtain land through agreement for the scheme. Forward purchasing also averts the risk of land disposal by current landowners possibly into small parcels that would make future purchase potentially more complex and expensive.

In addition, the purchase of this land provides an opportunity to provide green infrastructure for the enjoyment of residents in Spelthorne, which is underserved by the Council's Countryside Estate which provides 10,000 acres of high-quality landscape and recreational space across the county but in Spelthorne, is limited to Sheepwalk Lake. The area known as Chertsey Meads on the opposite side of the river, complements the site linked on both sides to the Thames Path, a 184 mile long national walking trail, which provides an opportunity for a circular route within the site and an additional attraction for visitors to explore along the river.

Since the landscape quality of the site is currently low, there is a high net biodiversity value to be gained from managing the site to maximise value delivered by new wetland, woodland and grasslands.

Approving the purchase of the land will allow Surrey County Council to support both the River Thames Scheme project and the Greener Futures priority objective.

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

92/21 2020/21 MONTH 11 (FEBRUARY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 13]

As at February 2021 the Council was forecasting a full-year £3.3m underspend, an improvement of £1.1m from the previous month. The £3.3m underspend consists of a projected £2.3m overspend on Covid-19 and a projected £5.6m underspend on Business as Usual. The Cabinet Member highlighted some of the budgetary achievements made throughout the year including council tax being kept to a minimum and reserves increasing. As of 9 April, the council had produced a balance budget for the year. Huge thanks was given to the finance team for their hard work throughout the year.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year be noted.

Reason for Decision:

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]

93/21 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 14]

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.

94/21 ACQUISITION OF LAND IN SUPPORT OF THE RIVER THAMES SCHEME [Item 15]

The purchase price for the freehold land was agreed by Cabinet and the purchase of the land via the means detailed in the report was agreed as most suitable.

RESOLVED:

1. That the purchase of the freehold land at a price of [E-10-21], plus stamp duty costs of [E-10-21], and legal, surveying and site transaction costs be approved.

Reason for decision:

See Minute 91/21.

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

95/21 PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE PROVISION OF TEMPORARY RESOURCE [Item 16]

The Leader introduced a Part 2 report containing information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

RESOLVED:

See Exempt Minute [E-11-21]

Reason for decision:

See Exempt Minute [E-11-21]

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

96/21 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 17]

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

Meeting closed at 03:12pm

Chairman