



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



Agenda and Reports
for the meeting of
THE COUNTY COUNCIL
to be held on
11 OCTOBER 2022

Woodhatch Place
Reigate
Surrey

Friday, 30 September 2022

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, 11 October 2022, 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:** For those Members wishing to participate, Prayers will be said at 9.50am. The Reverend Richard Wilson, Vicar of St Mary's Church, Reigate, has kindly consented to officiate. If any Members wish to take time for reflection, meditation, alternative worship or other such practice prior to the start of the meeting, alternative space can be arranged on request by contacting Democratic Services.*

There will be a very short interval between the conclusion of Prayers and the start of the meeting to enable those Members and Officers who do not wish to take part in Prayers to enter the Council Chamber and join the meeting.

***Note 2:** This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chair 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. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Amelia Christopher on 07929 725663 or via the email address above.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chair to report apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES

(Pages
13 - 50)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12 July 2022.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or

- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest

- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)

- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

4 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

HM Queen Elizabeth II

At this first County Council meeting since the decease of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, I ask, those who can, stand and join me in a minute's silence of respect and reflection.

On 12 September, I read a copy of the Proclamation of the Accession of His Majesty King Charles III on behalf of Surrey County Council. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those Members, officers and staff that attended, whether in person or virtually.

God Save the King! (Members repeat: God Save the King!)

My thanks to my Office, all those staff of the County Council and the emergency services for all their hard work and extra hours in making sure the Council showed proper respect and observances during the period of mourning of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II and the proclamation of King Charles III across the county's services.

David Ivison - former County Councillor

During the summer break we heard about the death of a former colleague, David Ivison. David served as a county councillor from 2005 to 2017 for the division of Heatherside and Parkside, amongst other posts held during his tenure, David was Chair of the Surrey County Council Transport Select Committee. Our condolences to his family and friends.

For those that can, please stand for a moment's reflection in respect of our past colleague.

Rosemary Scott - former County Councillor

Former county councillor Rosemary Scott has also very sadly passed away. Rosemary was a local and long serving county councillor for the old Ashford East division. Her family were by her side when she passed. Rosemary will be fondly remembered.

For those that can, please stand for a moment's reflection in respect of our past colleague.

Alison Todd (née Griffiths) - County Councillor

It is with great sadness to have to inform you of the recent death of Surrey County Council Councillor Alison Todd. Alison had been ill for quite some time and many of us knew this but it has still come as a shock to many colleagues and friends. Alison was a hardworking, amazing and giving colleague and a good friend to many. Our hearts go out to her family and to all her colleagues and staff who will be deeply saddened that we have lost such a kind and talented person.

Alison joined Surrey County Council in 2017. During her time as a councillor, she served as Deputy Cabinet Member for Health between May 2019 and May 2021; prior to that she was the Deputy Cabinet Member for All-Age learning from May 2018 to April 2019.

Alison was a dedicated Councillor for several years. She was a staunch advocate for the residents of Sunbury & Ashford Common and her death will come as a bitter blow to her community. Her passion for doing the right thing by her residents and getting things done shone through.

Tributes have poured in from colleagues across the council, describing Alison as a 'wonderful woman, liked by colleagues from across the political spectrum' and highlighting how hard working and dedicated she was to helping people.

Alison leaves behind her four children Dean, Chloe, James and Jade, her five grandchildren and devoted husband, Phil. Our condolences to her family and friends.

For those that can, please stand for a minute's silence in respect of our colleague.

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service

I wish to thank the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, who were much in demand over the summer period in which we experienced unusually hot weather and drought. And of course, to add our thanks to all emergency

services in the county along with our community resilience teams, who together responded to incidents brought about by the extreme weather.

In July Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) were called to a wildfire at Hankley Common, Tilford. On arrival they were faced with a rapidly spreading fire, made worse by the strong winds and tinder-dry conditions. Crews worked tirelessly to control the fire and prevent it from spreading into surrounding properties. During one of the many briefings to the Ministry of Defence (MoD), SFRS asked if they could make use of a helicopter with water dropping facilities. The following morning a multi-agency meeting was held, and just three hours later the helicopter had arrived on scene and dropped its first 1,000 litres of water. Thanks to joint efforts from Surrey Police, the MoD and Landmark Support Services the helicopter continued to fly between Frensham Great Pond and Hankley Common, making 120 drops totalling over 120,000 litres of water with pin-point accuracy.

This collaborative working took some of the strain off already stretched resources, allowing them to be re-deployed to provide much needed cover during what was an exceptional hot and dry period. Following the success of deploying the helicopter SFRS are developing policies and procedures to allow us to consider its use at future wildfires.

Young Mayor & Youth Project Fund

Members you will recall, I hope, Surrey Young Mayor's Youth Project Fund (YMYPF). The fund was set up to support youth-led social action projects as well as charities that benefit Surrey's young people. Thanks to the generous support of our Members who provided the funding, this year Surrey's Young Mayor, Natalie Wingfield, has been able to support several outstanding projects and charities, including Surrey Heath Youth Council, Blossom, Momentum, Challengers, Wheels For All and Leatherhead Youth Projects.

Natalie has asked that I pass on her sincere thanks to Members and ask for their continued support with the YMYPF - helping to inspire more youth social action, fund more amazing youth charities and show support for the future of the Surrey Young Mayor role.

If you would like further information about the Young Mayor, the Youth Project Fund or how you could lend further support, please do contact my Office.

During the summer break and the last month, I carried on Chair's business by hosting events here at Woodhatch Place and supporting charitable events across the county as well as visiting charitable organisations. Most of this can be found on my social media pages.

5 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader to make a statement.

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

6 CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

(Pages
51 - 60)

Council is asked to note the Leader's changes to Cabinet Portfolios.

Council is asked to note a number of further appointments to vacant committee seats.

7 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

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

(Note: Notice of questions in respect of the above item on the agenda must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Democratic Services by 12 noon on Wednesday 5 October 2022).

2. Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios.

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

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions.

8 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

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

(Note: Notice of statements must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Democratic Services by 12 noon on Monday 10 October 2022).

9 ORIGINAL MOTIONS

Item 9 (i)

Bernie Muir (Epsom West) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes:

- This Government's long-term vision for transforming social care through reforms which include a cap on care costs of £86,000, a more generous means-test, a shift towards a 'fair' cost of care, and the ability for residents who arrange and fund their own care to ask their local authority to do it on their behalf.
- The consensus amongst local authorities and commentators, including the work undertaken by Newton Europe on behalf of the County Councils Network (CCN), that the £3.6bn allocated for Charging Reforms & Fair Cost of Care is substantially below the true likely cost of implementing such reforms.

- With uncertainty on whether the three-year Spending Review will proceed, financial planning in Surrey, as well as other councils up and down the country is taking place in the dark.
- The scale of additional cost impact represents a very real threat to the sustainability of the Council's finances if sufficient new funding is not provided by the Government to cover the cost of the new burdens on Surrey County Council.

This Council further notes:

- That 60% of Older People receiving Adult Social Care (ASC) services in Surrey currently privately fund their own care and will often purchase additional or enhanced services that are above meeting a person's Care Act eligible needs.
- That the Council will need to fund care for more people due to the increases to the capital threshold limits and as people reach the care cap. The changes apply to all people but will primarily impact older people.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Re-affirm its continued commitment to working with central government to seek sufficient resources and a fair distribution for Surrey, in order to meet current system pressures and fully fund reforms across the decade.
- II. Continue to push for the delay and phased implementation of charging reforms beyond 2023 to provide Surrey County Council with sufficient time to transform its operating models and prepare for effective implementation.
- III. Help ensure the development of Integrated Care Systems leads to a meaningful integration of health and social care.
- IV. Support the continued investment in public health to maximise the role councils can play in reducing health inequalities.
- V. Reinforce our commitment of tackling health inequalities across Surrey, ensuring no one is left behind.

Item 9 (ii)

John O'Reilly (Hersham) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes:

- That the Local Government Boundary Commission for England is currently undertaking a boundary review of Surrey, the recommendations of which will be implemented for the 2025 election.

This Council further notes:

- This Council's strong support for the retention of single member electoral divisions, as a way of maintaining clear democratic accountability and community connectiveness, in a county where many divisions already cover large geographical areas.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Write to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to state its request to retain single member divisions in the forthcoming boundary review.

Item 9 (iii)

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

This Council notes that:

- Surrey's current Draft Capital Programme is oversubscribed against the affordability criteria.
- When Your Fund Surrey (YFS) was set up, the financial landscape of the United Kingdom was very different.
- YFS does not rely on funds that the Council already has, but instead, the council borrows the money at rapidly increasing interest rates which will impact on Revenue going forward.
- The value of the applications received for YFS already exceeds £100million.
- Residents have said in the budget survey that they support shifting investment to early intervention and prevention. This is in line with the current leadership motto of "no one left behind".
- There have been very few applications from the most deprived areas of Surrey, and none have yet been successful. In contrast there have been a significant number of applications from the most affluent areas (the top 20% in terms of affluence).
- As of the end of June successful bids have all come from the top 30% of areas in Surrey.

This Council resolves to call upon the Cabinet:

- I. Once the total amount of YFS grants approved reaches £20m, or such lower figure as Cabinet may decide by no later than 31 December 2022, to pause further YFS approvals.

- II. During that period of pause to refocus YFS to better align with the Council's priorities, the current financial challenges and the feedback from the residents in the budget survey.

Item 9 (iv)

Jonathan Essex (Redhill East) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes that:

- Advertising is successful in encouraging demand for the products advertised. For example, research by Purpose Disruptors showed that the UK advertising sector, through increased product sales had the impact of increasing UK carbon emissions by 28% (186 MtCO₂) in 2019. Similarly, research by the New Weather Institute indicates that the carbon emissions resulting from the increased demand, for cars in the EU, generated by advertising, are more than Belgium's total greenhouse gas emissions.
- The [2022](#) Climate Mitigation Report published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) highlighted the potential for behaviour change to support carbon emission reductions. It lists regulation of advertising as an example of a policy measure that can have a "*major influence on mitigative capacity*".
- In an Attitudes to Advertising poll in the UK by Opinium Research in 2022 of 2000 people, 68% of UK adults said they would support restrictions on advertising of environmentally harmful products.
- Advertising prohibitions and restrictions already exist; these include prohibition on advertising all tobacco products and e-cigarettes, guns and offensive weapons, 'obscene material'. Rules also affect marketing aimed at children; high fat sugar and salt products; medical and health claims.

This Council believes that:

- Banning advertising does not ban the products themselves; people are still free to buy the products.
- Surrey County Council has committed to work in partnership to reduce carbon emissions across Surrey. A baseline report by Surrey University on behalf of the Surrey Climate Commission showed the extent of scope 3 emissions (in what we buy and import from outside of Surrey). One area where these can be reduced in Surrey is through the impact of advertising in public spaces.
- Some advertising content undermines the Council's objectives. For example, petrol and diesel car adverts, especially for Sports Utility Vehicles, undermine air quality objectives. Airline advertising undermines carbon emission targets.

This Council resolves to call upon the Cabinet:

- I. To amend its Advertising and Sponsorship Policy to ban advertisements specifically for fossil fuel companies, flights, petrol and diesel vehicles, and wording the amendment to ban other as yet unidentified high carbon products.
- II. To implement this revised Advertising and Sponsorship Policy internally and wherever possible promote its adoption by other partners committed to Surrey's Climate Change Strategy. This should include restricting advertising of high carbon products on bus stops, billboards and advertising spaces, plus all publications by Surrey County Council.

Item 9 (v)

Liz Townsend (Cranleigh & Ewhurst) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council acknowledges that:

The Cabinet is scheduled to agree 'A County Wide Strategic Approach To Accommodation, Homes And Housing Needs In Surrey'.

This Council notes that:

Housing is not a core responsibility of the County Council.

This Council requests that:

The Cabinet's forthcoming strategy prioritises bringing forward key worker and affordable housing on its own land as a matter of priority and to suspend activities that are already under the statutory control of district and borough councils.

- | | | |
|-----------|--|--------------------|
| 10 | SELECT COMMITTEES' REPORT TO COUNCIL | (Pages
61 - 64) |
| | For Members to note the headline activity of the Council's overview and scrutiny function in the period April to September 2022 asking questions of Scrutiny Chairs as necessary. | |
| 11 | GOVERNANCE CHANGES - LOCAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES | (Pages
65 - 70) |
| | That Council approves the transferring of non-executive functions of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) from the Local and Joint Committees, the ceasing of the Local Committees, and serving notice of Council's intention to withdraw from the Joint Committees. | |
| 12 | AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION | (Pages
71 - 74) |
| | It is the Council's responsibility to approve changes to the Council's Constitution. This includes the Scheme of Delegation regarding non-executive functions, while amendments to executive functions are the responsibility of the Leader and are brought to County Council to note. | |

This report sets out proposed changes to the Constitution's Standing Orders and also includes executive and non-executive functions set out in the Scheme of Delegation and these are brought to Council for information and formal approval.

These changes are brought to Council in accordance with Articles 4.09, 5.02 and 11.02 of the Council's Constitution.

13 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Pages
75 - 80)

To receive the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 26 July 2022 and 27 September 2022.

14 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS

(Pages
81 - 96)

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 10 October 2022.

(To follow: Minutes, Cabinet - 27 September 2022)

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 Chair 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 AT
WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY,
RH2 8EF, ON 12 JULY 2022 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE
COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

Helyn Clack (Chair)
Saj Hussain (Vice-Chair)

Maureen Attewell	Rachael Lake
Ayesha Azad	* Victor Lewanski
Catherine Baart	David Lewis (Cobham)
Steve Bax	David Lewis (Camberley West)
John Beckett	Scott Lewis
Jordan Beech	Andy Lynch
Luke Bennett	Andy MacLeod
Amanda Boote	Ernest Mallett MBE
* Liz Bowes	Michaela Martin
Natalie Bramhall	* Jan Mason
Stephen Cooksey	Steven McCormick
Colin Cross	Cameron McIntosh
Clare Curran	Julia McShane
Nick Darby	* Sinead Mooney
Fiona Davidson	Carla Morson
* Paul Deach	Bernie Muir
Kevin Deanus	Mark Nuti
Jonathan Essex	John O'Reilly
Robert Evans	Tim Oliver
Chris Farr	Rebecca Paul
Paul Follows	George Potter
Will Forster	Catherine Powell
John Furey	* Penny Rivers
Matt Furniss	John Robini
Angela Goodwin	Becky Rush
Jeffrey Gray	Tony Samuels
Tim Hall	Joanne Sexton
David Harmer	Lance Spencer
Nick Harrison	Lesley Steeds
Edward Hawkins	Mark Sugden
* Marisa Heath	* Richard Tear
Trefor Hogg	* Alison Todd
Robert Hughes	Chris Townsend
Jonathan Hulley	Liz Townsend
Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Denise Turner-Stewart
Frank Kelly	Hazel Watson
Riasat Khan	Jeremy Webster
Robert King	Buddhi Weerasinghe
Eber Kington	Fiona White
	Keith Witham

*absent

45/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [ITEM 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Liz Bowes, Paul Deach, Marisa Heath, Victor Lewanski, Jan Mason, Sinead Mooney, Penny Rivers, Richard Tear, Alison Todd.

46/22 MINUTES [ITEM 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 24 May 2022 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

47/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [ITEM 3]

There were none.

48/22 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [ITEM 4]

The Chair:

- Noted that her full announcements could be found in the Council agenda front sheet.

49/22 LEADER'S STATEMENT [ITEM 5]

George Potter arrived at 10.05 am.

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Referring to the Surrey Pay Policy Statement 2022/2023 and in light of the cost-of-living crisis, welcomed the percentage increase to be granted to the Council's staff on the lower end of the pay scale.
- Despite the Council's recent contact with Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC), noted concern by the lack of any increase in over ten years in the 45p per mile travel allowance and noted that there seemed to be an unwillingness to argue for the urgent changes needed.
- Welcomed the announcement of early engagement with Members on the 2023/24 budget, however further detail on the Council's pressures and efficiencies and detail from the Government on the adult social care costs remained unclear.
- That whilst the Local and Joint Committees would be discontinued, the detail on their replacement had yet to be agreed.
- Welcomed the increase in Member's allocation for highways for their division, however noted that the changes were confusing.
- Understood the need to review Home to School Transport, however noted disappointment in the recent delays and the delay in Member involvement concerning the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange work.
- Welcomed the recent email from the Cabinet Member concerning the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) timing, however noted that Surrey's residents faced being left behind.
- Regarding the recent water damage at Quadrant Court, queried whether the Council should sell the building or stay, queried whether it was an example of

neglected repairs over the last fifteen years; further scrutiny was needed concerning the Agile Office Programme.

- Noted the significant resident opposition concerning the Reigate Priory Junior School and delay of at least one year for the move.
- Queried the difference in cost between the purchase of Woodhatch Place and the sale of County Hall.
- Noted the repair delays and that all children's homes must be fit for Surrey's children.
- Noted the tax cuts proposed by the national Conservative Party leadership contenders which go against what the Council has been saying cross-party that local government and public services require extra funding, particularly for social care and roads and to tackle the aging population; asked whether the Leader would be raising the issues with the leadership contenders.
- As a result of the flux in Government, asked how likely it was that the county deal and levelling up proposals would continue and what the Council's relationship should be with the district and borough councils; asked whether the Leader had spoken to the new Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities on those matters and what the Council's bargaining points were.
- That one of the last official acts of the previous Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities was to allow oil drilling in Dunsfold, previously refused by the Council's Planning and Regulatory Committee. Asked whether the Council would be lobbying the Government and new Secretary of State to reverse that decision in order to protect the Surrey Hills from oil drilling.
- Highlighted that Gatwick Airport was again consulting on its plan for a second runway after having underestimated the impact on the highway network and the economic impact of climate change. Asked the Leader for confirmation that there would be a Member briefing on the matter and that the Council's response would be shared publicly before being agreed.
- Welcomed that the Council has been improving and the ambition of no one left behind but emphasised the need for more humility from all Members in distinguishing between how far the Council has come in different areas and what is good enough on issues around Children's Services and the highways.
- Welcomed that Children's Services was no longer under threat of takeover but noted that it was a long way from Ofsted's outstanding rating and the provision of adequate places and services for children in the county, including those in care and with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).
- That with the increase in child and fuel poverty, asked what transformation was still needed and what the Council's emergency action plan was as prices rise and what role the Land and Property team would play in providing affordable homes as homelessness and food bank usage rises in Surrey.
- Welcomed the improvements in the Surrey Highways but noted that more was needed to address road safety and integrated transport to revolutionise bus fares to deliver the Surrey Transport Plan (Fourth Edition).
- Questioned whether the ongoing reorganisation would be enough to change the mindset to transform transport sufficiently to deliver the substantial reduction in carbon emissions needed across Surrey; progress on the estate and vehicle fleet risked underplaying the wider challenge across the county.
- Reiterated that it was a climate emergency and the Council needed to act, working cross-party on issues such as climate, children and roads.
- Paid tribute to the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) concerning the Surrey Heath fires, however highlighted the recent Staines fire when the fire was only put out because SFRS had to call upon the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service and the London Fire Brigade because of the cuts to and understaffing of SFRS.

- That with the delay to the Fair Funding Review, asked the Leader how or whether the Council should put pressure on Surrey's MPs and the new incoming Government to ensure that Surrey receives a fair deal so that it can better serve its residents and not have to repeat the £15 million in cuts.

50/22 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [ITEM 6]

Becky Rush left the meeting at 10.39 am.

Questions:

Notice of twenty-three questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in the supplementary agenda on 11 July 2022.

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

(Q1) Trefor Hogg noted that given the food within its use by date can often be frozen, he asked the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste to ensure that space to accommodate freezers on the Council's premises for food banks is mandated wherever possible.

Catherine Powell asked whether the Council could look to use apps such as OLIO which allow food that cannot be used on the day to be advertised online and distributed on the day to those in need free for collection.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste noted that the food service was currently contracted out to Selecta UK. She would look into Trefor Hogg's request with the Facilities Management team and would look into Catherine Powell's request.

(Q3) Robert King asked whether the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning was confident that meals and the nutrition of meals in all schools in Surrey in a year's time would be the same they are today.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning explained that both the funding and the nutrition of meals would be sustained for Surrey's children. She noted that the funding from the Department for Education was maintained for the next three years for the provision for school holidays. She highlighted that the Council continued to provide assistance to families with children eligible for free school meals during school holidays and provision had continued during the academic year. Regarding the summer holidays, families would be provided with holistic support such as supermarket vouchers and activities for children.

(Q4) Robert Evans referring to the comparative figures of the Council budget over the same period, asked whether the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources was aware that since the last census the Consumer Price Index had increased by nearly 20%. He asked how she felt that had impacted on the Council's services and budget.

In response, the Leader, in the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources' temporary absence, noted that he would ask the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources to provide a written response. The Leader noted that the Council's budgeting process considers anticipated inflation and

he noticed from the census that there had been a reduction in the number of older people in the county, which could make a difference to Adult Social Care.

(Q6) Nick Darby asked whether the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy could provide his thoughts in relation to corridors to allow resident access to the M3 and two local hospitals.

Will Forster noted that the response states that fines generated in Surrey would be retained in Surrey. He noted that was nonsensical as fines would be generated in London and sought clarification on whether fines generated by vehicles registered in Surrey should be spent in Surrey. He asked whether the Council had the legal power to create ULEZ for Surrey in the future.

David Harmer asked the Cabinet Member whether he was aware of the impact on school teachers cross-border with London, as there could be considerable chaos in the education system.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy responded to Nick Darby, noting that the ULEZ consultation was underway by Transport for London (TfL). He informed the Member that the Council would make that point about corridors particularly concerning access to hospitals and the Council could lobby them to change certain elements, however he noted that the corridors do not follow the border exactly as they give people a chance to turn around and avoid the ULEZ.

The Cabinet Member responded to Will Forster, explaining that because the fines would affect the vehicles from Surrey and neighbouring counties, he was liaising with his counterparts in the surrounding county councils bordering London to have a pan-London response. He noted that Surrey should not be paying for Londoners to be able to scrap their cars, that scheme should be extended to Surrey and the neighbouring counties because it would be those residents who would be paying for the fines to enter London. Consideration was also needed on the improvement to the cross-border public transport which was not mentioned in the consultation. The Government has extended moving traffic enforcement powers and the Council had received its moving traffic enforcement powers and would be commencing enforcement going forward.

The Cabinet Member responded to David Harmer, agreeing that it was a concern and needed to be taken into account, it would form part of the Council's general response to the consultation. He reminded Members of the Member Development session on 18 July 2022 regarding the expansion of the ULEZ, where further comments would be collated.

(Q9) Will Forster noted that less buses on some of Surrey's busiest routes was not positive. He asked what the Council's and Stagecoach's plan was to recruit more drivers to ensure that Surrey has the public transport network that it needs.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy noted that the Council was meeting with Stagecoach's senior management and director regularly. He noted that there was a driver shortage nationally, many bus drivers had a conversion on their licence allowing them to move into the HGV sector. That with the acquisition of Arriva, Stagecoach did not get the same level of drivers moving over to their company. He provided assurance that none of the Council's subsidised routes are affected as it is commercial routes operated by Stagecoach that are affected. Stagecoach had recruited an additional ten drivers recently and the Council would continue to work with them to encourage them to do more.

(Q10) Hazel Watson asked which adult education courses are being provided by East Surrey College in Mole Valley.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning noted that the Surrey Adult Learning received a very good grading from its Ofsted inspection in May and the demand for adult learning in Surrey was shifting with around a third of learning done remotely with the rest done face-to-face, compared to all face-to-face learning pre-pandemic. The Council was working with East Surrey College to explore how it can improve the opportunity and availability for adult learning and Mole Valley residents. She would look to provide a list of all of the courses available. It was the Council's ambition that Mole Valley would receive all of the of the opportunities available that are extended to the rest of Surrey.

(Q11) Lance Spencer asked the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning whether she was confident that all Ukrainian children would be found places by September when the new term begins and that sufficient resources would be available to support those children with any mental health issues they might have.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning noted that the Council recognised the additional needs and vulnerabilities of children with refugee status and additional demands placed on the schools. Schools were able to access Educational Psychology support via weekly telephone conversations and mental health support via Mindworks Surrey. The salary scale had been uplifted for Educational Psychology and the data showed that outputs exceed the capacity. She provided assurance that the Council was focusing on a long-term plan for more active engagement in early intervention.

(Q12) Robert King had no supplementary question.

David Lewis (Cobham) he asked whether the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy could advise whether Surrey Highways could look to ensure that Sat Nav systems are updated to reflect the diversion routes concerning the M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange work that have been agreed with National Highways.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy noted that he and the Member would be meeting with National Highways tomorrow to discuss the matter. He explained that Sat Navs are updated on a six-monthly basis, so it is unlikely that the diversion routes would be programmed in; however there would be the necessary signage on the roads where the diversion routes are in place. He provided assurance noting that Surrey Highways had programmed in a number of works on the local network, National Highways would have to work around those as they do not automatically get a diversion or get to choose where it goes.

Becky Rush rejoined the meeting at 10.55 am.

(Q13) Robert Evans had no supplementary question.

Catherine Powell highlighted the apparent situation occurring in Surrey where in some areas where numbers are increasing in some schools and decreasing in other schools. She asked the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning how the Council could better plan for housing developments to ensure there were places for students without breaching the maximum numbers and to ensure that all of the schools within

Surrey are protected, particularly around the borders with Hampshire and other districts and boroughs.

Jonathan Essex referred to the written response which stated that the Department for Education would not share the data of class sizes regarding academies, he asked the Cabinet Member whether the Council could ask the academies directly. As knowing the class sizes of academies and schools would help with the placement of Ukrainian refugee children over the summer, and to understand the capacity across Surrey.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning responding to Catherine Powell, clarifying that capital funding from the Government was for the provision of additional places and was not directly related to class size. She explained that additional school places were allocated through the admissions process and were not based on class sizes unless in relation to limits through infant class size legislation. She outlined the multiple reasons why classes may have more than thirty pupils in relation to nursery classes, from year three onwards there are no limits on class sizes and the School Admissions Code sets out a number of exceptions.

The Cabinet Member noted that she would take away the question from Jonathan Essex about the academies and provide a written response.

(Q14) Nick Darby welcomed that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources had written to HMRC. He asked for assurance that Members would be provided with a copy of the response as it is received.

In response, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources noted that she was happy to provide a copy of the response once received.

(Q15) Catherine Baart referring to Project Horizon, noted that although the criteria were published, the scoring for each individual scheme was not shown on the website. She asked whether the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy agreed that providing a link on the website for each individual scheme, and how it been scored would provide full transparency for the selection of the project Horizon Schemes.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy suggested having a discussion after the meeting on the matter. He noted that the Member could write to the Highways team who would be able to provide the scoring for a specific road. He was unsure of the wider benefit of publishing all the scoring information. The Highways team was about to rewrite the Project Horizon criteria, ensuring that it is in line with the Surrey Transport Plan (Fourth Edition), therefore having that discussion after the meeting would inform the Highways team on what to include going forward.

(Q16) Jonathan Essex highlighted that the response states that a team of officers was being pulled together to address the issues. Once that team was up and running, he wondered whether there could be a briefing to all councillors across Surrey: Members, borough and district councillors and parish councillors on what they were doing so all residents can be provided with support.

In response, the Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment in the Cabinet Member for Environment's absence, would discuss the matter with the Cabinet Member for Environment and would liaise with the Member.

(Q17) Robert King asked the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning whether she would look at a new informal check at point of appeal for parents by officers, as parents often fail to provide sufficient evidence at time of appeal because they do not understand the process. He also asked whether she agreed that an outstanding rated school for a child without SEND needs is often different to a child with SEND needs.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning explained that the appeals process had been thoroughly reviewed, so that parents are adequately supported and prepared. There was a new parent guide and there was officer representation within the Member cohort so that the schedule and frequency of appeals can be maintained. She noted that she would not wish to differentiate the quality of provision provided to any child within Surrey, more weight was not put on providing outstanding education for one student over another.

(Q18) Robert Evans noted confusion in the response which states that no reference was made to Surrey County Council in the article, however the article stated that more than one third of schools in Surrey had buildings in urgent need of repair and across the county 151 state-funded schools had at least one building at serious risk of imminent failure. He requested that the Cabinet Member provides a response that answers his question.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste noted that according to officers, the Surrey article refers to the national position. She noted that one school that urgently needed replacement was Reigate Priory Junior School and the Department for Education funding of £10 million had been secured for its replacement, the planning application for the new carbon net zero school proposed to be delivered on the site was submitted in June.

(Q19) Nick Darby had no supplementary question.

Steve Bax noted that Gladstone Place/Summer Road were in his division, he had been meeting with residents and officers to discuss the matter. He asked whether as divisional member he could be included in any discussions on the matter with Nick Darby.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy noted that he was happy to include Steve Bax in any discussions.

(Q20) Catherine Baart noted that the fees for auditing were agreed in 2007, she asked whether there were plans to review the hourly rate and also whether it would be possible to review existing travel plans against the Surrey Transport Plan (Fourth Edition).

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy noted that he was happy to look into the requests made.

(Q21) Jonathan Essex asked for clarification on the timeline which the team was working to, he asked when Members and residents would get to see the results or progress made on the subject of reviewing future bus provision.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy noted that the Council was in discussions with the bus operators. He explained that public consultation would be launched later this year, the new contracts and routes need to be agreed by December and January; to be in place for September 2023.

(Q22) Catherine Baart noted that when she cycles along shared pavement on the A23 she crosses twenty give way lines and drivers can see those and that they apply to cyclists. She asked whether she should be giving way to the vehicles or whether she should trust them to follow the Highway Code and give way to her. She asked whether the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy agreed that the matter was confusing and unsafe for cyclists and motorists.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy advised the Member to never assume that someone is going to give way. Regarding the Surrey Transport Plan (Fourth Edition) and changes to the Highway Code it would take time for Surrey Highways to retrofit all of its existing road network, including all the cycleways. Surrey Highways was costing up what it could do quickly across the county to start retrofitting continuous pavements and the long-term costings were being worked out.

Cabinet Member Briefings:

These were also published in the supplementary agenda on 11 July 2022.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Property and Waste: on the gasifier at the Eco Park in operation, **Nick Harrison** asked whether the county has signed it off as fully operational in accordance with the specification, particularly concerning its reliability, effectiveness and emissions.

In response, the Cabinet Member confirmed that the independent certifier had signed off the gasifier. Under the terms of the Council's agreement with Suez, it has to operate 55% of the time and it is currently operating at that level and the Environment Agency are also happy with the current limits.

Leader, and Cabinet Member for Education and Learning: on a comment made by the Leader in his response under the Leader's Statement to a comment on home to school transport appeals and that there was a delay because of Members not putting their names forward and it was a comprehensive change as the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning had outlined. **Chris Townsend** sought clarification on the matter as Members from the Residents' Association and Independent Group had put their name forward for the appeals and received no response; a later email stated that the matter was still being worked on.

In response, the Leader clarified that his point was that there was a lack of Member availability for the home to school transport hearings.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning confirmed that there was a lack of Member availability which led to delays and to the review of the whole process. She recognised that some Members did provide their availability during that process and that was followed up by Democratic Services and officers to resolve as the appeals process was being changed to provide remote accessibility for parents. That had been completed and the schedules had been set.

Deputy Cabinet Member for Children and Families: on the review of the family centres underway, **Catherine Powell** wondered when the report would be issued as a local family centre remained locked for all but two hours a week. She would like to understand what the Council was going to do to improve that situation.

In response, the Deputy Cabinet Member would take that comment away and would provide a written response.

Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy: regarding Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) and Active Travel, **Ernest Mallett MBE** asked the Cabinet Member whether he could issue Members with a table of the headings and location of the schemes which had been repeated, agreed, under consideration and refused; as residents sought information on the matter. Whilst there were proposals in Molesey, he would like to know if they had been refused or not.

In response, the Cabinet Member confirmed that a table could be provided to the Member.

Cabinet Member for Children and Families: welcomed that Members were able to make a contribution from their local allocation into the Celebration Fund for Looked After Children and Care Leavers last year. Rebecca Jennings-Evans asked whether the Cabinet Member could share with Members how money from the Celebration Fund is being used to improve the quality of life for those children.

Eber Kington referred to a comment made by the Leader in his response under the Leader's Statement that regarding Children's Services the Council was no longer inadequate, but that should not be the measure of success as it was about getting the best outcome for Surrey's children. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm whether she would also not be using Ofsted judgments as a measure of success going forward.

In response, the Cabinet Member thanked the twenty-nine Members who generously contributed some of their Members' Allocation to the Celebration Fund which is a small discretionary fund established to support Surrey's Looked After Children and Care Leavers in a variety of ways such as to pursue hobbies and to go out on trips. A large number of awards had been made during the course of the last year. She would send Members the printed annual report of the Celebration Fund. She would welcome contributions from Members for the new municipal year to the Celebration Fund.

The Chair noted that she was sure that Members would be happy to continue to contribute to this worthwhile cause.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that the general improvement of Children's Services in Surrey as she and the Leader have frequently said, is the highest priority of the Council. The Council has an ambition for outstanding services which are recognised by Ofsted and the Council had made progress in its Children's Services. She emphasised that it was not simply a journey to reach the outstanding rating to tick a box for Ofsted, but that it is the Council's journey to provide the best possible services for Surrey's children, young people and their families.

51/22 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [ITEM 7]

Clare Curran (Bookham and Fetcham West) made a statement on Mole Valley Connect, a Surrey County Council funded new demand responsive door-to-door electric minibus service. The service takes passengers to their local destination in the north of Mole Valley or to several nearby locations. She highlighted the travel times, affordable fares and accessible booking service and explained that its aims were to encourage the shift to a sustainable form of transport for shorter journeys and to keep people connected.

52/22 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [ITEM 8]

Item 8 (i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Fiona White moved:

This Council notes that:

- On 1 April 2022, Ofgem increased the energy price cap by 54 per cent.
- In light of the increased energy price cap, the average standard tariff energy bill will increase by £693 per year. The average pre-pay meter energy bill will increase by £708 per year (Ofgem, 2022).
- On 6 April 2022, the Government increased National Insurance by 1.25 percentage points, which is projected to cost the average family in Surrey an additional £600 a year.
- The Government has suspended the pensions 'triple lock' for 2022/3, meaning Surrey's over 209,000 pensioners will see a rise of 3.1 per cent this year (instead of 8.3 per cent under the triple lock formula). This year, this will cost individual pensioners in the county hundreds of pounds.
- Evidence shows that use of foodbanks across Surrey has increased by 300% compared with the same month in 2019 including use by households who are working and have never had to ask for help until now.

This Council further notes:

The decision taken in June 2022 to impose a 'Windfall Tax' on the super-profits of oil and gas companies and to redistribute this as a one-off payment of £400 to households later this year. Though the Windfall Tax is welcome, Council believes it does not go nearly far enough and the Government should be doing much more to support local people through the Cost-of-Living crisis.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Call for a Surrey Cost-of-Living Emergency Summit, with stakeholders including Citizens Advice, Surrey Welfare Rights Unit, Food Banks, Local Trades Unions and Chambers of Commerce to draw up a joint plan to alleviate the impact on Surrey residents, especially those in the most vulnerable households, and invite local MPs to attend this meeting.
- II. Welcome the increased Household Support Fund from the Government which has enabled ringfenced funding to pensioners who are struggling financially and additional support to foodbanks and voluntary, community and faith organisations.
- III. In addition to the funds in resolution II. above, to provide further funding to meet the increased demand on foodbanks and community fridges and provide more money to the Surrey Crisis Fund to expand its remit to emergency purchase of such things as fridges and washing machines.
- IV. Increase efforts to provide advice and practical help to enable residents to insulate their homes and make them more energy efficient especially those experiencing fuel poverty.

- V. Continue to review the support given to residents as the crisis deepens especially with the further increase in fuel costs in the autumn.
- VI. Call on the Government to:
 - i. immediately reduce the standard rate of VAT from 20 per cent to 17.5 per cent for one year, saving the average household in Surrey a further £600 this year.
 - ii. Immediately re-introduce the pensions triple lock to support Surrey's pensioners.
 - iii. Immediately restore the Universal Credit supplement of £20, which was cancelled by the Government in September 2021.

Fiona White made the following points:

- That the motion was triggered by conversations with a home school worker who asked about the provision of resources to help the number of families who could not afford their electricity; and with a charity running a Jigsaw Project who noted that 450 families had been referred by schools as they could not afford school uniforms for their children.
- Noted concern about the long-term problems that families and individuals would have to cope with.
- That inflation was predicted to hit 11% this financial year, energy prices are doubling in two years and ever-increasing, the country has the highest tax burden since the 1940s and the Good Company had reported an 85% increase in the use of its five food banks in Surrey since 2019.
- Turning to the resolutions, noted that it was clear that no single organisation could provide the support that was needed in Surrey, therefore a countywide summit was needed to pool resources.
- As a result of the cost-of-living crisis some families have had to use up their savings to meet day-to-day bills and cannot afford to replace a basic household appliance if it breaks.
- That the increases in interest rates meant higher mortgage payments and people had to maximise their borrowing ability to afford somewhere to live.
- That a car was essential for many people but petrol prices had reached the highest monthly increase in records dating back to 2000.
- That charities nationally reported a decrease of 4.9 million donors in 2021, before the crisis hit and that trend was likely to continue this year.
- That better insulated homes meant lower energy bills.
- That however hard the Council and the other Surrey organisations try, there was a limit to how much can be done locally to mitigate the problems, support from central Government was essential.
- Noted the uncertainty on whether the next Chancellor would stick to the promise to reintroduce the triple lock pension, pensioners generally spend a bigger proportion of their income on essentials such as food and energy and one in five UK residents reaching retirement this year would rely on the state pension as their only or main income.
- That the removal of the £20 uplift on Universal Credit should never have happened and should be restored, and the benefits increased supporting those on the lowest income levels.
- The statistics outlined in the motion did not take the human impacts into account of the current crisis on individuals and families.

The motion was formally seconded by Carla Morson, who made the following comments:

- Despite the Council's commitment to no one being left behind the reality of the current cost-of-living crisis meant that there was a danger of that unless intervention happens now, using resources to the best effect.
- Highlighted the Trussell Trust's slogan of being one meal away from breaking, new requests were coming in daily to help with food provision via the community food parcel projects and community fridge in the Ash division.
- Noted the requests to help with energy costs, people were running out of their emergency allowance and cannot afford to top their meters up.
- Noted the increasing cost of debt not just affecting the lower income groups, persistent debt problems had surged by almost a third since December last year.
- The increases in food, energy and fuel prices and debt leads to physical and mental health problems in residents due to sustained stress and would increase the cost to the Council.
- That health, welfare, care and GP services were already overburdened.
- Reiterated that no single organisation could resolve the issues all faced with the cost-of-living crisis, resources needed to be pooled and stakeholders to be engaged with.
- That supporting the resolutions would ensure that no one is left behind.

Ten Members made the following comments:

- The Leader wished that the Liberal Democrat Group would not keep putting forward motions from their head office and should focus on what was being done by the Council in Surrey.
- The Leader recognised the cost-of-living challenges outlined but noted that no solutions had been put forward other than a county-wide summit.
- The Leader noted that the extent and the depth of the Council's partnership working continued, in his Leader's Statement at the May Council AGM he had outlined what the Council was doing.
- The Leader noted that the Council had a limited ability to control the Government and he outlined the practical solutions underway in Surrey: the Council was putting more money into the Surrey Crisis Fund, helping householders across Surrey to save energy and combat rising energy prices through grants, there was a 1% rise in Council Tax ring fenced for mental health and the Mental Health Investment Fund (MHIF) was composed of £13 million, the Council had its own poverty strategy, there was a health and welfare hub, food vouchers were provided to families, the Household Support Fund was being used, £500,000 had been invested to find barriers faced by excluded groups, various employer initiatives had been set up and the pay review had been agreed with Council staff.
- Recognised the issues set out in the motion but disagreed with its political posturing, giving the impression that only the Liberal Democrat Group cared about the issues.
- That the solutions in the motion were not fully thought through.
- Questioned how the Liberal Democrat Group's leader could oppose the tax cuts being put forward by the Conservative Party contenders but then vote for a tax cut as set out in the motion.
- That the Liberal Democrats ignore the £37 billion of extra support being provided by the Government, composed of the £15 billion to help with energy bills, the cost-of-living payment, top ups on the annual winter fuel payments and

disability costs, the Household Support Fund and increase in the National Insurance contribution thresholds.

- That the motion would make the poor poorer in the long run, the Leader had outlined what the Council was doing to support residents.
- Endorsed the Leader's comments, noting that the motion did not set out how the Council might further use its resources, contacts and influence locally to make a difference, the motion promoted national political policies rather than recognising the problem for Surrey's residents.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up noted that the Council's ambition of no one is left behind was embedded into all of its work and it was more important than ever regarding the ongoing cost-of-living crisis.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up highlighted that the Council was one of the first to launch a childhood poverty strategy, which seeks to address the underlying root causes of poverty.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up noted that the Council has a variety of support schemes in place to deliver on its ambitions, many of which rely on a strong working relationship with the voluntary sector.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up highlighted one example where the Council has effectively partnered with charities to meet the challenge faced, the Period Dignity initiative with Binti International where around 1,000 items had been received and no further funding was needed over the £1,500 initial investment.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up highlighted another example, the Winter Poverty Fund of £200,000 that was set-up through the Community Foundation for Surrey to support organisations seeking to tackle the impact of rising costs and the root causes of poverty.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up noted that much was being done already by the Council to support Surrey's residents and therefore the motion was unnecessary. The Council's priority should be to continue to deliver this support while thinking innovatively, working with its partners.
- That regarding national issues, on the one hand Conservative Group Members take credit for the achievements of the Conservative Party Government or state how they have been lobbying the Government; however they denounce issues which they seem less concerned about as national issues which have nothing to do with the Council, yet issues raised such as in the motion are both local and national issues.
- That energy bills alone would rise to £270 per month in October for the average household and many were struggling with payments; Universal Credit for those under 25 years old to cover all costs was £260 a month.
- Acknowledged that the Council has done a great deal to support residents, however asked whether the Council was saying that there was nothing more that can be done, if so that was absurd and obscene.
- Noted that the motion was asking for some simple common-sense changes, those who did not like all of the motion could amend it.
- Noted that getting together with stakeholders across the county to come up with better ideas of working together was crucial.
- Noted that even if the motion is voted down, the borough and district councils, the town and parish councils would continue to help its communities.
- Regarding the comments made on political game playing, highlighted the difference between those politicians that recognise that issues cut across all levels and seek to use every avenue of opportunity to do address them; whilst other politicians shun their responsibility.
- That the cost-of-living crisis affected the entire country and county, to call the details of the motion nonsense was insulting and the practical issues that have

been outlined in the motion are positive steps that could be taken on by the Council.

- Agreed with the aspiration that no one should be left behind but noted that people were being left behind in light of the highest inflation for forty years, the highest taxes for seventy years, high fuel costs, gas and electricity bills in some cases had tripled and people were consumed with debt.
- That to understand the situation of those struggling one must walk in their shoes, despite all the help from the Government and the Council people were still struggling.
- That it was up to the Council to put party political disputes aside and to work together for all of Surrey's residents.
- Highlighted that Waverley Borough Council had convened a body to bring people together on the matter, hoped the Council would step up in the same way.
- That as the matter is of such significance, the various stakeholders need to meet specifically to tackle the crisis.
- That the Council's administration does a gross disservice to its residents by dismissing motions because of political differences.
- Speaking as chair of a local charity focused on the relief of poverty, had been working with the issues related to multiple deprivation since the 1970s and had witnessed destitution around the world.
- Noted personal support provided to a local food bank cooking nutritious meals every Sunday to those who need it; the local food bank also provided counselling, companionship, practical help and signposting.
- That a lack of money was a symptom of deprivation, it was not the only cause; whilst providing immediate relief to issues such as food poverty was vital, simply throwing money at the problem would be a neglect of the Council's responsibilities as Council Tax would have to further increase.
- That more needed to be done locally to tackle the root causes of deprivation, changing life chances leading to the long-term defeat of the inequalities that cause deprivation.
- Asked each Member to consider their own personal responsibility to provide the local leadership needed to remove the root causes of poverty.
- Urged the motion's proposer to read on the terms of reference of the One Surrey Growth Board, a multi-stakeholder body set up by the Council to map out and tackle the challenges facing Surrey such as inequality and inclusion and those issues listed in the motion.
- That the Council would continue to lead from the front and was committed to protecting the most vulnerable residents across the county through the MHIF and over £800,000 from Your Fund Surrey had been provided to communities across Surrey.
- Noted disappointment with the Leader's comment that he and the Conservative Group would oppose the motion which did acknowledge what the Council had done, to dismiss the motion would be an error as it could be amended to remove references to national politics.
- That the request to have a cost-of-living summit was important and aligned to the ambition of leaving no one behind, best practice could be shared across organisations and that the administration would regret that by not agreeing to the motion.

The Chair asked Fiona White, as proposer of the motion to conclude the debate, she made the following comments:

- Noted disappointment at some of the responses to the motion particularly where it has been dismissed as a political motion, too often politicians say that they recognise the problem and that enough was being done to address it; yet examples given in support of the motion highlighted that what the Council was doing was not enough as many were in desperate situations.
- Noted that she was proud that it was a Liberal Democrat motion as it was about people, their needs and protecting them.
- Noted that it would be impossible to deal with the cost-of-living crisis without some element of national politics.
- Reiterated the point made about Universal Credit not covering the cost of energy bills, before even other necessities of life could be paid for.
- Noted that she did not see Citizens Advice or many voluntary organisations on the membership list of the One Surrey Growth Board despite the fact that they help people daily through some of the issues raised.
- Reminded the Council of its policy of no one left behind, yet the Council was leaving people behind; careful consideration was needed on the matter.

The motion was put to the vote with 19 Members voting For, 40 voting Against and 12 Abstentions.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

The motion was lost.

Item 8 (ii)

Chris Townsend left the meeting at 12.04 pm.

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Will Forster moved:

This Council notes that:

It regrets that the Council will not be supporting Surrey's Local and Joint Committees after 31 October 2022.

Discussions have started between Borough and District Councils and the Council about the potential replacement for Local and Joint Committees. However, these discussions are at an early stage and there are currently no firm proposals.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Call on the Cabinet to continue to provide support to a Local or Joint Committee until a corresponding replacement has been implemented in that Borough or District.

Will Forster made the following points:

- That the Liberal Democrat Group does not want Local and Joint committees to stop operating, which was likely to happen later in the year.
- The ask was for the Council to continue supporting those until each replacement was agreed.

- That Local and Joint Committees had been in place since 2002 and were established by the Council as a way to build relationships within the borough and district councils and Members.
- Emphasised that Local and Joint Committees were about bringing decisions closer to local residents and enabling local people to raise concerns around key issues such as highways, education or climate.
- That four years ago the Council did a survey on what Members and residents thought of Local and Joint Committees, Members thought that they were a good forum for discussing local priorities and strategies, they were good at local decision making and partnership working and they were effective at engaging the public.
- That despite the positives of Local and Joint Committees, the Cabinet wants to stop them operating and have a different approach.
- Highlighted that there were no firm plans and Local and Joint Committees had not been consulted on any proposals, nor had there been a public consultation on what the new system would look like.
- That the Local and Joint Committees should be kept going to avoid a gap in provision as it would take time to consult with the borough and district councils and residents, there were key public facing bodies where residents can ask questions and Members can work with the borough and district councils.

The motion was formally seconded by John Robini, who made the following comments:

- Highlighted that Local and Joint Committees have for many years been a local meeting place for residents and councillors to air their views and communicate matters concerning the local community.
- Agreed that the Local and Joint Committees in their current form needed to change but not abolished, as too often discussions were made remotely with few opportunities for local input from residents.
- That Local and Joint Committees should be allowed to work out how they would continue in their best interests for the future and they need some support in this interim period.
- Emphasised that the Local and Joint Committees were too valuable an asset to be allowed to fail by default in the absence of any future plan for them.
- Pleaded that the Council works with the Members, borough and district councillors and residents on the Local and Joint Committees, which are one of the most important communications tool that the Council has for local issues.

Robert Evans left the meeting at 12.08 pm.

Nine Members made the following comments:

- The Cabinet Member for Communities implored the Council to move on and look forwards, as Local and Joint Committees had not been effectual for the last few years, they were constitutionally cumbersome, outdated and alienated residents.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities stressed that residents want the Council to communicate, listen, change, understand the issues that concern them, to take action and be more proactive and less restricted in its approach; the Council was progressive and had taken action.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities noted that the Council has embarked on a ground-breaking approach to engagement through a variety of tools, which

aim to put residents and Surrey's communities first and to encourage them to engage.

- The Cabinet Member for Communities highlighted that new Community Link Officers would work with Members across divisions, building relationships with external partners, borough and district councils and communities.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities highlighted that the recent Member Development Session on Community Engagement was generally well received cross-party and had explained how the changes would work and the reasons for the changes.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities noted that the Council was channelling its efforts and resources on the new approach, it was nonsensical to prolong the inevitable as having removed the highways decision making process the Local and Joint committees have no value.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities noted that the new approach was not a replacement for the Local and Joint Committees but was a brand new way of working.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities noted that a strategy was being worked on to build a community style forum which would coordinate partners including the borough and district councils, health colleagues, charities and volunteer groups; and would be shared in due course.
- The Cabinet Member for Children and Families noted that having been a Member of the Council, and member of the Mole Valley Local Committee for a number of years and its chairman previously, could not say that that Local Committee had made any contribution to the improvement of the delivery of services by the Council in the local community.
- The Cabinet Member for Children and Families noted that last year a number of members of the Mole Valley Local Committee had put forward the north of Mole Valley to the Communities Engagement team to be a pilot area for a local engagement initiative to run in parallel with the Local Committee. Following wide-ranging engagement across the community, positive discussions were had on the collective ambitions and priorities and on wide-ranging issues; and the initiative had met in a different and informal way.
- Emphasised that it was not a political motion but a basic operational one.
- Asked whether the Cabinet Member for Communities could share all of the engagement he has had with Waverley residents to come to the conclusions that he alluded to in relation to the Waverley Local Committee.
- Agreed with the Leader that the Local and Joint Committees were in need of reform and applauded the Council and the Leader for recognising the issues and addressing them; however there were no firm plans nor replacements.
- Thanked two fellow divisional Members for Waverley for their proactive and early engagement with him and Waverley Borough Council on the matter.
- Acknowledged that the Local and Joint Committees had flaws, however they were one of the few areas that allow residents to engage formally and locally with county processes in a structured way where actions can be pursued.
- That it was a shame that the Local and Joint Committees do not work as well in some areas as they do in others.
- That the Local and Joint Committees provide a forum to hear petitions and for interaction between Members and borough and district councillors.
- That the Local and Joint Committees were important and the decision to scrap them was causing a lot of local concern.
- That the motion made a straightforward request of not reviewing the decision made, but to simply extend the current practices until a firm replacement is established to ensure a proper transition.

- Noted that Local and Joint Committees could and should have been part of the process to deal with their own reform or at the very least have been briefed properly about what those changes would be.
- Accepted that the future way of working has been proposed, but the question was what happens moving forwards, noting that the Guildford Joint Committee as its last meeting discussed the issue of an air quality management area for Guildford Town Centre.
- That there were many issues across Members' divisions which have county and as well as district and borough implications.
- That having a mechanism where stakeholders can get together in public - where discussions take place transparently - with the ability for public participation was vital.
- That irrespective of whether the Council wishes to engage with the process or not, in many areas replacements of some form would be set-up and in the absence of firm plans the simple ask was for the Council's continued support to the current Local and Joint Committees to enable them to carry on with their business.
- That as Vice-Chairman of the Waverley Local Committee, took exception to the description of the Local Committee from the Leader as being tired and outdated; whilst it did need reform, it was highly valued and ways were being looked into of continuing it in association with the borough council.
- That as the fairly long-standing Chairman of the Mole Valley Local Committee, regretted that the system was now broken, reduced to a question time and the leader of Mole Valley District Council refusing to discuss issues such as the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money and the Transform Leatherhead project with the Local Committee and Members.
- Reiterated the local engagement underway in the north of Mole Valley as an alternative to the Local Committee, engagement and items of discussion were wide-ranging; thanked the partnership team who came to Bookham Village Day and had facilitated several events.
- That having previously chaired the Surrey Heath Local Committee on average there would be around eight residents which was considerably more than most of the other Local and Joint Committees; with only two residents attending a presentation from the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service.
- Highlighted the continued lack of consultation with the existing Local and Joint Committee chairmen and vice-chairmen.
- That having missed the Member Development Session along with two other chairmen, was still awaiting the invitation along with those chairmen to have a separate session.
- Asked whether there would be a guarantee that a viable alternative would be up and running by October, if not what further guidance would Members and borough and district councillors be receiving to fill the void.
- That as the newly established Chairman of the Guildford Joint Committee and having attended many Local and Joint Committee meetings over the years; felt sorry for Mole Valley because it seemed as though that they had not made the most of their Local Committee.
- That Covid-19 had an impact on the attendance to the Local and Joint Committees and that was still being rebuilt.
- Highlighted that a positive example at the Guildford Local Committee - since replaced by the Guildford Joint Committee - was when it held its meetings within the local villages and communities, meetings were well attended.
- That despite having attended the Member Development Session, did not fully understand what would replace the Local and Joint Committees, the motion

outlined that the current Local and Joint Committees should remain until there was a tried and tested substitute in place and working.

The Chair asked Will Forster, as proposer of the motion to conclude the debate, he made the following comments:

- Concluded that the system should not be thrown out before there was a replacement, which there was not.
- Hoped there would be a consultation on the replacements otherwise it looked like this administration was hiding from its residents and running away from the borough and district councils that it tried to abolish a couple of years ago.

The motion was put to the vote with 30 Members voting For, 39 voting Against and 1 Abstention.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

The motion was lost.

Item 8 (iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Lance Spencer moved:

This Council notes:

Surrey County Council has a Greener Future Delivery Plan to tackle climate change. This will transform the lives of Surrey residents. The two main areas for climate action in Surrey relate to buildings and transport as follows:

These are:

1. Reduce energy demand through retrofitting buildings including social, private rented and owner-occupied housing, public sector buildings (e.g. schools, NHS, council buildings, libraries), community facilities, commercial and industrial buildings.
2. Reducing energy demand in transport as set out in Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 including: liveable neighbourhood schemes, local cycling and walking infrastructure plans, public transport and EV charging roll-out.

Successful delivery requires effective partnerships with district/borough councils, other local organisations and engagement with residents.

To be effective this partnership will need to include public debate and decision making.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Support the creation of local Environmental Action Committees, as a way of addressing the issue.

- II. Establish a cross-party working group to consider how Members should meet publicly with Borough/District councillors and together engage with residents and local organisations to agree upon how the Greener Futures Delivery Plan will be implemented a locally level.
- III. Task the cross-party working group to report back to Cabinet in autumn 2022.

Lance Spencer made the following points:

- That it was the third motion brought to the Council in the last twelve months about the climate emergency as little progress was being made globally, nationally or locally.
- Highlighted that the global average temperature has already increased by 1.1 to 1.2 degrees Celsius, in the absence of dramatic action it would reach 3 degrees Celsius which would be catastrophic.
- That 2021 was the fifth hottest year on record, the last seven years had been the hottest years on record and this upcoming Sunday is expected to be the hottest day on record with an amber weather warning.
- Highlighted that Surrey's residents alone contribute about 20 million tonnes of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere each year, of which 6.6 million tonnes comes from direct activities such as heating homes, transport and running businesses.
- That the aim in the Greener Futures Climate Change Delivery Plan was to get that to zero by 2050, to do so emissions need to be reduced by 1.3 to 2.8 million tonnes by 2025.
- Suspected that by 2030 there would be more evidence of the massive impact of climate change on the planet and that his grandson would question what he was doing back in 2022 when the impact of climate change was known and why more was not being done to address it.
- Noted the successes in LED lighting and investment in electric buses, however the impact of those changes of actions proposed where the Council has direct control and if all delivered would equate to a reduction of 43,000 tonnes by 2025 or only 2% of what was required.
- That the Council must work out how to communicate and engage with all Members, residents and the numerous businesses to get them to understand what was needed to save our beautiful planet and county.
- Stressed that a step change was needed in how Surrey's communities live, work and play.
- That the two main areas for climate action in Surrey relate to buildings and transport which account for over 70% of Surrey's emissions, of which 41% related to transport and energy demand must be reduced through retrofitting buildings of which 30,000 had been identified.
- That successful delivery of the reduction of Surrey's emissions requires effective partnerships with the district and borough councils, local organisations, and engagement with residents through public debate.
- That the proposed local community networks might have some impact but it was unrealistic to expect those to have the level of impact demanded by the climate change emergency.
- That having asked an officer responsible for rolling out the 10,000 electric vehicle charging points across Surrey in the next seven years, he was confident he could liaise with the officers in the borough and district councils, but would have to engage with each Member individually and it was up to Member whether and how they engaged with the borough and district councillors and their residents.

- That Members need to be seen to take a visible lead in their communities on climate, allowing residents to engage and participate in the transformation required in each community.
- Asked Members to support the motion to allow local communities to work together to deliver the massive change that would be required.

The motion was formally seconded by Catherine Baart, who made the following comments:

- Highlighted that the Council has a strong Greener Futures team which was putting substantial effort into plans to reduce carbon emissions particularly in Surrey's estate, compared especially to many other councils; however Surrey's challenging greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for 2025, 2030 and 2035 were hardly referred to by the Council externally.
- That the Council was not on track to meet the 2025 deadline for achieving the target of 46% greenhouse gas reduction, Atkins estimated the level of investment required for the 2025 target was between £3.4 and £4.2 billion, that scale of investment has not yet been secured.
- That there was no UK retrofit plan for the Council align with and that whilst the Council's Surrey Transport Plan (Fourth Edition) was due to be agreed in a later item, more action needed to be taken faster as reaching the emissions reduction targets late would be a failure; faster effective change required more participation and support for future changes to living.
- Highlighted the Leader's earlier comment that the Council knows how communities differ across Surrey, so it must work locally in conjunction with the borough and district councils and residents to bring about effective change rather than having a one-size-fits-all approach.
- Noted that a huge amount was to be gained in supporting the proactive motion which identified the most effective ways to engage local people democratically in the Council's climate action plans, with the results to be put to the Cabinet in order to increase the momentum to meet Surrey's climate change targets.

One Member made the following comments:

- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment in the Cabinet Member for Environment's absence noted that Conservative Group Members agree that a strong community structure was needed to support the Greener Futures agenda.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment provided assurance that a mechanism was in place to work with the district and borough councils, including the community groups and charities through the Greener Futures Partnership Group and the Greener Futures Board.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment noted that the Council had employed a Greener Futures Community Engagement Officer who was linking up all of the existing low carbon community resident groups and creating a network between them which would link into the work of the Climate Commission.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment highlighted that the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee had already established a Greener Futures Reference Group, where Members can ask questions and make suggestions.
- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment noted that what the motion was suggesting under resolutions two and three would sit well within the existing Greener Futures Reference Group, however resolution one on setting up local

Environmental Action Committees could not be supported until both the Conservative Group and officers were satisfied as to what was the right mechanism to engage the community.

- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment noted that the Conservative Group's suggestion was to amend the motion by deleting resolution one:

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

~~I. Support the creation of local Environmental Action Committees, as a way of addressing the issue.~~

- The Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment noted that the Conservative Group was happy to agree resolutions two and three, however understood that the deletion of resolution one had been refused by the proposer and so the Conservative Group cannot support the motion and remained open to suggestions through the current mechanisms in place.

Lance Spencer, the proposer of the motion responded noting that he would be happy to accept that amendment.

Lance Spencer accepted the amendment and therefore it became the substantive motion.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes:

Surrey County Council has a Greener Future Delivery Plan to tackle climate change. This will transform the lives of Surrey residents. The two main areas for climate action in Surrey relate to buildings and transport as follows:

These are:

1. Reduce energy demand through retrofitting buildings including social, private rented and owner-occupied housing, public sector buildings (e.g. schools, NHS, council buildings, libraries), community facilities, commercial and industrial buildings.
2. Reducing energy demand in transport as set out in Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 including: liveable neighbourhood schemes, local cycling and walking infrastructure plans, public transport and EV charging roll-out.

Successful delivery requires effective partnerships with district/borough councils, other local organisations and engagement with residents.

To be effective this partnership will need to include public debate and decision making.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Establish a cross-party working group to consider how Members should meet publicly with Borough/District councillors and together engage with residents and local organisations to agree upon how the Greener Futures Delivery Plan will be implemented a locally level.
- II. Task the cross-party working group to report back to Cabinet in autumn 2022.

Item 8 (iv)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, Becky Rush, moved a proposal. The proposal was as follows:

That the motion below by Jonathan Essex be referred to the Resources and Performance Select Committee for consideration.

This Council notes that:

- Polling from the Institute for Business Ethics finds that “corporate tax avoidance” has, since 2013, been the clear number one concern of the British public when it comes to business conduct.
- 66% of people believe the Government and local councils should at least consider a company’s ethics and how they pay their tax, as well as value for money and quality of service provided, when awarding contracts.
- 17.5% of UK public contracts have been won by companies with links to tax havens. Lost corporation tax revenues from multinational profit-shifting (just one form of tax avoidance) have been estimated to be costing the UK some £17bn per annum.
- The Fair Tax Mark offers a means to demonstrate good tax conduct and has been secured by a wide range of UK businesses, including FTSE-listed PLCs.

This Council believes that:

- As recipient of significant public funding, Surrey County Council should promote exemplary tax conduct, including ensuring contractors pay their proper share of tax, and refusing to condone offshore tax arrangements when buying land and property.
- This should apply equally to trading companies partially or fully owned by Surrey County Council.
- Current UK procurement law imposes restrictions on councils’ ability to both penalise poor tax conduct and reward responsible tax conduct.
- Due diligence into tax arrangements of suppliers will help identify the Council’s exposure to Russia and other international bad actors. Information on the beneficial ownership of companies will help Surrey County Council ensure its procurement maximises benefit to Surrey’s economy.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Approve the “Councils for Fair Tax Declaration”.
- II. Lead by example and demonstrate good practice in its tax conduct of both Surrey County Council and its trading companies.

- III. Ensure IR35 is implemented robustly such that contract workers pay a fair share of employment taxes.
- IV. Avoid offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property.
- V. Undertake due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately by suppliers to reduce the payment of tax and business rates.
- VI. Demand clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers and their consolidated profit & loss position.
- VII. Include tax conduct in social value scoring for assessing contracts.
- VIII. Support Fair Tax Week events in Surrey and celebrate the tax contribution made by businesses who pay their fair share of corporation tax.
- IX. Support calls for urgent reform of UK procurement law to enable local authorities to better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct through their procurement policies.

Jonathan Essex made the following points:

- Highlighted that the motion was about corporate tax avoidance and about action on fairer tax at a local level and whilst having consistently been areas of concern for business conduct in market research, many UK public contracts continue to be run by companies with links to tax havens.
- That the motion was about ensuring that the Council's procurement processes follow best practice on the matter and are consistent with requirements for local authorities to consider social value throughout their procurement.
- That the motion seeks greater transparency into the beneficial ownership and the fullest possible financial reporting from the Council's suppliers.
- That such due diligence into the ownership and tax arrangements of suppliers would enable the Council to identify indirect exposure to Russia and other international bad actors and would help the Council understand how much money it spends recirculates directly into the local Surrey economy.
- That the resolutions confirm that the Council was complying with off-payroll working rules and avoiding offshore structures for its land and property investments.
- That the motion calls on the Council to celebrate its commitment as part of Fair Tax Week in June 2023 and calls for UK procurement law to be strengthened in ways that allow local authorities to better include tax conduct in their procurement policies.
- That the motion would support the Council's procurement processes, particularly with regard to due diligence on companies that it employs and it aligns with the Council's existing efforts to reduce the risk of fraud.

In speaking to her proposal, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources:

- Recommended the referral of the motion to Resources and Performance Select Committee where the matter of the Council's procurement policy extension could be given the due consideration needed.
- Noted that the matter of tax compliance for the Council and also its suppliers was an important matter and an informed view was needed.
- Noted that the Council and its subsidiaries, including investment property companies, were fully tax compliant including with IR35 legislation.
- Noted that regarding the Council's suppliers, all wish to see a fair tax system for companies operating in the UK; however the Council needs to tread carefully on the right side of procurement law and ensure that it does not penalise its ability to operate in a competitive market or leave itself exposed to legal challenge as companies have the right to organise their tax affairs how they choose.
- Clarified that the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 provide for contracting authorities to exclude a supplier on the grounds of tax evasion and the Council adheres to those regulations.
- Noted that issues concerning tax avoidance were significantly more complex, the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 do not make provision for discretionary exclusions based on concerns about matters such as tax arrangements or beneficial ownerships.
- Highlighted the budget risks to the Council as the due diligence and compliance checking required would be complex and the risk of delivery of core services in sectors with complex ownerships and tax structures, such as the care sector where private equity funding arrangements were impacting on suppliers in the sector.
- Recognised the merit in examining the Council's policies and procedures, striving for best practice and that would be done via the select committee.
- Noted that in making practical changes the Council must recognise that the impending change in Public Contracts Regulations 2015 combined with internal improvements to suppliers, conduct requirements, compliance and contract management would go a significant way to achieving the desired outcomes and provide a platform for further enhancements.

Jonathan Essex confirmed that he was in support of the referral of the motion to the Resources and Performance Select Committee.

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 Resources and Performance Select Committee for consideration.

53/22 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2022/2023 [ITEM 9]

The Leader as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) introduced the report and highlighted that the three main areas it covered related to the remuneration of Chief Officers, the responsibility of the PPDC in relation to the appointments of Chief Officers and the Council's policy on equal pay, redundancy and severance. He noted that the Statement reflected the positive outcome of the negotiations with the Trade Unions: UNISON and GMB, resulting in the agreed pay settlement. In addition to the inflation increase awards to those at the lower end of the pay scale, the incremental pay progression would continue with effect from 1 April 2022 for staff with headroom within their individual grade.

RESOLVED:

That Council agreed the Pay Policy Statement for 2022/2023.

54/22 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S DRAFT 2021/2022 MODERN SLAVERY STATEMENT [ITEM 10]

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the report and noted that the impending changes to the Modern Slavery Act 2015 meant that local authorities would soon become subject to Section 54 of the Act requiring the publication of an annual Modern Slavery Statement. She noted that modern slavery is a heinous practice affecting millions of people worldwide and in line with the Council's ethos of no one left behind, the Council should care how its services are procured and delivered. The Council was being asked to approve the Council's first Statement to be published in September in accordance with the Home Office's timeframe. She explained that the Statement was developed by an officer with prior experience on the matter and had been developed using best practice ensuring that the Council's policies and practices mitigate the risks of modern slavery in its supply chains.

RESOLVED:

That Council approved Surrey County Council's draft 2021/2022 Modern Slavery Statement (see Annex).

55/22 ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL – MEMBER DEVELOPMENT [ITEM 11]

The Chair noted that the amended recommendations had been circulated within the supplementary agenda.

The Chairman of the Member Development Steering Group (MDSG) introduced the report and noted that the MDSG was a cross-party group responsible for overseeing all-Member training and support. He thanked the members of the MDSG for their constructive challenge and input and noted that the report detailed the Member development activity over the past year. He noted that the MDSG welcomed the Council's reaccreditation of the Charter Plus status in September 2021, in recognition of the Council's development programme. The MDSG had agreed multiple priorities for improvement for next year, such as implementing the recommendations of the Charter Plus assessment. He highlighted the report's amended recommendations.

RESOLVED:

1. That Council endorsed the current approach to Member development and agreed that it is equitable and effective.
2. That Council endorsed the approach of striving to continuously improve the Council's member development offer – and approved the priorities for improvement as set out in the report.

56/22 ONGOING IMPROVEMENTS TO COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY [ITEM 12]

The Chair of the Select Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs' Group introduced the report and highlighted that scrutiny had developed in the Council over the last few years. He noted that it was taken more seriously, the select committees were

undertaking in depth preparation with officers, the chairs and the vice-chairs and with Members, and experienced officers had helped drive scrutiny forward. He noted that Members of the opposition parties had been more involved than ever before and select committees were challenging each other to ensure that they were making a greater number of recommendations.

RESOLVED:

1. That Members noted and commented on the future improvement work identified within this report.
2. That Members reviewed the new protocol on scrutiny of Council companies and agreed to add it to the Constitution of the Council.
3. That the Scrutiny Business Manager is appointed as the Statutory Scrutiny Officer for Surrey County Council to cover the Governance Lead Manager's maternity leave.

57/22 MEMBER CONDUCT PANEL REPORT [ITEM 13]

The Chair as Chairman of the Member Conduct Panel introduced the report and explained that the Panel had noted that the Member had fully co-operated with the investigation and had voluntarily admitted and apologised for his conduct.

RESOLVED:

That Council noted the decision sheet of the Member Conduct Panel of 23 May 2022 attached as an appendix.

58/22 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION [ITEM 14]

The Chair noted that an addendum report had been published in the supplementary agenda and included an additional recommendation seeking special dispensation for Jan Mason.

The Leader introduced the report and noted that the amendment to the Scheme of Delegation related to the Stage Two Travel Assistance Appeals, it was proposed that officers be allowed to sit on that Panel.

The Leader and the Chair wished Jan Mason a speedy recovery.

RESOLVED:

1. That the executive function changes to the Officer Scheme of Delegation in relation to home to school transport reviews approved by the Leader in June 2022 be noted (as set out in Annex 1).
2. That the amendments to the Terms of Reference for the Appeals and Representation Panel be noted (as set out in paragraph 6).
3. That Jan Mason may continue to be absent from meetings until December 2022 by reason of ill health. The Council looks forward to welcoming her back in due course.

59/22 REPORT OF THE CABINET [ITEM 15]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 31 May 2022.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents:

- A. The Surrey Transport Plan (Fourth Edition) – Adoption *(as set out in the Cabinet paper from 31 May 2022)*

RESOLVED:

1. That Council approved the Surrey Transport Plan including launch of new related Surrey website pages on the 13 July 2022.

That the Council agreed:

2. That the Cabinet noted the efforts that have gone into extending the engagement with communities and partners over the new Surrey Transport Plan including analysis and feedback received from the statutory public consultation and subsequent additional targeted engagement.
3. That Cabinet noted how delivering the Surrey Transport Plan associated policies, strategies and measures will support the Climate Change Delivery Plan.
4. That Cabinet noted the capital investment required to deliver the plan as set out in the 2022/23 budget and beyond in line with the Medium-Term Financial Plan.
5. That Cabinet recommended to Council that authority be delegated to the Executive Director, for Environment, Transport & Infrastructure, in discussion with the Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure for any final changes that may be necessary to allow publication of the plan on 13 July 2022 and any key changes thereafter to comply with new government policy.
6. That Cabinet thanked the Members of the Greener Futures Reference Group for their work in developing the Plan thus far.

Reports for Information/Discussion:

- B. Surrey Infrastructure Plan - Phase 2 Schemes
- C. Minerals and Waste Development Scheme
- D. 2021/22 Outturn Financial Report

- E. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 14 May 2022 - 1 July 2022

RESOLVED:

1. That Council noted that there had been no urgent decisions in the last two months.
2. That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 31 May 2022 be adopted.

60/22 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [ITEM 16]

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.59 pm]

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Leader's Statement – County Council, 12 July 2022

Madam Chair, Members, I doubt any of us here in this chamber have been oblivious to the unprecedented times in our national political landscape.

The events of last week, and beyond, have demonstrated the importance of good, clear leadership in being able to deliver your ambitions, whether that's in public service or private enterprise.

There are many fine examples within this council, from Joanna Killian down through the organisation, and indeed within our elected Members – committed to public service and making the lives of our residents better.

Politically, we also stand by these principles.

We have reviewed and revised our Select Committee system and put a renewed emphasis on scrutiny – to give Members across this chamber the chance to properly engage, question, understand the work that is going on and the policies we aim to put in place.

As a Cabinet we welcome scrutiny, from Members, from residents, from the local media – as we know it's an essential part of leadership.

Without that confidence and trust, we would not have been able to make the progress we have.

We have set out our ambition and we are steadfast in our determination and our effort in delivering it.

Enabling a greener future for Surrey, tackling health inequality, empowering our communities, growing a sustainable economy, and ultimately ensuring no one is left behind.

Whilst chaos and uncertainty have spread through our national politics, here in Surrey we carry on, united in our mission and delivering day in day out for the people who call our county home.

Madam Chair, as well as our great teams here within the council, we couldn't truly deliver a better quality of life for our residents without working with our partners across the county.

We are one part of a Surrey-wide ecosystem, all interdependent on each other, and when working together what we can achieve is limitless.

County Council, Surrey Police, Surrey Fire & Rescue Service, the local NHS, Districts & Boroughs, the voluntary and community sector, transport providers, utility companies and many more.

COVID showed in the clearest, quickest terms the impact of that partnership, coordinated through Surrey's Local Resilience Forum.

That Forum remains in place day-to-day, assessing and understanding risks, mitigating those risks, and ready to stand up quickly to respond to any incident. Forty-four organisations across Surrey working together – our residents should rest easy that the systems are in place to keep us safe – and I'm pleased to see the new Independent Secretariat now in place to coordinate that work going forward.

Another really positive recent development in our partnership working has been the formal introduction this month of the new Integrated Care System – an evolution of our

relationship as a council with our local health services, ensuring that people's health and care needs are met more effectively and efficiently.

It will help make sure people are not passed around the system, that acute health providers and the social care system is more joined up, with joint working and joint appointments already in place to take that integration forward.

It will also help us take that next step together in reducing health inequalities – tackling the wider determinants of health more effectively – things like education, housing, pollution - to relieve pressure on our health and care system in the long term and ultimately to improve life outcomes for our residents. In essence to deliver our prevention and early intervention agenda.

This partnership will also be evident through our work together 'on the ground' in our communities – listening, understanding, and better targeting tailored support.

That local engagement is so key in delivering our No One Left Behind ambition, and everything that strengthens that community understanding and partnership should be celebrated.

We are determined to use every tool at our disposal to improve that work – whether it's co-designing the future of town centres with the community like in Horley; using our library spaces to bring more support together in one place and opening access for communities to use more flexibly; creating new, modern community hubs like the plans in Sunbury; or ensuring we support local community events - getting under the skin of what local areas need and want to make them better places. And of course, we are rolling out community link officers to be our eyes and ears, so we truly understand what issues we need to address in those communities.

We'll be there – the council and its partners – for all residents.

Members, at the last council meeting I announced that the member allocation for highways improvements in your divisions would double, and since then there has been a workshop to demonstrate how the council is putting the tools in place to support us to engage with residents effectively around this type of local decision making.

The old, tired, and bureaucratic local and joint committee system does not properly engage residents in the things that matter to them – we must show more imagination, more energy, and have more meaningful conversations with more residents and partners, in order to really help our communities thrive.

For every one of us, that is our passion, that's why we're here – talking and understanding the people who elect us.

Let's embrace new ways of doing that more effectively.

Let's make it happen.

Madam Chair, I am incredibly proud of Surrey as a place.

I'm proud of our communities, our people, our businesses big and small.

I'm proud of our schools and our young people.

I'm proud of our villages, our towns, our universities.

And I'm proud of our environment, our beautiful countryside that offers so much benefit to everyone here and beyond.

It is one of our most treasured assets, and I'm proud of the role Surrey County Council has in managing, protecting, and enhancing that rich biodiversity and nature.

Last week I had the honour of attending the Queens Baton Relay for the Commonwealth Games that start in Birmingham later this month.

The baton had travelled to over 70 countries around the world before coming to the UK, and Surrey was chosen from a competitive list of entries across the country to host a leg of the relay.

The setting, at Newlands Corner, was superb – with the added bonus of our magnificent new Visitor Centre being open.

There have been many inspirational Surrey residents chosen to be baton bearers and our wonderful county was chosen to host it.

Thanks to the efforts of some brilliant council officers and colleagues from Active Surrey, the event was a great success, with local school children sharing in the moment, along with our partners at Surrey Police, Surrey Fire & Rescue Service, Surrey Hills, and Guildford Borough Council.

It really encapsulated what a great place this county is.

But it also demonstrated what a responsibility we have, together with residents and partners, to protect our county.

We have acted over the last few weeks to restore and put protections in place for some hugely important rural sites in Surrey, including working to restore the chalk grassland at the Downs near Caterham.

We're working with Surrey Wildlife Trust – another important partner – to develop a nature reserve in East Ewell, and we recently worked with five other councils to purchase Tice's Meadow in Farnham to protect the long-term future of its natural habitat.

We also stand ready to react quickly – with no better example of this than the excellent response of Surrey Fire & Rescue Service last week to contain the wildfire at Bisley Ranges.

The cause of that fire is not yet known, but I should take this opportunity, ahead of the summer, to remind everyone to be careful and considerate when out in our wonderful countryside – please do not take barbeques out with you, pack a picnic instead and dispose of cigarettes and litter correctly.

As you all know, we have a comprehensive Climate Change Delivery Plan in action, with good progress already underway but plenty more to do.

Our transport plan is a huge part of that – aimed at cutting the 41% of Surrey's carbon emissions that is caused by transport with practical measures to help people to get around Surrey easily and sustainably.

More walking and cycling routes, more electric vehicle charging points, more bus services, as well as improving internet connections for home-working and redesigning neighbourhoods to enable easier access to local services, lessening the need to travel by car.

We also saw the on-demand bus service go live in Mole Valley last week. Two electric minibuses offering a shared door to door bus service for residents which can be used

to take them to a doctors or hospital appointment, to access further education and training, or to go shopping.

With the ability to book trips to and from outside the area and running alongside the existing bus service this will help people who may be isolated due to their rural location or have had little choice but to use their car.

We will roll this service out across the whole county over time, and it will be a really important part of not only hitting our carbon neutral targets but also opening up our communities.

Travelling more actively – walking, cycling, scooting, running, whichever you prefer – also has huge health benefits for our residents and can save money. It's win-win, but we recognise it's not always easy in Surrey – this plan helps to tackle that.

We're committed to this agenda, and there is yet more to come. We will not falter.

It's our collective responsibility to protect this wonderful place of ours.

Madam Chair, last time we assembled as full council, I spoke at length about the measures we have put in place to support our residents with the cost-of-living crisis.

Our dedicated welfare support webpages and helpline, Surrey Crisis Fund, our work with the Community Foundation for Surrey and other voluntary sector groups, our lobbying of government and use of the hardship fund.

That work continues in earnest, with targeted support reaching the most vulnerable.

One achievement since that meeting in May that I'm particularly proud of is our pay agreement for Surrey County Council staff, through positive and productive discussions with the unions.

We are implementing a phased salary increase, meaning those paid the least get the most – our lowest paid workers seeing an increase of 7.85%.

The percentage increase drops further up the scales, with those in the top pay bands receiving no increase.

We think this is fair, responsible and, in very real terms, enables us to help those who need it most.

We will continue to work collaboratively with our partners, always striving to improve people's quality of life and life chances.

To protect our wonderful county and make it the best place it can possibly be – for everyone.

On that note I will update our next council meeting on where we are with our county deal ambitions, but I have had some productive conversations with our District and Borough colleagues over the past few weeks and I am confident that we will put together a compelling bid for the benefit of the residents of Surrey.

Madam Chair, while other areas of our political landscape grab the attention, we crack on and stay true to our ambitions and principles.

We won't falter, we'll adapt to work with the new government that is formed, tackle any challenge that is put in our way, be open to new ideas and opportunities.

Always working hard on behalf of Surrey's residents and businesses.

Thank you.

CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

1. Article 6.02 of the Council's Constitution requires that the Leader of the Council will report any changes to Cabinet appointments to Council.
2. Article 6.03 and Article 6.04 of the Council's Constitution authorises the Leader to appoint Cabinet Members and Deputy Cabinet Members respectively.
3. On 1 September 2022, the Leader made changes to the membership of Cabinet. The new membership is listed in **Annex 1**. The updated Cabinet Portfolios are listed in **Annex 2**.
4. As a consequence of these changes, vacancies have been created for Select Committee Task Group Leads (Vice-Chairmen) of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee and the Resources and Performance Select Committee. Under Standing Order 6.10, these roles must be appointed by Council.
5. Council is also asked to note a number of further appointments to vacant committee seats.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the changes to Cabinet appointments and Portfolios set out in Annex 1 and 2 to this report be noted.
2. That Jonathan Hulley be appointed as a Select Committee Task Group Lead for the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee for the remainder of the 2022/23 Council Year.
3. That Robert Hughes be appointed as a Select Committee Task Group Lead for the Resources and Performance Select Committee for the remainder of the 2022/23 Council Year.
4. That the following committee appointments be noted:
 - Steve Bax to Resources and Performance Select Committee
 - Becky Rush to Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
 - Mark Sugden to Audit and Governance Committee

Lead/Contact Officers:

Sarah Quinn, Senior Manager – Regulatory & Appeals,
sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

County Council's Constitution

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Portfolios

Cabinet Member	Portfolio
Ayesha Azad	Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources
Matt Furniss	Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth
Kevin Deanus	Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience
Marisa Heath	Cabinet Member for Environment
Natalie Bramhall	Cabinet Member for Property and Waste
Mark Nuti	Cabinet Member for Adults and Health
Clare Curran	Cabinet Member for Education and Learning
Denise Turner-Stewart	Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety
Sinead Mooney	Cabinet Member for Children and Families

*Leader and Deputy Leader not included in the above

Deputy Cabinet Member	Portfolio
Rebecca Paul	Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up
Maureen Attewell	Deputy Cabinet Member for Children and Families
Paul Deach	Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment
Jordan Beech	Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET PORTFOLIO UPDATES – 1 September 2022

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Leader of the Council	Tim Oliver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall vision and strategic direction • Major Government and National Representation • District and Borough partnerships • Regional and Strategic partnerships • Communications • Engagement and Consultation • Business Relationships • Corporate governance • Place-based work e.g. Thinking place work • HR and OD • Health and Wellbeing including Mental Health • Major projects • Transformation Programme • Integrated Business Planning & Performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chief Executive • Deputy Chief Executive/Resources • Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth • Executive Director for Customer and Communities • Joint Executive Director for Public Service Reform • Chief of Staff to Chief Executive • Strategic Director, Communications and Engagement • Strategic Director of People and Change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources and Performance Select Committee • Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up	Rebecca Paul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levelling up Fund Opportunities • Communications strategy for levelling up agenda (cross-portfolio) • Strengthening Families (e.g. family hub) • Infrastructure for opportunity • Social infrastructure development (e.g. youth centres) • Data and SODA • EDI (joint) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth • Executive Director for Public Service Reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee • Adults and Health Select Committee • Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Adults and Health	Mark Nuti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Social Care • Adult Safeguarding • Accommodation for vulnerable and elderly adults • Learning Disabilities • Transitions • Local Outbreak Engagement Board • Health and Social Care Integration • Public Health • Integrated commissioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Adult Social Care and Health Integration • Executive Director for Public Service Reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adults and Health Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Children and Families	Sinead Mooney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children's Services • Children's Integrated Commissioning • Corporate Parenting (including fostering and adoption) • Children with Disabilities (CwD) • Children's Safeguarding • Accommodation for vulnerable children • EDI (joint) • Housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning • Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth • Chief of Staff to Chief Executive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee • Resources and Performance Select Committee • Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
Deputy Cabinet Member for Children and Families	Maureen Attewell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Services • Children's Mental Health (Mindworks) • Domestic Abuse • Family Resilience • Other Children's Commissioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Education and Learning	Clare Curran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Special Education Needs and/or Disabilities (SEND), including Transport • Schools - relationships • Place planning • Admissions • Adult learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety	Denise Turner-Stewart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Democracy and Engagement Design Local & Joint Committees Community Foundation Surrey relationship Customer Services Libraries, Arts and Culture Registration Services Your Fund Surrey VCFS Town and Parishes Corporate Health and Safety Trading Standards Fire and Rescue (SFRS) Community Safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Director for Customer & Communities Executive Director for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth Chief Fire Officer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources and Performance Select Committee Children's, Families and Lifelong Learning Select Committee Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience	Kevin Deanus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways and operational delivery including procurement Road Safety Parking Flooding Coroners Emergency Planning Military Covenant Community Resilience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure Executive Director for Customer & Communities Strategic Director, Communications and Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways	Jordan Beech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways and Operational Delivery Street Works Asset Planning Road Safety Parking and Enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth	Matt Furniss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport • Air and Rail • Infrastructure • Planning • 5G Rollout • Economic Growth • Skills and Apprenticeships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure • Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Environment	Marisa Heath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greener Futures Programme • Climate Change • Air Quality • Countryside • Waste (Greener Futures Oversight) • Trees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment	Paul Deach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greener Futures Communication • Norbury Park - resident liaison and general overview • Greener Futures Steering Group support for MH and developing connections with D&B political members • Attendance at meetings alongside MH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Property and Waste	Natalie Bramhall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property portfolio • Waste contract • Capital Programme Delivery • Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Resources • Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure • Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources and Performance Select Committee • Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

CABINET MEMBER POSITION	NAME	RESPONSIBILITIES	KEY OFFICER(S)	SELECT COMMITTEE(S)
Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources	Ayesha Azad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance – Revenue & Capital • Digital, Business and Insights Programme • Capital Programme • Internal Control/Audit • Commercial Investment and Capital Programme Oversight • Procurement • Orbis • Legal and Democratic • IT • Digital • Contract Management • SCC Companies • Performance and Management Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director for Resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources and Performance Select Committee

This page is intentionally left blank



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

SELECT COMMITTEES' REPORT TO COUNCIL

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

For Members to note the headline activity of the Council's overview and scrutiny function in the period April to September 2022 asking questions of Scrutiny Chairs as necessary.

BACKGROUND:

As part of the ongoing process to raise standards in the Council's overview and scrutiny function and to raise the profile of the work of Select Committees more generally, Chairs agreed to regularly report activity to Council.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY APRIL TO SEPTEMBER 2022:

In this period Democratic Services welcome two new Scrutiny Officers to the team. Omid Nouri and Julie Armstrong support the Adults and Health Select Committee and Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee respectively.

Adults & Health Select Committee

The Committee met once formally in this period in March. Members undertook a review of the Council's All-Age Autism Strategy a year on from its implementation. The Committee recommended deeper partnership working on the aims of the strategy and that autism is a part of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training for social care and health staff.

Complaints made to the Adult Social Care Directorate were also reviewed with suggestions made to improve the system for reporting and analysing complaints at the Council.

Finally, the Committee followed up on the health and social care system in Surrey's response to recommendations made by an independent peer review to improve mental health services in the county taking in a wide ranging of evidence from the Council and its partners.

The Committee's *Health Inequalities Task Group* met to consider its next steps and alighted upon three areas of focus for the final phase of its review: Black and Minority Ethnic Groups and Gypsy, Roma, Traveller communities; those experiencing Homelessness, Drug and Alcohol Abuse; and those suffering Domestic Abuse using the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy as a framework for scrutiny.

The Committee convened seven informal sessions of its Membership for briefings on a range of topics including access to primary care, mental health and changes to charging in Adult Social Care.

Children, Families, Lifelong Learning Select Committee

The Committee met three times in this period: April, June and July including one extraordinary meeting called to review the closure of a Children's Care Home.

The Committee made recommendations to the Corporate Parenting Service to ensure the energy efficiency of Care Leavers' accommodation and to encourage district and borough councils to support the independent accommodation of this cohort. The Committee made several recommendations to the character of the new Home to School Transport Assistance policy to Cabinet which were noted and a response can be found [here](#).

The review of the circumstances which led to the closure of a Children's Home in Surrey resulted in material changes in the reporting of planned inspections and their outcomes to the Select Committee and Members more broadly with information routinely shared on the Members' Portal.

Latterly, the Committee reviewed and was supported of the Council's approach to sufficiency and sustainability of school places and committed to ongoing oversight of Children's Services response to Ofsted's January 2022 inspection and the *Achieving Excellence* programme. Further to this the Committee's Performance Sub-Group is working on a set of indicators to help track Children's Services ongoing improvement work.

Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee

The Committee met formally once in June and undertook a comprehensive performance review of the Environment, Transport and Infrastructure Directorate as well as items on the Council's approach to any devolution deal for the county and pre-decision scrutiny of the Waste & Minerals Plan.

The Committee also runs two Member Reference Groups on the Greener Futures programme and Highways Maintenance offering feedback and views on the implementation of new policies.

A Member Reference Group met in September to assess progress against the Council's carbon net zero by 2050 commitment by reviewing the climate change delivery programme which included data on emissions and updates on the various projects underway to meet this commitment.

Resources and Performance Select Committee

There were two meetings held by this Committee in the period of this report: April and July. The Committee did pre-decision scrutiny work on the Supported Independent Living – Design & Construction decision being taken to Cabinet. The Committee received an update from People & Change and sought to influence HMRC to make the 45p mileage rate for business travel non-taxable.

In July, the Committee received an update from Customer Services and an overview of the roll-out of improvements to digital infrastructure across Surrey, including changes introduced by Central Government to the way in which public subsidy is administered to support digital connectivity.

The Committee also held a performance monitoring session in June to review the services under its remit.

Budget Scrutiny

All four Select Committees will resume work on scrutiny of the draft 2023/24 Revenue and Capital Budget in early October having all held briefings with Finance and the relevant Cabinet Members and Executive Directors in July on the early direction of the upcoming budget.

The cross-committee *Budget Task Group* has been reviewing the proposals for 'twin-track' savings in the next budget and monitoring in-year budget performance throughout this period. A round of public, formal scrutiny of budget proposals will take place in December 2022.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That Council review the work summarised in this report providing feedback to Scrutiny Chairs as appropriate.
2. That the Select Committees report to Council once more this calendar year.

Lead/Contact Officers: Ross Pike, Scrutiny Business Manager,
ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

Select Committee Agenda and Minutes:
[Committee structure - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](#)



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

GOVERNANCE CHANGES - LOCAL AND JOINT COMMITTEES

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

This report seeks approval to update the governance arrangements of the Council by recommending:

- the ceasing of the Local Committees, with effect from 31 October 2022
- serving notice of Council's intention to withdraw from the Joint Committees (the notice to expire on or before 30 April 2023), and
- the transferring of non-executive functions of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) from the Local and Joint Committees.

This change follows a decision by the Leader on 27 September 2022 to remove the remaining LC/JC Executive functions and the advisory functions with effect from 11 October 2022.

All committee members will be written to with details of the decisions.

BACKGROUND:

The Council has made a clear commitment to adopt a new approach to how it works, to make it a more connected and more effective local partner, working with and alongside local people. This includes better supporting county councillors as community leaders, redefining roles to get more staff working directly in communities, providing funding and support for community-led projects and working with Members to better co-ordinate the Council's work and support our communities to do more for themselves. The withdrawal from LC/JCs directly supports this.

This commitment will contribute towards improved opportunities for our residents to be involved in setting local priorities, supporting the Council's own Empowering Communities organisational priority. This is consistent with residents' expressed desires to be more involved in what the Council is doing but through events and conversations rather than through boards and meetings. This is evidenced by research in the past year which has shown that far more residents have been able to communicate with the Council through a wider range of mechanisms than has been the case historically using traditional Local and Joint Committee processes. For instance, in

2021/22, 11 online engagement sessions reached over 50,000 members of the public, whilst in comparison only 650 residents attended LC/JCs between 2019 and 2021.

To withdraw from the Local and Joint Committees, Council approval is required.

Following the decision by the Leader on 27 September 2022 to remove the remaining LC/JC Executive functions and the advisory functions with effect from 11 October 2022, to enable an ordered withdrawal away from the LC/JCs three separate decisions of Council are required:

- i. the ceasing of Local Committees
- ii. serving notice of the Council's intention to withdraw from the Joint Committees, to expire on or before 30 April 2023.
- iii. the transferring of non-executive functions of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) from these committees.

Changes to the Constitution as a consequence of the Leader's decision are noted in a separate constitutional report elsewhere on the agenda for today's Council meeting.

DETAILS:

Ceasing the Local Committees

Changes to the governance processes of the County Council as set out in the constitution are the responsibility of Council. Under recommendation 1 within this report, Council approval is therefore sought for the ceasing of the Local Committees with effect from 31 October 2022.

With the ceasing of Local Committees the non-executive functions for Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will transfer from these committees.

This follows the previous transfer of all executive highway functions from Local and Joint Committees with effect from 01 April 2022 following a decision of Cabinet on 22 February 2022, and of the last three remaining executive functions resulting from a decision by the Leader on 27 September 2022.

Any decisions now delegated to officers as a result of these changes would be recorded, reported and available for scrutiny following established County Council procedures.

Serving notice of Council's intention to withdraw from the Joint Committees, to expire on or before 30 April 2023

The Council has four Joint Committees, which are established with Runnymede, Spelthorne, Guildford and Woking Borough Councils. These Joint Committees operate in place of Local Committees for these Borough Areas. Constitutional arrangements for the Joint Committees are different

from those for the Local Committees.

Each Joint Committee is jointly constituted between the two participating local authorities and has its own constitution. The constitution for each Joint Committee is itself listed within the County Council's constitution.

The Constitutions of the Joint Committees state that notice should be given by either participating authority of the intention to withdraw from the Joint Committee arrangement. This is in order that the other participating authority can put appropriate transition arrangements in place for the functions it has delegated to a Joint Committee.

Recommendation 2 of this report asks for Council approval for notice to be given to the other participating authorities of the Council's intention in relation to the Joint Committees, with this notice to expire on or before 30 April 2023 to ensure new arrangements have been finalised before the end of this municipal year.

Recommendation 7 of this report asks Council to note that the Director of Law and Governance will work in conjunction with democratic service officers from Guildford, Runnymede, Woking, and Spelthorne Borough Councils to update their respective constitutions.

The transferring of non-executive functions of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) from LC/JCs

The Council has a duty to maintain the 'definitive map' which is the legal record of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) in the county. It has both powers and duties to make legal orders which may add, remove, or modify a PRoW. It then has a duty to make subsequent amendments to the map. Amendments usually result from an application by a member of the public, but changes may also be instigated by the Council itself.

Prior to making a determination, consultation processes on whether to make a legal order or not, are delegated to officers. If an objection is received following initial consultation the decision is currently delegated to Local and Joint Committees. With the removal of Local and Joint Committees, the opportunity to review decision making on PRoW has enabled officers to consider more efficient and inclusive ways of working.

Internal and external analysis and benchmarking showed:

- Over half the reports taken to Local Committees in the last seven years have gone to just two committees: Mole Valley and Waverley. Whilst the nature of these areas may be more rural and their PRoW more well used, the Council remains keen to encourage interest in, and use of, PRoW in all areas.
- Alongside statutory consultation, there is an opportunity to engage more with residents on possible changes to a PRoW through new engagement mechanisms. This will also provide the opportunity to

resolve any objections and support the local Divisional Member in exploring public opinion before a decision is made.

- That other authorities in south-east England afford their officers a higher level of decision making on PRoW changes, including those where an objection has been raised.

Recommendations in this report would mean that decision making is delegated to Officers in consultation with the local Divisional Member. Should they not agree or if either feels a PRoW application should be heard by committee, it is proposed that it is heard by the Planning and Regulatory Committee (PRC) and delegation is passed to the PRC to decide.

The PRC frequently debates and decides upon similar issues and legislation. Under Standing Orders, Divisional Members, members of the public and their representatives may address the PRC on any planning application and all applications relating to PRoW being considered by that Committee.

Contentious issues such as Traffic Regulation Orders, or PRoW on County Council owned land or land relating to a planning application will still need to be heard by committee. These would be delegated directly to the PRC with the local Divisional Member fully engaged in the preparation of the reports to committee.

In cases where a PRoW passes through more than one division, or impacts a neighbouring division, the delegated officer will work in consultation with all relevant local Divisional Members.

To ensure visibility across all divisions, an electronic list of proposed modifications to PRoW received by the Council will be maintained and made accessible to all Members. A comprehensive briefing note on PRoW will be provided to all Members and training will be provided via member seminars on the new processes.

Local and Joint Committee Chairmen

The Council at its annual meeting in May 2022 appointed Chairmen and Vice Chairmen to relevant Local and Joint Committee roles to 31 October. These appointments will lapse on that date to coincide with the cessation of Local Committees. The Council currently appoints Chairmen to two of the four Joint Committees and Vice-Chairmen to the other two. Given the serving of notice to withdraw from the Joint Committees and the removal of all County Council executive and non-executive functions from the Joint Committees from 11 October, the Joint Committees will no longer consider County Council matters for the remainder of this municipal year. Consequently, it is recommended that no appointments are made by the Council to the roles of Chair and Vice Chairs after 31 October. If a Joint Committee needs to meet, a vice chair who is a borough member could chair the Committee, or in the absence of this, the committee could agree to appoint a chair for a particular meeting.

Petitions Scheme

Paragraph 27 of the Council's Petitions Scheme currently provides that petitions with a minimum of 30 signatories may be considered at a Local or Joint Committee.

If Council agrees the recommendations in this report, the petition scheme will need to be amended as the Local Committees will no longer be available to consider petitions from 31 October. For Joint Committees, as there will be no County Council functions within their terms of reference they will no longer consider County Council-related petitions from 11 October 2022.

Petitions will instead be referred for the most appropriate alternative action as set out in the scheme. This will generally be for service consideration with the petitioner and Divisional Members but could be a referral to the Cabinet member or scrutiny where appropriate. Petitions with over 100 signatures will continue to be considered by the relevant Cabinet member. Residents will still have the right to submit petitions, but the aim is that closer engagement with residents will help drive outcomes before a petition is felt necessary.

A practice note for officers will be produced to accompany the updated petition scheme for when petitions are referred to service areas, emphasising the necessity to communicate with Divisional Members when petitions arise.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that County Council:

1. Agrees that Local Committees will cease, with effect from 31 October 2022.
2. Agrees to serve six months' notice of the Council's intention to withdraw from the Joint Committee in each appropriate borough, to expire on or before 30 April 2023.
3. Agrees to the transfer of all Public Rights of Way (PRoW) functions from Local and Joint Committees with effect from 11 October 2022. Non-contentious, non-executive decisions which affect PRoW will be delegated to officers in consultation with the relevant local Divisional Member/s. All contentious issues such as decisions for Traffic Regulation Orders or PRoW on County Council owned land or land relating to a planning application will be referred to the Planning and Regulatory Committee (PRC) to be heard and a decision made.
4. Agrees that where the local Divisional Member(s) or Officer(s) do not agree, or where they feel a determination should be made by committee, the case can be referred to the PRC. In cases where

one or more divisions are involved, then the delegated officer will work in consultation with all relevant Members.

5. Notes that a list of proposed changes to PRow or modifications to the definitive map received by the Council will be maintained and accessible to all Members.
6. Agrees that the Director of Law and Governance makes the relevant changes to the Council's Constitution to reflect the new arrangements.
7. Notes that the Director of Law and Governance will work in conjunction with democratic service officers from Guildford, Runnymede, Woking, and Spelthorne Borough Councils to update their respective constitutions.
8. Agrees the consequential amendments to the Council's petition scheme as described above.
9. Notes that appointments of Chairs and Vice Chairs to Joint Committees will lapse on 31 October 2022 and Joint Committees will appoint a Chair as required if meeting in the six-month notice period.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Marie Snelling - Executive Director, Customer & Communities

Paul Evans - Director, Law & Governance

Sources/background papers:

Highways Report to Cabinet Feb 22 [Cabinet Report LC JC Highway Functions Final.pdf \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](#)

Leader Decisions report - Sept 2022 [Leader Decisions - Local and Joint Committee Executive Functions](#)

County Council's current petition scheme [SCC-Petition-Scheme.pdf](#)



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

It is the Council's responsibility to approve changes to the Council's Constitution. This includes the Scheme of Delegation regarding non-executive functions, while amendments to executive functions are the responsibility of the Leader and are brought to Council to note.

This report sets out proposed changes to the Constitution's executive and non-executive functions set out in the Scheme of Delegation and these are brought to Council for information and formal approval.

These changes are brought to Council in accordance with Articles 4.09, 5.02 and 11.02 of the Council's Constitution.

BACKGROUND:

1. The Leader is responsible for maintaining a list in Part 3 of the Constitution setting out who will exercise executive functions. Any changes to this list are required to be reported to the next appropriate meeting of the County Council. Such changes, which have already been agreed by the Leader, are set out in paragraphs 3 to 4 of this report.
2. In addition, changes to any non-executive functions require approval by the Council. These are set out in paragraph 5 but are the subject of a separate report on today's agenda.

FUNCTIONS FOR REPORT TO COUNCIL

Local and Joint Committee (LC/JC) Executive Functions

3. The Leader was asked to approve the transfer of the remaining executive functions from the LC/JCs delegated by the Leader with effect from 11 October 2022. This enabled the approval of changes to library opening hours to be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety, or to officers where appropriate; and for the clarification of executive Community Safety, Youth Provision and advisory LC/JC functions, bringing the Constitution into

line with current working practices following recent service, policy and commissioning changes.

4. The Leader agreed these changes on 27 September 2022, and the decision notice is attached as **Annex 1**. The Council is asked to note the Leader's approved changes to Part 3 of the Constitution.

FUNCTIONS FOR APPROVAL BY COUNCIL

Local and Joint Committee (LC/JC) Non-Executive Functions – Public Rights of Way (PROW)

5. Elsewhere on today's agenda, Council is asked to agree that the non-executive functions relating to Public Rights of Way (PROW) set out in the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, as amended currently delegated to the LC/JCs in Part 3, Section 1, Paragraph 7.4 of the Constitution, be transferred to the Planning & Regulatory Committee and officers. This will enable the Planning & Regulatory Committee and officers to take decisions relating to PROW if agreed by Council. The new delegations will be added to the Constitution and consequent amendments made.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. That the executive function changes approved by the Leader on 27 September 2022 be noted.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Sarah Quinn
Senior Manager – Regulatory & Appeals
sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Leader Decision Notice, 27 September 2022

Sources/background papers:

Constitution of the Council

CABINET MEMBER DECISION

Decision:

LOCAL AND JOINT COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

(i) Details of decision

1. That the transfer of the remaining Local and Joint Committee Executive Functions delegated by the Leader with effect from 11 October 2022 be agreed.
2. That the approval of changes to library opening hours are delegated to the Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety, or to officers where appropriate, with effect from 11 October 2022 be agreed.
3. That the executive functions previously delegated by the Leader to Local and Joint Committees relating to Community Safety and Youth Provision are incorporated within the general service delegations to officers, and advisory functions are removed, due to service, commissioning and policy changes, to bring the constitution into line with current practice, with effect from 11 October 2022 be agreed.
4. That the Director of Law and Governance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, make the relevant changes to the Council's Constitution including to the Executive and Officer Scheme of delegation as set out within this report.
5. It was noted that a report will be put to full Council on 11 October 2022 recommending transferring the non-executive functions of Public Rights of Way (PROW), the ceasing of the Local Committees, and serving notice of Council's intention to withdraw from the Joint Committees.
6. That the Director of Law and Governance be requested to work in conjunction with Democratic Services officers from Guildford, Runnymede, Woking, and Spelthorne Borough Councils regarding the notice and in updating their respective constitutions.

(ii) Reasons for decision

The removal of executive decision making from Local Committee/Joint Committees will contribute directly to Council's Empowering Communities priority by helping Surrey County Council (SCC) withdraw from the committees as part of the process of introducing a new approach to engagement including a greater variety of engagement options. It will help clarify decision making channels and contribute towards improved opportunities for our residents to be involved in setting their own local priorities.

This is consistent with residents' expressed expectations and wishes to be more involved in what the Council is doing through more informal channels and simpler processes.

Residents locally will benefit from the introduction of the Council's new engagement model through the ability to draw on a range of engagement methods and tools, thereby widening local resident involvement and encouraging more open conversations.

This change is evidenced by research in the past year which has shown that far more residents have been able to communicate with the Council through a wider range of mechanisms than has been the case historically using traditional local and joint committee processes. For instance, in 2021/22, 11 online engagement sessions reached over 50,000 members of the public, whilst in comparison only 650 residents attended Local Committee/Joint Committees between 2019 and 2021.

The clarification of executive Community Safety, Youth Provision and advisory Local Committee/Joint Committee functions will also bring the constitution into line with current working practices, following recent service, commissioning and policy changes.

(iii) Details of any alternative options considered and rejected

n/a

(iv) Details of any consultation and representations received not included in the published report

n/a

Conflicts of Interest and any Dispensations Granted

(Any conflict of interest declared by any other Cabinet Member consulted in relation to the decision to be recorded and any dispensations granted by the Audit and Governance Committee).

N/A

Decision taken by:

- (i) Name: Tim Oliver**
- (ii) Portfolio: Leader of the Council**

Date of Decision: 27 September 2022

Date of Publication of Record of Decision: 27 September 2022

**Date decision effective (i.e. 5 working days after date of publication of record of decision unless subject to call-in by the Resources & Performance Select Committee):
4 October 2022**

County Council Meeting – 11 October 2022

REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Cabinet met on 26 July 2022 and 27 September 2022.

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 14. 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 10 October 2022).

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 26 July 2022 Cabinet considered:

A. INCREASING ACCESS TO LIBRARY BUILDINGS

Following Cabinet's approval of the Library and Cultural Service Strategy 2020-2025 in November 2019, the Library and Cultural Services Transformation Programme has commenced significant change across the Library Service. This includes a major workforce transformation and initiation of a five-year programme of work to modernise library settings across Surrey.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet agrees the introduction of Open Access technology in thirteen libraries across the county.
2. That Cabinet agrees an initial capital allocation of £345k from the £1.8m identified in the Capital Pipeline.
3. That Cabinet agrees the proposed approach to a phased introduction of Open Access in additional libraries.
4. That Cabinet delegates to the Capital Programme Panel (CPP) the approval of any subsequent release of funding, within the overall envelope identified in the Capital Pipeline and subject to a robust business case.

Reasons for decisions:

Cabinet agreement to introduce Open Access technology into libraries is essential to unlock the full potential of library buildings, increasing access beyond the current opening hours, and empowering communities to reap wider benefit from using these valuable community assets. Thirteen libraries have been prioritised, based on analysis of where there is greatest opportunity to achieve positive impact, and with a good geographic spread across the county. Careful analysis of usage, cost and revenue generation opportunity from the initial thirteen will inform the proposal and business case for future phases of implementation.

B. SUNBURY HUB

This report sought Cabinet approval to redevelop the former Sunbury Fire Station with a new integrated five-storey, multi-service hub. The aim is to bring together key local services into a vibrant community facility which will provide residents with space to connect, socialise, learn and access to essential public services in one building, in their local area.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves the allocation of capital funding from the pipeline to the capital programme for the development of the detailed design and construction of Sunbury Hub. The funding required is commercially sensitive and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of an appropriate construction contractor partner for the delivery of all associated services required in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. Regarding the procurement of the construction contractor, Cabinet agrees that the Executive Director of Resources and the Director of Land and Property authorise and award such contracts, within the +/-5% budgetary tolerance level.

Reasons for decisions:

Approving the recommendations in this report will:

- a. Regenerate a vacant Council-owned site.
- b. Accelerate much-needed investment in Sunbury to support regeneration.
- c. Deliver a multi-purpose building that improves service delivery and the community experience.
- d. Optimise use of Council-owned assets and release other assets for Service re-use or disposal, in line with the Council's Asset and Place Strategy.
- e. Support the Adult Social Care (ASC) transformation programme ambition to reduce the number of people with a learning disability and/or autism in

residential care by 40-50% by 2025, and ensure these residents are supported in-county.

- f. Provide modern space and enable digital solutions for Services.
- g. Produce benefits which link to all of the Council's strategic priority areas.
- h. Specifically reduce carbon emissions by using innovative technologies and smart build in the project's design.
- i. Support the delivery of the Council's Agile Office Estate programme.
- j. Create commercial opportunities where appropriate.
- k. Offer tangible social value to residents.

C. OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE FOR THE RE-PROCUREMENT OF WASTE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL SERVICES

This report sought to award twenty local bus contracts to nine operators, for the provision of twenty-four public bus services. This decision relates to 20 current contracts which expire on 27 August 2022 and have been retendered. If awarded the new contracts will commence from 28 August 2022.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves the Outline Business Case for the future re-procurement of the Waste Treatment and Disposal Services to inform the development of a Detailed Procurement Strategy.
2. That Cabinet delegates authority of approval of the final procurement route to market for services from 2024 to the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste, in consultation with the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure.

Reasons for decisions:

Approval of the OBC is critical to enable the Council to continue to deliver its statutory duty seamlessly beyond September 2024. This will also be instrumental in designing the services to both maximise value for money and contribute to Surrey's ambitious environmental targets.

At its meeting on 27 September 2022 Cabinet considered:

D. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE PROCUREMENT POLICY

This report set out the proposed policy to improve environmental considerations in the Council's procurement activities to meet the Council's Strategic Priority areas for 'Enabling a greener future' and 'Growing a sustainable economy so that everyone can benefit'.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approve the Environmentally Sustainable Procurement Policy on behalf of Surrey County Council (SCC).

2. That Cabinet delegate authority for approving any future changes to the Policy to the Director of Procurement in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Cabinet Member for Environment, to enable the policy to evolve and adapt to local and national developments.

Reasons for decisions:

This policy aims to improve the environmental considerations built into the core delivery of goods, works and services that the Council procures. Having declared a climate emergency and published both the Climate Change Strategy and Delivery Plan, this policy supports the net zero targets of the Council and embeds environmental sustainability, such as increases to Surrey's biodiversity and reducing waste, into procurement decisions to lead to a greener future for Surrey and its residents. This policy will prepare prospective suppliers for the environmental considerations and expectations that will be implemented into the Council's future contracts. On average, SCC spends £890million through its procurement activities across an average of 6,300 vendors per annum; increasing environmental considerations across the Council's procurement activity presents a significant opportunity to influence a reduction in carbon emissions across the county and within SCC's own services.

As national policy and technology are rapidly changing, the policy must also be agile. Therefore, it is recommended that delegated authority be given to the Director of Procurement in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Cabinet Member for Environment, to enable the policy to evolve as needed. Review of the policy is expected to take place on an, at least, annual basis once approved or as required following local and national policy directives.

E. REVISION TO PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT STANDING ORDERS

Cabinet is asked to approve amendments to the 2021 Procurement and Contract Standing Orders (PCSO's) which require updating due to changes in government legislation and internal practice.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet gives approval to amend summary table 2.7a in the 2021 PCSO's to update the current thresholds to ensure compliance with the World Trade Organisation (WTO) GPA (General Procurement Agreement).
2. That Cabinet agrees to change the requirement for further approvals of contract awards over the regulated threshold to only being required when the budget is exceeded by +5%, removing further approval if the recommended contract price is below the allocated budget.
3. That Cabinet agrees to utilise the flexibilities for sourcing the best route to market for below threshold Public Contracts Regulations (PCR) 2015 Light Touch Regime procurements (applicable to Health, Educational, Cultural and Social Care related service procurements).

4. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Resources for future changes to the regulatory thresholds specified in table 2.7a to be made in accordance with the WTO GPA thresholds without submitting to Cabinet / Council.
5. That Cabinet agrees to the removal of the requirement to register and maintain contracts over £5k and to increase this to £25k. This specifically relates to the uploading of contracts onto the procurement contracts database. Procurement is responsible for sourcing contracts over the value of £25K and therefore all contracts below this level are registered and maintained by the service. This amendment does not change any of the controls or the method/process of how we compliantly source the good/services.

Reasons for decisions:

- Care related services falling below the Light Touch Regime threshold have greater flexibility in procurement delivery methods whilst still ensuring value for money is secured.
- Providing delegated authority to amend table 2.7a in line with regulatory thresholds will negate the need for Cabinet / Council approval whenever they are updated.
- The revisions will ensure that the Procurement and Contract Standing Orders (PCSO's) are current and in line with the latest government legislation and internal practice to enable procurement efficiency and compliance.

F. QUARTERLY REPORT ON DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER SPECIAL URGENCY ARRANGEMENTS: 2 July 2022 – 30 September 2022

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.

The Cabinet RECOMMENDS that the County Council notes that there have been NO urgent decisions in the last three months.

**Tim Oliver, Leader of the Council
30 September 2022**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 26 JULY 2022 AT 2.00 PM
AT COUNCIL CHAMBER, WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL,
REIGATE, SURREY ,RH2 8EF.**

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

Members:

* = Present

*Tim Oliver (Chairman)
*Natalie Bramhall
*Clare Curran
*Matt Furniss
*Mark Nuti
*Denise Turner-Stewart
*Sinead Mooney
*Marisa Heath
*Becky Rush
*Kevin Deanus

Deputy Cabinet Members:

*Maureen Attewell
*Rebecca Paul
Steve Bax
*Jordan Beech

Members in attendance:

Lance Spencer, Local Member for Goldsworth East and Horsell Village
Jonathan Essex, Local Member for Redhill East and Green Party Group
Leader
Nick Darby, Local Member for the Dittons and Residents' Association and
Independent Group Leader
Will Forster, Local Member for Woking South

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

100/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Steve Bax.

101/22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 31 MAY 2022 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

102/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

103/22 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There was one member question. The question and response was published as a supplement to the agenda. In relation to his main question Lance Spencer asked when the research been undertaken by the research partner to engage and listen to families using services and those currently not engaging with the service would be finalised and whether this would be made public. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families explained that research was ongoing and in fact outreach was being undertaken on social media inviting members of the public, families, children to make their views known. The research would be finalised by the end of the summer and the Cabinet Member would check if the report could be shared with members.

104/22 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were two public questions. The questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda.

In relation to the first public question Malcolm Robertson's question queried the claim that the gasifier is certified as currently operating at 55% of the time. The Cabinet Member was asked to confirm if the certification was for the gasifier, as specified by Surrey, or if it just related to the plant working as an incinerator? The Cabinet Member agreed to send the questioner a written response.

In relation to her public question Jenny Desoutter asked if the new posts and the land management policy would put biodiversity and protecting nature as its first overall priority. She then asked if the range of initiatives to support biodiversity would be put into an overarching biodiversity action plan and if baseline surveys across the countryside estate would be undertaken. The Cabinet Member for Environment explained that biodiversity had been treated within the climate change plan with urgency. Baseline surveys had been done with Surrey Wildlife Trust and a biodiversity plan would be included in a vision for the county. Biodiversity was a priority for the Cabinet Member and more detail would be coming through in the autumn.

105/22 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

106/22 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

107/22 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There were none.

108/22 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

There were ten decisions for noting. The Cabinet Member for Communities informed members that two applications to your fund Surrey had been approved and would increase wider community involvement.

RESOLVED:

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

109/22 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]

The Cabinet member of the month update was presented by the Cabinet Member for Communities, Mark Nuti. The following key points were raised:

- Your Fund Surrey was picking up momentum and residents were encouraged to submit bids to the fund.
- Surrey had the second busiest library service in the country. All libraries in Surrey would be introducing library welfare officers to support the local community.
- Customer Services had recently launched a new telephone and digital welfare information and advice service for residents who are struggling and need financial, welfare or wellbeing support, including newly arrived Ukrainian refugees.
- Ten newly recruited community link officers would be working alongside councillors to help join up people, partners, funding, and opportunities, making better use of resources and supporting the ambitions of our communities.
- There was now three Local Area Coordinators (LACs) working alongside local communities in Maybury/Sheerwater, Horley (Central/West) and Hurst Green, and another about to be recruited to work in Old Dean / St Michael's. LACs are based in the local community for the local community and offer a unique type of individual support at a very local level. They help people of all ages become stronger, healthier, happier and more connected members of their community.
- The Cabinet Member explained that there were a number of events taking place across Surrey during the school holidays, many of these being free. The summer reading challenge would be taking place in libraries and there were a number of adventure zones across Surrey. There was a cultural mapping service on the Surrey County Council website which explains the exciting things going on around Surrey.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month report be noted.

110/22 INCREASING ACCESS TO LIBRARY BUILDINGS [Item 8]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Communities who explained that Cabinet were being asked to agree the introduction of Open Access technology into libraries. Open Access was technology that enables increased and flexible access to buildings, through library membership-based door entry systems and associated security features. Open Access would increase the ability of libraries to meet the needs of communities, support wider strategic priorities, and be fit and sustainable for the future. There would

be an initial capital allocation of £345k from the £1.8m identified in the Capital Pipeline. The Open Access technology would be introduced into thirteen libraries with the expectation that the rest of the libraries would have access to the technology in 2-3 years' time. There was support from Cabinet on the item and a recognition that libraries would become community hubs. Will Forster queried what difference this technology would make to residents, the evidence base for introducing this technology and what reductions would be made to staffing as a result of this. The Cabinet Member for Communities stated that this work was being done as residents had asked for libraries to be open later and for longer. There were no planned redundancies but open technology would enable staff to work smarter.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agrees the introduction of Open Access technology in thirteen libraries across the county.
2. That Cabinet agrees an initial capital allocation of £345k from the £1.8m identified in the Capital Pipeline.
3. That Cabinet agrees the proposed approach to a phased introduction of Open Access in additional libraries.
4. That Cabinet delegates to the Capital Programme Panel (CPP) the approval of any subsequent release of funding, within the overall envelope identified in the Capital Pipeline and subject to a robust business case.

Reasons for Decisions:

Cabinet agreement to introduce Open Access technology into libraries is essential to unlock the full potential of library buildings, increasing access beyond the current opening hours, and empowering communities to reap wider benefit from using these valuable community assets. Thirteen libraries have been prioritised, based on analysis of where there is greatest opportunity to achieve positive impact, and with a good geographic spread across the county. Careful analysis of usage, cost and revenue generation opportunity from the initial thirteen will inform the proposal and business case for future phases of implementation.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee)

111/22 GOVERNMENT ADULT SOCIAL CARE CHARGING REFORMS [Item 9]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health who explained that the report summarised the current proposals which make up the government's Adult Social Care Charging and Fair Cost of Care reforms and the anticipated cumulative impact for Surrey County Council. The reforms would harmonise costs and provide a fair cost of care for our self funders. In Surrey we have 60% self funders. The lack of detail pose a number of risks to the council. These risks are presented in potential and modelled increased costs, reduced income and increased numbers of new residents needing support within adult social care. The reforms have potential to disrupt provider relationships and will lead to significant increase in staffing capacity. The Cabinet Member said that she was confident that the adult social care

leadership and corporate leadership would navigate through these reforms and implement them to the benefit of all of our Surrey residents. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources raised concerns around the financial impact of the proposed reforms on the Councils financial stability. The magnitude and uncertainty around the adult social care reform was the biggest unquantifiable area of financial pressure.

Will Forster queried how the possible impacts from the reforms would be displayed on the councils risk register and how the council planned to reduce the cumulative costs of the reforms to the council over the next ten years. The Leader stated that this was a sighting paper as reforms would come about in October 2023. The Leader did not think it was helpful to pin down what the reforms would look like without quality data. The Leader had been reassured that the next Prime Minister would honour the commitment of the government to fund the reforms. It was important that the government analyse the data from the trailblazer councils as this would help better understand the counties position moving forward.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the key changes, implications and overarching risks of the government's Adult Social Care Charging and Fair Cost of Care reforms for Surrey residents and Surrey County Council.
2. That Cabinet notes the collaborative approach and the emerging plans to prepare, and as far as possible mitigate risks, for implementation from October 2023.
3. That Cabinet approves up to £2.9m of the Council's Budget Equalisation Reserve to be used to fund additional expenditure required in 2022/23 to facilitate the implementation of Adult Social Care Charging and Fair Cost of Care reforms above funding provided by government as set out in Annex 2.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Government published its Adult Social Care system reform white paper 'People at the heart of care' on 1 December. The intent of the white paper is to *make the system fairer and ensure more people do not face enormous care costs*. In Surrey the reforms will mean the Council will fund care for more people, the availability and therefore the quality of care may be affected, and a significant funding short-fall is anticipated based on current proposed government funding which has been widely commented on as insufficient to meet the full cost of the reforms. With high levels of self-funding residents and existing staffing challenges in Surrey, the implementation timetable means it will be challenging to recruit, upgrade systems and build capacity to support so many residents. Current government guidance recommends an awareness campaign from January – March 2023, assessments starting in April 2023 in readiness for implementation from October 2023.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Adults and Health Select Committee)

112/22 RECOMMENDATION ON THE DELIVERY MODEL FOR EXTRACARE HOUSING AT THE FORMER BENTLEY DAY CENTRE, BANSTEAD HORSESHOE, REIGATE AND BANSTEAD [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the report explaining that the report set out the proposed delivery approach for one site of extra care housing at the former Bentley Day Centre. This supports the councils strategy to deliver accommodation of a total of 725 affordable units by 2030, which will enable people to access the right health and social care at the right time, in the right place. Providing appropriate housing for residents that need help to enable them to remain independent. The development will be in the heart of the community and the design will make these homes for life. Support was given to the Pond Meadow site in Guildford where 60 units were being developed. The property team and the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste were thanked for delivering the much needed properties.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves the development of Extra Care Housing on the former Bentley Day Centre site owned by the Council set out in this paper.
2. That Cabinet approves external delivery of Extra Care Housing at the former Bentley Day Centre through a tender for a strategic development and housing management partner(s) as the preferred option. This site will be tendered with four further sites that have previously been approved for Extra Care Housing by Cabinet.
3. That Cabinet grants delegated authority for contract award to the following officers:
 - a. Deputy Chief Executive, Executive Director for Resources and Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources
 - b. Executive Director for Adult Social Care in consultation with Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
4. That Cabinet notes that a separate procurement process will be conducted to identify onsite support and care provision to avoid long-term support and care provision being tied into the development and housing management contract.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

Tendering for strategic development and housing management partner(s) to take forwards the development of Extra Care Housing on the former Bentley Day Centre is consistent with previous decisions made by Cabinet. In October 2019, July 2020 and October 2020 Cabinet agreed to identify a strategic partner(s) for the development and housing management of Extra Care Housing at the former Pond Meadow School, the former Brockhurst Care Home and the former Pinehurst Resource Centre, Salisbury Road and Lakeside sites through tendering processes.

There are multiple benefits for the Council from including the former Bentley Day Centre site in the tender with the existing four sites. These include:

- Accessing economies of scale from delivering Extra Care Housing across more settings, which is likely to lead to a more commercially favourable response for the Council.
- Preventing unnecessary delay to the delivery of Extra Care Housing at the former Bentley Day Centre because it would not be advised to tender a single site.
- Accelerating the delivery of the strategy by including the site in the upcoming tender.

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

The other option available is for the Council to directly deliver the Extra Care Housing scheme at the Bentley site. This would involve the Council committing significant capital expenditure and be responsible for the ongoing housing management function of the Extra Care Housing setting. This option is not recommended as it is anticipated significantly less financially beneficial to the Council and would mean one Extra Care Housing scheme would be developed by the Council in isolation while a strategic development and housing management partner was developing four other Extra Care Housing schemes (assuming the tender for these sites is successful, which we expect to be the case based on market engagement). Financial modelling for both options is set out in the Part 2 paper.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Adults and Health Select Committee)

113/22 SUNBURY HUB [Item 11]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste who explained that Cabinet were being asked to approve capital funding to develop a new integrated five story multi surface hub on the former Sunbury Fire station site. Office space will be accommodated on the 1st- 3rd levels and the 4th and 5th levels would be dedicated to supported independent living. The site was well located and was easily accessible by local transport. Developing this vacant site and relocating public services into the new building would save the Council backlog and future maintenance costs on the existing old and rundown properties. This would be a second hub delivered by the council following the Merstham Hub. Members were in support of the proposals and recognised the huge amount of effort that had gone into this project. Councillor Alison Todd was thanked for all her efforts in this project.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves the allocation of capital funding from the pipeline to the capital programme for the development of the detailed design and construction of Sunbury Hub. The funding required is commercially sensitive and is set out in the Part 2 report.

2. That Cabinet approves procurement of an appropriate construction contractor partner for the delivery of all associated services required in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. Regarding the procurement of the construction contractor, Cabinet agrees that the Executive Director of Resources and the Director of Land and Property authorise and award such contracts, within the +/- 5% budgetary tolerance level.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approving the recommendations in this report will:

- a. Regenerate a vacant Council-owned site.
- b. Accelerate much-needed investment in Sunbury to support regeneration.
- c. Deliver a multi-purpose building that improves service delivery and the community experience.
- d. Optimise use of Council-owned assets and release other assets for Service re-use or disposal, in line with the Council's Asset and Place Strategy.
- e. Support the Adult Social Care (ASC) transformation programme ambition to reduce the number of people with a learning disability and/or autism in residential care by 40-50% by 2025, and ensure these residents are supported in-county.
- f. Provide modern space and enable digital solutions for Services.
- g. Produce benefits which link to all of the Council's strategic priority areas.
- h. Specifically reduce carbon emissions by using innovative technologies and smart build in the project's design.
- i. Support the delivery of the Council's Agile Office Estate programme.
- j. Create commercial opportunities where appropriate.
- k. Offer tangible social value to residents.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)

114/22 FREEMANTLES SCHOOL PROJECT, PHASE 1 SEND CAPITAL PROGRAMME [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning introduced the report explaining that the Freemantles School expansion project was one of the remaining Phase 1 SEND Capital Programme projects to be delivered that was approved by Cabinet in September 2019. The original brief to expand the school by 40 additional places for autistic children with severe or profound and multiple learning difficulties was increased in 2020 to 72 places and Cabinet subsequently approved an budget of approximately £10m in March 2021. The project would reduce the councils reliance on independent schools, reduce journey times between home and school for the children and young people, and ensure that the children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities who require specialist placements have their needs met in Surrey communities and schools.

The Leader highlighted that residents council tax would go towards the £140 million to deliver 2300 additional specialist places. Both SEND places and delivering extra care facilities were hugely important to the council. Will Forster welcomed the report and supported the project. He queried if the project was still achievable taking into account of issues in the construction industry with sourcing materials. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning stated that the council was committed to the timescales highlighted in the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves £15.159m SEND Capital funding against the Freemantles School Phase 1 Capital project. This an uplift to the individual scheme budget allocation within the existing SEND Capital Programme funding envelope.

Reasons for Decisions:

The project will deliver 72 additional specialist school places and re-provide 54 current specialist school places for autistic children with severe or profound and multiple learning difficulties in Surrey from September 2023 onwards.

The scheme represents good value for money at a cost of £120k per pupil place. Equivalent annual independent sector placement costs for the 72 new places would be a minimum of £3.8m per year compared to £1.6m per year for maintained special school placements.

Investing in the Freemantles expansion project now generates the positive impact on outcomes for pupils with complex special educational needs and disabilities, as well as improving the council's financial sustainability.

The Freemantles School expansion project is business critical to ensure Surrey County Council discharges its statutory duties under Section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999, Sections 13 and 14 of the Education Act 1996 and Part 27 Section 3 of the Children and Families Act 2014.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee)

115/22 REPLACEMENT OF HYDROTHERAPY POOL AT PHILIP SOUTHCOTE SCHOOL, ADDLESTONE [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste introduced the report. Cabinet were being asked to approve capital funding to design and construct a new hydrotherapy pool at Philip Southcote School, a Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND) school in Addlestone. Hydrotherapy was a fundamental part of the school's curriculum, and the current pool and building were now beyond reasonable economic repair. The report proposes replacing the current structure and constructing a new building on the existing site, to house the new pool and its associated facilities. The proposals would continue to benefit residents, swim clubs, groups and organisations who hire the pool.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding identified in the Capital Programme Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Pipeline allocation for Philip Southcote School. An additional amount will be transferred from the Corporate Maintenance Budget. The funding required is commercially sensitive and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of the supply chain for the delivery of all associated services required, in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. Regarding the procurement of supply chain partners, Cabinet agrees that the Executive Director of Resources and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, within the +/-5% budgetary tolerance level.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approving the report's proposal will:

- a. Support the Council to fulfil its statutory obligations for SEND pupils attending Philip Southcote School.
- b. Support the school to fulfil its curriculum and teaching responsibilities.
- c. Have a positive impact on the pupils physical, emotional and mental health, leading to better focus on their learning and education.
- d. Allow the school to continue and strengthen community links as it hires out the pool and its facilities to third parties (outside of curriculum hours).
- e. Continue to benefit residents, swim clubs, groups and organisations who hire the pool.
- f. Allow the school to continue and increase income from pool hire to support the pool's operating costs and enhance the school's therapeutic offering for its pupils.
- g. The school also runs a café when hiring out the pool; the café is staffed by pupils who gain valuable work experience and life-skills.
- h. Continue to provide a facility that has been in place for over 50 years.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)

116/22 LOCAL BUS CONTRACT RETENDERING [Item 14]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy who explained that there were currently 207 bus services operating in Surrey and the County Council gives some financial support to around 75% of these. The report seeks to award twenty local bus contracts to nine operators, for the provision of twenty-four public bus services. The decision relates to 20 current contracts which expire on 27 August 2022 and have been retendered. If awarded the new contracts will commence from 28 August 2022. Overall, these proposals would maintain the existing network of bus provision with some amendments proposed to the vehicles operating these services which will improve emissions standards and air quality. Euro 6 buses would be replacing Euro 5 buses on 14 contracts

which comprises 17 services in total. The remaining 7 services will seek opportunities for funding to enable them to move to Euro 6 or even hydrogen or electric. The Cabinet Member for Environment welcomed the introduction of Euro 6 buses.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the background information set out in this report, and following consideration of the results of the procurement process, award the contracts to the operators as set out in the Part 2 report.

Reasons for Decisions:

Progressing the award of these contracts will enable SCC to:

- Provide a robust local bus network providing essential public transport to residents so that they may continue to access key services, including employment, education, health care and essentially shopping, whilst supporting resident well-being by providing the ability for residents to travel throughout Surrey.
- Provide bus services that are delivered by reputable operators that meet the County Council's specified quality standards and enable us to meet our statutory duty as a Local Transport Authority.
- Establish sustainable funding arrangements with bus operators.
- Increase the proportion of lower emission Euro 6 buses on our network, replacing those with far higher emissions.

To comply with Procurement Standing Orders (PSO), Cabinet approval for contracts that reach a specified value is required.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)

117/22 OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE FOR THE RE-PROCUREMENT OF WASTE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL SERVICES [Item 15]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste who explained that the item proposes a future model for the delivery of waste following considerable work undertaken on the outline business case presented within the report. As the report indicated, the situation with respect to the gasifier on the Eco park at Shepperton remains unclear. The facility was operational and had been accepted by the independent certifier. However, there was an outstanding dispute with Suez over the delivery of facilities at the Eco park. The council was working to find the best resolution possible and a further update on this would be brought to cabinet in the autumn.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves the Outline Business Case for the future re-procurement of the Waste Treatment and Disposal Services to inform the development of a Detailed Procurement Strategy.

2. That Cabinet delegates authority of approval of the final procurement route to market for services from 2024 to the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste, in consultation with the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approval of the OBC is critical to enable the Council to continue to deliver its statutory duty seamlessly beyond September 2024. This will also be instrumental in designing the services to both maximise value for money and contribute to Surrey's ambitious environmental targets.

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)

118/22 2022/23 MONTH 2 (MAY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 16]

The report provided details of the County Council's 2022/23 financial position as at 31st May 2022 (M2) for revenue and capital budgets, and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resource explained that at M2, the Council was forecasting a full year deficit of £23.0m, against the revenue budget approved by Council in February 2022. The council was experiencing higher than budgeted inflation arising from increased global and economic uncertainty and this significantly increased the risk of the Council on delivering the revenue and capital budgets for this financial year. The Deputy Leader gave an update on significant budget pressures and areas of risks.

It was explained that there had been an overspend with Surrey Fire and Rescue. The Cabinet Member for Community Protection explained that the service was facing a difficult period in terms of recruitment and retention with the London Fire Brigade advertising for roles. There had been a temporary increase in staffing and investment in learning and development opportunities that had come at a cost. The service was investing in equipment and specialist training. The Cabinet Member gave an update on all the incidents the service had attended including the fire at Hankley Common and thanked staff for their dedication and professionalism in keeping the public safe. The Leader thanked the Chief Fire Officer and the teams for their professionalism in challenging times. This view was echoed by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health who thanked the service for attending an incident at the ex-servicemen's club in Staines.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year. The report provided details of the County Council's 2022/23 financial position as at 31st May 2022 (M2) for revenue and capital budgets, and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)

119/22 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 17]

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.

120/22 RECOMMENDATION ON THE DELIVERY MODEL FOR EXTRACARE HOUSING AT THE FORMER BENTLEY DAY CENTRE, BANSTEAD HORSESHOE, REIGATE AND BANSTEAD [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health introduced the Part 2 report which 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 the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

See Exempt Minute [E-18-22]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-18-22]

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Adults and Health Select Committee)

121/22 SUNBURY HUB [Item 19]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste introduced the Part 2 report which 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 the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

See Exempt Minute [E-19-22]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-19-22]

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)

122/22 REPLACEMENT OF HYDROTHERAPY POOL AT PHILIP SOUTHCOTE SCHOOL, ADDLESTONE [Item 20]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste introduced the Part 2 report which 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 the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

See Exempt Minute [E-20-22]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-20-22]

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Resources and Performance Select Committee)

123/22 LOCAL BUS CONTRACT RETENDERING [Item 21]

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy introduced the Part 2 report which 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 the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

See Exempt Minute [E-21-22]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-21-22]

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)

124/22 OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE FOR THE RE-PROCUREMENT OF WASTE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL SERVICES [Item 22]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste introduced the Part 2 report which 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 the authority holding that information) and paragraph 5: Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

RESOLVED:

See Exempt Minute [E-22-22]

Reasons for Decisions:

638

See Exempt Minute [E-22-22]

(The decisions on this item can be called-in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee)

125/22 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 23]

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

Meeting closed at 15:30

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank