



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



Agenda and Reports
for the Annual meeting of
THE COUNTY COUNCIL

to be held on

23 MAY 2023

Woodhatch Place
Reigate
Surrey

Friday, 12 May 2023

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, 23 May 2023, 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 Martin Colton, Vicar of St Mark'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 CHAIR

1. To elect a Chair for the Council Year 2023/24.
2. The Chair to make the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

2 ELECTION OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR

The Chief Executive, as County Returning Officer, formally to report the election of a new County Councillor. Ashley Richard Tilling for the Walton South and Oatlands division at the by-election held on 4 May 2023.

3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chair to report apologies for absence.

4 MINUTES

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 21 March 2023.

(Pages 7
- 38)

5 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.

6 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair to report.

7 VICE-CHAIR

1. To elect a Vice-Chair for the Council Year 2023/24.
2. The Vice-Chair to make the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

8 MOTION OF THANKS TO RETIRING CHAIR

The newly elected Chair to move a formal motion of thanks to Helyn Clack, the retiring Chair of the Council.

9 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader to make a statement.

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

10 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

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 17 May 2023).

11 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 22 May 2023).

12 APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE

(Pages
39 - 40)

The purpose of this report is to request that the County Council considers whether to agree that County Councillor John Furey may continue to be absent from Council meetings by reason of ill health.

13 ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY

To formally review the proportional political allocation of places on committees and to adopt a scheme of proportionality for the Council Year 2023/24.

(Note: to follow)

14 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

To appoint Members of the various Boards / Committees of the Council for the Council Year 2023/24 subject to any changes of membership to be reported to the meeting by Group Leaders.

(Note: to follow)

15 ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN

To elect Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees for the Council Year 2023/24.

(Note: to follow)

- 16 SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2022/23** (Pages 41 - 54)
For Council to review the Scrutiny Annual Report 2022/23 as presented in the accompanying paper offering feedback and comments as required.
- 17 APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL** (Pages 55 - 58)
To ratify the appointment of members of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP).
- 18 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION** (Pages 59 - 72)
It is the Council's responsibility to approve changes to the Council's Constitution. This report sets out proposed changes to Part 7 - Members' Allowances Scheme. These are brought to Council for formal approval in accordance with Article 4.04(b) and (k) and Article 13.01 of the Council's Constitution.
- 19 REPORT OF THE CABINET** (Pages 73 - 80)
To receive the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 28 March 2023 and 25 April 2023.
- 20 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS** (Pages 81 - 106)
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 22 May 2023.

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 21 MARCH 2023 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING
CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

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

Maureen Attewell	Eber Kington
Ayesha Azad	Rachael Lake
Catherine Baart	Victor Lewanski
Steve Bax	David Lewis (Cobham)
John Beckett	* David Lewis (Camberley West)
Jordan Beech	* Scott Lewis
Luke Bennett	Andy Lynch
Amanda Boote	Andy MacLeod
Harry Boparai	Ernest Mallett MBE
* Liz Bowes	r 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
r Paul Deach	Bernie Muir
Kevin Deanus	Mark Nuti
Jonathan Essex	John O'Reilly
Robert Evans OBE	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	* Joanne Sexton
* Tim Hall	Lance Spencer
David Harmer	Lesley Steeds
* Nick Harrison	Mark Sugden
Edward Hawkins	Richard Tear
Marisa Heath	Chris Townsend
Trefor Hogg	Liz Townsend
Robert Hughes	Denise Turner-Stewart
Jonathan Hulley	* Hazel Watson
Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Jeremy Webster
Frank Kelly	Buddhi Weerasinghe
Riasat Khan	* Fiona White
Robert King	Keith Witham

*absent

r = Remote Attendance

10/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Follows, Tim Hall, Nick Harrison, David Lewis (Camberley West), Scott Lewis, Julia McShane, Joanne Sexton, Hazel Watson, Fiona White.

Members who attended remotely and had no voting rights were Paul Deach, Michaela Martin.

11/23 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 7 February 2023 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

12/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

13/23 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

Buddhi Weerasinghe joined the meeting at 10.08 am.

The Chair:

- Informed Members of the deaths of former County Councillor Janet Maines and Eloise Appleby, former Chief Executive of the Grange in Bookham. She paid tribute to the contributions they had both made to the county of Surrey.
- Thanked Robert Hughes for attending Eloise Appleby's memorial on behalf of the Council and highlighted the letter of thanks and certificate of service awarded through the Chair's Office before she died.
- Invited Robert Hughes and David Harmer to speak, they paid personal tribute to Eloise Appleby and Janet Maines respectively.
- Led the Council in a moment of reflection for Janet Maines and Eloise Appleby.
- Noted that Tony Samuels had resigned as County Councillor for Walton South and Oatlands, and thanked him for his service to the Council as a divisional Member, past Cabinet Member and Chair of Council.
- Noted that the rest of her announcements could be found in the agenda.
- Highlighted her attendance at the recent Surrey Armed Forces Covenant Conference 2023, held at Pirbright. Over 150 delegates attended with many services represented, with a fantastic array of speakers on life in the services and their families' experiences. She congratulated the organisers of the conference, the Armed Forces and her office.

14/23 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Noted that potholes were a major problem and there was a dangerous amount, it could no longer be said that Surrey's roads were improving compared to a year ago.

- Noted that the Highways service was overwhelmed and Surrey's roads were disintegrating, sufficient money was needed for repairs to ensure public safety.
- Noted that highways were a major concern for residents, and residents were entitled to expect the delivery and timely repair of potholes and to be kept informed.
- Provided examples of roads potholed to a dangerous extent in Elmbridge, loose stones, incomplete work and resurfacing not carried out, bridge replacement delayed, cars swerving to avoid potholes, residents facing poor lighting, broken suspension and significant costs; in line with encouraging cycling, Surrey's roads must be safe.
- Noted sadness at Tony Samuels' resignation and thanked him for the immense amount of hard work and help given to Members.
- Noted surprise that the Leader praised the recent national Budget which signalled the worst decline in living standards in living memory and offered no new support on the cost of living; residents would continue to struggle due to the lack of help from the Government and the Council needed to lobby the Government to help the most vulnerable.
- Noted that the Leader stated that a key priority for the Council was improving health outcomes, yet residents were suffering worse outcomes due to insufficient funding; the national Budget signalled no extra money for the NHS despite hospitals having costly repairs backlogs and NHS services were struggling.
- Welcomed the announcement of Government funding for a special needs school in the north of Surrey but noted that more special educational needs places in Surrey were needed; asked the Leader to confirm when a site selection and planning application would be done for this school.
- Residents were frustrated with the state of Surrey's roads and things were going to get worse as next year's 2024/25 Highways budget would be reduced by £51.8 million with Members losing their £100,000 divisional allowance; asked whether the Leader would reverse those cuts.
- Highlighted that Lime Tree Primary School in Redhill, approved by the Planning and Regulatory Committee in 2014, was built on a green urban site by claiming special circumstances, despite the alternative site assessment which proposed that housing could be built on that site.
- Regarding new school delivery, noted that the Planning and Regulatory Committee had rejected plans to move Reigate Priory Junior School to Woodhatch Place, asked whether the Council would apply its new transport policy and place the new school in the middle of a 20-minute neighbourhood.
- Asked whether the Council would properly assess the site options for the Reigate Priory Junior School, and for the Leader to confirm that the same scheme would not go back to a Planning and Regulatory Committee primed to approve it, instead asking for a commitment to realign the Council's new school planning to its climate strategy, transport plan and residents' wishes.
- Noted the members of the public in attendance at the meeting to protest about Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) provision, and asked how proposed new SEND places would impact on the ballooning Home to School Transport budget.
- Asked whether the new SEND school in Dorking would be served by the Council's expanded on demand bus service.
- Noted that the Budget statement did not refer to councils' key role in delivering climate outcomes through public transport expansion, retrofitting homes, different approaches to health and wellbeing, early help and prevention through more children's centres, not just in fixing more potholes; asked whether the Leader agreed that Government help was required.

- Noted that the Leader referred to the Chancellor's "inspirational" Budget, asked whether the Leader could provide any details of how he thought the budget would benefit Surrey's residents.
- Welcomed the Chancellor's announcement of increased childcare, but asked how it would be organised in Surrey, where would the facilities be and staff found, and would they be adequately paid.
- Regarding potholes, referred to the leaflet received by Members from the Leader investing in Surrey's future with £188 million invested on Surrey's roads and pavements, which only equated to just over £2 million per division.
- Highlighted a newspaper headline which reported that "potholes misery deepens as roads across the country would be resurfaced every 116 years"; there was a long wait to see many of the roads in Surrey resurfaced.
- Asked whether the Leader had any idea of how many new electric vehicle (EV) charging points would be provided across Surrey and whether measures would be put in place to stop people parking non-EV vehicles in these spaces.
- Asked the Leader whether there were any controls on temporary traffic lights, raising concerns that these were sometimes in use where work did not appear to be taking place.

Eber Kington left the meeting at 10.49 am and joined remotely.

15/23 CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS [Item 6]

The Leader introduced the report noting that the Cabinet Member for Environment's portfolio would now include responsibility for all issues relating to flooding, with all aspects of waste (including oversight of future waste strategy the re-procurement of the waste contract) becoming the responsibility of the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste. The Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up would have a greater focus on assisting with the work underway regarding the integration of health and social care, particularly following the publication of the Hewitt Review next week.

In response to a comment made by a Member regarding the frequent nature of changes to Cabinet Portfolios, the Leader explained that these were updated on a regular basis in order to reflect the demands of the priority focus at the time.

RESOLVED:

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

16/23 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Questions:

Notice of twenty-five questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in the supplementary agenda on 20 March 2023.

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

(Q2) Colin Cross concerning the 114 new houses to be built in Effingham, he noted that response stated that there was no consultation process because consultation had already taken place, yet that was prior to the decision and there had been over 900 objections to the previous application. He asked why Wisley Airfield was included

in the response as a reason for the new school expansion, as the Wisley Airfield application in the Local Plan already included plans for a new school with 400 places.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning reiterated that the response did not state that there would be no consultation carried out - it stated that the consultation was to be carried out by the Trust and not by the Council. She highlighted that the Trust had previously consulted widely across the area. She noted that the reference to the proposed development in Wisley Airfield was to underline the reasons why the school place planning team felt that there was sufficient growth in the population in the vicinity of the school to justify additional places at that school. The Wisley Airfield site would include an additional primary school; the school being referenced was a secondary school.

(Q3) John Beckett had no supplementary question.

Ernest Mallett MBE referring to part (f) of the response, asked whether the Cabinet Member recognised that resurfacing concrete roads had been a traditionally neglected area. Considering that fine milling had been accepted as a possible solution, he asked what alternative technology there was for dealing with concrete roads that were not suitable for fine milling.

Catherine Powell referred to the response that stated that footways to large schools with more than 500 pupils were defined as Category 3 link footways rather than primary or secondary walking routes. With the increased emphasis on Active Travel and the priorities set out in the fourth Local Transport Plan (LTP4), she asked whether the Cabinet Member would consider increasing the category of footways that serve schools, particularly in areas where schools have populations more than 1,000 pupils. She asked how many of the temporary repairs undertaken during that winter had already failed.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience noted that he would provide written responses to both Members, and asked them if they could confirm the details of their questions outside the meeting.

(Q4) Catherine Powell noted that the planning system focused on one application at a time where the use of infiltration and impact on recharging the aquifer was compounded; she sought reassurance from the Cabinet Member that it would be addressed in the forthcoming Climate Change Adaption Strategy. Referring to the response around the categorisation of flood risk that was only used for fluvial flood risk, she asked what categorisations of surface water and groundwater flooding would be adopted going forward. She asked whether the Cabinet Member accepted that once the decision had been made to allow the development without infiltration, the ability to recharge any aquifer below would have been removed forever and there would be a lasting impact on water security.

The Cabinet Member for Environment suggested holding a meeting with the Member and relevant team to consider her questions in more detail.

(Q5) Ernest Mallett MBE noted that he found the £400,000 parking surplus that Elmbridge Borough Council claimed to have received to be odd. As the Council would not be maintaining the local green infrastructure when it takes over the work, he asked why it would take it over if as an improvement would not be provided to residents.

Denise Turner-Stewart asked whether the Cabinet Member would agree that the Your Fund Surrey Small Projects Fund had been designed with improvements such as vegetation, hanging flower baskets and assets within Surrey's communities and shopping centres in mind, with a focus on environmental projects and boosting the local economy to equip all Members to work alongside their communities locally and sympathetically with what their residents wanted.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience agreed with Denise Turner-Stewart's question regarding Your Fund Surrey. Responding to Ernest Mallett MBE, he noted that the reason for taking over the verge cutting contract was to bring consistency across the county and because a number of the borough and district councils wanted to hand that power back to the Council.

(Q6) Robert King asked the Cabinet Member to respond regarding approaching local businesses to help a universal roll out of free school meals to primary schools that Surrey maintains and to ask her team to cost that so the budget shortfall could be understood.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning presumed that what the Member had in mind was similar to what the Mayor of London had announced recently for a roll out of universal school meals across all primary schools in London. She reminded the Member that all children who were in Key Stage 1/infant schools already received universal school meals. She imagined that the Member was envisaging a roll out across Key Stage 2/junior schools. She noted that she would ask officers to price up the cost of that offer. She noted that the Council's in-house catering provider Twelve15 already provided universal free school meals across 140 maintained schools, equating to around 16,000 children. However, she noted that the uptake of those free school meals in Surrey was only around 80%, and one in five children who were entitled to a free school meal chose not to. She personally felt that targeted free school meals was a better way of reaching those who needed them than blanket provision. She also noted that schools received additional funding for every child who was eligible for free school meals, which was a vital lifeline of additional funding.

(Q7) Jonathan Essex asked how the maintenance backlog of pavements had changed over the last five years as £200 million was a large amount. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm that aligning highway maintenance to the LTP4 would increase the prioritisation of key walking routes, increasing the funding allocated to improve the condition of poorer pavement locations.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience explained that His Majesty's Treasury's accumulated depreciation formula was used to value the highway network, whereby a cost would be provided for turning the amount of kilometres rated as red and amber, to green. He noted that backlog calculations were different, as those factored in some of the repairs which might be rated green, the cost removal therefore of the red and amber rated repairs was higher. He noted that whilst the backlog figure for roads had been calculated, that was not the case for pavements, so the accumulated appreciation figures were used; discussions were underway with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth on the potential impact.

(Q10) Fiona Davidson noted that Guildford Borough Council, in common with a lot of other local authorities, had stopped using glyphosate other than where there were invasive species. She asked the Cabinet Member when the Council would adopt that more progressive approach to limiting the use of glyphosate on the premise that

currently there were some species that could only be controlled by it, but surely the Council should be adopting a policy to limit the use.

The Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed that the Council did have a policy whereby it only used glyphosate on invasive notifiable weeds and only on hard surfaces across the highways; rigorous training and safety procedures were in place. She noted that alternatives were currently being tested out and included hot foam, hand weeding, high pressure hot water, brushing and the use of vinegar; those solutions were not currently as effective as glyphosate. She noted that there had been a 50% reduction in use of glyphosate across the county and the hot foam treatment showed some good results, but there were issues to overcome such as the high use of water and the fact that it was labour intensive. The Council's ambition was to stopping using glyphosate but had to balance the fact that people wanted their roads kept neat and tidy. The Council would only undertake one spray at road level in 2023, avoiding the grass verges.

(Q11) Robert Evans OBE asked whether the Cabinet Member had asked anyone at Transport for London or the Mayor of London's Office for a face-to-face meeting to discuss the matter, ensuring that Surrey's residents get the health benefits but not the negative impacts from the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ). He asked whether the Cabinet Member would agree in principle with the health aims of ULEZ, and whether he was aware that the original idea for the scheme came from the former Mayor of London, Boris Johnson. He asked whether the Cabinet Member was aware that in other parts of the country where similar schemes had been brought into operation, for example Bath, the Conservative Government had picked up the bill for a wider scrappage scheme, covered by point two in his response. On point three of his response around the extension of Zone 6 Oyster Card scheme, he asked whether the Cabinet Member was aware that there had been efforts in several boroughs in the county to get that scheme. They had faltered because His Majesty's Treasury and the Department for Transport would not underwrite South Western Railway or the other railway companies for any losses that they might incur; he asked whether the Cabinet Member would follow that up with the Chancellor.

George Potter welcomed that the administration raised the issue of the Council not being properly consulted concerning ULEZ, he asked whether the Cabinet Member would follow that same approach to his own department's highways schemes across the county such as that which had been imposed in his division last year.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth responded to Robert Evans OBE confirming that the Council had requested a face-to-face meeting on several occasions. He noted that it was disappointing that only the threat of legal action prompted Transport for London and the Mayor of London's Office to respond. He agreed with the principles and the health benefits of ULEZ, noting that under Surrey's LTP4 an option was included for the Council to consider ULEZ for Surrey. He noted that he asked the Government regularly for additional funding and he was preparing to speak to the Secretary of State for Transport on the impacts of ULEZ.

(Q12) Liz Townsend asked whether the Cabinet Member could share how she was weighing up the financial costs with the impact of glyphosate on residents and the environment. She noted that many cities in Europe and across the world had banned - some decades ago - the use of such pesticides, particularly glyphosate. She noted that there were several councils in the UK leading the way on a ban, including Waverley Borough Council. Public awareness on the subject had increased and many were calling for a more precautionary approach. She noted that many residents had concerns with the use of glyphosate, particularly near to their homes and recreational

spaces. She asked for the Cabinet Member to provide a specific timeline for when she would phase out the use of glyphosate.

The Cabinet Member for Environment reiterated that the Council was only using glyphosate safely on hard surfaces along highways, not near recreational areas. The Council had reduced its use, using only one spray in 2023. She noted that she would await the public feedback around that and how the Council manages it highways in between then. She noted that once the trials on the alternatives had concluded, there would be a cost analysis and decision taken by the Cabinet and officers as to what would be the best way to proceed. She noted that the Council was looking at what other authorities had done, and she welcomed feedback.

(Q14) Mark Sugden on part (c) of his question, given that the Government parking consultation ended in November 2020, with 15,000 responses, he asked whether the Cabinet Member could ascertain from the Department of Transport when it might publish responses to that consultation and any associated recommendations.

Robert King asked whether the Council would assist Blue Badge holders by recognising a Blue Badge scanner on the Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) system rather than requiring them to go online to register their number plate, as many carers frequently change the vehicles they used.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience responded to Mark Sugden noting that he would liaise with the Department of Transport on the matter. Responding to Robert King, he noted that the Council had asked the borough and district councils for areas where they believed offences had been committed; including where disabled bays were being misused.

(Q15) John Beckett noted that the up to ten working days response time to a Member in most instances regarding parking was unacceptable. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could review Members' accessibility to the parking team regarding incidents that happen instantaneously. He noted that at his borough council, residents' issues were addressed by sending a team out.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience acknowledged that a number of parking issues were instantaneous, he noted that Members had a phone number that they could call and that their emails were prioritised. He also noted that some issues might stray into policing; things were being done on the matter.

(Q16) Catherine Powell asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm whether the ongoing additional procurement of energy to waste capacity would be within Surrey and whether she could advise what procurement would likely be reviewed by the relevant select committee.

The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste confirmed that the energy from waste plants would be within the South East, not within Surrey. Regarding bringing contracts to select committees, she noted that it would likely be an item at a future Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee meeting, an item on waste was taken to that select committee yesterday.

(Q17) Robert King thanked the Cabinet Member for his recent engagement with him on roads in his division. He requested further information from the Cabinet Member on how or if value for money assessments within the contract period were carried out and whether there were grounds for the termination of a contract if those were not met.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience noted that he would provide a written response.

(Q18) Jonathan Essex referring to part (a) of the response, inferred that the Council does place new people in Adult Social Care placements in homes that were rated as Requires Improvement, subject to checks, but noted that all children were placed in Good and Outstanding rated children's homes. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm that the Council was prepared to place its adults in homes with a lower standard than its children, and whether that was consistent with the "no one left behind" policy. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm that in closing the recent in-house adult care homes, all would be placed in Good or Outstanding rated homes; it was unacceptable for the Council to move people from its homes into private homes that were rated Requires Improvement.

The Cabinet Member for Adults and Health noted that in an ideal world, the Council would place everybody in a perfect home. He noted that the Requires Improvement rating did not mean that the care was substandard or insufficient, and all those homes were independently checked for the individual's needs prior to the placement taking place with agreement sought from the individual's relatives. No one was put at risk and placements were monitored. He noted that the marketplace did not always lend itself to having every home rated Good or Outstanding, but the Council strived to help them achieve those levels of attainment with the Care Quality Commission (CQC).

(Q20) Robert Evans OBE asked the Leader where appropriate, could Members be kept informed of all relevant ventures affecting their division.

The Leader of the Council responded that yes, if that information was available, it would be shared with Members.

(Q21) Liz Townsend asked the Cabinet Member to provide the details of the cut and collect trials and where those were. She asked whether the Cabinet Member could provide assurance that where there were ongoing issues with the grass across the highway and footpaths and where that was causing drainage issues, that would be down to highways to clear up; as opposed to the borough and district councils.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience noted that he would provide a written response.

Cabinet Member Briefings:

These were also published in the supplementary agenda on 20 March 2023.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Education and Learning: on the third bullet point in the Briefing concerning an additional 200 plus new specialist school places for children and young people starting in September 2023. **Chris Townsend** asked where the specialist school places would be, for example in specialist schools or in mainstream schools.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning referred the Member to the report to next week's Cabinet meeting, which provided detail on the capital programme for the forthcoming year and when that would be delivering additional places. She noted that she had a Cabinet Member Decision meeting next week to approve five different

schemes. Most of the schemes that would open next year would be an expansion of the current provision and the opening of additional needs units within mainstream schools; she did not believe that any new schools would be opening around the same time next year.

Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth: on the skills and economy paragraph, **Robert King** asked how that work interacted with the education offered in Surrey's technical colleges and the feedback mechanism around local employers and some councils regarding the shortfall in the number of technical skills.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth noted that the Council had a good working relationship with all its further and higher education providers as well as its independent providers. He noted that he and the Leader in January met with all those providers and had regular discussions with the Surrey Chambers of Commerce and other businesses. The colleges were informed of where skills shortages and needs had been identified, Surrey's education providers were responsive as for example in the case of a shortage of lab technicians, within a year the North East Surrey College of Technology (Nescot) was running a course.

17/23 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

Buddhi Weerasinghe (Lower Sunbury and Halliford) made a statement on a campaign to bring rail stations in Spelthorne into the Transport for London (TfL) zoning system. The campaigners carried out an extensive feasibility study to prove there would be an increase of footfall which would benefit the local communities. The Department for Transport required a feasible business case to open talks with South Western Railway and that had recently been provided by Shepperton Studios. He asked the Council to lobby the Government on Shepperton Studios' letter.

Jonathan Hulley (Foxhills, Thorpe & Virginia Water) made a statement on the Thorpe Green Community Project for £68,000 approved in July 2022 by the Your Fund Surrey (YFS) Advisory Panel. The applicant, the Core Judo Academy would use the funding to provide a new community use car park and outdoor gym facility. It had been discovered that the earmarked land was common land so an application had to be made to the Secretary of State. He praised the joint working between Runnymede Borough Council and the Council to agree a solution and welcomed Runnymede Borough Council's additional allocation of £25,000. He thanked the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety, and YFS officers.

Rachael Lake (Walton) made a statement on the newly opened Heathside Walton-on-Thames free school, further to her statement a year ago noting her residents' concerns. The small roundabout at the junction of Terrace Road and Waterside Drive was becoming a hub for significant environmental impact. Within less than 500 metres on Waterside Drive there were several leisure and sporting facilities, many other sites, private dwellings and the new free school which led to more traffic problems from only one year's intake. The roundabout connecting Waterside Drive and Terrace Road was near a school and a nursery; a further school to follow. She stressed to the Leader that an in-depth environmental assessment was needed.

Mark Sugden (Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott) made a statement on Network Rail's refurbishment to three local railway bridges, two in his Division and the other in Esher. He noted that significant road diversions were in place which inconvenienced the local community, there had been a delay to the completion of Claygate bridge and the footbridge at Claygate Station had closed to carry out emergency work. He recognised the need for those works, however there were adverse impacts to local

businesses, commuters and roads. He asked the relevant Cabinet Member to reinforce to Network Rail the need to complete those works with urgency.

The Chair suggested that those Members could circulate their written statement to all Members after the meeting if they overran their time limit.

Eber Kington rejoined the meeting at 11.40 am.

18/23 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

Item 9 (i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 John O'Reilly moved:

This Council notes that:

Surrey County Council has a significant role in the design and implementation of new development, particularly in respect of streets and transportation in general. As such, the County Council as the local Highway Authority advises the county's district and borough councils on the transportation implications of applications for planning permission.

The Healthy Streets for Surrey guide, adopted by the Cabinet on 25 October 2022, established the standards that the County Council would expect newly designed streets to meet.

It builds on national guidance but is more detailed and takes into account the existing policies of the County Council. Such policies enable the creation of places that improve the physical and mental health of Surrey residents and reduce their environmental footprint by encouraging cycling and walking more often; streets in which children can play safely; improved air quality; re-greened streets and public spaces; a reduction in residents' transport carbon footprint; and the creation of beautiful, resilient and popular streets that will ultimately require less long-term maintenance.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Request that the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth writes to all district and borough councillors to request they adopt the Healthy Streets Guide, in order to give the guidance additional weight in the planning process. The County Council will support them to adopt it as a supplementary planning document or to incorporate it into their own design guidance/design codes.
- II. Renew its regular offer of transportation development planning training to district and borough councils' planning committee members and this will be expanded to include training on the Healthy Streets guidance and approach.

John O'Reilly made the following points:

- Thanked the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety and Liz Townsend for agreeing to amalgamate some parts of the amendment to the motion.
- Quoted from the introduction of the new Healthy Streets for Surrey design guide which encapsulated the need for change and why the new guide was a step forward, regarding streets as places as opposed to simply facilitating movement between places.
- Highlighted the frustration of those who served on a planning committee at borough and district council level when the Council as the highways authority expressed no objection to some planning applications, not taking into account the issues that the revised Guide stipulated.
- Summarised what the Guide intended to achieve: streets in which it was easy for everyone to move, streets in which it was safe, enjoyable and easy to walk for everyone, green streets that enriched Surrey's diverse biodiversity, enhanced environment and improved air quality, Streets that connected seamlessly to existing places, allowing natural movement, streets that were beautiful, and streets that supported happy, healthy and sustainable lives for all.
- Noted that the new Guide expanded the information to be considered by the Council when it commented on planning applications and by the planning authorities when making decisions - the borough and district councils.
- Hoped that since the new Guide was endorsed by the Cabinet in October that members of the planning committees, community groups and residents were already seeing the benefits.
- Noted that the Guide emphasised the importance of transparency and consultation with residents, ensuring that residents participate in the process and noted that the Council's officers were willing to help participate in any way as part of that consultative process.
- Noted that the Guide sought to improve the environment and residents' quality of life and it was vital for the Council to use its ability to assist and promote that.

The motion was formally seconded by Trefor Hogg, who made the following comments:

- Noted that the motion was about improving and redefining the relationship between people, cars and streets; for streets to be comfortable with clean air, spacious with trees and green spaces and a place where people can keep healthy mentally and physically.
- Stressed the need for real change in Surrey's streets for health, life and happiness.
- Noted that the healthy new Guide was a key contribution towards making that change, it was vital for the Council to ensure that it would be used across Surrey by putting the effort needed into helping the borough and district councils adopt it as planning policy.

Liz Townsend moved an amendment which had been published in the supplementary agenda (items 7 and 9) on 20 March 2023, which was formally seconded by Lance Spencer. She noted that after discussions with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety, she agreed to withdraw resolutions two, four and five of her amendment (II, IV and V).

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

This Council notes that:

Surrey County Council has a significant role in the design and implementation of new development, particularly in respect of streets and transportation in general. As such, the County Council as the local Highway Authority advises the county's district and borough councils on the transportation implications of applications for planning permission.

The Healthy Streets for Surrey guide, adopted by the Cabinet on 25 October 2022, established the standards that the County Council would expect newly designed streets to meet.

It builds on national guidance but is more detailed and takes into account the existing policies of the County Council. Such policies enable the creation of places that improve the physical and mental health of Surrey residents and reduce their environmental footprint by encouraging cycling and walking more often; streets in which children can play safely; improved air quality; re-greened streets and public spaces; a reduction in residents' transport carbon footprint; and the creation of beautiful, resilient and popular streets that will ultimately require less long-term maintenance.

This Council resolves to:

- ~~I. Request that the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth writes to all district and borough councillors to request they adopt the Healthy Streets Guide, in order to give the guidance additional weight in the planning process. The County Council will support them to adopt it as a supplementary planning document or to incorporate it into their own design guidance/design codes.~~
- ~~II. Renew its regular offer of transportation development planning training to district and borough councils' planning committee members and this will be expanded to include training on the Healthy Streets guidance and approach.~~
- I. Implements the existing Street Design Guidance including principles for healthy streets as adopted by the Cabinet on 25 October 2022.**
- II. Directs Highways officers to assist and encourage developers with regard to the design and implementation of streets and transport in accordance with the Healthy Streets Guide.**
- III. Consults with districts and boroughs to seek their consideration for incorporating in borough/district wide Design Codes or as a material consideration subject to public consultation.**
- IV. Ensures Highways officers are incorporating the Healthy Streets Guide in their comments against planning applications and local plans.**
- V. Ensures Highways officers facilitate training on transportation development planning to district and borough councils' planning committee members, including training on the Healthy Streets guidance and approach, where required.**

Liz Townsend spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- Noted that she agreed to withdraw resolutions 2, 4 and 5 of her amendment as she had received assurances that officers were already carrying those duties out, she welcomed seeing more evidence of that, especially in future planning applications across her own borough of Waverley.
- Stressed that the Council was the statutory consultee for planning regarding highways matters on new developments and as such provided comments and could object to planning applications on highways grounds.
- Noted that when the Cabinet agreed the draft Guide it was clear that it was being produced to assist developers, the borough and district councils and the communities to understand what the Council would be seeking when it was considering new development proposals; she hoped that was the case.
- Noted that she would like to see Surrey securing roads on new developments that would be built to adoptable standards and using the guide, currently there were many new developments being built with private roads that did not meet technical standards and that residents themselves were having to maintain.
- Noted that she was sure that most Members and local planning authorities would like to see the aspirations of the Guide being implemented, encouraging slower speeds, high quality paving, promoting Active Travel and including the newly planted street trees and maintenance of existing street trees.
- Noted that the aspirations should be sought now by the Council from developers, particularly in the pre-application stage to ensure that highways infrastructure would be built to the standard outlined in the Guide. More roads needed to be built to that adoptable standard, that was difficult to see as more private developers wanted to build to higher densities and viability arguments overruled adopted material considerations by local planning authorities.
- Noted that the reason for her amendments was that the Guide could not simply be adopted by the borough and district councils, as the Guide needed to go through a rigorous inspection by professional planning officers against national and local planning policies and documents, followed by a public consultation stage with a range of stakeholders and developers. After that consultation, the Guide might need minor or major modifications before formal adoption.
- Noted that therefore the Council must consult with borough and district councils before they assigned their resources and finances to complete that task, she was grateful that had been recognised in the acceptance of her amendments.

The amendment was formally seconded by Lance Spencer, who reserved the right to speak.

John O'Reilly accepted the amendment and therefore it became the substantive motion.

Three Members spoke on the motion and made the following comments:

- In representing a largely rural division, resonated with the overarching principles of the Guide. The villages of Shere and West Clandon suffered from too many cars and oversized lorries in narrow roads, damaging historic buildings.
- Noted that parish councils were a key agency as part of the solution, the Guide stated that communities were more likely to positively engage when they were involved early on.
- Noted that to have healthy streets that were safe, enjoyable and efficient to walk on with pleasant pavements and safe cycle routes, size restrictions were needed for large lorries and traffic calming measures needed to be brought in and local villagers must be listened to.

- Highlighted the Americanisation used interchangeably in the motion, suggested that ‘transportation’ be removed and ‘transport’ be used consistently.
- Noted that having been a member of the borough - Chairman for eleven years - and Council planning committees, recognised the challenge posed to borough planning committee by the Council’s immovable advice, members of the planning committee found it frustrating that they could not refuse an application when the Council had not supported them.
- Liked street furniture and had seen designs change over the years, for example supported the use of grey water and making more use of the local environment.
- Noted that whilst not compulsory, the borough and district councils as the planning authorities would work with the Council, acknowledging the Guide.
- Noted that the Guide would be absorbed into the local plans and with the changes to planning committees following the local elections in May, it would be vital to train the councillors of the future who would be making far reaching decisions on their environment, of the importance of the Guide in the decision-making process alongside the other planning documents.

The Chair suggested that there be a joint briefing session on the Guide in the new administrative year following the elections between Members of the Council and borough and district councillors, to understand the differing points of view.

The Chair asked John O’Reilly, as proposer of the motion to conclude the debate, he made the following comments:

- Noted that he was happy to remove the Americanisation of ‘transportation’, replacing it consistently with ‘transport’.
- Supported the comments made by Members.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

Surrey County Council has a significant role in the design and implementation of new development, particularly in respect of streets and transport in general. As such, the County Council as the local Highway Authority advises the county’s district and borough councils on the transport implications of applications for planning permission.

The Healthy Streets for Surrey guide, adopted by the Cabinet on 25 October 2022, established the standards that the County Council would expect newly designed streets to meet.

It builds on national guidance but is more detailed and takes into account the existing policies of the County Council. Such policies enable the creation of places that improve the physical and mental health of Surrey residents and reduce their environmental footprint by encouraging cycling and walking more often; streets in which children can play safely; improved air quality; re-greened streets and public spaces; a reduction in residents’ transport carbon footprint; and the creation of beautiful, resilient and popular streets that will ultimately require less long-term maintenance.

This Council resolves to request that the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth:

- I. Implements the existing Street Design Guidance including principles for healthy streets as adopted by the Cabinet on 25 October 2022.
- II. Consults with districts and boroughs to seek their consideration for incorporating in borough/district wide Design Codes or as a material consideration subject to public consultation.

Item 9 (ii)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience, Kevin Deanus, moved a proposal. The proposal was as follows:

That the motion below by Will Forster be referred to the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee for the purpose of consideration and making recommendations to the Cabinet or the Council for decision.

This Council notes that:

- Road collision statistics in Surrey have hardly changed over the last ten years.
- In 2021 24 people were killed and 647 were seriously injured.
- The effects of a road traffic collision can have a physical, emotional, social and economic impact on everyone involved.
- In financial terms the cost of road collisions in Surrey was approximately £250 million in 2021.

This Council further notes that:

- Vision Zero is a set of principles and policies aimed at eliminating serious injuries and fatalities involving road traffic. It shifts responsibility for crashes from road users to the designers of the road system - if one occurs, it is up to authorities to ensure that it does not happen again.
- Vision Zero ambition has already been adopted by comparable authorities such as Essex, Kent and Oxfordshire County Councils.

This Council calls on the Cabinet to:

- I. Adopt a Vision Zero “Safe System” approach to road danger reduction.
- II. Work closely with partners and stakeholders to take a whole system approach, working together on infrastructure, behaviour, technology and legislation to achieve this change.
- III. Set a target date for there to be zero fatalities and severe injuries on Surrey’s roads.
- IV. Embed Vision Zero in all relevant Surrey County Council policies, including, but not limited to, implementing the fourth Local Transport Plan (LTP4).

- V. Instruct officers to bring a paper to Cabinet within six months to address how these points will be achieved.

Will Forster made the following points:

- Noted that the motion sought for the Council to commit to agreeing that one day it would have a road safety policy where no one is killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads, following in the footsteps of other local authorities.
- Questioned why in the twenty-first century, in the UK, in Surrey a huge number of people were killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads, that number had largely been unchanged for ten years.
- Stressed that the Council needed to agree that it was unacceptable and would have such a policy, designing out accident black spots.
- Noted that in referring the motion to the select committee, it would not look at whether such a policy should be enacted, but it would look at the detail of how to enact such a policy, the exact timetable and resource needed to meet that ambition.

In speaking to his proposal, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience:

- Noted that Vision Zero followed the principle that it was neither inevitable nor acceptable that anyone should be killed or seriously injured when travelling; he was sure that every Member would support that principle.
- Noted that the aim of Vision Zero was to achieve a highways system with no fatalities or serious injuries involving road traffic, that approach started in the 1990s in Sweden and had been adopted across the UK; those local authorities had set different targets of achieving that for example, 2041 in London and 2050 in Kent.
- Noted that in Surrey 53.4% of those tragically killed or seriously injured were from the county, that showed that a partnership approach of all partners at the regional, national, and international levels was vital.
- Highlighted that the Council's Chief Fire Officer on 1 March 2023 became the Road Safety Lead for the National Fire Chiefs Council.

Will Forster confirmed that he was in support of the referral of the motion to the Communities, Environment and Highways 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 Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee for the purpose of consideration and making recommendations to the Cabinet or the Council for decision.

Item 9 (iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Catherine Baart moved:

This Council notes that:

- Food production has a high impact on climate and the environment. The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report on climate change and land estimates that 21-27% of total greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) are attributable to the food system ([Special Report on Climate Change and Land, IPCC, 2019](#)). Local, organic and animal friendly food production systems reduce these emissions.
- What we eat has a significant impact on our climate impact in the UK. This is explored by the Centre for Alternative Technology ([Zero Carbon: Rethinking the Future - Centre for Alternative Technology](#))
- What we eat has a strong role to play in our public health, including through Surrey's Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

This Council believes that:

- Surrey County Council has a significant role to play in leadership in this area - including through our procurement of food, addressing food waste and through our farm ownership.
- Implementing Surrey's Climate Change Strategy will have a positive impact on our land-use in Surrey.
- Surrey County Councillors can play an active role in advocating for what is needed in this area.

This Council resolves to call on the Cabinet to:

- I. Ensure that the forthcoming Surrey Food Strategy and Local Nature Recovery Strategy are both fully aligned to Surrey's Climate Change Strategy.
- II. Engage an appropriate range of Surrey stakeholders and in particular Members in the production of these strategies through the Greener Futures Reference Group.

Catherine Baart made the following points:

- Highlighted the global context surrounding the motion, noting that food security was threatened by climate change: changing weather patterns, extreme weather events, increasing pests and diseases.
- Noted that in a vicious circle, the current food system made climate change worse, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimated that between 20 and 30% of greenhouse gas emissions was caused by the global food system, which included food waste.
- Noted that although not by intention, the current farming practices in the UK had contributed to a fall in natural capital, such as biodiversity and flood mitigation.
- Noted that health outcomes and therefore healthcare costs were affected by the type of food eaten.
- Noted that the Council had a significant leadership role on food, it procured food for about 16,000 school children, it processed food waste and owned around

100 farms involved in food production; and had systems to communicate effectively with its residents, allowing Members to advocate for change.

- Was encouraged to read the plans for the Norbury Park pilot mentioned in the Deputy Cabinet Member for Environment's Briefing, it set out how local farming practices would be aligned with the Council's climate change policy to enhance biodiversity and natural capital, to start reversing the losses in those areas and to provide recreational benefits to residents, which would have health benefits while still producing quality food.
- Noted that the motion called for the county's developing strategies for land use and for food to align with the Council's Climate Change Adaptation Strategy, Members' support and interest would be crucial in ensuring that the strategies lead to meaningful change.

The motion was formally seconded by Marisa Heath, who made the following comments:

- Thanked the motion's proposer for the pragmatic way in which she put the motion forward and thanked both Green Party Members for their work on Greener Futures.
- Noted that she and the motion's proposer wanted to have a meaningful motion that could support Surrey's farmers, businesses, residents and the countryside.
- Noted that food production and access to healthy and sustainable food was central to how the Council tackles issues around health inequality, environmental damage and animal welfare.
- Noted that the issues relating to food access as seen through Covid-19 and the Ukraine invasion had touched the surface of potential problems all could face concerning food chains in the future; preparation for future unknowns was crucial.
- Noted that in Surrey and more widely, soil degradation, the threat of disease spreading through animals, water pollution and use of antibiotics could pose significant risks to the population.
- Noted that working across both livestock production and protein alternatives, highlighted that the biggest challenge was intensive farming and being able to provide affordable food, but the costs to health had been immense, with huge NHS waiting lists, poor animal welfare and the farmers producing the food had been impacted.
- Noted that the consolidation of the food system to a few organisations had been disastrous, meaning that they controlled the profit and the farmers were often left at break-even; many relied solely on the former Common Agricultural Policy funding.
- Noted that the motion was not about telling people what they should or should not eat, it was focused on ensuring better systems and moving away from those large consolidated food chains into local systems; and organic systems too.
- Concerning local systems, the Council could support Surrey's farmers more directly, working with small businesses, retailers and communities; maybe even enacting a change on Surrey's high streets to create vibrancy and a break from chain retailers.
- Recognised that there were challenges around how good, sustainable and healthy food could be made accessible, particularly to lower income families; public procurement and working closely with farmers and food producers would be vital to finding ways of providing security to them whilst getting the price right for consumers.

- Noted the importance of directly involving communities in the production of food and engagement needed to be undertaken on that, also addressing the mental and physical health challenges faced.
- Emphasised that it was the Council's responsibility, it was drafting a Land Management Policy and would be leading on preparing the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, the Council was supporting farmers ensuring that they could make the most of the land, it brought together the Wildlife Trust, the Surrey Hills Enterprises, the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), businesses, schools and universities to make a plan that could change things.

No comments were made by Members.

The proposer of the motion, Catherine Baart, made no further comments to conclude the debate.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

- Food production has a high impact on climate and the environment. The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report on climate change and land estimates that 21-27% of total greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) are attributable to the food system ([Special Report on Climate Change and Land, IPCC, 2019](#)). Local, organic and animal friendly food production systems reduce these emissions.
- What we eat has a significant impact on our climate impact in the UK. This is explored by the Centre for Alternative Technology ([Zero Carbon: Rethinking the Future - Centre for Alternative Technology](#))
- What we eat has a strong role to play in our public health, including through Surrey's Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

This Council believes that:

- Surrey County Council has a significant role to play in leadership in this area - including through our procurement of food, addressing food waste and through our farm ownership.
- Implementing Surrey's Climate Change Strategy will have a positive impact on our land-use in Surrey.
- Surrey County Councillors can play an active role in advocating for what is needed in this area.

This Council resolves to call on the Cabinet to:

- I. Ensure that the forthcoming Surrey Food Strategy and Local Nature Recovery Strategy are both fully aligned to Surrey's Climate Change Strategy.

- II. Engage an appropriate range of Surrey stakeholders and in particular Members in the production of these strategies through the Greener Futures Reference Group.

19/23 SELECT COMMITTEES' REPORT TO COUNCIL [Item 10]

The Chairman of the Select Committee Chairs and Vice-Chairs' Group introduced the report and thanked the select committee chairmen and Task Group Leads and others for their work over the last two years, improving the scrutiny undertaken by the select committees. He noted that there was more to do and hoped that his work would be carried on by another Member in May onwards, presenting the scrutiny annual report.

RESOLVED:

1. That Council reviewed the work summarised in this report providing feedback to Scrutiny Chairs as appropriate.
2. That the next scrutiny report to Council will be the annual report.

20/23 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT [Item 11]

The Leader introduced the report reminding Members that nearly three years ago the Council agreed to adopt the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel that included a provision for a Consumer Price Index (CPI) increase from 1 April annually. Due to the current high level of inflation, the increase would be 8.8% based on CPI which was unacceptable. He thanked Group Leaders for their support in agreeing the proposal of a capped increase of 3%.

RESOLVED:

That the Council approved the proposed 3% increase in Members' Allowances for the 2023 - 2024 financial year.

21/23 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL - ELECTORAL REVIEW PHASE TWO (DIVISION BOUNDARIES) SUBMISSION [Item 12]

The Leader introduced the report noting that the review was comprised of two parts, the first phase was to agree the number of Members of the Council, following that review the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) in February had accepted the Council's recommendation to retain 81 Members. The second phase was to consider any need to redraw the divisional boundaries within the existing district and borough boundaries. Members had been invited to meetings to discuss the second phase and their comments would be fed back to the cross-party Electoral Review Task Group to ensure consensus across the Council, with a single Surrey County Council response sent to the LGBCE. The submission must be made by 8 May, which was prior to the next Council meeting. Members and political groups could submit their individual recommendations and suggestions to the LGBCE.

RESOLVED:

That the Council endorsed the suggestion that the Electoral Review Task Group agree Surrey County Council's response to phase two of the Electoral Review.

22/23 CHANGES TO BORDER TO COAST PENSION PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE [Item 13]

The Vice-Chairman of the Surrey Pension Fund Committee introduced the report noting that it sought approval from the Council on the changes identified from the review of the governance of the Border to Coast Pension Partnership (BCPP), and that future decisions in respect to BCPP matters be delegated to the Surrey Pension Fund Committee and Shareholder representative where appropriate. The recommendations were reviewed by the Surrey Local Pension Board and commended by the Surrey Pension Fund Committee. He asked Members to note that the latest UK Government budget included measures aimed at increasing the extent and pace of pooling pensions investments, making it even more necessary for the funds to be able to respond promptly to changes in the regulatory environment.

RESOLVED:

1. Approved the proposed changes to the Stakeholder agreement, Articles of Association and Inter Authority Agreement outlined in this report.
2. Approved for all future decisions in respect of BCPP matters to be delegated in the following way:
 - a) Inter authority agreement matters (BCPP Joint Committee) – to the Surrey Pension Fund Committee;
 - b) Articles of Association and shareholder agreement matters – to the shareholder representative (the Section 151 officer or their delegate, in consultation with the Chairman of the Surrey Pension Fund Committee).
3. Approved for authority be delegated to the Section 151 officer and the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Chairman of the Surrey Pension Fund Committee to update the Council's Constitution to reflect the above approvals and to approve for execution by the Council the final versions of any documents necessary to put these decisions into effect.

23/23 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION [Item 14]

The Leader introduced the report noting that it was important that the Constitution was updated to reflect any change of practices. He noted that the report contained minor amendments to the Financial Regulations which had been through an extensive consultation and the changes were approved by the People, Performance and Development Committee on 27 February 2023 and the Audit and Governance Committee on 8 March 2023.

RESOLVED:

1. Approved the amendments to the Financial Regulations and Scheme of Delegation, as set out, in Annexes 1 and 2.

[Meeting ended at: 12.20 pm]

Chair

Leader's Statement – County Council, 21 March 2023

Madam Chair, Members, I think it's safe to describe this meeting as our first of springtime despite the ever-changeable weather, and I look forward to coming out of a challenging winter period with a fresh outlook and energy for the months ahead.

I know how hard the winter has been for lots of people, with inflation across the board impacting people's household budgets, causing a lot of stress and some very difficult choices.

Those challenges won't go away overnight, and we will continue to be here to support those in need as we head into warmer months.

Madam Chair, the Chancellor's budget last week showed that we have cause for optimism in the country's economic outlook, with any downturn not as bad as feared, markets stabilised and inflation showing signs of coming under control.

It will be a relief to many that the energy support is continuing and that wholesale energy prices have reduced, easing a burden on many families.

Here in Surrey, and across local government, we welcome more money for potholes and an expansion of free childcare, as well as the anticipated transfer of Local Enterprise Partnership responsibilities to councils.

This will further empower our local economic strategy, as we push ahead alongside Surrey businesses and education providers in developing the skills and workforce for the future.

It is clear that this government is recognising the importance of strong local government, and we'll continue to work with them to bring benefits to the wider sector, but most importantly to the county of Surrey.

Madam Chair, Members, as I regularly point out, this council is an ambitious one.

We have clear priorities and challenge ourselves all the time to be better.

We have a vision and guiding principles, and we have developed the right culture to help us get there.

However, I know that talk is cheap.

I can stand here and say we want to do *this*, or we have a strategy to achieve *that*.

But what matters is what we deliver out in our communities.

What we are actually doing, or have already done over the last few years, to improve the lives of people in Surrey.

How exactly this council is making Surrey a better place.

Well members, we *are* delivering. And we should be proud of what we've delivered.

Just this month, plans for a brand-new school for children with additional needs and disabilities in Dorking received planning permission.

And the Department for Education have agreed to fund another specialist free school in the north of Surrey.

These will be excellent, modern buildings with first class facilities, to give young people a great start in life.

This is another huge boost for parents, alongside the 700 additional school places for children with additional needs that we've already delivered over the last three years.

With 200 more places available from September, this huge increase in provision tackles a very real problem of children with additional needs, often having to travel far outside their own communities to school.

Our action and delivery on this issue is helping these often-vulnerable children go to school much closer to their homes, improving their wellbeing, life chances and the lives of their parents.

We're also delivering real life improvements for adults with additional and complex needs, and those growing old and in need of extra support.

We're building new, modern, state-of-the-art accommodation here in Surrey.

We are transforming how care is delivered, focusing on what each person really needs – where their strengths lie and how we can keep people active and in their community for as long as possible, rather than the traditional residential care home model.

725 new extra care homes – brilliant places, specifically designed to help older people to live independently, with their own front door, in the community, with companionship and support.

And an increase in Supported Independent Living accommodation for adults with learning difficulties and those with mental health needs – again, modern places for

people to live, with the right level of support to boost independence, and improve the quality of life and life chances for some of our most vulnerable residents.

This is hugely important.

This council is investing in improving people's lives – people who need us most.

The biggest part of our budget is spent on adult social care. It's not something that all residents see – and many will even be unaware that their local council is responsible for this type of care. But addressing health inequalities requires a genuine partnership approach. We continue to work closely with Surrey Heartlands and Frimley ICSs as well as the VCSE to find better ways of delivering improved health outcomes for our residents, and I particularly look forward to the publication of the Hewitt Review in the next couple of weeks when I'm confident that the recommendations will accelerate the focus on that partnership working.

But we're serious about using all the technology, innovation, and expertise available in this area to deliver the best possible care when people need it.

This innovation and forward thinking is essential if we're to make sure Surrey is a place fit for the future.

Soon we'll announce a nationally leading roll out of electric vehicle infrastructure, with the UK's biggest single contract for EV charge points.

Thousands of new charge points for Surrey residents – to enable an electric vehicle revolution starting here in this great county.

Our ambitious move in this area demonstrates both our commitment to a greener future, and also our understanding of the barriers residents face when wanting to do their bit for the environment.

Well, this council is removing those barriers in a very real way.

Surrey will be *THE* place to switch to electric.

Further evidence of our commitment to rethinking transport – and actually helping residents to change the way they travel – is our on-demand bus service.

Again, this council has delivered a pioneering service that is benefiting residents in their everyday lives *AND* helping us tackle the climate emergency.

You only have to read that great local media outlet – the Surrey Live website – to see the impact of our electric, accessible, Mole Valley connect service.

As they put it:

‘A **lifesaver** on-demand bus service is taking passengers door-to-door for shopping, medical appointments, language classes and more.’

Madam Chair this is what local government should be all about – real, useful solutions to improve people’s lives, and deliver long-lasting positive change.

Thousands of journeys across one district, reducing car use, connecting communities, helping people socialise and access services, cleaning up our air and saving the planet.

I’m confident all members here will echo the thoughts of residents Beryl and Alison Wood who described the service as ‘wonderful’.

We're rapidly expanding the bus service across the whole of Mole Valley and into Waverley and Guildford, and I'm determined that we will roll this service out even further over the next 12 months across Surrey.

More delivery. More lives improved. More cars off our roads.

And for those people who are still using their car – quite a few according to our recent inboxes – we are doing the basics and getting those potholes fixed and roads resurfaced.

A continual and never-ending challenge with utility companies constantly working on our highways.

I know how annoying it is for car users and cyclists alike, especially at this time of year with potholes appearing and worsening overnight.

It's dangerous as well as unsightly.

We've stepped up, with over double our normal number of teams out on our 3000 miles of roads.

They are not superhuman, and there is a finite number of them, but they have accelerated their work, clearing any backlog and completing over one and a half thousand repairs every week – that is even more than the number reported to us.

I think the Chancellor was probably lobbied by every councillor in the country on this issue as well as Peter Martin the former deputy leader here, ahead of his budget – after all potholes don't just occur in Surrey – and thankfully he has provided some additional money to help tackle the problem.

But here in Surrey, we allocated extra resource months ago. And even more in our capital budget for roads maintenance last year, this year, next year and every year of a conservative administration.

I know potholes will keep appearing, and residents will keep complaining – understandably.

We can't resurface every road as quickly as we'd like, but members we are delivering.

We are fixing our roads.

Madam Chair, we're also planting trees.

As pledged, we're pushing ahead with our ambitious target of 1.2m by 2030.

Surrey is the most wooded county in the country – something we're hugely proud of, and an accolade we are determined to keep.

The 125,266 trees we've planted so far not only help us keep that title, but they make our county healthier, improving the air Surrey residents are breathing and the environment we are living in.

This tree planting is accelerating further and faster – even doing our bit here at Woodhatch.

Something else that residents will start to notice over the coming months is our re-wilding project for roadside verges and roundabouts across the county, now we manage these spaces directly.

More wildflowers, more insects, improving biodiversity and absorbing more carbon from the air.

This council is making Surrey a better – and greener – place.

One project that probably encapsulates the level of our ambition best is Your Fund Surrey – delivery of grant funding directly to communities.

Tens of millions of pounds dedicated to improving the places in which people live.

Projects funded and already complete include the wonderful family garden in Claygate, the 3G pitch for South Park Sports Association here in Reigate, the Limpsfield Way Cycle and Walking Trail, Weybridge's Men's Shed, and the new community picnic area in Tatsfield Village Green.

With millions more committed to successful applications all across the county, including a community shop, playgrounds, community centres, recreation ground improvements, a community swimming pool, and more sports clubs, the legacy of this project is being felt far and wide. I encourage all members to work closely with their communities to identify suitable schemes, schemes that can be transformational for local residents.

Real, tangible delivery, benefiting communities, making Surrey's towns and villages even better places to live.

Madam Chair, we're also directly supporting those in serious financial need across our county.

The last year has been extremely tough for many people, with rising costs squeezing household budgets and tipping more people into difficulty.

Councils are here, in many ways, to redistribute wealth. Using council tax to deliver services that prioritise those most in need.

Things like adult social care and children's services provide a lifeline to our most vulnerable residents.

But we also provide immediate help to those people who are facing a financial crisis, through our Surrey Crisis Fund.

In the last 12 months we've received more than 4,000 applications, approving 72% of them.

We have paid out £323,000 to help people buy food, toiletries and pay utility bills, and a further £425,000 on white goods and furniture to more than 800 households in emergency need.

This is a sobering example of the level of need in Surrey.

But we are here, delivering in real terms, for those families most in need. We've stabilised the council's finances, we've transformed our service delivery in many areas though I fully appreciate there is still more to do, particularly for families that have children with additional needs and we are seeing improved inspection outcomes. We continue to build strong foundations, foundations that have seen this council deliver for our residents during covid and foundations that will see this council deliver on its ambition that no one in this county will be left behind.

Madam Chair, all of this...

All of this investment, improvement, innovation.

It all delivers towards our four key priorities.

It helps deliver a greener future, stronger communities, a growing economy and better health outcomes.

Pulled together, all of it helps us in reaching our ambition that no one is left behind in Surrey.

We're working closer with our communities and our partners.

We're forward thinking and ambitious.

We're clear and transparent about what we're trying to do.

We are focused on delivering for the people of Surrey.

Madam Chair, when things go wrong, we'll fix them.

When things could be done better, we'll do it.

We'll keep at it. We'll keep improving. We'll keep delivering.

Because this council's leadership, and this council's workforce, are committed to making Surrey a better place.



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

The purpose of this report is to request that the County Council considers whether to agree that County Councillor John Furey may continue to be absent from Council meetings by reason of ill health.

BACKGROUND:

Under Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972, a Member ceases to hold that office if he/she has not attended a meeting for a period of six consecutive months, unless the failure to attend is due to a reason approved by the authority during that six months.

The last meeting that John Furey attended was a meeting of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee in December 2022. He has been unable to attend any formal meetings since then due to ill health.

For that reason the County Council is requested to agree that he may continue to be absent from meetings while maintaining membership of the Council during his period of ill health. This decision will be reviewed at the County Council meeting in October 2023.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That John Furey may continue to be absent from meetings until October 2023 by reason of ill health. The Council looks forward to welcoming him back in due course.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Sarah Quinn - Senior Manager – Regulatory & Appeals, Democratic Services, Surrey County Council, sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

None

This page is intentionally left blank



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2022/23

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

For Council to review the Scrutiny Annual Report 2022/23 as presented in the accompanying paper (Annex 1) offering feedback and comments as required.

BACKGROUND:

The Council's four Select Committees have been in operation in their current form since May 2019. Many improvements have been made to structure, composition, and practice since this time.

This report reflects on the key scrutiny work undertaken by each of the four committees in the last municipal year and also signposts the work that will happen in 2023/24 to continuing improving and embed current good practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Members note the work done by the Select Committees and support the next areas of improvement identified by the report.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Ross Pike - Scrutiny Business Manager, Democratic Services, Surrey County Council, ross.pike@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

Select Committee Agendas, Minutes and Forward Plans
[Surrey County Council - Committee structure \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Annual Report 2022/23

Page 43

23 May 2023

Surrey County Council Scrutiny Review

- All of this year's meetings in public have taken place in-person at Woodhatch but Select Committees continue to use remote video technology to hold all sorts of preparatory meetings and witness sessions.
- Select Committees continue to conduct pre-decision scrutiny of the most important executive decisions and make reports to Cabinet.
- Select Committees have improved their use of external witnesses to complement the evidence gathered from within the Council.
- Scrutineers have engaged with a number of issues of high importance including children's services improvement, home to school travel assistance, mental health services, access to primary care, the Greener Futures programme and the council's budget setting.
- The Council's budget setting process this year included three briefing stages for each of the Select Committees before four formal sessions in December.

Outputs 2022/23

- The four Select Committees held a total of **21 public meetings to consider 68 substantive scrutiny items** with a continued focus on pre-decision scrutiny.
- Select Committees made frequent use of informal, online meetings to receive briefings on new or complex policy areas before formal scrutiny.
- Select Committees made **11 reports to Cabinet totalling 53 recommendations**, the majority of which were accepted by the Cabinet.
- We have run three task & finish groups this year on: Adult Learning, Health Inequalities and the cross-committee Budget Task Group.
- Select Committees also used a number of sub-groups to stay in touch with officers on ongoing scrutiny topics e.g. the Greener Futures climate change work and to monitor service performance.

Adults and Health

- 1. Mental Health Improvement Plan:** The committee held two formal meeting items (June 2022, October 2022) to examine improvements to Mental Health Services and the degree to which Mental Health Task Group recommendations are being implemented. The committee recommended the collation and sharing of data to indicate areas of need and to inform prioritisation exercises.
- 2. All-Age Autism Strategy:** The committee held a formal meeting item in June 2022 to examine the effectiveness of the various workstreams. It recommended further improvements to reduced waiting times for diagnoses and increased employability prospects for residents with Learning Disabilities & Autism.
- 3. Mindworks:** In collaboration with the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee, the committee held a formal meeting item on Children's Mental Health Services in February 2022; during which both committees recommended for the formulation of SMART Performance Metrics to measure the performance of Children's Emotional Wellbeing & Mental Health Services.
- 4. Access to GPs:** The committee held a formal meeting item on this in April 2023, whereby improvements to GP access were reviewed. The committee recommended for the swift rollout of Cloud-Based Telephony Systems and enhanced support for vulnerable residents, including those with limited technology access.
- 5. Access to Dentistry:** The committee held a formal meeting item on this in February 2023, the timing of which was crucial given the delegation of dentistry commissioning from NHS England to regional Integrated Care Systems. The committee recommended for increased access to NHS Dentistry for vulnerable residents and for improvements to NHS contracts to encourage Dentists to perform NHS treatments.
- 6. Accommodation with Care & Support Strategy:** The committee held an extra-formal meeting in November 2022 to examine the provision and expansion of Extra Care & Supported Independent Living Accommodation.

Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture

1. The Committee recommended changes to the reporting the outcomes of **children's home inspections** to Members; these are now routinely shared on the Members' Portal following a review of the closure of a home in Surrey.
2. The Committee reviewed and endorsed the Council's strategic approach to growing capacity in children's homes, with the aim that 80 per cent of Surrey's Looked After Children live in the county.
3. The **Committee's Performance Sub-Group** developed a set of key indicators measuring Children's Services progress against Ofsted recommendations following the January 2022 inspection. The Directorate agreed to share an overview of performance data at every formal meeting, including external assessment ratings and turnover of social workers and foster carers.
4. The Committee is involved in a **Local Government Association pilot training offer to help improve scrutiny effectiveness**. Members received feedback on an observed formal meeting and took part in workshops on best practice and work programming.
5. The Cabinet agreed to incorporate several recommendations made by the Committee into the **Inclusion and Additional Needs Strategy 2023–2026**, including producing an easy-read version and a series of webinars for parent carers.

Continued

6. In recognition of the challenge of **recruiting social care staff**, Members made a series of visits to quadrants where they met with service managers and social workers to better understand the issues they face. Multiple resulting recommendations on stabilising the children's social care workforce were welcomed by Cabinet and led to, for example, guidance supported by trade unions for staff experiencing discrimination and every single leaver offered a face-to-face exit interview with a colleague of their choice. There was also additional funding for recruitment and retention in the 2023/24 budget following the Committee's recommendation that these should be prioritised.
7. Against a backdrop of labour and skills shortages and the cost-of-living crisis, a Committee Task Group on **adult learning and skills** has taken evidence from Surrey Adult Learning, South Orbital College Group and Surrey Chambers of Commerce and is finalising its report.
8. Members collaborated with the Adults and Health Select Committee to review the children's emotional wellbeing and mental health services provided by **Mindworks** Surrey.
9. The Committee looked at the impact of home to school transport pressures on families, and many of its recommended amendments to the **Home to School Travel Assistance Policy** were agreed by Cabinet. These include a commitment that all parent carers in receipt of a mileage allowance are, as a general rule, paid for a return rather than one-way journey to the child's setting, backdating this policy to September 2022 and reimbursing recipients.

Communities, Environment & Highways

1. The committee has kept an overview role with regard to the Council's **Greener Futures** programme overing its views to officers through regular meetings of a Member Reference Group.
2. It also has had sub-groups meet on the **Highways Maintenance Contract** over a number of years and on **Electric Vehicle Charging**.
3. The committee has made recommendations to Cabinet on a broad range of topics: *Your Fund Surrey, Greener Futures, the Skills Plan for Surrey, Surrey Strategy for Accommodation, Housing & Homes and Delivering in Partnership – Towns Approach*.
4. The committee held **performance reviews** of the Surrey Fire & Rescue Service and Environment, Transport and Infrastructure.
5. Another key topics for the committee have been **transport** with a focus on the future of bus services and the potential for a **devolution** deal for Surrey.

Resources and Performance

1. All four select committees were briefed on the **budget-setting process** earlier in the year, in July, and following the Committee's scrutiny of the Council's draft 2023-24 budget, Cabinet agreed to also undertake initial equality analysis earlier in the budget-setting process for 2024-25, enabling potential likely impacts and mitigations to be shared with select committees in December.
2. Three meetings of the **Budget Task Group** held throughout the year took a deep dive into the financial positions of all directorates and discussed the impact on services and residents of increasing rates of inflation.
3. The Committee considered a **responsible tax conduct motion** referred by Council and, in agreement with its recommendations, the Council signed up to the Fair Tax Declaration, with certain exceptions.
4. The Committee held four **performance monitoring sessions**, reviewing key performance indicators to monitor the services under its remit.
5. The Committee has supported the Council's **Agile Office Strategy**, which seeks to reduce costs and environmental impact.
6. The Committee has also had an overview of **workforce challenges** and the rollout of digital infrastructure in Surrey, and has asked the service to produce a business plan for the Council's **Data Strategy Transformation Programme**.
7. The Committee heard evidence from Citizens Online and is to nominate Members to engage with their work on minimising **digital exclusion**. It has asked for a commitment from Cabinet to ensure that an alternative form of contact to online remains available while their work is ongoing.

Task & Finish Groups

1. Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee - Adult Learning & Skills Task Group: Against a backdrop of labour and skills shortages and the cost-of-living crisis, a Committee Task Group on adult learning and skills has taken evidence from Surrey Adult Learning, South Orbital College Group and Surrey Chambers of Commerce and is finalising its report.

2. Adults and Health Select Committee - Health Inequalities Task Group: aligned its research with the Health & Wellbeing Strategy by narrowing its focus to three priority population groups:

1. *Ethnic Minority Groups.*
2. *Residents experiencing Homelessness.*
3. *Residents experiencing Domestic Abuse.*

The group found through numerous witness sessions that these groups have increased susceptibility to poorer Health Outcomes, and therefore aims to highlight the health disadvantages experienced by these group and to make recommendations to address these. The Task Group expects to submit its final report by June 2023.

The Future of Surrey County Council Overview & Scrutiny

- To continue the improvements to the function in 2023/24 a number of areas of focus have been identified by Members and in having due regard to the statutory guidance:
 - Offering training and development on the role and purpose of scrutiny via an external provider for Members and Officers.
 - Increasing public participation in scrutiny processes as witnesses, co-optees and through stakeholder engagement in the development of committee forward work programmes.
 - Broadening the scope of our scrutiny methods to include meetings in the community, increased use of data and novel ways of working such ‘scrutiny in a day’ reviews and the continued use of remote meeting technology.

Next Steps

- Regular Select Committee update at three Council meetings per year.
- Implement a training and induction programme for Members and Officers in early summer.
- Planning sessions with new committee memberships in June and July to set relevant forward work programmes that align with Council priorities.

This page is intentionally left blank



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

To ratify the appointment of members of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP).

BACKGROUND:

1. The arrangements for setting a Scheme of Allowances and appointing an IRP are set out in The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003. These Regulations state that local authorities must establish and maintain an IRP with the purpose of making recommendations to the authority about allowances paid to members. On 31 October 2022, the three year term of the IRP came to an end.
2. A panel must consist of at least three members and two of the three appointees chose not to seek reappointment. Consequently, a new IRP must be appointed prior to any further review or changes to the scheme.
3. At its meeting in December 2022 the County Council agreed that the IRP should consist of three members and that the Appointments Panel should consist of:
 - Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council
 - Conservative Group Leader
 - Residents' Association/Independent Group Leader
 - Liberal Democrat Group Leader
 - Monitoring Officer present for governance (ensuring that it is a fair, consistent and transparent process) and to record the panels scoring and decision.

(a) For the interview stage, the Monitoring Officer approved the substitution of the Conservative Group Leader with the Deputy Leader due to another cabinet commitment.

4. The recruitment process followed the County Council approved format and entailed:
 - Advert published on 17 January 2023 (posted on the SCC website, Jobs Go Public, Reed, Indeed, Surrey Jobs, LinkedIn and the Guardian) – the closing date for applications was 12 March.
 - Shortlisting took place on 16 March.
 - Interviews were held on 20 April and successful applicants were offered the roles subject to County Council ratification.
5. **IRP Remuneration.** There are no changes proposed to the current arrangements which are payments of £1500 for the Chairman and £1000 per panel member (plus travel expenses) per review.
6. **IRP Terms of Reference.** There are no changes proposed to the current IRP TOR (Annex A), last approved by County Council in October 2019.

APPOINTMENTS PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS:

7. The Appointments Panel recommends:
 - a) Steve Banks-Smith (IRP Chairman): Previous IRP panel member and former Metropolitan Police Service.
 - b) Chris Brown (IRP Member): Former Senior Partner at PwC and EY, and Member of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy (CIPFA).
 - c) Pinky Kwok (IRP Member): Currently a Director at Morgan Stanley for Regulatory and Executive Compensation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the County Council ratifies the appointments of the Independent Remuneration Panel for a three year term.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Elliot Sinclair - Support Services Manager, Democratic Services,
Surrey County Council, elliott.sinclair@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

[The Local Authorities \(Members' Allowances\) \(England\) Regulations 2003 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk)

Annex A

INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. The establishment, composition and duties of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) are required to comply with the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003.
2. The IRP is to review the County Council's Members' Allowances Scheme, taking into account the roles and responsibilities of Members (both in the Council and in serving their communities) set out in the County Council's agreed role profiles. The Panel will also have regard to:
 - (a) comparative data on the allowances paid by other similar local authorities; and
 - (b) the need for the composition of the Council to better reflect the population of Surrey.
 - (c) the recommendations of the Chief Executive when developing the scope of its review programme.
3. To make recommendations to the Council on:
 - (a) the amount of Basic Allowance which should be paid to all Members;
 - (b) the responsibilities or duties for which Members should receive Special Responsibility Allowances and the amount of such allowances;
 - (c) the amount of the Childcare and Dependents' Carers' Allowances;
 - (d) Travelling and Subsistence Allowances;
 - (e) Co-optees' Allowances;
 - (f) whether payment of allowances should be backdated to the beginning of the financial year;
 - (g) whether any allowances should be withheld if a Member is wholly or partially suspended;
 - (h) whether adjustments to the level of allowances should be determined according to an index, and if so, which index and how long that index should apply.
4. The Panel will be administratively supported by Democratic Services and will have access to any Member, officer or information that it considers necessary to fulfil its duties.

This page is intentionally left blank



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 report sets out proposed changes to Part 7 – Members' Allowances Scheme. These are brought to Council for formal approval in accordance with Article 4.04(b) and (k) and Article 13.01 of the Council's Constitution.

BACKGROUND:

1. At its meeting in March 2023, The Council approved the proposed 3% increase in Member's Allowances for the 2023-2024 financial year. This was instead of the 8.8% CPI indexing currently adopted by the scheme.
2. The allowances schedule in Part 7 has been updated to reflect these changes.
3. When the only change made to a scheme in any year is an annual adjustment, the scheme shall be deemed not to have been amended.
4. An updated guide to Members Allowances and Expenses will be published on the SCC external website and circulated to Members.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Council is asked to approve the updated Members' Allowances Schedule (Annex A).

Lead/Contact Officers:

Elliot Sinclair - Support Services Manager, Democratic Services, Surrey County Council, elliott.sinclair@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

The Council's Constitution
Council - Minutes, 21 March 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME

The Surrey County Council, in exercise of the powers conferred by The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, hereby makes the following amended scheme:

INTRODUCTION

1. This scheme may be cited as the Surrey County Council Members' Allowances Scheme, and shall have effect for the year commencing 23 May 2022 and until otherwise amended.
2. In this scheme,
 - 'councillor' means a member of the Surrey County Council who is a councillor;
 - 'year' means the 12 months ending with 31 March.
3. The scheme should be read in conjunction with the Guide to Members' Allowances.

BASIC ALLOWANCE

4. Subject to paragraph 18, for each year a Basic Allowance of £13,520 shall be paid to each councillor.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES

5. (1) For each year, a Special Responsibility Allowance shall be paid to those councillors who hold the special responsibilities in relation to the authority that are specified in Schedule 1 to this scheme.
- (2) The amount of each such allowance shall be the amount specified against that special responsibility in Schedule 1.
- (3) No councillor shall receive more than one Special Responsibility Allowance. Where a councillor performs more than one special responsibility specified in Schedule 1, they will be entitled to the Special Responsibility Allowance which is the highest in value.

ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCES

6. No Attendance Allowances shall be paid.

TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE

7. Travelling and Subsistence Allowances will be paid for 'Approved Duties' as set out in Schedule 2 to this Scheme.

CO-OPTEE'S ALLOWANCE

8. No co-optees allowances are payable. However, co-opted members may claim travel expenses.

CHILDCARE AND DEPENDENT CARERS' EXPENSES

9. The Council will reimburse Members for expenditure incurred in providing child care arrangements for children for whom they have parental responsibility to enable them to attend an approved duty subject to a number of requirements specified in the Guide to Members' Allowances.
10. The Council also provides for the reimbursement of expenditure incurred by Members in providing care for dependant adults or children who are frail and/or disabled at a rate based on actual cost up to a specified limit.
11. The amount which may be claimed is the actual costs incurred by a councillor in order to participate in approved duties as specified in the Guide to Members' Allowances.
12. Councillors may also claim any additional costs incurred where they can demonstrate that the cost was wholly and necessarily incurred in order to participate in approved duties as specified in the Guide to Members' Allowances.

PENSIONS

13. From 1 April 2014 councillors in England were unable to join the LGPS. Those councillors in England who were in the scheme on the 31 March 2014 were able to remain in the scheme until the end of that council term in 2017.

RENUNCIATION

14. A councillor may by notice in writing given to the Member Services Manager forego any part of his/her entitlement to an allowance under this Scheme.

PART-YEAR ENTITLEMENTS

15. (1) If an amendment to this Scheme is made which affects payment of a Basic Allowance or a Special Responsibility Allowance in the year in which the payment is made, a councillor will entitled

to payment at the revised rate from the date on which the change was approved (unless otherwise stated).

- (2) If a councillor becomes or ceases to be eligible for a Basic or Special Responsibility Allowance during the course of a year, the entitlement will be adjusted by reference to the number of days for which entitlement existed relative to the number of days in that year.

CLAIMS AND PAYMENTS

16. A claim for travelling and subsistence allowances under this scheme shall be made in writing within two months of the date of the meeting in respect of which the entitlement to the allowance arises.
17. Subject to any in-year amendments to the Scheme or changes in entitlement, Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances will be paid in instalments of one-twelfth of the amount specified in this Scheme on the last Thursday of each month.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

18. Under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) England regulations 2003:
 - (1) Allowances may be withheld during any period of suspension.
 - (2) Part of any Special Responsibility Allowance payable to a Member may be withheld in respect of the responsibility or duties from which the Member is suspended or partially suspended.
 - (3) In the event of suspension of a Member from a post of special responsibility, and the appointment of another Member to fill that post, then the full allowance relating to the post should be paid to the Member acting in that capacity.
 - (4) That the implications of suspension on the rules governing the attendance at meetings should be taken into account by the Standards Committee when considering what sanctions should be made against a Member.
19. The foregoing Scheme was made pursuant to the authority given by the County Council at its meeting held on 24 May 2022.

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
SCHEME OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES**

SCHEDULE 1

A Special Responsibility Allowance will be paid to those Members of the Council/Independent Representatives who hold the following offices:

Type of Allowance	Allowance (£)
Basic Allowance	13,520
Leader	46,780
Deputy Leader	30,320
Chairman of the Council	19,600
Vice-Chairman of the Council	7,080
Cabinet Member	24,480
Deputy Cabinet Member	10,860
Select Committee Chairman	10,890
Select Committee Task Group Leads	1,640
Planning and Regulatory Committee Chairman	13,070
Audit and Governance Chairman	10,890
Surrey Pension Fund Committee Chairman	10,890
Opposition Leaders	13,070 (total amount, divided between two posts proportionally)
Members of Adoption and Fostering Panels	110 per session attended plus travel expenses
Childcare Allowance	Actual costs incurred
Care of Dependants Allowance	Actual costs incurred

If a Member qualifies for a Special Responsibility Allowance for more than one post, only the allowance which is highest in value may be claimed.

The Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowances shall be adjusted annually on 1 April commensurate with the Consumer Price Index at the previous September. This provision applies for a maximum of period of four

years from 7 July 2020, at which point the Independent Remuneration Panel shall reconsider the matter.

SCHEDULE 2

Approved Duties

Travelling and subsistence allowances are payable in respect of the approved duties listed in Appendix 1.

APPROVED DUTIES

Approved duties are defined as follows:-

- (a) a meeting of the Council, the Cabinet (or a Cabinet Member meeting), any committee, or any formally constituted task groups or panels appointed by the Council, the Cabinet or any committees;
- (b) any other meeting (including, for example, a site visit or tour or induction or training seminar) convened by the Council, the Cabinet or a committee, or convened by the Chairman of the Council, the Cabinet or committee acting on their behalf (but not a meeting convened by an officer of the Council), provided that it is a meeting to which members of at least two political groups have been invited (except in the case of meetings relating to the work of a local committee which consists of a single political group);
- (c) attendance by the Chairman of the Cabinet or a committee at a meeting of any Task Group of the Cabinet or that committee of which he/she is not a member;
- (d) attendance by a non-member of the Cabinet, a committee or task group in the following circumstances:
 - (i) an item on the agenda in which they have a local interest and on which, with the Chairman's consent, they would wish to speak;
 - (ii) an Original Motion in their name which stands referred to the Cabinet or a committee under Standing Orders;
 - (iii) an item on the agenda of which they have given notice under Standing Orders; or
 - (iv) a question of which they have given notice under Standing Orders.

and where advance notice has been given to the Support Services Manager

- (e) attendance by an individual or named group of Members especially appointed by the Cabinet or a committee or task group to examine a particular problem or site or to meet representatives of other organisations or individuals as part of an agreed programme of activity;

- (f) attendance by Members at local briefing meetings at the invitation of an officer of the Council, provided that members of at least two political groups have been invited (except in the case of meetings relating to the work of a local committee which consists of a single political group);
- (g) attendance by Members at public consultation meetings on significant matters of policy or service change, provided that members of at least two political groups have been invited (except in the case of meetings relating to the work of a local committee which consists of a single political group);
- (h) attendance by Members at joint briefings on the business to be transacted at committee meetings, organised by officers under the Member/Officer Protocol, provided that members of at least two political groups have been invited (except in the case of meetings relating to the work of a local committee which consists of a single political group);
- (i) attendance at County Hall or elsewhere by -
 - (i) the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council
 - (ii) the chairmen and vice-chairmen of committees
 - (iii) Cabinet Members

for the purpose of agenda planning and ‘call-over’ prior to a meeting; conferring with officers; visiting County establishments; inspecting sites; or being engaged in a similar manner directly in connection with the discharge of any of the functions -

- (i) of their respective offices; or
 - (ii) of their respective committees.
- (j) meetings held in connection with Local Ombudsman investigations; provided that they are meetings to which members of at least two political groups have been invited (except in the case of meetings relating to the work of a local committee which consists of a single political group);
- (k) a meeting of the Local Government Association, or of any committee, or other Member group of the Association to which a Member of the Council has been duly appointed;
- (l) attendance as a duly appointed County Council representative or nominee at meetings of those bodies listed on the Council’s website.

- (m) visits by Members to County Council establishments including children's homes, other social services' residential establishments and special schools in accordance with a pre-determined rota;
- (n) meetings between leaders of the political groups;
- (o) meetings of parish and town councils and residents associations;
- (p) attendance at official openings at the specific invitation of the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the County Council;
- (q) attendance at formally arranged meetings with officers or representatives of external organisations to discuss a significant issue relating to a County Council service or affecting the Member's Electoral Division.
- (r) Attendance at a meeting with a constituent from the Member's own Division in direct response to a request about County Council services.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES

(a) **MOTOR CYCLES**

24p per mile

(b) **MOTOR CARS**

45p per mile for the first 10,000 miles

25p per mile for mileage over 10,000

An additional claim of 5p per mile may be made for each car passenger (not exceeding four) for whom travel expenses would otherwise be payable.

(c) **Electric Cars**

45p per mile

This allowance is only claimable in relation to the use of fully electric cars.

(d) **TAXI FARES**

Actual fare and a reasonable gratuity for travel by taxi. A taxi should only be used in cases of urgency or where no public transport is available.

(e) **HIRED MOTOR VEHICLES (OTHER THAN A TAXI OR MINICAB)**

Reimbursement may be claimed not exceeding the rate allowed for the use of a Member's own car.

(f) **TRAVEL BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

The actual expenditure may be claimed but Claims for reimbursement should normally be restricted to the cheapest available fares for the chosen mode of transport. Claims for first class travel may only be made if no alternative ordinary fares were available at the time of booking or where exceptional circumstances apply.

(g) **TRAVEL ABROAD**

Where travel abroad is necessary, for example for meetings or site visits, the officers involved will make the necessary travel

arrangements. In any circumstances where individual Members need to travel abroad and officers are not directly involved in setting up the visit, they should obtain approval from the Leader of the County Council and contact the Democratic Services Support Services Manager, who will make the necessary arrangements. Bookings for travel abroad will normally be made using the cheapest appropriate available fare.

(h) **CYCLE ALLOWANCE**

The current rate for cycling allowance is 20p per mile.

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

DAY SUBSISTENCE

1. Breakfast Allowance (more than 4 hours away from normal place of residence before 11.00am e.g. 7 am - 11 am) **£5.30**;
2. Lunch Allowance (more than 4 hours away from the normal place of residence including a lunchtime between 12 noon and 2.00pm e.g. 10 am - 2 pm; 12 pm - 4 pm) **£7.25**;
3. Tea Allowance (more than 4 hours away from the normal place of residence including the period 3.00pm to 6.00pm e.g. 2 pm - 6 pm) **£2.90**;
4. Evening Meal Allowance (more than 4 hours away from the normal place of residence ending after 7.00pm e.g. 4 pm - 8 pm; 5 pm - 9 pm) **£9.00**.

OVERNIGHT SUBSISTENCE

5. For absence overnight (deemed to cover a continuous period of 24 hours) from the usual place of residence, **£85.80**, or where the absence overnight is in London or for attending one of the approved conferences, **£97.85**.
6. Overnight subsistence may only be claimed by Members to reimburse them for the cost of hotel accommodation and meals when attending one of the approved conferences, and up to the maximum rate set out in the guide.

If overnight allowance is claimed the Member may not claim allowance for meals which are provided as part of the overnight allowance e.g. breakfast, evening meal etc.

In most cases where the Member attends an approved conference, the booking arrangements are made by Democratic Services and the invoices will be paid directly by them on the Member's behalf. It will therefore not usually be necessary to claim overnight subsistence.

This page is intentionally left blank

County Council Meeting – 23 May 2023

REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Cabinet met on 28 March 2023 and 25 April 2023.

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 20. 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 22 May 2023).

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 28 March 2023 Cabinet considered:

A. A HOUSING, ACCOMMODATION AND HOMES STRATEGY FOR SURREY

This report set out the Housing, Accommodation and Homes Strategy for Surrey.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet endorses the benefit of and approach taken to initiating and developing a county-wide strategy for Housing, Accommodation and Homes,
2. That Cabinet adopts the strategy and encourages others to do likewise in a spirit of collective endeavour to address the evidenced housing crisis in Surrey.
3. That Cabinet delegates authority to the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Housing and Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth to make any necessary final amendments to the strategy following a period of public consultation.

Reasons for decisions:

The baseline assessment undertaken as part of the work of developing a strategy makes clear the challenges in housing, accommodation, and homes in Surrey, with advisors describing the situation as a crisis. While recognising the sovereign responsibilities and service responsibilities for Housing and Planning of other

organisations, the strategy sets out a 'Call to Government' and a 'Call to Action' to which everyone involved in housing in Surrey is encouraged to contribute.

B. RE-MODELLING THE STRATEGIC SHORT BREAKS OFFER FOR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES AND/OR AUTISM

Cabinet was asked to approve the proposal to re-model the Council's Strategic Short Breaks offer by working with the market to ensure a more diverse Short Breaks offer. The Council's Short Breaks offer needed modernising to provide modern fit for purpose overnight accommodation for residents. Through modernising and remodelling the council will provide a more diverse offer of support in the community, ensuring equity of access for individuals with eligible needs and employing a strengths-based approach that promotes the independence of our residents.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves the proposal to re-model the Council's Strategic Short Breaks offer by working with the market to ensure a more diverse Short Breaks offer.
2. That Cabinet grants approval to proceed with the design and construction of Short Breaks accommodation at two identified sites in Reigate and Banstead and Woking within the capital funding envelope set out in Part 2 of this paper. The sites are as follows:
 - Lakers, Denton Way, Goldsworth Park, Woking, GU21 3LG
 - The Squirrels, The Horseshoe, Banstead, SM7 2BQ
3. That Cabinet confirms approval to procure a developer to construct the new Short Breaks accommodation and delegates approval to award the contract, (including any associated changes related to the contract, once it has been awarded to ensure that it continues to meet the objectives related to this report) and manage the developments within the agreed capital funding envelope to:
 - The Director of Land and Property in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste.
 - The Joint Executive Director for Adult Social Care and Integrated Commissioning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health.

Reasons for decisions:

To promote Carers' wellbeing and enable them to have a break from their caring responsibility, but still be able to support the individual to live at home.

To enable residents with learning disabilities and/or autism who meet the Council's eligibility criteria for Adult Social Care (ASC) funding to have their need for overnight Short Breaks met in a modern, fit for purpose setting with all the necessary facilities and amenities.

To promote the independence of Surrey residents with learning disabilities and/or autism and enable them to remain in their family homes and connected to their local community.

To ensure that together with our partners we develop a range of options that improve outcomes and support for individuals and their families when offering a short break.

To make an essential contribution towards the Council's strategic objective to tackle health inequality, in line with the 2030 Community Vision for Surrey.

C. FUTURE BUS NETWORK REVIEW AND LOCAL BUS SERVICE INVESTMENT

In considering the need to adapt and change certain bus services, planned investment to grow patronage and plans to expand Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT), the Council completed a comprehensive consultation exercise that enabled residents and stakeholders to have their say on investment in infrastructure, maintaining or changing bus services to better reflect use and more DDRT services. The report set out the process and outcome of the consultation, with more than 2,600 responses received, which were used to shape the recommendations and way forward.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet notes the response to the public and stakeholder consultation.
2. That Cabinet agrees the proposed changes to the public bus network as set out in Annex B, with service changes to be implemented at the start of the new academic year in September 2023.
3. That Cabinet agrees the recommended priority areas for capital investment to support bus services and help grow bus patronage.
4. That Cabinet agrees the recommended areas for expansion of new Digital Demand Responsive Transport services in 2023 as set out in Annex C.
5. That Cabinet agrees the process and timescales for updating the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and Enhanced Partnership Scheme and agree that the approval and submission of the Bus Service Improvement Plan to Government be delegated to the Director of Highways and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth.
6. That Cabinet agrees that the decision to award contracts for local bus services and Digital Demand Responsive Transport services is delegated to the Director, Highways and Transport, following discussion with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth, and the Council's Section 151 Officer.

Reasons for decisions:

The public consultation has helped shape the bus service changes proposed in Annex B. These changes are necessary to ensure the network is financially sustainable and has responded to changed travel patterns, particularly in areas where passenger numbers are unlikely to ever recover to pre-pandemic levels. The financial review of bus services also meets the Department for Transport's (DfT) requirement for accessing the extension of Covid bus recovery funding. The Council is committed to supporting local bus services and has increased revenue

support for service delivery and capital investment to improve their operational effectiveness and efficiency.

The public consultation has also helped shape our proposed investment in bus infrastructure. It demonstrated that resident support for investment in buses is high, showing that people value bus services and that targeting investment will aid patronage growth.

The Council's previous Bus Service Improvement Plan, published in 2021, set out a desire to expand our Digital Demand Responsive Transport offer, learning from the successful Mole Valley Connect scheme funded from the DfT's Rural Mobility Fund. This report sets out proposals for new DDRT schemes shaped by consultation feedback, including the need to promote new schemes and the flexibility they offer residents.

All Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) are required to review their BSIPs annually. The DfT agreed that the Council's BSIP refresh could be undertaken once the public consultation was complete, enabling the views and suggestions of residents and stakeholders to be included in the BSIP review. This report sets out the BSIP refresh process, with a submission to date at the end of May 2023.

Following the Future Bus Network Review and the consideration of consultation responses, coupled with ongoing dialogue with bus operators, the Council needs to tender the services proposed for change, along with retender of a number of contracts that were extended during the pandemic. New contracts will be awarded following a procurement process in line with the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement and Contracts Standing Orders.

At its meeting on 25 April 2023 Cabinet considered:

D. TRANSFORMATION OF ACCOMMODATION WITH CARE AND SUPPORT FOR WORKING AGE ADULTS: DELIVERY STRATEGY FOR MODERNISING AND TRANSFORMING ACCOMMODATION WITH SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS

Cabinet was asked to approve the delivery strategy for the Accommodation with Care and Support (AwCS) Programme for Mental Health and approve all five sites for new Supported Independent Living accommodation.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet endorses the direction of travel for the Surrey County Council People Strategy 2023-2028.

Reasons for decisions:

Tackling health inequality and empowering our communities are two of the council's four strategic priorities. Poor mental health is a key factor in a range of conditions and personal situations, such as substance misuse, unemployment, poor physical health, that create and/or worsen health inequality. The mental

health system in Surrey is under great stress and is struggling to manage the demands made upon it.

The mental health AwCS programme will contribute to tackling health inequality and empowering our communities by making sure no one is left behind. It will enable a strong focus on prevention and addressing services gaps, alongside improving outcomes for people with mental health needs. It will achieve this by focusing on three specific areas: a place to call home, support to recover, and short-term support.

The mental health AwCS programme will contribute to 'The Housing, Homes and Accommodation Strategy for Surrey' by ensuring that the council and partners are delivering the SIL needed for our residents.

Approving the sites in principle for mental health SIL, which are part of the council's current estate portfolio, will allow us to re-use or optimise existing freehold assets.

E. REIGATE FIRE STATION - REDEVELOPMENT SCHEME

Cabinet was asked to approve the redevelopment of Reigate Fire Station to address and mitigate constraints to the service provided by the Surrey Fire Rescue Service (SFRS) and health and safety issues for SFRS operational crews and staff. Approving the investment and the proposal recommended in this report will allow SFRS to improve and enhance its service and ability to best protect the lives of Surrey residents.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding from the pipeline to redevelop the Reigate SFRS site to design and construct a new fire station on the existing site. The capital funding required to develop the new facilities is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate supply chain partners to deliver the design, build and fit out of the new structures in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of supply chain partners, the Executive Director for Resources and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +5% of the budgetary tolerance level.

Reasons for Decisions:

It is essential to redevelop Reigate Fire Station in order to:

- Address and mitigate constraints the current building presents to SFRS, its service and the personnel based in the fire station.
- House the new, larger fire appliances used by SFRS.

- Improve the health and safety provision and welfare facilities for SFRS staff.

F. GODSTONE DEPOT – REDEVELOPMENT

Cabinet was asked to approve the redevelopment of Godstone Depot to ensure that Surrey County Council's Highways and Transport Service has fit for purpose, year-round facilities with a long-term operational lifespan to deliver its critical service maintaining Surrey's roads for safer travel across the county for residents, businesses and visitors.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding from the pipeline to redevelop the Godstone Depot site to design and construct a new working and operational facilities on the existing site. The capital funding required to develop the new facilities is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate supply chain partners to deliver the design, build and fit out of the new structures in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of supply chain partners, the Executive Director for Resources and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +5% of the budgetary tolerance level.

Reasons for Decisions:

It is essential to redevelop Godstone Depot in order to:

- Enable the Service to improve and enhance its critical front-line function, supporting the county's economy by enabling safer travel for Surrey's road users.
- Provide fit for purpose, long-term facilities for the Highways and Transport Service and its partners to deliver its critical services and statutory duties to maintain the county's roads, including gritting during winter weather.
- Improve the working, operational and health and safety environments for Highways and partner staff based at Godstone Depot.

G. QUARTERLY REPORT ON DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER SPECIAL URGENCY ARRANGEMENTS: 4 February 2023 - 12 May 2023

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
12 May 2023**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 28 MARCH 2023 AT 2.00 PM
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL,
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
- *David Lewis
- *Mark Nuti
- *Denise Turner-Stewart
- *Sinead Mooney
- *Marisa Heath
- *Kevin Deanus

Deputy Cabinet Members:

- *Maureen Attewell
- *Rebecca Paul
- *Paul Deach
- *Jordan Beech

Members in attendance:

John O'Reilly, Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee
Nick Darby, Chairman of the Resources and Performance Select Committee
Jonathan Essex, Member for Redhill East
Catherine Baart, Member for Earlswood and Reigate South

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

25/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were no apologies.

26/23 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 31 JANUARY 2023 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

27/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

28/23 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

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

29/23 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were four public questions. The questions and responses were published in a supplement to the agenda.

James King thanked the council for the road works undertaken at the weekend and the response provided by the Cabinet Member. He further asked if the council was able to give a timeline on when UK Power Networks would have completed their part of the work and if possible, if other councillors and the local community could be kept informed of any progress. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience explained that the council did not have the ability to refuse the emergency works on the highways but always negotiated with the utility companies to ensure high quality repairs were not dug up immediately.

In response to her main question, Jenny Desoutter asked the Cabinet Member how the operation at Sheepleas SSSI had been supervised and if the risk assessments undertaken were fit for purpose. The Cabinet Member for Environment stated that the decision to remove the trees at Sheepleas had not been taken lightly and had been supported by a number of partners including Natural England, Surrey Wildlife Trust, the Forestry Commission and local ecological groups. The Cabinet Member explained that the council's ambition was to plant trees and not take them down. Every tree was checked before being removed and the council ultimately had a public safety responsibility. The council had been informed that the dormice boxes were empty. When the one box had been found, the council referred itself to the rural police. The council would be reviewing the situation and would be holding workshops with relevant parties to understand what is being seen in the countryside.

In regards to his main question, Robert Whitcombe explained that Fetcham Residents Association (FRA) had missed the communications regarding the LCWIP consultation because of the death of their Chairman last year. The association welcomed the further consultation offered when specific cycling and walking infrastructure proposals were taken through feasibility and design stages. It was explained that shortly after the July 2022 Consultation on the Mole Valley LCWIP there had been two developments significant to the LCWIP and the extent that it served Fetcham. First, following sheet-piling work by Network Rail to strengthen an embankment alongside an important Footpath (16) linking Fetcham and Leatherhead and second, SES Water had generously agreed to a new combined footpath-cycleway across its land in Fetcham, which would by-pass the current footpath and provide a safer route with less impact on a Priority Habitat. The FRA recognised the LCWIP as a key planning tool to guide long term investment and asked the council that this new footpath-cycleway is factored into the "Final" Mole Valley LCWIP before sign off. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth stated that FRA could submit any information they wanted as part of the LCWIP consultation prior to it going out to public consultation in the summer. The Cabinet Member also agreed to a follow up meeting with the FRA, Clare Curran and Tim Hall to discuss feasibility of the other proposals mentioned.

30/23 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

31/23 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

32/23 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

The Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee attended the meeting to present the reports from his Select Committee. The Chairman of the Select Committee thanked the Cabinet Member for her response to the Select Committee's report on the Surrey strategy for accommodation, housing and homes and asked how the relationship with the district and boroughs was developing as part of the development of the strategy. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families thanked the Select Committee for its steer on the strategy and explained that the majority of district and boroughs were looking forward to working with the county council.

The Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee thanked the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety for her response to the Select Committee report on delivering in partnerships. The Chairman of the Select Committee stated that a critical element of the success of this initiative would be the active involvement of the NHS in all forms. The Chairman welcomed an update report back to the Select Committee in December. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety thanked the Select Committee for its report and agreed that work had been agreed and shaped with health partners. She welcomed returning to the Select Committee in December.

RESOLVED:

That the three Select Committee reports be noted and recommendations considered.

33/23 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

The decisions taken since the last Cabinet meeting were considered.

RESOLVED:

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

34/23 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families introduced her update report. The following key points were made:

- Transformation Assurance Board- As part of her commitment to continue to embed change in Children's Social Care, the Cabinet Member had taken on chairmanship of the Children's Social Care Transformation and Assurance Board. The Board provides oversight

of transformation activity in children's social care. The Board is supported by external independent members and had cross party member representation.

- Family Safeguarding Model- the directorate had recently launched a 'Phase 2' implementation of the Family Safeguarding model in children's social care and had been successful in securing funding from the Department for Education that enables them to work in partnership with the Centre for Family Safeguarding from November 2022 to March 2023.
- Building Belonging Programme- The Building Belonging Programme would provide a multi-agency approach to preventing children and young people with complex needs entering the criminal justice system. The partnership had been successful in a bid for funding from NHS England to implement a pilot in one district in Surrey.
- Foster carer remuneration- Recruiting and retaining in-house foster carers was key to the sufficiency strategy of providing Surrey homes for Surrey children. Currently 51% of children in foster care, excluding those living with Council foster carers from their own kinship network, are placed with Independent Fostering Agency carers. Investment totalling £2.7m had been approved to bring fostering allowances and skills payments more in line with competitors and to reward and incentivise areas of fostering that are more complex or difficult to recruit to.
- Staff were thanked for their hard work during the three week joint targeted inspection. Findings and recommendations would be made available in due course.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month update be noted.

35/23 DELIVERING IN PARTNERSHIP: TOWNS - THE NEXT PHASE [Item 8]

The report was introduced by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety who explained that the report set out the work and approach to deliver essential services for residents in Surrey towns. Multi agency service delivery would take place at a local town level and would be based on the council and partners priorities. The town's approach would enable the council to target resources and efforts at the people and neighbourhoods in Surrey that were most at risk of being left behind. The council would be working with partners to reduce health inequalities, improve life expectancy, improve equality of opportunity and enable access to services. The work being undertaken would focus on the priority groups that had been agreed by partners in the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet supports and endorse the strategic approach of delivering in partnership in towns, to address key priorities for residents, communities, partners, and the County Council.
2. That Cabinet approves the prioritised towns, identified through assessment against key socio-economic and health criteria, as set out at paragraph 20.

Reasons for Decisions:

As set out in the report, a number of communities and places in Surrey experience significant challenges with e.g. health inequalities, worklessness, skills, aging populations, child poverty, homelessness and housing, despite the general perception of the county as comfortable and prosperous. Partners across the county have set out high ambitions, supported by strategic plans, to address these. Experience has shown that the complex nature of many of the 'wicked issues' requires a multi-agency, highly collaborative approach. The approach being recommended, which reflects the learning from work to date, will drive practical delivery, beyond strategic intent, through convening, galvanising and empowering partners to work together to deliver, at an optimum spatial level (e.g. towns), supported, guided and overseen by elected representatives.

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

36/23 A HOUSING, ACCOMMODATION AND HOMES STRATEGY FOR SURREY [Item 9]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Children and Families who started by thanking everyone who had contributed to the development of the housing, accommodation and homes strategy including registered social landlords across the county, Homes England representatives, colleagues from health and importantly district and borough housing and planning officers. The production of the strategy was supported by Inner Circle Consulting and special thanks was given to Michael Coughlin who was lead officer for the strategy. The Cabinet Member stressed that access to good housing was a basic human right and the baseline assessment demonstrated that Surrey did have a multidimensional and complex housing crisis which would only be addressed through taking a different approach together in partnership. It was explained that both Tandridge District Council and Mole Valley District Council had indicated that they did not want to be partners in the strategy.

The Leader encouraged council's who did not support the strategy to embrace the strategy for the benefit of Surrey residents. The Deputy Cabinet Member for Children and Families stated that she was also the Lead Member for housing at Spelthorne Borough Council. The local council supported the strategy and the positive impacts it would have on local residents. Members agreed that the strategy would help the council in achieving its net zero ambitions and would be welcomed by businesses who recognised housing as critical to economic growth.

Jonathan Essex welcomed the strategy and welcomed the focus on key worker housing. It was queried if key worker housing could be delivered via the councils vacant sites such as the Dormers and Park Hall care homes and what the next steps would be in bringing forward key worker housing and care leaver accommodation. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families agreed to take the feedback from the Member back to the team that would be responsible for delivering the strategy. The Leader explained that the county council was in discussions with a local council about the use of one of the

properties mentioned by the member for key worker housing. Unfortunately this local council had not endorsed the strategy.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet endorses the benefit of and approach taken to initiating and developing a county-wide strategy for Housing, Accommodation and Homes,
2. That Cabinet adopts the strategy and encourages others to do likewise in a spirit of collective endeavour to address the evidenced housing crisis in Surrey.
3. That Cabinet Delegates authority to the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Housing and Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth to make any necessary final amendments to the strategy following a period of public consultation.

Reasons for Decisions:

The baseline assessment undertaken as part of the work of developing a strategy makes clear the challenges in housing, accommodation, and homes in Surrey, with advisors describing the situation as a crisis. While recognising the sovereign responsibilities and service responsibilities for Housing and Planning of other organisations, the strategy sets out a 'Call to Government' and a 'Call to Action' to which everyone involved in housing in Surrey is encouraged to contribute.

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

37/23 SEND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2023/24 DELIVERY [Item 10]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning who explained that the report was seeking Cabinet approval for the use of £100m for future SEND capital funding as set out in the medium term financial strategy. This represented capital investment for 20 projects with viable schemes, established locations and confirmed costs. The project would create in the region of 700 additional state maintained specialist school places in Surrey with delivery from September 2023 onwards. This would mean that Surrey children with additional needs and disabilities who need to go to specialist schools can be educated closer to home and rooted in their own communities. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources explained that when looking at the cost of the project over its lifetime the annual cost of the scheme would be under £2500 per pupil. The report was welcomed by Members. The positive work being undertaken between the SEND team and the land and property team was recognised.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agrees the use of £100.2m of the total approved SEND Capital budget of £202m for 2022/23 to 2027/28 against twenty SEND Capital Programme projects with confirmed viable schemes, locations, and costs. These are part of the four capital strategies previously approved by Cabinet between 2019-2022.

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. That Cabinet agrees that the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Resources, and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award contracts, up to +10% of the budgetary tolerance level for individual projects and within the overall £202m funding envelope for 2022/23 to 2027/28 that has already been agreed.

Reasons for Decisions:

- Investing in the Capital Programme's 2023/24 delivery tranche will generate a positive impact on outcomes for children with complex special educational needs and disabilities, as well as improving the Council's financial sustainability.
- The committed expansion projects are business critical to ensure Surrey County Council (the 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 confirmed budgets against each of the 20 projects in the Capital Programme's 2023/24 delivery tranche are above the current threshold for £1m. Cabinet's delegated authority is required to enable the Cabinet Members for Property and Waste, Education and Lifelong Learning and Finance and Resources to approve contracts and allocate resources from the approved Capital budget for the programme to individual projects following Capital Programme Panel (CPP) approval of business cases.
- To that end, agreement is sought to use defined resources to enable project progression against the Procurement Forward Plan, so that contracts can be awarded in time to facilitate target delivery timescales for 2023 and 2024.

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

38/23 'PATHWAYS TO EMPLOYMENT: SUPPORTING SURREY RESIDENTS' SKILLS DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY THROUGH IMPROVED CAREERS PROVISION [Item 11]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth who explained that the report set out a programme of work that follows on from, and supplements the recently launched Surrey Skills Plan and the upcoming Lifetime of Learning education strategy and includes additional key operational activity that will support the ambitions of both these documents as well as delivering on multiple outcomes across educational equity, economic growth and opportunity for all. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning welcomed the report and highlighted the model for delivery which included greater engagement of employers in

designing and delivering employment and skills activity in schools and through a range of events.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet endorses the focus on local recruitment, skills development and career support for all ages and notes that this programme of work aligns with the planned Lifetime of Learning Strategy as well as the Surrey Skills Plan.
2. That Cabinet endorses the approach for SCC to further explore taking on new responsibilities related to schools-focused careers advice and guidance in line with recognition of the need to operate on a Surrey County geography, subject to the appropriate funding being in place.
3. That Cabinet notes that the approach will be enhanced by 'all-age' interventions where appropriate to reflect the challenges around recruitment and the data on economic inactivity, subject to a transformation funding business case.

Reasons for Decisions:

Currently, employment, skills and careers activity is delivered through a number of organisations, in a complex skills landscape. The County Council taking greater ownership of this agenda through a stronger lead and co-ordinating role, and in some cases responsibility for direct delivery, will allow us to ensure that services, support, and activity has better alignment with our strategic priorities, whilst also delivering greater impact and improved outcomes for residents and businesses. This would enable more and better targeted support to be provided for those individuals who need it the most, as well as addressing the barriers to economic growth which are being encountered by Surrey's employers, who are keen to be more involved in designing and delivering local solutions.

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

39/23 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL CARE OMBUDSMAN PUBLIC REPORT REGARDING CONCERNS ABOUT THE DELIVERY OF EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN WITH ADDITIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES (SEND) [Item 12]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning who provided the Cabinet with an update on the Ombudsman's report. It was explained that the council had been found at fault around the provisions set out in a child's Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP). The council had accepted the recommendations of the Ombudsman and would provide the family with financial compensation and a formal apology. The council would also review its procedures for arranging and monitoring the delivery of provision within an EHCP as well as reviewing the complaint handling procedures within the Children's Directorate. The Leader stated that the Cabinet had been briefed on the details of the report and apologised to the family and child involved.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet considers the Ombudsman's report and the steps that will be taken by the Service to address the findings, and
2. That Cabinet considers whether any other action should be taken.
3. That Cabinet notes that the Monitoring Officer will be bringing this report to the attention of all councillors.

Reasons for Decisions:

There is a statutory requirement for the Monitoring Office to bring to Members' attention any public report issued by the Ombudsman about the Council which identifies it is at fault and has caused injustice as a result.

40/23 RE-MODELLING THE STRATEGIC SHORT BREAKS OFFER FOR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES AND/OR AUTISM [Item 13]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health who explained that there were approximately 1350 individuals who lived with family carers across the county. Nearly half of these were between the age of 20 and 30 years old. The council supported these families through various means but one of the most important was giving carers an overnight break. The council currently provided somewhere in the region of 4600 nights accommodation, which could be in one of five sites across the county. Cabinet was being asked to approve the design and construction of Short Breaks accommodation at two identified sites in Reigate and Banstead and Woking within the capital funding envelope set. This would increase the council's Short Break offer and would provide provision to the west of the county. The Cabinet Member for Land and Property supported the proposals adding that the land and property team would be looking to start work on the Woking site this year for delivery in 2025 and the Banstead site would be coming forward soon after. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families welcomed the report and recognised the benefits it would provide to carers. The Cabinet Member stated that she had seen the plans for the buildings which were modern and fit for purpose.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves the proposal to re-model the Council's Strategic Short Breaks offer by working with the market to ensure a more diverse Short Breaks offer.
2. That Cabinet grants approval to proceed with the design and construction of Short Breaks accommodation at two identified sites in Reigate and Banstead and Woking within the capital funding envelope set out in Part 2 of this paper. The sites are as follows:
 - Lakers, Denton Way, Goldsworth Park, Woking, GU21 3LG
 - The Squirrels, The Horseshoe, Banstead, SM7 2BQ
3. That Cabinet confirms approval to procure a developer to construct the new Short Breaks accommodation and delegates approval to award the contract, (including any associated changes related to the contract, once it has been awarded to ensure that it continues to meet the

objectives related to this report) and manage the developments within the agreed capital funding envelope to:

- The Director of Land and Property in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste.
- The Joint Executive Director for Adult Social Care and Integrated Commissioning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health.

Reasons for Decisions:

To promote Carers wellbeing and enable them to have a break from their caring responsibility, but still be able to support the individual to live at home.

To enable residents with learning disabilities and/or autism who meet the Council's eligibility criteria for Adult Social Care (ASC) funding to have their need for overnight Short Breaks met in a modern, fit for purpose setting with all the necessary facilities and amenities.

To promote the independence of Surrey residents with learning disabilities and/or autism and enable them to remain in their family homes and connected to their local community.

To ensure that together with our partners we develop a range of options that improve outcomes and support for individuals and their families when offering a short break.

To make an essential contribution towards the Council's strategic objective to tackle health inequality, in line with the 2030 Community Vision for Surrey.

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

41/23 ELECTRIC TOWNS AND CITIES INITIATIVE (ETCI) A3 AIR QUALITY PROJECT [Item 14]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth who explained that the stretch of the A3 running through Guildford had been identified as a priority area for action, having a mean annual NO₂ level of more than double the legal limit. Although National Highways were the responsible highway authority for this stretch of road, Surrey County Council, as the relevant local highway authority, and Guildford Borough Council in its role as the relevant environmental health authority, had a shared interest with National Highways in addressing the issues. There was a legal duty on National Highways, as issued by the Secretary of State for the Environment, to address the NO₂ levels along the A3 in Guildford. This stretch of road had been identified as one of the worst roads for air quality in the country. The Cabinet Member referred to the statement of intent in Annex 1 explaining that more was required than the initial project to tackle the air quality challenge.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves the receipt of £11m grant funding from National Highways for the A3 air quality scheme through the Electric Towns and Cities Initiative, and proceeds with the scheme subject to the

approval of a detailed business case by the Council's Capital Programme Panel.

2. That Cabinet agrees that, if the scheme is successful and National Highways allocates further grant to the Guildford A3 scheme within the existing timeframe, the acceptance and spend of the additional grant is delegated to the Director of Highways & Transport, in conjunction with the relevant Cabinet member.

Reasons for Decisions:

There is a legal duty on National Highways, as issued by the Secretary of State for the Environment, to address the NO₂ levels along the A3 in Guildford. This stretch of road has been identified as one of the worst roads for air quality in the country. The County Council, with Guildford Borough Council and National Highways, has a shared interest in addressing the air quality in this area - both from a public health perspective but also in light of our net zero carbon targets as a county. Residents who are users of the footpaths/cycle paths alongside this stretch of road will benefit from reduced exposure to emissions upon completion of the initiative; as well as a secondary benefit for those who drive electric vehicles having access to additional local charge points. Residents who are employed in organisations/businesses in the local area may also benefit from the travel planning element of the initiative, whereby the opportunity to join a salary sacrifice scheme may be available to encourage the move to electric vehicles.

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

42/23 FUTURE BUS NETWORK REVIEW AND LOCAL BUS SERVICE INVESTMENT [Item 15]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth who started by saying that increasing sustainable travel alongside the Council's investment in zero emission buses and minibuses would help deliver the carbon reduction targets set out in the Climate Change Delivery Plan. The Council was committed to supporting local bus services and had increased revenue support for service delivery and capital investment to improve their operational effectiveness and efficiency. Since Covid the council had been working with the bus industry to build back bus patronage. 2600 people had responded to the future bus network consultation which enabled residents to have a say on investment and infrastructure of the bus network. The Mole Valley connect service would be expanded across the county and the council would be proposing a 20 and under half price concessionary fare scheme. Members welcomed more investment being put into the service and the roll out of the on demand service which would be welcomed by residents.

The Leader explained that the Cabinet was absolutely committed to extending access to public transport alongside the active travel schemes. The council would continue to subsidise the commercial buses and the roll out on demand minibuses.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the response to the public and stakeholder consultation.
2. That Cabinet agrees the proposed changes to the public bus network as set out in **Annex B**, with service changes to be implemented at the start of the new academic year in September 2023.
3. That Cabinet agrees the recommended priority areas for capital investment to support bus services and help grow bus patronage.
4. That Cabinet agrees the recommended areas for expansion of new Digital Demand Responsive Transport services in 2023 as set out in **Annex C**.
5. That Cabinet agrees the process and timescales for updating the Bus Service Improvement Plan and Enhanced Partnership Scheme and agree that the approval and submission of the Bus Service Improvement Plan to Government be delegated to the Director of Highways and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth.
6. That Cabinet agrees that the decision to award contracts for local bus services and Digital Demand Responsive Transport services is delegated to the Director, Highways and Transport, following discussion with the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth, and the Council's Section 151 Officer.

Reasons for Decisions:

The public consultation has helped shape the bus service changes proposed in **Annex B**. These changes are necessary to ensure the network is financially sustainable and has responded to changed travel patterns, particularly in areas where passenger numbers are unlikely to ever recover to pre-pandemic levels. The financial review of bus services also meets the Department for Transport's (DfT) requirement for accessing the extension of Covid bus recovery funding. The Council is committed to supporting local bus services and has increased revenue support for service delivery and capital investment to improve their operational effectiveness and efficiency.

The public consultation has also helped shape our proposed investment in bus infrastructure. It demonstrated that resident support for investment in buses is high, showing that people value bus services and that targeting investment will aid patronage growth.

The Council's previous BSIP, published in 2021, set out a desire to expand our DDRT offer, learning from the successful Mole Valley Connect scheme funded from the DfT's Rural Mobility Fund. This report sets out proposals for new DDRT schemes shaped by consultation feedback, including the need to promote new schemes and the flexibility they offer residents.

All LTAs are required to review their BSIPs annually. The DfT agreed that the Council's BSIP refresh could be undertaken once the public consultation was complete, enabling the views and suggestions of residents and stakeholders to be included in the BSIP review. This report sets out the BSIP refresh process, with a submission to date at the end of May 2023.

Following the Future Bus Network Review and the consideration of consultation responses, coupled with ongoing dialogue with bus operators, the Council needs to tender the services proposed for change, along with retender of a number of contracts that were extended during the pandemic. New contracts will be awarded following a procurement process in line with the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement and Contracts Standing Orders.

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

43/23 STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT - FINANCIAL YEAR 2021/22 WITH 2022/23 MID YEAR UPDATE [Item 16]

The annual report was introduced by the Leader who explained that the council had a number of investments in companies and trading companies designed to deliver income and efficiencies. The council had not invested in any commercial properties for a number of years. The Strategic Investment Board was supported by a number of senior officers and there were a number of governance arrangements in place to support any decision making around investments. The report set out the companies the council had ownership off and percentage ownership off. All companies were financially sound and contributed to the councils budget.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet endorses the Annual Report of the Strategic Investment Board.

Reasons for Decisions:

- To inform the Council about the activities of the Strategic Investment Board
- The Strategic Investment Board has been established in accordance with best practice governance to ensure effective oversight and alignment with the strategic objectives and values of the Council.

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

44/23 YOUR FUND SURREY- CF118 MASTER PARK COMMUNITY PAVILION [Item 17]

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety introduced the report explaining that the advisory panel were extremely impressed with the passion of the applicant and how they had involved the whole community of all ages in their plans from the design to the fundraising. The report was seeking £1.86 million which was 63% of the overall cost of the project. The project had wide community benefits and would provide free access to many groups who would be supporting vulnerable residents. The new pavilion would provide 225 hours of use per week for community groups. There was very high and considerable support from local residents and the divisional member for this project. The Leader expressed his support for the application stating that the funding being given was one of the largest

contributions from Your Fund Surrey and was for a worthy cause. Members recognised the positive impact the project would have on the local community.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agrees to fund Master Park Pavilion Charity for the full amount requested of £1,860,000 towards the creation of the Master Park Community Pavilion.
2. That Cabinet recommends the applicant provides evidence to confirm full funding is in place before funding is released.

Reasons for Decisions:

This application has been the subject of a rigorous assessment process and officers consider the project meets the aims and published criteria of the Fund and to satisfy the requirements to award funding.

The new pavilion will create a new hub in the centre of the busy town, providing opportunities and facilities for the whole community.

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

45/23 2022/23 MONTH 10 (JANUARY) FINANCIAL REPORT & 2023/24 FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW [Item 18]

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the Month 10 finance report. At Month 10, the Council was forecasting a full year deficit of £2.4m, against the approved revenue budget, an improvement of £3.4m since Month 9. A reset of the capital budget was undertaken at the end of Month 9 which showed a slight reduction in the overall capital budget. Cabinet was being asked to approve the transfer of the closing surplus revenue and capital balances of the Mead Infant School to its successor academy and approve the new charges and increases to existing Fees & Charges. The Leader was confident the council would have a balanced budget without the use of any reserves.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year, including the use of the contingency budget and the commitment to continue to develop Directorate budget recovery plans.
2. That Cabinet approves the transfer of the closing surplus revenue and capital balances of the Mead Infant School to its successor academy (revenue surplus £85,963.92 and capital surplus £3,789.76) (Paragraph 12 - 13)
3. That Cabinet notes the summary of the Fees & Charges review (paragraph 14 - 23 and Annex 2)

4. That Cabinet approves the new charges and increases to existing Fees & Charges that are more than budget setting guidance (paragraph 22 and Annex 3)

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. It also outlines Cabinet requirement to approve the transfer of balanced for forced academy conversions and the Financial Regulations setting out when Cabinet approval is required for Fees and Charges price increases.

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

46/23 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 19]

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.

47/23 SEND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2023/24 DELIVERY [Item 20]

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning 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 Minute 37/23.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Minute 37/23.

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

48/23 RE-MODELLING THE STRATEGIC SHORT BREAKS OFFER FOR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES AND/OR AUTISM [Item 21]

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-03-23]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-03-23]

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

49/23 STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT - FINANCIAL YEAR 2021/22 WITH 2022/23 MID YEAR UPDATE [Item 22]

The Leader 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 Minute 43/23.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Minute 43/23.

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

50/23 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 15:56

Chairman

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 25 APRIL 2023 AT 2.00 PM
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL,
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
- *David Lewis
- *Mark Nuti
- *Denise Turner-Stewart
- *Sinead Mooney
- *Marisa Heath
- *Kevin Deanus

Deputy Cabinet Members:

- *Maureen Attewell
- *Rebecca Paul
- *Paul Deach
- *Jordan Beech

Members in attendance:

Jeremy Webster, Vice-Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

51/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were no apologies.

52/23 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 28 MARCH 2023 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

53/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

54/23 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There was no member questions.

55/23 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were three public questions. The questions and responses were published in a supplement to the agenda.

With regards to her public question, Anna Sutherland asked the following supplementary question which was at what stage during the tribunal process did the council usually concede as currently 71 % of SEND cases were resolved before the hearing and if the council uses the often lengthy SEND tribunal process as a way to save some expensive special school fees. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning stated that with regards to the 71% of cases settled before tribunal she would check if this information was available and pass this information onto the questioner. The Cabinet Member stated that the SEND process was not used as a way of saving money on independent non- maintained sector fees. The council's aim was to ensure every child's needs were met at the earliest possible opportunity and that every child should get the education they need. The council did not put families through the unnecessary stress of tribunals as the council was aware of the distress these caused.

With regards to the second public question, a supplementary question was asked on behalf of Louise Gannon which was how does the council feel about the money being paid out to well deserving families when they could fix their many procedural faults and use the £182 + K for making SEND better for all children & families. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning stated that when a fault was found with the council it was important the council acknowledged these faults and compensated these families accordingly. It was important the council learns from these cases and what went wrong in the past and how to make services better for the children and young people going forward.

56/23 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

57/23 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

58/23 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

The report was introduced by the Vice-Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning & Culture Select Committee who welcomed the Cabinet response and the recognition in the response to the need for culture change within Children's service. The Vice-Chairman stated that whilst visiting staff at offices, concern had been raised around parking and flexibility in the workplace. Concern was also raised by the Select Committee around how managers were carrying out management of staff and finally, key worker housing had been raised as a concern. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families thanked the Select Committee for their report and welcomed the support being provided to the service. The Cabinet Member agreed to pass on the operational comments raised by the Vice-Chairman to the Executive Director for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning. Key worker housing was a priority for the council and work was being undertaken to deliver this. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning explained that there had been a

rich discussion at the Select Committee around workforce. There had been a shortage of educational psychologists in the SEND department which was also a national issue. The Leader stated that the council would be looking to use its own land to support key worker housing going forward.

RESOLVED:

That the Select Committee report be noted and recommendations considered.

59/23 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

The decisions taken were briefly explained and noted.

RESOLVED:

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

60/23 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety provided the Cabinet with an update on the work she and the services she supports had been undertaking. The following key points were raised:

- Local Area Coordinators and Community link officers were active in each of our 11 districts and boroughs, building strong Connexions alongside county councillors and working with many community groups. Their work had been well received and they have an important role signposting residents and linking communities to council. In Hurst Green the Local Area Coordinator had worked with residents to set up a craft club and pop-up café, which is leading to introductions to people who need support but don't know where to turn.
- The towns and villages work was enabling effective joined up working around residents and families in their locality and their unique town or village. This work would directly address health inequalities and improve equality of opportunity.
- Your Fund Surrey was launched in November 2020 and applications were increasing and the council was funding many more projects, including the largest to date £1.9 million to create a new community centre and pavilion in the heart of Oxted.
- The Customer Services Welfare line continues to work closely with Citizens Advice and Surrey Crisis Fund colleagues dealing with a range of enquires from benefits advice to emergency support and mental wellbeing issues.
- Ambitious plans for Surrey libraries would be delivered through significant capital investment, alongside grants and funding and will mean every Surrey library would benefit. These changes would deliver an improved offer for all residents, cementing libraries as community anchors and hubs.
- With regards to Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, investment was being made in the redevelopment of Reigate fire station and Chobham

and Lingfield on- call fire stations, as well as the new training facilities and a firehouse at Wray Park.

- Trading standards had been working to protect young people from unsafe vapes and the Community safety team were working with Surrey Police to respond to the government's anti-social behaviour action plan and to counter serious youth violence by providing teachers with resources to deliver community safety messaging.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month update be noted.

61/23 TRANSFORMATION OF ACCOMMODATION WITH CARE AND SUPPORT FOR WORKING AGE ADULTS: DELIVERY STRATEGY FOR MODERNISING AND TRANSFORMING ACCOMMODATION WITH SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS [Item 8]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health who explained that the report furthers the council's 2021 strategy for adult social care and mental health. The council was aware that there was a demand deficit for supported independent living units by 2030. It was vital residents had good quality places to live. The service was looking at five potential sites owned by the council to develop or repurpose into supported living accommodation. These sites were spaced evenly across the county. Cabinet was being asked to approve £2.1m for a feasibility study to move the business case forward for the projects. The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste commented that the business cases would determine the delivery route for the accommodation and the capital funding requirement. If the delivery routes were not affordable on any of the sites, then the relevant sites would be released to other services for other uses. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families welcomed the development of the mental health supporting individuals team which would review people in existing supported independent living and identify if that accommodation was still the most appropriate for them

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves the delivery strategy for the Accommodation with Care and Support Programme for Mental Health.
2. That Cabinet gives in-principle approval for the sites listed in Part 2 to be used for Supported Independent Living accommodation for people with mental health needs. Subject to successful completion of feasibility studies at the site, business cases will be presented to Cabinet to confirm final approval for the development of SIL accommodation at these sites including any required capital funding from the council.
3. That Cabinet approves capital funding of £2.1m from the Corporate Feasibility Fund for a feasibility study to progress Supported Independent Living accommodation at five identified sites disclosed in Part 2 of this report.

4. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate supply chain partners for the delivery of all associated services required for the feasibility studies (which includes appointments, contract award and negotiation of any contractual changes based on the appointments) in accordance with the council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
5. That Cabinet agrees that, regarding the procurement of supply chain partners for the feasibility studies, within the +/-5% budgetary tolerance level, the Executive Director of Resources and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts.

Reasons for Decisions:

Tackling health inequality and empowering our communities are two of the council's four strategic priorities. Poor mental health is a key factor in a range of conditions and personal situations, such as substance misuse, unemployment, poor physical health, that create and/or worsen health inequality. The mental health system in Surrey is under great stress and is struggling to manage the demands made upon it.

The mental health AwCS programme will contribute to tackling health inequality and empowering our communities by making sure no one is left behind. It will enable a strong focus on prevention and addressing services gaps, alongside improving outcomes for people with mental health needs. It will achieve this by focusing on three specific areas: **a place to call home, support to recover, and short-term support.**

The mental health AwCS programme will contribute to 'The Housing, Homes and Accommodation Strategy for Surrey' by ensuring that the council and partners are delivering the SIL needed for our residents.

Approving the sites in principle for mental health SIL, which are part of the council's current estate portfolio, will allow us to re-use or optimise existing freehold assets.

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

62/23 STRATEGIC WASTE INFRASTRUCTURE [Item 9]

The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste introduced the report explaining that Surrey County Council was the statutory waste disposal authority and was responsible for the transfer, treatment and disposal of all household waste collected within Surrey. The council's current waste infrastructure included 5 waste transfer stations, 15 community recycling centres, a gasifier treating 55,000 tonnes of residual waste and an anaerobic digester treating 40,000 tonnes of food. A full review had been carried out and this had identified that there would be gaps in the council's infrastructure network post 2024. The plan sets out the infrastructure required within the next seven years to sustain waste management over the next 30 years. The report focused on the upgrade and development of assets within the geography of Surrey where there was a critical need for that infrastructure, presenting five recommended work packages needed to safeguard the future of waste services. It was

added that a reuse hub, Ivy Dene Cottage, would be developed on the site adjacent to the Eco Park. Cabinet Members welcomed the initiatives that would be incorporated at the Eco Park and the development of the reuse hub at this site.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approve the programme of work for the development of strategic waste infrastructure needed to meet the statutory duty of Surrey County Council to manage residual municipal waste and to encourage more recycling and reuse.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approval of the waste Strategic Infrastructure Plan is pivotal in testing the feasibility of the infrastructure developments required to meet Surrey's residents' growing needs and the Council's statutory obligations. The packages of work detailed will provide a robust basis on which solutions can be developed. These solutions will provide the Council with resilience to legislative and market changes, security of facilities reducing dependency on third parties, and ensure value for money for the future delivery of statutory waste services.

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

63/23 REIGATE FIRE STATION - REDEVELOPMENT SCHEME [Item 10]

The report was introduced by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member For Communities and Community Safety who explained that Cabinet was being requested to approve the redevelopment of Reigate Fire Station. Improvements were required to allow Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) to accommodate the new larger fire appliances used by the Service as well as to upgrade welfare facilities and the working environment for SFRS personnel. Significant engagement had taken place between the design team and crew. The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste commented that the project would be a 12 month build out undertaken in phases to reduce operational impact.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding from the pipeline to redevelop the Reigate SFRS site to design and construct a new fire station on the existing site. The capital funding required to develop the new facilities is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate supply chain partners to deliver the design, build and fit out of the new structures in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of supply chain partners, the Executive Director for Resources and the Director of

Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +5% of the budgetary tolerance level.

Reasons for Decisions:

It is essential to redevelop Reigate Fire Station in order to:

- Address and mitigate constraints the current building presents to SFRS, its service and the personnel based in the fire station.
- House the new, larger fire appliances used by SFRS.
- Improve the health and safety provision and welfare facilities for SFRS staff.

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

64/23 GODSTONE DEPOT - REDEVELOPMENT [Item 11]

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience introduced the report explaining that Cabinet was being asked to approve the redevelopment of Godstone depot which needed to be fit for purpose so it could provide critical frontline services all year. The Cabinet Member explained the work that would be undertaken including constructing new storage areas and improving the current vehicle routing through the site. The depot was strategically critical to the highways service especially those in the east of the county and would be designed to be more energy efficient. The Cabinet Member for Property and Waste explained that construction was expected to take a year and start in April 2024.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding from the pipeline to redevelop the Godstone Depot site to design and construct a new working and operational facilities on the existing site. The capital funding required to develop the new facilities is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate supply chain partners to deliver the design, build and fit out of the new structures in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of supply chain partners, the Executive Director for Resources and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +5% of the budgetary tolerance level.

Reasons for Decisions:

It is essential to redevelop Godstone Depot in order to:

- Enable the Service to improve and enhance its critical front-line function, supporting the county's economy by enabling safer travel for Surrey's road users.

- Provide fit for purpose, long-term facilities for the Highways and Transport Service and its partners to deliver its critical services and statutory duties to maintain the county's roads, including gritting during winter weather.
- Improve the working, operational and health and safety environments for Highways and partner staff based at Godstone Depot.

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

65/23 2022/23 MONTH 11 (FEBRUARY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources introduced the report explaining that at Month 11 the Council was forecasting a full year deficit of £2.1m against the approved revenue budget, an improvement of £0.3m since Month 10. The capital budget was reset at Month 9 to £210m. The Month 11 forecast of £199.9m was £10.1m less than the reset budget. Strategic Capital Groups were working towards mitigating this slippage for the remainder of this financial year. The Cabinet Member was confident that the council would achieve a balanced budget at year end. This was confirmed by the Leader who was confident no reserves would be required to balance the budget. The Leader commented that this year had been challenging with rising inflation and increasing demand and commended Cabinet Members and officers for achieving a respectable outturn for the year.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year, including the use of the residual contingency budget and the commitment to continue to mitigate overspending budgets.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

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

66/23 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 13]

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.

67/23 TRANSFORMATION OF ACCOMMODATION WITH CARE AND SUPPORT FOR WORKING AGE ADULTS: DELIVERY STRATEGY FOR MODERNISING AND TRANSFORMING ACCOMMODATION WITH SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS [Item 14]

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:

1. That Cabinet gives in principle approval for the sites disclosed in Part 2 of the report for new Supported Independent Living accommodation, subject to the completion of feasibility assessments and full financial business cases being presented to Cabinet for final approval, including any required capital funding from the council for the recommend delivery model.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Minute 61/23.

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

68/23 REIGATE FIRE STATION - REDEVELOPMENT SCHEME [Item 15]

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety 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-04-23]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-04-23]

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

69/23 GODSTONE DEPOT - REDEVELOPMENT [Item 16]

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience 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-05-23]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Minute 64/23.

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

70/23 PROPERTY TRANSACTION- DISPOSAL OF HALSEY GARTON LTD INVESTMENT ASSET [Item 17]

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:

That Cabinet approves the disposal of the investment asset.

See Exempt Minute [E-06-23]

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute [E-06-23]

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

71/23 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 18]

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

Meeting closed at 15:03

Chairman