



Agenda and Reports  
for the meeting of  
**THE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
to be held on  
**12 DECEMBER 2023**

(i)

Woodhatch Place  
Reigate  
Surrey

Monday, 4 December 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, 12 December 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 (officiant to be confirmed). 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 email Amelia Christopher on [amelia.christopher@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto: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 ELECTION OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR**

The Chief Executive, as County Returning Officer, formally to report the election of a new County Councillor: Dennis Booth for the Horsleys division at the by-election held on 19 October 2023.

## **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Chair to report apologies for absence.

## **3 MINUTES**

(Pages  
15 - 48)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 10 October 2023.

## **4 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.

## **5 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Susan Thomas, RIP**

I am very sorry to report the sorrowful death of former Chairman of Surrey County Council, Baroness Susan Thomas of Walliswood OBE DL, in Chichester last month.

Wife of the late David, Susan was a loving mother and grandmother, Liberal Democrat, campaigner and passionate gardener.

Our thoughts and prayers are with her family at this time.

### **Act of Remembrance**

It was an honour to host and join the procession as Surrey County Council marked Act of Remembrance last month. For the first time, we held the service in the reception area at Woodhatch Place due to the inclement British weather.

I had great pleasure in welcoming the Lord Lieutenant of Surrey, the High Sheriff of Surrey, members of the Royal British Legion, Surrey's currently serving and retired military, Deputy Leader Cllr Denise Turner Stewart, Deputy Chief Executive Leigh Whitehouse and Chief Fire Officer Dan Quin.

We all joined together to pay respects to all those who fought in the two World Wars to defend our freedoms and protect our way of life, as well as those who have fought in many conflicts since. It was also great to see how many staff joined us wearing red poppies in respect as a symbol of remembrance, hope for a peaceful future and to commemorate the soldiers who fought and died in war.

### **Chair's Theme**

As you know, my theme for my term of office is 'Celebrating Diverse Communities'. This month I have been visiting charities that support members of diverse communities across the county to learn more about what they do; listen to their needs; learning about the barriers facing those they support; and to determine how I and Surrey County Council can help champion their work. I look forward to reporting in the new year the charities I have visited and the outcomes of those visits.

### **Volunteers' Reception – Call for Nominations**

Nominations for the Chair's annual Volunteers' Reception are starting to arrive; many thanks indeed to those of you who have submitted your nominations.

I am, however, yet to receive nominations from most of you. I know that you all have incredible people serving your communities who making a significant difference to the residents in your divisions. I would love to receive at least one nomination from each of you – although the more nominations the merrier!

Please do not be discouraged from nominating by my diversity theme. My office would love to hear from anyone in your patch that is doing great work for others and who deserves to be recognised and celebrated. Please submit all nominations by 20 December. Thank you.

### **Social Media Drop-in**

Our Communications & Engagement team is holding a social media drop-in session!

Please come and meet officers from the Communications & Engagement team to discuss one-to-one, how you can use social media in your roles as Members.

This will be an informal drop-in session to provide the opportunity for you to ask about any queries or concerns you may have relating to social media. They can advise on things like setting up Facebook pages, when to respond to residents and where to find the right information.

Officers can be found at the back of the Council Chamber both before and after the Council meeting on 12 December.

## **Christmas**

The festive season is well and truly upon us and I have had the pleasure of turning on many Christmas lights in towns, villages and communities across Surrey. Being amongst the joy and good cheer has been truly heartwarming and one of the wonderful highlights in my role as Chair.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish you all and your families a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. I hope you enjoy the break and recharge your batteries.

I look forward to seeing you all in the New Year.

## **6 LEADER'S STATEMENT**

The Leader to make a statement.

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

## **7 CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES**

(Pages  
49 - 58)

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

Council is asked to agree the appointment of Keith Witham as a Select Committee Task Group Lead for the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee, replacing Steve Bax.

## **8 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME**

1. The Leader of the Council, the Deputy Leader 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 6 December 2023).***

2. Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios.

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

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions.

## **9 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 11 December 2023).***

## 10 ORIGINAL MOTIONS

### Item 10 (i)

**Paul Follows (Godalming South, Milford & Witley) to move under standing order 11 as follows:**

**This Council notes:**

- The disruption to potable water supply across large parts of the boroughs of Guildford and Waverley that commenced on Saturday 4 November, the ongoing water supply issues in Cranleigh and surrounding villages, and the repeated discharge of raw sewage into the river network;
- All efforts from across the community to support people, and in particular those who are vulnerable, in accessing alternative supplies of water during the period of disruption;
- The legitimate concerns of residents about raw sewage being regularly discharged into our river network from Sewage Treatment Works and from Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) and from raw sewage back flowing onto their private property and highway network;
- Concerning elements of Thames Water's response to the disruption, including but not limited to:
  - (a) poor communication with those impacted in the community, and
  - (b) limited actions to ensure the vulnerable or those unable to queue for water, were able to access alternative supplies.
  - (c) delayed environmental cleanup operations.
- The chronic underinvestment from the government towards the water industry which risks the possibility of future water shortages and increased raw sewage discharges and notes the three lead executives at Thames Water during the previous financial year were estimated to have been paid a total of £1.52 million, exclusive of bonuses, benefits, pensions and other incentives.

**This Council resolves to:**

- I. Ensure the Leader of the Council writes to the leadership of Thames Water, to request:
  - a. a detailed report of the cause of the disruption to water supply and the steps taken to resolve the matter;
  - b. a detailed report on the instances and quantity of raw sewage discharges into the river network and Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) assurances over the past four years and the investment plans to resolve this;
  - c. that residents and businesses receive timely and full compensation for the disruption to water supply and sewage

- spills;
  - d. an improved communications plan for informing the local community should a similar disruption to water supply occur again and/or raw sewage incidents; and
  - e. a reassessment of its processes, procedures, and criteria for ensuring the vulnerable or those unable to queue are able to access alternative supplies of water in the event of a disruption.
- II. Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State for the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to commission an investigation into the most recent water supply incident and the agency response, in addition to the requirement for water companies' to record and report raw sewage spills onto private property and the public highway through their assets.
- III. Task the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee with:
- a. reviewing the Council's emergency response measures regarding water and sewerage infrastructure.
  - b. reviewing how and when the Council determined the need to enter into emergency response measures.

**Item 10 (ii)**

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

**This Council notes:**

- Surrey County Council spends around £80 million per year on travel assistance and transport, across three key directorates (Children, Families and Lifelong Learning; Adult Social Care; and Environment, Transport and Infrastructure), the majority of which (£55 million) is for Home to School Transport Assistance (H2STA).
- To deliver on the Surrey Climate Strategy transport targets there is a need to increase overall bus use, both fixed bus routes as well as Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT). Surrey County Council is already extending its rollout of DDRT with an aspiration for a Surrey-wide service.
- At the same time the NHS procures non-emergency transport services and also there are workplace transport providers plus community and voluntary sector transport provision.

**This Council further notes:**

- Surrey County Council has a Freedom to Travel (F2T) transformation programme. Phase 1 is to improve Home to School Transport Assistance up until 2025. Phase 2 will then explore the benefits of pooling of transport provision across Surrey County Council directorates.



(viii)

- Bringing forward Phase 2 and extending it to include the NHS and borough and district councils would increase bus use, helping deliver on our Local Transport Plan and improving the viability of fixed bus routes and DDRT.

**This Council resolves to request that Cabinet:**

- a. Brings forward and extends Phase 2 of the Freedom to Travel transformation programme across Surrey County Council in collaboration with other partners.
- b. Works with Surrey Heartlands and NHS Frimley to explore pooling the funding of non-emergency patient transport for the NHS across Surrey.
- c. Works with all district and boroughs to pool community transport provision (including taxi vouchers) to deliver DDRT across Surrey.
- d. Works with key workplaces (e.g. hospitals and large businesses) to strengthen incentives for travel to work by public transport.

**Item 10 (iii)**

**Matt Furniss (Shalford) to move under standing order 11 as follows:**

**This Council notes:**

- Surrey County Council has been leading in its strong commitment to promoting skills development and education for all residents of Surrey to support the Surrey Local Economy. This meets this Council's strategic priority of Growing a Sustainable Economy So Everyone Can Benefit and its guiding mission to make sure No One is Left Behind through providing skills training to enable residents of all ages access the jobs they want.
- Last year, this Council launched the Surrey Skills Plan: The Skills Plan sets out a vision for a dynamic, demand-led skills system that meets the needs of businesses and individuals in Surrey.
- In 2023, SCC has delivered on a number of key priorities of the plan including:
  - Establishing the Surrey Careers Hub to work with 95 schools and colleges across the county to improve their performance against the Gatsby benchmarks and help them deliver world-class careers advice, information and guidance. This single service covering all of Surrey was formally launched. The Careers Hub will work with all the county's secondary schools, special schools and colleges with the aim of ensuring every young person can find their best next step.

- Establishing an annual skills and careers festival (the Festival of Skills), which hosted 80 exhibitors and over 1300 students and teachers to showcase a wide range of career pathways and opportunities.
- Enabled more businesses, both large and small, to inform skills provision planning through the delivery of Skills Bootcamps – short training courses to upskill and reskill Surrey’s adults.
- Worked in collaboration to successfully win a number of significant funding bids, including £6m for the Local Skills Improvement Fund, £1.8m for Skills Bootcamps and over £6m for Individual Placement Support in Primary Care (funding to support those with both mental and physical disabilities move into the workforce).
- In addition, this Council has made significant investments in skills training and education programs, including the Surrey Adult Learning service, which provides a wide range of free and subsidised courses to help residents develop the skills they need to succeed in the workplace and with the Level 2 Devolution Deal now agreed by the Government this Council can look to enhance the offering to Businesses and residents on vocational skills through SAL.
- Surrey is a strategically important economic powerhouse which contains a productive and highly skilled workforce. We have a large, highly productive economy which contributes £48bn in GVA and with a high employment rate.
- Lastly, a partnership team, led by Royal Holloway, University of London (RHUL), and involving Pinewood Studios, disguise, BT, Buckinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership, University of Surrey, Abertay University and National Film and Television School, alongside the County Council, has been announced as the winner of the ‘Convergent Screen Technologies and performance in Realtime (CoSTAR)’ national lab.
- The successful bid will create hundreds of new jobs and add tens of millions of pounds to Surrey’s economy. The £51m funding application was submitted in February 2022 by StoryFutures at RHUL on behalf of the wider bid team. The application focused on establishing a CoSTAR national lab at Pinewood Studios, alongside associated facilities and programmes to drive innovation and creativity in the UK’s screen and performance industries.
- Surrey County Council’s proposed contribution includes a capital commitment of £3m to fund the establishment of a CoSTAR satellite studio and incubator space on the RHUL campus in Surrey. It’s hoped these facilities will provide a sizeable boost to Surrey-based creative industry businesses, with over 200 expected to benefit.
- The Surrey-based Satellite Studio Facility is also projected to create 350 jobs over six years, and make a net contribution of

c£35m gross value added to Surrey's economy. Both facilities aim to open in early 2026.

**This Council resolves to:**

- I. Express its strong support for Surrey County Council's work on promoting skills to support residents and the local economy in Surrey.
- II. Commend the Council for its development and implementation of the Surrey Skills Plan.
- III. Welcome the new Single Surrey-wide Careers Hub to provide career pathway advice for Surrey residents.
- IV. Encourage the Council to continue its efforts to promote skills development and education for all Surrey residents.

**11 SELECT COMMITTEE FEEDBACK ON A REFERRED MOTION:  
'VISION ZERO'**

To provide feedback from the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee on the Council motion titled 'Vision Zero' as requested by the Council.

*(Note: report to follow)*

**12 APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCES**

(Pages  
59 - 60)

The purpose of this report is to request that the County Council considers whether to agree that County Councillor Nick Darby and County Councillor Fiona White may continue to be absent from Council meetings by reason of ill health.

**13 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2023/2024**

(Pages  
61 - 84)

For the approval of the Surrey Pay Policy Statement for the period 2023/2024.

**14 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION**

(Pages  
85 - 88)

It is the Council's responsibility to approve changes to the Council's Constitution.

This report sets out proposed changes to Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions and Scheme of Delegation, Section 3 Part 3A (Specific Delegations to Officers). These are brought to Council for formal approval in accordance with Article 4.04(b) and Article 13.01 of the Council's Constitution.

**15 REPORT OF THE CABINET**

(Pages  
89 - 94)

To receive the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 31 October 2023 and 28 November 2023.

**16 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS**

(Pages  
95 - 102)

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 11 December 2023.

*(Note: to follow: Minutes, Cabinet - 28 November 2023)*

**MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE**

Members of the public and the press may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode during meetings. Public Wi-Fi is available; please ask the committee manager for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at Council meetings. Please liaise with the committee manager prior to the start of the meeting so that the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

The 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 any Council equipment or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

Thank you for your co-operation.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT  
WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 8EF,  
ON 10 OCTOBER 2023 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING  
CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

Saj Hussain (Chair)  
Tim Hall (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	Michaela Martin
Natalie Bramhall	Jan Mason
Helyn Clack	Steven McCormick
Stephen Cooksey	Cameron McIntosh
Colin Cross	r Julia McShane
Clare Curran	Sinead Mooney
* Nick Darby	Carla Morson
Fiona Davidson	Bernie Muir
Paul Deach	Mark Nuti
Kevin Deanus	John O'Reilly
Jonathan Essex	Tim Oliver
* Robert Evans OBE	Rebecca Paul
Chris Farr	George Potter
* Paul Follows	Catherine Powell
Will Forster	Penny Rivers
* John Furey	John Robini
Matt Furniss	Becky Rush
* Angela Goodwin	Joanne Sexton
Jeffrey Gray	* Lance Spencer
David Harmer	Lesley Steeds
Nick Harrison	Mark Sugden
Edward Hawkins	Richard Tear
Marisa Heath	Ashley Tilling
Trefor Hogg	Chris Townsend
Robert Hughes	Liz Townsend
Jonathan Hulley	Denise Turner-Stewart
Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Hazel Watson
Frank Kelly	Jeremy Webster
Riasat Khan	Buddhi Weerasinghe
Robert King	* Fiona White
	Keith Witham

\*absent

r = Remote Attendance

**58/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Nick Darby, Robert Evans OBE, Paul Follows, John Furey, Angela Goodwin, Eber Kington, Scott Lewis, Julia McShane (remote), Lance Spencer, Fiona White.

**59/23 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 11 July 2023 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

**60/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**61/23 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

*Jordan Beech joined the meeting at 10.05 am.*

*Harry Boparai joined the meeting at 10.07 am.*

The Chair:

- Informed Members of the death of former Surrey County Councillor David Goodwin, he paid tribute to the contribution he had made to Surrey and led the Council in a moment of reflection.
- Congratulated Hazel Watson on her 30th anniversary of being a Surrey County Councillor [*Hazel noted her thanks for the recognition of her service, noting that much had changed since 1993*].
- Encouraged Members to attend the in-person Member Development Day on 20 October at Woodhatch Place.
- Referred to the 'Thank You' Reception for Surrey's volunteers, inviting Members to nominate their local volunteers.
- Hoped that Members would be able to attend the Act of Remembrance on Friday 10 November in the Memorial Garden at Woodhatch Place.
- Highlighted the first Surrey Hate Crime Conference held yesterday and thanked the former Chair, Helyn Clack for facilitating that.
- Highlighted the Stripey Stork charity which celebrated their tenth birthday, he praised their work whereby five million pairs of shoes had been donated.
- Asked Members to read the information provided on the Council's Fostering Service.
- Noted that the rest of his announcements could be found in the agenda.

**62/23 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]**

A recruitment video regarding the Council's Fostering Service was shown, the Chair encouraged Members to share the video and promote the work.

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

*Rebecca Jennings-Evans joined the meeting at 10.28 am.*



Members raised the following topics:

- Noted that it felt as though the Government could not do anything right regarding industrial relations, long waiting lists, inability to agree a high-speed train line; that mantra of nothing is working appeared at the Council with some staff not being paid due to IT glitches, sought reassurance that they would be supported.
- Noted that the Leader did not mention climate change, over the last month the national Conservative Party distanced itself from previous commitments, asked what impact that would have on the Council's climate change plans and whether the Leader disagreed with the Prime Minister's change of tone.
- Noted that residents were anxious that climate change was not mentioned in the Council's recent budget consultation, sought reassurance that it was an omission and fighting climate change remained a fundamental part of the Council's vision.
- Regarding the recent inspection of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS), noted that the Leader's tone in his statement around SFRS being on a journey of improvement was not reflected in the Council's triumphant response to the inspection report.
- Noted that Woking residents were concerned that SFRS did not have a tall buildings policy in place there, urged the administration to be open and truthful with the challenges faced.
- Noted that it was World Mental Health Day, in May 2019 the Council had adult social care packages in place for 426 people in Surrey, that had increased over the years to 725 in July 2023.
- Noted that regarding children there were long waiting lists for mental health support and more children were absent from school.
- Recognised that finances were challenging but questioned at what point the administration would invest more in proven effective early intervention and prevention services to stop statutory services' costs spiralling out of control.
- Stressed that people were not just being left behind but the odds were being stacked against them, it was the time to act to recognise the vast socio-economic differences across Surrey, for example 18 areas in Surrey were in the bottom 10% of the children and young people sub-domains and three areas were in the bottom 10% for the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index.
- Wished that the warnings about the Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) system had been heeded sooner to avoid the current crisis but welcomed the £15 million of additional funding over the next three years.
- Noted however that there was no increased investment in early preschool intervention, that would lead to further escalation in need with backlog recovery impacted by more applications for needs assessments.
- Noted that the supply of places on preschool programmes was outstripped by demand, regarding the local early autism programme the 18 places per quadrant could have been taken four times over this year.
- Highlighted that the majority of the forecasted £24.4 million overspend against the budget related to the price inflation in social care placements for children's services, as Corporate Parents that was not good enough.
- Noted that a higher proportion of children taken into care in Surrey had Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), last year's policy decisions to focus on the allocated budget for respite care and short breaks on some groups and remove it from others left gaps in support with devastating impacts.
- As part of the equality impact assessments for the budget, would continue to challenge the administration to put a value on preventative and support services.
- Noted that the system needed to be simplified, more complex caseworkers for children and more foster carers were needed; encouraged Members to reach out to their divisional foster carers to offer support.

- Noted that mental health and SEND support for children were the most raised issues, asked the Leader to advise what he could do to support that.
- Asked whether the Leader would agree that the Council must increase pace to turn its Local Transport Plan (LTP4) into a better plan that works for all, ensuring that better Surrey public transport aligns to London's plan so it does not become more expensive to travel to London by train; noted the absence of funding to improve the alternatives of new cross-border bus routes, bike lanes and walking.
- Noted that to make the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) fairer and improve transport systems, the Government needed to intervene by introducing fairer ways of charging to reduce road traffic along the principle of polluter pays.
- Asked the Leader to call on the Government to introduce a national scrappage scheme, to prioritise funding for new bus routes, make permanent the £2 maximum bus fare, to cap train fares, to demand that it does not frustrate the potential to reduce speed limits and to introduce 'school streets'.
- Asked whether the Leader agreed that Gatwick Airport's expansion plans were at odds with LTP4, expanding road traffic with grade separated interchanges and increasing congestion, pollution, carbon emissions and off airport parking; for the Leader to provide assurance that Surrey's response robustly highlights how the expansion undermines both LTP4 and climate commitments.
- Asked the Leader to confirm that as well as providing statutory services, the Council would continue to provide non-statutory services going forward so it leaves no one behind.
- Joined the Leader in highlighting the importance of foster children having a good and loving family, setting out a future where they are valued.
- Noted that the International Monetary Fund reported that the UK was expected to have the highest inflation and second lowest growth of the G7 economy, the Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer was therefore right to champion fiscal discipline which would be essential in restoring household finances.
- Noted that in the Leader's recognition of Government's cuts to local government finances to deliver essential services, asked whether the Leader agreed that the Prime Minister was out of touch to consider cutting inheritance tax for the wealthiest while thousands of residents could not afford heating or rent/mortgage.
- Asked whether the Leader agreed that the Government's rolling back on its environmental promises to appease the right of the Conservative Party was wrong for future generations and the country's global image.
- Asked whether the Leader would join him in thanking officers who helped secure funding for Egham to have the 'liveable neighbourhoods' funding for design and scoping works; and to lobby the Department for Transport against its scrappage.
- Asked whether the Leader was aware that during September to now the new on-demand Surrey Connect bus service for West Guildford had seen a 45% increase in the number of bus passenger journeys compared with its predecessor run by Stagecoach, the service filled in a gap left by Arriva and Stagecoach.
- Noted that residents were supportive of the new Surrey Connect bus service which was available 7am-7pm, particularly useful for those wishing to use the bus to commute; thanked the Leader for pursuing the policy.
- Thanked the Government for the additional £7.9 million funding provided to help fund bus services in Surrey and could be used for real-time information displays, local services were vital to those with lower incomes or mobility issues; looked forward to seeing more bus services in Surrey.
- Noted new and improved bus services in Camberley and sought for more facilities to make bus services friendlier, more accessible bus stops, more bus shelters and real-time information displays.
- Noted that a highlight of being a Member had been the gradual but positive progress by the Council towards support for more liveable, walkable, cyclable

neighbourhoods and communities for example via 20 mph zones and Active Travel Schemes; sought assurance that the administration would not turn its back on that progress as was the case by Government ministers.

- Noted the importance of expanding the Surrey Connect bus service county-wide.
- Hoped that the 458 bus service run by the White Bus operator becomes part of the £2 flat fare scheme.
- Welcomed the Surrey Connect bus service in Cranleigh, it was important in rural areas enabling residents to access local services; however older residents were unable to book the service via phone and had to download the app, urged the Leader to review that.

### **63/23 CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES [Item 6]**

The Leader introduced the report noting that transformation work had happened over the summer which resulted in a restructuring of the Corporate Leadership Team by the Chief Executive, he had updated the Cabinet portfolios to reflect that.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. Noted the changes to Cabinet appointments and Portfolios set out in the Annex 1 and 2.
2. Appointed Helyn Clack as a Select Committee Task Group Lead for the Adults and Health Select Committee, replacing Riasat Khan, for the remainder of the 2023/24 Council Year.

### **64/23 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]**

#### **Questions:**

Notice of thirty-one questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in the supplementary agenda (items 7 and 9) on 9 October 2023.

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

**(Q1) Keith Witham** asked whether the Cabinet Member would agree that the information regarding Project Horizon should be made available by division on the Council's website and that information should be kept up to date with both current and future works undertaken.

**Will Forster** asked the Cabinet Member to explain the difference in the percentage of resurfacing on roads to pavements, was it the case that Surrey's pavements were in better condition than roads; or were pedestrians being short changed.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience explained that the Council's website contained information on the Project Horizon programmes listed. He noted that Surrey's pedestrians were not in a worse position than road users, roads and pavements were regularly inspected.

**(Q3) Catherine Baart** asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm that in budget consultation surveys from now on there would be a separate option for climate change.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources confirmed that would be the case.

**(Q7) Mark Sugden** asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm the number of children attending private schools in Surrey and what percentage they represented of total children attending Surrey schools. He asked whether top line information could be provided by division.

**Robert King** requested data on children who attend Surrey independent schools that do not live in Surrey and travel into the county.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning confirmed that the Council knew how many children there were enrolled at independent schools in Surrey, there were over 150 independent schools across the county. She would liaise with the service to provide the information requested.

**(Q8) Jan Mason** noted that Surrey's firefighters were brilliant. She noted that in her 22 years of service at the Council there had been cut backs to the SFRS. She stressed that the Council had a responsibility to deal with the inspection outcome properly, she asked whether the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member felt the inspection report had nothing to do with the Council.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety recognised the Member's commitment to SFRS. She noted that this year saw an unprecedented uplift in the budget of SFRS, there was full establishment with a highly motivated and skilled workforce. The Council welcomed the report from His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS). Feedback had been received prior to submission in relation to the Cause of Concern Action Plan which indicated that the contents met the requirements of the Inspectorate. The report highlighted the areas where SFRS needed to focus on and the successes within the context of a challenging environment. SFRS was progressing the improvements set out in the inspection report. SFRS was good at keeping people safe and had a robust response system. Under the leadership of Chief Fire Officer and his senior leadership team, the work focused on dealing with the most challenging issues such as improving the culture of the service, addressing misconduct and ensuring every member of staff felt welcomed and valued without fear of discrimination or bullying. Other fire and rescue services were looking to SFRS for guidance. She welcomed the regular scrutiny through the select committee.

**(Q9) Ashley Tilling** noted that he had been a victim of the poor MySurrey roll out by not having received his Member's Allowance since being elected in May. Many people, schools and other organisations had been affected by that new IT system. He asked why the new IT system was not properly tested before it replaced the previous system, to prevent the costly and lengthy remediation measures currently taking place.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources clarified that the new system had been tested, in that testing process the team tried to identify all potential issues, due to its complexity there were unanticipated issues. The situation concerning payroll had been regrettable, apologies had been sent and work was underway to resolve the problems around delayed and incorrect payments. He explained that the problems that were experienced in September related to leavers and joiners, most people who were impacted had received emergency payments. Work was ongoing to ensure that the October payroll runs as smoothly as possible, the team was working closely with the schools and employees affected.

**(Q10) Hazel Watson** asked the Cabinet Member how temporary was temporary and what was the timescale for replacing temporary premises with permanent premises.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning explained that the temporary accommodation was short term for a term or possibly longer in the context of a building project. She noted that there were other schools where temporary accommodation was kept for longer periods. Regarding the thirty-four projects the team was currently working on to deliver over the next couple of years, some of those had temporary solutions which had been planned for, to be in place until the construction of the final building. She would be happy to discuss any schools with the Member where she was concerned that there were temporary buildings in place for a long time.

**(Q11) Will Forster** had no supplementary question.

**George Potter** sought an answer to part a) as the response simply stated that areas that 'require improvement' did not necessarily mean that things were worse than last year; the question was whether having seven areas requiring improvement was considered good enough. Regarding part b) he asked whether the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member was willing explain to the Leader that a tall buildings policy being published in January next year was not the same as having one in place currently.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety noted that regarding part b) there is an existing tall buildings policy in place which had been reviewed, a revised policy would be published in January 2024. Regarding part a) she noted that her responses to Q8 and Q11 referenced the interview with the HMICFRS Inspector, it was important to hear his view of SFRS; he said unequivocally that the SFRS had improved consistently over three inspections. The main issue was culture and needed to be addressed before other issues could be addressed - the inspection took place six months ago. She noted that SFRS had an outstanding culture, other fire and rescue services were looking to SFRS to improve their culture, that had been a priority for the service led by the Chief Fire Officer; all the other improvements were being carried out. The Inspectorate's feedback was that it was satisfied with the proposed plan which would be submitted tomorrow.

**(Q12) Stephen Cooksey** noted that it appeared that from the information provided one of the main reasons for the delay was the retention and recruitment of staff, he asked the Cabinet Member whether those teams were now fully staffed.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience noted that the retention and recruitment of staff was difficult, especially when competing against the private sector which could offer more money. He would liaise with the Highways team to provide a response around whether those teams were fully staffed.

**(Q13) Catherine Powell** asked the Cabinet Member what additional support would be provided to Family Voice Surrey as it has been working extremely hard during the challenging times and had been put under significant pressure.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning clarified that Family Voice Surrey (FVS) was the county's independent parent carer forum, it was an independent charity and must remain so. She noted that she was aware of some parents who did not feel that the parent carer forum could sufficiently represent their views because of the close working between it and the Council, and would like it to be further distanced from the Council. She was therefore unsure whether further support from the Council would be welcomed by FVS, she would ask FVS' Chief Executive.

**(Q15) Keith Witham** noted that regarding getting a simple black and white directional sign, asked whether the Cabinet Member could ask the relevant officer to reinspect the

location alongside him, the chairman of the community shop and a parish council representative.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience noted that he was happy to arrange that.

**(Q16) Jonathan Essex** referred to the first table in the response which showed that there had been an increase of 350 non-maintained and independent school places over that three-year period with a unit cost for each which was 2.5 times more expensive than those provided by the Council in state provided specialist provision. He asked whether that data could be reviewed and for the Council to reconsider whether there was an opportunity to expand its programme to provide more special places for additional needs children. He noted that the special school places were more expensive in terms of the unit increase in Home to School Transport costs than that provided in mainstream schools due to a greater distance. He requested whether the costs for Home to School Transport could be split between state and non-maintained provision, to see whether the shift to the Council providing more in-house places would save money on Home to School Transport.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning noted that the Council recognised some time ago that one of the reasons for the huge pressure on the High Needs Block was that the county had disproportionately more children with special needs in non-maintained independent special school places than others, often in places far from home which was reflected in the high Home to School Transport costs. There was an urgent need for the Council to invest heavily in its maintained specialist provision and that was underway. She referred to the information in her Briefing that set out that by September 2023 the Council had opened 230 new specialist places and teams were working on 34 projects to take the total number of specialist maintained places up to 6,000 by the end of 2025/26. She agreed that it was imperative that the Council continues with its ambitious programme of capital investment in specialist maintained places, she would ask the team in the Home to School Travel Assistance service whether in future they could split out the spending between those children in state maintained provision and those who were in non-maintained provision.

**(Q17) Catherine Baart** highlighted the steep upwards trend of paying out for flood damage. She asked the Cabinet Member whether a table could be provided to Members of all the sites and the problems that made up that £110,000; and what was being done or had been done to avoid repeated flooding at those sites broken down by division.

The Cabinet Member for Environment reiterated that the £110,000 was not indicative of the date the incidents occurred, the legal cases and the conversations took place over time and that could be explored further with the Member. She noted that at present she did not want to commit to asking officers to do a large piece of work, however they could provide a list of the issues per division. Solutions were being considered and a flooding strategy was being created. She noted that the team was exceptional and would be happy to invite the Member to meet with them to discuss the matter.

**(Q20) Ashley Tilling** had no supplementary question.

**Robert King** asked the Cabinet Member whether Members could get premium access to crash maps, Members could access the free service, but that only showed the individual accidents and not the police reports and the reason behind those accidents.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience would find out whether that would be possible and would liaise with the Member.

**(Q21) Catherine Powell** noted disappointment that no report would be issued as it was a missed opportunity for continuous improvement. As the Cabinet Member accepted that the decision not to collect cuttings was an economic matter rather than an environmental one, she asked whether the Cabinet Member could commit to updating the messaging to residents to reflect that. As there would be no policy changes regarding the maintenance of footways or cycleways, their use deterred by vegetation that could not be covered by the divisional Member Highway Fund allocation of £7,500, could the Cabinet Member advise when the maintenance strategies would be aligned with LTP4. Regarding development and Highway wet spots she had an example in her division which was contrary to the Cabinet Member's response and would email him.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience noted that the rationale was not just economic, but also was based on the impact on the carbon footprint of having vehicles travelling around. He welcomed the Member to detail her questions and would provide a written response, copying in the new Cabinet Member.

**(Q24) Catherine Baart** asked the Cabinet Member whether it would be possible to have a table outlining what was happening with each hospital in Surrey on Active Travel and improving the use of public transport.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth would see what information could be provided as hospitals commissioned their own public transport too, for example Ashford and St Peter's Hospitals would have an improved public transport service between them thanks to a campaign by the Council and the MP for Woking. Whilst hospitals acted as their own entity, the Council did engage with them.

**(Q26) Catherine Powell** noted that based on her correspondence with the National Autistic Society she was confused as her understanding was that before the recommissioned services were introduced in April, it was providing two youth clubs, two children's clubs and holiday outings. However now they were only able to fund one youth club for the whole of Surrey in Godalming, which was forty minutes or more from large areas of the county. Was the Cabinet Member advising that the situation had changed and more funding had been provided.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning would liaise with the Member outside of the meeting.

**(Q30) Jonathan Essex** noted that as it was confirmed that there was no match funding, he asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm how much funding the Council was providing for each of the Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) areas and how much it would cost if that was to be rolled out county-wide.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth noted that it cost around £100,000 per DDRT bus, rolling the service out county-wide would cost around £12 to £16 million. The Council was already subsidising buses at over £10 million a year and would look to reuse some of that because it would be providing a more enhanced convenient and cheaper service. He noted the additional £7.9 million funding awarded to the Council from the Government, some of that would fund DDRT and the Surrey LINK bus card scheme with half price bus fares for young people in Surrey aged 20 and under. That funding was on top of the Council's £49 million broken down to: £32 million for the decarbonisation of buses including 32 hydrogen buses with Metrobus, £6 million for electric minibuses for community transport, £9 million for the bus priority measures and £1.4 million to expand the real-time information displays. The county was the only one working with bus operators to decarbonise their fleets.

### **Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Briefings:**

These were also published in the supplementary agenda (items 7 and 9) on 9 October 2023.

Members made the following comments:

**Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways:** on parking and enforcement, **Chris Townsend** noted the minimal enforcement by the new team in his division. The repainting of the yellow lines did not happen often, since April only had two repaints had been done; he asked why little was happening.

The Deputy Cabinet Member was surprised as the feedback he had received, and what he had seen on the ground was that there were more parking enforcement officers than ever on Surrey's streets. The statistics also showed that more penalty charge notices were being issued than ever. He asked for the Member to email the location he was referring to and would ask NSL to provide the figures and would put him in touch with the local parking enforcement team.

**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning:** on Home to School Transport, **Helyn Clack** noted that this time last year the Leader apologised for the problems that occurred regarding Home to School Transport. There had been a massive improvement since then, she congratulated the Cabinet Member and the team for their work. She noted that she did not have the same problems that she had last year and issues were resolved quickly. She asked what the one significant issue was that the team overcame to ensure the improvement in Home to School Transport this year.

The Cabinet Member thanked the Member for recognising the significant improvement in the Home to School Travel Assistance service, a much better service had been delivered this year for children and their families. She noted that there was not one thing that was done, there had been many recommendations from the reports into the team, an end-to-end process review, a restructure of the team, recruitment and training, careful management and procedures introduced, and more resources invested. She was confident that the team would build on the progress made; she would pass on the Council's thanks to the staff that led the improvement work.

**Jonathan Essex** on the scale of investment in special school places going forwards, asked if it would be possible for the Cabinet Member to provide information on how the increased capital spending there was likely to reduce revenue spending in future.

The Cabinet Member was happy to provide that information. She noted that she reported to the Cabinet regularly on the progress of the capital programme on Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in partnership with the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste. She noted that every maintained specialist school place that the Council provided had a revenue impact greater than £20,000 a year; another reason why the Council needed to invest that scale of capital into its SEND programme.

**Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources:** on the arrangements to cover the £24.4 million deficit forecast, **Nick Harrison** asked the Cabinet Member to what degree was that covered by contingencies in either the current year or brought forward reserves. Noting that the payroll difficulties concerning MySurrey caused consequential impacts on the processing within the pension section, he asked whether the Cabinet Member was aware of that and was paying attention to that.



The Cabinet Member noted that regarding funding the deficit, the Council had a £20 million contingency budget which was included in the 2023/24 budget; there had also been a review of its reserve position which had significantly improved over the last five years and some of those reserves would be used sensibly. He noted that the Cabinet had agreed to make some additional investment to enable the improvement of the delivery of the Council's services. At the same time directorates were continuing to look for efficiencies to close that gap. Regarding the payroll there were teething problems, he and the team were fully aware of the issues, those were being taken into account to ensure the provision of a professional and accurate payroll system.

**Cabinet Member for Property and Waste:** on the agreements with SUEZ and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), **Nick Harrison** was pleased to note those. However, he expressed disappointment that the Council was having to deal with 150,000 tonnes of residual waste outside of the current network, it was disappointing that the energy from waste plant was not built with sufficient capacity when that decision was made several years ago.

The Cabinet Member noted that it was good news regarding Defra that a positive conclusion to the negotiations had been reached. Regarding the 150,000 tonnes of residual waste, in 1999 when the contract was signed the Council was to deliver two energy from waste plants; unfortunately it could not secure planning permission for the second energy from waste plant. She was pleased that officers were bringing forward plans for another mixed recycling facility in the county, the Land and Property team had identified a potential site to deal with that residual waste.

*Bernie Muir left the meeting at 11.50 am.*

## **65/23 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]**

Helyn Clack (Dorking Rural) made a statement on her division and other Surrey areas being under constant pressure from traffic and congestion. Gatwick Airport was one of the three airports in Surrey proposing to increase its capacity with passenger traffic to double to 90 million yearly, enabled by building a new runway to the north of the existing runway. There would be up to 90,000 car parking spaces at the airport, rural roads would likely be more congested and need more maintenance. In the plan submitted there was no suggestion of a curb or ban of night flights, she encouraged the Council to object to the plan without a proper contingency for funding Surrey's rural roads.

Steve Bax (East Molesey and Esher) made a statement on East Molesey which was surrounded by three rivers. Water safety was a constant concern, particularly for young people engaged in dangerous activities. Education was key, he welcomed the outreach activities of SFRS in schools to raise awareness of the risks and river safety. Using his Member Allocation he funded an additional throw line at Hurst Park riverside and through Your Fund Surrey he provided match funding for a patrol boat for the Thames, called the Surrey Volunteer. The patrol boat would be used by the Maritime Volunteer Service to patrol the river every weekend. The Deputy Leader alongside him attended its launch. He urged Members to spread the word for more volunteers for the patrol boat and he thanked the administration for providing that funding.

Fiona Davidson (Guildford South-East) made a statement on the London Road Active Travel Scheme in Guildford. Studies show that a lack of trust in organisations stems from saying one thing and doing another. The Council had declared values of caring about residents, being open, respecting others; yet what it says is not matched by what it does. She was concerned that the consultation letter to residents claimed that the road width after implementation would be the same as currently, residents had been provided with

the drawings but not the dimensions despite frequent requests. Another contentious issue was the risk of serious congestion and displacement of traffic, residents had not been provided with promised traffic modelling information. The scheme's original consultation exercise was not representative of those most impacted, and the new survey was open to anyone to comment. Residents deserve better than that.

## **66/23 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]**

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

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Matt Furniss moved:

#### **This Council notes:**

- The proposed removal of Day Travelcards by the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, for those travelling into and throughout London. This will result in Surrey residents having to buy separate rail and London transport service tickets. Currently, Day Travelcards provide unlimited travel on Transport for London (TfL) services, including the London Underground, Bus, Tram, Docklands Light Railway, London Overground and Elizabeth line, and National Rail services in London. They can also be used to obtain a one third reduction in River Services fares. The proposals to remove Day Travelcards constitute an unfair, unacceptable and expensive levy on our residents who wish or need to travel to London.
- The proposals have deliberately targeted the removal of the Day Travelcard as a method to generate additional income for TfL. It is anticipated by the Mayor's own consultation that the withdrawal of Day Travelcards will result in rail operators ceasing to sell Zone 1-6 Travelcards. This will add barriers and travel friction to journeys to London – running counter to evidence that passenger journeys and the use of public transport are enhanced by improving integrated ticketing not reducing it. No regard is given in the proposals for the potential loss of revenue to the London economy that may be caused by the increase in travel costs as Surrey residents risk being priced out of the nation's capital. Employers, retail and leisure businesses, theatres and many others may see a reduction in revenue as residents reduce their time and/or expenditure in London. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth has written to TfL on this matter to express concern and a lack of support for these proposals.

#### **This Council resolves to:**

- I. Demand that London Mayor, Sadiq Khan, immediately withdraws his proposals for the removal of Day Travelcards.
- II. Request that the Leader of the Council writes to Sadiq Khan informing him of this resolution of Surrey County Council, the discriminatory nature of his proposal, the impact on Surrey residents, the negative impact on the economy of London and therefore the need to abandon plans to remove Day Travelcards.
- III. Ensure the Leader of the Council writes to the Secretary of State for Transport urging him to intervene in this matter.

Matt Furniss made the following points:

- Thanked Jonathan Essex and Robert King for their help and collaboration in crafting the cross-party updated amendment.
- Noted that there was an invisible wall being drawn around London by the Mayor of London, restricting the freedom of movement and social inclusion.
- Noted that ensuring the affordability and accessibility of public transport had been outlined as a priority for the Council and the London Assembly.
- Noted that Day Travelcards alleviated higher fares for certain passengers travelling into and around London, 14.2 million tickets had been purchased on the National Rail network alone annually across the UK.
- Noted that without the Day Travelcard passenger fares would rise by 7% for off-peak and families would pay 16% more for their tickets.
- Called for more integrated ticketing not a reduction, the withdrawal of the Day Travelcard would likely have a negative impact on Transport for London's (TfL) income and would lead to more expensive and time-consuming journeys; disability groups had voiced concerns.
- Noted that on 27 September, alongside leaders of a range of councils outside of London, business representatives, bus users and advocates of public transport and disabled people, he signed a joint letter urging the Mayor of London to abandon the withdrawal.
- Noted that the updated amendment enabled the Council to negotiate on the zone 6 extension to areas of Surrey bordering London, currently some residents could use the Oyster card system whilst others used the National Rail ticketing system.
- Noted that some operators introduced smart ticketing, however that was not a truly pay as you go ticket.
- Noted that simplifying the complexities in ticketing would reduce the financial barrier for many short trips and having a zonal ticketing structure, and fares reform were a key part of the strategy to achieve a modal shift towards public transport.
- Noted that rail operators needed to adapt to the post-pandemic commuting pattern, the Council's Surrey Connect bus service reflected that.
- Noted that the new joined up bus and rail ticketing approach could be accompanied by a similar cap used in the Oyster card system in London, limiting the total cost through ticketing integration; that would widely benefit Surrey.

The motion was formally seconded by Jeremy Webster, who made the following comments:

- Noted that there were 84 railway stations in Surrey with 16 in the zones and six in the Oyster card area, leaving 62 railway stations where travellers would be affected by the Day Travelcard withdrawal.
- Noted that the withdrawal was a discriminatory action against the elderly, disabled, families, children and those on low incomes, and many people do not have access to modern technology or a bank card; it would affect visitors and casual users who do not understand the system and would be unable to buy an add-on Day Travelcard to their rail ticket.
- Noted that without an Oyster card or a bank card in the zones, travellers would have to buy single peak tickets for each journey and could not use buses as those were cashless; children were charged adult fares when using bank cards to pay for buses.
- Noted that registering senior or disabled railcards and therefore claiming the discounts on fares within the zones was only possible via an Oyster card.
- Noted that TfL was keeping the Oyster card and bank card capping at the Day Travelcard price.

- Noted that the revenue apportioned to TfL from Day Travelcards was less than that received by TfL from Oyster cards.
- Urged for the discussions to take place between the Mayor of London, the Rail Delivery Group and the Department for Transport (DfT), and to stress the importance of the Day Travelcards to London and the surrounding counties.

Jonathan Essex moved an updated amendment which had been published in the second supplementary agenda (item 9 (i)) on 10 October 2023, which was formally seconded by Robert King.

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

**This Council notes:**

- The proposed removal of Day Travelcards by the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, for those travelling into and throughout London. This will result in Surrey residents having to buy separate rail and London transport service tickets. Currently, Day Travelcards provide unlimited travel on Transport for London (TfL) services, including the London Underground, Bus, Tram, Docklands Light Railway, London Overground and Elizabeth line, and National Rail services in London. They can also be used to obtain a one third reduction in River Services fares. The proposals to remove Day Travelcards constitute an unfair, unacceptable and expensive levy on our residents who wish or need to travel to London.
- The proposals have deliberately targeted the removal of the Day Travelcard as a method to generate additional income for TfL. It is anticipated by the Mayor's own consultation that the withdrawal of Day Travelcards will result in rail operators ceasing to sell Zone 1-6 Travelcards. This will add barriers and travel friction to journeys to London – running counter to evidence that passenger journeys and the use of public transport are enhanced by improving integrated ticketing not reducing it. No regard is given in the proposals for the potential loss of revenue to the London economy that may be caused by the increase in travel costs as Surrey residents risk being priced out of the nation's capital. Employers, retail and leisure businesses, theatres and many others may see a reduction in revenue as residents reduce their time and/or expenditure in London. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth has written to TfL on this matter to express concern and a lack of support for these proposals.

**This Council resolves to:**

- I. Demand that London Mayor, Sadiq Khan, immediately withdraws his proposals for the removal of Day Travelcards.
- II. Request that the Leader of the Council writes to Sadiq Khan **and the Secretary of State for Transport** informing **them both** ~~him~~ of this resolution of Surrey County Council, the discriminatory nature of his proposal, the impact on Surrey residents **and surrounding counties**, the negative impact on the economy of London and therefore the need to abandon plans to remove Day Travelcards.
- III. Ensure the Leader of the Council writes to the Secretary of State for Transport urging him to intervene in this matter **and request a joint meeting with TfL and DfT, to include in those negotiations extension of zone 6 to areas of Surrey**

**bordering London to increase Surrey residents' direct access to contactless TfL fares and so cheaper train travel.**

Jonathan Essex spoke to his updated amendment, making the following points:

- Noted that the updated amendment was a result of cross-party discussion and agreement and provided an opportunity to make things better by opening up talks between the Mayor of London's office, TfL, DfT and councils around London to not just keep the Day Travelcard but as part of the wider reforms to make transport more affordable for all around as well as in London.
- Noted that the Mayor of London was proposing the withdrawal following a reduction of TfL's operational revenue grant from the Government by £700 million in April 2018, TfL now received less revenue support from the Government than any comparable world city.
- Highlighted that TfL was therefore over dependent on ticket revenue to fund its transport services, with the reduction in Government funding TfL's losses against pre-pandemic levels had been topped up by DfT in funding agreements agreed behind closed doors.
- Noted that the proposal to withdraw Day Travelcards was first made public in DfT's Annex A of their funding agreement settlement letter in February 2022.
- Noted that the updated amendment retained the first resolution to demand the Mayor of London withdraw the removal of Day Travelcards, on the basis that the DfT and Train Operating Companies (TOCs) agree an alternative arrangement that allows TfL to meet the requirements of its funding agreement with the Government.
- Called for greater transparency and accountability going forward, neither the Council nor the Greater London Authority had been included in such talks.
- Noted that the updated amendment proposed that in addition to writing to both the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State for Transport, that the Council work with other councils around London to call on them to openly negotiate a wider fair transport deal and fairer funding settlement to address the long-standing fare inequality where travel into London was more expensive from just outside the zoning area.
- Noted that the wider economic, social and environmental benefits of Day Travelcards must be recognised.
- Noted that the updated amendment called on the Government to extend zone 6 into Surrey and create further zones as required, so all of Surrey would be within the area that was discounted and contactless; as enjoyed for many years by some areas north of London.
- Noted that for many years different areas of Surrey had requested extension to zone 6, doing so now would provide access to the Day Travelcard area, including buses as well as trains and providing discounted public transport to London.
- Noted that the Government's Committee on Climate Change had called for a rework of ticketing prices to make public transport more affordable, that would only have value if Day Travelcards are retained. The further discounting of tickets down to a fairer level around London would require financial support and permission from the Government and agreement by the TOCs.

The updated amendment was formally seconded by Robert King, who made the following comments:

- Thanked Jonathan Essex and Matt Furniss for their hard work in the negotiations, it was an opportunity to get something right for Surrey's residents.
- Highlighted the 'Feltham dash' whereby residents would exit a South Western Railway service to scan their card in zone 6 and jump back on to save money.

- Noted that DfT had withdrawn the ability to book out of zone 6 using national ticketing, that affected passengers already hit by price rises.
- Regarding the extension of zone 6 many residents had called for that for years, the TOCs and TfL were in favour; however DfT and the Secretary of State for Transport were needed to underwrite the potential initial cost of that.
- Noted that despite operating in a major city, TfL received one of the lowest levels of funding in Western Europe; TfL had to find between £500 million and £1 billion per year in extra revenue in the Government's funding settlement.
- Noted that it was an opportunity not to degrade the service by removing Day Travelcards, but to find new revenue from new customers using public transport leaving their cars; making public transport a truly attractive proposal through a zone 6 agreement across Surrey.

Matt Furniss accepted the updated amendment and therefore it became the substantive motion.

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

- Noted that the idea of withdrawing Day Travelcards was ridiculous, many residents found it to be a vital service.
- Noted that the substantive motion went a step further as in addition to the Mayor of London, it sought to lobby the Government to support the continuation of the Day Travelcard; as well as seeking to extend zone 6 so that more of Surrey could benefit from what other London areas benefitted from.
- Noted the need to acknowledge that TfL was being asked to do a lot with very little. Whilst the Mayor of London's decision to withdraw Day Travelcards was wrong, the decision was proposed because over 70% of the cost of travel in London was funded from fares, whereas it was less than 30% in Paris.
- Noted that the root cause of the issue was for proper funding for London, Surrey and the home counties on their transport systems.
- Praised the cross-party discussions on the updated amendment now substantive motion, that in working together to find root causes of problems better solutions could be delivered.
- Noted that many residents in their division used the main London Waterloo to Guildford line.
- Understood that the Mayor of London signed the order telling TfL to stop selling Day Travelcards from January 2024 if no alternative proposals are agreed; hoped that the Council in its joint discussions would note that shortage of time.

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

- Thanked all for their comments, welcomed the cross-party substantive motion as the issue affected many residents; hoped that the Government would provide support on the matter.

The substantive motion was put to the vote and was carried.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

**This Council notes:**

- The proposed removal of Day Travelcards by the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, for those travelling into and throughout London. This will result in Surrey residents

having to buy separate rail and London transport service tickets. Currently, Day Travelcards provide unlimited travel on Transport for London (TfL) services, including the London Underground, Bus, Tram, Docklands Light Railway, London Overground and Elizabeth line, and National Rail services in London. They can also be used to obtain a one third reduction in River Services fares. The proposals to remove Day Travelcards constitute an unfair, unacceptable and expensive levy on our residents who wish or need to travel to London.

- The proposals have deliberately targeted the removal of the Day Travelcard as a method to generate additional income for TfL. It is anticipated by the Mayor's own consultation that the withdrawal of Day Travelcards will result in rail operators ceasing to sell Zone 1-6 Travelcards. This will add barriers and travel friction to journeys to London – running counter to evidence that passenger journeys and the use of public transport are enhanced by improving integrated ticketing not reducing it. No regard is given in the proposals for the potential loss of revenue to the London economy that may be caused by the increase in travel costs as Surrey residents risk being priced out of the nation's capital. Employers, retail and leisure businesses, theatres and many others may see a reduction in revenue as residents reduce their time and/or expenditure in London. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth has written to TfL on this matter to express concern and a lack of support for these proposals.

**This Council resolves to:**

- I. Demand that London Mayor, Sadiq Khan, immediately withdraws his proposals for the removal of Day Travelcards.
- II. Request that the Leader of the Council writes to Sadiq Khan and the Secretary of State for Transport informing them both of this resolution of Surrey County Council, the discriminatory nature of his proposal, the impact on Surrey residents and surrounding counties, the negative impact on the economy of London and therefore the need to abandon plans to remove Day Travelcards.
- III. Ensure the Leader of the Council writes to the Secretary of State for Transport urging him to intervene in this matter and request a joint meeting with TfL and DfT, to include in those negotiations extension of zone 6 to areas of Surrey bordering London to increase Surrey residents' direct access to contactless TfL fares and so cheaper train travel.

**Item 9 (ii)**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Trefor Hogg moved:

**This Council notes:**

- The very strong links between the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals for 2030;
- The United Kingdom's commitment to the UN Sustainable Development Goals;
- That **leave no one behind** is the central, transformative promise of the UN 2030 Sustainable Development Goals; and
- Our own Community Vision for 2030 which states Our Ambitions for People and Place as **making Surrey a special place where no one is left behind**.

### **This Council further notes:**

That the framework of the UN Sustainable Development Goals provides a balanced, well-researched and detailed model of how those goals are strongly linked and interact with each other. For Surrey they provide a guide that supports a coherent view of Our Ambitions for People and Place and how they are strongly linked and interact with each other.

### **This Council resolves:**

- I. That where practicable this Council will make use of the UN Sustainable Development Goals as a guide to how we should address the interlinked nature of Our Ambitions for People and Place. Particularly in relation to our own policies for the environment to shape them so that they will support delivery of the UN Sustainable Development Goals and will be a key part of our contribution to leaving future generations a place to live in that allows them to thrive.

Trefor Hogg made the following points:

- Noted that the motion sought a joined-up approach to delivering the Council's ambitions for Surrey and how it would make Surrey a special place where 'No one is left behind'.
- Noted that substantial progress had been made but there was more to do, to deliver that change the 17 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provided that guidance.
- 1. No Poverty and 2. Zero Hunger: noted his deep personal commitment to fighting both, the cost of living crisis continued to bite the most vulnerable in society, and Surrey continued to help them.
- 3. Good health and well-being: noted the excellent health service in Surrey, however the level of challenge to them was rising, the focus must be on the causes and not symptoms; focusing on health inequalities.
- 4. Quality education: noted that Surrey's schools were among the best in the country equipping children for the future, 91% of them were Ofsted rated Good or Outstanding.
- 5. Gender equality: noted that across Surrey there was still much to do to change long held attitudes.
- 6. Clean water and sanitation: noted that the Council must continue to hold its utility companies to account.
- 7. Affordable and clean energy: noted that the Council's ambition was that 15% of Surrey's energy should come from solar energy by 2032; he welcomed hearing people getting solar panels installed.
- 8. Decent work and economic growth: noted that economic growth was essential in terms of being able to afford a greener future, waste of resources including energy must be eliminated.
- 9. Industry, innovation and infrastructure: noted that Surrey's research centres were world class in various disciplines, Surrey could provide the infrastructure required.
- 10. Reduced inequalities: targeting Surrey's identified priority areas and priority groups with the resources needed to deliver change.
- 11. Sustainable cities and communities: noted that the Healthy Streets for Surrey design guide was a good beginning to allowing us to enjoy natural spaces and energy efficient buildings.



- 12. Responsible consumption and production: communications, education and making it easier to be responsible were vital, just imposing more taxes was not.
- 13. Climate action: noted that the easier part of reducing emissions over the last thirty years in the country had been done, now action needed to be done on the harder work of changing technology and reducing consumption; supporting businesses and residents every step of the way.
- 14. Life below water and 15. Life on land: noted that the state of nature in Surrey was inadequate, the Council must strive to mobilise its residents and landowners to participate in restoring nature through efforts such as planting the 1.2 million trees and further developing and delivering the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.
- 16. Peace, justice and strong institutions: were needed that help residents through persuasion, but do not compel them.
- 17. Partnerships for the goals: working together for a better county, making Surrey that special place where 'No one is left behind'.

The motion was formally seconded by Jonathan Hulley, who reserved the right to speak.

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

- Noted that the SDGs captured many of the Council's ambitions around inequality, sustainability, health and justice; and whilst already looked at in the climate change and environmental work, it was good to have an explicit commitment and focus.
- Noted that it was important that the Council was seen to be playing its role in the bigger picture of what needs to be done to create a better county, but also a better world.
- Noted that most of the SDGs were meant to be accomplished by 2030, those were last revised in 2017 and had been written before that; questioned why the administration waited so long to bring forward the motion.
- Noted that the SDGs were high-level and broad, it was hard to see what the motion would do in terms of implementing anything which would make a difference in anyone's lives.
- Noted that it was difficult to see how protecting the oceans was relevant to a landlocked county like Surrey, nor how the Council could reduce income inequality within and between nations, or how it could promote more international cooperation.
- Noted that looking at the SDGs such as working to tackle climate change, the Council had already declared a 'climate emergency' and had a climate change plan setting out more detail than the SDG set out.
- Could not see a reason to vote against the motion, however simply saying the Council agrees with the SDGs and seeks to do something about those was meaningless as the motion did not spell out action to be taken; hoped that detailed plans on action to be taken would be provided.
- Noted that the SDGs were a collection of interlinked objectives designed to serve as a shared blueprint for nations for peace and prosperity for people and the planet now and into the future; the UK signed up to them in 2015.
- Passionately supported the SDGs, however eight years had passed and the SDGs were in jeopardy as progress stalled noting the climate crisis, economic fluctuations, conflicts and increasing inequality with household disposable income falling.
- Noted that the Government pledged to max out on oil and gas reserves, the quality of rivers and seas was threatened by raw sewage, more of the country's natural biodiversity had been lost compared to most countries in Western Europe, public services were under threat, doctors, nurses and

teachers felt undervalued and overworked, there were cost of living and mental health crises and the Criminal Justice System had its funding cut.

- Noted that committing to the SDGs was an admirable pledge, however it would be helpful to know how against the above national backdrop, the Council would meet the SDGs.
- Noted that in April 2023 the UN Secretary-General highlighted that nations had only made 12% progress on the SDGs with seven years to go. The ambitious SDGs needed to be met now and all levels of government must strive to promote peaceful and inclusive societies, promote sustainability, and provide access to education and justice for all.
- Noted disappointment in the motion where it used the wording 'where practicable', asked when the values would not be practical and when there would be a time that the Council would approach a situation with decisions and policies that promote inequality, injustice and unsustainable actions.
- Asked what the motion was trying to achieve, hoped that its purpose would be to take some of the SDGs that relate to concerns today in areas that the Council could address.
- Regarding SDG 7, renewable electricity was vital particularly with local generation however generating solar panels stripped large amounts of natural resource from the land, suggested the use of vertical wind turbines and using skills in Surrey to develop technologies that could be used within the urban environment to make a real difference; as part of the Council's takeover of the Local Enterprise Partnerships' responsibilities.
- Noted that the Government's reports highlight a large gap in strategy around the storage and transport of hydrogen; asked what the county could do to fill that gap as the Council invests in 32 hydrogen buses.
- Regarding SDG 12, reiterated that Surrey's carbon footprint was based on the carbon used within Surrey; it did not include airport transport or imported food; did not believe that the motion's purpose was to widen that remit.
- Noted the need to discuss the prominence of economic growth in politics and the county, the SDGs were a good opportunity to do that, linking the climate impacts of over consumption of resources and emissions in Surrey and addressing entrenched poverty and inequality locally.
- Noted the need to have an economy that thrives and survives locally, with growth which does not mean building on green belts and destroying sustainable communities.
- Noted that the Council bravely shared its leadership of its Greener Futures Board with the Founding Director of the Institute for Sustainability at the University of Surrey; the global quality of life had declined since 2016 partly due to climate pressures.
- Noted that SDGs were in decline, the Council therefore in declaring that it wants to move forward in Surrey as part of that global challenge was brave, it must take its leadership role seriously setting out a clear message.
- Welcomed the restructuring of the Cabinet and the Corporate Leadership Team with growth and the environment moved into the same section; it provided an opportunity to discuss the balancing of the economy, environment and social aspects of sustainability.

Jonathan Hulley, the seconder of the motion, made the following comments:

- Noted that whilst the SDGs were high-level, the Council had already delivered projects that brought meaning to those.
- Referring to SDG 11, the Council had rolled out the Surrey Connect bus service across the county - thanked the Leader and Cabinet Member for that -

and furthermore the Council had its tree planting strategy and focused on planting of trees in Surrey's streetscapes.

- Referred to SDG 17, delivering the Council's Community Vision for Surrey 2030 required the support and the cooperation of residents, businesses, the public sector and the district and borough councils; all needed to be part of the solution.

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

- Acknowledged that the SDGs were framed by the United Nations in relation to nations, that was why the wording 'where practicable' was used in the motion, as the SDGs need to be applied at a county level.
- Noted that as a county, Surrey was doing well but had further to go; for example currently a lot of energy and resources were wasted, targeting waste was the best way of improving Surrey's position.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

**This Council notes:**

- The very strong links between the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals for 2030;
- The United Kingdom's commitment to the UN Sustainable Development Goals;
- That **leave no one behind** is the central, transformative promise of the UN 2030 Sustainable Development Goals; and
- Our own Community Vision for 2030 which states Our Ambitions for People and Place as **making Surrey a special place where no one is left behind**.

**This Council further notes:**

That the framework of the UN Sustainable Development Goals provides a balanced, well-researched and detailed model of how those goals are strongly linked and interact with each other. For Surrey they provide a guide that supports a coherent view of Our Ambitions for People and Place and how they are strongly linked and interact with each other.

**This Council resolves:**

- I. That where practicable this Council will make use of the UN Sustainable Development Goals as a guide to how we should address the interlinked nature of Our Ambitions for People and Place. Particularly in relation to our own policies for the environment to shape them so that they will support delivery of the UN Sustainable Development Goals and will be a key part of our contribution to leaving future generations a place to live in that allows them to thrive.

**67/23 APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE [Item 10]**

The Leader introduced the report and explained that John Furey was undergoing rehabilitation following a major operation, he was expected to be back and walking by the end of the year.

**RESOLVED:**

That John Furey may continue to be absent from meetings until March 2024 by reason of ill health. The Council looks forward to welcoming him back in due course.

**68/23 SELECT COMMITTEES' REPORT TO COUNCIL [Item 11]**

The Chair of the Select Committee Chair & Vice-Chairs' Group introduced the report noting that the select committees had planned their annual forward work programmes, had received briefings about next year's budget and were carrying out deep dives on key issues in their remits. The Group had recently discussed performance monitoring of the Council's services and she believed that the select committees were working hard to improve services for Surrey residents.

The Leader thanked the chairs and the members of the select committees for their hard work. He noted however that not all select committees were running two task and finish groups, the intention was that they would run at least one and that was the role of the Select Committee Task Group Leads. He sought to understand what the issue was so the select committees could undertake deep dives via the task and finish groups.

**RESOLVED:**

That Council reviewed the work summarised in this report providing feedback to Scrutiny Chairs as appropriate.

**69/23 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL - ELECTORAL REVIEW: RESPONSE TO LGBCE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS [Item 12]**

The Chair of the Electoral Review Task Group introduced the report which was the final stage to a process that had taken almost a year to pursue. He thanked the Support Services Manager and his team for their work. He thanked the members of the Task Group and provided reassurance that the recommendations for Council to approve had been agreed unanimously by it. He outlined the previous two stages of the process and that the report detailed the Council's collective response to the Commission's draft recommendations, final recommendations to be published in December. Conflicting views were overcome by sending all suggestions back to the Commission and the Task Group did not take a view in favour of one suggestion over another. He emphasised that those unhappy with the Commission's proposals could write separately to the Commission by the 16 October 2023 deadline.

A Member supported the submission and thanked the Task Group for its work. However, he hoped that when the review concludes the Council would include in its feedback to the Commission that it was unhelpful of them to commence the review without waiting to have regard to the new ward boundaries which had been adopted at the May local elections. He was disappointed regarding the uneven offering provide to him compared to another Member regarding the boundary of the Guildford East division, where the other Member's detailed argument against the proposals was included whilst he was not offered the same opportunity to put forward the argument as to why he agreed with the proposals. He would write to the Commission directly.

A Member thanked the work of the Task Group noting that creating artificial administrative boundaries across an area taking into account numbers rather than communities was difficult. He was disappointed that his request that the submission incorporates the recent Guildford Borough Council boundaries was not met, as for example the small village community of Wanborough relied on the neighbouring village

of Puttenham's services. He would write to the Commission directly. In future he asked for the recently approved boundary changes to be incorporated.

The Chair noted that Members should write to the Commission if they had concerns.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Council endorsed the Electoral Review Task Group's response to the LGBCE.

**70/23 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION - REPORT OF THE PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE [Item 13]**

The Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee introduced the report noting that the changes were made following inspection and interviews by the Planning Advisory Service. Some of the main changes were around speaking and the other related to the running order of speakers and the way the Committee was run. The Committee would review the operation of the changes after six meetings to see how they worked, the changes to be in place for the next Committee meeting later in the month.

**RESOLVED:**

1. Approved the amendments to the Surrey Code of Best Practice in Planning Procedures and Standing Orders as set out in Annexes 1 and 2.
2. That the Planning & Regulatory Committee reviews the operation of these changes after six meetings.

**71/23 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 14]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 25 July 2023 and 26 September 2023.

**Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents:**

**26 September 2023:**

- A. Youth Justice Plan

**RESOLVED:**

Approved the 2023/24 Youth Justice Plan.

**Reports for Information/Discussion:**

**25 July 2023:**

- B. The Care and Support Commissioning Strategy for Extra Care Housing
- C. Freedom to Travel Strategy
- D. Approval to Procure Increased Educational Psychology (EP) and Special Educational Needs (SEN) Service Capacity
- E. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 4 July 2023 - 2 October 2023

**RESOLVED:**

1. Noted that there had been two urgent decisions since the last Cabinet report to Council.
2. Adopted the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 25 July 2023 and 26 September 2023.

**72/23 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 15]**

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.50 pm]

---

**Chair**

## Leader's Statement – County Council, 10 October 2023

---

Mr Chairman, Members, welcome to October's full Council meeting – the first since the summer months, with the new academic year well underway and the hubris of the party conferences behind us, at least for the time being.

I want to talk through some of the work that has been continuing over what has been an extremely busy summer for us, but first let me touch on what we've just watched.

I can see that many of you were touched by our new fostering recruitment video – as indeed was I.

A couple of weeks ago I attended a launch event for this video campaign, alongside foster carers and young people who had experienced the benefit of fostering in their own lives.

The message was clear – foster families have a huge positive impact on the lives and life chances of children in care, but we need more.

With over a thousand Surrey children in care, and under 400 foster families, it is clear that we do not have enough foster carers in the county.

At the event, I was honoured to meet a young lady called Fiaa.

Her story is truly inspirational and with our help through the foster care system, Fiaa is now a successful music artist and even due to appear on TV's Children in Need later this year.

I am proud that we have been able to support Fiaa but, the honest truth is, we need to be doing more. And we can all help.

We must explain the benefits of fostering to our residents and indeed the pleasure that families tell me they get from seeing children in their care flourish. As you heard in the video – it could be any of us.

So please take that message out into your communities, speak openly and passionately about fostering, encourage people to consider stepping forward – we know that word of mouth is our most successful recruitment tool.

The fostering team can provide you with any information and marketing material you might need and you can also share their content on social media.

So, what else has happened. Well, I'm delighted that we've expanded our revolutionary on-demand bus service, Surrey Connect, from Mole Valley now across Tandridge, Farnham, Cranleigh, West Guildford, and Longcross – putting the infrastructure and solutions in place to help people get around Surrey in a more environmentally friendly way. We will continue that rollout across the county in 2024.

To help people even further with public transport, we've introduced a new half price travelcard for young people, and secured funding from government to improve and protect bus services across Surrey – adding to already committed funding to make our buses cleaner, more reliable and easier to use.

I am absolutely committed to getting sustainable travel infrastructure in place, instead of resorting to punitive fines or ultimatums, which seems to be the way of the Mayor of London.

More community projects have been funded, opened and – quite literally, launched - through Your Fund Surrey, including the Kingston Maritime Volunteer Service boat on the Thames, keeping people safe and reassured on the river.



Kenyngton Manor Park's new playground will be opening soon, nearly £100,000 agreed for a disability challengers playground in Stoke Park in Guildford, and a small fund grant for Tandridge Access Group for new mobility gates in Limpsfield, with more applications coming into the Your Fund Surrey team all the time.

A major development for Surrey's local economy came in August, when the government announced that Upper Tier Councils will take on the functions and responsibilities of Local Enterprise Partnerships – something we've called for and have set about preparing for.

We are committed to delivering a strong and sustainable local economy, and now this Council will have responsibility for representing our businesses, strategic economic planning, and delivering government programmes to boost the regional economy.

Both of our LEPs - Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3 - have accomplished a lot of good work since being established in 2011.

At the start of September, as an early part of this process, we took on responsibility for the Careers Hub service. We're delighted to be working with all the county's secondary schools, special schools, and colleges with the aim of ensuring every young person can find their best next step.

The service will formally launch at the first ever Festival of Skills on November 23<sup>rd</sup> at Sandown Racecourse.

This work is key to growing a sustainable economy, fit for the future, here in Surrey.

Mr Chairman, last month we received the latest inspection report from His Majesty's Inspectorate into our Fire and Rescue Service.

While I'm pleased to see inspectors recognise that we are heading in the right direction and note a marked improvement in our culture, there are other elements that need further progress.

I know that progress is already being made, and we are in good hands with our Chief Fire Officer Dan Quin committed to that work. We will meet that challenge – like all we face – head on.

Our action plan is going back to inspectors this week, and our Service Improvement Plan will be shared with Select Committee in December.

In the meantime, our fire service officers will continue to work 24/7 to protect the people of Surrey.

However, further challenge has come to local government – and in particular in areas of Surrey – over recent months, with severe financial pressure bearing down on some of our District and Borough councils.

As the County Council, we are very much part of an important ecosystem of public and community organisations across the county, that work together for the benefit of Surrey.

If one or more of those organisations struggle, it impacts us all and we must work together as far as possible to protect and serve the people of Surrey.

However, Members, I must be very clear – while the County Council has a solid and robust budget position, thanks to many years of hard work and bold thinking, we face pressures like everywhere else.

We cannot, and will not, simply pick up the funding or running of services for which we have no responsibility, resources or capability.

We cannot, I'm afraid, be the white knight across the county, riding to the rescue if and when funding for community services delivered by others is withdrawn or reduced.

We must be a responsible organisation, and that often means tough conversations, and difficult decisions, but we must deliver the services we're here to deliver, and protect our own long-term future, for the benefit of Surrey residents.

Mr Chairman, as I've said, this Council's finances are in good shape.

Our transformation over the last few years has given us a solid base and is helping us weather the storms encircling local government and indeed the global economy.

But things are not easy.

Everything we do has become more expensive. Demand for services is increasing. Other organisations are struggling. Public finances are stretched.

We must face up to these challenges, as we have done consistently, to set balanced budgets and fulfil our responsibilities.

But we cannot keep approaching these challenges in the same way.

We cannot salami slice services. We cannot simply cut costs. We cannot just be reactive.

We cannot stop delivering. We cannot stand still.

We must draw on the innovative thinking, the ambition, the energy that has led our successful transformation programmes and look to the future with a renewed sense of purpose.

We must act now to prepare for upcoming challenges. We must use our relative position of strength to drive a robust programme of change and transformation, building a different kind of Council, an organisation fit for the ever-changing future.

I genuinely believe that as a Council we are moving forwards, but those drivers of sustained progress need to be regularly reviewed and refreshed.

So, over the summer I have been working closely with our Chief Executive and the team to take a fresh look at how we are delivering our four key areas of –

- Building a sustainable economy
- Improving health outcomes
- Delivering a greener future and
- Creating thriving communities

That work has involved a root and branch review of all the delivery and improvement programmes and projects that are happening every day here at Surrey County Council.

What is clear, is that some things have to stop, at least in the short term, whilst we focus on those big programmes that will move the dial on delivery of improved services and outcomes for our residents. And we need to build a sustainable budget for the next five years on the working assumption that no government is going to have the wherewithal to throw billions of more funding at local government.

We would be naïve in the extreme if we were to sit back and wait to be bailed out. We need to take responsibility of how we use the public's money effectively and efficiently and we will.

We will look at the way support services are organised and delivered within the County Council.

We will accelerate projects that will deliver a truly integrated Health and Social Care System, including quicker and safer discharge from hospital.

We will continue to look to strengthen our relationship with the District and Boroughs at a time when they are facing budget pressures resulting in the reduction in spend on non-statutory services.

We will engage with the voluntary and charitable sector and be open and honest about who this Council will be working with to deliver our collective ambition that no one is left behind.

We will actively engage with key stakeholders and organisations that can help us build on a more preventative and early intervention approach to Children Services.

We will create a new customer service offering, putting residents front and centre so they can more easily flag up issues of concern and have those issues resolved more speedily.

We will continue to actively engage with residents as we drive forward our transformation plans seeking feedback and input wherever appropriate.

Members, if we are to be a Council that really delivers on its ambitions for our residents, it is imperative that we continually assess how we are doing things, that we look outside this organisation for examples of best practice, that we continue to embed a culture across the whole organisation of pride in delivering excellent quality services.

The foundations of change were laid 5 years ago, starting with our finances, and it was that willingness to adapt and refocus that helped us through the pandemic. But the world looks different now with different ambitions, different concerns, and different ways of working and we need to reinforce and re invoke that “can do” spirit.

We have come out of that dark tunnel of Covid into the sunlight and we must look to the future with optimism but also increase the pace at which we drive excellent practice in a robust, deliverable and sustainable way across all directorates.

We can do this.

We will do this.

We are doing this.

I don't want this Council having to react to crisis, but to be strong enough to ward off that crisis before it comes.

We should have the vision and the insights to see problems of the future and work to prevent them. We should understand the evolving world, including the opportunities it brings, and ensure we are best equipped to embrace it.

This is what our residents would expect. They are at the heart of all that we do, and we must ensure that we can deliver the best public service for them, now and long into the future.

Our children and young people will need us throughout their lives – let's make sure we're there to deliver from cradle to grave.

So, Mr Chairman, it's been a busy summer, and we are in the midst of a busy autumn, and I'm afraid to say winter is fast approaching.

We know that winter brings with it increasing concern for residents, as the heating has to go back on, the nights draw in and the sense of increasing cost pressures grow for people as they go about their lives.

Last year we published and distributed a directory of support to our residents, highlighting the help available as energy bills escalated and the cost of living rocketed.

We know that people found it useful, and this year we have compiled an expanded version, highlighting an even broader range of useful Council – and partner services.

It will be making its way through letterboxes early next month, and I sincerely hope residents – particularly those who don't access our digital channels – find it a useful guide to help them in their everyday lives.

We are all here in this room with the common purpose of supporting our residents and making their lives better.

As the seasons change, let us all keep working together to make sure we deliver that, and continue working towards that ultimate ambition that no one in Surrey is left behind.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank



County Council Meeting – 12 December 2023

## **CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES**

1. Article 6.02 of the Council's Constitution requires that the Leader of the Council will report any changes to Cabinet appointments to Council.
2. Article 6.03 and Article 6.04 of the Council's Constitution authorises the Leader to appoint Cabinet Members and Deputy Cabinet Members respectively.
3. On 1 November 2023, the Leader made changes to the membership of the Cabinet. The new membership is listed in **Annex 1**. The updated Cabinet Portfolios are listed in **Annex 2**.
4. Under Standing Order 6.10, Committee Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen, and Select Committee Task Group Leads must be appointed by Council.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. That the changes to Cabinet appointments and Portfolios set out in Annex 1 and 2 to this report be noted.
2. That Keith Witham be appointed as a Select Committee Task Group Lead for the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee, replacing Steve Bax, for the remainder of the 2023/24 Council Year.

---

### **Lead/Contact Officers:**

Sarah Quinn, Regulatory Business Manager  
[sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk)

### **Annexes:**

Annex 1 - Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Portfolios – 1 November 2023

Annex 2 - Cabinet Member Portfolio Updates – 1 November 2023

### **Sources/background papers:**

County Council's Constitution

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Portfolios**

Cabinet Member	Portfolio
Denise Turner-Stewart	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities
David Lewis (Cobham)	Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources
Matt Furniss	Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth
Kevin Deanus	Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience
Marisa Heath	Cabinet Member for Environment
Natalie Bramhall	Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure
Mark Nuti	Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, and Public Health
Clare Curran	Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong learning
Sinead Mooney	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

\*Leader not included in the above

Deputy Cabinet Member	Portfolio
Paul Deach	Deputy Cabinet Member to Leader of the Council
Maureen Attewell	Deputy Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning
Steve Bax	Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways
Jordan Beech	Deputy Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet Member Portfolio Updates – 01 November 2023**

<b>Cabinet Member Position</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Key Officers</b>	<b>Select Committee(s)</b>
<b>Leader of the Council</b>	Tim Oliver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall vision and strategic direction</li> <li>• Major Government and National Representation</li> <li>• District and Borough partnerships</li> <li>• Regional and Strategic partnerships</li> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Engagement and Consultation</li> <li>• Business Relationships</li> <li>• Corporate governance</li> <li>• Place-based work e.g. Thinking place work</li> <li>• HR and OD</li> <li>• Integrated Business Planning &amp; Performance</li> <li>• Transformation Programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chief Executive</li> <li>• Deputy Chief Executive/Executive Director for Resources</li> <li>• Executive Director for Customer and Communities</li> <li>• Strategic Director, Communications and Engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources and Performance Select Committee</li> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> </ul>
<b>Deputy Cabinet Member to Leader of the Council</b>	Paul Deach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide and support assistance to the Leader, and in particular with his responsibility for communications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Director Communications and Engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> <li>• Resources &amp; Performance Select Committee</li> </ul>
<b>Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources</b>	David Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance – Revenue &amp; Capital</li> <li>• Digital, Business and Insights Programme</li> <li>• Capital Programme</li> <li>• Internal Control/Audit</li> <li>• Commercial Investment and Capital Programme Oversight</li> <li>• Procurement</li> <li>• Orbis</li> <li>• Legal and Democratic</li> <li>• IT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director for Resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources and Performance Select Committee</li> </ul>

SCC Cabinet Portfolios

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital</li> <li>• Contract Management</li> <li>• SCC Companies</li> <li>• Performance and Management Reporting</li> <li>• SCC Data</li> </ul>		
--	--	---	--	--

<b>Cabinet Member Position</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Key Officers</b>	<b>Select Committee(s)</b>
<b>Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care</b>	Sinead Mooney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult Social Care</li> <li>• Adult Safeguarding</li> <li>• Accommodation for vulnerable and elderly adults</li> <li>• Learning Disabilities</li> <li>• Transitions</li> <li>• Housing Strategy</li> <li>• ASC Mental Health</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director for Health, Wellbeing and Care</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults and Health Select Committee</li> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee (housing)</li> </ul>
<b>Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, and Public Health</b>	Mark Nuti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health and Social Care Integration</li> <li>• Public Health</li> <li>• Health and Wellbeing</li> <li>• Mental Health for Public Health</li> <li>• Integrated Commissioning</li> <li>• EDI</li> <li>• Surrey Office of Data Analytics (SODA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director for Health, Wellbeing and Care</li> <li>• Executive Director for Resources (SODA)</li> <li>• Chief of Staff to Chief Executive (EDI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults and Health Select Committee</li> <li>• Resources and Performance Select Committee (EDI)</li> </ul>

Cabinet Member Position	Portfolio Holder	Responsibilities	Key Officers	Select Committee(s)
<p><b>Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong learning</b></p>	<p>Clare Curran</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Home to School Transport</li> <li>• Schools - relationships</li> <li>• Place planning</li> <li>• Admissions</li> <li>• Adult Learning</li> <li>• Children’s Integrated Commissioning</li> <li>• Corporate Parenting (including fostering and adoption)</li> <li>• Children with Disabilities (CwD)</li> <li>• Children’s Safeguarding</li> <li>• Accommodation for vulnerable children</li> <li>• Children’s Mental Health (Mindworks)</li> <li>• Family Resilience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee</li> </ul>
<p><b>Deputy Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning</b></p>	<p>Maureen Attewell</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide support and assistance to the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning, as well as including the below responsibilities:</li> <li>• Youth Services</li> <li>• Youth Offending</li> <li>• Early Help</li> <li>• Violence Against Women &amp; Girls</li> <li>• Domestic Abuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee</li> </ul>

SCC Cabinet Portfolios

Cabinet Member Position	Portfolio Holder	Responsibilities	Key Officers	Select Committee(s)
<b>Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure</b>	Natalie Bramhall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land and Property</li> <li>• Waste</li> <li>• Capital Programme Delivery</li> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Major Projects</li> <li>• 5G Rollout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director Environment, Growth, Land, Property and Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resources and Performance Select Committee</li> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> </ul>
<b>Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth</b>	Matt Furniss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• Air and Rail</li> <li>• Highways</li> <li>• Road Safety</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Economic Growth</li> <li>• Skills and Apprenticeships</li> <li>• Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) relationships</li> <li>• Planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director Environment, Growth, Land, Property and Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> <li>• Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee</li> </ul>
<b>Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways</b>	Steve Bax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide support and assistance to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth in relation to the Highways responsibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director Environment, Growth, Land, Property and Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> </ul>
<b>Cabinet Member for Environment</b>	Marisa Heath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greener Futures Programme</li> <li>• Climate Change</li> <li>• Air Quality</li> <li>• Countryside</li> <li>• Trees</li> <li>• Flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director Environment, Growth, Land, Property and Infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> </ul>



Cabinet Member Position	Portfolio Holder	Responsibilities	Key Officers	Select Committee(s)
<p><b>Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities</b></p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Deputy Leader</b></p>	<p>Denise Turner – Stewart</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Democracy and Engagement Design</li> <li>• Community Foundation Surrey relationship</li> <li>• Customer Services</li> <li>• Libraries, Arts and Culture</li> <li>• Registration Services</li> <li>• Your Fund Surrey</li> <li>• VCFS</li> <li>• Town and Parishes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director for Customer &amp; Communities</li> <li>• Executive Director for Resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> <li>• Resources and Performance Select Committee</li> <li>• Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee</li> </ul>
<p><b>Deputy Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities</b></p>	<p>Jordan Beech</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide support and assistance to the Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive Director for Customer &amp; Communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience</b></p>	<p>Kevin Deanus</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire and Rescue (SFRS)</li> <li>• Coroners</li> <li>• Emergency Planning</li> <li>• Military Covenant</li> <li>• Community Resilience</li> <li>• Community Safety</li> <li>• Health and Safety</li> <li>• Trading Standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chief Fire Officer</li> <li>• Executive Director for Customer &amp; Communities</li> <li>• Strategic Director Communications and Engagement</li> <li>• Executive Director for Resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee</li> <li>• Resources and Performance Select Committee</li> </ul>

This page is intentionally left blank

**OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL****APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCES****KEY ISSUE/DECISION:**

The purpose of this report is to request that the County Council considers whether to agree that County Councillor Nick Darby and County Councillor Fiona White 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 Nick Darby and Fiona White attended was the meeting of the County Council in July 2023. Neither Member has been able to attend any formal meetings since then due to ill health.

For that reason, the County Council is requested to agree that they may continue to be absent from meetings while maintaining membership of the Council during their period of ill health.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That Nick Darby and Fiona White may continue to be absent from meetings until 31 March 2024 by reason of ill health. The Council looks forward to welcoming them back in due course.

**Lead/Contact Officers:**

Vicky Hibbert, Assistant Director – Governance and Democratic Services  
[vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Sources/background papers:**

None

This page is intentionally left blank



## OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

### SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2023/2024

#### KEY ISSUE / DECISION:

The approval of the Pay Policy Statement for the period 2023/2024.

#### BACKGROUND:

1. To comply with Section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011 and related guidance under Section 40 provided by the Secretary of State, all local authorities are required to publish a Pay Policy Statement, approved through decision by Council with effect from 1 April each year.
2. A copy of the Pay Policy Statement which reflects the 2023/2024 Surrey Pay settlement effective from 1 April 2023 is appended.

#### The main points that must be covered include:-

- the remuneration of Chief Officers.
  - the responsibilities of Surrey County Council's (SCC) remuneration committee (the People, Performance and Development Committee) for determining the terms on which Chief Officers are employed; and
  - the Council's current policies on equal pay, redundancy, and severance.
3. Please note that this pay statement has been updated following the Surrey Pay review for 2023/2024 and has been written as though it has already been agreed by Council.

#### Governance

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

Chief Officers. The PPDC reviewed and recommended the Pay Policy Statement for 2023/2024 at its meeting on 14 November 2023.

### **Publication of the Pay Policy Statement**

5. The Statement has been drafted to reflect the requirements of the Local Government Transparency Code 2014 as well as guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government on Openness and Accountability in Local Pay 2012, to comply with Section 40 of the Localism Act 2011. Account has also been taken of the final report and the recommendations made in the Hutton Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector 2011 and the revised 2021 guidelines.
6. This updated Pay Policy Statement reflects the negotiations with UNISON and GMB in respect of Surrey Pay, pay, terms and conditions. This year the pay negotiations have taken a little longer, the Council made an offer to the trade unions and their members in February 2023, their members were balloted, but we were unable to reach a collective agreement on the entire offer and discussions with the unions continued.
7. The changes outlined in the Pay Policy Statement are relevant to all staff on Surrey Pay terms and conditions, both in schools and non-schools.

### **Pay Award and Progression**

8. Staff have been kept informed of progress throughout formal negotiations with the Trades Unions.
9. Part of the offer made to the unions was to shorten the pay grades by removing the first pay point on all grades. As this was not a matter for dispute within the pay negotiations and had an impact on the annual increment process for pay progression agreement was reached to discontinue the use of the bottom pay point from 1 April 2023 whilst discussions with the unions continued.
10. In addition, it is important to note that incremental pay progression continued with effect from 1 April 2023 for all eligible staff with headroom within their grade.
11. The pay offer made to the trade unions was at the upper limit of affordability and the Council has not been able to make an improved offer. In June 2023, the Council received formal notification from Unison that they intended to ballot their members seeking approval for industrial action. In July, the GMB Union also indicated their intention to ballot.
12. Unison concluded their ballot for strike action on 25 July, however they did not meet the threshold required in respect of industrial action. The full results of the ballot are as follows:

- Number of individuals entitled to vote in the ballot: 2030
- Total number of votes cast: 975
- Total number voting “Yes”: 815
- Total number voting “No”: 159
- Total number spoiled or otherwise invalid: 1

13. The GMB ballot closed on 30 August and whilst the union reported 70% in favour of strike action and 80% in favour of action short of a strike, only 36% of their membership took part in the ballot. Therefore the 50% threshold needed for industrial action to take place was not met.
14. Given the current cost of living pressures, and following a decision by the PPDC (People, Performance and Development Committee) on the 17 July the trades unions were informed that the pay award would be implemented from August 2023 to include backdating to 1 April 2023. This decision was taken without prejudice to the outcome of the GMB ballot.
15. Following the outcome of the trade unions ballots and the unions failure to meet the threshold for industrial action the pay negotiations for 2023/2024 have now concluded.

### **Pay Multiple**

16. The independent review of public sector pay by Will Hutton in 2010, (revised in 2021) recommended that all organisations delivering public services should be required to ‘track, publish and explain their pay multiples over time’. This approach aims to hold public sector organisations to account for their remuneration policy and, how that policy applies to the highest paid director and to be able to demonstrate a fair and effective reward strategy.
17. Hutton’s interim report suggested the need for a fixed limit on pay variations in the public sector in which no manager could earn more than twenty times the lowest paid person in the organisation. However, in his final report Hutton concluded that a hard cap would not be workable across a diverse public sector workforce and would go against the principle of ‘fair’ pay (i.e. People at the top of large and complex organisations, but with low paid workers, could earn less than people running simpler bodies but whose lowest paid workers were better paid).

### **SCC Pay Multiple**

18. As a result of the Hutton review, every public body is required to publish (and monitor) the multiple of top to median pay; median earnings are a more representative measure of the pay of the whole workforce.
19. Table 1 shows the data available for SCC over the last few years, this table will be updated once reports are available.

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

Year	Median Salary	Highest Salary	Ratio
2021/2022	£28,544	£234,600	8.2:1
2020/2021	£29,333	£234,600	8:1
2019/2020	£27,099	£220,000	8.1:1
2018/2019	£25,821	£220,000	8.5:1
2017/2018	£22,872	£232,683	10:1
2016/2017	£25,328	£232,683	9.2:1

20. The published Pay Policy Statement will include hyperlinks to:

- (i) documents already published on the council's website:
- Councillors and Committees (which sets out the role of the PPDC as the Council's remuneration committee).
  - Statement of Accounts, which relates to salaries for senior staff.
- (ii) Additional documents on the Council's website including:
- Equal Pay Statement.
  - Gender Pay Gap report,
  - Surrey Pay rates; and
  - Pay Multiple

21. Once approved by Council, this Pay Policy Statement will be published on Surrey County Council's website.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council agree the Pay Policy Statement for 2023/2024.

---

**Lead Officer:** Shella-Marie Smith, Strategic Director People & Change

**Contact details:** [shella.smith@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:shella.smith@surreycc.gov.uk) **Mobile:** 07977 662850

**Sources / Background papers:**

None

**Annexes/Appendices:**

Appendix 1 - Surrey County Council Pay Policy Statement 2023/2024 including Annex 1 - Surrey Pay Scale 2023/2024





# Surrey County Council

## Pay Policy Statement 2023-2024

### Contents

Surrey County Council .....	1
Pay Policy Statement 2023-2024.....	1
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Further Details .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Governance .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Definitions .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. Salary Transparency.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6. Equal Pay.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7. Remuneration for Chief Officers.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>8. Remuneration for employees who are not Chief Officers .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>9. Other elements of remuneration .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>10. Pension Benefits.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>11. Remuneration - Contract for Services .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>12. Salary Protection .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>13. Early Retirement and Severance .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>14. Termination of Employment of Chief Officer.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## 1. Introduction

This Pay Policy Statement was approved by a meeting of the full County Council on 10 October 2023 and is effective from 1 April 2023. It is published to comply with the requirements of Section 38(1) of the Localism Act, 2011 and related guidance under Section 40 provided by the Secretary of State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2. Further Details

Specific details may be accessed via the links indicated below. Full details of 2023/2024 pay scales can be found in Annex 1, attached.

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

### 3. Governance

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

The Surrey Pay award is effective from 1 April each year, where the pay award is agreed and implemented after 1 April it will not be retrospectively applied to anyone who has left the council's employment between the effective date of the award and the agreement date, (i.e. the date that any collective agreement with the trade unions is signed or in the absence of a collective agreement, the date of PPDC approval to implement).

### 4. Definitions

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

- i. **Lowest paid employees**

Surrey County Council defines its lowest paid employees as those who are paid on the lowest Surrey Pay grade, PS 1/2. As of 1 April 2023, this equates to £20,733 per annum for full time staff.
- ii. **Full time**

A full-time post is based on a 36-hour working week for staff on main Surrey Pay
- iii. **Chief Officers**

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

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

### 5. Salary Transparency

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

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

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

## **6. Equal Pay**

The Council is committed to ensuring that its employment policies and practices comply with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010. This includes the application of a robust job evaluation process to ensure that all staff receive equal pay for work of equal value.

### **i. Grading Structure**

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

### **ii Remuneration on Appointment**

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

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

### **ii. Supplements**

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

## **7. Remuneration for Chief Officers**

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

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

## **8. Remuneration for employees who are not Chief Officers**

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

### **i. Surrey Pay staff**

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

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

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

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

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

Annual individual pay progression will be subject to:

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

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

### **ii. Apprentices**

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

- The salary for level 2/3 apprenticeships is equivalent to the starting salary in grade PS1/2 in year one, rising to the minimum pay point for PS3 in year two.

- The salary for level 4/5 apprenticeships is equivalent to the starting salary for grade PS3 in year one, rising to the second pay point in PS3 in year two.
- Apprenticeships at level 6 and above will be paid the rate for the role as evaluated.

**iii. Commercial Services Education Catering**

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

**iv. Former Buckinghamshire County Council Trading Standards staff**

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

There is no adjustment made to the pay bands for 2023/2024. A 4.75% performance-related pay progression will be applied to staff employed on Buckinghamshire County Council terms and conditions with effect from 1 July 2023, subject to successful performance and available headroom with the pay range.

In addition, in accordance with their terms and conditions:

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

**v. Tutors - Surrey Arts and Community Learning & Skills**

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

**vi. Political Assistants**

SCC employs Political Assistants on Surrey Pay contracts to support political groups. These Assistants work directly for the political groups rather than as mainstream officers within the officer structure of the Council. These are unique posts and have a set maximum salary determined by The Local Government (Assistants for Political Groups) (Remuneration) (England) Order 2021. This is currently capped by the maximum pay point for Surrey Pay grade PS9 or NJC pay point 38, if lower.

**viii. Staff Employed on National Conditions**

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

- **Centrally Employed Teachers'**

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

A locally agreed pay policy is in place, which sets out the pay progression arrangements for centrally employed teachers in line with the national scheme.

- **Soulbury and JNC Employees**

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

## 9. Other elements of remuneration

A copy of the School Teachers Pay and Conditions Document is available on the [Governments website; Gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/government-employees). Copies of the conditions of service for all other employees covered by this statement can be obtained from [the Local Government Employers](#).

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

### i. **Employee Benefits**

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

### ii. **Additional Payments**

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

The definition of honoraria payments includes the ability to apply a financial recognition payment of up to £1,000 per person per annum in order to reward:

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

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

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

**iii. Unsocial hours payment**

Payments for working unsocial hours are paid to the LGV Engineering Technicians (on Surrey Pay grade PS8) who provide 24-hour on call cover to enable the safe and efficient running of the Fire and Rescue Service. In addition, payments are made to the Highways Lab and Survey Technicians, Senior Technicians & Project Managers (on Surrey Pay grades PS7 to PS9) who provide laboratory sampling and surveying at nights and weekends. Details of these enhanced payments are set out in the Councils Reward Policy.

Employees in Adults and Children's Social Care Service areas who are employed in roles graded at PS8 and below employed to work overnight (i.e., all of their working hours between 8pm and 8am) on a waking night basis will receive an enhancement of 50 percent (time and a half) as part of their contractual terms and conditions.

Employees who work an overnight shift as above on a non-contractual basis will also receive payment of time and a half in respect of these shifts worked. In addition, the enhancement of 50 percent (time and a half) will be applied to all hours worked on a Saturday, Sunday, and each Bank Holiday.

Bank Holidays include all bank holidays designated by SCC. Currently there are 8 such days in a calendar year, but from time-to-time additional days may be so designated for which the above payments would apply.

All payments are in complete recompense and no additional compensatory time off will be given.

**iv. Travel and Expenses**

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

Out of pocket expenses incurred during the course of employment will be met by the council provided that the expenses are directly related to employment and are approved as reasonable.

**v. Professional Fees**

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

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



**v. First Aid Allowance**

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

## **10. Pension Benefits**

- **Teachers' Pension Scheme.**

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

- **Local Government Pension Scheme**

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

## **11. Remuneration - Contract for Services**

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

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

## **12. Salary Protection**

Details of the Council's salary protection provisions that apply to employees who are redeployed into a new post as a result of organisational change can be found in the Council's Managing Reorganisations & Restructures Policy. The provisions relating to safeguarding (pay protection) set out in the School Teachers Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD) apply to centrally employed teachers. Other Council employees are eligible to receive salary protection for a period of up to one year if they are redeployed into a lower-graded post, with the amount of protection depending on the difference between the grades of their former job and new job.

### **13. Early Retirement and Severance**

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

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

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

### **14. Termination of Employment of Chief Officer**

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

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

## Surrey Pay

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

**Table 1: Job Family Pay Scales – effective from 1 April 2023**

		1 April 2023 - 31 March 2024					
Pay Model	Grade Name	Pay Scale					
		Point 1	Point 2	Point 3	Point 4	Point 5	Point 6
Job Family Pay Model	PS1/2	£20,733					
	PS3	£20,761	£21,269	£21,776			
	PS4	£22,069	£22,475	£22,890	£23,312	£23,743	£24,193
	PS5	£24,521	£24,977	£25,441	£25,915	£26,399	£26,886
	PS6	£27,384	£27,897	£28,420	£28,955	£29,499	£30,048
	PS7	£30,682	£31,262	£31,852	£32,455	£32,702	£33,321
	PS8	£33,701	£34,356	£35,024	£35,706	£36,402	£37,101
	PS9	£38,005	£38,746	£39,502	£40,273	£41,060	£42,053
	PS10	£43,081	£43,923	£44,783	£45,659	£46,554	£47,681
	PS11	£48,849	£50,047	£51,275	£52,533	£53,823	£55,125
	PS12	£56,479	£57,868	£59,291	£60,750	£62,245	£63,755
	PS13	£65,169	£66,774	£68,420	£70,108	£71,836	£73,583
	PS14	£75,399	£77,260	£79,168	£81,123	£83,129	£85,153
	Leadership Pay Model	PS15	£85,561				
PS16		£96,432					£119,552
PS17		£119,553					£143,464
PS18		£143,465					£172,157
CEX		£223,822					£248,017

**Please note:**

1. Employees appointed on pay point 1 on grades PS3 to PS14 between 1/10/22 and 31/3/23 will have their incremental date brought forwards to 1 April 2023. This means that they will get their increment early and move to pay point 2. This changes applies to April 2023 only.
2. All other employees entitled to an April increment will receive this increment as normal.
3. All roles on grades PS3 to PS14 will be advertised with a starting salary of the second pay point in each grade.

## Career Pay Grades

**Table 2: Social Wellbeing\* – effective from 1 April 2023**

Social Wellbeing – 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2024				
Job Family	Pay Model	Grade Name	Pay Point	Salary
Social Wellbeing	Career Pay Model	PS8SC	N/A	£35,401
		PS9SC	Point 1	£38,746
			Point 2	£39,355
			Point 3	£40,703
			Point 4	£42,053
		PS10SC	Point 1	£43,923
			Point 2	£44,614
			Point 3	£46,148
			Point 4	£47,681
		PS11SC	Point 1	£50,047
			Point 2	£50,942
			Point 3	£53,034
			Point 4	£55,125
		PS12SC	Point 1	£57,868
			Point 2	£58,033
			Point 3	£60,458
Point 4	£63,755			

\*Applies to all Social Workers and Occupational Therapists.

**Table 3: Finance CIPFA Trainee Scheme – effective from 1 April 2023**

Finance CIPFA Trainee Scheme – 1 April 2023 - 31 March 2024				
Job Family	Pay Model	Grade Name	Pay Point	Salary
Finance Trainee	Career Pay Model	PS7F	Point 1	£31,262
		PS8F	Point 1	£34,356
		PS9	Point 1	£38,005
	Point 2		£38,746	
	Point 3		£39,502	
	Point 4		£40,273	
	Point 5		£41,060	
	Job Family Pay Model	Point 6	£42,053	

**Table 4: Community protection, Transport and Environment – effective from 1 April 2023**

<b>Scheme 1: PS5HT - PS7*</b>				
Job Family	Pay Model	Grade	Point	Salary
Regulation and Technical	CT&E Career Pay Model	PS5HT	Point 1	£24,977
			Point 2	£25,704
		PS6HT	Point 1	£27,897
			Point 2	£28,716
	Job Family Pay Model	PS7	Point 1	£30,682
			Point 2	£31,262
			Point 3	£31,852
			Point 4	£32,455
			Point 5	£32,702
			Point 6	£33,321

<b>Scheme 2: PS6HT – PS8*</b>				
Job Family	Pay Model	Grade	Point	Salary
Regulation and Technical	CT&E Career Pay Model	PS6HT	Point 1	£27,897
			Point 2	£28,716
		PS7HT	Point 1	£31,262
			Point 2	£32,185
	Job Family Pay Model	PS8	Point 1	£33,704
			Point 2	£34,356
			Point 3	£35,024
			Point 4	£35,706
			Point 5	£36,402
			Point 6	£37,101

<b>Scheme 3 PS7HT - PS9*</b>				
Job Family	Pay Model	Grade	Point	Salary
Regulation and Technical	CT&E Career Pay Model	PS7HT	Point 1	£31,262
			Point 2	£32,185
		PS8HT	Point 1	£34,356
			Point 2	£35,401
	Job Family Pay Model	PS9	Point 1	£38,005
			Point 2	£38,746
			Point 3	£39,502
			Point 4	£40,273
			Point 5	£41,060
			Point 6	£42,053

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

**Table 5: Lawyers Career Scheme – effective from 1 April 2023.**

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade Name	Pay Point	Salary
Business Function	Career Pay Model	PS10L	Point 1	£43,923
			Point 2	£45,659
		PS11L	Point 1	£50,047
			Point 2	£52,533
			Point 3	£55,125

**Table 6: Twelve 15 Education Catering - effective from 1 April 2023\***

1 April 2023 - 31 March 2024			
Position	Grade	Pay Point	Starting Salary
Catering / Servery Assistant	PS1/2	N/A	£20,733
Cook - Primary / Secondary & Smart			
Caterer - Primary Small	PS3	Point 2	£21,269
Caterer - Primary Medium	PS3	Point 2	£21,269
Deputy Caterer - Primary / Secondary Large			
Caterer - Primary Large	PS3	Point 3	£21,776
Caterer (Secondary Small)	PS4	Point 2	£22,475
Caterer Primary - Very Complex	PS4	Point 3	£22,890

\*These represent starting salaries. Individuals will progress in accordance with the normal pay progression rules. Further details of the complete pay scale is outlined in Table 1.

**Table 7: Political Assistants – effective from 1 April 2023**

Grade	Pay Scale					
	Point 1	Point 2	Point 3	Point 4	Point 5	Point 6
PS9(PA)	£38,005	£38,746	£39,502	£40,273	£41,060	£42,053

**Note:** Pay for political assistants is subject to the Local Government (Assistants for Political Groups) (Remuneration) (England) Order 2021 and Surrey Pay grade PS9.

**Table 8: Planning Officers – effective from 1 April 2023**

Job Family	Pay Model	Grade	Pay Point	Salary
Regulation & Technical	Career Pay Model	PS7PG	Point 1	£31,262
			Point 2	£32,455
		PS8PG	Point 1	£34,356
			Point 2	£35,706
	Job family pay model	PS9	Point 1	£38,005
			Point 2	£38,746
			Point 3	£39,502
			Point 4	£40,273
			Point 5	£41,060
			Point 6	£42,053

**Table 9a: Surrey Adult Learning Tutors – 1 September 2023 – 31 December 2023**

Role Level	Surrey Grade equivalent	Surrey Adult Learning Tutor Grade	Basic Hourly Rate	Total incl. hourly rate & preparation allowance <sup>1</sup>	Total Hourly Rate Inclusive of Holiday Pay <sup>2</sup>		
					Less than 2 years service (15.51%)	More than 2, and less than 5 years service (16.54%)	More than 5 years service (17.59%)
Adult Learning Standard (ALS) Community courses which are non-qualification based	PS7	ALS A	£16.74	£23.69	£27.36		
		ALS B				£27.60	
		ALS C					£27.85
Adult Learning Higher (ALH) Accredited courses which are qualification based	PS8	ALH A	£19.48	£27.57	£31.85		
		ALH B				£32.13	
		ALH C					£32.42
Adult Learning Top (ALT) Highly specialist subject areas	PS9	ALT A	£21.05	£29.79	£34.41		
		ALT B				£34.72	
		ALT C					£35.03

<sup>1</sup> Preparation allowance is 41.5% of the basic hourly rate.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage uplift of basic hourly rate & preparation allowance to reflect annual leave entitlement with 9 bank holidays for 2023.



**Table 9b: Surrey Adult Learning Tutors – 1 January 2024 – 31 August 2024**

Role Level	Surrey Grade equivalent	Surrey Adult Learning Tutor Grade	Basic Hourly Rate	Total incl. hourly rate & preparation allowance <sup>1</sup>	Total Hourly Rate Inclusive of Holiday Pay <sup>2</sup>		
					Less than 2 years service (15%)	More than 2, and less than 5 years service (16%)	More than 5 years service (17%)
Adult Learning Standard (ALS) Community courses which are non-qualification based	PS7	ALS A	£16.74	£23.69	£27.24		
		ALS B				£27.48	
		ALS C					£27.71
Adult Learning Higher (ALH) Accredited courses which are qualification based	PS8	ALH A	£19.48	£27.57	£31.70		
		ALH B				£31.98	
		ALH C					£32.26
Adult Learning Top (ALT) Highly specialist subject areas	PS9	ALT A	£21.05	£29.79	£34.26		
		ALT B				£34.56	
		ALT C					£34.86

<sup>1</sup> Preparation allowance is 41.5% of the basic hourly rate.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage uplift of basic hourly rate & preparation allowance to reflect annual leave entitlement with 8 bank holidays for 2024.

**Table 10a: Surrey Arts Tutors – 1 September 2023 – 31 December 2023**

Role Level	Surrey Grade equivalent	Surrey Arts Tutor Grade	Basic Hourly Rate	Basic hourly rate plus preparation & travel allowances <sup>1</sup>	Total Hourly Rate Inclusive of Holiday Pay <sup>2</sup>		
					Less than 2 years service (15.51%)	More than 2, and less than 5 years service (16.54%)	More than 5 years service (17.59%)
Unqualified Instrumental Music Teacher; Qualified Instrumental Music Teacher.	PS7	SA1 A	£16.63	£24.29	£27.94		
		SA1 B				£28.18	
		SA1 C					£28.43
Assistant Teacher for the whole class; Team Support Teacher; Curriculum Lead.	PS8	SA2 A	£17.05	£24.90	£28.64		
		SA2 B				£28.89	
		SA2 C					£29.14
		SA3 A	£17.81	£26.00	£29.91		
		SA3 B				£30.17	
		SA3 C					£30.43
		SA4 A	£18.83	£27.50	£31.63		
		SA4 B				£31.91	
SA4 C					£32.19		
Group/Ensemble Conductor/Director; Lead Teacher for the whole class.	PS9	SA5 A	£20.06	£29.28	£33.69		
		SA5 B				£33.98	
		SA5 C					£34.28
		SA6 A	£22.11	£32.29	£37.14		
		SA6 B				£37.46	
		SA6 C					£37.79

<sup>1</sup> Travel allowance of 4.5% & preparation allowance of 41.5% applied to basic hourly rate.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage uplift of basic hourly rate & preparation allowance to reflect annual leave entitlement with 9 bank holidays for 2023.

**Table 10b: Surrey Arts Tutors – 1 January 2024 – 31 August 2024**

Role Level	Surrey Grade equivalent	Surrey Arts Tutor Grade	Basic Hourly Rate	Basic hourly rate plus preparation & travel allowances <sup>1</sup>	Total Hourly Rate Inclusive of Holiday Pay <sup>2</sup>		
					Less than 2 years service (15%)	More than 2, and less than 5 years service (16%)	More than 5 years service (17%)
Unqualified Instrumental Music Teacher; Qualified Instrumental Music Teacher.	PS7	SA1 A	£16.63	£24.29	£27.82		
		SA1 B				£28.05	
		SA1 C					£28.29
Assistant Teacher for the whole class; Team Support Teacher; Curriculum Lead.	PS8	SA2 A	£17.05	£24.90	£28.52		
		SA2 B				£28.76	
		SA2 C					£29.00
		SA3 A	£17.81	£26.00	£29.78		
		SA3 B				£30.03	
		SA3 C					£30.28
		SA4 A	£18.83	£27.50	£31.50		
		SA4 B				£31.76	
SA4 C					£32.03		
Group/Ensemble Conductor/Director; Lead Teacher for the whole class.	PS9	SA5 A	£20.06	£29.28	£33.54		
		SA5 B				£33.83	
		SA5 C					£34.11
		SA6 A	£22.11	£32.29	£36.98		
		SA6 B				£37.29	
		SA6 C					£37.60

<sup>1</sup> Travel allowance of 4.5% & preparation allowance of 41.5% applied to basic hourly rate.

<sup>2</sup> Percentage uplift of basic hourly rate & preparation allowance to reflect annual leave entitlement with 8 bank holidays for 2024.

**Table 11: Apprenticeship and internship pay rates – effective from 1 April 2023**

Apprenticeship	Apprenticeship Level	Year	Annual Salary
Intermediate and Advanced	2	Year 1	£20,733
		Year 2	£21,269
	3	Year 1	£20,733
		Year 2	£21,269
Higher	4+	Year 1	£21,269
		Year 2	£21,776
Internship	N/A	N/A	£21,269

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

## Local (Non-Surrey) Pay Terms & Conditions

**Table 12: Former Buckinghamshire County Council trading standards pay scale.**

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



## 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 3 – Responsibility for Functions and Scheme of Delegation, Section 3 Part 3A (Specific Delegations to Officers). These are brought to Council for formal approval in accordance with Article 4.04(b) and Article 13.01 of the Council's Constitution.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

### 1. CONTEXT AND SCOPE

- 1.1 Officers in the Countryside Access Team have highlighted that references to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Cycle Tracks Act 1984 have been omitted from delegation EAI 95. The areas of legislation set out in the delegation constitute the majority of order-making work undertaken by the team where no objections are maintained or where no significant objection has been maintained and compensation payable.
- 1.2 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 accounts for a small portion of work undertaken by the Countryside Access Team. Part X of this statute relates to highways (which includes Public Rights of Way) and any changes required to be made to them as a result of development. The powers therein are exercisable by Planning Authorities (Surrey County Council is a Planning Authority in relation to mineral working).
- 1.3 The Cycle Tracks Act 1984 is mentioned in the first part of delegated authority EAI 95 where no objection is received but is omitted, for no obvious reason, in part two where no significant objection has been received.
- 1.4 It is therefore proposed that the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Cycle Tracks Act 1984 are included in in both parts of delegation EAI 95. This does not affect delegation EAI 133 whereby

non-executive functions relating to public rights of way (PRoW) set out in the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000, as amended, may be determined in consultation with the relevant local divisional Member/s, with certain exceptions and where significant objections are received. In this latter case, Orders can be considered by the Planning and Regulatory Committee if the officer and Member are not in agreement or deem it necessary.

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
-------------------------

- A. The amendments to Part 3, Section 3, Part 3A of the Constitution as set out in this report be approved.

---

**Lead/Contact Officers:**

Sarah Quinn, Regulatory Business Manager, Democratic Services  
[sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 – proposed amendments to EAI 95

**Sources/background papers:**

Constitution of the Council

---



EAI95	<p>Planning &amp; Placemaking</p> <p>Environment</p>	<p>To process all Public Rights of Way Orders under the Highways Act 1980, Cycle Tracks Act 1984, Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981, <b><u>Town and Country Planning Act 1990</u></b> and Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and make and confirm such orders where no objection has been maintained or compensation is payable. To proceed to written representations, hearing or Inquiry where objections are maintained after an Order is made.</p> <p>Where no significant objection has been received or compensation payable (Policy 2/2006) and after consultation with the local member and Director of Law &amp; Governance, to process all Public Rights of Way Orders made under the Highways Act 1980, the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981, <b><u>Cycle Tracks Act 1984, Town and Country Planning Act 1990</u></b> and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which comply with national legislation and county policy. To proceed to Inquiry where objections are maintained.</p>	<p>Director Highways &amp; Transport Director Environment</p> <p>Natural Capital Group Manager Access Team Manager</p> <p>Senior Countryside Access Officer (Legal Definition)</p>
-------	--	--	--



County Council Meeting – 12 December 2023

## **REPORT OF THE CABINET**

The Cabinet met on 31 October 2023 and 28 November 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 16. 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 11 December 2023).

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

### **RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

#### **A. COORDINATED ADMISSIONS SCHEME FOR SEPTEMBER 2025 (as set out in the Cabinet paper from 28 November 2023)**

1. That Cabinet RECOMMENDS that County Council approves the coordinated admissions scheme for 2025 in accordance with the requirements of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Coordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations and the School Admissions Code at its meeting on 12 December 2023.

#### **Reasons for decisions:**

- The coordinated admissions scheme for 2025 is essentially the same as 2024 with dates updated
- There is just one point of clarification in paragraph 3 of the primary and secondary scheme (pages 3 and 9 of Annex 1), but this does not alter current practice
- The coordinated admissions scheme will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated admissions scheme is working well
- The Local Authority has a statutory duty to publish its coordinated admissions scheme for 2025 by 1 January 2024
- The proposed scheme meets the statutory requirements of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Coordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012 and the School Admissions Code

**At its meeting on 31 October 2023 Cabinet considered:**

**B. SURREY CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCE STRATEGY**

Cabinet was asked to approve the Surrey Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Strategy which would help Surrey County Council and partners manage climate impacts and risks in a more efficient and coordinated manner.

***It was AGREED:***

1. That Cabinet approve the Surrey Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Strategy.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The impacts of climate change are already being felt across Surrey and will worsen in the coming years. The Surrey Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Strategy “Surrey Adapt” sets out Surrey’s collective approach to avoiding, reducing and adapting to these increasing risks. This includes planning for and adapting to: floods; droughts and water insecurity; heatwaves and prolonged changes in temperature extremes; wildfires; and other potential knock-on impacts of climate change on human health, disease burden, impacts on infrastructure and the natural environment.

**C. LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP) INTEGRATION**

From 1 April 2024, the Government will cease providing funding to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and the functions previously held by LEPs will transfer to Upper Tier Local Authorities. The report set out the key implications for the council, proposes a set of principles to guide the approach to LEP integration, and outlines the steps being taken to put the council in a strong position to take advantage of these new functions to deliver improved outcomes more effectively for local businesses and residents.

***It was AGREED:***

1. That Cabinet welcome the announcement from government regarding the transition of LEP responsibilities; that will provide a single economic vision and enable the Surrey-wide provision of business support and economic growth activities and services.
2. That Cabinet approve the adoption and application of the proposed principles that will guide the council’s approach to the integration of LEP functions, as set out in paragraph 12.
3. That Cabinet approve the approach outlined for the LEP integration process and engagement with key partners and stakeholders.

4. That Cabinet delegate authority to the Executive Director responsible for Economic Growth to lead the negotiation and integration process, in consultation with the Lead Cabinet Member.
5. That Cabinet receive a further report on the integration of LEP functions before 1 April 2024.

**Reasons for decisions:**

To bring the significant strategic decision of the government and its consequent implications and opportunities to the attention of Cabinet and to ensure a smooth and effective approach to the transfer and integration of LEP functions for Surrey into the County Council.

**D. CONVERGENT SCREEN TECHNOLOGIES AND PERFORMANCE IN REALTIME (COSTAR): DRIVING INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY IN THE UK'S SCREEN AND PERFORMANCE INDUSTRIES - CAPITAL FUNDING APPROVAL**

Cabinet was asked to approve a one-off £3m (plus a SCC held contingency of £0.3m) capital contribution to a successful CoSTAR (Convergent Screen Technologies and Performance in Realtime) National Lab grant application. This will co-fund a Satellite Studio and Incubator Space in Surrey.

***It was AGREED:***

1. That Cabinet note the significant economic and social benefits of the CoSTAR Satellite Studio and Incubator Space as set out in the report, achieved through the County Council's proposed capital contribution,
2. That Cabinet approve the transfer of £3.3m from the CoSTAR pipeline to capital budget for a £3m contribution to the construction of the CoSTAR Satellite Studio and Incubator Space and a SCC held contingency of £0.3m.

**Reasons for decisions:**

The CoSTAR Satellite Studio and Incubator Space proposed to be co-funded by the County Council will directly contribute to achieving the Council's strategic priority of *Growing a Sustainable Economy from which everyone can benefit* through the economic outcomes it will deliver for Surrey. These include: c300 jobs created over 6 years with a 10-year NPV net GVA contribution of £29.6m (including construction jobs) to Surrey's economy; 200 businesses assisted including incorporating 10 new start-ups; 10 relocating businesses and 180 businesses supported through the CoSTAR programme. These outcomes have been agreed with Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) and will be monitored through a benefits realisation project management process (see Risk Management Section below).

Other social and non-financial benefits arising from CoSTAR include practical application of immersive technologies in service provision that will enable wider participation, especially for hard-to-reach groups, which aligns with the Council's

underlying principle of *No One Left Behind*. For example, the potential to expand the libraries' service ongoing work to bring Virtual Reality into Surrey's libraries from Autumn 2023. CoSTAR will also contribute to Surrey's Skills Plan objectives, for example, enabling collaboration between skills providers, businesses, and anchor institutions and leveraging createch skills development through the Local Skills Improvement Fund and Skills Bootcamp funding opportunities.

**At its meeting on 28 November 2023 Cabinet considered:**

**E. 2024/25 DRAFT BUDGET AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY TO 2028/29**

The Council has a statutory duty to set a balanced budget in advance of each financial year. The report and the 2024/25 Draft Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy to 2028/29 set out progress towards delivering a balanced budget.

***It was AGREED:***

1. That Cabinet note the 2024/25 Draft Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy to 2028/29, including progress to date in setting out spending pressures and efficiencies, as set out in Annex A.
2. That Cabinet note the provisional budget gap of £13.5m for 2024/25 and the next steps required to close the gap.
3. That Cabinet note the proposed Draft Capital Programme for 2024/25 to 2028/29 of £1.9bn set out in Section 6 of the report and Annex B
4. That Cabinet note the summary of Resident Engagement and next steps set out in Section 9 of the report.

**Reasons for decisions:**

In January 2024, Cabinet will be asked to recommend a Final Budget for 2024/25 to full Council for approval in February. The draft budget sets out proposals to direct available resources to support the achievement of the Council's corporate priorities, balanced against a challenging financial environment, giving Cabinet the opportunity to comment on the proposals and next steps.

The draft budget also provides an update on the Council's SWITCH (Surrey Way, Innovation, Transformation and Change) programme, setting out the medium to long term portfolio of redesign and transformational change that will enable greater financial sustainability for the Council.

**F. CLIMATE CHANGE PROGRESS ASSESSMENT 2022/23**

The report set out the achievements that had been made in supporting residents and businesses to reduce their carbon emissions in line with the net zero 2050 target, as well as the progress made to date on the Council's net zero 2030 target, up to the end of March 2023.

***It was AGREED:***

1. That Cabinet note the findings and approve the key areas of focus for next year as well as the approach to mitigate the evident shortfalls as set out in the conclusions.

**Reasons for decisions:**

Part of the council's net-zero commitments is to produce an annual report; synthesising a substantial amount of national and local data to ensure we understand if carbon emissions are reducing in line with the net-zero targets. Whilst the scope has not changed, the progress report identifies where we need to focus our attention to address the most challenging areas and ensure the Delivery Plan is as impactful and cost effective as possible.

**G. QUARTERLY REPORT ON DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER SPECIAL URGENCY ARRANGEMENTS: 3 October 2023 - 4 December 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 TWO urgent decisions since the last Cabinet report to Council.***

1. SEND and AP Capital Programme project budgets: Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning Decisions, 28 November 2023.
2. Local Area SEND Inspection Report: Cabinet Special Meeting, 11 December 2023.

**Tim Oliver, Leader of the Council  
4 December 2023**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON 31 OCTOBER 2023 AT 2.00 PM  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL,  
REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 8EF.**

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

Members: \*=present

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

Deputy Cabinet Members:

\*Maureen Attewell  
Paul Deach (joined the meeting virtually)  
\*Jordan Beech

Members in attendance:

Catherine Baart, Member for Earlswood and Reigate South  
Steve Bax, Member for East Molesey and Esher

**PART ONE  
IN PUBLIC**

**152/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Natalie Bramhall.

Paul Deach joined the meeting virtually.

**153/23 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 26 SEPTEMBER 2023 [Item 2]**

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

**154/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**155/23 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]**

**155/231 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]**

There were none.

**156/23 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]**

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

Anna Sutherland asked a supplementary which was if the council was excluding opinions of family and the child in the legally binding sections of an EHCP as a means to force parents to accept a substandard EHCP or to take the council to tribunal. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning explained that all EHCPs were quality assured by an independent team and the council was of the view that plans being produced were generally of a good standard. If parents are not happy with the contents of a plan then they had a right to appeal to the independent tribunal service.

**157/23 PETITIONS [Item 4c]**

There were none.

**158/23 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]**

There were none.

**159/23 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]**

There were none.

**160/23 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]**

There was one decision for noting.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**161/23 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]**

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



- Surrey had been recognised as the highest performing county in England for Eco Schools. There were 88 Schools in Surrey that had Green Flag status – the highest accreditation in the scheme. The pupil-led scheme is the largest education programme in the world which helps sustainability become an integral part of school life.
- LoCASE funding: this was an EU grant which had been a success in Surrey with 229 organisations receiving funding of just under £2m in grants.
- Crest Awards: guests at these awards had commented that Surrey businesses were leading the way when it came to being innovative and doing things around sustainability which enhances economic standing and supports us with the climate change agenda.
- Funding was currently available via the Rural England Prosperity Fund and the A3 EV Grant. The council was undertaking work to support rural businesses and farming as they tie in to the net zero agenda. In September a session was held with farmers to talk about the environmental grants available to them and to try and support them in their work.
- The work being undertaken was ensuring ‘nobody is left behind’ whether it is decarbonising homes, working to reduce fuel bills, creating ‘warm hubs’ or tackling flooding and extreme heat. The work being undertaken around the environment was welcomed by the Cabinet.
- The Leader stated that a leaflet sign posting essential services provided by the council would be posted out to residents in the coming weeks.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the Cabinet Member of the Month update be noted.

#### **162/23 SURREY CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCE STRATEGY [Item 8]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Environment who explained that the Surrey Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Strategy had been developed with partners, and helps Surrey County Council and partners to manage climate impacts and risks in a more efficient and coordinated manner. The proposed strategy set out a vision and 9 priority programmes that will support the council’s ability to manage the climate risks that we are already facing. The strategy also includes a set of underlying principles guiding how Surrey will approach adaptation and resilience in a changing climate alongside partners. It was noted that the Strategy proposes a goal of adapting to a world 2°C warmer and preparing for scenarios up to +4°C by 2050. This is in spite of 1.5°C being the focus in the main climate change strategy which still remains a target.

Catherine Baart spoke on the item and asked if an interim goal of 1.5°C could be set ahead of 2050. The Cabinet Member for Environment stated that a footnote would be added to the Strategy explaining that the 1.5°C target remained and that a 2°C had been included to ensure work could be developed around a more realistic target.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet approve the Surrey Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Strategy.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The impacts of climate change are already being felt across Surrey and will worsen in the coming years. The Surrey Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience Strategy “Surrey Adapt” sets out Surrey’s collective approach to avoiding, reducing and adapting to these increasing risks. This includes planning for and adapting to: floods; droughts and water insecurity; heatwaves and prolonged changes in temperature extremes; wildfires; and other potential knock-on impacts of climate change on human health, disease burden, impacts on infrastructure and the natural environment.

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

**163/23 LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP) INTEGRATION [Item 9]**

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth introduced the report explaining that the government had announced changes to how economic growth functions would be delivered in local areas on 4 August 2023. From 1 April 2024, the Government would cease providing funding to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and the functions previously held by LEPs will transfer to Upper Tier Local Authorities. In Surrey, this meant the functions of Coast to Capital LEP and Enterprise M3 LEP would transfer to the County Council and delivery of economic activity will be undertaken on a single Surrey footprint. The report set out the key implications to the council and proposes a set of principles to guide the approach for not only LEP integration, but also how to deliver improved outcomes effectively for local businesses and residents. The Council was already well placed to take on these additional functions from local enterprise partnerships and would deliver a number of functions of behalf of the government departments including growth hub and the careers hub.

The Leader commented that having two LEPs across the county meant there had not been a single lense on Surrey’s footprint. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth commented that there would be a festival of skills taking place on 23 November at

Sandown Park Racecourse with over 15000 children coming to meet businesses and education providers to start thinking about career pathways.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet welcome the announcement from government regarding the transition of LEP responsibilities; that will provide a single economic vision and enable the Surrey-wide provision of business support and economic growth activities and services.
2. That Cabinet approve the adoption and application of the proposed principles that will guide the council's approach to the integration of LEP functions, as set out in paragraph 12.
3. That Cabinet approve the approach outlined for the LEP integration process and engagement with key partners and stakeholders.
4. That Cabinet delegate authority to the Executive Director responsible for Economic Growth to lead the negotiation and integration process, in consultation with the Lead Cabinet Member.
5. That Cabinet receive a further report on the integration of LEP functions before 1 April 2024.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

To bring the significant strategic decision of the government and its consequent implications and opportunities to the attention of Cabinet and to ensure a smooth and effective approach to the transfer and integration of LEP functions for Surrey into the County Council.

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

**164/23 CONVERGENT SCREEN TECHNOLOGIES AND PERFORMANCE IN REALTIME (COSTAR): DRIVING INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY IN THE UK'S SCREEN AND PERFORMANCE INDUSTRIES - CAPITAL FUNDING APPROVAL [Item 10]**

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth introduced the report explaining that Cabinet approval was required for a one-off £3m capital contribution to a successful CoSTAR (Convergent Screen Technologies and Performance in Realtime) National Lab grant application. The CoSTAR Satellite Studio and Incubator Space proposed to be co-funded by the County Council and Royal Holloway University of London would directly contribute to achieving the Council's strategic priority of Growing a Sustainable Economy from

which everyone can benefit through the economic outcomes it will deliver for Surrey. These include: c300 jobs created over 6 years with a 10-year NPV net GVA contribution of £29.6m (including construction jobs) to Surrey's economy; 200 businesses assisted including incorporating 10 new start-ups; 10 relocating businesses and 180 businesses supported through the CoSTAR programme. CoSTAR was the Government's flagship Research, Development, and Innovation (RD&I) infrastructure funding programme for the UK's screen and performance industries.

The report was welcomed by the Cabinet and the support being given to creative industries in Surrey.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet note the significant economic and social benefits of the CoSTAR Satellite Studio and Incubator Space as set out in the report, achieved through the County Council's proposed capital contribution,
2. That Cabinet approve the transfer of £3.3m from the CoSTAR pipeline to capital budget for a £3m contribution to the construction of the CoSTAR Satellite Studio and Incubator Space and a SCC held contingency of £0.3m.

**Reasons for Decisions:**

The CoSTAR Satellite Studio and Incubator Space proposed to be co-funded by the County Council will directly contribute to achieving the Council's strategic priority of *Growing a Sustainable Economy from which everyone can benefit* through the economic outcomes it will deliver for Surrey. These include: c300 jobs created over 6 years with a 10-year NPV net GVA contribution of £29.6m (including construction jobs) to Surrey's economy; 200 businesses assisted including incorporating 10 new start-ups; 10 relocating businesses and 180 businesses supported through the CoSTAR programme. These outcomes have been agreed with Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) and will be monitored through a benefits realisation project management process (see Risk Management Section below).

Other social and non-financial benefits arising from CoSTAR include practical application of immersive technologies in service provision that will enable wider participation, especially for hard-to-reach groups, which aligns with the Council's underlying principle of *No One Left Behind*. For example, the potential to expand the libraries' service ongoing work to bring Virtual Reality into Surrey's libraries from Autumn 2023. CoSTAR will also contribute to Surrey's Skills Plan objectives, for example, enabling collaboration between skills providers, businesses,

and anchor institutions and leveraging createch skills development through the Local Skills Improvement Fund and Skills Bootcamp funding opportunities.

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

## **165/23 2023/24 MONTH 5 (AUGUST) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 11]**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources who provided the Cabinet with an update on the County Council's 2023/24 financial position, for revenue and capital budgets, as at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2023 (M5) and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year.

With regards to the Revenue budget, at Month 5 the Council was forecasting an overspend of £0.9m against the 2023/24 revenue budget. In recent months Cabinet had approved £9.2m of additional investment, targeting improvement in service delivery in some specific areas which are facing sustained pressure and changing demands. Cabinet was asked to approve the use of £9.2m of the Council's Budget Equalisation Reserve to fund the identified improvement areas, reinstating the contingency budget to £20m. In recognition of the significant pressures being forecast, specifically in relation to the ongoing high inflationary environment and pressures relating to the cost of children's social care placements, Cabinet was asked to approve the use of the £20m contingency budget to mitigate the overall forecast overspend position.

With regards to Capital budget, a re-set of the capital budget was undertaken in August to ensure that the budget reflects spend profiles more accurately, taking into account known delays, additional in-year approvals and reflecting the current supplier market and wider economic conditions impacting on programme delivery. The revised budget is £268.4m. This is an overall net reduction of £58.1m compared to the M4 budget. The Leader explained that councils were facing significant financial challenges and the government would be lobbied for additional funding.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue and capital budget positions for the year, including the application of the full contingency budget.
2. That Cabinet approves the funding of £9.2m additional investments from earmarked reserves.
3. That Cabinet approves the use of the Council's allocation of the new Adult Social Care Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund – Workforce Fund as set out in paragraphs 12-15.
4. That Cabinet approves the re-set of the capital programme budget.

### **Reasons for Decisions:**

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

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

### **166/23 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 12]**

**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.

### **167/23 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 13]**

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

Meeting closed at 14:53

---

**Chairman**