



Agenda and Reports
for the Annual meeting of
THE COUNTY COUNCIL

to be held on

21 MAY 2024

(i)

(ii)

Woodhatch Place
Reigate
Surrey

Monday, 13 May 2024

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, 21 May 2024, beginning at 10.00 am, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda set out overleaf.

LEIGH WHITEHOUSE
Interim Chief Executive

Note 1: *This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the 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

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Amelia Christopher on 07929 725663 or via the email address above.

1 CHAIR

1. To elect a Chair for the Council Year 2024/25.
2. The Chair to make the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chair to report apologies for absence.

3 MINUTES

To confirm the minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 19 March 2024 and 9 April 2024.

(Pages 9
- 40)

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

Welcome

Welcome everyone to the Council's Annual General Meeting. I find it incredible that a whole year has passed since I became Chair of our Council – and what a year it has been. It is something of an understatement to say it has flown by. I have thoroughly enjoyed my first year as Chair and I am immensely looking forward to the next year.

A friendly reminder that following the meeting, lunch is provided for Members and CLT who have requested it. Please do join me in the canteen. I look forward to seeing you all there.

Chris Norman RIP

I am afraid I begin with the sad news of the passing of Chris Norman, former Conservative councillor in the Chertsey division. Chris passed away in April, after a long battle with illness. Some of you will remember

Chris, who retired from public office in 2017 having served two terms as a county councillor. I am sure you will join me in sending condolences to his wife Judith.

Installation of the High Sheriff of Surrey, 2024-25

In March I attended the installation of the High Sheriff of Surrey 2024-25, Shahid Azeem. This is Shahid's second term as High Sheriff, having served in 2020-21, and I am delighted that I will be in post as Chair for Shahid's year. His theme for his term of office is 'interfaith and community cohesion'. I wish Shahid a highly productive and enjoyable year.

Chair's Theme: Celebrating Diverse Communities

As you are aware, my theme for my time as Chair is 'Celebrating Diverse Communities'. Throughout the past year I have met with many organisations and individuals who do so much to support, celebrate and empower many of the different communities in our county. Surrey is a richly diverse county and it has been a fantastic yet deeply humbling experience to discover and learn more about the various cultures, communities and individuals that have made our great county their home.

Amongst the communities and organisations I have supported, is the wonderful Surrey Youth Focus, who I am sure you are all familiar with. I have been able to help fund very valuable research into exploring 'inclusion' for children and young people with neurodiverse traits, to amplify their voices to influence the difference they would like to see in their communities. This project aims to address the needs expressed by young people who are both neurodiverse and have another protected characteristic or need, such as being from a minority ethnic background or living in poverty. I will share the outcomes with you all in due course.

I have also supported the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People (SCDP) to purchase IT equipment for those they support, in order to help with on-going employment and job opportunities; to connect with others over the internet; and have the opportunity to engage more with life and with people that many of us so often take for granted. Technology really can be an invaluable lifeline for so many people with disabilities and SCDP does a marvellous job in supporting those who need it.

As well as these larger organisations, I have visited and supported many smaller groups and communities throughout our county, such as Briars Field Forest School and Mindfulness for SEN, a charity which aims to improve the lives of SEN (Special Educational Needs) children and their families through outdoor activities and nature; LeatherHEAD Start, which provides emergency, short-term accommodation for the homeless; Egham Constellations, a swimming club for the disabled; and Global Grooves Foundation, which promotes cultural interaction in the community – amongst many others.

Throughout my next year as Chair, I look forward to working more closely with SCC's diverse communities and networks and offering support and a voice where I can.

If you would like to learn more about the organisations I have been supporting, or would like to nominate a group or charity for me to visit, please do get in touch with my office.

Thank You

As always, I would like to say a big 'thank you' to Surrey County Council's officers who do such an outstanding job of supporting Members and serving and protecting our residents. Thank you for all that you do. Please do keep it up!

6 VICE-CHAIR

1. To elect a Vice-Chair for the Council Year 2024/25.
2. The Vice-Chair to make the statutory declaration of acceptance of office.

7 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader to make a statement.

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

8 CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS

(Pages
41 - 42)

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

9 ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY

To formally review the proportional political allocation of places on committees and to adopt a scheme of proportionality for the Council Year 2024/25.

(Note: report to follow)

10 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

To appoint Members of the various Boards / Committees of the Council for the Council Year 2024/25 subject to any changes of membership to be reported to the meeting by Group Leaders.

(Note: report to follow)

11 ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN

To elect Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Committees for the Council Year 2024/25.

(Note: report to follow)

12 APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

(Pages
43 - 44)

The purpose of this report is to request that County Council approves the appointment of an Interim Head of Paid Service.

13 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER TO THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (Pages 45 - 48)

Council is asked to ratify the appointment of the Independent Member to the Audit and Governance Committee for a period of four years as detailed in the report.

14 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION (Pages 49 - 70)

It is the Council's responsibility to approve changes to the Council's Constitution. Amendments to Executive functions are the responsibility of the Leader and are brought to Council to note.

This report sets out proposed changes to:

- Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions and Scheme of Delegation – Proper Officer Functions (Part 3, Section 3, Part 4).
- Part 6 – Codes and Protocols – Officer Code of Conduct (Part 6 (03)).

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

A recent amendment to Executive functions in relation to the governance of the Basingstoke Canal is brought to Council for noting.

15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

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 15 May 2024).

16 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 20 May 2024).

17 REPORT OF THE CABINET (Pages 71 - 76)

To receive the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 26 March 2024 and 23 April 2024.

18 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS (Pages 77 - 96)

Any matters within the minutes of the Cabinet's meetings, and not otherwise brought to the Council's attention in the Cabinet's report, may be the subject of questions and statements by Members upon notice being given to Democratic Services by 12 noon on Monday 20 May 2024.

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

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT
WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 8EF,
ON 19 MARCH 2024 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING
CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

Saj Hussain (Chair)

* Tim Hall (Vice-Chair)

Maureen Attewell	Eber Kington
Ayesha Azad	r Rachael Lake BEM
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
Dennis Booth	Ernest Mallett MBE
* Harry Boparai	Michaela Martin
Liz Bowes	Jan Mason
Natalie Bramhall	Steven McCormick
Helyn Clack	* Cameron McIntosh
Stephen Cooksey	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
r Frank Kelly	Jeremy Webster
Riasat Khan	r Buddhi Weerasinghe
Robert King	Fiona White
	Keith Witham

*absent

r = Remote Attendance

13/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from John Beckett, Jordan Beech, Harry Boparai, Fiona Davidson, Jeffrey Gray, Tim Hall, Frank Kelly (remote), Rachael Lake BEM (remote), Cameron McIntosh, George Potter, Buddhi Weerasinghe (remote).

14/24 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 6 February 2024 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

15/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

John O'Reilly declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 noting that he is a British Petroleum (BP) pensioner and owns shares in that company.

Liz Bowes declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 noting that she is a British Petroleum (BP) pensioner.

David Lewis (Cobham) declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 noting that he is a pensioner in Shell and owns shares in that company.

Trefor Hogg declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 noting that he is a community representative to NHS Frimley.

Edward Hawkins declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 noting that he is a Council appointed foundation governor at Frimley Park Hospital.

Carla Morson declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 noting that a close family member works at Frimley Park Hospital.

16/24 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chair:

- Noted that he had the privilege of visiting the Grange Centre in Great Bookham, which supports people with disabilities; noted that it would be a good place for Members to support using their allocations.
- Highlighted the recent Surrey Armed Forces Covenant Conference at Pirbright, noting that the Council works closely with the military and it was interesting to hear speeches from those in the army and those who provide support.
- Encouraged Members to complete their Related Party Disclosure form.
- Noted that the rest of his announcements could be found in the agenda.

17/24 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Highlighted that it was World Social Work Day, joined the Leader in thanking all of Surrey's social workers for their hard work despite facing tough conditions.

- Congratulated those officers in being appointed as Interim Chief Executive and Interim Section 151 Officer, noting that they would do a good job despite ongoing financial pressures and increasing demand.
- Noted that at the end of month nine the forecast was for a £3.3 million overspend in the Council's budget this year, that had increased to £4 million even after using the £20 million contingency budget and additional money from reserves for the Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) Recovery Plan.
- Noted that the demand for children's and adults' statutory services continued to rise, the Council was not intervening early enough; children with special educational needs and mental health issues were being pushed back.
- Noted that the new Mindworks Surrey strategy allowed each school, irrespective of size or number of pupils, to book a one-hour monthly slot to consult on two children and young people who meet specific requirements, there were only 35 slots a week and over 500 schools in Surrey, equating to only four slots a year.
- Asked whether the Schools Forum had been consulted on that new strategy, and whether the Council was giving schools additional funding or support, some families and carers were taking out large loans to fund private assessments.
- Emphasised that support was ineffective and charities could only do so much, there was ongoing frustration at poor communication and record keeping.
- Regarding the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) capital programme, the Budget Task Group raised concerns about its cost yet the delivery of the programme had not been flagged as a risk; costs had increased by 48% with between 920 to 1,180 places delivered against the target of 2,000.
- Hoped that the Council was looking at the demands going forward, more scrutiny was needed and reports must highlight the areas for improvement.
- Noted that there was indication that the Government was willing to address the financial challenges faced by the Council, funding for public health was vital to provide the necessary early intervention and prevention support.
- Made a plea for the Council to visibly create hope for those feeling hopeless.
- Was pleased that the Leader mentioned the excellent visual impairment unit at Woking High School, highlighted that Woking College sought a similar unit.
- Noted that members of Unison had voted over 90% in favour of strike action, Council staff were paid less than the National Joint Council pay award and many neighbouring councils.
- Asked how the Council was engaging with staff and its unions on staff pay and conditions, and how would it mitigate strikes.
- Noted that the County Deal provided Surrey with more control over matters within the county, however noted concern in the extra workload as the Council would have to adequately resource those new responsibilities.
- Asked whether the Leader had assessed the impact of that burden and whether there would be changes to the Cabinet and select committees to be able to scrutinise that; how much would the County Deal cost in money and staff time.
- Asked whether the Leader was aware and agreed with Guildford Borough Council's decision - or possible misinterpretation - to ban all campaigning in Guildford High Street on the basis that it was Surrey County Council land.
- Referring to the elections for the Mayor of London on 2 May and the transport links between Surrey and London, asked whether the Leader would review the Council's approach of non-cooperation with a newly elected Mayor of London.
- Regarding the recent inspection, noted that the Council had let down many families and children over the last few years, asked when the Leader thinks that the recovery would be complete.
- Welcomed the new children's homes, but asked what proportion of children were being placed in homes outside of Surrey; and when the Leader thinks that would be reduced to zero in the future.

- Asked the Leader to list the specific benefits of the County Deal that residents could expect to see in the next few months and years.
- Asked whether the Leader in his recent visit to Downing Street mentioned the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) which had been replaced by Surrey's County Deal.
- Asked whether the Council had no choice but to spend an extra £200 million to extend its twenty-five year waste and incineration contract by five more years despite market engagement indicating no commercial interest in the incinerator.
- Asked whether it was in residents' interest to give Ringway the responsibility for filling potholes and road resurfacing in a contract that could run for twenty-one years and be worth £2.5 billion, how could the Council ensure that it does not lead to money being spent on repairing roads at the expense of funding buses.
- Noted that an independent review in 2018 concluded that Surrey was not delivering high quality Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services; the Mindworks Surrey contract was for ten years and queried why the Council accepted Mindworks Surrey not taking referrals for neurodiverse children.
- Noted that EHCPs were supposed to cut waiting times for additional needs children to twenty weeks, yet the Council did not have the funding to support the increased demand for school places in Surrey and was required to take out £8 million from schools' budget for the Safety Valve Agreement; schools with more SEND children suffered most from the EHCP delays and funding shortfall.
- Queried whether the Council's large waste and road contracts were delivering the best value and whether those could be reviewed to generate savings which could be reinvested to support vulnerable residents and young people.
- Noted a recent visit to the new children's home in Epsom which was homely and had a good atmosphere, and was in the centre of the town, it was a blueprint for future homes; congratulated those involved in making it a reality.
- Regarding the County Deal, welcomed the devolution of the adult education budget from 2026 to 2027 to the Council, it would provide an opportunity to provide adequate adult education in Mole Valley, helping residents in improving their skills leaving no one behind.
- Congratulated the Leader for securing a historic Level 2 County Deal, which would boost economic growth including green jobs and promote house building and urban regeneration; asked whether the Leader was ambitious to broaden and deepen devolution to Surrey and if so, what other responsibilities would he like to see devolved to the Council over time.

18/24 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Questions:

Notice of eighteen questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in the supplementary agenda on 18 March 2024.

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

(Q2) Catherine Powell asked whether the Cabinet Member believed that there was an opportunity for better working with the Council's partners to consider their solutions regarding shared care records and asked how those services could be promoted widely.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care explained that work was underway concerning record sharing and Technology Enabled Care, as well as scrutiny from the

select committee. The programme would become clearer as the transformation plan is rolled out, she was keen to engage with the Member on that as it moves forward.

(Q3) Robert Evans OBE asked whether the Cabinet Member had seen the articles by the press regarding the sale of the former County Hall in Kingston, which was sold by the Council for £25 million. He asked whether she was surprised to see that the forecast value was £250 million, querying whether it had been undersold. In response to the Leader who stated that the figure quoted regarding the forecast value was inaccurate, he asked whether the Cabinet Member would clarify the figures.

Jonathan Essex referred to the penultimate sentence of the response around future development of the site and the Council securing 'any excess of value', he asked whether the Council would receive additional money.

Steven McCormick referred to the last sentence of the response asking whether the 'legal charge against the asset' was time constrained, when would the full amount of the sale be realised; would that information be available to Members and residents.

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure confirmed that the Council sold the former County Hall site for in excess of £25 million. Regarding the Gross Development Value, Savills estimated it to be worth £250 million and so far, the purchasers RER (Kingston) Ltd had spent approximately £700,000 annually on empty rates, they had spent on security and planning application costs in excess of £1 million, interest rates had increased dramatically. She estimated that over £32 million had been spent on the site and that the residual land value with planning permission was between £35 and £40 million. She noted that hundreds of millions of pounds would be spent developing the site, the market was at a low point and the purchasers had spent more on the site than they likely expected. Therefore, she believed that the Council secured a good deal.

(Q4) Jonathan Essex praised the response which highlighted the progress being made in reopening one of the largest libraries in east Surrey. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm that Consort House has full disabled access and how for example, would the library be advertised in the town centre.

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure was pleased that the Council was able to transfer the library service from the Harlequin Centre to Consort House. Consort House was Disability Discrimination Act compliant so should have disabled access, however she would check that was the case. Regarding signage advertising the reopening of the library, she would leave that to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities to liaise with the service.

(Q6) Andy MacLeod welcomed that on-street parking enforcement was back on track and that there was a focus on informing Members about parking enforcement. He disagreed with the explanation for why it all went wrong a year ago due to only twelve Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) transferred from the boroughs and districts, when sixty CEOs were needed. He noted that it went wrong because the transfer process was badly managed, similarly that was the case in the transfer of grass cutting to the Council. He was concerned that there was not a proper focus on change management and asked the Cabinet Member whether lessons would be learnt regarding all transfers handled by the Council.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that each time a transfer or change happens lessons were learnt. He noted disappointment that more staff did not transfer over, NSL was recruiting throughout and the amount of

CEOs was at the right level and the Council would continue to review their performance. He noted that NSL was only paid when it deployed teams, so it was in their interest to continue the parking enforcement around the county.

(Q7) Lance Spencer noted the immense stress faced by the 125 families with additional needs children who were trying to find a school placement and asked whether the figure would be less in future years as lessons are learnt.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning noted that this year the SEND service dealt with 1,837 children who went through the under 16 Key Stage transfer process, which was the largest number it has ever managed and next year the number was likely to be higher. She recognised the stressful situation for the 125 families who were awaiting a school placement for their child for September, it demonstrated the urgent need to advance the SEND capital programme to build those additional places to meet the needs of children in the future. Noted the hard work by the SEND admissions team across the different settings, particularly in the non-maintained independent sector.

Jonathan Hulley left the meeting at 11.06 am.

(Q8) Angela Goodwin noted that she had received many complaints about the Council's poor communication about the on-street parking and visitor permits in Guildford. She asked whether the Cabinet Member would consider working with the relevant team to improve the communication specifically on the website, and in the run up to the renewal letters in late summer for on-street parking and visitor permits.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that he always looked to improve the team's communications. He noted that most people had signed up online for their parking permits and he had asked the team to send a regular email to residents in permitted areas about any changes. Those who had not signed up by email would be written to.

(Q9) Catherine Powell noted that many people were confused by the situation, therefore it would be helpful if the Cabinet Member could provide a briefing regarding what Mindworks Surrey was and was not doing. She asked whether the Schools Forum knew about and had agreed to the correspondence sent out yesterday.

Jonathan Essex asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm what the current average waiting time was and what the process was of taking referrals that were not being accepted by Mindworks Surrey. If a child had been waiting half a year, once accepted would that amount of time be factored into the date when Mindworks Surrey starts taking all of the cases it was contracted to take.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning emphasised that the waiting lists and backlogs in the Mindworks Surrey neurodiversity service were unacceptable and the needs of neurodiverse children and young people were not being met. Noted that the situation highlighted the difficulty of partnership working with differing priorities, challenges and budgets; Mindworks Surrey was delivered by Surrey and Borders Partnership (SABP). Noted that high demand was a national problem, and the Council continued to work alongside SABP to address the waiting lists. She would ask the joint integrated commissioning team to prepare an urgent written briefing for Members about what was happening with the Mindworks Surrey neurodiversity service. Noted that it was unlikely that the Schools Forum would have been consulted as the matter was outside its remit, the relevant bodies were the different phase councils. She would check and include in the briefing whether schools were consulted on the interim

arrangements. She would ask SABP officers to provide information on the average waiting times, to be included in the briefing as well as the alternative pathways for children not currently being seen.

(Q10) Robert Evans OBE asked the Cabinet Member what provisions were in place should weather conditions require grass cutting more frequently than scheduled.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that extra crews were on standby if additional cuts were needed. He noted that the number of cuts had increased from four to six in urban areas, with two cuts in rural areas; grass cutting had already started in March.

(Q11) Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member to clarify and consider the number of bus stops needed to cope with the current and future number of buses.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that he would provide a written response.

(Q12) Catherine Baart asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that the Council was happy to take no action to address the gap in the provision of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) from Redhill Station to East Surrey Hospital; and confirm that the Council was pursuing funding from Active Travel England for that. Asked whether the Council was happy to take no action and abandon the bus service to the diabetes and stroke rehabilitation centres in the only borough which has no community transport or Digital Demand Responsive Transport.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth reiterated that as Princes Road was private, it was the landowner's responsibility. Noted that the Council would consider adopting the road should the landowner ensure it meets the adoptable standard and pays the commuted sum; that was currently not being pursued. He noted that the team was looking at alternative routes to address the matter. The Council was maintaining the Town Path part of Princes Road.

(Q14) Robert Evans OBE asked whether the Cabinet Member was disingenuous by not providing the requested figures going back to 2010 as requested, it was for Members to decide whether comparisons were only meaningful for the last few years.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources reiterated that much had changed over the past ten years, those numbers were difficult to obtain and do not provide meaningful comparisons. The response provided meaningful data for the last five years. Looking beyond that, the level of services provided by the Council and the level of grants received were completely different. If desired by the Member, those figures could be provided.

(Q15) Catherine Powell queried the last sentence of the response around recreational verges which were not part of the public highway, she noted that there were such verges that were part of the public highway in estates. She asked the Cabinet Member whether he would reconsider either reallocating the maintenance of those recreational verges currently designated as highway verges or come to another way of managing those, as green spaces were vital to young people's mental health.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that all Members were sent the maps and were asked to review their divisions. Every section of the highways extent would be cut, he encouraged the Member to email him

regarding sections that the Members wants reviewing and he would ask the team to follow up. He clarified that the Council would not cut third party landowners' grass.

(Q18) Catherine Powell sought clarity on how many places had been provided to date under the programme, was it 920 or 1,180; and what was the plan. She asked the Cabinet Member to explain what processes were underway to ensure that the current needs were being met, those needs were increasing.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning noted that she would ask officers to prepare a detailed written briefing covering the completed projects to date, how many new places had been delivered and had been re-provided and in which schools, and what the future programme was and how it was being reviewed to ensure that it meets the needs of children with additional needs.

Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Briefings:

These were also published in the supplementary agenda on 18 March 2024.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth: on the problems with parking enforcement, **Chris Townsend** noted that monthly reports were sent to Members outlining parking enforcement data and that now included schools. Having reviewed the reports, most of the parking enforcement was in Guildford and Woking, and not in his division and he asked why that was. Residents in his division reported that they had never seen one of the 65 CEOs, they had contacted NSL reporting that people were parking on yellow lines and NSL responded that a CEO would be deployed; they had never been seen.

The Cabinet Member asked the Member to contact him with particular roads and he would raise his concerns with the team, the Member could also email NSL. He noted that Guildford and Woking had more controlled parking enforcement in place than the Member's division.

On the transfer of the LEPs' functions to the Council, **Nick Harrison** requested further information on what assets were being transferred and for periodic updates to be provided detailing what budgets, functions and schemes the Council has in mind.

The Cabinet Member explained that the Council was working with Hampshire County Council, and Brighton and Hove City Council to determine the assets and monies to be transferred from 1 April. He noted that there had been a recent Member Development Session on the matter, an update with answers to the questions asked would be provided shortly. As the process develops, updates would continue to be provided to Members around what was available. The most significant asset would be Longcross, Runnymede which was an enterprise zone. The Council would also receive loan repayments, and there was a ring-fenced pot of money to support high growth businesses in Surrey.

Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure: contrary to the Cabinet Member's previous comments in response to question three, **Robert Evans OBE** noted that the former County Hall building in Kingston had been granted planning permission, Kingston Council's decision in September 2023 reference 21/03939/FUL. He asked whether the Cabinet Member would correct her earlier statement.

The Cabinet Member noted that she had been informed that planning permission had not been granted, she noted that the conditions might yet to have been cleared. She noted that the Council had made the correct decision to dispose of the building which was not in the county.

Edward Hawkins asked the Cabinet Member to confirm how many extra care units and other units there were for vulnerable and elderly adults, as well as the number of children's homes in the pipeline.

The Cabinet Member would provide a written response to the Member once she had spoken to the relevant Cabinet Members.

Cabinet Member for Environment: on the Surrey Local Nature Recovery Strategy, **Helyn Clack** noted that Members representing rural areas were becoming more aware of the new strategy and the consultation underway. She asked how the Cabinet Member would be engaging further with Members on the strategy.

The Cabinet Member noted that the Council was working with other local authorities, residents and interested parties on the implementation of the strategy. Work was underway measuring and monitoring the current provision to understand how nature and biodiversity could be improved across Surrey, baseline data was starting to be collected. Other related pieces of work would link into the strategy, covering biodiversity net gain, land management concerning crops, and recreation. She would provide an update in her next Cabinet Member Briefing to the Council.

19/24 **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]**

There were none.

20/24 **ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]**

Item 8 (i)

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

Under Standing Order 20.3 (a) Robert Evans OBE moved a proposed alteration to the original motion standing in his own name, which had been published in the supplementary agenda on 18 March 2024.

The proposed alteration to the motion was as follows (with additional words in bold/underlined and deletions crossed through):

This Council believes that:

The current system for local government finance is no longer fit for purpose.

This Council resolves to:

Call on the next government to bring in a fairer and more robust system ~~to replace Council Tax.~~

Under Standing Order 20.3, the proposed alteration to the original motion was put to the vote and Council agreed to the proposed alteration and it was therefore open for debate.

Robert Evans OBE made the following points:

- Noted that the current system for local government finance was no longer fit for purpose, it was largely based on Council Tax and a reform of which would be popular and make economic sense.
- Noted that thirty years since the current Council Tax system was introduced, successive governments had not acted to address the long overdue reform.
- Noted that Council Tax was based on 1991 property valuations, since then average house prices in Surrey had increased more than five times.
- Stressed that the Council Tax system was unfair as those in the cheapest properties in Surrey pay disproportionately more than others in multi-million-pound homes.
- Noted that if the motion is carried, Surrey could be at the forefront of change, sending a signal to a new government that reform was needed.
- Suggested that in the short term, some new Council Tax bands could be introduced, meaning that those in larger more expensive properties contribute a fairer percentage of their income to the Council.
- Suggested that in the long term, Council Tax, Stamp Duty Land Tax and the bedroom tax could all be replaced by a proportional property tax based on property values annually, doubled for empty homes; £5 billion potentially could be raised and distributed fairly.
- Suggested that a land tax would be more radical whereby the land would be valued and whilst it would be fairer, it would take longer to develop.
- Emphasised that the motion did not exclude alternative suggestions by Members.
- Believed that the next government must address the inequities, to make the country's economy stronger.
- Noted that there was no reason that a wealthy county like Surrey, should be constantly short of money and cutting services.

The motion was formally seconded by Will Forster, who made the following comments:

- Noted that councils' funding nationwide had been cut by a quarter since 2016, the current system was broken and needed fixing.
- Noted that Buckingham Palace was valued at £1 billion, was in Band H and was charged just over £1,800, that was equivalent to a Band B property in Surrey.
- Noted that the Palace was charged less than an average three-bedroom house in Blackpool and 46% of households in England would pay more Council Tax.
- Referred to Parliament's cross-party Levelling Up, Housing and Communities Committee report released earlier in the year which noted that there was a £4 billion gap in council funding for 2024/25.
- Noted that the County Councils Network (CCN) stated that even well-run and efficient councils would not be able to withstand further funding reductions.
- Noted that demand was not reducing, the CCN called for a cross-party discussion between the political parties nationally as to what councils can be expected to deliver whilst facing a further funding squeeze.
- Noted that the Director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies stated that the Government knows that Council Tax was outdated, inequitable, inefficient and anti-levelling up; and it was not brave enough to address that.
- Quoted the Leader that a non-partisan discussion was needed about the future of business rates and Council Tax, which were based on outdated valuations; there needed to be a 'modernised tax system' based on 'the ability to pay'.
- Stressed that the Government was not listening, the Council could help bring about the change needed if the motion is carried.

Eleven Members made the following comments:

- Hoped that the focus would be on the first part of the motion and not about deleted aspects of the motion in the second part.
- Noted that the Community Charge or poll tax was implemented in Scotland first as there had been a call from residents to make changes, it had been reversed due to its unpopularity.
- Noted that the Council Tax system was brought back in which did not differ largely from the previous domestic rates system; it was difficult to produce a system that meets the needs of all residents.
- Noted that over many years the Council had repeatedly stated that it was concerned about the funding formulas and settlements received from the Government.
- Noted that the Council's current in-year budget expenditure position was that the cost of meeting the demands had exceeded the income received.
- Noted that it was difficult for the Council to plan for the medium term due to the Government's reluctance to provide multi-year funding settlements.
- Welcomed the six-month extension of the Household Support Fund, yet that was introduced with little notice in the Spring Budget and would eventually end.
- Noted that the Member for Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood had long campaigned for a change in the way that the highways maintenance grant was calculated, the funding allocation was based on road length and did not account for traffic volumes and usage, which disadvantaged Surrey.
- Noted that when public health responsibilities were transferred to local authorities, the grant allocations were based on the NHS spend rather than the needs assessment; the Council was the fifth lowest funded authority receiving a grant of £34.73 per head compared to £199 per head for the City of London.
- Called for the reform by the next government in the way local authorities are funded, the system of local government finance was no longer fit for purpose.
- Agreed that there needed to be an overhaul of the local government finance system; stressed that for the Council to be able to deliver its services, greater funding was required whether from the Government or locally.
- Urged caution, noting that the Council remained in a negative revenue support grant position whereby it owes the Government around £20 million annually, that had been waived over the last few years.
- Called for a fair funding review, however noted the risk around there being a more heavily weighted deprivation index, which would disadvantage the Council.
- Noted that Surrey had an ageing population, 70% of the Council's budget was spent on the delivery of social care and regarding Home to School Transport, by 2026/27 upper tier authorities would be in difficulties if the current level of inflation and demand continues.
- Disagreed with the suggestions put forward by the proposer but agreed with calling on the next government for a fair and more robust system; recognised that business rates needed to be reviewed.
- Highlighted that the County Deal was an opportunity to look at fiscal devolution, the Council would have greater control over its activities in the county and how it funds the services and raises money, for example through a tourist tax.
- Noted that £1.2 billion was needed to run the Council, 76% of that was generated from Council Tax, if Council Tax was to be abolished then that money would have to be generated some other way.
- Agreed that local government was at crisis point and a different approach was needed.

- Noted that as Chair of the CCN would continue to lobby the current and next governments.
- Noted that the Government must act to ensure that local government can deliver adequate services to support the local population, as it faces a funding reduction and a significant increase in social care costs.
- Noted that in addition to the County Deal, the Government must enable councils to benefit from and expand their ability to raise revenue locally, a new sustainable funding system would enable to Council to meet residents' needs.
- Noted that for example, an airport passenger duty would raise just under £4 billion this year and the Council deserves its fair share being sandwiched between Heathrow and Gatwick Airports, there could be a local levy on fuel duty in Surrey's petrol stations and an increase in the levels of fines for breaches.
- Agreed that an increase in the number of Council Tax bands was needed to relieve the pressure on local government.
- Referred to the call for a voluntary contribution scheme in the budget amendment at the last Council meeting which was not agreed, noting that such a scheme had been implemented at Waverley Borough Council, and other borough and district councils such as Woking Borough Council.
- Noted that reform was necessary regarding all local government funding, that needed to be reviewed cross-party nationally.
- Noted concern that short term financial pressures caused local authorities to make irrational decisions such as selling properties cheap, which they could have developed themselves for more money; in some local authorities, legal issues had built up over time causing bankruptcy.
- Noted that all taxation is unfair, defining fair taxation was difficult and often rewarded some at the expense of others.
- Noted concern around having a mansion tax, the market would be distorted and property price inflation would penalise those who had struggled to buy their family home, often the elderly who were funding their social care through mortgaging their house.
- Noted that proper consideration and planning was needed around the suggestions to reform local government finance.
- Noted that residents' Council Tax bills were not equivalent to the total of what their council was spending, as councils received government grants, a share of business rates, money from fees and charges, and funding from capital programmes.
- Noted that Surrey's businesses paid around £600 million annually to the Government, yet the Council and the borough and district councils received around £130 million a year; called for a campaign to reform business rates so that residents receive a greater share of those.
- Noted that in the past at a different local authority, 70% of its expenditure was on education and it was increasing, the Government took over the running costs from local authorities replacing that responsibility with social care; today 70% of local authorities' expenditure was on social care.
- Noted that the focus must not be solely on how local government generates money from residents, the Council and borough and district councils must consider what services they would like to be responsible for.
- Noting the importance of early intervention, did not understand why if the Council wants something done it has to wait for the General Election; the movers of the motion could discuss the matter with their national political party colleagues committing their party to address the issue via their manifestos, to get the mandate for it and for the electorate to then decide.
- Supported having additional Council Tax bands so wealthier residents with larger homes contribute significantly more than those least able to pay.

- Noted that Council Tax was regressive, yet councils had increased their Council Tax by just under one third above inflation since 2010 and their core spending power had been reduced by 27% in real terms.
- Noted that councils were receiving less money from the Government and from business rates, yet residents were paying more for less services.
- Noted that those most able to pay tax should do so, society is created through the pooling of resources; leaving no one behind.
- Noted that councils must act in fairness to future generations, for example through a mandated government responsibility for action on climate change.
- Noted that the proposer had shown a misunderstanding of the commercial property market, it was wrong to infer that a new government using a new tax system would allow the Council to keep hold of all the money raised.

The Chair asked Robert Evans OBE, as proposer of the motion to conclude the debate, he made the following comments:

- Noted that he did not have a hotline to any incoming government, less so than the Cabinet Members to the current government.
- Highlighted that overall, there was consensus on supporting the motion.
- Noted that he had put forward some suggestions for change and welcomed the other suggestions made around an airport tax and tourist tax; supported the review of business rates.
- Rejected the comment that all taxation is unfair, had been to countries without a system of taxation where instead there was bribery and brutality.
- Reiterated that the motion stated the current system was not fit for purpose and asks the next government to bring in something fairer and more robust; believed that a good government is bold and should consult on creating a better system.
- Encouraged the Members who were Parliamentary candidates to take the motion forward nationally, to work to improve the system.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried with one abstention.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council believes that:

The current system for local government finance is no longer fit for purpose.

This Council resolves to:

Call on the next government to bring in a fairer and more robust system.

21/24 SELECT COMMITTEE FEEDBACK ON A REFERRED MOTION: 'ADVERTISING & SPONSORSHIP POLICY' [Item 9]

The Chair of the Greener Futures Reference Group (GFRG) introduced the report and explained that the motion referred from the Council meeting on 11 October 2022, called for the Council to take the lead in not promoting carbon producing products on advertisements on the Council's highways. He noted that despite the motion being consistent with the Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency in 2019 and the move towards a global warming of 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, it had been referred to the select committee avoiding meaningful debate at the Council meeting; and other motions on climate change had either been amended or referred. He noted that at the GFRG meeting in November 2023, officers were concerned by the

potential loss of £500,000 annually if that advertising was banned and suggested that the money generated from advertising carbon producing products be used to support greener future projects to reduce carbon emissions. He welcomed the review by the Cabinet to weigh up the immediate financial benefits to the Council against the long term damage from the carbon emissions of the promoted products. He hoped that the Cabinet would delay signing the contract in process, to seek a better solution.

The motion's proposer urged Members to support the GFRG's recommendation to challenge the reasons given for not pursuing the motion's resolutions. Noted that the argument that it would decrease income was not proven, and it was absurd that the money generated from advertising such products could be used to reduce carbon emissions elsewhere. Stated that the advertising change would demonstrate the Council's positive leadership on climate change and was in line with its climate strategy. Many national and international bodies had called for the banning of advertising high carbon goods, just under 70% of the public agreed. Referred to a legal opinion that councils could introduce low carbon advertising policies, Somerset Council and Cambridgeshire County Council had committed to such policies.

The motion's seconder suggested that when the Council negotiates contracts for its new electronic billboards and creates new advertising space, it aligns its advertising policy with its ambitions for Surrey's green economy and net zero target. Called for the Council to plan how to use its new devolved powers to promote Surrey's own green companies.

The Leader clarified that purpose of the report was not for the motion to be debated as it would be considered by the Cabinet, he welcomed the Chair of the GFRG and movers of the motion to speak on the matter at a Cabinet meeting.

RESOLVED:

That Council noted that:

- i. the Greener Futures Reference Group (GFRG) did not endorse the recommendation of officers.
- ii. the GFRG recommends that the issue be considered by the Cabinet.

22/24 ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (FRIMLEY PARK HOSPITAL) [Item 10]

The Chair of the Adults and Health Select Committee introduced the report, noting that the national New Hospital Programme aimed to build forty new hospitals by 2030. He noted that Frimley Park Hospital, served residents in Surrey, Hampshire and Bracknell Forest, and was one of the seven hospitals most severely affected by Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC). The intention was to rebuild the hospital in a new location, and the regulations required the establishment of a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) to scrutinise the design plans. He explained that the Council would be the host authority with four members to sit on the JHOSC from Surrey, four from Hampshire and two from Bracknell Forest; politically proportionate and proportionate to the number of residents using the current hospital. Local Members for the divisions closest to the current hospital and new location if different, would be invited to the JHOSC meetings as non-voting observers.

Three Members made the following comments:

- Welcomed the clarification around the local Members as non-voting observers which would include Members with residents who use Frimley Park Hospital such as Farnham residents, asked for those local Members to be included.
- Highlighted that a resident's relevant hospital did not solely depend on where they live, but it also depended on the surgeries they use. An understanding was needed around which surgeries are associated with Frimley Park Hospital, rather than just the towns and villages.
- Asked whether the Council's JHOSC membership was composed of Members that live in the part of Surrey that Frimley Park Hospital serves. The Chair clarified that the membership had been published in the supplementary agenda.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care thanked the Chair of the Adults and Health Select Committee for providing clarity about the next steps. She thanked the select committee for supporting Adult Social Care. She noted that it was Social Work Week and she asked Members to support the service particularly as it goes through the upcoming Care Quality Commission inspection.

RESOLVED:

1. That the County Council agreed to the establishment of the Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Frimley Park Hospital) with effect from 19 March 2024 for the duration of the rebuilding programme (expected to be 10 years).
2. That the County Council be represented by four Members including the chair of its health scrutiny committee; and its membership be confirmed as:
 - Trefor Hogg
 - Richard Tear
 - Michaela Martin
 - Carla Morson
3. Any consequential amendments are made to the Council's Constitution as required.

23/24 SELECT COMMITTEES' REPORT TO COUNCIL [Item 11]

The Chair of the Select Committee Chair and Vice-Chairs' Group introduced the report, noting that scrutiny's role was to help improve services provided to Surrey residents by holding the Cabinet and senior officers to account for their decisions; and to help develop the Council's policies. The report set out the huge amount of work undertaken by the select committees across a range of subjects, including the deep dives by the Task and Finish Groups. She noted that it was vital to continue collecting valuable evidence from external witnesses and for recommendations to be effective.

The Leader thanked the Chairs of the select committee and the Chair of the Select Committee Chair and Vice-Chairs' Group for all their hard work. He noted that he had continued to deliver on his commitment that all policy changes would be scrutinised by the select committees. He was pleased that Task and Finish Groups were up and running, those provided in-depth analysis of areas that could be improved.

A Member called for greater officer support for the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee, to ensure that it is supported adequately.

RESOLVED:

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

24/24 ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL - MEMBER DEVELOPMENT [Item 12]

The Chairman of the Member Development Steering Group (MDSG) introduced the report, providing assurance that it was equitable; it was for Members to decide its effectiveness. He noted that requested changes had been made to ensure that the Member Development Sessions were more interactive, there was also greater interaction through the two in-person Member Development Days. He noted that neither the sessions nor days were well-attended and improving that was a work in progress. He noted that the new Member Reference Library on Microsoft Teams would go live next month and would assist Members to use the facilities available. He encouraged Members to use the training offered by the Local Government Association. He noted that he was stepping down as the Chairman of the MDSG and he thanked officers for their hard work. He emphasised that the MDSG should be representative of all Members, that was why the membership changed annually and he asked Members to put themselves forward to join so they could shape the work. The next MDSG meeting would be in June and he noted that the MDSG's work this year would focus on the Member induction courses post the 2025 county elections.

RESOLVED:

That Council endorsed the current approach to Member development and agreed that it is equitable and effective.

25/24 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 13]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 February 2024.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents:

There were no reports with recommendations for Council.

Reports for Information/Discussion

27 February 2024:

- A. Promoting and Supporting Sustainable Economic Growth in Surrey (LEP Integration)
- B. Provision of Primary School Places in the Planning Area of Reigate
- C. Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman Public Report Regarding Concerns About the Delivery of Education for Children with Additional Needs and Disabilities (SEND)
- D. SFRS Fire House and Training Facility

A Member noted a recent visit to the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) headquarters in Reigate, noting the large amount of work that it undertook. Thanked the Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience, and the Cabinet for their support of the redevelopment of the SFRS which once redeveloped could let out facilities and develop the training offer to other Fire and Rescue Services nationally.

- E. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 3 February 2024 - 11 March 2024

RESOLVED:

1. Noted that there had been no urgent decisions since the last Cabinet report to Council.
2. Adopted the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 27 February 2024.

26/24 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 14]

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.44 pm]

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Leader's Statement – County Council, 19 March 2024

Good morning Mr Chairman, Members.

Today's Council Meeting is our first meeting without Joanna Killian leading the organisation as Chief Executive, and the next time we come together will be to ratify the appointment of a new permanent Chief Executive.

It is our final meeting of the financial year 2023/24, with the 2024/25 budget agreed at our last meeting and planning for 2025/26 budget setting already underway, and with the Council AGM to come in May.

We have this week officially entered the pre-election period – not relating to elections here for the County Council, but for many of our District & Borough partners, and the Police & Crime Commissioner in Surrey.

We know there will be a general election at some point in the coming months.

As I will touch on a bit later, we are in the midst of ramping up our improvement programmes within the Council – to build on the heavy lifting work we have done these past years so that our services are fit for what promises to be a challenging future.

However, the change we are operating in today is very different to the change we were operating in six years ago. Surrey was then, where several Councils are today. Financially challenged, struggling to cope with rising demand and no clear long-term post Covid vision.

In that context, the circumstances of this particular organisation today could not be more different.

Surrey County Council is seen as a leading local authority. Our finances are stable. Our services are improving across the board. Our workforce is focused and ambitious for Surrey.

That gives us a solid bedrock to face what is now required – an evolution, to progress even further and faster along the upward trajectory we're on.

While we await the appointment of a new Chief Executive, the Corporate Leadership Team are picking up the baton and offering us further stability, reassurance, and strong leadership.

Our improvement work continues in earnest, our future planning remains on track, our services continue to positively impact residents' lives every single day.

This Council is on track, and while change swirls around us, we know where we want to be, we will not deviate from that course, and we remain guided by our ambition that no one in Surrey should be left behind.

Mr Chairman, since we agreed our budget at our previous Council meeting, our residents have been receiving their council tax bills and information.

For some, this can be one of the only times they interact with us as a Council, and for many it is another burden on already stretched family finances.

We know it's a difficult thing to land with residents – another tax, another bill that they see rising.

And it is this time of year, and the demand for council tax, that brings into sharp focus the importance of making sure that every single public pound is spent appropriately.

Everything we do – every hour of work, every visit made, every contact we have, every project, every job, every service – must be delivered in the most effective and the most efficient way possible.

Our residents must have the confidence that their money is being spent wisely and with the most impact– to make Surrey a better place, and to care for and support those people who need us most.

Alongside those bills issued by District and Borough Councils, our Communications Team, with support from our Finance Team, produced a very clear leaflet, explaining exactly how our residents' council tax is spent, as well as an excellent video showcasing what the County Council does.

I would urge all Members to share those useful resources and take up that collective responsibility to clearly and honestly explain how the Council uses its budget.

Spending public money is a huge responsibility – especially in the current financial climate, and it is a responsibility we must all take extremely seriously.

More than 70% of our entire budget is spent on Adult Social Care and Children's Care – more than £2m every single day spent on what is a relatively small proportion of our population, but it is those people who need us most.

And we will continue to do all that we can to ensure that we do not leave those people behind.

It is the smaller proportion of our budget that is actually spent on our more visible services, like road maintenance, libraries, countryside management, and community recycling centres – the things that are experienced by the most people – as well as

those services that keep us safe like Surrey Fire & Rescue Service, and Trading Standards.

We have to be straight with people. With public finances stretched, there is less money from government, coupled with higher demand for services that are more expensive to deliver.

Local government is expected to do more, with less.

But here in Surrey, we won't shy away from that challenge. We'll tackle it head on.

That involves an honest conversation – with residents, with partners, with ourselves – about the type of organisation we are, and the organisation we want to be in the future.

About our priorities.

About how we organise ourselves – as an organisation, and as a system of partners.

About how we design and deliver services differently – using data more effectively and making the most of new technology and digitisation opportunities.

About the size of our workforce, and ensuring we have the very best people delivering for the very best county in England.

This a challenge we face collectively – everybody involved in delivering public services, in supporting the most vulnerable people in society.

And so, we have a collective responsibility to tackle it, and to ensure that in another six years' time we can again say that we recognised what we needed to do, and we did it successfully.

We have clear priority areas where this improvement is underway – in Children’s Social Care, our service for families with children who have Additional Needs and Disabilities, and Adult Social Care.

Building on progress in delivering better outcomes for residents, and reducing demand through a focus on prevention, early support, and greater independence.

In the case of our Customer Transformation programme - a focus on getting things right first time, responding better and more effectively to the needs of our residents, and really improving that experience when people need us.

We know there is work to do to improve further, and that improvement is the core focus of our transformation work.

Mr Chairman, I just want to focus on some of the progress already being made in services for children with additional needs and disabilities, following the recent findings of the Ofsted and CQC Local Area SEND Inspection published late last year.

Inspectors found that although there is more work to be done, we “have put in place important actions that are starting to make a difference.”

Of particular note, we have made huge and rapid progress on Education, Health, and Care needs assessments, after many families faced long waits and delays due to complex issues within the system.

We have been determined in our action on this matter, recognising the importance to families of having the support they need for young people to thrive.

Our additional investment and work to counteract the national challenges in availability of Educational Psychologists, has allowed us to increase capacity in Surrey, which is

making a big difference to how quickly we can process assessments. Our focus and that of our partners, must now be to deliver those plans in a timely way.

Although there is more to do, this is a significant step in our recovery journey.

To ensure families are kept up to date on progress, we will soon be launching a new termly update for Additional Needs and Disabilities information and events. Anyone can sign up for these updates via the Local Offer website, and I encourage everyone to do so.

Support for these young people and their parents and carers is absolutely central to our ambition that no one is left behind and is reflected in our priorities within our investment programme too.

As part of this, we've recently completed the construction of a new facility specifically for visually impaired pupils at Woking High School.

This is modern, cutting-edge teaching space for 20 visually impaired students, in a net-zero state of the art building and will make a massive impact on the lives of the young people who will use it.

It is the 43rd project under the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities, Alternative Provision Capital Programme, which has already provided over 1,180 specialist school places since 2019, and there are 40 more projects in the pipeline to 2026/27.

In addition to this Mr Chairman, we recently announced our pride in opening three brand new purpose-built children's homes in the county - one in Epsom and two on a site in Walton-on-Thames – again as part of our capital investment programme.

This investment is vital to increase residential capacity for young people in care in the county.

Currently, around 70% of Surrey children in residential homes are placed out of county, a figure which is largely due to a lack of available homes for them here in Surrey.

These homes will reduce that proportion of Surrey children living out of county and give more young people in care the choice to stay living in Surrey, close to their communities, where it is appropriate for their needs and circumstances.

A great deal of care and consideration has gone into the build, location, and design of these homes, with modern, green technology and efficiency, ensuring they are suitable and sustainable for the long-term.

These are great examples of our ambitious investment programme – also agreed at our last Council meeting – delivering a real impact for residents, helping us reach our no one left behind ambition, and transforming how we deliver services.

Mr Chairman, a positive development for Surrey since our last meeting came in the announcement of Surrey's County Deal by the Chancellor as part of the Spring Budget early this month.

This is an important step in delivering true devolution of powers from Westminster to local communities, recognising the ability of local government, working closer to residents, and knowing how to provide the best conditions for our local areas to thrive.

It also demonstrates the strength of this Council, being one of a select few that have achieved a County Deal.

I had the pleasure of attending Political Cabinet at 10 Downing Street last week, as this government really does want to hear the voice of local authorities.

I spoke on behalf of the sector and had very productive conversations about the key issues and pressures facing local government. I will be having specific follow up meetings with the relevant Secretaries of State in the coming weeks.

I know that, given the right support, in the right way, local government can lead the way in tackling some of this country's biggest challenges.

And that, Members, is something on which I'm sure we can all agree.

Ultimately, this County Deal— albeit with limited additional powers at this stage - is one of those opportunities for the Council to act with greater influence, independence, and flexibility to make a difference in our wonderful county. It also gives us the opportunity to work more closely with the other tiers of local government who face their own challenges, playing to our respective strengths for the benefit of our residents.

One of the crucial changes will mean Surrey County Council will be taking on a leadership role of our vibrant economy - meaning for the first time we will be able to deliver a cogent economic strategy for the whole of the county.

Integration of powers, held previously by LEPs, is already underway - we thank colleagues at Enterprise M3 and Coast to Capital for their support on this.

Integration will be complete by April, bringing a range of benefits for businesses and residents.

Setting a single economic vision for the county, ensuring Surrey-wide solutions are developed to support local economic growth.

A new Surrey business brand and website will make it easier for our 110,000 businesses to know where to access the right information, advice, and guidance.

The creation of a Surrey Growth Hub service will provide better support for business, and targeted interventions for high-growth local businesses.

Our Surrey Careers Hub, launched in September and already engaging with more than 97% of the county's secondary schools, colleges, and educational providers, will continue to grow.

Future government funding to support local growth will now be focused on the whole of Surrey, instead of it being spread across larger regional areas.

We are working with partners across Surrey, public and private sector, education providers, and District and Borough colleagues in developing this exciting new opportunity to strengthen our business community and ultimately a growing, sustainable local economy.

Mr Chairman, before I finish, I must note that this week is Social Work week – an opportunity to recognise the importance of one of our key services and celebrate some of our most important front-line staff.

Social Workers dedicate their time to supporting our most vulnerable residents - young and old, and all ages in between. They are the embodiment of our ambition that no one is left behind, and I want to pay tribute to each and every Surrey Social Worker and thank them for the vital work they do every single day.

Of course, we'd like more of them, and I would ask all of us to share in celebrating that profession – not only this week, but every week – to promote the benefits of that career and encourage people to consider that path.

Mr Chairman, Members, we continue to live through a period of change, but our foundations are strong, and our ambitions are clear.

We signal the end of a financial year that has been full of progress and improvement, and although I am quite sure the coming year will have its challenges, we look forward to the next phase of the development of this Council with renewed energy and vigour.

Thank you.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COUNTY COUNCIL
HELD AT WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY,
RH2 8EF, ON 9 APRIL 2024 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 BEM
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
Dennis Booth	Ernest Mallett MBE
Harry Boparai	Michaela Martin
Liz Bowes	Jan Mason
Natalie Bramhall	Steven McCormick
Helyn Clack	* Cameron McIntosh
* Stephen Cooksey	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

27/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Jordan Beech, Luke Bennett, Stephen Cooksey, Paul Deach, Robert Evans OBE, Marisa Heath, Frank Kelly, Eber Kington, Scott Lewis, Cameron McIntosh, Carla Morson, Bernie Muir, George Potter, John Robini, Becky Rush, Joanne Sexton, Ashley Tilling, Fiona White.

28/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]

There were none.

29/24 APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND HEAD OF PAID SERVICE [Item 3]

The Leader, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC), introduced the report. He thanked the team responsible for the selection process, particularly the Director of People and Change. He noted that there had been an excellent field of candidates, who faced tough panel interviews and he thanked the participants in the stakeholder engagement day. He noted that the PPDC conducted the final interviews and recommended that Terence Herbert be appointed as the Council's Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service. He highlighted that Terence had been the Chief Executive of Wiltshire Council for the past four years and had a background in mental health and social work; he had been the Director of Children's Services at Wiltshire Council when its rating moved from Requires Improvement to Outstanding. He thanked Leigh Whitehouse for stepping up as the Interim Chief Executive and agreeing to continue in that role prior to his departure and he congratulated him for his new role as Chief Executive of West Sussex County Council. He noted that at the next Council meeting he would provide the date for the arrival of the permanent Chief Executive and plan regarding the permanent Section 151 Officer. He recognised that the changes to the Chief Executive and the Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) could be unsettling, but provided assurance that the Council had a strong foundation and clear ambition of 'no one left behind'. He stressed the need for the Council to drive the transformation plan forward with enthusiasm and momentum.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council appointed Terence Herbert as the Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service of Surrey County Council, with a start date to be agreed.
2. That the Council appointed the preferred candidate for the Chief Executive as the Returning Officer for Surrey County Council.
3. That the Council approved that Leigh Whitehouse will continue as the Interim Chief Executive and Head of the Council's paid service of Surrey County Council until the new permanent Chief Executive takes up their position, or until Leigh Whitehouse leaves the Council to take up his new role as Chief Executive of West Sussex County Council.
4. That the Council approved that Anna D'Alessandro continues as Interim Statutory Section 151 Officer.

30/24 APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM MONITORING OFFICER [Item 4]

The Leader, as Chairman of the PPDC, introduced the report. He noted that he was sorry to see that the Director of Law and Governance, and Monitoring Officer, Paul Evans would be leaving the Council and was retiring from local government. On behalf of the Council, he thanked Paul and he noted that he had been outstanding in his role, providing a calm and reflective approach and clear advice throughout challenging times such as the Covid-19 pandemic and challenging legal matters. He was delighted

that the Council had secured Asmat Hussain as the Interim Monitoring Officer to provide that continuity prior to the appointment of a permanent Monitoring Officer in due course.

RESOLVED:

That the Council appointed Asmat Hussain to act as the Interim Monitoring Officer for Surrey County Council with effect from 22 April 2024.

The Chair thanked Paul Evans for all his expertise and guidance provided to the Council over the past four and a half years as Director of Law and Governance, and Monitoring Officer; he noted that Paul would be leaving the organisation later in the month and wished him well for the future.

The Chair invited Members and the CLT to join him for refreshments and networking.

[Meeting ended at: 10.10 am]

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Portfolios

Cabinet Member	Portfolio
Tim Oliver	Leader
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, Families and Lifelong Learning
Sinead Mooney	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Deputy Cabinet Member	Portfolio
Paul Deach	Deputy Cabinet Member to Leader of the Council
Maureen Attewell	Deputy Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning
Steve Bax	Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways
Jonathan Hulley	Deputy Cabinet Member for Strategic Highways

This page is intentionally left blank



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

The purpose of this report is to request that County Council approves the appointment of an Interim Head of Paid Service.

BACKGROUND:

1. The Local Government and Housing Act 1989 requires local authorities to have in place three statutory officers; the Head of Paid Service, the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer. The Council therefore has a statutory obligation to appoint a Head of Paid Service to cover the period after Leigh Whitehouse leaves the Council to take up a new role as Chief Executive at West Sussex County Council, until the new permanent Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service, Terence Herbert, starts on 19 August 2024. Leigh Whitehouse's last working day is Friday 31 May 2024, so the interim arrangements need to be in place from Monday 3 June 2024.
2. Members of the People, Performance and Development Committee recommend that Michael Coughlin, Executive Director Customers, Digital and Transformation, is appointed as Head of Paid Service during this period.
3. Michael is currently due to leave the Council on 30 June 2024 but has agreed to extend his service to take on this temporary role. Michael has worked for Surrey County Council since February 2018 and was previously the Deputy Chief Executive. He has experience as a Head of Paid Service from when he was Chief Executive at Reading Borough Council for 4 years until May 2012.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the County Council appoints Michael Coughlin to act as Interim Head of Paid Service for Surrey County Council from 3 June 2024 until 18 August 2024.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Sheila Smith, Director of People and Change

Email: Sheila.Smith@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

None



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER TO THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

A vacancy arose for an Independent Member to the Audit and Governance Committee when the former Independent Member stood down following the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on 13 March 2024. Recruitment to this post has been undertaken and the role has been offered. Council is asked to ratify the appointment of the Independent Member for a period of four years as detailed in the report.

BACKGROUND:

The Council at its meeting on 12 October 2021, agreed the principle of appointing an Independent Member to the Audit and Governance Committee for a period of four years. The Council also agreed that the Director of Law and Governance, in consultation with the Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee, be delegated the authority to finalise the role description, skills, competencies and person specification.

The Committee's former Independent Member (Terry Price) was appointed on 8 February 2022. Mr Price decided to stand down from his role following the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on 13 March 2024. At that March meeting, the Audit and Governance Committee noted the recruitment process being undertaken to fill the vacancy and following an interview process, would recommend the preferred candidate to County Council to be appointed as the Independent Member to the Audit and Governance Committee.

RECRUITMENT PROCESS UNDERTAKEN:

A recruitment campaign has been conducted with an advertisement placed on Surrey County Council's website and all the usual recruitment websites used by the Council: Guardian Jobs, Surreyjobs, JobsGoPublic, Indeed, Find a Job (GOV) and LinkedIn. Applicants were asked to send a covering statement to express their interest and explain how they meet the desired requirements, together with a CV before the closing date.

A recruitment panel met to interview suitable candidates on 9 April 2024. The panel consisted of the Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee (Victor Lewanski), one Conservative group member (Richard Tear), and two opposition group members (Steven McCormick and Will Forster) and was supported by the Director of Law and Governance. Following the interview process, members of the Audit and Governance Committee were updated on the outcome of the interviews.

CONFIRMATION OF SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATE:

The recruitment panel agreed to offer the role to Matthew Woods and Mr Woods has confirmed that he would like to accept the role.

Mr Woods brings a wealth of experience to the role. He is a Risk Management and Internal Audit professional and has fifteen years' experience within the Financial Services industry. He is a fully qualified and chartered member of the Chartered Institute of Internal Auditors holding CMIIA and CIA designations. In his current role at Link Group - Senior Internal Audit Manager, Corporate Markets, London, he heads-up an Internal Audit team in EMEA (Europe, Middle East, Africa). He is passionate about the third sector and has significant experience at Board and Audit committee level across multiple organisations and sectors.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council agrees to the appointment of Matthew Woods as the Independent Member of the Audit and Governance Committee for a period of four years.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Any costs associated with the recruitment, selection, appointment and subsequent disbursements to any Independent Member were met from within existing revenue service budgets. This is an unpaid appointment; the Independent Member will be able to claim travel expenses, which will be covered from the existing budget.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER:

A council's audit committee is established further to the Local Government Acts 1972 and 2000 and its purpose is to give assurance to elected Members and the public about the governance, financial reporting and performance of the Council. The appointment of a non-voting Independent Member on the Audit and Governance Committee will assist and promote good governance and scrutiny by the Committee and the Council.

RISK IMPLICATIONS:

Subject to adequate vetting procedures and adherence to the person specification, this initiative should augment the Audit and Governance Committee's independence, provide additional expertise, and provide an opportunity for the community to play an enhanced role in the governance of the Council.

Contact Officer:

Asmat Hussain, Interim Director of Law and Governance, and Monitoring Officer; Asmat.Hussain@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

Arrangements at other local authorities
CIPFA Guidance

This page is intentionally left blank



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

It is the Council's responsibility to approve changes to the Council's Constitution. Amendments to Executive functions are the responsibility of the Leader and are brought to Council to note.

This report sets out proposed changes to:

- Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions and Scheme of Delegation – Proper Officer Functions (Part 3, Section 3, Part 4).
- Part 6 – Codes and Protocols – Officer Code of Conduct (Part 6 (03)).

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

A recent amendment to Executive functions in relation to the governance of the Basingstoke Canal is brought to Council for noting.

BACKGROUND:

FUNCTIONS FOR APPROVAL BY COUNCIL

Proper Officer Functions

1. At its meeting on 12 July 2022, Council agreed that the Scrutiny Business Manager be appointed as the Statutory Scrutiny Officer for Surrey County Council during the period of the Governance Lead Manager's maternity leave.
2. Following a Democratic Services Management Team restructure in October 2023, the Governance Lead Manager role was deleted and replaced with the Assistant Director – Governance and Democratic Services post. A new Scrutiny Business Manager was appointed in April 2024, and it is therefore proposed that the temporary arrangement set out in paragraph 1 be made permanent.
3. Council is therefore asked to amend Part 3, Section 3, Part 4 of the Constitution to reflect this change as follows:

LOCALISM ACT 2011

Section	Purpose of Appointment	Proper Officer
Sch.2, Pt1, Para.9FB	Designation as Scrutiny Officer	Governance Lead Manager <u>Scrutiny Business Manager</u>

Revised Officer Code of Conduct

4. At its meeting on 9 April 2024, the People, Performance & Development Committee (PPDC) received a report setting out proposed changes to the Council's Officer Code of Conduct, which was last updated in December 2022.
5. The Code of Conduct is published on Our Surrey (SCC Intranet) and also available on the [Surrey County Council website](#) as part of the constitution of the Council. The current published Code of Conduct is dated December 2022.
6. The Officer Code of Conduct is part of the Constitution of the Council. The Code forms part of the Codes and Protocols (Part 6) and includes links to the following related information:
 - Equalities information
 - Drug & Alcohol policy
 - Smokefree policy
 - Conflict of interest guidance
 - Gifts and hospitality policy and guidance
 - Information governance including Data Protection
 - Health & Safety
 - Information Technology and Digital (IT&D) policies
 - Whistleblowing
 - Financial governance
 - Procurement guidelines
 - Disciplinary Policy
 - Personal use of social media guidelines
7. The custodian of the policy is the Director of People and Change. All policies and inter-relationships are centrally reviewed by the HR Policy and Reward Board and Surrey County Council Trades Unions, whose

role it is to act as one body and represent the interests of its constituent bodies and their members in response to SCC proposals.

8. Following the update to the Officer Code of Conduct in December 2022, it was agreed that the Code would be reviewed annually with a view to align with other policy amendments and reflect current working practices.
9. The Officer Code of Conduct has been amended in consultation with Internal Audit and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) team. A full update including Health & Safety and IT&D colleagues was conducted in Winter 2022.
10. An amendment has been made to Paragraph 7.2 (Working with Colleagues), to make reference to the Ending Bullying and Harassment at Work Policy, which was approved by PPDC in March 2023, in order to set out the Council's approach to colleagues who demonstrate poor or threatening behaviour to colleagues.
11. An amendment has been made to Paragraph 7.7 (Equality, Diversity and Inclusion), expanding the wording by setting out the Council's responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010 and providing a link to the EDI page on the Council's public website.
12. PPDC further amended the Officer Code of Conduct by inserting a link to the Council's Domestic Abuse Policy and amending the word "employees" to "officers" throughout the document.
13. The revised Officer Code of Conduct was approved by People, Performance and Development Committee on 9 April 2024.
14. The Officer Code of Conduct forms part of the Constitution and therefore Council is asked to agree the revised document (Annex 1).

FUNCTIONS FOR REPORT TO COUNCIL

Basingstoke Canal Governance

15. The Leader was asked to approve changes to Basingstoke Canal governance and operational model. This included the removal of the BCA's Joint Management Committee (JMC) from the Council's Constitution.
16. The Leader approved these changes on 26 March 2024, and the decision notice is attached as Annex 2. The Council is asked to note for information the Leader's approved changes to Part 3, Section 2 of the Constitution (Responsibility for Functions and Scheme of Delegation) which took effect on 4 April 2024.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. That the amendment to Part 3, Section 3, Part 4 of the Constitution as set out in paragraph 3 of this report be approved.
 - B. That the revised Officer Code of Conduct (Part 6(03)) as set out in Annex 1 to this report be approved.
 - C. That the changes to Part 3, Section 2 of the Constitution (Scheme of Delegation) made by the Leader on 26 March 2024 be noted.
-

Lead/Contact Officers:

Sarah Quinn
Regulatory Business Manager
sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Revised Officer Code of Conduct
Annex 2 – Leader’s Decision Notice – 26 March 2024

Sources/background papers:

Constitution of the Council
Report to Council, 12 July 2022
Report to Leader’s Decision Making Meeting, 26 March 2024
Report to PPDC, 9 April 2024

Surrey County Council

Officer Code of Conduct

Part 6 (03)

This Issue	Last Issue	Review Date
February 2024	Nov 2022	March 2025

Contents

1.	Policy Scope and Purpose.....	3
2.	Introduction	3
3.	Organisational ethics and personal conduct	4
4.	Compliance with instructions	5
5.	Health, safety and wellbeing	5
6.	Governance	5
6.1	Handling and treatment of information relating to the County Council	5
6.2	Declaring personal interests and outside commitments	6
6.3	Declaring related party transactions	7
6.4	Declaring bankruptcy	7
6.5	Whistleblowing.....	8
6.6	Fraud and corruption	8
7.	Working relationships	8
7.1	Working with members	8
7.2	Working with colleagues.....	8
7.3	Working with the local community and service users	9
7.4	Positions of trust	9
7.5	The Press and Media	9
7.6	Political neutrality.....	10
7.7	Equality, Diversity & Inclusion.....	10
8.	Contractors and competitive tendering	11
8.1	Contractors.....	11
8.2	Separation of roles during competitive tendering.....	11
9.	Gifts & Hospitality	12
10.	Use of the Council's materials or resources.....	12
10.2	Information Technology (IT) systems	13
10.3	Intellectual property.....	13
11.	Use of social media	13
12.	Approvals.....	14
13.	If in doubt.....	14
	Glossary of Policies.....	14

1. Policy Scope and Purpose	
Scope and Purpose:	The purpose of this Code is to support the Council's aim to provide high quality services fairly and efficiently in line with its values. There is a Code of conduct for members and there is also protocol which outlines how members and officers work together. All these documents are part of the Council's constitution and are published on the Council's website.
Who uses this Policy:	The Officer Code of Conduct applies to all employees and workers of the Council, including school based employees, agency workers, contractors and their staff whilst working for, or on behalf of, the Council. In this document the term "officer" covers all these groups.
Roles and Responsibilities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line Managers are responsible for ensuring the Code is followed • All officers will be responsible for engaging with and adhering to the Code and related guidance and procedures • Trade Unions will be consulted in regard to the content of the Code • The Human Resources team will be responsible for the Code and providing guidance and direction • The People, Performance and Development Committee is required to approve the Code and onward recommendation to Full Council for inclusion in the constitution
Is there further information available?	<p>The Code refers to a number of supporting policies which are published on SharePoint or Our Surrey.</p> <p>Those which are statutory policies will also be published on the Surrey Education Services Hub</p>

2. Introduction

The public is entitled to expect the highest standards of Conduct from all local government officers. To the public you represent the Council. You are expected to maintain the highest standards of professional competence, knowledge, integrity, confidentiality, financial propriety and personal conduct.

Officers are expected to apply the Code of Conduct and other Council policies to the performance of their duties. The Code should be read alongside your services requirements, legislation and the professional standards which apply to your role.

Where an officer identifies themselves or can be identified as a Surrey County Council officer, the same rules that apply to actions in general apply to conduct online, including on work related, and personal, social media sites.

Officers need to be aware of the standards of behaviour outlined in the Code of Conduct in relation to their conduct outside of work. Any conduct by officers that takes place outside of work, including situations which may affect the Council's reputation or position, will be considered as a disciplinary matter which may involve formal action being taken. For example: you are required to inform your manager of any cautions, arrests or convictions, in respect of any criminal offence as soon as possible, this includes offences under the Road Traffic Act and sanctions from a professional body for misconduct eg. Social Workers, Accountants, Lawyers.

Breaches will be considered as a disciplinary matter which may involve formal action being taken. The code may be taken into account in performance management.

Throughout this policy there are references to a number of Council employment policies. All of these can be found on SharePoint or Our Surrey. Where they are policies required by statute they are available on the Surrey Education Services Hub. If you need any further assistance or clarification, please contact myhelpdesk@surreycc.gov.uk or 020 8541 9000.

3. Organisational ethics and personal conduct

The Council needs to ensure its decisions and operations are open, accountable and in line with recognised ethical standards. Officers of the Council are therefore required to act in accordance with [The Seven Principles of Public Life](#), which are:

Selflessness – Officers are expected to act solely in terms of the public interest;

Integrity – Officers are expected to avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work;

Objectivity – Officers are expected to act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias;

Accountability – Officers are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and required to submit themselves to scrutiny as appropriate;

Openness – Officers are expected to act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should only be withheld from the public if there are clear and lawful reasons to do so;

Honesty – Officers are expected to be truthful. This includes declaring any conflicts of interests and taking steps to resolve such conflicts; and

Leadership – Officers are expected to actively promote and support these principles by applying them to their own behaviour and challenging poor behaviour.

This code is based, and builds, on these seven principles published by [the Committee on Standards in Public Life](#).

The Council expects all officers to behave ethically and maintain high standards of personal conduct to sustain the good reputation of the Council and its services. In doing so officers are expected to be aware of and act in accordance with the Council's values as set out on Our Surrey.

4. Compliance with instructions

The Council expects all officers to comply with lawful written and oral instructions.

This will ensure that we take a consistent approach across the Council in relation to how we procure services and goods, carry out people management activities and how we approach financial management.

The relevant procedures and instructions are published on Our Surrey. Schools are expected to comply with locally adopted policies and procedures.

5. Health, safety, and wellbeing

All officers must take reasonable steps to protect their own health and safety and that of other people who may be affected by their work. Some officers, particularly managers, have specific responsibilities and these are detailed in the Council's safety policies and procedures. The Council's [Health, Safety and Welfare Policy](#) and [Manual](#) is published on Our Surrey.

Officers are expected to report for work in a fit and safe state to carry out their duties. You must not drink alcohol or take drugs at any time whilst at work, including during rest or meal breaks spent at or away from Council premises. Incidents outside working hours that involve intoxicating substances may be considered a disciplinary offence if the incident breaches the Code of Conduct. For further detail about the Council's expectations regarding drugs and alcohol officers should refer to the [Drug and alcohol workplace policy](#) on Our Surrey or Surrey Education Services hub for schools under HR Resources.

The Council is committed to providing a smoke free environment for staff and officers are expected to comply with the Council's [Smokefree workplace policy](#) on Our Surrey.

6. Governance

6.1 Handling and treatment of information relating to the County Council

All officers should be aware as to what information should be made available to Members, government departments, service users and the public; and which information should remain confidential. Any information made available should be provided in a clear and concise way.

Officers should not use any information gained in the course of their employment for personal gain or pass it on to others who might use it in such a

way. Information concerning a service user, resident, officer's or Member's personal affairs should not be divulged without prior approval, except where that disclosure is required or sanctioned by law.

It is important that officers take all relevant steps to comply with data protection requirements and ensure that confidential information is kept secure.

Whilst the organisation is working hard to align strategies to evidence-based findings in terms of relevant data sets to inform strategic activities, it is worth noting that some data may not be available to be shared, if this would mean that individuals and their characteristics, or personal data could be identified. This would contravene UK GDPR regulations.

For further information you should read the Information Governance guidance, available on Our Surrey: [Managing information – your responsibilities](#).

6.2 Declaring personal interests and outside commitments

The Council expects that officers will ensure:

- their private interests or beliefs do not conflict with their professional duties
- their position within the Council is not used to confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person
- they are not involved in, nor influence, any decision or allocation of Council services or resources from which they, their family or friends might benefit.

Officers must declare personal interests where there is, or could be perceived to be, a conflict of interest between their duties as an officer and their membership of any organisation.

Officers should declare their conflict of interest on My Surrey logging system, which ensures the line manager is aware and has to approve the conflict and reassess the situation every 12 months.

Actual or potential conflicts of interest are recorded and reviewed annually

All officers must declare:

- i. Any financial or non-financial interest which could be considered in any way to bring about a conflict with the Council's interests. This includes discussions or correspondence over any private interest with organisations that may have a business connection with the Council
- ii. Membership of any organisation that is not open to the public; requires commitment of allegiance to the organisation to be a member; and which has secrecy about its rules, membership, or conduct
- iii. Membership of any groups, clubs and societies, (including online groups – please see Section 11 regarding Social Media), that an officer believes could be relevant to declare in particular circumstances, especially where a conflict of interest may occur.

- iv. If a relative, partner or close personal friend holds a senior managerial position in an organisation with which the Council does, or seeks to do, business.

If officers have any doubt about whether they need to declare a personal interest or outside commitment, they must discuss the situation with their manager. Their manager will decide what controls should be put in place to mitigate any associated risks and confirm these in writing.

Officers are required to seek written permission from their Assistant Director/Headteacher before engaging in any other work or business which might relate to or impact your duties for the Council. This includes paid or unpaid work. It is important not to take paid or unpaid work which conflicts with the Council's interests. In addition, some officers have contractual restrictions on taking outside employment.

Agency workers who wish to be employed by other organisations at the same time as working for the Council should ensure this is checked by their agency, and that they are not working over the Working Time Directive limits and are having regular breaks to ensure they are fit and well to work.

For further guidance see the [Working Time Policy](#) and [Conflict of Interest](#) guidance on Our Surrey.

6.3 Declaring related party transactions

The Council is required to disclose material transactions with related parties. The requirement aims to provide assurance to readers of financial statements that any material transactions entered into between the organisation and those in a position of power to influence its decisions are disclosed and above board.

Officers must declare annually:

- i. Positions of influence they hold within partnerships, companies, trusts or any entities providing services to the Council/School
- ii. Positions of influence they hold (in a personal capacity) within organisations receiving grant funding from the Council/School

Declarations extend to a relative or partner of the officer if they have an interest in any such organisation.

6.4 Declaring bankruptcy

Bankruptcy may impact on the duties of officers who have a financial responsibility. Such officers must inform the relevant Assistant Director/Headteacher if they are declared bankrupt or are involved as a Director of a company which is wound up or put into voluntary liquidation, if it may potentially impact upon your role and duties. The purpose of the declaration is to ensure that a proper framework of support for the officer is in place.

6.5 Whistleblowing

The Council is committed to the highest possible standards of honesty, openness, probity and accountability. We seek to conduct our affairs in a responsible manner, ensure that our activities are openly and effectively managed, and maintain our integrity and principles of public interest disclosure.

In line with this commitment, where you become aware of activities which that you believe to be illegal, improper, unethical, or otherwise inconsistent with this code you are encouraged to report the matter in line with the Council's confidential reporting procedure – see the [Whistleblowing policy](#) on Our Surrey or Surrey Education Services hub via School Business Manager.

Officers who raise matters of concern in this way have specific protections afforded them under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998.

6.6 Fraud and corruption

Officers have an important role in the Council's strategy against fraud and corruption. All officers need to understand their responsibilities and duties in regard to the prevention and reporting of suspected fraud and corruption as outlined in the [Council's Strategy Against Fraud and Corruption](#), which is published on the Council's website.

7. Working relationships

Relationships with colleagues, service users and contractors should be conducted in a professional, courteous and respectful manner. Officers are expected to treat others with fairness and dignity at all times and to work to resolve differences where these exist.

The Council will not tolerate any form of harassment, bullying, victimisation or discrimination against service users, residents, colleagues, other officers or job applicants.

7.1 Working with members

Mutual respect between officers and members is essential to good local government. Close personal familiarity between officers and individual members can damage the relationship and should therefore be avoided.

For further information about working relationships between officers and members please see the Members/Officers protocol published on the Council's website.

7.2 Working with colleagues

Officers are expected to treat colleagues and those with whom they come into contact in the course of their work with fairness and respect.

[The Ending Bullying and Harassment Policy](#) defines bullying and harassment which is published on Our Surrey.

In order to avoid any accusation of bias, officers should not be involved in an appointment, nor any decision relating to discipline, promotion or any pay adjustments or conditions of another officer, or prospective officer to whom they are related or have a close personal relationship.

7.3 Working with the local community and service users

Officers should ensure professional, courteous, efficient and impartial service delivery to all. Officers should be especially sensitive in dealing with vulnerable children and adults.

7.4 Positions of trust

Officers should ensure they maintain professional standards and do not abuse, or appear to abuse, their position of trust in the way they conduct their relationships with service users/pupils/contractors, their families or carers.

Specific examples of conduct which should be avoided include, but are not limited to:

- meeting socially with pupils or service users (or their carers or families); and/or
- exchanging personal contact details or connecting using social media; or
- engaging in activity or associating with people outside work whose current or past conduct could raise doubts or concerns about your integrity or ability to be in a 'position of trust' with regard to children or vulnerable adults.

7.5 The Press and Media

Officers must not deal directly with the press or the media in relation to anything related to Council business unless it is part of their role, or they have been expressly authorised by your Assistant Director/ Headteacher.

If an officer speaks as a private individual directly to the press or at a public meeting or other situation where their remarks may be reported to the press, they must take reasonable steps to ensure nothing said might lead the public to think they are acting in their capacity as a Council officer.

An officer should not make an endorsement in their work capacity, through press channels, or on social media, regarding an external organisation which might infer a corporate endorsement on behalf of Surrey County Council.

Trade Unions and their elected and accredited representatives may be approached by the media for comments or interviews on a particular issue. In such cases the representative must make it clear that they are doing so in their capacity as a representative of that union and not as a Surrey County Council officer and that their comments may not represent the views/policy of the council

7.6 Political neutrality

- i. Members are elected to direct the policies and activities of Surrey County Council. Officers should ensure they serve all members, not just those of the controlling group, and respect their individual rights.
- ii. Officers should ensure that their own personal or political opinions should not interfere with any policy of the authority. Where officers advise political groups, they are expected to be politically neutral.
- iii. Officers may not, by law be an elected member of the authority in which they are employed.

(Political assistants appointed on fixed term contracts in accordance with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 are exempt from political neutrality).

Certain posts are designated as politically restricted by the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. An officer's contract of employment will tell them whether they hold one of these posts and, if they do, they will be required by law to observe certain restrictions regarding their out of work activities

The political activities which are restricted for these posts include:

- standing as a Member of Parliament, Member of the European Parliament or a Councillor in any local authority (other than a Parish Council)
- holding office in a political party at any level, (except in limited roles concerned only with the internal membership of the party)
- canvassing at elections
- speaking in public or publishing any written or artistic work which appears to be intended to influence public support for a political party.

Officers need to be aware of their position in terms of political activity. If they are not sure whether an activity is subject to 'political activity restrictions', they should seek advice from their line manager, who will consult the Executive Director or Monitoring Officer if necessary.

Violation of the statutory rules is a breach of contract and will render them liable for investigation and possible disciplinary action under the Council's Disciplinary Procedure.

For further information see the [politically restricted posts positions](#) on Our Surrey.

7.7 Equality, Diversity & Inclusion

The Council is committed to creating a workplace that is inclusive and compassionate, where we value diversity and can be ourselves at work.

The Council sets out our commitment to the principles of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and all staff are expected to demonstrate commitment to these principles in carrying out their work.

The Council is bound by the Equality Act 2010 which protects any person from being discriminated against or harassed on the basis of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage of civil partnership status, pregnancy or maternity, race or ethnicity, religion or belief, sex, or sexual orientation. All staff are responsible for helping Surrey County Council to meet its obligations under the Equality Act which include:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advancing equality of opportunity
- Fostering good relations between groups of people with different protected characteristics

[Equality, diversity and inclusion - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk)

8. Contractors and competitive tendering

Contractors may include individuals who are temporarily working alongside Council officers, or officers of an external firm that has been awarded a contract to provide services on behalf of the Council. All contractors should be treated with courtesy and respect.

8.1 Contractors

Orders and contracts must be awarded by fair and open competition against other tenders. No special favour should be shown to businesses with particular connections to officers.

Officers should declare any relationship with a particular contractor, or any potential contractors, to the Assistant Director /Headteacher and should not participate in any buying activity where these Conflicts of Interest could arise. See the [Procurement standing orders](#) for further information.

If officers wish to tender for a contract from the Council, they must declare such an intention to the appropriate Assistant Director / Headteacher, at the earliest possible opportunity.

8.2 Separation of roles during competitive tendering

- i. Officers should be clear on the separation of client and contractor roles. Senior officers who have both a client/contractor responsibility must be aware of the need for accountability and openness.
- ii. Officers privy to confidential information on tenders of costs relating to contractors should not disclose the information to any unauthorised party or organisation.
- iii. Officers should ensure no special favour is shown to current or recent former officers, or associates, in awarding contracts.

9. Gifts & Hospitality

It is essential that the public can be confident that decisions are made for proper reasons and are not influenced by the interests of individual officers, their relatives or friends.

The Council expects officers, including those seconded to other organisations, to refuse offers of gifts and hospitality. Such offers should only be accepted in exceptional circumstances, where there is a clear justification for doing so and where this has been formally approved in advance.

For reasons of integrity and transparency, the gifts and hospitality requirements extend to the spouse, partner and immediate family of officers, where the provider is a business partner or associate of the Council.

Gifts & hospitality that have been offered, whether accepted, declined or accepted and passed on to charity, must be registered on the My Surrey system or the school's local register.

For further detail and information about what needs to be recorded see [Gifts and hospitality policy](#) on Our Surrey or Surrey Education Service hub under HR Resources.

10. Use of the Council's materials or resources

Officers are expected to use public funds entrusted to them in a responsible manner and should not make personal use of any Council resources unless authorised to do so.

10.1 Property and resources

Council property, materials and resources should be used solely in respect of its work. No improper use should be made of any facility such as vehicles, equipment, stationery or other services which the Council provides for its own business.

The Council recognises that there are times when calls must be made during working hours, for emergencies or to utility companies, for example. Reasonable usage of the telephone in these cases is permissible, but officers are expected to keep the length of call to the minimum possible.

Use of mobile phones is permitted for users who have been issued with a SCC mobile, for making work calls and logging of expenses, annual leave, sickness absence and any other work-related affairs.

Mobile phones must not be used whilst driving, unless the appropriate hands-free equipment is used, and it is essential and safe to do so.

A satnav can distract a driver physically through the manual entry of their destination details, visually, by looking at the electronic map or cognitively when the driver focuses their attention on listening to, or carrying out the instructions, or entering their destination into the system whilst driving.

It is important that drivers understand how best to use their satnav and learn not to use it when it may be dangerous to do so. Drivers should always input their destination details or update the sat nav system whilst stationary and not whilst driving.

For further information please see [Section D of the Health & Safety Manual](#)

10.2 Information Technology (IT) systems

The Council has an obligation and legal responsibility to ensure that the IT system is used appropriately and is not misused. We monitor use to ensure that misuse or abuse of the facility is identified. All officers are required to comply with the [IT and Information Security policies](#), procedures and published guidance on Our Surrey and locally in schools.

Whilst SCC fully supports agile working and recognises that more officers are not working full time from SCC premises, it is essential that SCC laptops are only used for SCC work and that they are not used for private or other external use, school staff should follow local guidance.

10.3 Intellectual property

Officers should be aware that "intellectual property" such as ideas, documents, software, etc. created during their employment belong to the Council. Any invention, improvement or design made or conceived by them while they are engaged to work for the Council which is in the existing, or contemplated, scope of the business of the Council shall become and remain the exclusive property of the Council.

Officers must also make sure that they do not breach the copyright held by others and thereby expose the Council to the risk of claims. If they wish to copy the work of others they should ensure that they comply with copyright law, seeking advice from their manager if they are unsure.

11. Use of social media

Officers need to be aware that posting information or views about local government or politics in general may not be isolated from your working life, if you have identified yourself as an officer of the Council.

If you have a personal account, you are advised to abide by its terms and conditions and read the advice it offers on using your social site.

The image they project on social media may adversely reflect on the image of the Council. We recommend that when they use social media that they remember our values.

If they identify themselves as an officer of the Council, or if they can be identified as an officer of the Council, ensure any communication that they make will not:

- bring the organisation into disrepute or seriously affect public confidence in its ability to deliver effective services, for example by

criticising the Council's decisions and/or activities connected with their own work

- breach confidentiality, for example by:
 - revealing confidential information owned by the organisation;
- be considered discriminatory against, or bullying or harassment of, any individual, for example by:
 - making offensive or derogatory comments
- breach the Council's Code of Conduct, its policies, its procedures and political neutrality.

Trade Unions and their elected and accredited representatives may be approached through social media for comments on a particular issue. In such cases the representative must make it clear that they are doing so in their capacity as a representative of that union and not as a Surrey County Council officer and that their comments may not represent the views/policy of the council.

12. Approvals

Where Assistant Directors, Directors, and Executive Directors require approval or notification under the Code then this shall respectively be obtained from the appropriate Directors, Executive Directors, or the Chief Executive. The Chief Executive will obtain approval from either the Monitoring Officer, or the Section 151 Officer.

Where a Head teacher requires approval under the code then this will be obtained from the Chair of Governors.

13. If in doubt

It is not possible to cover every situation an officer of the Council may face. If they are in any doubt about anything contained within this code or are concerned about anything relating to their personal position, they should speak to their line manager.

GLOSSARY OF POLICIES

The Seven Principles of Public Life

[Health, Safety and Welfare Policy](#)

Health and Safety [Manual](#)

[Drug and alcohol workplace policy](#)

[Smoke free workplace policy](#)

[Managing information – your responsibilities](#)

[Working Time Policy](#)

[Conflict of Interest](#)

[Whistleblowing policy](#)

[Council's Strategy Against Fraud and Corruption](#)

[Domestic Abuse Policy](#)

[Ending Bullying and Harassment](#)

[politically restricted positions](#)

[Procurement standing orders](#)

[Gifts and hospitality policy](#)

[Section D of the Health & Safety Manual](#)

[IT and Information Security](#)

[policieshttps://www.local.gov.uk/publications/core-code-ethics-fire-and-rescue-services-england](https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/core-code-ethics-fire-and-rescue-services-england)

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEMBER DECISION

Decision:

BASINGSTOKE CANAL

(i) Details of decision

The Leader of the Council:

1. Approved the changes in the governance model of the Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA) as detailed in the report.
2. Approved the removal of the BCA's Joint management Committee from Surrey County Council's constitution.
3. Delegated authority to the Executive Director of Environment, Infrastructure and Growth, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Head of Legal Services, to agree and enter into the necessary Memorandums of Understanding, Memorandums of Agreement, Agreements and arrangements with partners to deliver the updated governance.
4. Delegated authority, subject to the usual limits on officer decision making authority, to the Executive Director of Environment, Infrastructure and Growth in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to exercise all functions in relation to the management and maintenance of the Basingstoke Canal as an environmental navigational asset and the balancing of the interests of all users of the Basingstoke Canal and the conservation of the natural environment

This decision is made in the context of Surrey County Council's role as one of two landowning authorities for the Basingstoke Canal (alongside Hampshire County Council) and following the approval of a parallel decision by the Executive Member of Hampshire County Council these changes shall come into effect from 1st April 2024.

(ii) Reasons for decision

The current operation of the Basingstoke Canal is not financially sustainable, and existing governance and operating arrangements do not allow for either of the landowning authorities responsible for the Canal (Surrey County Council and Hampshire County Council), to take action to make the operation sustainable. The recommendations in this report to review and revise the governance model to facilitate good decision making is the first stage to enabling both authorities to address issues in relation to financial sustainability.

(iii) Details of any alternative options considered and rejected

None,

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

Paul Deach, Deputy Cabinet Member to the Leader of the Council, attended the meeting. The Deputy Cabinet Member spoke briefly on the benefits of the Basingstoke Canal and noted his role as Vice-Chairman of the Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee.

Conflicts of Interest and any Dispensations Granted

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

None.

Decision taken by:

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

Date of Decision: 26 March 2024

Date of Publication of Record of Decision: 27 March 2024

Date decision effective (i.e. 5 working days after date of publication of record of decision unless subject to call-in by the relevant Select Committee): 4 April 2024

County Council Meeting – 21 May 2024

REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Cabinet met on 26 March 2024 and 23 April 2024.

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 18. 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 20 May 2024).

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

RECOMMENDATIONS ON POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

There were no reports with recommendations for Council.

REPORTS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

At its meeting on 26 March 2024 Cabinet considered:

A. SURREY INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN – PHASE 5 SCHEMES

The Surrey Infrastructure Plan and associated prioritization framework was approved by Cabinet in February 2021. This report recommends the approval of a further phase of schemes to be implemented, identifies additional schemes requiring further development, and provides a brief update on the status of the earlier phases which have been approved by Cabinet.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet agree the implementation of the Surrey Infrastructure Plan Phase 5 projects identified in this report and set out in Appendix 1, within the approved budget envelope, subject to the final business case for each scheme being approved by the Capital Programme Panel.
2. That Cabinet agree the implementation of the Surrey Flood Alleviation Programme 2024/25 to 2025/26 as identified in this report and set out in Appendix 4a, within the approved budget envelope, subject to the final business case for each scheme being approved by the Capital Programme Panel.
3. That Cabinet agree the implementation of the Smallfield and Reigate Flood Alleviation scheme as identified in this report and set out in Appendix 4b,

within the approved budget envelope, subject to the final business case for each scheme being approved by the Capital Programme Panel.

4. That Cabinet agree to delegate the development and delivery of the schemes to the Executive Director for Environment, Infrastructure & Growth, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure.

Reasons for decisions:

The recommendations will enable the continued development and delivery of infrastructure schemes that meet a wide range of outcomes and demonstrate deliverability and affordability. They enable the implementation of the fifth phase of SIP schemes and the development of a continuous pipeline of projects that require further feasibility work. The process is intended to remain dynamic with new schemes added to the long list as they are identified. A continuous programme of schemes will be developed taking them from concept through to delivery identifying suitable funding opportunities as they progress.

B. CHENNESTONE PRIMARY SCHOOL - ROOF REPLACEMENT WORKS

Cabinet was asked to approve capital funding for essential works at Chennestone Primary School, Manor Lane, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 5ED.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding allocated within the School Capital Maintenance Budget for the Minor Capital Works (MCW) Programme of FY2024/25 to replace the roof coverings and water tanks, remove asbestos, undertake structural repairs, and carry out any other associated work for essential condition improvement works to Chennestone Primary School, Sunbury-on-Thames. The capital funding required is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate construction partners to carry out the works in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of construction partners, the Executive Director for Environment, Infrastructure & Growth and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +5% of the budgetary tolerance level.
4. That Cabinet authorises Legal Services to seal any awarded contract where required.

Reasons for decisions:

Approving the recommendations in this report will enable the Council to:

- Provide a dry, warm and safe learning and working environment for the school's pupils and staff.
- Support the school's operational activities and the children's education.
- Improve the building's energy efficiency and contribute to the Council's NZC target.
- Maintain and protect the building, providing a fit for purpose building for future years.
- Reduce the maintenance burden for the Council and school.

At its meeting on 23 April 2024 Cabinet considered:

C. KALIMA GYPSY ROMA TRAVELLER CAMP, WOKING

This report asked Cabinet to approve funding from the Capital Maintenance Budget to undertake the renewal of 15 utility blocks as well as associated services, civil and drainage works at Kalima Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) Camp, Woking.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding to renew 15 utility blocks and undertake associated drainage and civil works at the Kalima GRT Camp, Woking. The capital funding required to develop the new facilities is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate supply chain partners to deliver the design, build and fit out of the new structures in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of supply chain partners, the Executive Director for Environment, Infrastructure and Growth and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +/-10% of the budgetary tolerance level and any other legal documentation required to facilitate the approvals within this report.
4. That Cabinet authorises Legal Services to seal any awarded contracts where required.

Reasons for decisions:

The decisions recommended in this report will contribute to enabling the Council to:

- Provide much-needed, safe and suitable utility blocks for the circa one hundred adults and children who are tenants and residents on site.
- Make an essential contribution towards the Council's strategic objective to tackle health inequality, in line with the 2030 Community Vision to ensure no-one is left behind.

- Support the partnership between the Council and District and Borough Councils to improve and provide accommodation and facilities for the permanent GRT community.
- Under the Race Relations Act 2000 and The Equality Act 2010, the GRT community is entitled to the same services as those in the housed community, including the right to occupy premises that are fit for use. This includes accessible and suitable utility blocks.

D. YOUR FUND SURREY- THE HASLEMERE LINK COMMUNITY HUB

This report set out the Your Fund Surrey application from the Haslemere Link Community Hub for the consideration of Cabinet.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet agree to fund the full amount requested of £1,000,000 comprised of:
 - £1,000,000 of capital funding towards transforming the Haslemere Link Community Hub, to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend.
 - Including 5% to be held by SCC (Surrey County Council) until final evidence of income, expenditure, and final completion such as building control sign-off.

Reasons for decisions:

The project aims to transform an existing community building (the Link) in the East of Haslemere into a larger, more useable space and, in addition, to create smaller meeting areas to meet increasing demand.

E. ASH VALE COMMUNITY WELLBEING MEETING PLACE AND NEW SCOUT HEADQUARTERS

This report set out the key information on the Ash Vale Community Wellbeing Meeting Place and New Scout Headquarters, Your Fund Surrey application for the consideration of the Cabinet.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet agrees to fund project CF259 for the full amount requested of £606,443 comprised of:
 - £606,443 of capital funding towards the development of the new building, outside area and bicycle storage to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend.
 - Including 5% to be held by SCC until final evidence is provided of income and expenditure, evaluation and completion (such as building control sign-off).

Reasons for decisions:

The project aims to turn an existing end-of-life scout hut, currently not fit for purpose, into a modern and accessible community hub adjacent to an identified SCC Key Neighbourhood. Existing nearby community buildings are at capacity during the day so the new hub would provide much-needed extra capacity for community groups.

F. QUARTERLY REPORT ON DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER SPECIAL URGENCY ARRANGEMENTS: 12 March 2024 - 13 May 2024

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 has been ONE urgent decision since the last Cabinet report to Council.

1. Chennestone Primary School - Roof Replacement Works: Cabinet, 26 March 2024

**Tim Oliver, Leader of the Council
13 May 2024**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 26 MARCH 2024 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
Jordan Beech
*Steve Bax

Members in attendance:

Catherine Baart, Local Member for Earlswood and Reigate South
Catherine Powell, Residents' Association and Independent Group
Leader

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

38/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Jordan Beech.

39/24 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 27 FEBRUARY 2024 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

40/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

41/241 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

41/24 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were three member questions. The questions and responses were published in a supplement to the agenda. It was agreed that the member questions would be taken with Item 5, the Select Committee report on the referred council motion 'Advertising & Sponsorship Policy'.

42/24 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

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

43/24 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

44/24 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

45/24 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

The referred council motion 'Advertising & Sponsorship Policy' report was introduced by the Chairman of the Greener Futures Reference Group who confirmed that the Group was unanimous in its view that the current advertising policy did not support the council's greener future agenda and ambitions. The Group was of the view that it was undesirable to enable advertising for commercial benefit by companies or products in direct opposition to the Council's net zero goals and aims. The length of the contracts for large and small format advertising were queried.

The Cabinet Member Highways, Transport and Economic Growth stated that he would be happy to send the member details of the advertising contracts. There was recognition around the importance of the Council's net zero goals and aims. If the council was to accept the recommendations of the Group it would impact the council's income stream and advertising for council services such as the bus service which is valued by residents. The Cabinet Member for Environment stated that she did not believe it was right to interfere with the current contracts for advertising and explained that strict guidelines around advertising were set by the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) whom she would contact asking them to consider whether guidance could be formed around the advertising of fossil fuels and high carbon products.

Catherine Baart asked if the Cabinet Member Highways, Transport and Economic Growth thought it would be appropriate to see a flight being advertised on a billboard in Surrey and if the new advertising space could be used to support green companies based in Surrey. The Cabinet Member explained that the council would be leasing sections of the highways for advertising and would not be owning the advertising boards. The ASA had a set criteria of what is acceptable for advertising. As a result the council could not dictate what should or should not be advertised. The Cabinet Member welcomed advertising space being used by green companies based in Surrey.

The Leader noted that the Council was taking a leading role in the greener futures agenda and asked for the Cabinet Member for Environment to write to the relevant Minister around future plans to tighten advertising guidance in relation to fossil fuels.

The Surrey Utilities – Water and Wastewater Services report was introduced by the Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee. The Chairman gave an overview of the work that been undertaken and the witnesses that been engaged. The Chairman briefed the Cabinet on the Committee’s conclusions and recommendations. The report was welcomed by the Cabinet Member for Environment who acknowledged the positive work that had been done by the committee. There were known issues with utilities companies and it was positive to see the committee on the front foot trying to resolve these issues. The Cabinet recognised the value of the work undertaken by the committee.

RESOLVED:

That the Referred Council Motion ‘Advertising & Sponsorship Policy’ report and the Surrey Utilities – Water and Wastewater Services report be noted along with the Cabinet response.

46/24 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

There were three decisions for noting. The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning explained that one decision related to the determining of a statutory notice to bring into effect the formal commencement to change the age range and extend the premises at St Paul’s CofE Infant School whilst the other related to the approval of the use of £3.33m for Guildford County School’s new mainstream SEN Unit which would create permanent accommodation for 25 additional state-maintained specialist school places in Surrey from September 2025 onwards.

RESOLVED:

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

47/24 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources who made the following points:

- Key focus had been on developing the 2024/25 budget and MTFS. The council was in a robust financial position. Work was being done to develop the 2025/26 revenue and capital budgets.
- In January, Grant Thornton presented their Annual Audit Report for 2022/23 to the Audit & Governance Committee. The assessment focuses on three areas: financial sustainability, governance and improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Grant Thornton expressed opinion that the Council had strong arrangements in place and that the findings in their report were in contrast to reports relating to many other local authorities in the current climate.
- There was a focus on AI capabilities and how AI could address some of the challenges facing the council. Aida, the MySurrey chatbot had successfully reduced the number of queries coming through and had also reduced pressure on the support teams allowing them to focus on more complex questions.
- The Cabinet Member apologised for the inconvenience and distress caused by the implementation of Unit 4 stating that teething issues should be expected with the introduction of a brand new system.
- The Cabinet Member had been involved in the purchase of Victoria Gate in Woking and was looking forward to working with the agile team to understand the buildings capacity.
- Thanks was given to the Interim CEX Leigh Whitehouse who would be leaving the council to join West Sussex County Council as CEX. Leigh's work in turning around the council's financial position was recognised.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month update be noted.

48/24 SURREY INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN - PHASE 5 SCHEMES [Item 8]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure who explained that Cabinet were being asked to agree the implementation of the Surrey Infrastructure Plan Phase 5 projects within the approved budget envelope, subject to the final business case for each scheme being approved by the Capital Programme Panel. Cabinet were also being asked to agree the implementation of the Surrey Flood Alleviation Programme 2024/25 to

2025/26. The Cabinet Member briefly described each of the projects contained in Phase 5.

Members welcomed the report and endorsed the projects within Phase 5. The projects were welcomed by local residents and demonstrated investment in the county. There was recognition that the Surrey Infrastructure Plan had benefited the county and residents.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agree the implementation of the Surrey Infrastructure Plan Phase 5 projects identified in this report and set out in Appendix 1, within the approved budget envelope, subject to the final business case for each scheme being approved by the Capital Programme Panel.
2. That Cabinet agree the implementation of the Surrey Flood Alleviation Programme 2024/25 to 2025/26 as identified in this report and set out in Appendix 4a, within the approved budget envelope, subject to the final business case for each scheme being approved by the Capital Programme Panel.
3. That Cabinet agree the implementation of the Smallfield and Reigate Flood Alleviation scheme as identified in this report and set out in Appendix 4b, within the approved budget envelope, subject to the final business case for each scheme being approved by the Capital Programme Panel.
4. That Cabinet agree to delegate the development and delivery of the schemes to the Executive Director for Environment, Infrastructure & Growth, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure.

Reasons for Decisions:

The recommendations will enable the continued development and delivery of infrastructure schemes that meet a wide range of outcomes and demonstrate deliverability and affordability. They enable the implementation of the fifth phase of SIP schemes and the development of a continuous pipeline of projects that require further feasibility work. The process is intended to remain dynamic with new schemes added to the long list as they are identified. A continuous programme of schemes will be developed taking them from concept through to delivery identifying suitable funding opportunities as they progress.

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

49/24 CHENNESTONE PRIMARY SCHOOL - ROOF REPLACEMENT WORKS [Item 9]

The report asked Cabinet to approve capital funding for essential works at Chennestone Primary School, Manor Lane, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 5ED. The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure explained that work was required to improve the condition of the school's flat roofing, thereby safeguarding the health and safety of pupils and staff, mitigating the impact on the school's operational activities and the children's education whilst improving the school's overall energy efficiency. The Leader queried if there were any Surrey school buildings with RAAC (Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete) issues. The Cabinet Member stated that the school in question did not have any RAAC issues and that the school estate had been thoroughly investigated with only one primary school flagging with RAAC concerns.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding allocated within the School Capital Maintenance Budget for the Minor Capital Works (MCW) Programme of FY2024/25 to replace the roof coverings and water tanks, remove asbestos, undertake structural repairs, and carry out any other associated work for essential condition improvement works to Chennestone Primary School, Sunbury-on-Thames. The capital funding required is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.
2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate construction partners to carry out the works in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of construction partners, the Executive Director for Environment, Infrastructure & Growth and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +5% of the budgetary tolerance level.
4. That Cabinet authorises Legal Services to seal any awarded contract where required.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approving the recommendations in this report will enable the Council to:

- Provide a dry, warm and safe learning and working environment for the school's pupils and staff.

- Support the school's operational activities and the children's education.
- Improve the building's energy efficiency and contribute to the Council's NZC target.
- Maintain and protect the building, providing a fit for purpose building for future years.
- Reduce the maintenance burden for the Council and school.

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

50/24 2023/24 MONTH 10 (JANUARY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 10]

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources explained that at Month 10 the Council was forecasting an overspend of £4m against the 2023/24 revenue budget, after the application of the contingency budget. This was an £0.7m deterioration since Month 9. The overspend relates to pressures on care package budgets due to demand and market pressures and the forecast impact of assessed fees & charges debt across the year in Adult Social Care. There was also further increases in Home to School Travel Assistance and additional costs for children in Education placements within Children Services. At Month 10, capital expenditure of £269.1m was forecast for 2023/24, a variance of £0.8m more than the re-set budget of £268.3m. This was a decrease of £1.8m from the forecast at M9. The Council had assessed its reserve levels and believes they are resilient and robust.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue budget (after the application of the full contingency budget) and capital budget positions for the year.

Reasons for Decision:

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

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

51/24 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 11]

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.

52/24 CHENNESTONE PRIMARY SCHOOL - ROOF REPLACEMENT WORKS [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure introduced a Part 2 report which contained information which was exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of Paragraph 3: information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding of [E-03-24] allocated within the School Capital Maintenance Budget for the Minor Capital Works (MCW) Programme of FY2024/25 to replace roof coverings and water tanks, remove asbestos, undertake structural repairs, and carry out any other associated work for essential condition improvement works to Chennestone Primary School, Sunbury-on-Thames.
2. See Minute 49/24.
3. See Minute 49/24.
4. See Minute 49/24.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approving the recommendations in this report will enable the Council to:

- Provide a dry, warm and safe learning and working environment for the school's pupils and staff.
- Support the school's operational activities and the children's education.
- Improve the building's energy efficiency and contribute to the Council's NZC target.
- Maintain and protect the building, providing a fit for purpose building for future years.
- Reduce the maintenance burden for the Council and school.

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

53/24 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

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 23 APRIL 2024 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
- *Steve Bax

Members in attendance:

Carla Morson, Local Member for Ash
Catherine Powell, Residents' Association and Independent Group Leader

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

54/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were no apologies.

55/24 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 26 MARCH 2024 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

56/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 10 explaining that her family members were members of the Epsom hockey club.

57/241 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

57/24 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were none.

58/24 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were none.

59/24 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

60/24 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

61/24 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

There were none.

62/24 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

There were seven decisions for noting.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing explained how the decision-making process had been changed and agreed with the Committees in Common Sub Committee however he suggested that the paper would have to be amended and returned to the Committees in Common Sub Committee for ratification to include confirmation that any decision would be signed off by the relevant Cabinet Member / the Leader.

The Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities briefed the Cabinet on the Your Fund Surrey projects that had been agreed. The Leader explained that he had taken a decision regarding the governance of the Basingstoke Canal Authority. The Cabinet Member to the Leader explained that there was cross party support from the district and boroughs on the changes to the governance model.

RESOLVED:

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

63/24 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Fire, Rescue and Resilience who made the following points:

- Investment in Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) continues with redevelopment works at Chobham, Lingfield, and Reigate Fire Stations due to start in Summer 2024. The Wray Park Training Centre will see works begin in 2025 to construct a new, greener, fire house and new training facilities.
- His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) revisited SFRS in February to review the actions carried out in response to the Cause of Concern related to our

protection work. The Inspectorate said that the service needs to do more to assure itself that its risk-based Inspection programme prioritises the highest risks and includes proportionate activity to reduce risk. The cause of concern had now been removed. HMICFRS stated that Surrey had fully reviewed the risk based inspection programme as a comprehensive plan and had complete commitment from the service. The Cabinet Member stated that this was positive feedback but only the start of the journey.

- It had been a busy start to the year for the Emergency Planning team with several weather-related incidents, business continuity issues and an unprecedented closure of the M25. In January, Storm Henk lead to widespread flooding across the county. The team was involved with daily calls with Local Resilience Forum partners to ensure we were able to respond to the issues affecting residents.
- Prevent (Counter Terrorism): The Cabinet Member explained that the UK threat level remained Substantial. The Counter Terrorism Policing network are working on more than 800 investigations nationally, and since March 2017 Counter Terrorism Policing and UK Intelligence Services have disrupted 39 late-stage attacks. The council organised monthly Channel Panel meetings to identify, safeguard, and provide early intervention and diversion for individuals at risk of being drawn into terrorism, as well as working with statutory partners to oversee county-wide Prevent delivery, evaluate our impact, agree and update risk assessments and progress partnership plans. The Leader queried the council's role with Prevent. The Cabinet Member explained that the council had a statutory role to engage with the Prevent strategy.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month update be noted.

64/24 KALIMA GYPSY ROMA TRAVELLER CAMP, WOKING [Item 8]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure who explained that Cabinet was being asked to approve funding from the Capital Maintenance Budget to undertake the renewal of 15 utility blocks as well as associated services, civil and drainage works at Kalima Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) Camp, Woking. The fabric and structure of the existing 15 utility blocks were in poor condition, with various elements at the end of their useful life. Around 100 hundred adults and children lived on the site. It was noted that the GRT community faced social exclusion and discrimination and the proposed scheme would align with the council's guiding mission that No One is Left Behind, addressing inequality through prevention and early intervention to help ensure an Empowered & Thriving Community. The Leader noted the importance of upgrading the existing GRT sites.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet approves capital funding to renew 15 utility blocks and undertake associated drainage and civil works at the Kalima GRT Camp, Woking. The capital funding required to develop the new facilities is commercially sensitive at this time and is set out in the Part 2 report.

2. That Cabinet approves procurement of appropriate supply chain partners to deliver the design, build and fit out of the new structures in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Standing Orders.
3. That Cabinet notes that, regarding the procurement of supply chain partners, the Executive Director for Environment, Infrastructure and Growth and the Director of Land and Property are authorised to award such contracts, up to +/-10% of the budgetary tolerance level and any other legal documentation required to facilitate the approvals within this report.
4. That Cabinet authorises Legal Services to seal any awarded contracts where required.

Reasons for Decisions:

The decisions recommended in this report will contribute to enabling the Council to:

- Provide much-needed, safe and suitable utility blocks for the circa one hundred adults and children who are tenants and residents on site.
- Make an essential contribution towards the Council's strategic objective to tackle health inequality, in line with the 2030 Community Vision to ensure no-one is left behind.
- Support the partnership between the Council and District and Borough Councils to improve and provide accommodation and facilities for the permanent GRT community.
- Under the Race Relations Act 2000 and The Equality Act 2010, the GRT community is entitled to the same services as those in the housed community, including the right to occupy premises that are fit for use. This includes accessible and suitable utility blocks.

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

65/24 YOUR FUND SURREY APPLICATION - ASH VALE COMMUNITY WELLBEING MEETING PLACE AND NEW SCOUT HEADQUARTERS [Item 9]

The report set out the key information on the Ash Vale Community Wellbeing Meeting Place And New Scout Headquarters, Your Fund Surrey application for the consideration of the Cabinet. The Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities explained that the Cabinet was being asked to approve £606,443 of capital funding towards the development of the project which would demolish a 1960s, prefabricated, reinforced concrete building, in very poor condition, and replace it with a new energy efficient community building and scout headquarters, outside area and bicycle storage. The project would complement and enhance existing community facilities, with a focus on youth and the elderly. The 1st Ash Vale Scout Group was a registered charity with a long history of working in the local communities of Ash Vale and Ash.

The local member, Carla Morson attended the meeting and spoke in support of the application stating that the Scout Group had a long and positive history within the community. The current building was in a poor condition and a new energy efficient building was welcomed. The project was welcomed by the local community and would help tackle deprivation. The Deputy Cabinet Member to the Leader explained that his division neighboured the Ash Vale Community Wellbeing Meeting Place And New Scout Headquarters and was well utilised by residents in his local community.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agrees to fund project CF259 for the full amount requested of £606,443 comprised of:
 - £606,443 of capital funding towards the development of the new building, outside area and bicycle storage to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend
 - Including 5% to be held by SCC until final evidence is provided of income and expenditure, evaluation and completion (such as building control sign-off).

Reasons for Decisions:

This application has been the subject of a rigorous assessment process by officers, as set out in the body of this report. Officers consider the project to meet the aims and published criteria of the fund and to satisfy the requirements to award funding.

The project aims to turn an existing end-of-life scout hut, currently not fit for purpose, into a modern and accessible community hub adjacent to an identified SCC Key Neighbourhood. Existing nearby community buildings are at capacity during the day so the new hub would provide much-needed extra capacity for community groups.

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

66/24 YOUR FUND SURREY APPLICATION - EPSOM SPORTS CLUB OLD SCHOOLS LANE PAVILION [Item 10]

The report sets out the Your Fund Surrey application for the Epsom Sports Club Old Schools Lane Pavilion. Cabinet was being asked to approve £1,000,000 of capital funding towards the development of the pavilion. This was 44% of the overall project costs. The remaining monies needed for the project had been raised or are expected from various sources. Funding was now being sought to contribute towards Phase 2 which is for a new Clubhouse and associated car parking at the Old Schools Lane site to provide the space and facilities for local community groups to use with ESC's hockey and cricket sections being the main regular users of the facilities with hire of the playing facilities to local schools. The new building would have modern, fully accessible changing facilities to cater for increased demand for women's, girls and disability sports as well as providing space for community activities

and socialising. The application was supported by local member's Steven McCormick and John Beckett.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agree to fund project CF235 the full amount requested of £1,000,000 comprised of:
 - £1,000,000 of capital funding towards the development of the pavilion to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend.
 - Including 5% to be held by SCC until final evidence is provided of income and expenditure, evaluation and completion (such as building control sign-off).

Reasons for Decisions:

This application has been the subject of a rigorous assessment process by officers, as set out in the body of this report. Officers consider the project to meet the aims and published criteria of the fund and to satisfy the requirements to award funding.

Epsom Sports Club's (ESC) proposed pavilion at Old School's Lane will provide a home for community sports and offer long term sustainability for football, hockey, cricket and other sports for all ages. This will address a deficiency in current provision and benefit the local community.

The proposed pavilion facilities will also be used by other community clubs and organisations, ensuring the space is a vibrant hub in the heart of the local community, adjacent to an identified SCC Key Neighbourhood.

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

67/24 YOUR FUND SURREY APPLICATION - THE HASLEMERE LINK COMMUNITY HUB [Item 11]

This report sets out the Your Fund Surrey application for the Link Community Hub. Cabinet was asked to approve £1,000,000 of capital funding towards transforming the Link Community Hub which was 47% of total project costs. The Link was looking to renovate their ground floor to increase accessibility and flexibility of the space for community use to provide a wide range of social activities. It will also introduce an upper floor within the existing roof line to create smaller, private rooms suitable for counselling and other community support services not currently available in Haslemere. Once the building was complete future users will include Citizen's advice, Crossways Counselling service, Haslemere festival, Haslemere for Ukraine support group, Haslemere clothing bank, free community meals, Mental health support services, English lessons for refugees and youth group support. The local member John Robini supported the application.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agree to fund the full amount requested of £1,000,000 comprised of:
 - £1,000,000 of capital funding towards transforming the Haslemere Link Community Hub, to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend.
 - Including 5% to be held by SCC (Surrey County Council) until final evidence of income, expenditure, and final completion such as building control sign-off.

Reasons for Decisions:

This application has been the subject of a rigorous assessment process by officers, as set out in the body of this report. Officers consider the project to meet the aims and published criteria of the fund and to satisfy the requirements to award funding.

The project aims to transform an existing community building (the Link) in the East of Haslemere into a larger, more useable space and, in addition, to create smaller meeting areas to meet increasing demand.

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

68/24 2023/24 MONTH 11 (FEBRUARY) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 12]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources who provided details of the Council's 2023/24 financial position, for revenue and capital budgets, as at 29th February 2024 (M11) and the expected outlook for the remainder of the financial year. With regards to Revenue, at Month 11, the Council was forecasting an overspend of £3.3m against the 2023/24 revenue budget, after the application of the contingency budget. This was a £0.7m improvement since M10. Pressures still continued although adult social care had seen a £0.7m improvement since last month due to a reduction on carers contracts and other wider support services (-£0.5m), and staffing forecasts (-£0.2m).

With regards to the Capital budget, at Month 11, capital expenditure of £273.3m was forecast for 2023/24, a variance of £5m more than the re-set budget of £268.3m. This was an increase of £4.2m from the forecast at Month 10. The Leader stated that the overspend at year end would be £3.3m or less which was a very small percentage of the total budget. This should be viewed alongside an increase in demand in services and an increase in inflation.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue budget (after the application of the full contingency budget) and capital budget positions for the year.

Reasons for Decisions:

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

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

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care made some comments regarding the Former Dormers Care Home report which would be considered in part 2 of the meeting due to commercial sensitivities. It was explained that last year the council started some work to produce a countywide housing and accommodation strategy which recognised the housing crisis felt across the county and set out a call for action for partners to play their part in addressing this. The Former Dormers Care Home report was a good example of this. The Care Home was closed as it was no longer seen fit for purpose. The report coming before Cabinet would bring forward a 100% affordable rental housing scheme with 13 housing units being provided with Tandridge District Council. This would be done in accordance with legislation that requires the disposal to secure the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of an area. The housing and accommodation strategy was beginning to have a positive impact. The Leader commented that it was positive to see two council's working together for the benefit of Surrey residents.

69/24 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 13]

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

70/24 KALIMA GYPSY ROMA TRAVELLER CAMP, WOKING [Item 14]

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure asked Cabinet to approve the capital funding for the project which was agreed.

A separate part 2 minute was done for this item.

RESOLVED:

1. Approves capital funding of [E-05-24] to renew 15 utility blocks and undertake associated drainage and civil works at the Kalima GRT Camp, Woking.
2. See Minute 64/24.
3. See Minute 64/24.
4. See Minute 64/24.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Minute 64/24.

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

71/24 PROPERTY TRANSACTION- THE FORMER DORMERS CARE HOME, CATERHAM [Item 15]

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure asked Cabinet to approve the sale of the former Dormers Care home at Caterham to Tandridge District Council to support an affordable rental housing scheme.

A separate part 2 minute was done for this item.

RESOLVED:

1. Formally declares the asset surplus to operational requirements.
2. See Exempt Minute E-06-24.
3. See Exempt Minute E-06-24.
4. See Exempt Minute E-06-24.

Reasons for Decisions:

See Exempt Minute E-06-24.

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

Meeting closed at 14:57.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank