



Agenda and Reports

for the meeting of

THE COUNTY COUNCIL

to be held on

10 DECEMBER 2024

(i)

(ii)

Woodhatch Place
Reigate
Surrey

Monday, 2 December 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, 10 December 2024, beginning at 10.00 am, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda set out overleaf.

TERENCE HERBERT
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 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chair to report apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 8 October 2024.

(Pages
13 - 50)

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

4 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Signing of the Armed Forces Covenant

This morning (10 December) Colonel Kenny from the British Army visited the Council Chamber in Woodhatch Place to co-sign the Armed Forces Covenant. The covenant is to formalise a commitment to support and respect the members of the Armed Forces community. This includes serving personnel, veterans, and their families. The covenant aims to ensure that they are treated fairly and receive the support they need in recognition of the sacrifices they make for the nation.

Act of Remembrance

We recently paid our respects in a well-attended Act of Remembrance, with over 150 participants, including a Deputy Lieutenant for His Majesty The King, military personnel, veterans, members of the Royal British Legion, other invited guests, and both past and present Members and staff.

Call for Volunteers

We are calling for more nominations for the Community Champions Event. Volunteers and charity workers are the backbone of our community, and their contributions are invaluable. Whether it is helping at events, supporting local initiatives, or aiding those in need, they each make a

significant impact. If you know someone who embodies the spirit of giving back to the community, please submit your nominations by 31 December.

Season of Celebrations

We have had a wonderful season of celebrations, showcasing the vibrant and diverse spirit of our community. Here are some highlights:

The First Citizenship Ceremonies at Woodhatch Place: We were honoured to welcome new citizens in a heartfelt ceremony, marking their official membership in our community.

The SFRS Honours & Awards Evening: This event celebrated the bravery and dedication of our Surrey Fire and Rescue Service personnel, recognising their outstanding contributions and service.

The Woking Sea Cadets AGM & Annual Awards: A proud moment for our young cadets, where their achievements and commitment to maritime skills and community service were acknowledged.

The Artventure Trust 4th Anniversary Celebration: We celebrated four years of incredible work by the Artventure Trust, which supports adults with learning disabilities through creative arts.

The Woking Diwali Parade: A vibrant and joyous celebration of Diwali, the festival of lights, bringing together people from all walks of life to enjoy the cultural festivities.

The Dashain and Tihar Festival: These important Nepalese festivals were celebrated with great enthusiasm, highlighting the rich cultural heritage and traditions of our Nepalese community.

The Community Foundation Celebration Event: This event recognised the invaluable contributions of local charities and community groups, celebrating their efforts in making a positive impact.

SCC's Stars in Surrey Awards (3rd Year): Our annual awards ceremony honoured the exceptional achievements and dedication of individuals and teams within Surrey County Council, celebrating their hard work and commitment.

These events have truly highlighted the strength and unity of our community. Thank you to everyone who participated and contributed to making these celebrations memorable.

A Time for Reflection

While this is a season of celebrations, it is also a time of worry and sadness for many. As we enjoy the festivities, let us remember those facing difficult times. The holiday season can be challenging for those struggling with financial hardship, health issues, or personal loss. We encourage everyone to consider making Christmas donations to support those in need. Whether it is contributing to local food banks, donating warm clothing, or supporting essential charities, every act of kindness makes a difference. The Chair will be donating to Surrey's foodbanks and homeless shelters to provide hot meals and warm beds. Together, we can bring hope and comfort to those who need it most.

Thank you for your continued support and for making our community a place of care and compassion.

Christmas Wishes

That just leaves me to say I wish you and your families a very Happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year filled with joy, peace, and good health! Please do take the break as an opportunity to rest and spend time with your nearest and dearest.

5 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader to make a statement.

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

6 APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE

(Pages
51 - 52)

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

7 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL - ELECTORAL REVIEW: FINAL REPORT

(Pages
53 - 56)

This report provides an update on the conclusion of Surrey County Council's (SCC) electoral review process, which was conducted by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).

The Council is asked to note the final recommendations, which will determine the names and boundaries of SCC electoral areas (divisions) from the May 2025 local election onwards.

8 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS

(Pages
57 - 64)

For the Council to formally note its thanks to the two retiring Independent Persons following the end of their term of office, and to appoint two new Independent Persons for a four-year term.

9 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

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

(Note: Notice of questions in respect of the above item on the agenda must be given in writing, preferably by e-mail, to Democratic Services by 12 noon on Wednesday 4 December 2024).

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

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

There will be an opportunity for Members to ask questions.

10 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 9 December 2024).

11 ORIGINAL MOTIONS

Item 11 (i)

Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council recognises that:

- The UK is committed to reduce its carbon emissions to net zero by 2050, and by 68% from 1990 levels by 2030. The government's Committee on Climate Change is due to report on the UK's Carbon Budget on 26 February 2025.
- The Climate Change Committee has estimated that Local Authorities have powers or influence over roughly a third of emissions in their local areas.
- The Local Government Association have estimated that climate action can be three times more cost effective if led by local rather than national government.
- Surrey County Council has a target of achieving net zero across the county of Surrey by 2050, in line with the climate science as set out in the Surrey Climate Change Strategy.
- Significant additional financial resources are required to achieve these targets, in collaboration with local public, private and third sector partners.
- The Leader confirmed at the last full Council meeting that Surrey County Council has now formed strategic relationships with the University of Surrey, Royal Holloway and University of the Creative Arts.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Commission a report for the council's Cabinet that identifies the additional finance, powers and partnership arrangements needed to deliver our county-wide 2050 climate target; and
- II. Use this report to support a request to the Secretary of State that Surrey County Council and all local authorities are given statutory duties, powers and funding to enable them to achieve net zero in line with the UK's legal commitment on carbon emissions.

Item 11 (ii)

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

This Council agrees that:

- Surrey County Council used to support a network of 58 Sure Start Children Centres with some government support. These were replaced with 23 Family Centres in 2017 and these are now funded through 11 Family Centre and Family Resilience contracts that also include youth services up to 18 (and age 25 for those with SEN).
- This shift to the family centres model has been accompanied by a shift in council funding for children services. There is now less funding allocated to universal and community support, and signposting to families (often through group sessions) alongside increased funding for more targeted and intensive support to individual families, including through the new Intensive Family Support Service (IFSS).
- Recent academic research has highlighted that the Sure Start Children Centres model reduced childhood obesity and youth crime whilst increased early identification of SEN (and reduced SEN and EHCPs in secondary schools) and improved educational outcomes.
- The above shift in funding in children's services within a post-Covid context of continued austerity, together with service improvements in Surrey County Council, has contributed to a reduction in children being taken into care in Surrey. However, at the same time there has been an increase in the numbers of children requiring additional support when they start school, and a surge in the number of children who have mental health needs.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Commission a review of recent research into the benefits of taking a broader preventative approach to children's services. This review should include recommendations to improve long-term outcomes for Surrey families, including through strengthening universal and community support to meet emerging needs earlier.
- II. Write to the new Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, the Rt Hon Angela Rayner MP to call for additional funding for local authority Children's Services across the UK that is directed to prevention, to improve outcomes to meet the objective that no children or families are left behind.

Item 11 (iii)

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

This Council recognises that:

Children and young people have a legal right to special educational provision and support that meets their needs. However, currently too many children and young people are not getting the education and support they need, with long-term consequences for their educational outcomes and overall wellbeing, together with that of their families.

Many parents and carers of children and young people with additional needs often find the system to access education an arduous and expensive battle that brings families to breaking point.

Part of the process that they report causes much distress is the panel decision making process. This is the point when decisions are made about their child behind closed doors often by unknown professionals, and to which the individual case officer, who is involved with the families on a day-to-day basis, is not automatically invited.

This Council acknowledges that:

Many parents do not currently feel that the panel process is transparent or consistent. These panels are making significant decisions about the future of children and young people with additional needs, and it is important parents are part of the process.

Due to its closed nature, many parents and carers often feel that vital information is not adequately covered and, in some cases, omitted. Once a decision is made, the rationale provided to parents and carers for this is often reported as inadequate and this compounds a feeling of exclusion and mistrust.

This Council notes:

This process is not a statutory requirement and could be changed in line with The SEND code of Practice [SEND Code of Practice January 2015.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/424223/SEND_Code_of_Practice_January_2015.pdf) that sets out the requirements to involve families and young people in decision making.

This Council resolves to call on the Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning to commit to:

- I. Provide the opportunity for parent/carers of children with additional needs to be involved in the panel decision process with a clearly defined role.
- II. Provide the opportunity for the child or young person with additional needs to be involved in the panel decision process with a clearly defined role.
- III. Ensure the relevant case officer is automatically invited to attend panel decision meetings.

Item 11 (iv)

Marisa Heath (Englefield Green) to move under standing order 11 as follows:

This Council notes that:

- Having felt the impact of COVID and the conflict in Ukraine leading to rising costs in energy prices and food, our local economy, particularly our small and rural businesses need support and the ability to focus on growth, not additional tax burdens and complexity.

- The recent budget has had an immediate impact on farmers and rural businesses at a time when stability is important and as we seek to provide more healthy, sustainable and, where possible, local, food and look after our environment.
- The NFU has evidenced that around 75% of commercial family farms will be affected by the new IHT policy which was announced in the budget rather than the government's initial claim that it would only be 27% of farms. This means many Surrey farms will be impacted.
- Several farms will not yet fully understand the implications of the changes as they will not have had their farms formally valued since the 1992 changes. Many feel that the current change are a tax on rural areas.
- Many farms do not earn enough money to pay the potential Inheritance Tax Bill without selling off some of their land or business, which in turn makes the farm business unviable and threatens the future of Surrey farming.
- The average farm size in 2023 was 88 hectares. This is the fourth smallest average farm size of all the English regions and the same as the English average of 88 hectares. 63% of farms were below 50 hectares. Due to relative land values, farms in the south-east could be more affected by changes to Inheritance Tax than those in other parts of the country. Based on average land-values (arable and pasture) the average 88ha south-east farm has a value of between £2.1m and £2.6m (excludes machinery/ plant equipment – for context, a combine harvester can cost as much as £0.5m).
- 31% farms are rented and the impact on farmers who do not own their farms has yet to be measured.
- Surrey County Council has been working with local farmers and sharing information and best practice as it is recognised that farmers play a crucial role in land management and nature recovery across Surrey.
- The inflationary impacts of the budget on key inputs such as labour costs will prevent farmers and rural businesses being able to add investment and drive growth. Alongside this, the Rural Prosperity Fund comes to an end in March 2025 and there is no replacement for it which restricts businesses investing in their long-term resilience, competitiveness and their environmental performance.

This Council believes that:

- Food security and sustainability is a key priority for both Surrey and the nation, and the added financial pressure of the budget does not support the prioritisation of these important objectives.
- Farmers should be supported to get through the changes of moving away from direct payments, driving forward environmental objectives and producing high quality British food and encouraged to invest long-term in their businesses.
- We should not risk losing Surrey's high quality agricultural land used for food production to other uses which do not benefit the wider community.
- The tax would undermine investment and innovation in the sector at a time when we need Surrey farmers to invest in their businesses.
- In Surrey we have several rural businesses and farmers who are looking to both national and local Government for help to navigate changes such as the reduction in direct payments and it is important we respond to that and set out ways in which we will speak up for them.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Inform the Treasury that Surrey County Council disagrees with IHT proposal and calls for the policy on IHT to be scrapped.
- II. Call on the Treasury to provide a multi-year funding to support local rural businesses crucial to economic recovery, farming and sustainability.
- III. Ensure that Surrey County Council continues, and increases, support for farmers, local food production and rural businesses enabling sharing of best practice and resource.

12 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Pages
65 - 72)

To receive the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 29 October 2024 and 26 November 2024.

13 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS

(Pages
73 - 86)

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 9 December 2024.

(Note: 26 November 2024 Cabinet minutes to follow)

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

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

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

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

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT
WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 8EF,
ON 8 OCTOBER 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 OBE
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	r Mark Sugden
Edward Hawkins	Richard Tear
* Marisa Heath	Ashley Tilling
Trefor Hogg	Chris Townsend
Robert Hughes	Liz Townsend
Jonathan Hulley	Denise Turner-Stewart
Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Hazel Watson
Frank Kelly	Jeremy Webster
* Riasat Khan	Buddhi Weerasinghe
Robert King	* Fiona White
	Keith Witham

*absent

r = Remote Attendance

62/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Jordan Beech, Nick Darby, Will Forster, Angela Goodwin, Marisa Heath, Riasat Khan, David Lewis (Camberley West), Scott Lewis, Cameron McIntosh, Penny Rivers, Mark Sugden (remote), Fiona White.

63/24 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 9 July 2024 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

64/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

65/24 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chair:

- Welcomed the Council's new Chief Executive, Terence Herbert.
- Noted the sad news of the passing of former County Councillor for Farnham South between 2016-21, Wyatt Ramsdale and led Council in a moment of reflection.
- Noted the recent service to remember the fiftieth anniversary of the Guildford pub bombings.
- Noted that his full announcements could be found in the agenda.

66/24 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

Rebecca Paul arrived at 10.10 am.

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Introduced himself as the new Liberal Democrats' Group Leader and noted that his group would be a constructive opposition offering alternatives, working to tackle external and internal challenges.
- Thanked his predecessor, both a Member and now a Member of Parliament who recognised the challenges faced by the Council and local government.
- Noted that change was needed nationally to enable counties like Surrey to continue to support its residents, his group would lobby for that change and noted the difficult task ahead by the new Chancellor of the Exchequer having inherited significant public sector debt and underfunded public infrastructure.
- Noted that Surrey has the power to influence the lives of over one million people, yet devolved powers without funding was a concern.
- Welcomed the new Chief Executive, new Executive Director - Adults, Wellbeing and Health Partnerships and new Section 151 Officer.
- Had been educated and lived in Surrey for most of his life and from personal experience, noted that adult health and social care, Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) management and the Council's treatment of parents, carers and children were highly important.

- Noted his roles as a leader at a town council and borough council governing jointly with other political parties, providing assurance that he would work collaboratively to achieve positive outcomes for residents.
- Noted the desire for the improvement of the working relationship between the Council and the borough and district councils.
- Sought greater resident engagement and understanding of the work of local government which should be close to the communities it serves.
- Stressed the need for robust and viable statutory services to ensure that 'no one is left behind'.
- The Institute for Fiscal Studies estimated that the funding per person from central government to councils was 46% lower in 2024/25 than it was in 2010.
- Noted the vicious cycle requiring a huge effort to break regarding the financial strains, less spending on prevention and early intervention, and increasing demand on statutory services; last year's budget task group called on the Council to intervene early and prevent escalating need.
- Noted that her rejected budget amendment focused on supporting charities providing such services and addressing inequalities, valuing the third sector was critical to the outcome to residents.
- Noted the concerns about the capital budget, cost and focus of the borrowing, and affordability of Your Fund Surrey, had queried whether that should have been targeted on areas of deprivation and to SEND schools.
- Highlighted the silos in the Council, joined up teams were needed concerning Children's Services and Adult Social Care, asked for a review of the request to have complex caseworkers.
- Queried whether Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) was a good use of public money, asked for the better use of community transport systems to be reconsidered providing varied services, reducing carbon emissions and building rural communities.
- Called for the streamlining of directors to be reviewed in the budget.
- Noted the need to learn from mistakes and improve, preventing issues from reoccurring, ensuring long-term solutions.
- Noted that frontline staff know where the inefficiencies are, their views and concerns as well as Members' must be heard; eliminating duplication was vital working with third sector partners and foster carers.
- Noted that despite the planning permission for oil drilling at Horse Hill being quashed, the oil company continued to produce oil there, asked the Leader whether that was unacceptable and was contrary to the climate targets.
- Asked the Leader to request that the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government and Deputy Prime Minister should help Surrey deliver affordable homes on council sites rather than helping developers build on Surrey's countryside.
- Noted that Home to School Travel Assistance and SEND placements were huge concerns, queried why it took over ten days to respond to cases.
- Asked whether the Leader would commit to implementing the task force recommendations now, it was unacceptable that children with autism for example travel hours to get to school without assistance.
- Noted that instead of cutting discretionary funding for Home to School Transport, called for the full quota of school age and post-16 years old SEND places needed, to be delivered within budget.
- Referring to the devolution agreement for Surrey, asked the Leader how he envisaged the Council's compulsory purchase powers for housing and regeneration purposes would be used, using brownfield land and grey belt sites.

- Regarding the Council's powers around the Adult Education Budget to secure appropriate facilities for further education for adults, asked the Leader what he envisaged residents could expect.
- Asked whether the Leader had considered forming economies of scale with neighbours regarding fiscal devolution.
- Welcomed that the Leader would not defend the indefensible regarding the long-running issues and hoped that there would be genuine action on SEND and provision for children on Home to School Transport.
- Noted that whilst there were national issues, there were Surrey dimensions to the problem, highlighted a teenager that missed school having had to involve lawyers to get the Council to produce their Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP), that EHCP was subsequently reviewed.
- Noted that it was unfair that pupils in Surrey were unable to access facilities in the county that neighbouring counties were sending their children to.
- Noted that families were being forced to fight the Council to get a decision to be made, decisions were made late with too much bureaucracy.
- Noted that a large problem in rural areas was the lack of commercial bus services, thanked the Leader for the roll out of DDRT which had transformed that situation, urged for that service to be publicised more.
- Regarding the ability for local government in England to franchise bus services, asked whether the Leader had discussed the matter with the Government on using those powers to improve access for residents and address duplication.

67/24 APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE [Item 6]

The Chair introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor David Lewis (Camberley West) may continue to be absent from meetings until February 2025 by reason of ill health. The Council looks forward to welcoming him back in due course.

68/24 SELECT COMMITTEES' REPORT TO COUNCIL [Item 7]

The Chair of the Select Committee Chair and Vice-Chairs' Group introduced the report. She noted that the group met twice between July and September, at one meeting the Leader and interim Chief Executive provided an overview of the Council's priorities for the year and areas for collaborative working between the Cabinet and the select committees. The group reviewed approaches and prioritising activity to ensure scrutiny's effectiveness. The select committees scrutinised a range of important subjects and the group sought to raise the profile of the scrutiny work.

The Additional Needs and Disabilities: parent/carer experience Task Group Lead, noted that the Task Group heard examples of bad experiences faced but also the difference good administration and high-quality education makes. The Local Government Association (LGA) was advocating for the national change needed to develop a sustainable SEND system. The Task Group focused on the changes and improvements needed in Surrey as set out in the report. Welcomed the extra investment by the Council and work of the End-to-End team but progress was slow, therefore welcomed the Leader's suggestion for a session for all Members. Noted the need to empathise, increase knowledge of neurodiversity and the changing impacts on children, increase co-production, and the need to build in mediation, and

commended the work of the Learners' Single Point of Access (L-SPA). Thanked Task Group members and the Committee's Scrutiny Officer.

The Digital Business and Insights (DB&I): Lessons Learned Task Group Lead, noted his thanks to Democratic Services officers, the independent expert, officers and witnesses, the Cabinet Member and Task Group members. Commended the post-implementation review report on SAP to Unit 4 transition. The goal of the Task Group was to review the DB&I programme and to identify tangible deliverables to be used to make improvements to future programme and project delivery, producing realistic recommendations. The review did not seek to find someone to blame, nor did it find anyone, several factors contributed to the delays and overspend. All involved worked hard to deliver the complex programme, which was operational, yet issues remained which were being addressed by the MySurrey Stabilisation Board. The Internal Audit reports would assist in the process and the select committee would review progress.

Members made the following comments:

- Stressed that the work of the select committees was essential to the Council's good governance. Noted the constructive use of the select committee pre-meetings, yet the reports were received with short notice.
- The Chair of the Resources and Performance Select Committee commended the work of the Task Group on DB&I and Task Group Lead. Noted that the implementation did not go completely wrong, it was a complex system. The report sought to produce a template to follow for future purchases of IT and data systems; the progress of MySurrey would continue to be reviewed.
- The Chair of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture (CFLLC) Select Committee endorsed the findings of the Task Group on parent/carer experience and thanked the Task Group Lead. She noted that progress was slow and the needs were not being addressed comprehensively enough, and asked the directorate to review the quality of communications which had not improved two years later. Noted the need to be considerate of the case workers overwhelmed by their caseload.
- Noted that officers strived to get papers to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee in a timely manner.

The Chair of the Select Committee Chair and Vice-Chairs' Group thanked Members for their comments and thanked the select committees' support officers. She would follow up the comments made around ensuring that reports be delivered in sufficient time for Members to read the reports which were often lengthy.

RESOLVED:

That Council reviewed the work summarised in this report and provided feedback to Scrutiny Chairs.

69/24 APPOINTMENT OF THE SECTION 151 OFFICER [Item 8]

The Leader as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee introduced the report. He thanked the Director - People and Change, and her team for running a robust process, he thanked the interim Section 151 Officer for her work particularly around next year's budget. He noted that Andy Brown was experienced in local government having worked at other local authorities and his start date was confirmed as 14 October 2024.

RESOLVED:

Appointed Andy Brown as the Section 151 Officer of Surrey County Council, with a start date of 14 October 2024; the interim Section 151 Officer to continue until then.

70/24 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 9]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report and noted the key sections included. He noted that the committee was concerned with assuring itself that the Council's policies were being implemented and that appropriate systems were in place to provide adequate controls over the Council resources and assets, stressed that those arrangements were not the committee's responsibility. Summarised the work undertaken by the committee over the year, key areas were: risk management, counter fraud, the Annual Governance Statement, internal audit, deep dives into various service areas, the external audit plan and value for money arrangements, ethical standards and the Members' Code of Conduct. He thanked committee members and officers for their work. The committee operated apolitically which was crucial to its effectiveness.

RESOLVED:

Noted the work undertaken by the Audit and Governance Committee during the period May 2023 to May 2024.

71/24 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION [Item 10]

The Chair noted the proposed changes to Parts 3, 5 and 6 of the Constitution.

The Chairman of the Surrey Pension Fund Committee noted that the Council was both an employer and the administrative authority of the Surrey Pension Fund. Whilst the Council was the largest employer, it was one of over 300 employers in the fund. He noted that the changes recognised the Council's dual role and potential conflicts of interest, it recognised the statutory role of the Senior LGPS Officer and made officer delegations.

RESOLVED:

1. Approved the amendments to Part 3 - Section 2 and Section 3 Parts 3A and 3B and Part 5(02) in relation to improvements to the governance of the Surrey Pension Fund, as set out in Annex 2 of this report.
2. Approved the consequential amendments to Part 3 – Section 2 (the terms of reference of the PPDC) as set out in paragraph 10 of this report.
3. Approved the amendments to Part 6(02) of the Constitution (Arrangements for dealing with Member Conduct) as set out in Annex 3 of this report.

72/24 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 11]

Questions:

Notice of forty-three questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in the first supplementary agenda on 7 October 2024 (updated response to Q4 is contained in the second supplementary agenda published on 8 October 2024).

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

(Q1) Robert Evans OBE asked whether the Cabinet Member agreed that he should have been more specific in his question as he was referring to Brent Council's trial of placing skips in hotspots to encourage residents to deposit their rubbish rather than fly-tip. He noted the Council's responsibility for collecting fly-tipped items.

The Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure noted that the borough and district councils were the waste collection authorities, and the Council was a waste disposal authority. She noted that Reigate and Banstead Borough Council had previously put skips out in certain areas to collect waste in that way, she noted that twin-hatted Members may wish to follow up the suggestion.

(Q2) Eber Kington asked whether the Leader agreed that the suggestion in the last paragraph that Members might need training workshops implied that the problem lay with Member's ignorance rather than the quality of the data they received. He asked whether he would arrange for the performance team to fact check the claims made by Civic Watcher.

The Leader suggested that the Member attends one of the select committee meetings to ask questions there.

(Q3) Jonathan Essex noted that the data showed that there was a large increase in the number of Looked After Children and Care Leavers who are accommodated in semi-independent accommodation. However, more 16 and 17 year olds were in that type of accommodation compared to five years ago, he asked whether semi-independent accommodation was the best place for them to live and if not what more could be done. Asked whether Looked After Children and Care Leavers, and their former foster carers could be asked those questions.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning noted that it was difficult to equate those figures to the individual stories of those children. She noted that the service and the relevant teams tried hard in every case to find a home that meets that child's needs, which might be semi-independent living. She noted that some Care Leavers were unaccompanied asylum-seeking children where supported accommodation was the right solution.

(Q4) Catherine Baart welcomed the table provided of the twenty-nine schools. She asked which of the remaining twenty schools of the original forty-nine schools awaited their road safety improvements that were identified in 2021, and asked how much clearing the backlog would cost.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth would provide a list of the remaining schools. He noted that £3 million would be used as part of the project, to finish this financial year. Discussions were needed about future years and he was looking at identifying capital funding to continue the scheme. He asked Members to encourage their schools to sign up to the Feet First and Bikeability training, that equipped pupils with the skills to travel to and from school safely.

(Q5) Andy MacLeod noted that the problem was typically caused by old houses being built on narrow roads with no off-street parking. The Council had few powers to deal with the matter. He noted that there had been no outcome since the Department for Transport's (DfT) 2020 consultation and asked the Cabinet Member whether he agrees that the DfT should deal with the problem and provide solutions to it, and whether the Council and other councils should lobby them.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that he would write to the DfT asking for the outcome of the consultation. He noted that the Council could in some cases ban pavement parking but that was limited, noted the signage for partially sighted people. Noted that the Member might want to follow up with the borough and district councils, for them to review their parking standards so that pavement parking is considered when new housing is approved.

(Q6) Catherine Powell asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that the answer to her question was that minutes of the Multi-Disciplinary Team panels were not made, but the key points from discussions were recorded in a database and were not shared with parents and carers. She asked whether the Cabinet Member believed that recording the key points from discussions but not sharing those with parents and carers was compliant with section 36 of the Children and Families Act 2014 and the General Data Protection Regulation. She noted a poll of 100 parents and carers where more than 90% had not received a rationale regarding decisions being shared. She asked the Cabinet Member to review the response and whether she recognises that an EHC Needs Assessment should be undertaken in accordance with section 36, paragraph eight of the Children and Families Act 2014, that was not the same as the criteria for issuing an EHCP in the Cabinet Member's response.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning noted that her response stated that verbatim minutes were not kept of meetings, the key points were recorded and a decision letter produced which was sent to the parent. She provided assurance that the processes in assessing and issuing EHCPs were compliant with the relevant legislation and SEND Code of Practice. She was unaware of the poll mentioned and noted that the Member could follow up with her on the matter.

(Q7) Joanne Sexton had no supplementary question.

Robert Hughes noted that several parish councils spent money clearing out gullies which were left full of mud. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could review whether parish councils could be paid for their work undertaken, or for there to be an arrangement where they do that work on behalf of the Council.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that as part of the task and finish group findings, the amount for gully cleaning repairs had increased. An extra £3 million would be injected into the Highways service for the rest of the financial year to tackle all elements of street cleaning within the Council's responsibility. He noted that Members could use their highways revenue allocation to tackle any spot checks not done by the services and they could alert him to issues. He was happy to meet the Member's parish councils to see whether anything could be done, there had been schemes in the past with parish councils, those were costly.

(Q8) Fiona Davidson asked the Cabinet Member if she could confirm that the parents and carers of children with Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) would be actively involved in the proposed study, regarding their experiences in accessing diagnosis and treatment. She noted that under the current Children's Community Health Contract there was provision for that, but parents reported that the situation differed in reality. She hoped that under the new contract the provisions would be actively enabled and delivered.

Catherine Powell noted that a child in her division had been waiting for an FASD assessment for years despite it being confirmed during pregnancy. She asked the Cabinet Member to advise whether the Council or NHS keep records on the number of children in Surrey waiting for assessments and the length of the wait. She asked

her to advise whether the Council keeps records of where FASD was suspected to be a contributing factor to children struggling in mainstream settings.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning thanked the Chair of the CFLLC Select Committee for her persistence on the issue. She noted that the Public Health team and the Children's Commissioning team were scoping out the work, and she would work with the Chair of the select committee to ensure that the work needed to be done is carried out, which she expected would be co-produced with parents and carers. She would join with the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, and Public Health to ensure the issue is raised. Regarding Catherine Powell's question, she would liaise with the Public Health team to find out what information was known and records kept.

(Q10) Becky Rush asked who approved the works. She noted that the asset programme manager had emailed her confirming that the Highways service had no plans to resurface the road, the response indicated that it was not a resurface however the road was dug up and the plan was to replace 400 metres. She asked how it was approved and escalated to be carried out as an emergency with no notice. She noted that residents did not believe the road was closed due to fly-tipping. She asked again to be involved in future decisions about the road.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth would follow-up with the Member.

(Q11) Will Forster had given apologies so had no supplementary question.

Lance Spencer asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that Woking Borough Council had no information on how much Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money had been spent on the projects that the Council had provided a delivery capability for, and that the Council had no information on how much delivery it had done in Woking on the project.

Rachael Lake BEM congratulated the Member on becoming a Member of Parliament. She asked Group Leaders to consider that many of the Member questions could have been answered before the Council meeting by email to an officer or Cabinet Member.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth responded to Lance Spencer noting that he did not know the project referred to. He urged twin-hatted Members to encourage Woking Borough Council to accept CIL bids from Surrey County Council, he noted that it would be good to have joint working going forward. He noted that he could discuss the matter with the Member further.

Eber Kington raised a point of order under SO 10.1 asking the Chair to preserve the right of opposition Members to ask questions and have those answered properly.

(Q12) Lance Spencer asked whether it was correct that the table implied that 32 young people had not been assessed in autumn 2024, and 71 young people were not yet assessed from 2023/24. He noted the bad use of language in the wording used in the reviews that the Council would not provide 'nice to have transport for special educational needs children when they are 16 years old', as parents and children faced a traumatic experience at the appeals panels. He asked whether the Cabinet Member could review the change in the implementation of the impacted policy.

Jonathan Essex asked that a review includes information on the distances and numbers of young children that had been affected and where, to understand why they were required to make those journeys by themselves.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning noted the significant budget overspend in-year and more than half of that was from an overspend in the Home to School Travel Assistance budget. She clarified that the Council had no statutory responsibility to provide Home to School Travel Assistance for anyone not of statutory school age, it may provide such assistance at its discretion, depending on their circumstances as assessed and parents could appeal. She noted that the Council must ensure that public money is appropriately spent on those who need the Council's support the most. She noted that she would not review the policy because that was the Council's statutory obligation.

(Q13) Hazel Watson noted the 15% reduction in early intervention spend in Surrey and asked the Cabinet Member what steps the Council would take to increase early intervention measures and how would it be measured.

Lance Spencer queried that between 2010/11 and 2021/22, the decrease had only been 15% as the report suggested it was 46%. He asked the Cabinet Member to provide more detail on the response as it seemed unrealistic.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning highlighted that the information related to a report detailing expenditure in 2021/22 which would likely relate to the previous year's spending in the previous administration and before she joined the Cabinet. Since then, the administration was focused on spending on early help and on prevention and early intervention. With a significant uplift in the Children's Services budget and over the past year an increase on spending on early help, the early help system was effective with a reduction in child protection plans and the number of Looked After Children; and Ofsted made a positive judgement on it. She noted that the CFLLC Select Committee did a recent deep dive into early intervention and early help spending which showed that the Council spent significantly more in certain areas of early health compared to other councils.

(Q14) Stephen Cooksey noted that many Members believed that the franchising system or a municipal bus company might have advantages for the provision of bus services, he queried whether an assessment of those changes would cost millions of pounds. He asked the Cabinet Member whether the Council would undertake a comprehensive review following the publication of the Better Buses Bill.

Robert King noted that DDRT excluded many residents in Runnymede and Spelthorne and asked whether there was a plan to expand that into those boroughs.

Edward Hawkins asked the Cabinet Member to let Surrey Heath divisional Members know when the roll out of DDRT would happen in the borough in the coming months.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that the feasibility around franchising was being considered. He stressed that the risk currently sat with the bus operators, the risk would sit with the Council if it goes for the full franchise system. He noted that Surrey had a competitive system with twenty-two bus operators compared to less than four elsewhere. He noted that there were some small and medium sized family businesses too which would be unable to compete on a franchise system level. He noted that Surrey Connect was in Surrey Heath, there was a third phase being looked at around the roll out to other areas including

Runnymede and Spelthorne, the focus was on areas without a good public transport network.

(Q16) Liz Townsend was disappointed by the response and noted that she had asked for the rationale to be provided to parents and carers and whether the decision to withhold the information reflected statutory requirements or was based on a Surrey policy and practice. She noted that the response did not indicate what information parents and carers should expect to receive in terms of the minutes and the rationale for the decision-making process, as many parents reported that they received nothing; asked why there was a disparity between what the Cabinet Member was saying and what parents reported.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning reiterated her apology to those families who felt the service provided by the Council was inadequate. She was unable to answer the question about why that disparity exists and noted that it was the Council's ambition to work in a more open and relational-based way with parents. That was in line with an objective from the End to End Review to work more closely with parents before decisions go to the panel to ensure a better understanding of the process and the information that would be shared.

(Q17) Ashley Tilling noted that it was unacceptable for the situation to continue beyond eighteen months regarding the four cherry trees being cut down by the Council. He noted that officers had concluded that the crossing would not be moved, meaning that there was unspent CIL money available. He asked that the four damaged trees be replaced without further delay.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth said that he would speak to officers and a policy was in place that any removed or damaged trees be replaced.

(Q18) Penny Rivers had given apologies so had no supplementary question.

Lance Spencer asked the Cabinet Member whether it would be possible to schedule training for Members on the changes to the 20 mph policy and how Members could access funding to pay for the consultation and speed strips.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that Members had training on the matter but that could be re-provided. He encouraged Members to contact their highways engagement officer so they could provide advice on how to use their highways allocation for speed surveys and consultation.

(Q19) Paul Follows noted that as the Government would not allow anyone but the local transport authority - the Council - to franchise bus services, he asked whether the Cabinet Member would commit to working with the borough and district councils, and the town and parish councils to provide hyperlocal services. He noted that Godalming Town Council and Waverley Borough Council were both willing to work with the Council and provide funding and support to deliver that.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth encouraged the Member to write to him to discuss any particular routes or areas being missed.

(Q21) Chris Townsend asked the Cabinet Member how it was not a change in policy or strategy when the response stated that the five-year strategy was nearing its conclusion. He noted that the organisations had been visited to explain the end of the

tenancy agreements, however he asked why those organisations were not being informed of how the change would work.

George Potter noted that the response focused on what was technically permissible rather than addressing the question of what was right or wrong. Whilst the Council did have the permission, he asked whether it was right for a youth centre to be closed without any alternative provision being put in place. He asked whether there were plans to put in place a new five-year strategy once the existing one ends.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning said that she would follow the matter up with Chris Townsend as there were local issues which were not part of a county-wide policy. She noted that it was a Land and Property issue concerning the management of a building and not about service delivery.

(Q22) Robert Evans OBE asked whether the Cabinet Member would agree that it would not look good to residents if grass cutting happens after street sweeping.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth noted that the Council shared information about its schedules with the borough and district councils regarding grass cutting and drain cleaning. Ideally, grass cutting would be followed by street sweeping and then gully cleaning. He noted that the Council was open to working more closely with the borough and district councils on the coordination.

In line with Standing Order 10.12, the time limit of 45 minutes had been reached. Members could ask supplementary questions on Q23 - Q43 via email.

Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member Briefings:

These were also published in the first supplementary agenda on 7 October 2024.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure: on Reigate Priory School, **Catherine Baart** noted that ISG went into administration and as the application was joint with the Council she asked what the implications were for the proposal to relocate the school.

The Cabinet Member noted that she would follow-up with the Member on the application.

Jonathan Essex on the new location for the temporary library in Redhill, he understood that the temporary library would be needed until mid-next year, but its current location Consort House would have a new lease from the end of the month. He asked if the Cabinet Member could confirm whether the library would remain in Consort House with the new lease owners, or whether there would be a move to somewhere else and where. He hoped that the service would continue to be provided seamlessly to the new location.

The Cabinet Member noted that the library was a priority to get delivered, it would move from Consort House and would be in the centre of Redhill. The new tenant would take over Consort House once the new library building is finished with upgrades and Super Access - a service in Surrey Libraries providing extended opening hours.

Deputy Cabinet Member for Strategic Highways: provided an update on the work of the Street Works Taskforce, which last met in late September and a key outcome of that meeting was that the fourteen utility providers and Council representatives agreed to talk to the Greater London Authority (GLA) about a new online tool mapping service. That mapping service would be useful to residents, utility providers and critical to the Council. He thanked the Assistant Director - Highways – Network and Asset Management for her work in chairing the taskforce.

Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning: on Independent School fees, **Rebecca Paul** noted that the new Labour government had decided to put a 20% VAT on those fees which was a concern, particularly as it was happening mid-year in January 2025. She asked whether the Council had assessed the impact of the potential influx of students into the state system and for Members to receive an update on a divisional basis.

The Cabinet Member noted that the secondary school admissions window was open and the team were monitoring the additional number of admissions to secondary schools, and it would do the same for primary schools. She noted that between June and September the School Admissions team received 161 in-year admissions, the team was working to assess that in partnership with Independent School providers across Surrey. She noted that information could be provided to Members but she was unsure whether that could be done on a divisional basis.

Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth: on highways communications, **Eber Kington** noted that the Cabinet Member had been advised that the painting of the yellow line parking restriction was prioritised and consequently was completed in early October. However, he noted that the yellow line had not been painted and he asked the Cabinet Member where he got that information and to confirm the new expected completion date.

The Cabinet Member would speak to the team and provide the revised date.

George Potter on highways communications, was surprised that the Cabinet Member replied to his local Facebook group on drain clearances. He was also surprised to see an announcement that drains should be funded out of the divisional maintenance budget. Asked whether the Cabinet Member felt that £7,500 per member, per year was sufficient to clear all the drains across Surrey.

The Cabinet Member noted that he was not happy with the service's response to residents regarding the case referenced and so responded directly, he had spoken to the team and revised communications would be circulated to residents. He noted that the amount to clear gullies and tackle the backlog of defects had increased by £5 million. He noted that the use of local allocation would ensure a quick response, with teams funded through the task and finish groups to undertake the extra work.

Robert King on the Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) award, asked whether the Cabinet Member would communicate the recent changes on the ITS award to include a lack of duplicates and a year's bidding round on divisions. He noted that his ITS had been vetoed despite it scoring the highest in the independent panel's discussion for a neighbouring ward and he was not informed on why that happened.

The Cabinet Member apologised that the change was not communicated to the Member, he noted that he was trying to be fair as the Member was successful in the ITS programme last year. He noted that the criteria would be changing for the ITS to vary the schemes as there were many pedestrian crossings being prioritised, other

schemes missed out. He noted that rural areas were struggling to submit their ITS bids and missed out on the scoring because often those areas did not connect up to pavements or cycleways. He noted that Members should have received a response from the Highways team alerting them as to whether they had been successful or not with their technical assessment. Once the future scoring criteria for the ITS programme is agreed, the recommendations would be taken to the select committee.

Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways: on the weed spray programme, **Ashley Tilling** noted that some streets in Elmbridge had yet to be sprayed. He asked whether there was an issue with the poor timeliness of placing contracts for weed spraying and asked whether the contracting process was under review to prevent future delays. Given the Council's commitment to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, he asked whether the use of non-glyphosate weed killers could be explored such as Foamstream.

The Deputy Cabinet Member acknowledged the issue in Elmbridge, noting that the contractor made a later start and had been affected by the wet weather so the weed spraying was unfinished. The programme was under review to see whether the timeliness could be improved for next year, potentially adding a second spray. He noted that the alternative options to glyphosate were more expensive.

Mark Sugden on a potential second weed spraying, asked who would decide that, how would it be funded and what was the process to make that happen.

The Deputy Cabinet Member noted that it was being reviewed by the Cabinet, further discussions were needed and further information would be provided in due course.

John O'Reilly on the weed spray programme, sought assurance that the weed spraying in Elmbridge would happen this year and would not be delayed until 2025.

The Deputy Cabinet Member confirmed that the weed spray would happen, it had been left late in the year to undertake and despite the wet weather it was worth doing. He noted that there were some streets in Elmbridge where the weeds were out of control and needed to be addressed as quickly as possible.

73/24 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 12]

Chris Townsend noted that Ashted Youth Centre was run and managed well by the Friends of Ashted Youth Club charity. There was a youth club, and other organisations and charities used the centre and the money from them helped maintain it. However, the buildings housing such youth centres across Surrey were being taken back by the Council's Land and Property team. When the communication was given by the relevant Council staff they did not know how it would happen and that caused concern to those running the service and the users of youth centres. There was no consultation with those organisations. He noted that the Leader agreed to put a halt to the situation to find out what centres were open and what the centres were doing.

Catherine Powell provided examples of one week's emails on SEND in her division, in one case an autistic child in a mainstream secondary school attended without an EHCP and no to assess was upheld, she queried whether anyone reviewed the information from the school. In another case a child with autism spectrum disorder hyperactivity in a mainstream primary school had an EHCP which identified specialist provisions, had been suspended and consultation with three specialist schools had been unsuccessful. In another case there was a tribunal concerning a child in nursery

and the EHCP for specialist provision was accepted but the matter remained with the tribunal team and the child would miss the first term of school. She noted that there were many other cases and called for all to work together to break down the silos.

Joanne Sexton shared a message from a resident about the vital role of Ashford Youth Club. Post-Covid-19 it had been a lifeline opening during the day, offering a safe space for anxious families and helping children thrive. There was a community garden, and free youth programmes funded from renting the building. The resident was concerned about the club's future and uncertainty whether families would have to pay for activities, they felt left out of the decision-making process. The youth club's hours would be limited as it was told that adolescent services needed the building, some financial support would be provided to cover the loss. She understood that the current arrangement set out in the youth work strategy had changed and asked how the future of such essential programmes would be safeguarded.

Nick Harrison and Victor Lewanski left the meeting at 12.35 pm.

74/24 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 13]

Item 13 (i)

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

Under Standing Order 20.3 (a) Steven McCormick moved an updated proposed alteration to the original motion standing in his own name, which had been published in the second supplementary agenda on 8 October 2024.

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

This Council notes that:

Home delivery via motorcycles and pedal cycles from takeaway outlets is becoming increasing popular. It responds to customer demand, adds to the local economy and provides employment opportunities for delivery drivers. However, like some other changes of shopping behaviour and consumer preferences, it can also raise unexpected, and sometimes unwanted consequences.

~~Currently, in too many areas of Surrey, high streets and shopping centres are facing a need for parking spaces by delivery drivers and, too often, that is leading to inconsiderate, dangerous and illegal parking on the pavement to the detriment and safety of pedestrians and shoppers and, currently, there is no agreed response from SCC.~~

Surrey County Council should be consulted on applications for outlets by the district planning authorities. In the case of purpose built sites Transport Development Planning have ensured that there is sufficient space for delivery drivers and are additionally mindful of the need to build in provision for mopeds and motorcycles on applications the Surrey County Council is consulted on.

In some areas of Surrey, high streets and shopping centres are facing a need for parking spaces by delivery drivers and, too often, that is leading to inconsiderate parking on and illegal driving over the pavement to the detriment and safety of pedestrians and shoppers.

In light of the factors listed above, and with reference to the [Transportation Development Planning Good Practice Guide](#) this Council calls upon the Cabinet to commit to:

- I. ~~Create a new piece of 'Standing Advice' for local planning authorities to consider, that new retail developments, and changes of use, factor in the requirements for motorcycle delivery parking.~~
- II. ~~Write to central government to request a consultation on a nationwide scheme whereby delivery companies will suspend riders for a period of time on receipt of photographic evidence, from Highways or the Police, if one of their riders access or park on the pavement or in contravention of the law.~~
- III.
 - I. Write to delivery companies (Uber Eats, Deliveroo, Just Eat, etc.) to highlight the issue of motorcycle delivery parking **on pavements and issues caused by riding on and across pavements.** and ~~to~~ request that they introduce a policy whereby delivery companies will suspend riders for a period of time on receipt of photographic evidence, from Highways or the Police, if one of their riders access or park on the pavement or in contravention of the law. **information from these companies on the training and guidance given to their riders and for them to provide information on their policies for dealing with evidenced poor rider behaviour involving the highway or pavement.**
 - IV. ~~Create a new piece of 'Standing Advice' for input into Local and Neighbourhood Plans, requiring sites with takeaway outlets to have designated parking areas close to the high street where motorcycles can be left securely.~~
 - II. **To request a round table meeting with all delivery companies and Surrey Police to discuss best practice guidelines for delivery riders in Surrey.**
 - V. ~~Work with take-away outlets, local landowners and borough and district councils across Surrey to identify sites for designated parking areas close to the high street where motorcycles can be left secure.~~
 - VI.
 - III. Work more closely with partners, the **with Surrey Police, as the enforcement authority,** and borough and district councils, to enforce more effectively the current parking restrictions, and to identify measures to discourage all motorised vehicles accessing the footway. **to tackle key areas where this issue occurs and educate the drivers on their driving behaviour where appropriate.**

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

Steven McCormick made the following points:

- Noted that the issue related to moped delivery riders riding on and parking on the pavement outside fast-food outlets on Epsom High Street.
- Noted that Members and borough councillors had correspondence from concerned and impacted residents and business owners.

- Noted a plea from the manager at Swale House, Epsom that mopeds and bikes on the pavement were an obstacle course for the blind and partially sighted.
- Noted a recent interview by BBC Surrey on the problem, for one week there were no bikes on the pavement following the interviewer reaching out to the delivery companies.
- Noted that the solutions concerned several agencies, delivery companies and the restaurants and fast-food outlets could speak to the delivery riders.
- Noted that the Council, and Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, and Surrey Police could enforce certain aspects; however that parking enforcement only temporarily resolved the issue.
- Noted a recent multi-agency meeting at Epsom with some of those stakeholders, action points were agreed. Thanked the Council's officers for their work and the contributions by the Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways.
- Noted that the motion highlighted the issue and suggested proactive steps to take forward, working in partnership with stakeholders and agencies.

The motion was formally seconded by Matt Furniss, who made the following comments:

- Thanked the Member for making the updated alteration, which would allow the Council to work with the other agencies, particularly Surrey Police which has the enforcement powers for parking on and driving over pavements.
- Noted that the issue was both county and country wide.
- Noted the need to use the authority's influence to engage with the companies as they were responsible for their employees and their actions.

Ten Members made the following comments:

- Noted that the issue affected many of Surrey's communities, had spoken to disabled and partially sighted individuals who struggled to navigate the town centre because of the obstruction created.
- Noted the alarming headlines in Dartford with nuisance food delivery drivers putting lives at risk.
- Noted that Ealing Council took a multi-agency approach, it ran roadshows and events speaking to the riders to educate them and to look at their safeguarding around unlicensed vehicles and human trafficking.
- Hoped that the Trading Standards team could assist, the solution would be more achievable by tackling it collectively.
- Noted that the issue was more impactful in some areas in Surrey and thanked the proposer for agreeing to the changes to ensure that enforcement sits in the right place.
- Noted that the issue was extremely dangerous with drivers riding on footpaths and down alleyways.
- Noted that it was vital to work with the employers to resolve the issue, as where the police intervened, they found that many drivers were uninsured and unlicensed, with multiple people using the same bike at different times.
- Noted that training and behaviour change were important, but so too was providing the different infrastructure and locations to encourage delivery drivers to pick up from.
- Suggested the need to call on the Government to require food delivery apps to prioritise awarding food collection to drivers that sit in designated areas.
- Noted that delivery vans were also problematic blocking pavements in rural areas forcing children to walk into the road.

- Noted the need to address the issue relating to the new Brightwells Yard shopping centre in Farnham, there were cars pulling up onto pavements outside companies and there would be more to come.
- Noted the worsening of the problem in Guildford town centre even in those areas where there were enforcement powers such as disabled parking bays and waiting restrictions, since the centralisation of on-street parking enforcement there were no enforcement officers to be seen.
- Noted the need to resource parking enforcement and enforce restrictions, asked the Cabinet to consider introducing a byelaw to prohibit pavement parking, to enable enforcement officers to fine motorists.
- Noted the issue in Walton-on-Thames, Churchfield Road off the High Street where delivery drivers park in the designated area, but there was a large overhang of motorbike boxes over the narrow pavement and road, and neither rails or bollards could be put in place.
- Noted anger in the large amount of delivery vans parking on pavements and displaying a disabled badge.
- Noted that home delivery was beneficial for the local economy, employment and consumer choice.
- Noted that on Epsom High Street, there were more motorcycle delivery riders driving on the pavement which meant it was residents' most common concern in June; raised the issue with the Highways team but the responses listed the reasons why nothing effective could be done.
- Noted that a meeting with affected parties had not been set up by the Cabinet Member, despite being agreed in response to a Member question at the last Council meeting.
- Noted that a fellow Member set up a meeting in September to find solutions, attended by Council, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, and business representatives, and residents, it was positive with actions agreed and those solutions were incorporated into the motion.
- Noted that the removal of resolutions which seemed like hard work for the Council such as resolution V was disappointing.
- Noted that the Residents' Association and Independents Group had forced the Council to take the issue seriously, having come up with the local partnerships and links that the Council could work with and solutions.

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

- Acknowledged that the problem was county-wide and noted that the motion was the starting point.
- Noted the comments around safeguarding which was a concern and would be considered, as would the suggestion for having different locations for motorcycle pickup.
- Noted that enforcement officers were available and the bikes disappeared when they turned up.
- Welcomed Members' support and stressed the need to work collaboratively with all Members, to try and achieve a positive outcome for residents.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

Home delivery via motorcycles and pedal cycles from takeaway outlets is becoming increasingly popular. It responds to customer demand, adds to the local economy and provides employment opportunities for delivery drivers. However, like some other changes of shopping behaviour and consumer preferences, it can also raise unexpected, and sometimes unwanted consequences.

Surrey County Council should be consulted on applications for outlets by the district planning authorities. In the case of purpose built sites Transport Development Planning have ensured that there is sufficient space for delivery drivers and are additionally mindful of the need to build in provision for mopeds and motorcycles on applications the Surrey County Council is consulted on.

In some areas of Surrey, high streets and shopping centres are facing a need for parking spaces by delivery drivers and, too often, that is leading to inconsiderate parking on and illegal driving over the pavement to the detriment and safety of pedestrians and shoppers.

In light of the factors listed above, this Council calls upon the Cabinet to commit to:

- I. Write to delivery companies (Uber Eats, Deliveroo, Just Eat, etc.) to highlight the issue of motorcycle delivery parking on pavements and issues caused by riding on and across pavements. To request information from these companies on the training and guidance given to their riders and for them to provide information on their policies for dealing with evidenced poor rider behaviour involving the highway or pavement.
- II. To request a round table meeting with all delivery companies and Surrey Police to discuss best practice guidelines for delivery riders in Surrey.
- III. Work with Surrey Police, as the enforcement authority, to tackle key areas where this issue occurs and educate the drivers on their driving behaviour where appropriate.

Item 13 (ii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Mark Nuti moved:

This Council notes:

- Council's commitment in its Organisation Strategy and through the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy to reducing health inequalities, particularly in key neighbourhoods and amongst vulnerable groups.
- The significant impact of the cost of living on health inequalities in Surrey; 8.3% of households are in fuel poverty and 8.5% of children aged 0-19 years live in households experiencing relative poverty.
- The Government's pre-election commitment to adopting Section 1 of the Equality Act 2010 in England that will require all public bodies to adopt transparent and effective measures to address the inequalities that result from differences in socio-economic status.

- Good Company (Surrey) - a charity with a mission to see communities 'free of poverty, where everyone can afford life's essentials'; they co-ordinate local food banks, the Poverty Truth Commission and currently work with pupils on free school meals to understand their needs.
- The signing of Good Company's End Poverty Pledge by the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board in July 2024, also adopted by Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Partnership at a first combined meeting in September 2024 and Board/Partnership's commitment to enacting the pledge, including support for Board/Partnership members' organisations to also sign in their own right.

This Council believes that:

- Socio-economic disadvantage and financial hardship are barriers to reducing health inequalities and improving health and wellbeing in Surrey.
- In the delivery of all our services, we need to consider those in or at risk of poverty.
- Working with Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations, such as Good Company, that work with those with lived experience of financial hardship is important in ensuring service responses are led by our communities.
- Signing the Good Company's End Poverty Pledge demonstrates that this Council leads from the front in the Surrey system to reduce health inequalities so no-one is left behind.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Request the Leader of the Council sign Good Company's End Poverty Pledge on behalf of the Council.
- II. Request that the Leader of the Council subsequently instructs officers to develop an SCC poverty action plan (to include proposed actions such as the adoption of section 1 of the Equality Act 2010 which builds in addressing the inequalities that result from differences in socio-economic status and becoming an anchor institution) for mitigating and preventing poverty amongst Surrey residents.

Mark Nuti made the following points:

- Thanked the Principal Lead - Health and Wellbeing, who was instrumental in introducing the Good Company to the Council and producing the motion.
- Noted that the word poverty was harsh and it was complex, traps people in a cycle and isolates them; it means many things to people such as financial hardship, homelessness, lack of education, and unemployment.
- Urged the Council to take the End Poverty Pledge, to continue the work to mitigate and prevent poverty and inequalities.
- Urged Members to support the pledge personally, to consider how they could make a difference.
- Noted that the Good Company believed that collaboration was the key to preventing people from falling into poverty and supporting people to move out of poverty.
- Noted that winter was a difficult time for many families, especially the elderly, particularly considering the Government's withdrawal of the Winter Fuel Payment, and increase in the energy price cap.

- Noted that as part of Surrey's Fuel Poverty Programme, the Council won a grant of nearly £1 million from the Southern Gas Network to support vulnerable residents.
- Noted that last year, 570,000 households were helped with winter resilience planning. Last winter, around 46,000 residents accessed one of the 43 warm hubs across Surrey.
- Noted that the Surrey Crisis Fund provided support to over 2,000 residents every year and over 86,000 households received support from the Household Support Fund last year.
- Thanked the voluntary and charitable sector for the work done in communities.
- Noted that all could help by being CLEAR: Communication, Listening, Empathy, Agency, Respect; no one wants to live in poverty.
- Noted that poverty was a catalyst that often leads to mental and physical ill health, urged all to sign the pledge to make sure 'no one is left behind'.

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

- Noted that poverty is a reality in Surrey, for example Court ward in Epsom.
- Had signed the pledge as Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- Highlighted the actions from the Health and Wellbeing Board, and Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Partnership September 2024 report on the pledge, concerning the key areas: Leadership, Culture, Accountability.
- Noted that the Good Company's Epsom Advice Café and the Epsom Pantry, made a real difference.
- Provided a summary of Ben's story, he had worked since he was twelve years old and was out of work due to ill health, and noted the difficulty of seeking help and the fear of not being able to feed his family was terrifying.
- Noted that recent crises had increased the number of people and families in trouble.
- Emphasised that collaborative working with all stakeholders was vital to create effective solutions.

Lance Spencer moved an amendment which had been published in the first supplementary agenda on 7 October 2024, which was formally seconded by Hazel Watson.

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

This Council notes:

- Council's commitment in its Organisation Strategy and through the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy to reducing health inequalities, particularly in key neighbourhoods and amongst vulnerable groups.
- The significant impact of the cost of living on health inequalities in Surrey; 8.3% of households are in fuel poverty and 8.5% of children aged 0-19 years live in households experiencing relative poverty.
- The Government's pre-election commitment to adopting Section 1 of the Equality Act 2010 in England that will require all public bodies to adopt transparent and effective measures to address the inequalities that result from differences in socio-economic status.

- Good Company (Surrey) - a charity with a mission to see communities 'free of poverty, where everyone can afford life's essentials'; they co-ordinate local food banks, the Poverty Truth Commission and currently work with pupils on free school meals to understand their needs.
- The signing of Good Company's End Poverty Pledge by the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board in July 2024, also adopted by Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Partnership at a first combined meeting in September 2024 and Board/Partnership's commitment to enacting the pledge, including support for Board/Partnership members' organisations to also sign in their own right.

This Council believes that:

- Socio-economic disadvantage and financial hardship are barriers to reducing health inequalities and improving health and wellbeing in Surrey.
- In the delivery of all our services, we need to consider those in or at risk of poverty.
- Working with Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations, such as Good Company, that work with those with lived experience of financial hardship is important in ensuring service responses are led by our communities.
- Signing the Good Company's End Poverty Pledge demonstrates that this Council leads from the front in the Surrey system to reduce health inequalities so no-one is left behind.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Request the Leader of the Council sign Good Company's End Poverty Pledge on behalf of the Council.
- II. Request that the Leader of the Council subsequently instructs officers to develop an SCC poverty action plan (to include proposed actions such as the adoption of section 1 of the Equality Act 2010 which builds in addressing the inequalities that result from differences in socio-economic status and becoming an anchor institution) for mitigating and preventing poverty amongst Surrey residents.
- III. **Request that the Cabinet review any changes proposed for the budgets for 2025/26 to ensure there is no reduction in funding to organisations that Surrey County Council works with to mitigate and prevent poverty in Surrey.**

Lance Spencer spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- Supported the motion and had received good feedback about the Good Company, which was one of many organisations supporting those most in need across Surrey.
- Read out what Microsoft Copilot said that the Council could do to reduce poverty in Surrey, noting that whilst Surrey was wealthy it had pockets of deprivation and the Council must further act to support those residents. The initiatives underway were noted, but a more sustained and comprehensive approach was needed considering the rising cost of living.
- Targeted financial support and co-production was vital, the Council must expand its funding to community-based projects that address immediate needs and enhance its collaboration with local charities and community

organisations. A more inclusive and supportive environment could be built through empowering communities and encouraging local initiatives.

- Noted that as of February 2024, over 26,000 households in Surrey were on Universal Credit, that was a nearly 10% increase from last year. The number of single parent households on Universal Credit had risen by nearly one third over the last two years, the number of households on Universal Credit with children and adult couples had risen by 10%.
- In the 2023/24 school year there were over 22,000 pupils in state-funded Surrey schools that were eligible for free school meals, the percentage of eligible children increased from about 9% in 2018/19 to nearly 15%. Eligibility rates were highest in state-funded alternative provision schools and special schools.
- Stressed that the funds at local government level were inadequate to support families, voluntary and charity sectors provided support to families yet all funding had stopped for all local charities in Woking.
- Called on the Council to ensure that the funding for the voluntary and charity sectors is not reduced during the upcoming budget setting process.

The amendment was formally seconded by Hazel Watson, who made the following comments:

- Stressed that providing help and support to the most disadvantaged Surrey residents was a vital Council function.
- Noted that often the voluntary organisations working locally provided that support to make a difference.
- Had worked with the Council's Mole Valley Community Link Officer (CLO) and a group of residents in Box Hill to help isolated and disadvantaged residents.
- Noted an event last month with stalls from various organisations.
- Noted the 'a warm welcome' weekly event at the doctor's surgery between November and March providing food, advice and activities.
- Noted that a Council survey of the village to obtain the views of residents on their needs had been carried out and the results were being analysed.
- Suggested that it would be appropriate for the Council's Chair and Chief Executive to write to the CLO to thank her for her work.
- Noted that reducing the Council's funding in next year's budget to the voluntary organisations would be regressive.

Mark Nuti did not accept the amendment and therefore the amendment was open for debate.

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

- Suggested that the amendment's proposer attends a select committee meeting to listen to discussions from officers and Members about addressing poverty.
- Noted that the motion sets the scene, highlighting the pockets of deprivation and recognised that people were suffering; noting the various funds available, the Council knew what needed to be done and where.
- Could not commit the Council to top slicing the budget for next year, the statutory responsibilities to fund SEND children, Adult Social Care, and Highways were priorities.

- Noted that the administration would have agreed wording around the Council protecting the funding of organisations it works with, the Council could not commit to the ask without the relevant organisations being named.
- Noted the active conversation with the voluntary sector, which the Council values and depends upon to help deliver services to vulnerable residents.
- Encouraged Members that wish to speak on the draft Council budget to attend the November Cabinet meeting.
- Noted that borough and district councils were financially challenged, with Citizens Advice in some areas unable to be supported, noted the importance of partnering with voluntary organisations which provide additional services that local authorities cannot.
- Noted that Runnymede Borough Council reviewed its budget on what the council and voluntary sector could best provide, and provided that funding.
- Stressed the importance of the Council partnering with the borough and district councils, with the upcoming determination of Council Tax.
- Noted that several borough and district councils provided full relief for Council taxpayers, it was ridiculous that councils were taking people to court for not paying Council Tax, as they could not afford it.
- Encouraged the Council to pass on the Household Support Funding once received to the borough and district councils.
- Noted that the Council relied on support from the third sector, those organisations were connected to the communities they serve.
- Noted that without the commitment to not reducing the funding in 2025/26, there would be further cuts and a reduction in support to residents; they had low workforce costs and a high impact. Consistency and security in their future funding was needed.
- Supported the work of the Poverty Truth Commission and Good Company.
- Noted that poverty had become an entrenched part of society after a decade of austerity, the use of food banks had become a lifeline for many.
- Noted that the pledge sought to ensure that people should be able to afford life's essentials and those struggling financially should receive compassion.
- Noted that an action plan for the pledge must be financed and the root causes of poverty tackled, addressing people's needs now and the Council must set out what ending poverty would look like in Surrey.
- Regarding the cost-of-living crisis the following were needed: retrofitting to address energy poverty, ensuring adequate affordable housing to address the housing emergency, and to sustain the £2 maximum local bus fares.
- Noted that simply signing the pledge felt hollow, practical action was needed to end poverty; the amendment requested that financial commitment by the administration.
- Noted frustration on the annual settlements from the Government which made planning by organisations difficult.
- Noted that many towns and parishes, and boroughs and districts entered into multi-year Service Level Agreements, the Council should do more of that, planning for how organisations are given secure long-term funding.

Mark Nuti noted the following comments in response to not accepting the amendment:

- Stressed that it was not a budget-setting Council meeting, signing the pledge meant a commitment to join the Good Company in understanding poverty and doing everything possible to mitigate it.

- Noted that there were many things done by staff daily irrespective of the pledge, the Council continues to support communities and provides funding to charities.
- Noted that a commitment could not be made to maintain that funding to the same charities as charity work was reviewed, the Council looked at where the best investment should go to support communities.
- Noted that the request for an action plan for poverty to address the Equality Act 2010 would be included in the Equality Impact Assessment reports.
- Stressed that eradicating poverty required working in partnerships across Surrey irrespective of politics, working from the top down together.

The Chair asked Lance Spencer, as proposer of the amendment to conclude the debate:

- Supported the idea of working together but noted that it had been difficult to do so over the Council term.
- Noted the horrifying situation faced by individuals in long-term and irreversible debt.
- Noted that the suggested alternative wording to the amendment by the administration would have watered it down.
- Noted scepticism that the amendment was a huge ask for the Council.
- Noted that for example, Woking Borough Council was in £2.4 billion debt, unable to give £1 to its local Citizens Advice.
- Highlighted that there were thousands of people in extreme debt that the amendment sought to support.

The amendment was put to the vote with 22 Members voting For, 34 voting Against and 5 Abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the debate on the substantive motion, no Members made any comments.

The Chair asked Mark Nuti, as proposer of the motion to conclude the debate, he made no further comments.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes:

- Council's commitment in its Organisation Strategy and through the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy to reducing health inequalities, particularly in key neighbourhoods and amongst vulnerable groups.
- The significant impact of the cost of living on health inequalities in Surrey; 8.3% of households are in fuel poverty and 8.5% of children aged 0-19 years live in households experiencing relative poverty.
- The Government's pre-election commitment to adopting Section 1 of the Equality Act 2010 in England that will require all public bodies to adopt transparent and effective measures to address the inequalities that result from differences in socio-economic status.

- Good Company (Surrey) - a charity with a mission to see communities 'free of poverty, where everyone can afford life's essentials'; they co-ordinate local food banks, the Poverty Truth Commission and currently work with pupils on free school meals to understand their needs.
- The signing of Good Company's End Poverty Pledge by the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board in July 2024, also adopted by Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Partnership at a first combined meeting in September 2024 and Board/Partnership's commitment to enacting the pledge, including support for Board/Partnership members' organisations to also sign in their own right.

This Council believes that:

- Socio-economic disadvantage and financial hardship are barriers to reducing health inequalities and improving health and wellbeing in Surrey.
- In the delivery of all our services, we need to consider those in or at risk of poverty.
- Working with Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations, such as Good Company, that work with those with lived experience of financial hardship is important in ensuring service responses are led by our communities.
- Signing the Good Company's End Poverty Pledge demonstrates that this Council leads from the front in the Surrey system to reduce health inequalities so no-one is left behind.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Request the Leader of the Council sign Good Company's End Poverty Pledge on behalf of the Council.
- II. Request that the Leader of the Council subsequently instructs officers to develop an SCC poverty action plan (to include proposed actions such as the adoption of section 1 of the Equality Act 2010 which builds in addressing the inequalities that result from differences in socio-economic status and becoming an anchor institution) for mitigating and preventing poverty amongst Surrey residents.

75/24 FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE ON A REFERRED MOTION: 'PLANT BASED MEALS' [Item 14]

The proposer of the original motion and Vice-Chair of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee introduced the report on the outcome of the referred motion. He noted that 'Meat-Free Mondays' encouraged people to skip meat one day a week as it had benefits to: health, the environment, animal welfare, global food security and the economy. He noted his motivation for tabling the original motion in July 2023 was that Woking High School discussed how to get more student engagement on climate issues and came up with the idea for 'Meat-Free Mondays'. He noted that the motion was referred to the select committee and discussed in April 2024, the response from officers was underwhelming but progress had been made with support from the Cabinet Member for Environment. He noted the motion resolution around schools having a plant-based menu one day a week; and the Service recommendations about schools defining 'Meat-Free Mondays', supporting schools to develop School Nutrition Action Groups and 'peer champions'.

RESOLVED:

1. Noted the key points from the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee's discussion of the Motion as described in this report and the work underway to address the issues raised in the motion through finalisation and implementation of A Surrey Whole System Food Strategy.
2. Noted that the strategy supports the Surrey Healthy Schools approach and has a focus on three key strands: addressing food insecurity, reducing climate impact of the local food system and supporting the local population to keep a healthy weight by enhancing the accessibility and affordability of nutritious food.

76/24 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 15]

The Leader thanked the outgoing Executive Director - Adults, Wellbeing and Health Partnerships, Helen Coombes for all her hard work in getting the Council prepared for the Care Quality Commission inspection.

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 23 July 2024 and 24 September 2024.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents:

There were no reports with recommendations for Council.

Reports for Information/Discussion:

23 July 2024:

- A. Customer Transformation
- B. A New Draft Vision Zero Road Safety Strategy and 20 Mph Speed Limit Policy
- C. Consort House, Redhill
- D. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 3 July 2024 - 30 September 2024

RESOLVED:

1. Noted that there had been no urgent decisions since the last Cabinet report to Council.
2. Adopted the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 23 July 2024 and 24 September 2024.

77/24 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 16]

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

[Meeting ended at: 13.34 pm]

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Leader's Statement – County Council, 8 October 2024

Mr Chairman, Members, here we are back together again for the first time since early July with the intervening months having seen some fundamental changes within this organisation, with our new Chief Executive settling in and getting familiar with the people, the place, and the idiosyncrasies of Surrey...

Welcome to your first Full Council meeting Terence. We're delighted to have you with us, and I can already sense the positive impact you are having even after just seven weeks in the role.

I'd also like to take the opportunity to welcome our new Executive Director for Adults, Wellbeing and Health Partnerships, Claire Edgar who started work yesterday – I'm sure you've wasted no time and are already fully up to speed!

And another important development in the leadership of this council came last week in the announcement that Andy Brown will be joining us next week as our new Executive Director for Finance and Corporate Services, as our S151 Officer and our Deputy Chief Executive – a vital role in challenging times, and I'm delighted we've managed to attract Andy to Surrey.

These changes – the appointment of really experienced officers with excellent track records of delivery - demonstrates Surrey's pull, as a place and as an organisation.

We are a serious, large council, with high ambitions and a strong reputation.

Terence, Claire and Andy – along with our talented wider Leadership Team – will drive this organisation even further forward at pace, help us to continually improve, and ensure that we are delivering the vital services the people of Surrey rightly deserve.

Mr Chairman, there may be change at the top, but there will be continuity in terms of our ambition and our mission as an organisation.

As I've said many times before at this meeting, we are a council that does not shirk a challenge.

We stand up to be counted, we identify where we need to improve, and we roll up our sleeves and get on with it.

We are ambitious, we're focused, innovative, and determined.

It is that attitude that has got this organisation through some huge challenges over the past few years, and it is that attitude that is going to see us through the challenges we currently face – as a council, and as a wider local government sector.

The burning issue we currently face – like every other public sector body – is a financial one.

Local government is facing financial pressures like never before – demand is accelerating and the cost of delivering everything from care packages to pothole repairs is higher than ever, and still rising.

The County Council Network's analysis released last week shows that councils in the UK face a cumulative funding gap of a massive £54 billion pounds over the next five years.

That is a fundamental problem for society in this country, that councils like this one are going to be tasked with solving.

Central government's finances are stretched, and their priorities seem to lie elsewhere, however acute the need is in frontline service delivery.

It is our responsibility to do everything we possibly can to balance our budget and balance the needs of our residents.

We must – and do – scrutinise every penny of public money that we spend, to ensure that it is delivering the best possible outcomes for the people of Surrey.

We are not a council that does things 'because we've always done things that way' – if we need to change, we do.

If there are better ways to deliver services, we'll do it.

If new challenges appear, we adapt to overcome them.

If outside forces change the climate in which we work, we will recognise that and deal with it.

Mr Chairman, we are having to do that right now.

The financial pressures are real, and there is no magic wand or government top-up on its way to close the budget gaps councils are facing up and down the country.

We must stand up and face the reality head on – as we always do.

I have every confidence in the people of this organisation, and our new leadership, to adapt, innovate, be decisive, and be bold.

We are in a stronger position financially than many councils, thanks to our transformation and financial management over the last five or six years.

But we are not immune.

We must go again. Be bold in our transformation programmes, and strict with our spending.

But we must not lose sight of what has enabled us to improve as an organisation to this point – ambition, and focus on our guiding principles, supporting those who need us most and ensuring that no one is left behind.

That means that difficult choices will no doubt have to be made across services, things will have to be done differently, or in some cases not done at all, where they are not a priority.

Government will have to support councils in a programme of reform, ultimately providing the investment and incentivisation to drive preventative activity and provide the resources to deliver early support and intervention. No council can do this on their own but if we don't innovate, we will simply be councils reduced to delivering basic statutory services.

Our residents deserve more.

So we will continue to lobby government for flexibility, for greater devolution, for statutory reform across the system and push for fiscal devolution. More of that in a minute.

For our own part we'll embrace technology, we'll drive out inefficiency, we'll operate as one council with collective responsibility for our budget, and our objectives.

The public trust us with their money. We must be extremely careful with it and ensure every penny is spent appropriately.

We have a responsibility to be sustainable, and ultimately still be here delivering services long into the future.

I know that we can do this while still improving as an organisation, and still improving outcomes for residents.

We've done it before, and we'll do it again.

Because we have good people with bright minds and the right attitude, officers and Members dedicated to public service and a belief in Surrey.

That bold thinking and ambition must not be confined to this organisation however.

We must encourage others to be bold, and to look outwardly for opportunities to be more effective and efficient, together.

A great example of that approach came just last month with the signing of our Civic Agreement with the county's three leading universities – The University of Surrey, Royal Holloway University of London, and the University of the Creative Arts.

By pooling resources and expertise, and working together towards shared goals and a collective vision for Surrey, we can better address local needs, drive innovation, and create a more resilient county fit for the future.

Mr Chairman, this is place leadership.

This is drawing on all the local expertise, knowledge, passion, and resources to collectively drive better outcomes for our residents, and indeed our businesses here in Surrey.

We can and must do more.

We've now had an indication from the current government that our County Deal agreement will be endorsed and delivered, cementing Surrey's geography and recognising our prominent role in driving growth and opportunity here.

This is good news, but I sincerely hope there is more to come in terms of devolution from central government.

I have had very constructive discussions with our District and Borough partners, and with government officials through both Surrey and the County Councils Network, and I'm encouraged that there is a collective will to deliver more powers and opportunities through further devolution measures.

I will of course remain totally engaged and committed to that agenda on behalf of this council, and the people of Surrey working with our District and Borough colleagues.

I now want to say something about SEND and those children with additional needs.

I know that there are families that believe this council has let them down. We have and for that I apologise, as I have done on a number of occasions in this public forum.

I do not and will not defend the indefensible.

But it is only fair that there is also recognition of the progress we have made on our improvement journey. The independent joint area review found many examples of good practise but that there was inconsistency in the way we were delivering some of those services and experiences to families and children.

However, the Department for Education and OFSTED endorsed our recovery plan, the plan that we are currently working through and against which we report progress to the DfE and to our Select Committee.

I'm not going to run through all of those improvements, but the starting point was to clear the backlog of assessments and by investing some millions of pounds to do that, we are now averaging 67% completion on time against a national benchmark of 50%. Of course, we will keep working to hit 100% but there needs to be recognition that there other partners who also need to step up to deliver an education, health and care plan.

We are also investing £240 million in our SEND capital programme, creating nearly 6,000 specialist school places across the county. This is in addition to the DfE's commitment to build four new specialist free schools.

Around 260 specialist school places were made available by this authority last month at the start of the new academic year.

Creating hundreds more places in specialist units in mainstream schools and a capital programme of hundreds of millions to build specialist schools is well underway but whilst we have to relentlessly drive improvements in local delivery, we know that the rising costs of specialist placements and home to school transport is an issue facing every single upper tier authority in this country.

That is why there is cross party support through the LGA and County Councils Network for reform of the system, reform that will be challenging but essential if we are to improve outcomes for children, something the current system often fails to do.

So yes, we absolutely need to improve our communications with parents and families, yes, we absolutely need to get this right first time, every time and yes, we must

absolutely focus on giving all children the very best start in life and whatever support is appropriate to meet their needs.

And that requires all of us, Members, officers, MPs, Government Ministers to work collectively, to work with each other to deliver the best service we can deliver and that is my ask.

There isn't any single person that speaks in this space that doesn't want the very best for our children and galvanising that energy and knowledge to look at what we as a whole society need to do, should be, and must be what drives the conversations.

Let's focus on solutions, solutions that reflect a very different country from that post-war - when much of the legislation back dates to, very different from 2014 when the last set of major reforms were enacted, and very different post COVID.

Here at Surrey, we will continue to do all that we can as an administration and as a council to get this right, whilst engaging in the national conversations as nothing could be more important than the health, the well-being and the happiness of our children as they progress into adulthood.

Another area that is showing continued progress, and we are focusing much of our transformation efforts on, is Adult Social Care.

This is our biggest area of spend as a council, and a statutory responsibility we take extremely seriously.

We have recently been visited by the Care Quality Commission for more external scrutiny. That inspection process went well – again we welcome that challenge – and we look forward to receiving their report very soon.

Whatever the outcome of that inspection, we will not stop improving.

But Mr Chairman, I wanted to end on a positive note.

Four years ago next month, this administration embarked on a mission to deliver ambitious, meaningful improvements in communities right across Surrey.

Investing in improvements that were rooted in community action – things that local people wanted and needed, things that would deliver benefits to the whole community, and that would leave a legacy in Surrey's towns and villages.

Through Your Fund Surrey, we asked communities to think big. To join up and join in and working together we will Make it Happen.

And Make it Happen we have -

- Swimming pools.
- Tree planting.
- Community cafes, shops and gardens.
- Football, cricket, rugby, gymnastics, and other sports facilities.
- New village halls.
- Inclusive playgrounds.
- Scout huts.
- Wildlife centres.
- Creative arts facilities.

Your Fund Surrey HAS delivered.

We've given local communities over £20m across 45 different projects. All having a demonstrable and long-term impact on people's health and wellbeing, and quality of life.

Surrey's communities are thriving and that is something we should be incredibly proud of.

Mr Chairman, this council is delivering for the people of Surrey.

We should be proud of how far we've come, and we must use that as motivation to go further, and at pace.

There is more to do and more to improve, we know that.

There are big challenges to overcome, and tough decisions to make.

There is a new government with a new agenda.

There are world events outside of our control but nevertheless impact on our residents.

But those are not new challenges.

These are challenges that this council, this county and local government takes in its stride.

And we will.

Nothing should distract us from delivering our ambition that no one in this county will be left behind.

Thank you.



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

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

BACKGROUND:

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

The last meeting that Mark Sugden attended was a meeting of the County Council in July 2024. He has been unable to attend any formal meetings in person since then due to ill health.

For that reason, the County Council is requested to agree that Councillor Mark Sugden may be absent from meetings while maintaining membership of the Council during his period of ill health. This situation will be monitored regularly and reviewed in March 2025.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Councillor Mark Sugden continues to be absent from meetings until March 2025 by reason of ill health. The Council looks forward to welcoming him back in due course.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER:

Section 85(i) of the Local Government Act 1972 states “if a member of a Local Authority fails throughout a period of six consecutive months from the date of their last attendance to attend any meeting of the Authority, they shall unless the failure was due to some reason approved by the Authority before the expiry of that period cease to be a Member of the Council.”

Attendance in an official capacity at a meeting of a committee or sub-committee of the council or at any meeting of a joint committee or other such body discharging functions of the council or at any meeting as a representative of the council is deemed to be a 'meeting of the council'.

If after six months from the date of a member's last attendance to attend any meeting, the council has not approved the absence then the member as a result of the operation of law ceases to be a member of the council from that date. The six months runs from the date of the member's last attendance and approval must be given within that six month period.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Vicky Hibbert, Assistant Director – Governance and Democratic Services,
Surrey County Council, vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

None



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL – ELECTORAL REVIEW: FINAL REPORT

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

This report provides an update on the conclusion of Surrey County Council's (SCC) electoral review process, which was conducted by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).

The Council is asked to note the final recommendations, which will determine the names and boundaries of SCC electoral areas (divisions) from the May 2025 local election onwards.

BACKGROUND:

1. An electoral review aims to ensure fair representation for residents and examines the structure of local council elections, including:
 - a) The total number of councillors elected to the local authority.
 - b) The quantity, name and boundaries of divisions.
 - c) The number of councillors per division.
2. The LGBCE conducts electoral reviews for several reasons, including requests from local authorities, scheduled periodic reviews, or significant changes within a council area. SCC's review was necessary because it had been 12 years since the last review (2010-2012).

THE ELECTORAL REVIEW PROCESS:

3. The electoral review involved three main stages:
 - a) **Council Size Consultation:** In December 2022, SCC submitted a response to the LGBCE in favour of retaining 81 single-councillor divisions. The LGBCE confirmed in February 2023 that SCC would continue to have 81 councillors.
 - b) **Division Boundaries Consultation:** The commission undertook the task of re-drawing division boundaries to meet statutory criteria, ensuring effective and equitable representation. Between February and

May 2023, an initial public consultation was conducted to gather input on community perspectives and preferences for the division boundaries. This feedback informed the commission's draft proposals, which were subsequently released for public consultation from August to October 2023.

- a. Following this, the commission held a limited further consultation on aspects of the refined proposals between January and March 2024, which focussed specifically on Elmbridge.
- c) **Final Recommendations:** In May 2024, the LGBCE published its final recommendations, which were subsequently laid before Parliament in July 2024. Following a statutory objection period ending in October 2024 (during which no objections were raised), the recommendations were formalised through the Surrey (Electoral Changes) Order 2024, signed on 20 November 2024.

DEVELOPING THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE:

4. SCC formed a cross-party councillor task group to lead its response to the review. The group comprised:
 - Cllr John O'Reilly (Conservative) – Chair
 - Cllr Amanda Boote (Residents' Association/Independents)
 - Cllr Jonathan Essex (The Green Party)
 - Cllr Will Forster (Liberal Democrats)
 - Cllr Tim Hall (Conservative)
 - Cllr Nick Harrison (Residents' Association/Independents)
 - Cllr Robert King (Labour)
 - Cllr Hazel Watson (Liberal Democrats)
5. The task group coordinated responses to the Council Size and Divisional Boundaries consultations.

OUTCOMES OF THE ELECTORAL REVIEW:

6. The final recommendations report by the LGBCE outlines the new electoral arrangements for SCC. The key points include:
 - a. SCC will continue to have 81 councillors representing 81 single-councillor divisions.
 - b. The boundaries of 56 divisions will change, with 25 divisions remaining the same.

- c. The names of 11 divisions will change, with 70 remaining unchanged.
- d. **Fair Representation:** The number of electors per councillor is projected to average 11,911 by 2029, an increase from the 2022 average of 10,820.
- e. Detailed maps of the each of the 81 new boundaries can be accessed online:
<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/3bef6b888e6f449aa465d505de8da6b9/>

NEXT STEPS:

- 7. The Surrey (Electoral Changes) Order 2024 will result in the changes to division boundaries being implemented at the local elections in May 2025. This Order is essential to ensure that the new arrangements are legally binding and enforceable. The Order will mean that the current county division boundaries will become obsolete and the May 2025 election will be run using the new boundaries as set out above.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Council is asked to:

- a) Note the final recommendations of the electoral review process.
- b) Recognise the efforts of the cross-party task group in shaping SCC's response.
- c) Note that the new county division boundaries will come into effect in May 2025.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER:

The review has been conducted by the LGBCE in accordance with the powers and rules within the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (The 2009 Act). There are no further legal comments arising out of the decision of the LGBCE.

Lead/Contact Officers: Elliot Sinclair, Support Services Manager, Surrey County Council, elliot.sinclair@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

- [Local Government Boundary Commission for England \(LGBCE\) Final Recommendations Report, May 2024.](#)
- [The Surrey \(Electoral Changes\) Order 2024](#)



OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS

KEY ISSUE/DECISION:

The Independent Person is a statutory role under Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011 with the purpose of assisting the County Council in promoting high standards of conduct by elected, appointed and co-opted Members of the County Council and in relation to disciplinary matters concerning the Council's Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer.

Section 28(7) of the Localism Act 2011 states that local authorities must appoint at least one Independent Person and must ensure that the process to appoint Independent Persons must be open and transparent, and any appointment must be approved by a majority of Members of the authority.

The Surrey County Council Arrangements for Dealing with Allegations of Breaches of the Member Code of Conduct (Part 6(02) of the Constitution) set out that the views of the Independent Person must be sought by the Council before it takes a decision on any allegation which it has decided should be investigated.

The Council's Officer Employment Procedure Rules (Article 11.08, paragraph 4(b)), set out that no disciplinary action against the Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer (Section 151 Officer) may be taken except in accordance with a recommendation in a report made by a designated Independent Person.

BACKGROUND:

1. In December 2020, following a recommendation by the Member Code of Conduct Working Group, the Council agreed to appoint two Independent Persons – Akbar Khan and Phillippa Harding.
2. Mr Khan and Ms Harding notified the Interim Monitoring Officer that they would be stepping down at the end of their term in December 2024. The Council would like to formally thank both Independent Persons for their work over their term of office.

3. In September 2024, the Audit and Governance Committee approved an updated Independent Member role profile (**Annex 1**) and noted the proposed recruitment process and the establishment of a cross-party panel to conduct interviews with suitable candidates. The cross-party panel consisted of: Councillors Amanda Boote (Residents Association/Independent); Helyn Clack (Conservative); John Robini (Liberal Democrat). The panel was supported by the Interim Director of Law and Governance (Interim Monitoring Officer).
4. The position was advertised in the following places:
 - Surrey County Council website
 - Surreyjobs
 - JobsGoPublic
 - Indeed
 - Guardian Jobs
 - Find a Job (GOV)
 - LinkedIn
5. Applicants were asked to send a covering statement to express their interest and explain how they met the desired requirements set out in the role profile, together with a CV before the closing date of 6 October 2024. Seven applications were received, and the Panel met on 21 October to agree a shortlist and interview questions.
6. Interviews took place on 31 October 2024. The Panel interviewed 4 candidates, and the recommendation is that Belinda Knight and Dean Spears be appointed as Independent Members for a four-year term. Biographies of Ms Knight and Mr Spears are attached to this report as **Annex 2**.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. That the County Council formally notes its thanks to the two retiring Independent Persons following the end of their term of office.
- B. That County Council appoints Belinda Knight and Dean Spears as Independent Members for a four-year term.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER:

Please see “Key Issue/Decision” section above.

Lead/Contact Officers:

Asmat Hussain, Interim Director of Law & Governance,
Asmat.Hussain@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

Localism Act 2011

Constitution of the Council

Report to Council, 8 December 2024

Report to Audit & Governance Committee, 11 September 2024

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Independent Person Role Profile

Annex 2 – Biographical Information – Belinda Knight and Dean Spears

ANNEX 1 – INDEPENDENT MEMBER ROLE PROFILE

1. To assist the County Council in promoting high standards of conduct by elected, appointed and co-opted Members of the County Council, and in particular to uphold the Member Code of Conduct and the seven principles of public life, namely selflessness, honesty, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness and leadership.
2. To be consulted by the County Council through the Monitoring Officer and/or the relevant panel or committee.
3. To be consulted by any Council Member who is the subject of an alleged breach of the Code of Conduct.
4. To participate on Panels appointed to consider the dismissal of relevant officers, as defined in the Council's Standing Orders, namely the Head of Paid Service, the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer.
5. To recommend any disciplinary action, other than suspension, to be taken in respect of relevant officers.
6. To liaise effectively with the Monitoring Officer, Members of the County Council and the Member Conduct Panel.
7. To acquire understanding of the work of the Council and how it operates. Support will be provided by the Council's Monitoring Officer, who will arrange any necessary training and the provision of such information which is considered necessary to enable the Independent Person to perform the role properly.
8. To attend Audit & Governance Committee in an advisory, non-voting capacity in relation to Code of Conduct matters only.
9. By law a person may not be appointed as an Independent Person if that person:
 - a. is a Member, co-opted Member or officer of the Council or of a parish council within Surrey.
 - b. is a relative, or close friend of such a person, or
 - c. has been a Member, co-opted Member or officer of the Council or of a parish council within Surrey in the previous 5 years.

The person will be appointed for a fixed term of 4 years.

ROLE DESCRIPTION

1. The Independent Person is a statutory role under Section 28(6) of the Localism Act 2011 with the purpose of assisting the County Council in promoting high standards of conduct by elected, appointed and co-

opted Members of the County Council and in relation to disciplinary matters concerning the Council's Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer.

2. The Independent Person should have a keen interest in standards in public life, personal integrity, an ability to act with independence, tenacity and objectivity, and sound inter-personal, decision making and analytical skills. They must demonstrate and promote their commitment to the Council's equality, diversity and inclusion policies.
3. The Independent Person may be called upon where the Council has received an allegation that one of its councillors has breached the Member Code of Conduct. If the Council decides to investigate the allegation, the Member Conduct Panel must consult the Independent Person and take their views into account before making a decision on that allegation. The Monitoring Officer and/or Member Conduct Panel may seek the views of the Independent Person about any other aspect of the allegation, whether or not it decides to investigate.
4. A Member of the Council who is the subject of an allegation may also seek the views of the Independent Person at any time. This advisory role to an individual Council Member will only arise where the Member is subject to an alleged breach of the relevant code of conduct. An Independent Person will not be expected – and should decline – to give advice to Council Members or to the public in any other circumstances.
5. In practice, when the Council receives a written allegation of a breach of the Code of Conduct, its Monitoring Officer may contact the Independent Person at any of the following points:
 - a) To discuss whether a complaint relates to a potential breach.
 - b) Exceptionally, to discuss whether disclosing the identity of a complainant to the Member might prejudice the outcome of an investigation.
 - c) To decide whether or not a complaint should proceed to investigation where informal resolution is not possible due to lack of agreement by the parties.
 - d) When a complaint has been investigated and the investigating officer concludes that there is no evidence of a failure to comply with the Member Code of Conduct, the Independent Person will receive a copy of the investigation report from the Monitoring Officer and asked for their view on whether to convene a Member Conduct Panel.
 - e) Where a complaint has been investigated and the investigating officer concludes that there is evidence of a failure to comply with

the Member Code of Conduct, the complaint will be considered by a Member Conduct Panel.

- f) The Chairman of the Member Conduct Panel will report to the Independent Person and seek their views before a final decision is reached on whether the Member has or has not failed to comply with the Code of Conduct.
6. There will only be limited occasions when the Independent Person is required to travel to a specified location in Surrey. However, the nature of the role requires the Independent Person to be readily contactable by telephone and email and to respond within agreed timescales.

ANNEX 2 – BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Belinda Knight is a long-standing Surrey resident. She has extensive experience of investigating complaints and conduct issues across a range of public sector organisations.*

Dean Spears is currently employed as Chief Operating Officer and Head of Blue Natural Capital, Sussex Bay, hosted by Adur and Worthing Councils on behalf of 11 councils. He is currently a Listening Volunteer and Befriender at the Brighton and Hove Community Switchboard and a Volunteer and Befriender for the NSPCC. He was previously employed as Operations Bursar (Director) at Brighton College; Divisional Director, Campus Services and Sustainability at the University of York, and Deputy Director of Estate Services at the University of Sussex. He also previously held senior local government roles at Camden Council and Brighton and Hove Council.

*Please note that Ms Knight has requested that specific details of the organisations she has worked with are kept confidential.

This page is intentionally left blank

County Council Meeting – 10 December 2024

REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Cabinet met on 29 October 2024 and 26 November 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 13. 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 9 December 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

A. COORDINATED ADMISSIONS SCHEME FOR SEPTEMBER 2026 (as set out in the Cabinet agenda from 26 November 2024)

1. That Cabinet RECOMMENDS that the County Council approves the coordinated admissions scheme that will apply to all applicants and schools for 2026.

Reasons for Decisions:

- The coordinated admissions scheme for 2026 is essentially the same as 2025 with dates updated
- There are several changes that have been made to the primary and secondary schemes as points of clarification (see paragraph 9), but these do not alter current practice
- The coordinated admissions scheme will enable the County Council to meet its statutory duties regarding school admissions
- The coordinated admissions scheme is working well
- The Local Authority has a statutory duty to publish its coordinated admissions scheme for 2026 by 1 January 2025
- The proposed scheme meets the statutory requirements of the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Coordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012 and the School Admissions Code

REPORTS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

At its meeting on 29 October 2024 Cabinet considered:

B. YOUR FUND SURREY APPLICATION- NEW ROWLEDGE VILLAGE HALL PROJECT, FARNHAM

This report set out the key information on the New Rowledge Village Hall, Farnham

Your Fund Surrey (YFS) application.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet agrees to fund the full amount requested of £800,000, comprised of:
 - capital funding towards the development of the new village hall, to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend
 - Including 5% to be held by SCC until final evidence of completion and building control sign-off and income and expenditure provided
2. That Cabinet agrees that funding would be conditional on evidence of the sale of their existing land and all other funding being in place before release of any grant.

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.

New Rowledge Village Hall Project aim to create a welcoming and supportive community space that will advance the health and wellbeing of the community including physical activities.

C. LONDON ROAD GUILDFORD ACTIVE TRAVEL SCHEME - INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 1 FOR CONSIDERATION TO PROCEED

Cabinet was asked to make a decision regarding the London Rd, Guildford Active travel scheme, funded by an Active Travel England grant.

RESOLVED:

Following a discussion on the item, a vote was taken by the Cabinet on the following recommendations:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Notes the contents of the independent technical review of section 1 and its conclusions concerning whether the scheme complies with current design guidance.
2. Proceeds with the construction of Section 1 –based on the strength of support from the local community, alongside the conclusions of the independent technical review.

There were THREE votes FOR and SIX votes AGAINST. The decision was therefore **not** carried.

At its meeting on 26 November 2024 Cabinet considered:

D. REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

The Cabinet decision of 29 October 2024 regarding the London Road Guildford Active Travel Scheme had been called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee. The Cabinet were asked to re-consider their decision.

RESOLVED:

1. In respect of the Call in report on the London Road Guildford Active Travel Scheme. The Cabinet confirmed that the decision taken on 29 October 2024 still stands **(See Paragraph C above)**.

Reasons for Decisions

The Cabinet agreed that no new evidence had been provided by the Select Committee and all the key issues raised by the Select Committee had already been considered by the Cabinet.

E. BAGSHOT COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRE

Cabinet was asked to make a decision around the closure of Bagshot Community Recycling Centre.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet agree to the closure of the Community Recycling Centre (CRC) at Swift Lane, Bagshot and as a consequence agree to the opening of the CRC at Wilton Road, Camberley for an extra day a week (Tuesday).
2. That Cabinet allow those residents of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead who currently use the Bagshot CRC to use Lyne CRC, Chertsey as an alternative.

Reasons for Decisions:

The Bagshot CRC site is small, unmodernised and not fit for purpose. It is not an 'unsafe' site (SUEZ have obligations to keep the site safe and lawful) but there are hazards – for example, users of the site park their cars in the centre of the plot, and then walk across the path of moving vehicles to access the various waste containers.

The site has to close for container exchange, leading to inconvenience and a build-up of queues. There is no means of compacting waste in the containers which means that they will be taken off the site with spare capacity – creating more of a carbon impact per tonne in terms of haulage and increased vehicle movements. These issues do not occur at modernised sites.

There is an ongoing pattern of vandalism, fly tipping and unlawful entry at the Bagshot CRC site which happens out of hours (i.e. when the CRC is closed and overnight). Staff have been threatened by (some) users of the site who are attempting to bring non-acceptable (potentially unlawful) material onto the site. Rather than confront the user, for their own safety, the staff have had to accept the waste as presented.

Fly tipping has occurred both within the site and outside of the entrance. The existing perimeter fencing does not present a sufficient barrier to these episodes, which often involve the use of mechanical equipment. Material fly tipped has in the past included hazardous materials such as asbestos. Prevention measures would be difficult and costly to implement and could include reinforced walls with climb prevention, enhanced 24 hr security guard presence and additional lighting.

SUEZ have recorded 801 instances of fly tipping across all Surrey CRC sites between January 2019 and August 2024. Of these, 531 (66%) were at Bagshot CRC. Of the other 14 sites, Lyne Lane CRC, near Chertsey, experienced 89 fly tipping incidents (11%) in the period. Fly tipping incidents at all of the other 13 sites combined make up the remaining 23%.

SCC's waste contractor, SUEZ, retain incident logs which have recorded 48 nuisance incidents (fly-tipping, break ins, vandalism, anti-social behaviour) at Bagshot CRC between 2nd January and 25th August 2024. No other SCC CRC suffers such high levels of nuisance-based disruption. This disruption impacts on site staff and users negatively, the site often having to close to allow remedial action. A summary of the SUEZ incident logs is included at Annex C.

Despite the high levels of disruption, a review of complaints received from users of the site by SUEZ since January 2023 shows that 23 complaints have been recorded across the CRC estate, none of which relate to Bagshot CRC. SUEZ believe that this reflects the empathy felt by users for the on-site staff, recognising the difficulties the site presents.

The access road is narrow and itself suffers from fly tipping.

Swift Lane is not accessible on foot, so its closure will not impact pedestrian visitors.

The nearest alternative site is Camberley CRC which is approximately 6 miles away from the Bagshot CRC and has a travel time between the two sites (by car) of approximately 15 minutes. Alternative CRC sites are located within 10 miles

Analysis undertaken by SCC's Transport Modelling specialists shows that the Swift Lane CRC in Bagshot is the closest CRC to 12,428 households. If the Bagshot CRC was to close:

- 7,894 (63.5%) would see no increase in drive time when accessing the nearest alternative CRC (Lyne, Woking or Camberley) if the Bagshot site was to close; and
- 4,544 (36.5%) would have a maximum drive time of 20 minutes (covering 7.8 miles) to their nearest alternative CRC site.

A map marked up with postcode 'clusters' in the Bagshot CRC catchment area showing the closest alternative sites is included at Annex D

The site is owned by Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) who lease it to SCC. The site will be returned to SHBC if it closed.

F. 2025/26 DRAFT BUDGET AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY TO 2029/30

Cabinet was asked to consider the 2025/2026 Draft Budget and Medium-term financial strategy to 2029/30 which set out progress towards delivering a balanced budget.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet notes the 2025/26 Draft Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy to 2029/30, including progress to date in setting out spending pressures and efficiencies, as set out in Annex A.
2. That Cabinet notes the provisional budget gap of £17.4m for 2025/26 and the next steps required to close the gap.
3. That Cabinet notes the proposed Draft Capital Programme for 2025/26 to 2029/30 of £1.4bn set out in Section 6 of the report and Annex B
4. That Cabinet notes the summary of Resident Engagement and next steps set out in Section 9 of the report.

Reasons for Decisions:

In January 2025, Cabinet will be asked to recommend a Final Budget for 2025/26 to full Council for approval in February. The draft budget sets out proposals to direct available resources to support the achievement of the Council's corporate priorities, balanced against a challenging financial environment, giving Cabinet the opportunity to comment on the proposals and next steps.

G. EQUITY IN EDUCATION – NO LEARNER LEFT BEHIND – SURREY'S LIFETIME OF LEARNING STRATEGY

Cabinet was asked to approve the Surrey Lifetime of Learning Strategy and its publication.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves the Surrey Lifetime of Learning Strategy and its publication.
2. That Cabinet endorses the ambition of the Surrey Education Partnership that no learner is left behind, and agrees the partnership ambition, principles and priorities for children, young people and adults as outlined in the strategy for 2024-30.
3. That Cabinet agrees to contribute as a key partner to the ambition, principles and priorities for children, young people and adults as outlined in the strategy for 2024-30.

Reasons for Decisions:

Whilst most of the children, young people and adults in Surrey achieve, thrive, belong and live well, this is not the case for everyone.

In Surrey, children from less-well off homes start school already educationally behind their peers, and this gap persists throughout school and into further and higher

education. In many instances outcomes are weaker than similarly disadvantaged learners in other parts of the country.

In some areas of Surrey, adults are less able to secure economic well-being because of skills and qualification gaps.

We are aware that attendance is a significant factor in achieving the best outcomes, and that in Surrey exclusion from school and poor attendance is too high.

Studies have also shown direct links between education and factors such as health and life expectancy rates, with academic achievement playing a potentially significant role in reducing health inequalities by shaping life opportunities.

This strategy will ensure that we take the necessary actions across the partnership, to close the gaps in terms of educational outcomes, exclusions and attendance. It will also ensure that Surrey adults can access learning opportunities, in high quality provision, that develop new skills or secure new qualifications to help them succeed at any time they need to.

H. RIGHT HOMES, RIGHT SUPPORT: OLDER PEOPLE'S RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING CARE DELIVERY STRATEGY

The report sought Cabinet approval for the Residential and Nursing Care Delivery Strategy to improve the residential and nursing care offer for older residents in Surrey within the wider Right Homes, Right Support Strategy (RHRS). Its inclusion ensures that Surrey County Council has a comprehensive strategy across Supported Independent Living for working age adults, affordable Extra Care Housing, and Residential and Nursing Care for older people.

It was AGREED:

1. That Cabinet approves the Right Homes, Right Support: Older People's Residential and Nursing Delivery Strategy.
2. That Cabinet approves £3.6m of capital funding from the Council's capital pipeline for the Older People's Residential and Nursing Delivery Strategy to:
 - a. Undertake the necessary Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Stage 0 Strategic Definition Studies, RIBA Stage 1 Feasibility Studies, and market engagement across the whole Council owned care home portfolio.
 - b. Enable a strategic business case to be developed across the whole care home portfolio.
3. That Cabinet notes the direction of travel for care homes on Council owned land (set out in recommendation 2) and the possible need for public consultation on the proposed future use of sites.

Reasons for Decisions:

Approval of the Strategy set out within this report will:

- a) Enable independence and improved outcomes for Surrey's older residents for as long as possible through delivering specialist care home accommodation, which will play a key role in the prevention of early admissions into acute hospitals and into long term care home placements that may not be necessary.
- b) Ensure that there is sufficient care home provision available to meet the increasing older peoples' population in Surrey and that can support people with complex mental health needs and complex physical frailty.
- c) Enable us to address the current, and future, deficit in available capacity from the wider care market. Despite extensive steps taken to address prices paid, developing new contracting arrangements, and investing in care home capabilities across the Surrey care market, we need new opportunities and improved capacity to enable the best outcomes for residents.
- d) Enhance our offer of support to providers to improve quality and outcomes for all residents receiving care and enable them to deliver services to meet increased demand and complex needs.
- e) Long standing strategic contracts commissioned by the Council will be managed through robust expiry planning to ensure there is minimal disruption to residents, carers, families and operational teams.
- f) Ensure that we develop (subject to detailed market engagement, feasibility studies and outcomes of possible public consultation) the most commercially viable and financially sustainable strategic business case for the Council to achieve its Residential and Nursing Care Strategy for Surrey's older residents.
- g) Ensure effective use of the Council's assets to deliver improved outcomes for our residents, that is financially sustainable and means 'no one is left behind'.

I. QUARTERLY REPORT ON DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER SPECIAL URGENCY ARRANGEMENTS: 1 October 2024 - 2 December 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 have been no urgent decisions since the last Cabinet report to Council.

**Tim Oliver OBE, Leader of the Council
2 December 2024**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET
HELD ON 29 OCTOBER 2024 AT 2.00 PM
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL,
WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY,
RH2 8EF.**

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

(* 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
*Jonathan Hulley

Members in attendance:

Cllr Fiona Davidson, County Councillor for Guildford South-East
Cllr George Potter, County Councillor for Guildford East

**PART ONE
IN PUBLIC**

132/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Clare Curran, Paul Deach and Steve Bax.

133/24 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 24 SEPTEMBER 2024 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

134/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

135/24 PROCEDURAL MATTERS [Item 4]

The Leader explained that the agenda would be re-ordered so the substantive item on London Road could be taken earlier as a number of members of the public had attended the meeting for this item.

135/241 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 4a]

There were none.

136/24 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 4b]

There were seven public questions. A response from the Cabinet was published in the supplementary.

Pat Daffarn asked a supplementary question in response to his original which was if all road and housing developments would be refused until a sustainable infrastructure was in place so that Surrey County Council could actually deliver their zero carbon commitments. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth explained that all planning applications reside with Guildford Borough Council as the development authority and Surrey County Council was consulted on applications and made recommendations as necessary. The council funded bikeability and feet first training which targetted schools and had positive take up. The Cabinet Member did not believe that applications would be refused by the districts until a comprehensive network was in place but recognised that walking and cycling provision needed to be improved as new developments increased.

Doug Clare asked a supplementary question in response to his original which was if the Cabinet was going to listen to 2000 school children with no votes or listen to a small group of objectors stopping progress. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth stated that a public consultation had been undertaken and people on both sides of the debate had been heavily lobbying the Cabinet.

Oliver Greaves asked a supplementary question in response to his original question which was if the Cabinet believed the impact on traffic, air quality, the cost benefit and the needs of all road users were relevant matters for Section 1. If not, then why not. Assuming the council did believe these were relevant matters, how could the council comply with its constitutional obligations when it do not have the traffic modelling report for Section 1, no pollution report had been produced for Section 1, no report had been produced considering the needs of all road users and no cost benefit analysis had been produced. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth stated that as part of the consultation, a number of the points that the questioner raised were published and considered as part of the report.

The Cabinet Member would be happy to share these documents with the questioner. The whole route including Section 1 had traffic modelling carried out which was shared with the stakeholder group and also published. The scheme would reduce air pollution and improve air quality with increased cycling.

137/24 PETITIONS [Item 4c]

There were none.

138/24 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON REPORTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE [Item 4d]

There were none.

139/24 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES, TASK GROUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL [Item 5]

A Cabinet response to the report from the Additional Needs and Disabilities Parent Carer Experience Task Group was included in the supplementary agenda.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet response to the Select Committee report is noted.

140/24 LEADER / DEPUTY LEADER / CABINET MEMBER/ STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE THE LAST CABINET MEETING [Item 6]

There were six decisions for noting.

RESOLVED:

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

141/24 LONDON ROAD GUILDFORD ACTIVE TRAVEL SCHEME - INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 1 FOR CONSIDERATION TO PROCEED [Item 8]

The Leader briefly introduced the item explaining that discussions around the scheme had been ongoing for nearly two years. The speakers would be given 3 minutes to speak on the item, followed by an introduction by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth and then a discussion by the Cabinet.

Terry Newman from the London Road Action Group, made the following key points:

- Spoke against the report. Concerns were raised around inaccuracies in the ARUP report. It was commented that ARUPs accident data was inaccurate, official data reveals five slight car and pedal accidents in the five years to 2023, that was one a year and not two so the road was not worse than the rest of Surrey.
- 1.5 meter separation is unreliable and passing HGV mirrors were just centimetres away.
- The Highway Code protects pedestrians by prohibiting cycling on pavements, yet still condones sharing. If mixing pedestrians and cyclists is a last resort for 45% of the length and is considered safe why not use foot ways to create 100% shared paths.
- DfT has spent £2.3 billion knowing far too little about what this spending has achieved. No evidence has appeared to enable an opinion about net zero achievement, but a 5% reduction in traffic would need the removal of 750 vehicles daily only adding 300 hundred more cyclists.
- Surrey Highways actually wrote the road will remain the same width as it is currently, and that is incorrect, at the pinch point reviewed existing distance between kerbs is 8 metres.

Yasmin Broome from the Surrey Coalition of Disable People, made the following key points:

- Strongly opposing the scheme. Blind, visually impaired, disabled, older and vulnerable bus passengers should be able to get on and off the bus independently and directly from or to the pavement, as they have always done. They should not have to cross cycle lanes or step into a cycle lane to get on and off a bus.
- These designs are not safe or accessible for blind, visually impaired, older and many vulnerable groups of bus passengers. They create a new barrier to accessing public transport independently.
- Many people cite that shared bus stops are working well in other countries but this is not the case. In Denmark injuries to bus passengers caused by cyclists went up from 5 to 73 after the shared style bus stop design was introduced. In Islington, London in 2016 a shared bus stop was removed as it did not take account of the safety and accessibility needs of blind and visually impaired bus passengers.
- Zebra crossing and flashing lights have been tried and tested and will not change the behaviour of cyclists. We believe an number of incidents at these shared bust stops are going unreported. There is political support for a moratorium on shared bus stops. Lord Holmes of Richmond made a recommendation

in the House of Lords on the 25 of April 2024 around the dangers of floating bus stops.

William Clark and Charles Graham representing the George Abbott School, made the following key points:

- Will was a current student at the school and cycles to school and uses the London Road on most of his journeys. The London Road was very dangerous and Will tried to avoid cycling on this road at peak times due to how dangerous it was. He had many close calls with other vehicles and had an incident where he was cut up on a roundabout next to London Road and went over the handle bars of his bike.
- Charles was an alumni of the school and cycled to and from school for 7 years. He explained that when he was 13, he was knocked off his bike by a car trying to overtake him on the road because there was no cycle lane. He went into the hedge and injured myself.
- The scheme was important as cyclists have to travel on roads that are not safe. This scheme would make cycling safer. The school had made a commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in any way possible and students cycling into school was an easy way to achieve this.
- Last year, George Abbott did a survey of 740 people and almost half of them said that they would cycle to school if there was improved cycle infrastructure in place.
- Things needed to change if we want to save our planet.

James Masterman representing the Guildford Bike User Group (G-BUG), made the following key points:

- Is a cyclist and lives 200 yards from London Road in Burpham. Burpham is part of an existing important bike lane network and no congestion is being added to the London Road by cycling.
- Only 1% of journeys on the London Road were by bike. 30% of reported injuries on the road are to cyclists.
- Segregating the cycle lane from traffic is something that Burpham residents want. In the public consultation, 5:3 were in support of this. The scheme would support the Council's own policies and plans including the Local Transport Plan 4. It would also support net zero ambitions. The council's own highway officers have redesigned the scheme following earlier concerns.
- ARUP have signed off the scheme from a safety point of view and the Local Member, George Potter and Local MP, Zoe Franklin support the scheme.

- Burpham Residents Association have no objection to the scheme. Cabinet were asked to support the scheme as it would be a travel improvement for the majority of Burpham residents who want to cycle but are scared to do so.

Cllr Fiona Davidson, Local Member for Guildford South-East, made the following key points:

- Asked Cabinet to vote against the scheme. The Cabinet report states the scheme has the support of the majority of local residents and that all the safety issues raised by those residents have been satisfactorily resolved by the ARUP report but this is not the case.
- The ARUP report was a limited desktop exercise and the author never visited the road.
- Residents in the Member's area which covers 3/8 of the road are heavily against the scheme and don't believe the scheme is safe and don't believe the outcomes justify the investment.
- London road was a safer road and in the last 5 years there had been 18 slight accidents, one serious, not involving a cyclist. Of the 18 slight accidents five involved cyclists and cars.
- Concerns were raised around the width of the new carriageway and its proximity to the footway. As some of the footway would be narrower this would cause issues for pedestrians and deter the disabled, the elderly and those with prams. As a partially sighted person the Councillor wouldn't use this footway as it's not an improvement on what exists now.
- Would support changes that could accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles separately and safely but the A3100N is narrow in places.

Cllr George Potter, Local Member for Guildford East, made the following key points:

- Two thirds of the route is in his division as a County Councillor and as a district and borough Councillor the entirety of the route is in his area.
- All the objections raised regarding the scheme had been addressed including the 8 month road closure, unsafe road lane widths, the floating bus stops and safety concerns about some aspects of design.
- The scheme in question would bring about major improvements for pedestrian safety as the current pavements are too narrow in some places and crossing over the road in some places is impossible.
- The majority of residents support this scheme which has been identified as a major part of the sustainable movement corridor

in Guildford. Objectors have not stated what they would like to see instead of this scheme.

- The scheme has been independently assessed by ARUP and Active Travel England as being the best scheme possible given the physical constraints of the route. The scheme would be a major improvement in safety, not just for cyclists but for pedestrians along the current route.
- Asked Cabinet to support the recommendations put forward by officers who have spent the last 2 years developing the scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth briefly introduced the report explaining that London Rd, Guildford is an active travel scheme funded and fully supported by an Active Travel England grant. It had progressed through the design and decision-making process as three separate identified sections. The scheme was previously considered for decision in February 2024. At this meeting, the decision was taken to proceed to delivery on Section 2 and carry out an independent technical review on Section 1 to enable future decision making on its delivery. A review undertaken by an independent professional engineering organisation concluded that the design of Section 1 allows HGVs to safely pass and that the shared use paths comply with LTN 1/20 guidance. The delivery of this project would allow the council to contribute to the ambitions of the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) and help achieve the county's net zero carbon target by 2050. It was explained that officers had been engaging with residents on the scheme for the last two years and a consultation had been undertaken in 2023 to understand their views. In this consultation, 50% of respondents agreed that the design of Section 1 positively contributed to the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and vulnerable road users.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care spoke on the report stating that she had been contacted by the CEO for Sight for Surrey and the CEO for the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People who were not in support of the scheme. As an advocate for vulnerable people the Cabinet Member was concerned that the scheme would deter vulnerable people from using local facilities and being independent she could therefore not support the scheme.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities recognised that a lot of time and deliberation had gone into consideration for the scheme. Although there are many benefits to the scheme one key area of concern was around safety. The technical review states that there may be an element of discomfort and giving way when users are passing one another on the shared pavement. This caused the Cabinet Member concern especially as there were 'pinch points' on the route and areas where the carriage way was more narrow. For this reason, the Cabinet Member could not support the recommendations.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, and Public Health stated his support for the scheme. The Cabinet Member declared that he was a Trustee of Active Surrey. The Cabinet Member explained that the UK was a nation of car drivers and if we are to change that and get fitter for the future we would need to see the introduction of schemes which would encourage walking and cycling. The Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience thanked residents for their emails and thoughts regarding the scheme. The Cabinet Member stated that his main concern was with the width of the road and shared pathway and the impact this would have on vulnerable residents. Although the scheme would be grant funded it was important that the money was used wisely. The Cabinet Member stated that he would not be supporting the officer recommendations.

The Cabinet Member for Environment stated that safety was a serious issue but so was the need to make Surrey a better county with sustainable transport links and better air quality. The Cabinet Member stated that a shift in transport would never be easy and would cause disruption but would also bring about better health, less congestion and cleaner air. The Cabinet Member explained how decisive action from Dutch politicians around cycle lanes had led to the Netherlands becoming the cycling capital of the world. The Cabinet Member welcomed the £6m funding coming into the county as a result of the scheme and stated her support for the proposals.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources declared that previously he had been a member and Chair of the Global Road Safety Partnership. He stated that the pros and cons for the scheme were evenly split. The two key issues he had were firstly around the width of the carriageway for two HGVs passing and the second was the width of the shared space/pavement. Although Cobham had shared spaces, the report states that in this scheme there would be areas where the shared space was narrow and could cause discomfort. The Cabinet Member had concern around the possible impacts on vulnerable residents after hearing from the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People and believed that the scheme needed to benefit everyone. The Cabinet Member therefore did not support the scheme.

The Leader started by saying that Surrey County Council was very supportive of people being more active which was one of the council's priorities. The council was also very passionate about reducing traffic as part of its net zero ambitions and this was one of the reasons why this scheme was introduced. The scheme had been significantly altered from what had been proposed originally. There was a recognition that appropriate consultation with residents hadn't been done. The Leader stated that issue around two HGVs passing safely on the road had caused compromise to the shared pathway, which in turn has caused concerns around safety. Concern was also felt for vulnerable residents. A full discussion had taken place over the last 2 years on the scheme.

The Leader thanked everyone for their contributions saying that the quality of conversations and submissions from everyone on both sides of the argument had been outstanding. The Leader explained that the Cabinet would be taking a vote on the recommendations in the report.

RESOLVED:

Following a discussion on the item, a vote was taken by the Cabinet on the following recommendations:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. *Notes the contents of the independent technical review of section 1 and its conclusions concerning whether the scheme complies with current design guidance.*
2. *Proceeds with the construction of Section 1 –based on the strength of support from the local community, alongside the conclusions of the independent technical review.*

There were THREE votes FOR and SIX votes AGAINST. The decision was therefore not carried.

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

142/24 CABINET MEMBER OF THE MONTH [Item 7]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure. The following points were made:

- The redevelopment of the former Debenhams site, Winchester was near completion. New tenants on the ground floor were at fit out stage ready to trade before Christmas and new tenants for upstairs had been found.
- Brightwells, Farnham: Practical Completion of the development of this new retail and leisure commercial scheme occurred in September. The council funded the commercial retail element of the regeneration of Farnham and also the substantial infrastructure.
- In terms of disposals, over the last five years, £150 million of capital receipts had been achieved and the council was on track to achieve another £55m for 2025/26.
- All soft and hard facilities management had been outsourced to Macro. The in-house team had reduced from 125 FTEs to a client team of 16 FTE team.
- Land & Property achieved the ISO 45001 certification following a recent audit. This is an international safety accredited certificate,

and a great achievement following 2 years of operational improvements.

- The Resource and Circular Economy Team were progressing a planning application and developing the business case for a Surrey Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). The MRF will sort kerbside collected recyclables into component streams of paper, glass, metals and plastics etc.
- The Resource and Circular Economy Team were developing a proposal for a Reuse Hub on Ivy Dean Cottage which is immediately adjacent to the Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton.
- Work was progressing on the A320 HIF bid north of Woking, with a view to mobilise works from November / December at the earliest. The works programme will be 18-months plus.
- Special thanks was given to land and property staff, the Managing Director for Halsey Garton Properties and waste and infrastructure staff for all the good work being done.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet Member of the Month report is noted.

143/24 YOUR FUND SURREY APPLICATION- NEW ROWLEDGE VILLAGE HALL PROJECT, FARNHAM [Item 10]

The report was introduced by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member Customer and Communities. The report recommended Cabinet to approve £800k towards the development of a new village hall. The current building was not fit for purpose and had little insulation, a leaking roof, did not meet environmental standards and was impossible to maintain economically. The existing hall was well-used, open-to-everyone and the only low-cost general-purpose community building within South Farnham. The new Rowledge Village Hall would serve the residents in the Rowledge community in South Farnham which is going through rapid growth with over 100 new homes having been built in the last 3 years. The Cabinet was being asked to fund 27% of the total project cost. The remainder of the funding would be secured via other means including CIL funding. It was commented that the Your Fund Surrey programme had delivered 325 projects over the last 4 years with £21m being allocated to projects.

The Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience commented that it was positive to see that other sources of funding had already been secured for the new village hall.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet agrees to fund the full amount requested of £800,000, comprised of:

- capital funding towards the development of the new village hall, to be paid in staged payments, on evidence of spend
 - Including 5% to be held by SCC until final evidence of completion and building control sign-off and income and expenditure provided
2. That Cabinet agrees that funding would be conditional on evidence of the sale of their existing land and all other funding being in place before release of any grant.

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.

New Rowledge Village Hall Project aim to create a welcoming and supportive community space that will advance the health and wellbeing of the community including physical activities.

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

144/24 2024/25 MONTH 5 (AUGUST) FINANCIAL REPORT [Item 11]

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources. It was explained that there was an inaccuracy on the front page of the report under the Capital heading which should read that ‘At M5, capital expenditure of **£319.3m** is forecast for 2024/25. This is **£2.8m** more than the re-phased budget’. At M5, the Council was forecasting an overspend of £16.7m against the 2024/25 revenue budget. This was a £1.3m deterioration in the forecast overspend compared with the end of month 4. The overspend reflected the challenges the council faced especially in the areas of home to school transport assistance and Older People care packages. Work was being undertaken to contain the overspend in the home to school transport budget which was now at £7.4m. Mitigating measures needed to be identified to compensate for the forecast overspend. Although the council had a £20m contingency in the budget the idea would be to use this minimally. An update was given on the Capital budget. The month five forecast was £319.1m, which is £2.8m more than the re-phased budget. The key challenge would be working together with services to identify mitigating measures to pull back the forecast overspend.

The Leader stated it would be important to continue to make the point to government around the difficulty in balancing the budget due to the increase in demand in adult social care services for adults with disabilities and the cost of home to school transport which was now costing the council over £70m. The local government finance settlement would be due in December and an item on the 2025/26 draft

budget and MTFs would be considered at the November Cabinet meeting. Andy Brown had joined the council as Deputy Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer and was already working on the budget.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet notes the Council's forecast revenue 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)

145/24 SURREY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2023/24 [Item 9]

The report was introduced by Teresa Bell, Independent Chair of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board who explained that the term 'safeguarding is everyone's business' was overused and not every perceived risk required a referral through the Section 42 process under the Care Act. Safeguarding was not achieved by one single agency but by partners cooperating to prevent abuse and neglect and identifying this as early as possible. Appropriate action should then be taken by the partnership with the person impacted at the centre. It was explained that a new approach was being taken to the safeguarding adults reviews to ensure timeliness and avoiding lengthy delays. Helen Coombs and Luke Adams were thanked for their support to the Board.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care welcomed the report and stated that it was good to see what the boards focus and priorities were. The Cabinet Member thanked the Independent Chair for her work and commented that she had galvanised partners across the board. The Leader echoed thanks to the Independent Chair stating that the Board was moving forward in a positive and constructive way.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet considers and notes the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Annual Report for 2023/24.

Reasons for Decisions:

This recommendation demonstrates that the Council is fulfilling its statutory requirement under the Care Act 2014 in having established a Safeguarding Adults Board in its area.

It will support the SSAB to be transparent by providing information to the public on the performance of the Board and its strategic plan.

146/24 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 12]

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

147/24 LEADERS STATEMENT [Item]

The Leader explained that in light of new legal advice around the Project Libra report, the Council would not act further on the decision made by Cabinet on 24 September 2024. In the event that the matter came back to Cabinet, it would be considered wholly afresh.

148/24 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 3.39 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank