

COUNTY COUNCILCOUNCIL MEETING - 15 OCTOBER 2013

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 15 October 2013 commencing at 10.30 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

David Munro (Chairman)
Sally Marks (Vice-Chairman)

Mary Angell	David Ivison
W D Barker OBE	Daniel Jenkins
Nikki Barton	George Johnson
Ian Beardsmore	Linda Kemeny
John Beckett	Colin Kemp
Mike Bennison	Eber Kington
Liz Bowes	Rachael I Lake
Natalie Bramhall	Stella Lallement
Mark Brett-Warburton	Yvonna Lay
Ben Carasco	Denise Le Gal
Bill Chapman	Mary Lewis
Helyn Clack	Christian Mahne
Carol Coleman	Ernest Mallett MBE
Stephen Cooksey	Peter Martin
Steve Cossier	Jan Mason
Clare Curran	Marsha Moseley
Graham Ellwood	Tina Mountain
Jonathan Essex	Christopher Norman
Robert Evans	John Orrick
Tim Evans	Adrian Page
Mel Few	Chris Pitt
Will Forster	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Pat Frost	Denise Saliagopoulos
Denis Fuller	Tony Samuels
John Furey	Pauline Searle
Bob Gardner	Stuart Selleck
Mike Goodman	Nick Skellett CBE
David Goodwin	Michael Sydney
Michael Gosling	Keith Taylor
Zully Grant-Duff	Barbara Thomson
Ken Gulati	Chris Townsend
Tim Hall	Richard Walsh
Kay Hammond	Hazel Watson
David Harmer	Fiona White
Nick Harrison	Richard Wilson
Marisa Heath	Helena Windsor
Peter Hickman	Keith Witham
Margaret Hicks	Alan Young
David Hodge	Victoria Young
Saj Hussain	

*absent

63/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Witham.

64/13 MINUTES [Item 2]

Mr Essex requested the deletion of the last two bullet points, in relation to Item 9(ii) – the amendment moved by him to the original motion standing in the name of Mr Martin.

The minutes of the County Council held on 16 July 2013, as amended, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

65/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- On 18 July, he was proud to attend the summer party at the Runnymede Centre for Surrey's Looked after Children, their carers, foster parents and Surrey staff.
- On 3 September, he had met with the Walton Bridge 'workers'. Also, he was pleased to announce that, at this year's Annual Highway Award Ceremony, Walton Bridge had won the UK Major Project of the Year.
- Congratulations to Linda Kemeny who had recently got married.
- The lunchtime speaker was Simon Morris, Headteacher of Esher High School.

66/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

67/13 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

The Leader made a statement. A copy of his statement is attached as Appendix A.

Members were invited to make comments, ask questions and made the following points:

- The resurfacing of many roads across Surrey was welcomed but he was asked what steps were in place to improve Surrey's pavements for pedestrians.
- Praise for the work of the Environment and Transport Select Committee's Winter Service Task Group which was on-going and an excellent example of cross party working.
- Congratulations to Lucie Glenday and her team and also to BT, for achieving 30 September 2013 targets in relation to Superfast Broadband.

68/13 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Notice of 18 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

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

(Q2) Mrs White asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care if he agreed that there had been too many occasions where the Budget agreed for Adult Social Care had not been realistic and then relied on one-off savings to keep the expenditure within budget. The Cabinet Member responded by stating that this year, three Rapid Improvement Events had taken place in the Adult Social Care service and they have made a substantial contribution to the current year's savings and contributed to the overall savings of approximately £105m, which would be achieved by the end of this financial year. He confirmed that a realistic budget had been set for 2013/14 and that the service continued to focus on being efficient.

(Q3) Mr Cooksey asked the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment when the 72 Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) currently out of action would be working. **Mrs Frost** also asked the Cabinet Member what was the length of time, from when a broken sign was reported, to repair it and **Dr Grant-Duff** asked him to comment on how the repairs to VAS were prioritised. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the signs were being repaired but it was the decision of local committees to prioritise them. Referring to the query about the time taken, he said that he would respond outside the meeting.

(Q4) Mr Ellwood was concerned that the new measures were 'voluntary' and sought reassurance from the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment that the new tenants would not be permitted to work outside working hours. The Cabinet Member said that the county was not in a position to influence Guildford Borough Council's decision, however, the county council had consulted with residents and he hoped that good working practices would prevail.

(Q5) Mr Robert Evans referred to the proposal to reduce the number of fire engines in Spelthorne from two to one and asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services what were the positives for his residents. **Mrs Saliagopoulos** said that there was cross border cover available in the Spelthorne area. She also asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that the proposals for fire cover in this area were still out for consultation. The Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services responded and confirmed that the proposals were still out for consultation and local communities had contributed to it. She also stressed the importance of looking at the fire cover for the whole county and that, should the proposals be agreed, the response time would still be within the agreed standard for the whole county. She reiterated the importance of working within budget and that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service had invested heavily in the right equipment for any future changes.

(Q6) Several Members expressed concern about the road closures in place for the cycle race on 4 August. **Mr Barker** mentioned a specific case in his division whereby an ambulance had been stopped from attending an emergency call to an elderly lady. **Mr Beardsmore** expressed concern about the length of time that roads were closed. **Mrs Watson** referred to a resident in her area that needed urgent hospital treatment and asked what action would be taken at future events to ensure health and safety was paramount. **Mrs Frost** asked whether the lessons learnt from the cycle race would be taken into account as part of the Cycling Strategy consultation.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services agreed to investigate details of specific cases mentioned and asked Members to send her details. She said that the cycle race was a new event in which 2000 Surrey residents had taken part. She confirmed that the county council had worked together with the emergency services

to ensure that they were placed appropriately. However, lessons learnt from this year's event would be taken on board and used to improve next year's cycle race.

(Also, Q6) Mr Young asked the Cabinet Member if she was aware that there had been extensive consultation with the parish councils and the Mayor of London's office in relation to the RideLondon Surrey route and **Mr Hodge** asked her how many people had registered for next year's event and from this year's event, how much money had been raised for charity. The Cabinet Member confirmed to Mr Young that she was aware of the consultation and in response to Mr Hodge, she said that approximately £3.5m had been raised for charity and 80,000 people had registered for next year's event.

(Q7) Mrs Watson did not consider that her question had been answered and asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services who at the county council had made the decision that the Prudential RideLondon Surrey classic event would take place in Surrey for 5 years from 2013. **Mr Hall** also considered that any evaluation of the event should be conducted independently and not by the event organisers. He also invited the Cabinet Member to view next year's event in his division. The Cabinet Member said that she would respond to Mrs Watson outside the meeting and that she would raise the point made by Mr Hall with the event organisers. Finally, she said that many Members from all parties had supported the event and it was important to have a balanced view. However, she acknowledged that the County Council needed to work with its partners to minimise disruption.

(Q8) Mr Orrick asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services when the four remaining libraries would become Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs). Mr Hodge also asked the Cabinet Member to comment on the volunteers' role and whether the Council had opened any other libraries. She confirmed that the transfer of the four remaining libraries was 'work in progress'. In response to the other questions, she confirmed that there had been a positive response to the volunteers and that following the establishment of a micro library in Shere, a second one was about to open in Beare Green.

(Q9) Mr Mallett disagreed with some points of the response. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care requested that he put his queries in writing and he would provide a response outside the meeting.

(Q10) Mr Jenkins said that the response had not identified specific measures for improvement and posed his question again to the Cabinet Member for Community Services. **Mrs Bowes** asked the Cabinet Member if she agreed that, as had happened in her division, many residents had celebrated the event and thought it was a positive experience. **Mr Martin** also considered that the extensive press coverage was good publicity and beneficial for Surrey's tourism. **Mr Townsend** asked the Cabinet Member to confirm whether the route for the RideLondon Surrey Cycle event would remain the same in future years. She informed him that consultation was ongoing and would finish at the end of October, however, she was keen to deliver future events safely and to consider the needs of communities and businesses. Finally, she said that it was the event organiser who applied for the route and that those Members whose divisions were on the proposed route were aware of it.

As set out in Standing Orders, question time was limited to 45 minutes. This time limit was reached after question 11 and Members were advised that written responses had been tabled for all questions and if they had any supplementary

questions, they were invited to contact the relevant Cabinet Member outside the meeting.

69/13 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There were no statements by Members.

70/13 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

ITEM 8(i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Fiona White moved the motion which was:

‘National figures announced by the Coalition Government have brought welcome news on the large number of “Troubled Families” being turned around by councils across the country.

Troubled families are those that have problems and cause problems to the community around them, putting high costs on the public sector. Government funding is provided to help turn round troubled families.

The scheme, aims to:

- get children back into school
- reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour
- put adults on a path back to work
- reduce the high costs these families place on the public sector each year.

This is achieved by:

- joining up local services
- dealing with each family’s problems as a whole rather than responding to each problem, or person, separately
- appointing a single key worker to get to grips with the family’s problems and work intensively with them to change their lives for the better for the long term
- using a mix of methods that support families and challenge poor behaviour

Nationally, out of 118,000 families, 14,000 had been turned around by the end of July 2013, a 12% success rate.

Council notes that the Leader announced on his taking office that the County’s children are his number one priority. Council further notes that in Surrey, out of 1,000 families, only 12 had been turned around in the same period, a success rate of only 1.2%.

Council requests the Chairmen of the Adult Social Care and Children & Education Select Committees to convene a joint meeting to scrutinise reports from officers as to why Surrey is underachieving by a factor of 10 below the national average and to make recommendations to Cabinet as to how a rapid turnaround in performance in this crucial area of the Council’s business can be achieved.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Lallement.

Mrs White said that:

- She was disappointed with the County Council's performance in turning around such a small number of troubled families and gave the statistics for surrounding counties, which were all better than Surrey County Council.
- The Lib Dems believed in creating a fairer society.
- Children who did not have family support struggled to achieve.
- The impact of 'troubled families' on local communities and their anti-social behaviour was an issue.
- The adults often claimed unemployment benefit and the cost of troubled families mounted up.
- Health issues were sometimes an issue.
- The failure to recognise the issues was letting the troubled families down.
- She was in contact with the family support unit in Guildford.
- The Council should agree to her request for a joint meeting of the Adult Social Care and Children & Education Select Committees to consider these issues so that they could make recommendations to improve the outcomes for these families.

Mrs Angell responded and made the following points:

- That in Surrey, the word 'troubled' was not used, it was called the Family Support Programme.
- The figures quoted by Mrs White were inaccurate and the figure of 12 families mentioned in the motion referred to the number of families involved in the pilot programme. From October 2013, 794 families were on the Surrey programme, which had achieved a 40% success rate to date.
- Senior civil servants had visited the County Council in June and their feedback on the Family Support Programme was that the council was a leading authority in this area.
- Officers working in this area were supporting the national programme.
- The Family Support Programme was subject to rigorous scrutiny - the Children and Education Select Committee had received a report on this programme at its meeting on 19 September 2013.
- A report on Public Service Transformation would be considered by Cabinet on 22 October 2013 – this included the outline business case for Surrey's Family Support Programme.
- She did not agree with the request for a joint meeting of the relevant select committees.

Seven Members spoke on the motion, with the following points being made:

- The programme was being delivered in partnership with Boroughs and Districts.
- Each family on the programme had an individual plan.
- Cross County support was now available for the Family Support Programme.
- It was wrong to play politics with children's lives.
- There was a continued drive to transform public services in Surrey.
- Concern about the accuracy of data used in the original motion.
- Reports on this programme had also been to the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, as well as to the Children and Families Select Committee and the select committee had supported the progress made and considered that it was a well-delivered programme.

- More help was needed for troubled families in Spelthorne.
- A reference to a letter received from Government, in relation to the Council's partnership work with Boroughs and Districts, and that this 2-tier council had made real progress towards a one team approach.
- That, when challenged, statistics were often misleading and that other counties had turned around more troubled families.
- That the troubled families funding had been made available by the Coalition Government and this Council must put this issue at the top of its agenda.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 12 Members voting for it. There were 2 abstentions and the remaining Members voted against it and therefore the motion was lost.

ITEM 8(ii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Hazel Watson moved the motion which was:

‘Council notes that:

1. The County Council appears to be implementing policies on the use of social media and filming in Council, Cabinet, Select Committees and Local Committees even though no policies have been approved by Members. Policies which should be promoting openness and transparency have not been set in an open and transparent way.
2. Legislation [S.I 2012 No. 2089 The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012] and guidance by the DCLG have been issued on the role of social media and filming to promote openness and transparency in decision making.
3. The policies being applied by Surrey County Council place unnecessary obstructions to the use of social media and filming. For example, limiting the use of social media in meetings to breaks in business at the end of items and requiring written applications to film meetings.

Council agrees that:

- a) the use of social media and the filming of meetings shall be permitted at all times, without written permission, in the public part of meetings provided it does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space.
- b) it will follow the spirit of recent legislation and guidance in ensuring openness and transparency in decision making and scrutiny of decisions.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Forster.

Mrs Watson referred to guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government, in relation to social media and filming in meetings and said that the County Council had an inconsistent approach to the publication of guidance on its committees' agendas. She believed that requests for filming meetings should be an administrative rather than a political decision and that Council policy needed changing. She urged all Members to support her motion.

Ms Le Gal moved an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mrs Frost), which was to delete points 1-3 and (b) of the original motion and amend (a) as follows (additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

Council agrees that:

- a) the use of social media and the filming of meetings shall be permitted at all times, ~~without written permission~~ with the Chairman's consent obtained in advance of the meeting, in the public part of meetings provided it does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space.

Ms Le Gal made the following points:

- That the County Council was open and transparent which was why her amendment had removed the political points.
- The Chairmen were in charge of meetings and therefore his / her consent was required. This was particularly relevant for local committee meetings because they were held at various venues.
- Committee meetings were meetings held in public and not public meetings.

Eleven Members spoke on the amendment, with the following points being made:

- A request that school governors be asked to replicate this guidance at their meetings, if possible.
- Concern that the Chairman may not be fully in control of the meeting if use of social media, such as Twitter, was permitted.
- The Chairman was in control of the meeting and therefore, it was reasonable to obtain their consent.
- The Chairman was answerable to the public.
- Agreed that social media guidance needed clarification but the amendment went too far in the other direction.
- A request that the Epsom and Ewell Local Committee could determine their own guidance if they wished.
- Removing the words 'without written permission' adhered to the legislation.
- Openness and transparency were important.
- That the amendment was more restrictive than the original motion.

The amendment was put to the vote with 51 Members voting for and 20 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion. Members then voted on the substantive motion, which was agreed and therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That the use of social media and the filming of meetings shall be permitted at all times, with the Chairman's consent obtained in advance of the meeting, in the public part of meetings provided it does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.55pm and resumed at 2.15pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Barton,

Mr Ellwood, Mr Fuller, Mr Hall, Dr Grant-Duff, Mrs Hicks, Mrs Lallement, Mrs Lay, Mrs Moseley, Mr Sydney, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

ITEM 8(iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Robert Evans moved the motion which was:

'This Council opposes moves to erase Stanwell Moor from the map of Surrey'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Jenkins.

Prior to the start of the debate on this motion, the Leader of the Council raised a point of order because he considered that the Council had debated a motion on airports in July and therefore, the council should not debate another motion on this topic within six months. The Chairman informed Members that he had taken advice and the motion had been ruled in order because it was sufficiently different from the motion debated in July.

In support of his motion, Mr Robert Evans, made the following points:

- That at the last Council meeting, he had voted in favour of the motion relating to Heathrow and Gatwick. However, since then the Davies Commission had reported, setting out several proposals for Heathrow, including a south west option which would have a direct impact on 850 homes in Stanwell Moor.
- Concern about the health of residents and that Stanwell would become a 'dead-end' village if this proposal went ahead.
- Further increased traffic movement.
- Consideration of other options such as better use of capacity at Heathrow and re-routing holiday flights to other airports.
- Unlike many European airports, Heathrow was situated in an urban area.
- That the County Council had a responsibility to its residents.

Mr Furey moved an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mr Martin), which was (additional words underlined and deletions crossed through):

'This Council ~~opposes moves to erase~~ recognises the concerns of the residents of Stanwell Moor from the map of Surrey about proposals for the expansion of Heathrow and calls on the Davies Commission to end the uncertainty for them as soon as possible.'

Mr Furey reminded Members what had been agreed at the Council meeting in July – that the Council recognised the crucial roles of both airports in Surrey and that this authority would look closely at the impact of any expansion.

He also made the following points:

- Thousands of Surrey residents worked at the airport.
- 58 schemes had been submitted to the Davies Commission and until its interim draft report was published in December 2013, it was impossible to comment on specific proposals.

- If the south west option was included in the proposals, the County Council would be a consultee.
- That he considered that the amendment reflected the concerns of Stanwell Moor residents and he urged the Davies Commission to end the uncertainty as soon as possible.

Nine Members spoke on the amendment, with the following points being made:

- That the amendment was patronising and insulting.
- Two well attended public meetings had taken place in the area and that an invite to a future public meeting was extended to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and the Environment.
- Concern that the community would be split.
- The importance of time limitation for noise issues.
- The amendment abdicated responsibility and the Council should be concerned about planning issues for both Heathrow and Gatwick.
- Uncertainty was a big issue.
- Current Council policy supported no further expansion at Heathrow or Gatwick and it was better to wait until the interim report before taking further action.
- The amendment proposed a more measured way to express concern.
- It was preferable for the Davies Commission to end uncertainty and it was hoped that the south west option would not be shortlisted but if it was, there would be several issues to consider, such as the environmental impact, mitigation and compensation options.

The amendment was put to the vote with 43 Members voting for and 19 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions.

Therefore, the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion. Members then voted on the substantive motion, which was agreed and therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this Council recognises the concerns of the residents of Stanwell Moor about proposals for the expansion of Heathrow and calls on the Davies Commission to end the uncertainty for them as soon as possible.

ITEM 8(iv)

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

The Chairman advised Members who had asked for guidance about participating in this debate, if they were members of the planning committee, that they could participate fully in the debate and subsequent vote and that this would not preclude them from any future planning decision provided they maintained an open mind when hearing those applications.

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Jonathan Essex moved the motion which was:

‘Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking) of Shale Type Rock

Surrey County Council notes that:

1. New sources of energy supply that involve controversial technologies and methods should be subject to careful scrutiny and regulation. One such process is Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking) of shale type rock to release entrapped gas in commercial quantities.
2. Unfortunately there are no specific onshore exploration or extraction regulations for natural gas and the offshore regulations developed in the 1990s are not sufficient to address all the issues that arise from moving the process onshore, such as in the heavily populated and unspoilt environment of Surrey.

In particular, large amounts of water needed for hydraulic fracturing to extract shale gas (as well as the well-documented risk of groundwater contamination as a result of fracking where well integrity has been compromised) would put further pressure on limited water supplies in Surrey, and may put residents and local agriculture at risk;

Surrey County Council shall:

- (i) Review whether any economic benefits for Fracking would not be outweighed by costs to others sectors such as tourism; and
- ii) Call on the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to introduce Industry Specific regulation of hydraulic fracturing for the UK shale gas industry, as there are still no specific onshore exploration or extraction regulations for natural gas (and the offshore regulations developed in the 1990s are not sufficient to address all the issues that arise from moving the process onshore).’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

In support of his motion, Mr Essex made the following points:

- Concern about fracking, both from an engineering point of view and on environmental grounds.
- That the volumes of water needed for hydraulic fracking was huge and pollution was inevitable.
- Reference to the minor earthquake caused by fracking in Lancashire.
- Industrialisation of Surrey’s countryside – with piping across it and additional lorries.
- Licences have been approved for ‘pilot’ exploration in several areas of Surrey.
- This motion asks for the benefits of fracking to be reviewed and better regulation, for this industry, be introduced by Government.
- A greater understanding of the impact so that the Council was more in control of Surrey’s countryside.

Five Members spoke on the motion, with the following points being made:

- Fracking was still in its infancy.
- Acknowledgement that it was of interest to residents and that a 'questions / answers' webpage would be kept up to date.
- The Government was encouraging exploration and that residents should be reassured that this country had some of the most stringent environment and safety regulations in the world, which were monitored by the Health and Safety Executive.
- Policies were in place and the County Council was a Mineral Planning Authority.
- Uncertainty on how much shale gas exists.
- The Department of Environment had published a balanced report on fracking in July.
- Surrey was rich in natural resources and any planning application would be subject to rigorous scrutiny.
- A licence to explore near Egham had been granted.
- This motion requested a review on whether the benefits of fracking outweighed the disadvantages.
- Proper regulation was required.
- This country was known for going forward and exploration.
- Concern re. the water resource required and that there were too many unanswered questions.
- The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment referred to the Shale Gas 'questions and answers' on the Surrey County Council website which could answer many Members' questions and will be updated as required to take account of the latest information.

The motion was put to the vote with 16 Members voting for and 40 Members voting against it. There were 3 abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

71/13 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 23 July and 24 September 2013.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

Services for Young People transforms the lives of Surrey Young People – the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning tabled a statement (Appendix C)

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A Revision of Procurement Standing Orders

An amended table 3.1.1, which included a footnote to explain the distinction between Cabinet and Cabinet Member decisions and replaced the table included in the agenda, was tabled.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders, as amended, be agreed.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Investment Strategy
- Public Service Transformation
- Surrey Rail Strategy
- Quarterly Report on Decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 July 2013 – 30 September 2013

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 23 July and 24 September 2013 be adopted.

72/13 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report from the Audit and Governance Committee and highlighted the key points relating to the Risk Management Policy and the Code of Corporate Governance.

A RISK MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT

RESOLVED:

That the Risk Management Policy, as set out in Annex A of the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.

B CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

RESOLVED:

That the updated Code of Corporate Governance, as set out in Annex B of the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.

73/13 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2013 / 2014 [Item 11]

Mr Hodge, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee introduced this committee's report and said that the purpose of the report was to give the committee flexibility to consider salary progression for individual senior members of staff exceptionally. It should be considered in conjunction with the report from the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development recommending an amendment to the pay policy and the report from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services which set out the necessary changes to the Scheme of Delegation.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the following amendment to the Surrey Pay Policy Statement 2013-2014 be agreed (additional text in italics):

Surrey Pay

The council's total reward strategy is based on the local negotiation of "single status" Surrey Pay terms and conditions of service. This means that the majority of staff are on consistent terms and conditions of services, except for teachers and fire fighters. Pay, including terms and conditions, is reviewed annually with any changes agreed by the PPDC normally made with effect from 1 April. The council recognises two trades unions, the GMB and UNISON, for the purposes of negotiating Surrey Pay. *Salary progression for individual members of staff may be awarded exceptionally during the current period of pay restraint and must be approved by the PPDC for all staff on senior pay or by the appropriate head of service and the Head of HR&OD for staff on salaries below senior pay.*

- (2) That the terms of reference for the People, Performance and Development Committee be amended, to include *"To determine pay progression for individual staff on senior pay in accordance with the Pay Policy Statement."*
- (3) That the scheme of delegation to officers be amended to include the following:

TITLE OF POSTHOLDER	FUNCTIONS DELEGATED
Head of HR &OD with relevant Head of Service	To determine pay progression for individual for individual Officers who are not on senior pay in accordance with the Pay Policy Statement.

74/13 INTERIM REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 12]

The Leader of the Council informed Members that this recommendation from the Independent Remuneration Panel was for an exceptional one-off payment for Cabinet Associates. He also requested that the word 'each' should be inserted prior to 'Cabinet Associate with immediate effect'

Mrs Watson moved an amendment, which was to add an additional recommendation to that proposed by the Independent Remuneration Panel. This amendment was formally seconded by Mrs White.

The additional recommendation was:

'As the appointment of Cabinet Associates is a redistribution of the workload of the relevant Cabinet Member, a deduction of £5,000 shall be made from the special Responsibility allowance of the relevant Cabinet Member; thus ensuring the Cabinet and Cabinet Associates remain cost neutral in the current period of pay restraint.'

Mrs Watson said that she considered that the creation of Cabinet Associate roles was unnecessary because, in her view, the workload of Cabinet Members had not increased. Also, there were a significant number of Conservative councillors with Special Responsibility Allowances, with Surrey council taxpayers footing the bill.

Nine Members spoke on the amendment, with the following points being made:

- That the balance of the Cabinet portfolios was unequal.
- Concern about the budget and which budget would fund the immediate payments.
- Merging the two children's select committees from the previous council into one Children and Education Select Committee had given this select committee a very large workload.
- Comparing with other local authorities, the allowances paid to Surrey's Cabinet Members was at the lower end of the spectrum.
- The workload of Cabinet Members was increasing and the role of the Cabinet Associates was to assist the Cabinet Member, it was not a job share.
- Increases proposed by the Independent Remuneration Panel to Members' Allowances over the last few years, had often been rejected.
- Cabinet Members were 'value for money' – they had responsibility for large budgets.
- Concern expressed that these additional posts would increase the cost of Members' Allowances, at a time when some residents were finding it difficult to meet their bills.
- It was the role of select committee chairmen to hold the Cabinet to account.
- That this change increased the overall number of special responsibility posts for Cabinet and Cabinet Associates so that this now exceeds that for scrutiny of the Cabinet for the first time.

Mrs Watson requested a recorded vote on the amendment and 10 Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted for the amendment:

Mr Beardsmore, Mr Beckett, Mr Cooksey, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mr Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Hickman, Mr Jenkins, Mr Johnson, Mr Kington, Mrs Mason, Mr Orrick, Mrs Searle, Mrs Selleck, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson, Mrs White, Mrs Windsor

The following Members voted against the amendment:

Mrs Angell, Ms Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Carasco, Mrs Clack, Mrs Curran, Mr Tim Evans, Mrs Frost, Mr Furey, Mr Gardner, Mr Goodman, Mr Gulati, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mr Hodge, Mr Kemp, Mrs Lake, Ms Le Gal, Mrs Lewis, Mr Mahne, Mr Mallett, Mrs Marks, Mr Martin, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Mr Page, Mr Pitt, Mrs Saligopoulos, Mr Skellett, Mr Taylor, Ms Thomson, Mr Walsh and Mr Wilson

There were three abstentions:

Mr Barker, Mrs Bramhall and Mrs Coleman

Therefore, the amendment to the recommendation was lost.

Returning to the original recommendation:

Mr Kington spoke and said that the creation of Cabinet Associates was a 'blank cheque' policy because there was no limit specified for the number of Cabinet Associates. He urged Members to vote against the recommendation.

Mrs Frost referred to the final report of the Independent Remuneration Panel, which was scheduled to be considered at the County Council meeting in March 2014 and requested that the Panel reviewed the responsibility allowances for the local committees' Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen in the light of the additional responsibilities now devolved to these committees.

The recommendation was put to the vote with 28 Members voting for and 20 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions. Therefore it was:

RESOLVED:

That, without prejudice to any recommendations to be made by the Independent Remuneration Panel in its final report in March 2014, an exceptional one-off payment of £5,000 for the financial year 2013/2014 be made to each Cabinet Associate with immediate effect.

75/13 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 13]

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

[Meeting ended at: 4.15pm]

Chairman