

COUNTY COUNCILCOUNCIL MEETING - 10 DECEMBER 2013

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 10 December 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

76/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Bramhall, Mrs Frost, Mr Fuller, Mr Goodwin, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harrison, Mrs Hicks, Ms Le Gal, Mrs Marks (am only) and Mr Sydney

77/13 MINUTES [Item 2]

Two amendments to the minutes were requested:

- (i) Item no. 70/13, the name of the Children and Education Select Committee was corrected.
- (ii) Item no. 74/13, re. the recorded vote - the name of Mrs Selleck was corrected to Mr Selleck.

The minutes of the County Council held on 15 October 2013, as amended, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

78/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- Mr Michael Gosling and Dr Joe McGilligan were recently awarded NHS Partnership / System Leader of the Year as part of the NHS Leadership Recognition Awards 2013.
- Ms Mary Hendrick, from Adult Social Care was recently named as runner up in the Guardian's Public Servant of the Year Award 2013 for her work with People with Learning Disabilities. In recognition of this outstanding achievement, the Chairman presented her with a certificate from the Council.
- That he had asked the Vice-Chairman of the Council to chair a task group, with representatives from the three largest political groups, to review the Standing Orders relating to the Council and committee processes in the Council's Constitution. He said that, as part of this work, all Members would be surveyed for their views and that the aim was for the report to be considered at the County Council's AGM in May 2014.
- That Members would also shortly be surveyed on the timings for future Council meetings and their views on the current lunchtime arrangements.
- The Chairman's reception would be a summer event, rather than at Christmas and this would be a gala occasion and opportunity to thank partners and others. He also reminded Members that their Christmas lunch was on Thursday 19 December.
- Long Service Awards – he was pleased to attend and give awards at two separate events: for staff that had completed 25 years service and also for those staff who had completed 40 and 45 years service with Surrey County Council.
- The lunchtime speaker was Dr Helen Bowcock, the current High Sheriff.

79/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

80/13 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 campaign to tackle litter was welcomed
- That residents were concerned about the on-going Surrey Fire & Rescue Service dispute. The Leader confirmed that he did respond, in confidence, to residents' correspondence.
- An invitation to state what quality of Nelson Mandela's he most admired. He said that it would be to lead by example.
- Praise that he was working for fairer funding for Surrey and that the Government should be reminded of Surrey's needs and the efficiencies made by the County Council over the last four years.

81/13 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT: JULY - DECEMBER 2013 [Item 6]

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report – July - December 2013, the ninth of the Chief Executive's six monthly reports to Members.

Two Members made the following comments:

- The Cabinet Associate for Children, Schools and Families drew attention to examples of where technology had been used to improve the way that the County Council worked – such as Patchwork, currently being implemented through Shift to support the Surrey Family Support Programme and also being tested out in Mole Valley – another example of partnership working.
- The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care congratulated the Leader for the excellent report and highlighted the work of the Employability team who helped people with learning disabilities to secure paid employment, voluntary work or work experience. He hoped that the County Council would be able to provide increased employment opportunities for people with learning disabilities.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Chief Executive be noted.
- (2) That the staff of the Council be thanked for the progress made during the last six months.
- (3) That the support for the direction of travel be confirmed.

82/13 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 22 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) Mr Robert Evans made reference to the Conservative election leaflet of Mrs Saliagopoulos and suggested that there was a discrepancy between their policy and her campaign literature. **Mr Beardsmore** said that the proposed changes would result in the response times in the Spelthorne area being longer. **Mr Norman** said that overall Surrey Fire & Rescue provided a top quartile performance.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services informed Members that no decision had yet been made in relation to the arrangements for the Spelthorne area. The feedback from the consultation was being analysed and would be discussed at the Communities Select Committee prior to the Cabinet's decision. She also confirmed that she was willing to discuss the matter with Mr Beardsmore outside the meeting. She also referred to the fire which had occurred at Ewell Court House in the early hours of the morning and the excellent response of the Surrey Fire & Rescue Service. Mr Kington, local Member for Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington made a statement in relation to this incident and this was attached as an annex to the minutes.

(Q3) Mr Cooksey asked the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and the Environment whether there was a timescale, including completion, for the footway programme. The Cabinet Member referred to the permit scheme, launched on 11 November 2013, which would enable the Council to control the work of utility companies and confirmed that all utility repairs to pavements would be inspected. **Mrs Coleman** asked if Members could also see the survey results. The Cabinet Member said that the information would be shared with local committee chairman and therefore Members should contact them.

(Q4) Mrs Windsor expressed surprise that Skanska was fulfilling its contract, given the issues with unlit bollards and the length of time taken for repairs. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment said that maintenance of the bollards was part of the Highways Budget and he accepted that there were issues with the current arrangements. **Mr Walsh** also asked the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment for his views on how Members could smarten up their local areas. He suggested that this was a matter for local committees and reminded Members to use their local allocations before the end of this financial year.

(Q5) Mr Essex requested details of the County Council's policy and procedures for assessing potential school sites in the Green Belt. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment said that he already had this information. **Mrs Coleman** considered that the last line of the response relating to land being restored and reverted to its former condition was incorrect. The Cabinet Member said that the County Council had an agreed minerals and aggregates plan. Also, the EU had recently praised the Council for the quality of restoration of these sites.

(Q6) Mrs Coleman said that she had recently visited one of the county's largest libraries and asked the Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes if he was aware that the hearing loop did not work and the staff had not been trained on its use and the equipment was not being maintained. She requested that the

person responsible for equalities investigated her concerns and that these issues were resolved.

Other Members raised issues with microphones in meeting rooms and in particular, in the Council Chamber. The Cabinet Member for Assets and Regeneration Programmes promised to investigate their concerns and report back.

(Q10) Mr Beardsmore considered that the response from the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment did not answer the first part of his question. The Cabinet Member disagreed and said that the response was clear.

(Q11) Mr Kington highlighted the success of Epsom and Ewell Schools and asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning, who agreed, to promote their success in the media. **Also, Q11, Mr Barker** asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning about next year's plans for school places in his area. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the County Council was on track to provide 3000 additional school places for September 2014 and she offered to discuss his specific concerns outside the meeting.

(Q13) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services if charges were the same as 'costs' – she agreed to confirm and respond outside the meeting.

(Q15) Mr Cooksey considered that the response had not provided clarification to his question. The Leader disagreed and said that all Conservative Local Committee Vice-Chairmen were aware that their role included liaison with the Highways Area Manager because this was seen as the best value for money.

(Q16) Mrs Lallement asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning whether it was a statutory requirement to monitor safeguarding of children in non-maintained schools. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the County Council did not have a statutory duty or the authority to enter independent schools to inspect safeguarding procedures. She also informed Members that this area had recently been discussed at the Children and Education Select Committee and that she was considering arranging a briefing on safeguarding for all Members.

(Q19) Both Mr Kington and Mr Ivison highlighted their concerns over the length of time taken to implement the parking review proposals. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment said that his written response set out the reasons and said that he would be reviewing the situation in the New Year.

83/13 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were three statements by Members:

- Mrs White in relation to a community library at Kings College, Guildford (Appendix Ci)
- Mr Young in relation to road closures for the Prudential Ride-London cycle race
- Mr Kington in relation to fire at Ewell Court House (Appendix Cii)

84/13 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

ITEM 9 (i)

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 recognises the huge contribution made to the County by its employees.

Members are therefore concerned to learn that the Council retains over 6000 people on 'zero hours contracts' and resolves to end this practice.

Furthermore the Council recognises that the cost of living in Kingston and Surrey is one of the highest in the country. The Council notes that the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson has stated that 'paying the London living wage is not only morally right, but makes good business sense' and that he has called for an updated figure of £8.80 an hour.

This Council, therefore, resolves that the London Living Wage should be the minimum paid to any person, directly or indirectly employed by Surrey County Council.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Essex.

Mr Evans said that:

- There were two parts of the motion: (i) zero hours contracts, (ii) London living wage but that both parts were about Surrey County Council being a better employer.
- Surrey had pockets of poverty and food banks were opening up in the county and this motion was a modest attempt to improve the matter for the poorer people living in Surrey.
- That 'zero hours contracts' had been rebranded by the County Council as 'bank contracts' and employees on these contracts were only paid for the hours actually worked and were expected to be available as/when the Council required them – he urged Members to decide today to end this practice.
- On the London living wage, he quoted hourly rates and also referred to the salary paid to Surrey's apprentices and said that paying the London living wage made good business sense, was morally right and was supported by the Mayor of London and also the Prime Minister.

Mr Martin responded and made the following points:

- That the motion was in three parts and that the Conservatives would endorse the huge contribution made to the County by its employees.
- The County Council had 1900 staff on the bank but when schools were included, the figure rose to nearly 6000, which was about 18% of the workforce.
- Bank staff covered vacancies and the practice worked well for covering unplanned activities.
- These contracts were part of the flexible working policy, many people preferred this way of working and the practice could be in both parties interest.

- The County Council used bank contracts responsibly and staff on these contracts were paid the same hourly rate as permanent staff in the same position but just paid for the hours that they worked. They were also entitled to the same basic terms and conditions of employment as permanent staff on a pro-rata basis.
- These arrangements made good business sense and he did not support ending this practice.
- Referring to the 'living wage', he said that there were three different rates in the UK for the living wage.
- When considering wages, it was important to consider the whole package and that the pension scheme, together with other staff benefits should be factored into the equation.
- Raising the living wage in Surrey to the rate paid for the London living wage would cost the County Council £2m.
- That the Council had spent £750K on apprenticeships and work experience opportunities.
- Finally, he said that recent pay settlements had favoured those on the lowest pay scales and he urged Members to reject that part of the motion referring to zero hours contracts and the London living wage.

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

- That the County Council's staff were valued, however, there was concern that Members were being asked to make policy 'on the hoof', with no allocated budget and therefore, agreeing to this motion could have an impact on other budgets.
- It was the right thing to do and was similar to a motion put forward by the Liberal Democrats during the last Administration.
- There was evidence from the Mayor of London that it was beneficial to pay the London living wage.
- That wages, particularly in the north of the county were influenced by London salaries but it was important to continue with the county council's current position in relation to wages.
- That Surrey County Council did not receive the same funding as London councils – if it did, council tax could be reduced. However, as it stood, services in Surrey would have to be cut if this motion was agreed.
- The Conservatives would always take the long term view and would balance delivery of services with the cost of staff.
- The People, Performance and Development Committee regularly looked at staff salaries and benefits at their meetings.
- This motion was about sharing benefits fairly.
- Disappointment that a high percentage of public sector and voluntary organisations used zero hours contracts.
- The difficulty of obtaining a mortgage for those people on zero hours contracts
- Members were urged to end this practice now and then work out the detail including its funding.

Mr Robert Evans requested a recorded vote on the motion and 10 Members stood in support of this request.

The Chairman informed Members that he had received a request to split the motion into three parts and to vote separately on each section.

On the first part of the motion, Members voted unanimously in support of:

‘This Council recognises the huge contribution made to the County by its employees.’

On the second part of the motion, relating to ‘zero hours contracts’, the following Members voted for it:

Mr Beardsmore, Mr Beckett, Mr Cooksey, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mr Hickman, Mr Jenkins, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mr Orrick, Mrs Searle, Mrs Watson, Mrs White

The following Members voted against it:

Mrs Angell, Mr Barker, Mr Bennison, Ms Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Carasco, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mrs Coleman, Mr Cosser, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Few, Mr Furey, Mr Gardner, Mr Goodman, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Gulati, Mr Hall, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mr Hodge, Mr Hussain, Mr Ivison, Mr Johnson, Mrs Kemeny, Mr Kemp, Mr Kington, Mrs Lake, Mrs Lay, Mrs Lewis, Mr Mahne, Mrs Marks, Mr Martin, Mrs Moseley, Mrs Mountain, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Mr Page, Mr Pitt, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Samuels, Mr Selleck, Mr Skellett, Mr Taylor, Ms Thomson, Mr Townsend, Mr Walsh, Mr Wilson, Mrs Windsor, Mr Witham, Mr Young and Mrs Young

There were two abstentions:

Mrs Barton and Mrs Lallement

Therefore, the second part of the motion was lost.

On the third part of the motion, relating to ‘the London Living Wage’, the following Members voted for it:

Mrs Barton, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Cooksey, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mr Jenkins, Mr Johnson, Mr Kington, Mrs Lallement, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mr Orrick, Mrs Searle, Mrs Watson, Mrs White

The following Members voted against it:

Mrs Angell, Mr Barker, Mr Bennison, Ms Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Carasco, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mr Cosser, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Few, Mr Furey, Mr Gardner, Mr Goodman, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Gulati, Mr Hall, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mr Hodge, Mr Hussain, Mr Ivison, Mrs Kemeny, Mr Kemp, Mrs Lake, Mrs Lay, Mrs Lewis, Mr Mahne, Mrs Marks, Mr Martin, Mrs Moseley, Mrs Mountain, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Mr Page, Mr Pitt, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Samuels, Mr Selleck, Mr Skellett, Mr Taylor, Ms Thomson, Mr Townsend, Mr Walsh, Mr Wilson, Mr Witham, Mr Young and Mrs Young

There were four abstentions:

Mr Beckett, Mrs Coleman, Mr Hickman and Mrs Windsor

Therefore, the third part of the motion was lost.

RESOLVED:

This Council recognises the huge contribution made to the County by its employees.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45pm and resumed at 2.15pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Barton, Mr Bennison, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Ellwood, Mr Tim Evans, Ms Heath, Mr Hickman, Mr Kemp, Mrs Lake, Mrs Moseley, Mr Norman, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

ITEM 9(ii)

Under Standing Order 12.3, the Council decided it wished to hear further before agreeing whether or not to debate this motion.

Mr Cooksey made a short statement giving reasons why the motion should not be referred. He considered that it was important for the Council to have the opportunity to discuss this issue and not just the Cabinet. He had proposed the motion because the stated intention was that the County Council was not proposing any changes to its home to school transport policy for 2015. It was his view that the current policy provided little flexibility and that officer decisions were based on the rigid application of this policy.

The Leader made a short statement stating that it would be inappropriate to debate this matter because the consultation on the County Council's Home to School Transport Policy was still on-going. He considered that the outcome of the consultation should be reported firstly, to the Children and Education Select Committee and then to Cabinet.

14 Members voted for debating the motion today but 39 Members voted against debating it today. There were three abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this motion be referred to the Cabinet, for determination. Under Standing Order 12.6, the Cabinet must report back to County Council at the earliest appropriate meeting.

ITEM 9(iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Ian Beardsmore moved the motion which was:

“This Council agrees to re-establish a Surrey-wide Youth Council at Surrey County Council to include representatives of young people from all eleven Boroughs and Districts in order to:

- (a) give Surrey young people the opportunity to debate and influence the County

Council's policies.

and

(b) to enable Surrey young people to be represented on the national Youth Parliament.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Searle.

Mrs Kemeny moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This was formally seconded by Mrs Curran.

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

~~'This Council agrees to re-establish a Surrey-wide Youth Council at Surrey County Council to include representatives of young people from all eleven Boroughs and Districts in order to:~~ supports the establishment of a County-wide youth democracy platform to include representatives of young people from our schools and colleges working alongside existing provision in Surrey's Boroughs and Districts, in order to:

- (a) give Surrey young people the opportunity to debate and influence the County Council's policies.
- and
- (b) to enable Surrey young people to be represented on the national Youth Parliament.'

Both Mr Beardsmore and Mrs Searle agreed to accept the amendment to this motion and therefore, it became the substantive motion.

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

- The motion was about giving young people the opportunity to contribute to shaping the County Council's policies.
- Praise for the excellent youth council in Mole Valley.
- Increasing the involvement of youth people in democracy was an important issue and thanks to officers for enabling the development of youth democracy in the Epsom and Ewell area.
- Pleased that the amendment had been accepted by the Liberal Democrats.
- The substantive motion was not supporting the reinstatement of a youth parliament (dissolved in 2012).
- This administration had seen an outstanding transformation of youth services during the last two years. In particular, the reduction in NEETS (Not in Education, Employment or Training) and young people had contributed to the shaping of Surrey's employability plan.
- Surrey's youth service was 'Value for Money' and work on youth democracy had started over the summer. It was expected that elections for representatives on the national Youth Parliament would be held on-line and it was planned that youth councillors would meet on-line as well as face to face.
- A higher expectation, with full inclusion and involvement in shaping the Council's policies for youth democracy was needed.

- Young people were brought up and were conversant with technology and therefore the on-line platform was the right way forward.
- Confirmation that both those Surrey young people that studied outside the county and also NEETS would be included and represented.
- The importance of investing in young people because they were the future of local government.

After the debate, the substantive motion was put to the vote and it was:

RESOLVED (unanimously):

This Council supports the establishment of a County-wide youth democracy platform to include representatives of young people from our schools and colleges working alongside existing provision in Surrey's Boroughs and Districts, in order to:

- (a) give Surrey young people the opportunity to debate and influence the County Council's policies.
- and
- (b) to enable Surrey young people to be represented on the national Youth Parliament.

ITEM 9(iv)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Will Forster moved the motion which was:

'Noting the start of the badger cull in Somerset and Gloucestershire and the possibility that DEFRA may roll out the badger cull across the rest of the UK, Council agrees not to allow the badger cull to take place on any of its county owned land, given that the science is not proven nor conclusive that a cull of badgers is the answer to eradicating Bovine TB from the countryside.'

Council agrees that more research should be undertaken by Government and the scientific community to find more effective and cheaper vaccinations for badgers and cattle to help eradicate this disease from the countryside.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs White.

Mr Forster said that:

- The case for badger culling was not proven and he did not want it to be allowed on any County Council owned land.
- Badgers were not a threat to human health because milk was pasteurised.
- The cull had not worked in Gloucestershire or Somerset.
- This motion was similar to one recently agreed by Hampshire County Council, where it had been supported by all political groups.
- Previously, this Council had agreed to protect the countryside.

Mr Furey responded and made the following points:

- That the Government Minister had confirmed that research would continue and an independent report had been commissioned.
- There was a target to eradicate the Bovine TB within 25 years.

- The National Trust had not ruled out culling of badgers on their land.
- A reference to the article in Surrey Nature about badgers.
- Clarification of the legal aspect relating to culling.

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

- Concern re. the logistics of organising a cull as badgers crossed boundaries.
- If Hampshire County Council had supported a similar motion, then why couldn't this County Council adopt a similar approach.
- The vaccine option may be cheaper but it was not an easy solution.
- The importance of further research - when considering this issue, there was no role for politics or sentiment, the decision must be based on scientific results.
- Members should be mindful of any decision made by the Government relating to badger cullings and the County Council may not have the authority to override the Government.
- There had already been a 10 year study on Bovine TB / Badgers, progress was being made and most Members who spoke considered vaccination the preferred option.
- This issue was of concern to residents and there was currently a petition relating to this topic on the Surrey County Council website.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote with 12 Members voting for it. 40 Members voted against it and there were no abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

ITEM 9 (v)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Peter Martin moved the motion which was:

'This Council fully supports the successful launch of its recent apprenticeship programme in helping the County's young people get a foot in the world of work but recognises that there is much still to be done.

The Council therefore calls on all Members to discuss and encourage the setting up of apprenticeships with their local businesses, Districts, Boroughs, Parishes and relevant partners.'

Mr Martin made the following points:

- Surrey's apprenticeship programme was a scheme that the Council was proud of, with 200 apprenticeships created within 100 days just over 2 years ago.
- In 2012, the programme was doubled and this year the County Council had invested £750K in the programme and had a target of 500 apprenticeships.
- This year, there had been four successful youth employment events in Surrey.
- The number of NEETS had fallen dramatically over the last two years.
- The County Council was 'practising what it preached'. For example, the procurement team were having an increased focus on delivering apprenticeships through their supply base, with one of the County Council's

key contractors, Babcock 4S committed to employing 35 apprentices this financial year.

- Finally, he commended the motion to Council and asked for all Members' help in engaging with the programme.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Angell who referred to all Members being Corporate Parents. She also said that a number of new initiatives concerning apprenticeships in Children Services would be shared with the Looked After Children teams.

Mr Essex moved an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans) which was to add an additional paragraph to the original motion so that it read:

'This Council fully supports the successful launch of its recent apprenticeship programme in helping the County's young people get a foot in the world of work but recognises that there is much still to be done.

The Council therefore calls on all Members to discuss and encourage the setting up of apprenticeships with their local businesses, Districts, Boroughs, Parishes and relevant partners.

This Council also resolves to ensure that all those carrying out duties in the Council previously undertaken by those in positions held by Surrey County Council employees should be paid at least the Surrey County Council's minimum wage.'

Mr Essex confirmed his support of the apprenticeship scheme and said that the County Council needed a commitment that apprenticeships were in addition to jobs currently available.

Three Members spoke and made the following points:

- It was important to ensure that young people are paid appropriately and also properly trained.
- This motion was not about the minimum wage and the amendment was beyond the remit of the Council.
- In response it was agreed that the amendment strengthened the motion.

The amendment was put to the vote, with 13 Members voting for and 42 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore, the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, the Deputy Leader said that there was widespread agreement for the motion. He also suggested that if Members required administrative support to contact businesses that they contact the Assistant Director for Young People.

RESOLVED (unanimously):

This Council fully supports the successful launch of its recent apprenticeship programme in helping the County's young people get a foot in the world of work but recognises that there is much still to be done.

The Council therefore calls on all Members to discuss and encourage the setting up of apprenticeships with their local businesses, Districts, Boroughs, Parishes and relevant partners.

85/13 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 22 and 30 October and 26 November 2013.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families tabled a statement relating to Maureen Giles, the Headteacher of Surrey's Virtual School, who retired on 18 December 2013 (Appendix D).

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A Youth Justice Strategic Plan

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families highlighted the key points from the Youth Justice Strategic Plan. In particular, that Surrey continued to be a very low user of custody, the Restorative Youth Justice programme had delivered outstanding results and was nationally recognised and that the numbers of entrants to the youth justice system had fallen dramatically over the last two years.

She thanked both staff for their work and also Mrs Hammond who had previously had responsibility for this area in her former portfolio.

RESOLVED:

That the Youth Justice Strategic Plan, as set out in Annex1 to the submitted report, be agreed.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Public Service Transformation
- Fairness and Respect Strategy 2013 - 2018

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 22 and 30 October and 26 November 2013 be adopted.

86/13 REPORT OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE [Item 11]

The Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee presented the report of his committee. He confirmed that the proposals were agreed unanimously by the Planning and Regulatory Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the following revisions to the Scheme of Delegation be approved:

Planning

P1 – amend to state “Where fewer than 5 objections have been received and no request has been made by the local member or a member of the Planning & Regulatory Committee for the application to be determined by that Committee, to determine planning applications for minerals, waste development and County Council development which comply with the development plan and national policies”.

P2 – amend to state “Where fewer than 5 objections have been received and no request has been made by the local member or a member of the Planning & Regulatory Committee for the application to be determined by that Committee, and after consultation with the Chairman or, in his/her absence, Vice-Chairman of the Planning & Regulatory Committee, to determine planning applications for minerals, waste development and County Council development which do not comply with the development plan and national policies”.

P6 – amend to state “To determine all details pursuant applications (applications relating to a previously granted permission) irrespective of the number of objections unless a request has been made by the local member or a member of the Planning & Regulatory Committee for the application to be determined by that Committee”.

P7 – amend to state “(i) To determine whether county development applications and minerals and waste applications constitute a ‘non material amendment’ within section 96A of the TCPA, and (ii) To determine such applications, irrespective of the number of objections, unless a request has been made by the local member or a member of the Planning & Regulatory Committee for the application to be determined by that Committee.”

87/13 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION [Item 12]

RESOLVED:

That the amendments to the Scheme of Delegation, as set out in the submitted report, be approved.

88/13 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:3.45pm]

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank