

COUNTY COUNCILCOUNCIL MEETING - 15 JULY 2014

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 15 July 2014 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 Cosser		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 Thomsson
*	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

42/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mrs Barton, Mrs Coleman, Mr Gosling, Mr Gulati, Mrs Hicks, Ms Le Gal, Mrs Mountain, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

43/14 MINUTES [Item 2]

Subject to amending the typo in item no: 31/14 – Members' Questions, Q1, the minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 6 May 2014 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

44/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (1) He drew Members' attention to the list of Her Majesty the Queen's Birthday Honours List 2014, included in the agenda and said that he had written to each Surrey recipient, who had gained the honour for services to Surrey.
- (2) The passing of Mr Tom Phelps-Penry, former County Councillor for Walton. Members stood in silent tribute.
- (3) He welcomed Liz Mills, who will be joining Democratic Services as Lead Manager in August, to her first County Council meeting.
- (4) Chairman's Receptions – he informed Members that he had hosted two receptions recently, both at Painshill Park. The first one on 2 July to thank all volunteer and community organisations who work closely with the County Council and secondly, on 14 July, a reception hosted with the Lord Lieutenant, to thank all those people who helped during last winter's flooding crisis.
- (5) The lunchtime speaker was Andrew Wates OBE DL – the Vice Lord Lieutenant of Surrey

45/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

[Note: Prior to the next item, the Leader of the Council made a personal statement, in relation to the Council's decision on Members' Allowances, made at the last County Council meeting in May. He informed Members that both he, and the Deputy Leader, had made a personal decision to accept only the level of allowance, for their positions, recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel.]

46/14 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 and ask questions. They made the following points:

- Following on from Surrey's policy to keep every library open, he was asked if he would apply a similar policy to Surrey's fire stations.
- Whether the Project Horizon initiative for Highways would be at some risk, unless the Council received additional Government funding for flooding Recovery work.
- The expansion of schools to accommodate the increase in school places required was welcomed, however, it was considered essential that highways officers were involved at the planning stage to ensure safe access to schools.
- Consideration should be given to updating Surrey libraries to ensure that they became more community hubs.
- The value of Members' Allocations, with a request that they would not be reduced further in future years.

47/14 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT: JANUARY - JUNE 2014 [Item 6]

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report – January - June 2014, the tenth of the Chief Executive's six monthly reports to Members.

Three Members made the following comments:

- That the regular six monthly report from the Chief Executive was a valuable document that clearly set out the achievements and work of the County Council's Members and officers.
- Case studies were highlighted, in particular, the joint work that the Fire and Rescue Service had undertaken with the Adult Social Care Service to reduce the risk of older residents from fire and also the partnership working between the person who had joined the Council on secondment from the Department for Works and Pensions to work on the Family Support Programme.
- The work undertaken with communities and partners across the county in response to the persistent flooding, demonstrated the 'one team' approach.

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.

48/14 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 16 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:

(Q1) Mr Witham said that he would be submitting his views and also those of his residents to Guildford Borough Council and he urged other Guildford County Councillors to do the same.

Other Guildford Members made points about school place planning and roads. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning was also asked whether he could persuade Guildford Local Committee to have an additional meeting to discuss the Borough Council's draft local plan so that there would be a co-ordinated response from this committee. The Cabinet Member said that it was not within his remit to instruct local committees to do this. Also, the dates for the arrangements were yet to be defined and therefore he suggested that Members met with officers to discuss their views and that he would take further questions outside the meeting.

(Q2) Mr Jenkins considered that his question regarding the production of a detailed timeline for flood defence and alleviation work had not been answered and he also asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery why officers and Members from affected authorities were trying to raise £120m when the Prime Minister had previously said 'money was no object'. The Cabinet Member referred to funding which Oxfordshire CC had recently received and said that Surrey had not yet received any funding for the River Thames scheme. He confirmed that the multi-agency plan to raise £120m would be difficult and was still being discussed.

(Q3) Mrs White asked the Leader of the Council what arrangements had been made to discuss funding for the Junior Citizen Scheme with the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and could she be advised of the outcome. The Leader confirmed that it would be discussed as part of the regular meetings that both he and the Chief Executive had with the Police and Crime Commissioner.

(Q4) Mrs Watson requested assurance that funding cuts would not be made to the Highways budget and this was confirmed by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery. **Mr Essex** asked for clarification on Value for Money and was advised to speak to the Cabinet Member outside the meeting.

(Q6) Mr Orrick confirmed that he would like to accept the Leader of the Council's offer for updates on the setting up of networks. He also asked the Leader what authorisation did the County Council have to set up these Boards and was assured that proper processes were in place which could be scrutinised by the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

(Q7) Mr Beardsmore questioned the response and referred to the Council motion from 16 July 2013 meeting when the Council had agreed to oppose any proposals that would reduce Heathrow's role as a hub airport. The Leader of the Council confirmed that, since 2008, the County Council had recognised the crucial role of the airport and had continued to support the economic position for Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, providing the infrastructure was in place. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agreed. They both considered that Mr Beardsmore had received a full answer and it would be wrong to say more until the outcome of the Davies Commission was known in 2015.

(Q8) Mr Robert Evans considered that since the Leader's personal statement made earlier in the meeting, the response was now inaccurate. **Mr Beardsmore** accepted that County Council's had been given 42 new responsibilities since 2010 but considered that the work was being done by all Members and staff and asked when they would receive financial remuneration. **Mrs Watson** said that, in the light of the recommendations from the Minister, Brandon Lewis in relation to Special Responsibility Allowances, would the Leader of the Council be reconsidering them.

Mr Essex asked if the Leader's decision to accept the level of allowance recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel was made as a result of public opinion. The Leader of the Council responded by stating that all Members of the Council were entitled to make

personal decisions on what they claimed as allowances or expenses and made no further comment.

(Q9) Mr Mallett considered that the parking at the adjacent sports club was critical for Woodmansterne Primary School and asked that the Council resolve this problem. The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning informed him that the sports club was privately owned, was not on County Council land and that the club was not interested in resurfacing their car park. Therefore, officers were exploring other options to mitigate the parking issues at this school.

(Q10) Mr Beckett asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery when had a building survey last been undertaken on Rowan House. Also, **Mrs Mason** challenged the statement that services to the public had not been affected, citing an issue of a delay in 180 disabled parking bays awaiting inspection. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery said that, whilst recognising that there had been IT issues, the whole operation was working again and he challenged the comments made by Mrs Mason.

(Q11) Mr Harrison asked the Leader of the Council, if he was confident that sufficient progress had been made so that the County Council would not have to use reserves and balances to achieve a balanced budget. Mr Robert Evans asked the Leader why he considered that the County Council got a 'raw deal' from Government when the County had 11 MPs. The Leader referred to the Council Budget meeting in February when it had been agreed to build up reserves to meet current needs. In response to Mr Evans comment, he said that the County Council had also received a low level of Central Government funding under the previous Labour Government.

(Q12) Mr Kington considered that the Council should have a contingency plan in place and that the delay in obtaining planning permission for a demountable classroom at the Vale Primary School was unacceptable. **Mr Hickman** said that there had been a similar instance in his division. **Mr Taylor** acknowledged the enormous effort that officers were making to provide school places. **Mr Beckett** referred to the school's travel plan which was due to be updated in the Autumn and asked that officers made it a priority to obtain the views of local residents.

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning responded by stating that the County Council was embarking on the biggest school expansion programme for many years and publically thanked officers from property, planning, education and highways, without whose work, this scale of expansion would not be possible. She acknowledged that parents preferred a local school so their children could walk there. On forecasting, she said that it could never be an absolute science but that the figures were within 2% accuracy of what was required and that work was on-going to improve the accuracy. Finally, she offered to respond to the questions from Mr Beckett and Mr Barker outside the meeting.

(Q14) Mrs Watson asked for the performance data to be available so that it could be scrutinised in public. The Leader of the Council said that scrutiny was the responsibility of select committees and that the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee examined the Council's performance on a quarterly basis, as stated in his written response.

(Q15) Mr Harrison asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, who said that he was cautiously optimistic, if he was content with the progress of the re-assessments of the open cases within the 'Older People' category.

(Q16) Mr Jenkins questioned the validity of the answer, because the biggest cost element was excluded. The Cabinet Member for Community Services provided an explanation

concerning the capital investment in the new fire station and said that it represented good value for Surrey and that she would like to see more investment in other fire stations across the county.

49/14 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were no statements from Members.

50/14 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

Item 9(i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Clare Curran moved the motion which was:

'Council notes:

- this Administration's commitment to economic stimulation which has helped significantly in reducing the number of NEETS in the county with Surrey now down to the lowest level nationally and;
- the great success in exceeding the target of 500 apprentices in just ten months which has led to the recently-launched drive to create a further 170 new apprenticeships for this County's young people.

Therefore, this Council thanks:

- our Skills Centres and all their staff who perform the vital role of filling a gap in post-16 provision and support young people towards full participation by focussing on preparing them for employment opportunities;
- the County's young people and apprentices who so enthusiastically embrace programmes such as the Ready for Work Re-engagement Programme, and;
- Surrey's business community and other partners who have been so supportive in giving Surrey's youth an opportunity in the workplace.'

Mrs Curran made the following points:

- That all Members joined her in congratulating those staff who had worked hard in achieving both the reduction in the number of NEETS in the county and also exceeding the Council's target of 500 apprentices in ten months.
- Initiatives such as the Ready to Work Re-engagement Programme and meaningful work placements were commended.
- The importance of networks.
- That, through the Local Committees, the Youth Service was embarking on re-commissioning its services for the next five years and she urged Members to ensure that the needs of the young people in their divisions were understood.
- The statutory duty of the Early Years Service to ensure all young children were 'school ready'.
- The Family Support Programme.

- The need to improve careers advice for all young people, starting in Year 9.
- That the service was working closely with LEPS and also the proposal for a University Technical college would broaden opportunities for young people.
- All these initiatives would help ensure that the County Council provided young people with the opportunities to enable them to have a good start in life.

The motion was formally seconded by Dr Grant-Duff.

Seven Members spoke, making the following points:

- Support for the motion – this was a ‘good news’ story.
- Promise of continued support through Members’ allocations for young people’s initiatives.
- The reduction in the number of NEETS was excellent news.
- Concern that the Youth Service future plans were presented with lack of clarity.
- Early intervention and prevention was crucial.
- Business Investment in Surrey – an example of how Surrey businesses were working to supply components for aircraft was given.
- Apprenticeships had been a success and were life changing opportunities for young people and Surrey’s commitment to the scheme deserved credit.
- It was good news that no Looked After Child (LAC) had entered the youth justice services in the last two years.
- The prospect of having a University Technical College (UTC) was a new concept of education.
- An invitation for all Members, who are aware of businesses in their division who may be willing to take on an apprentice, to contact the Head of Commissioning and Development.

After the debate, the motion was put to the vote and agreed, with no Member voting against it.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That Council notes:

- this Administration’s commitment to economic stimulation which has helped significantly in reducing the number of NEETS in the county with Surrey now down to the lowest level nationally and;
- the great success in exceeding the target of 500 apprentices in just ten months which has led to the recently-launched drive to create a further 170 new apprenticeships for this County’s young people.

Therefore, this Council thanks:

- our Skills Centres and all their staff who perform the vital role of filling a gap in post-16 provision and support young people towards full participation by focussing on preparing them for employment opportunities;
- the County’s young people and apprentices who so enthusiastically embrace programmes such as the Ready for Work Re-engagement Programme, and;

- Surrey's business community and other partners who have been so supportive in giving Surrey's youth an opportunity in the workplace.'

Item 9(ii)

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 welcomes the recently announced additional funding allocation from the Pothole Repair Fund and the Weather Repair Fund totalling £9.2m.

This Council notes that the Government allocated a greater share of funding to a number of model councils that were able to demonstrate best practice in highway maintenance. These councils have invested in new technology and initiatives.

This Council agrees that Surrey County Council will:

- (i) learn from best practice of other Councils to improve the speed and quality of pothole repair in Surrey

and

- (ii) review the way in which the County Council bids for funding from Government so that Surrey receives its fair share of funding in future.'

Mr Beardsmore said that this was a straight forward motion about the discrepancy of funding between different County Councils – both Kent and Hampshire had received more funding than Surrey and therefore, this Council needed to ascertain what the other counties were doing and then incorporate their 'best practice' into Surrey's bid for Government funding.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey.

Mr Furey moved an amendment at the meeting, which was formally seconded by Mr Harmer.

The motion, as amended, read:

'This Council welcomes the recently announced additional funding allocation from the Pothole Repair Fund and the Weather Repair Fund totalling £9.2m.

This Council notes that the Government allocated a greater share of funding to a number of model councils, Surrey being one of them, that demonstrated best practice in highway maintenance and congratulate the Leadership of the County Council on achieving this recognition. Surrey has invested in new technology, a long term approach to the maintenance and renewal of the highway asset, with a clear understanding of its values to residents, visitors and the economy.

This Council agrees that Surrey County Council will:

- (i) share, learn and work with other best Councils to continue to improve the quality and timeliness of pothole repair in Surrey

And

- (ii) Continue to press Government to review and change the funding methodology to take proper account of:
- a) The economic importance of the Surrey Road Network to the national economy.
 - b) The significant high wear and tear on Surrey Roads which is not recognised within the current funding framework.
 - c) The exemplary Asset Management approach to the Surrey Road network, by the use of term investment, ensuring Value for Money for the residents of Surrey.'

The Chairman confirmed to Mr Beardsmore that the amendment to his motion was ruled 'in order'.

Speaking to his amendment, Mr Furey highlighted the following points:

- The County Council had been awarded nearly £4m from the Government's 'pothole challenge' fund – the remaining funding awarded dealt with last winter's flooding crisis.
- The Department for Transport had confirmed that the County Council's bid was exemplary.
- Surrey was regarded as a 'top authority' and as such had received a 30% uplift in funding – one of only 15 (out of 153) highway authorities that had received this uplift.
- The development of a 15 year Asset Management programme had assisted the County's case.
- As part of the Council's contract with Kier, the liability for pothole repairs had passed to them – this highly efficient contract provide Value for Money for Surrey residents.
- The highway asset was one of the most valuable assets under Surrey's control.
- The County was one of the largest net contributors to the UK economy – a fact not reflected in the funding received from the Department of Transport.
- There were high traffic volumes in Surrey and there was a direct correlation between number of vehicles and highway defects.
- 59% of Surrey's roads were urban and working on these roads was more expensive, due to peak restrictions around peak hours.
- The damage caused by utility companies
- That the Government raised £33bn from fuel duty annually – if 2p per litre was invested in highways, and based on the current funding formula, this would provide an extra £18 – 25m per year for Surrey.

Six Members spoke making the following points:

- This was an important motion / amendment because many residents were concerned about potholes.
- It was also important to learn from the best practice of other local authorities.
- Most damage was caused by lorries rather than cars.
- Repairing the potholes was vitally important.
- The amendment was part of the process to obtain a better deal from Government.
- The Highways Members' Reference Group was doing an excellent job and all Members were encouraged to visit the Highways depot in Merrow to see their work firsthand.
- The introduction of the permit scheme had helped.
- Extra funding was needed from Government – the problems of the M25 and the effect on the A25 were highlighted.

- The amendment was self-congratulatory and did not address the issues raised in the original motion.
- Residents would not agree that Surrey was a model authority.
- Recognition that the County Council had more to learn from other local authorities.
- The Government did not believe that Surrey needed more support.

The amendment was put to the vote with 50 Members voting for and 14 Members voting against it. There were five abstentions.

The amendment became the substantive motion.

Under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Kington then moved:

'That the question be now put'

20 Members stood in support of this request. The Chairman considered that there had been adequate debate and agreed to the request.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council welcomes the recently announced additional funding allocation from the Pothole Repair Fund and the Weather Repair Fund totalling £9.2m.

This Council notes that the Government allocated a greater share of funding to a number of model councils, Surrey being one of them, that demonstrated best practice in highway maintenance and congratulate the Leadership of the County Council on achieving this recognition. Surrey has invested in new technology, a long term approach to the maintenance and renewal of the highway asset, with a clear understanding of its values to residents, visitors and the economy.

This Council agrees that Surrey County Council will:

- (i) share, learn and work with other best Councils to continue to improve the quality and timeliness of pothole repair in Surrey

And

- (ii) Continue to press Government to review and change the funding methodology to take proper account of:
 - a) The economic importance of the Surrey Road Network to the national economy.
 - b) The significant high wear and tear on Surrey Roads which is not recognised within the current funding framework.
 - c) The exemplary Asset Management approach to the Surrey Road network, by the use of term investment, ensuring Value for Money for the residents of Surrey.

51/14 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 May and 24 June 2014.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Bursary Fund Report 2014 was tabled on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Children and Families (Appendix C).

(2) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- High Performance Leadership Development Programme
- Establishment of a Property Company
- Surrey's Strategy for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Children and Young People 2014 - 2017
- Quarterly report on decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 April – 30 June 2014

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 27 May and 24 June 2014 be adopted.

52/14 REPORT BACK ON REFERRED MOTION [Item 11]

The Chairman reported that the motion from the Council meeting on 6 May 2014, standing in the name of Mr Forster, and which was referred to the Children and Education Select Committee and the Adult Social Care Select Committee for consideration was not supported, as detailed in the report set out in the agenda.

Mr Forster was given the opportunity to address the Council and expressed his disappointment with the outcome. He considered that he had presented a viable option to help Young Carers in Surrey. The Chairman of Children and Education Select Committee responded by drawing attention to the report of the young carers joint research group, which had been endorsed by the Children and Education Select Committee and then the Adult Social Care Select Committee.

53/14 REPORT OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE [Item 12]

The Chairman of Planning and Regulatory Committee presented the report and its recommendation to Council.

RESOLVED:

That the Surrey Code of Best Practice in Rights of Way Procedures, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved, for inclusion in the Constitution.

54/14 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 13]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee commended the report and the recommendations of his committee to Council:

RESOLVED:

1. That the Risk Management Policy Statement and Strategy, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.
2. That the Code of Corporate Governance, attached as Annex B to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.
- 3.

55/14 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION [Item 14]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the following delegation to the Chief Executive and to the Strategic Director for Business Services be approved:

Arrangements for the discharge of functions

In consultation with the Leader and with any Cabinet Member responsible for the function for which the Council is proposing to take responsibility, to agree arrangements with another local authority to discharge functions on behalf of that other authority.

2. That the amendments to the Scheme of Delegation, agreed by the Leader of the Council, as set out in the submitted report, be noted.
3. That the relevant changes to the Constitution to enable the Shareholder Board and the Coast to Capital Strategic Joint Committee to be established and become operational, as set out in Annex A and B of the submitted report be approved, and that the terms of reference of the Shareholder Board and the Coast to Capital Strategic Joint Committee be included in the County Council's Constitution.

56/14 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 15]

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 1.05pm]

Chairman