

COUNTY COUNCIL**COUNCIL MEETING - 17 MARCH 2015**

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 17 March 2015 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mr D Munro (Chairman)
Sally Marks (Vice-Chairman)

Mary Angell	*	David Ivison
W D Barker OBE		Daniel Jenkins
Mrs N 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		Ms D Le Gal
Bill Chapman		Mary Lewis
Helyn Clack		Christian Mahne
Carol Coleman		Ernest Mallett MBE
Stephen Cooksey		Mr P J Martin
Mr S 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
Mrs P 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
Mr D Harmer		Fiona White
Nick Harrison		Richard Wilson
Marisa Heath		Helena Windsor
Peter Hickman		Keith Witham
Margaret Hicks		Mr A Young
David Hodge		Mrs V Young
* Saj Hussain		

*absent

11/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Bowes, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Few, Mr Gardner, Mr Hussain, Mr Ivison and Mrs Moseley.

12/15 MINUTES [Item 2]

The following amendments were noted:

- (i) Mr Robert Evans voted against the budget recommendations
- (ii) Mr Kington abstained from the budget vote
- (iii) The Mole Valley figures in recommendation (6) on the Budget report should read: £49,846,761.76

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 10 February 2015, as amended, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

13/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- (i) He presented a Fellowship Award from the Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply to Laura Langstaff, Head of Procurement across Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council. Ms Le Gal, Cabinet Member for Business Services was invited to say a few words in support of this achievement.
- (ii) Related Party Disclosures- he reminded Members that it was a legal requirement to complete their forms and return them to Finance by the end of March.
- (iii) He reminded Members about the charity concert on 18 March 2015 for Keepout and the Yehudi Menuhin School and thanked those Members who had already bought tickets or made a contribution.
- (iv) He said that his most notable engagement since the last County Council meeting had been the Royal visit by HRH, the Earl of Wessex to the Surrey Youth Support Service. This had taken place at High Ashurst and had been a wonderful occasion and he expressed thanks to those staff who had organised the event.

14/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

Mr Page and Mr Skellett declared a pecuniary interest in Item 8(i), the original motion standing in the name of Mr Ian Beardsmore and relating to Heathrow and Gatwick airports and did not participate in that part of the meeting.

The following Members declared non-pecuniary interests in Item 8(i), the original motion standing in the name of Mr Ian Beardsmore and relating to Heathrow and Gatwick airports:

Mr Bennison, Mrs Clack, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Marks, Mr Page, Mr Skellett, Mr Walsh, Mr Wilson.

15/15 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Reference to the proposed cuts for Services to Young People and whether part of the £4.6m extra funding received from Government could be used to mitigate this reduction.
- Issues concerning the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) funding allocated for improvements to Epsom town centre and the consultation that had taken place and whether the scheme had the support of the local committee.
- Concern about the possible closure of up to 10 Children's Centres and the effect on the health and wellbeing of their users.
- Partnership working between SCC Highways officers with Boroughs / Districts, to ensure that sufficient infrastructure was in place for new housing developments.

16/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Notice of 14 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 asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning if he considered that having two similar incinerators within 10 miles of each other was unwise and would he like an incinerator in his area. The Cabinet Member said that the decision on the Eco Park at Charlton Lane would be taken by Cabinet in April 2015, after full consideration of the Value for Money information.

(Q3) Mr Cooksey said that he was seeking assurance from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding that Members be consulted on all new major schemes coming through Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). The Cabinet Member said that, as stated in his written response, the timetable for bidding could be changed by Government at short notice and in these cases it was not possible to share the details of the schemes with Members. However, future opportunities would allow for greater levels of engagement with local committees.

(Q4) Mrs Watson asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families what measures would be in place to raise the awareness of Surrey residents in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation. The Cabinet Member provided Members with a detailed verbal response, stating that the County Council was working closely with partners, including Surrey Police, to raise awareness of this issue.

(Q5) Mr Mallett queried whether the restructure of staff within Surrey libraries should have been considered by the Communities Select Committee. The Cabinet Member for Community Services confirmed her support for Surrey libraries but said that staff re-organisation was an operational issue and not a Member issue.

(Q6) Mr Jenkins asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding why Surrey County Council had not conducted a specific investigation into the flooding of the River Ash in February 2014. Both the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member consider that this supplementary question had been answered in the written response.

(Q7) Mr Harrison said that the Local Committee Chairmen met in private and requested that the minutes of the meeting where the part of the capital maintenance budget under the control of local committees was discussed, were published.

Mr Kington asked when the decision to reduce the Member Allocations was made and whether it had been published.

Mr Mallett expressed concern about the reduction in these allocations and considered that the decision should have been printed in the Budget papers.

The Leader of the Council advised Members that the details were in the Medium Term Financial Plan report, which had been published as part of the Cabinet agenda papers and would be considered at its meeting on 24 March 2015.

(Q9) Mr Beardsmore asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning for clarification on whether the internal officers were Spelthorne BC or Surrey CC officers and was informed that it was Surrey CC officers only.

(Q10) Mr Robert Evans said that the candidate concerned had not yet received a reply to his 4 February communication and requested that this could be expedited as soon as possible. The Leader of the Council agreed.

(Q11) Mr Cooksey asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to clarify two points (i) how was the County Council going to consult with residents about the proposed changes for Community Recycling Centres (CRCs), and (ii) following comments from the Secretary of State, whether charging at CRCs would be permitted. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the County Council would adhere to the proper consultation process for advising residents of any changes and with reference to charging, that he would write to Mr Cooksey outside the meeting.

(Q12) Mr Jenkins asked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding why it had taken over a year to correct the omission of the Thames Water Aqueduct on the Asset Register. The Cabinet Member said that this was the responsibility of Thames Water.

(Q14) Mr Beardsmore asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning for an explanation of restoration and quoted examples in Spelthorne. The Cabinet Member agreed to check the details and respond to him outside the meeting.

Cabinet Member Briefings on their portfolios are attached as Appendix C.

Members made the following comments:

CM Environment and Planning – On the Rural Surrey LEADER programme – clarification on how businesses would benefit from the programme and apply for grants. The Cabinet Member encouraged all Members to promote this programme which would be of benefit to Surrey.

He was also questioned on the Eco Park and the new Waste Management Strategy, which no longer included mention of Energy from Waste.

Deputy Leader – Superfast Broadband - the Deputy Leader agreed, that as part of the Open Market Review, he would seek as much advice and guidance from all sources, including residents and Members.

Also, consideration on whether the programme review of Superfast Broadband and the Open Market Review should be a future item on the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee (COSC) agenda. The Deputy Leader agreed that he would attend, if invited.

CM Schools and Learning – Support for the new Guildford University Technical College (UTC), which would support the regeneration of this area.

CM Community Services – The Cabinet Member was asked to confirm that the budget for the Magna Carta event had increased. However, she said that it had not. She also said that the Magna Carta was the ‘heart and soul’ of freedom and democracy and that she was proud that it had been sealed in Runnymede and that all Members would be invited to the celebration on 15 June 2015.

[Mr Kington has received further clarification of an increase in the budget from the Cabinet Member since the meeting.]

CM Adult Social Care – That the Care Act was the biggest change to Adult Social Care law in over 60 years and that the changes must be communicated to residents. In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, the Leader of the Council confirmed that plans were in place to advise residents of the new caps on care costs from April 2016 and the requirement to apply for an assessment. He was also asked why there was no reference to the decision taken by Cabinet on 10 March 2015 to close six Surrey County Council Care Homes for Older People. The Leader of the Council said that it had been carefully considered by Cabinet and he considered that the right decision had been made and that the minutes of this meeting would be included as part of the Cabinet minutes item for the next County Council meeting in May.

17/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There were no local Member statements.

18/15 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

ITEM 8(i)

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:

(i) oppose additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick in view of the adverse impact this additional capacity will have on Surrey residents, on Surrey’s already congested roads and on Surrey’s environment and Green Belt;

and

(ii) call on the Leader of the Council to lobby all Surrey MPs, the current and future Governments regarding the Council's opposition to additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Watson.

Mr Beardsmore said that:

- This motion was about logistics and expansion and whether Surrey and the South East could absorb any further expansion at these airports
- He referred to an advertisement that he had seen on a bus stop stating that expansion at Heathrow would create 120K jobs, however, additional housing and infrastructure would be required
- Passenger numbers would increase at Heathrow and Gatwick regardless of any expansion due to larger planes
- He acknowledged that 10% of his division depended on employment opportunities at the airport and supported Heathrow as it was now
- He considered that Heathrow and Gatwick would continue to be successful, whether they expanded further or not.

Mr Johnson moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This was formally seconded by Mrs Windsor.

The amendment was as follows (**with additional words underlined**):

'This Council agrees to:

(i) oppose additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick in view of the adverse impact this additional capacity will have on Surrey residents, on Surrey's already congested roads and on Surrey's environment and Green Belt, without detriment to the already stated position of the Council, that these two airports retain their role as the nation's hubs.

and

(ii) call on the Leader of the Council to lobby all Surrey MPs, the current and future Governments regarding the Council's opposition to additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick.'

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

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

- The County Council had debated the expansion of Heathrow and Gatwick two years ago and had agreed to say no to expansion without the required infrastructure in place
- This was the wrong time to debate this issue because submissions to the Davies Commission had now closed and their findings would not be reported until later this year
- Support for expansion at both airports
- Issue of alternative development for the Heathrow site if the airport closed and an estuary airport was developed

- The County Council had a duty to residents already employed at Heathrow and Gatwick
- It was regrettable that the decision on the future for Heathrow and Gatwick would be made public after the general election
- Heathrow had been allowed to evolve in a densely built up area and the country should be looking at innovative ways for airport expansion, such as options for Luton, Stansted, Southampton or Birmingham
- Questioned whether air travel would continue to increase as more people use Eurostar / trains as alternative options
- Continued increase in economic growth was only in the South East
- Additional housing would be required and there would be infrastructure problems if the airports expanded
- Aviation was the fastest growing cause of climate change
- This motion altered the County Council's position, agreed in 2013.
- Since agreement of that resolution, there had been 3 Member seminars on airport expansion, which had been well attended and Members views had been submitted as part of the response to the Davies Commission
- Without the outcome of the Davies Commission being known, the County Council could not depart from its agreed 2013 position because it would need to consider the package of mitigating measures, for the recommendations proposed by the Commission
- Some Surrey residents would welcome further airport expansion
- Hub status at Heathrow could not be retained unless the airport expanded
- The airport authority's for Heathrow and Gatwick were meeting and engaging with Surrey County Council
- A need to protect Surrey residents – concern about the effect on residents of increased noise and blocked roads which could worsen if the expansion of these airports were agreed
- This was the right time to debate this issue.

After the debate, the substantive motion was put to the vote with 15 Members voting for it. 47 Members voted against it and there were 7 abstentions.

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, Mr Will Forster moved the motion, which was:

'In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies are conducted to preserve bus services throughout Surrey.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey.

Mr Forster said that, as the fall in oil prices was likely to last for some time, this benefit should be used to help preserve Surrey's bus services because the Council should be able to get a better deal from its operators. He did accept that changes were needed but said that bus services were key to many residents' daily lives.

Mr Johnson moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

The amendment was as follows **(with additional words underlined)**:

'In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies are conducted to preserve and expand bus services throughout Surrey.'

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

Mr Goodman moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This was formally seconded by Mrs Frost.

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

'In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies ~~are conducted to preserve bus services throughout Surrey.~~ include this factor in developing proposals to meet the objectives of the Review.'

This amendment was not accepted by Mr Forster and therefore Mr Goodman spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- That oil prices were discussed when bus contracts were re-negotiated – contract price could only be changed at contract renewal date
- He was pleased to report that the bus review had attracted 6800 responses
- Stakeholder events had been organised and there had been a comprehensive approach to communicating with residents
- Officers were currently analysing the response and he assured Members that they would listen to their comments
- Whilst the County Council spent £8.9m annually on bus subsidies, there was a need to produce a £2m saving to public transport costs, as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan
- That the detailed consultation report would be on the website within the next few days and all Members would be sent the link to the report
- The outcome and decisions following the Bus Review would be considered at the Cabinet meeting on 26 May.

Six Members spoke on the amendment and made the following points:

- That the amendment was weak, unspecific and failed to protect Surrey's bus services
- That the Bus Transport Review had been discussed at the last Environment and Transport Select Committee meeting
- The oil price was a small part of the overall cost of providing bus services
- Examples of new services were given i.e. a commuter service to and from rural areas of Mole Valley to Dorking railway station and the Chatterbus in the Cobham area
- The review had been extensive and included responses from Borough / District and Parish Councils, and local committees
- The County Council had a good record of supporting bus companies

- The importance of working together with SCC officers and other partners and also using matched funding to ensure that bus services that suited the needs of residents were provided
- This had been an excellent review of the bus provision and had been conducted in a sensitive way
- In many rural areas, buses provided a vital community service
- There was a need to improve the viability of Surrey's bus services and preserve and expand them and the use of community transport was important and could improve the service provision

After which, under Standing Order 23.1, the Leader of the Council moved:

'That the question be now put'

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

The amendment was put to the vote with 56 Members voting for and 14 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

After which, under Standing Order 23.1, the Deputy Leader moved:

'That the question be now put'

Twenty Members stood in support of this request. The Chairman agreed to this request and the substantive motion was put to the vote, with 53 Members voting for and 11 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

In light of the recent significant fall in oil prices, Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to ensure the Transport Review and negotiations with bus operating companies include this factor in developing proposals to meet the objectives of the Review.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45pm and resumed at 1.30pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs Angell, Mrs Barton, Mrs Bramhall, Mrs Coleman, Mr Ellwood, Mrs Frost, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mr Johnson, Mr Kington, Mr Mahne, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mrs Thomson and Mr Townsend.

19/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 24 February 2015.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

There were none.

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A Admission Arrangements for September 2016 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools, Co-ordinated Schemes and Relevant Area

The Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning was invited to present the report.

RESOLVED:

That the following Admissions Arrangements for September 2016 for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools, Co-ordinated Schemes and Relevant Area be approved:

(1) That, subject to Connaught Junior School also agreeing to introduce a reciprocal sibling link with Bagshot Infant School, a reciprocal sibling link for Bagshot Infant School be introduced with Connaught Junior School so that Bagshot Infant School would be described as operating shared sibling priority with Connaught Junior School for 2016 admission.

(2) That a new criterion for Hammond Community Junior School be introduced for September 2016 to provide priority for children attending either Valley End or Windlesham Village infant schools as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Children attending Lightwater Village School
- d. Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e. Children attending either Valley End CofE Infant School or Windlesham Village Infant School
- f. Any other children

(3) That a feeder link from Meath Green Infant to Meath Green Junior School be introduced for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked After and previously Looked After Children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Children attending Meath Green Infant School
- d. Siblings not admitted under c) above
- e. Any other children

(4) That, in line with the tiered arrangements that currently exist at both schools, a tiered feeder link be introduced from Wallace Fields Infant School to Wallace Fields Junior School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- d. Children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address

- e. Other children for whom the school is the nearest school to their home address
- f. Other siblings for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- g. Other children attending Wallace Fields Infant School for whom the school is not the nearest school to their home address
- h. Any other children

(5) That admission criteria be introduced for Year 3 entry to Worplesdon Primary School for September 2016 as follows:

- a. Looked after and previously looked after children
- b. Exceptional social/medical need
- c. Siblings
- d. Children attending Wood Street Infant School
- e. Children for whom the school is the nearest to their home address
- f. Any other children

(6) That the Year 3 Published Admission Number for Cranleigh Primary School be removed for September 2016.

(7) That the own admission authority schools to be included in the assessment of nearest school be decided each year according to the policy set out in Section 12 of Enclosure 1, to the Cabinet report.

(8) That following consultation, the start date to the primary admissions round remains as 1 September for 2016 admission rather than 1 November as proposed.

(9) That Surrey's Relevant Area be agreed as set out in Enclosure 2, to the Cabinet report.

(10) That the Published Admission Numbers (PAN) for September 2016 for all other community and voluntary controlled schools be determined as they are set out in Appendix 1 of Enclosure 1, to the Cabinet report, which included the following changes:

- i. Ashford Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ii. Bishop David Brown Secondary – increase in Year 7 PAN from 150 to 180
- iii. Cranmere Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- iv. Farncombe CofE Infant School - increase in Reception PAN from 40 to 50
- v. The Greville Primary – increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- vi. Hinchley Wood Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- vii. Hurst Park Primary - increase in Reception PAN from 30 to 60
- viii. Manby Lodge Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- ix. Milford School – increase Reception PAN from 50 to 60
- x. North Downs Primary School – introduction of Year 3 PAN of 4
- xi. South Camberley Primary – increase in PAN from 110 to 120
- xii. Stoughton Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiii. West Byfleet Infant - increase in Reception PAN from 60 to 90
- xiv. Worplesdon Primary – introduction of a junior PAN of 30

(11) That the remaining aspects of Surrey's admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for September 2016, for which no consultation was required, be agreed as set out in Enclosure 1 and its Appendices, to the Cabinet report.

(12) That the Coordinated Admission Schemes for 2016/17 be agreed as set out in Appendix 4 of Enclosure 1, to the Cabinet report.

B Surrey Waste Strategy

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning presented the Surrey Waste Strategy to Members. He was asked about the large number of actions set out within the Strategy and confirmed that the County Council would continue to work with its partners to improve and develop actions and their outcomes. He was also asked if the methodology for calculating the Strategy's performance indicators was an exclusive list and to clarify whether 'Reprocessor' mentioned in the Glossary included the Eco park. He agreed to respond to these questions outside the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the new version of Surrey Waste Management Partnership's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Revision 2 (2015), as set out in Appendix 2 to the submitted report, be approved.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

That the report in relation to Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council Partnership was received and noted:

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24 February 2015 be adopted.

20/15 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015 - 2016 [Item 10]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report by stating that, in line with the Localism Act, the County Council was required to approve a Pay Policy Statement for publication on the Council's website.

Mr Young asked if future Surrey Pay Policy Statements could also include mean figures as well as median. The Leader of the Council said that, providing the Regulations stated that it should be included, he would consider the request.

RESOLVED:

That the Pay Policy Statement, Annex A to the submitted report, to be published on Surrey County Council's external website with effect from 1 April 2015.

21/15 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 11]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report and highlighted the following points:

- Working with select committees
- The Strategic Risk Register

- The New Models of Delivery projects, including any joint arrangements with other counties
- The obligations of Statutory Officers

Finally, he thanked Members of the committee for their work, this was reiterated by the Leader of the Council.

RESOLVED:

That the Audit and Governance Annual Report 2014, as attached as an Annex to the submitted report, be approved.

22/15 FORMATION OF A NEW SURREY LOCAL PENSION BOARD [Item 12]

The Cabinet Member for Business Services was invited to introduce this report and began by drawing Members attention to the tabled amendments to this report. (Appendix D), which were formally seconded by Mr Tim Evans.

She said that full Council had approved the formation of a Surrey Pension Fund Board on 19 March 2013 and since then, the Local Government Pension Scheme had produced a revised set of regulations, including the recommendation that the scrutiny function was undertaken by a separate body.

She confirmed that this Board would not have any decision making powers and would only have the powers to assist the Surrey Pension Fund Board in the exercise of its functions. She also drew attention to the new Governance Structure, as at 1 April 2015, as set out in the submitted report.

Mr Pitt proposed including the word 'nominated' in paragraph 4.6, Annex 1 so that it read 'nominated substitutes will be permitted to attend...' and the Cabinet Member for Business Services agreed to consider this request outside the meeting.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Local Pension Board be established, in accordance with the Public Services Pensions Act 2013 and the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 (as amended), with the Terms of Reference, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, with effect from 1 April 2015.
2. That authority be delegated to an appointment panel of officers and Members as set out in the submitted report, to oversee the Local Pension Board recruitment process and for the People, Performance and Development Committee to appoint members of the Local Pension Board, following recommendations from the appointment panel.
3. That the Terms of Reference, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved for adoption by the Local Pension Board.
4. That authority be delegated to the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Chairman of the Pension Board to create such policies and documents to assist the Local Pension Board.
5. That the Local Pension Board receive committee support from the Council's Democratic Services team

6. That any consequential amendments be made to the Council's Constitution as required.

23/15 FORMATION OF A NEW LOCAL PENSION BOARD FOR THE FIREFIGHTERS PENSION SCHEME [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Business Services also introduced this report and confirmed that the establishment of a Surrey Local Pension Board for the Firefighters Scheme was a statutory obligation and that the Board must be established no later than 1 April 2015. She confirmed that this was a statutory unfunded public service pension scheme, unlike the Surrey Local Pension Board (item 12 on the agenda) and it would not have any decision making powers, it would only have the power to assist the Scheme Manager in an advisory capacity.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Surrey Local Firefighters' Pension Board be established, in accordance with the Public Services Pensions Act 2013 and the Firefighters' Pension Scheme Regulations 2014 (as amended), with all matters as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, as its terms of reference with effect from 1 April 2015.
2. That authority be delegated to an appointment panel of officers and Members, as set out in the report to oversee the Local Pension Board recruitment process and for the People, Performance and Development Committee to appoint members of the Local Pension Board following recommendations from the appointment panel.
3. That the Terms of Reference, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report, be approved for adoption by the Local Pension Board.
4. That authority be delegated to the Director of Finance in consultation with the Chairman of People, Performance and Development Committee to create such policies and documents to assist the Local Pension Board.
5. That the Local Pension Board receive committee support from the Council's Democratic Services team.
6. That any consequential amendments be made to the Council's Constitution, as required.

24/15 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 14]

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: 1.55pm]