

COUNTY COUNCIL**COUNCIL MEETING - 13 OCTOBER 2015**

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 13 October 2015 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Sally Marks (Chairman)

* Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman)

Mary Angell	*	Saj Hussain
W D Barker OBE		David Ivison
Mrs N Barton		Daniel Jenkins
Ian Beardsmore	*	George Johnson
John Beckett		Linda Kemeny
Mike Bennison		Colin Kemp
Liz Bowes		Eber Kington
Natalie Bramhall		Rachael I Lake
Mark Brett-Warburton		Yvonna Lay
Ben Carasco		Ms D Le Gal
Bill Chapman		Mary Lewis
Helyn Clack		Ernest Mallett MBE
* Carol Coleman		Mr P J Martin
Stephen Cooksey		Jan Mason
Mr S Cosser		Marsha Moseley
* Clare Curran	*	Tina Mountain
* Graham Ellwood		Mr D Munro
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		Michael Sydney
David Goodwin		Keith Taylor
Michael Gosling		Barbara Thomson
Zully Grant-Duff		Chris Townsend
* Ramon Gray		Richard Walsh
Ken Gulati		Hazel Watson
Tim Hall		Fiona White
Kay Hammond		Richard Wilson
Mr D Harmer		Helena Windsor
Nick Harrison	*	Keith Witham
Marisa Heath		Mr A Young
Peter Hickman		Mrs V Young
Margaret Hicks		
David Hodge		

*absent

58/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Coleman, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Furey, Mr Gray, Mr Hussain, Mr Johnson, Mrs Mountain, Mr Page, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mr Skellett and Mr Witham.

59/15 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 14 July 2015 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

60/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- The untimely death of Councillor Robert Watts, Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, in a house fire last weekend. She informed Members that she had written to Councillor Mark Francis, Mayor of Spelthorne, to express her sympathies.
- That Surrey County Council had been awarded the Defence Employer Recognition Silver Award for demonstrating and communicating the Council's supportive behaviour towards the Armed Forces. She presented the award to David Munro, the Armed Forces Champion for Surrey County Council.
- The Summer Reception for volunteers - more than 50 of Surrey's unsung heroes were recognised for their work within their communities. Each volunteer was presented with a certificate and a specially commissioned voluntary medal struck at the Pobjoy Mint in Tadworth.
- The appointment of a new Lord-Lieutenant for Surrey - Mr Michael More-Molyneux of Loseley Park replaced Dame Sarah Goad, who retired after eighteen years of dedicated service.
- That, earlier this month, she had taken part in the civic procession from the Guildhall to the Holy Trinity Church, Guildford for the annual service for the Judiciary in Surrey.
- She reported on the following Royal Visits to the county, which had taken place since 1 September 2015:
 - (i) HRH Duchess Gloucester visited King Edward's School in Witley;
 - (ii) HRH Duke of Gloucester visited the Archaeological excavations at Woking Palace, McLaren Technology centre and opened the new sixth form block at Glyn School;
 - (iii) HRH Princess Royal had visited the Rural Housing Conference hosted at Loseley Park and presented two Queen's Awards for Enterprise: one for Innovation, and one for International Trade to Hallmarq Veterinary Imaging in Merrow.

- University of Surrey, had been recently awarded two University of the Year titles by the Times and the Sunday Times, achieving top spot overall and also being recognised for Student Experience.
- That the resignation of Mrs Stella Lallement as a county councillor be noted. She informed Members that a notice of vacancy has been published on the Council's website.

61/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

1. Mr Forster declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 (the motion standing in the name of Mr Robert Evans) because he works for a Member of the European Parliament.
2. Mr Essex declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 (the motion standing in the name of Mr Orrick) because he was a trustee of Furnistore, a reuse charity.

62/15 APPROVAL OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR ABSENCE [Item 5]

The Chairman said that the Council was requested to consider whether Mrs Clare Curran may continue to be absent from Council by reason of ill health, and on behalf of the Council, sent Members' good wishes to her.

It was:

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Clare Curran may continue to be absent from meetings by reason of her ill health until May 2016 and the Council looks forward to welcoming her back in due course.

63/15 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 6]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Devolution – this was generally welcomed but the Leader was asked what opportunities would the public have to comment on the proposals and how would it be finalised before it was submitted to Government.
- That a significant amount of work would need to be undertaken to develop the governance arrangements for Devolution.
- Assurance was requested from the Leader that he would arrange for a cost benefit analysis, relating to Devolution proposals, to be undertaken, following his meeting with Greg Clark, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
- Devolution should lead to increased efficiencies and value for money for residents and should be supported.

- That a £1.9m reduction of this year's youth service budget would have a detrimental effect on the provision of this service for young people.
- That Epsom had recently been named as the top town in the country for courtesy.
- A request for details of the formulation of the Devolution bid in relation to Local Enterprise Partnerships which spilled over into other counties.
- Whether the decision making process would become less transparent with Devolution.
- Could Devolution result in the County / Boroughs and Districts moving toward a unitary model for Local Government?

64/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 10 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 Robert Evans asked the Leader of the Council whether he, or any of his colleagues, had any discussions with Surrey's Police and Crime Commissioner. The Leader referred Mr Evans to the first paragraph of his written response.

(Q2) Mrs White asked the Leader of the Council if he agreed that Government changes to planning laws would not help Surrey and requested that he write to the Prime Minister. She also considered that 'affordable housing' was still likely to be beyond the reach of key workers in Surrey. The Leader considered that the Government was right to encourage builders but said that he would raise the issue with the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government at his meeting with him later in the week.

(Q4) Mrs Watson requested that a survey of all County Council roads be undertaken so that all county roads were included on the asset register. In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, the Leader agreed to ensure that the Cabinet Member was aware of her request.

(Q5) Mr Kington queried the response to the first part of his question because there was no direct link to the Ofsted reports or any search engine. The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience reiterated (as stated in her response) that she had asked officers to review the importance of clear and accurate tagging when putting information on the website.

(Q6) In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding, **Mr Selleck** asked the Leader of the Council why the County Council had recently received a cheque from Kier. The Leader agreed to make enquiries and to share the response with Members after the meeting.

(Q7) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience if it was possible to publish what the cost of the introduction of the National Living Wage on the Council would be and whether Central Government could be asked to provide additional funding to lessen the impact of its introduction. The Cabinet Member said that the budget figures produced in November, as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan refresh, may include an estimate and she

confirmed that the Leader of the Council continued to lobby Central Government in relation to fairer funding for Surrey.

(Q8) Mrs White asked the Leader of the Council if it may have been financially prudent to appoint a new temporary Cabinet Member rather than a fifth Cabinet Associate Member. The Leader referred to the Scheme of Members' Allowances and said that he was satisfied with his decision to appoint an additional Cabinet Associate Member.

(Q9) Mr Beardsmore expressed concern about the timescales involved for re-negotiating SITA Surrey's contract with the Allington Waste for Energy Plant in Kent. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning said that he had nothing to add to his written response already provided.

(Q10) Mr Essex asked if the answer already provided to part of his question, before the meeting, could also be circulated to Members. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agreed to this request.

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

Members made the following comments:

- The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience was asked for her comments on the scrutiny process for Orbis at both East Sussex and Surrey County Councils and whether there would be political support for any possible difficult decisions.
- Flood Forums – a request for more information to be provided to local committees within the next three months.
- Community Recycling Centres and proposed changes to the service – a plea to 'keep it simple' in order to continue to increase recycling rates in Surrey.
- A request for information on the cost of fly tipping and how much of that cost was attributed to the County Council – it was agreed that this information would be provided outside the meeting. Also whether the numbers provided in the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning's update included waste tipped on private land - the Cabinet Member said that those figures would be impossible to determine. However, he advised Members that the County Council would be working with landowners and other key partners to develop a fly tipping strategy.
- Enterprise M3 Growth Hub and the impact in the Guildford area – concern was expressed that little was known about Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), their decision making processes and what they do. The Deputy Leader referred Members to the LEP's website and confirmed that the County Council was working with businesses and institutions so that the partnership developed and would provide support to businesses across the Enterprise M3 area.
- MIPIM UK – a request for more information on this and whether Surrey was unique in being the only Local Authority taking part at this conference.

65/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were three local Member statements:

- Mr Robert Evans in relation to the bus provision in Stanwell Moor
- Mr Chris Townsend in relation to the Youth Service, Sure Start and School provision in Ashtead
- Mr Bill Barker in relation to Pigeon House Bridge, Wisley

66/15 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 views with sorrow the on-going migration crisis on mainland Europe and expresses its deep regret at the tragic loss of lives and deeply distressing images that have resulted.

Surrey County Council notes that the international community has failed to come up with credible policies to manage this humanitarian disaster, but recognises that the UK has a proud history of offering sanctuary to those who are fleeing from dangerous and desperate situations in other countries.

Notwithstanding the economic pressures that Surrey is facing, Council resolves to work with its eleven boroughs and districts to support initiatives to help migrants who may seek refuge in the United Kingdom, and for the County to take its fair share of refugees.

Surrey calls on the British Government to ensure adequate funding and resources are made available to all local authorities involved."

Mr Robert Evans made the following points:

- That over 4 million people were now displaced and there was no end to this crisis and that each day, approximately 5000 people were still leaving Syria.
- Huge numbers of migrants were anticipated across the European Union this year, it could be up to 1 million people.
- The refugees were not just from Syria, they were coming from many countries including Iran and Afghanistan.
- Many people were fleeing from countries where the UK had some previous involvement.
- Britain / Surrey had a proud record of helping and some Surrey Boroughs and Districts were offering support to refugees.
- Reference to previous refugees crises where people had settled in Surrey and had played a part in life in the county.
- That there were 3000 empty homes in Surrey and this resource could help alleviate housing needs.
- The importance of Surrey making a statement on this issue and that the county would be willing to work with Government and Surrey's Borough and

Districts to offer help where possible but that he had no magic solutions to this crisis.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Hodge who thanked Mr Essex for allowing him to second this motion. He also made the following points:

- That all Members were appalled with the on-going recent migrant crisis.
- Surrey residents had responded with generosity and he believed it was right for the County Council to work with Government to help migrants.
- He was pleased that Government had committed to extend funding for Syrian refugees beyond one year and he hoped that there would be long term sustainable funding.
- The importance of working together to have a co-ordinated multi-agency approach to helping with this crisis.
- That Members and the public would receive regular updates on the County's response.
- Finally, he said that both he and the Conservative Group were happy to support this motion.

The Chairman informed Members that, as there appeared to be a general consensus that this motion would be agreed, there should only be a short debate on it and said that Mr Essex, as the original seconder of this motion, should be the only speaker. He made three points:

- The importance of being pro-active in dealing with the migrant crisis
- Reference to the detention centres near Heathrow and Gatwick and the unfair burden on the Councils in those areas
- Action was required and that he would like to see Surrey County Council joining with Kent County Council to assist them with the large number of refugee children coming to the UK.

Following Mr Essex's comments, the motion was put to the vote.

It was:

RESOLVED (unanimously):

That this Council views with sorrow the on-going migration crisis on mainland Europe and expresses its deep regret at the tragic loss of lives and deeply distressing images that have resulted.

Surrey County Council notes that the international community has failed to come up with credible policies to manage this humanitarian disaster, but recognises that the UK has a proud history of offering sanctuary to those who are fleeing from dangerous and desperate situations in other countries.

Notwithstanding the economic pressures that Surrey is facing, Council resolves to work with its eleven boroughs and districts to support initiatives to help migrants who may seek refuge in the United Kingdom, and for the County to take its fair share of refugees.

Surrey calls on the British Government to ensure adequate funding and resources are made available to all local authorities involved.

ITEM 9(ii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr John Orrick moved the motion which was:

'This Council:

Notes:

1. that the consultation on the future of Recycling Centres ended on 30th September;
2. that the consultation sought views on four options - charging for non-household waste disposal, reducing opening hours, closing some centres for one or two days, and closing some centres altogether but failed to include an option to reject all four;
3. that consequently the consultation was flawed since its conclusion could only favour one of four unacceptable options.

Resolves:

to recommend to the Cabinet that all four options are rejected because the implementation of any one of them would lead to a significant reduction in service, adversely affect recycling rates and increase fly-tipping.'

Mr Orrick made the following points in support of his motion:

- That, as part of the consultation process on the future of Recycling Centres, he had spoken to many local residents
- A belief that the options presented were flawed and may result in increased costs, partly due to increased fly tipping
- Currently, recycling rates were increasing but this could change if Recycling Centres opened for fewer hours and started charging for non-household waste disposal
- That many residents who had responded to the consultation had praised the Recycling Centre staff
- Introducing charges would cause some issues for staff, with residents possibly haggling over any charge being made and also that providing a credit / debit service would incur costs.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey, who reserved his right to speak.

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

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

'This Council:

Notes:

1. that the consultation on the future of Recycling Centres ended on 30 September;
2. that the consultation sought views on four options - charging for non-household waste disposal, reducing opening hours, closing some centres for one or two days, and closing some centres altogether but failed to include an option to reject all four;
3. that consequently the consultation was flawed since its conclusion could only favour one of four unacceptable options.

Resolves:

to recommend to the Cabinet that all four options ~~are rejected because the implementation of any one of them would lead to a significant reduction in service, adversely affect recycling rates and increase fly tipping.~~ plus any other options that the Cabinet considers to be relevant are considered, before arriving at its decision.

During the debate, this amendment was further amended, with the consent of Council and point 3 was deleted.

The amendment was not accepted by Mr Orrick and Mr Goodman spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- That this consultation had followed a similar process to that used in the Transport Review earlier this year
- The consultation had received over 4500 responses
- The County Council had invested several million pounds in some of the Recycling Centres
- Officers were currently reviewing the consultation information and would compile recommendations which would be shared with the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board before going to Cabinet in November for discussion
- That there may be a need for further consultation in certain aspects of the changes, as happened in the Transport Review
- Where other authorities had introduced changes to Community Recycling Centres (CRCs), it had not resulted in an increase in fly tipping
- A Surrey wide strategy to reduce fly tipping was being worked on and would be introduced
- Surrey had excellent recycling rates at its CRCs – in 2014/15 it was 64.1% and its kerbside performance was 54%, the fifth best in England and landfill at 6%, the 6th best in England
- Finally, he said that the County Council would never be complacent about this issue, would continue to work in partnership with Boroughs and Districts and urged Members to support this amendment.

Seven Members also spoke to the amendment and made the following comments:

- Discussion of the proposals at the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board would provide Members with ample opportunity to suggest changes

- Savings targets, as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, needed to be met
- There was greater choice for household recycling at CRCs and the County Council should provide more investment for them
- Recycling rates had stalled
- Disposal costs for fly tipping were twice as expensive as planned recycling
- That the amendment would now include any other options that Cabinet considered relevant
- The County Council had some very good CRCs but some in the county had proved difficult to upgrade so the Council needed to commit to upgrading all its CRCs, although it was acknowledged that this could be very challenging
- There had been a long and constructive debate at the last meeting of Surrey Waste Partnership. However, concerns about possible fly tipping issues had been raised by Boroughs and Districts.
- The amendment was counter-productive and there were concerns about less recycling and the 'knock-on effect' of increased costs for Boroughs and Districts
- The reason for the consultation was to make £1.8m savings
- Some CRCs may be closed but to date there had been no indication which ones were vulnerable.

The amendment was put to the vote with 48 Members voting for and 16 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Two Members spoke on the substantive motion before it was put to the vote with 50 Members voting for it. 15 Members voted against it and there was 1 abstention.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

'This Council:

Notes:

1. that the consultation on the future of Recycling Centres ended on 30 September;
2. that the consultation sought views on four options - charging for non-household waste disposal, reducing opening hours, closing some centres for one or two days, and closing some centres altogether but failed to include an option to reject all four;

Resolves:

to recommend to the Cabinet that all four options plus any other options that the Cabinet considers to be relevant are considered, before arriving at its decision.

ITEM 9(iii)

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:

'This Council notes with significant concern the most recently released road injury statistics for 2014 showing that:

- (i) The number of people killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads increased by 23% from 2013 (up from 599 to 735) – the third worst performance of any police force area across England and Wales.
- (ii) The number of casualties on Surrey's roads has increased in 2014 compared with 2013 as follows:
 - Total road casualties increased by 3.5% from 5,223 to 5,408.
 - Fatal injuries more than doubled (111% increase) from 18 to 38.
 - Serious injuries increased by 20% from 581 to 697 - the highest number since at least 2005.
 - The number of children injured on Surrey's roads grew by 14% from 305 to 348.
 - The number of car occupants killed or seriously injured (KSIs) increased by 36% to 268 - the highest figure since 2008.
 - Cyclists KSIs increased for the sixth consecutive year by 14.5% to 166.
 - Pedestrians KSIs remained at 98 for a second year running - the highest number since at least 2005.
 - Motorcyclists KSIs increased by 32% to 185 to reach the highest recorded numbers since at least 2005.

In the light of Surrey's adverse and worsening road safety record, this Council requests the Cabinet to give a much higher priority to improving road safety including more funding for services such as Drive SMART, road safety outside schools and highway improvements, and establish a Road Safety Task Group in order to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on Surrey's roads.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Beardsmore.

Mr Forster made the following points:

- Highlighted the statistics, as detailed in the motion
- The increase in the number of children injured on Surrey's roads
- That many residents had contacted him since he had submitted this motion
- Surrey County Council was not doing enough to improve road safety on its roads
- The increased number of road casualties in 2014, in the South East
- Proposal of a Road Safety Task Group to enable a step change to reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured in Surrey
- Promotion of cycling and walking was important and therefore he considered that this motion was good for safety, health and the environment.

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

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

'This Council notes with significant concern the most recently released road injury statistics for 2014 showing that:

(i) The number of people killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads increased by 23% from 2013 (up from 599 to 735) – the third worst performance of any police force area across England and Wales.

(ii) The number of casualties on Surrey's roads has increased in 2014 compared with 2013 as follows:

- Total road casualties increased by 3.5% from 5,223 to 5,408.
- Fatal injuries more than doubled (111% increase) from 18 to 38.
- Serious injuries increased by 20% from 581 to 697 - the highest number since at least 2005.
- The number of children injured on Surrey's roads grew by 14% from 305 to 348.
- The number of car occupants killed or seriously injured (KSIs) increased by 36% to 268 - the highest figure since 2008.
- Cyclists KSIs increased for the sixth consecutive year by 14.5% to 166.
- Pedestrians KSIs remained at 98 for a second year running - the highest number since at least 2005.
- Motorcyclists KSIs increased by 32% to 185 to reach the highest recorded numbers since at least 2005.

~~In the light of Surrey's adverse and worsening road safety record, this Council requests the Cabinet to give a much higher priority to improving road safety including more funding for services such as Drive SMART, road safety outside schools and highway improvements, and establish a Road Safety Task Group~~

(iii) Though acknowledging the need to place 2014 data into the context of long term improvement.

This Council requests that the Drive Smart Board consider the 2014 data alongside the previous years' data and any other National information available, including the current 2015 data, in order to make recommendations to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board as to how best to promote road safety in a holistic way, in order to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on Surrey's roads.'

The amendment was not accepted by Mr Forster and therefore Mrs Hammond spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- That there had also been increases in casualties in other counties, although she acknowledged that every fatality or serious injury was a tragedy
- Uncertainty why there had been a comparatively large increase in the number of fatal / serious collisions in Surrey in 2014

- Analysis undertaken by the Department for Transport suggested a number of contributing factors including: (i) the effect of adverse weather, (ii) general increase in cycling participation especially in Surrey, following the success of the Olympic cycle races, (iii) random fluctuations in road safety statistics from year to year
- Emerging data was suggesting that the number of road casualties in 2015 would be much less than in 2014 but this still left no room for complacency
- Continued need to support road safety campaigns such as Safe Drive Stay Alive
- The Drive Smart Board had already considered the casualty data and commissioned and funded a media and publicity campaign on cycling safety.

Ten Members also spoke to the amendment and made the following comments:

- The necessity of reviewing safe routes to schools, including lower speed limits at school crossing points
- Congestion and its impact on Surrey's roads
- Obesity
- Drivers' use of Surrey's roads – there should be zero tolerance to going through red lights and speeding
- Footpaths should be regularly cleared to enable safer walking routes
- Elimination of inconsiderate parking outside schools
- Promotion of the safety campaigns, including wide dissemination of Drive Smart videos, particularly for young drivers
- Enforcement and the lack of officers to do it
- Many of these issues were matters for local committees
- Difficulty of recruiting school crossing patrol staff
- Drive Smart Board was not a decision making body, the responsibility for Road Safety sat with the Cabinet and the Council should be giving road safety a higher priority and not relying on the Drive Smart Board
- Signage encouraged slower driving
- A need to look at the statistics over the last 20 years, which showed a dramatic improvement, rather than just one year's data
- Utilising the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board to consider how best to promote road safety was a better option than establishing a Road Safety Task Group.

The amendment was put to the vote with 46 Members voting for and 18 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Three Members spoke on the substantive motion before it was put to the vote with 46 Members voting for it. 16 Members voted against it and there were 2 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes with significant concern the most recently released road injury statistics for 2014 showing that:

- (i) The number of people killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads increased by

23% from 2013 (up from 599 to 735) – the third worst performance of any police force area across England and Wales.

(ii) The number of casualties on Surrey's roads has increased in 2014 compared with 2013 as follows:

- Total road casualties increased by 3.5% from 5,223 to 5,408.
- Fatal injuries more than doubled (111% increase) from 18 to 38.
- Serious injuries increased by 20% from 581 to 697 - the highest number since at least 2005.
- The number of children injured on Surrey's roads grew by 14% from 305 to 348.
- The number of car occupants killed or seriously injured (KSIs) increased by 36% to 268 - the highest figure since 2008.
- Cyclists KSIs increased for the sixth consecutive year by 14.5% to 166.
- Pedestrians KSIs remained at 98 for a second year running - the highest number since at least 2005.
- Motorcyclists KSIs increased by 32% to 185 to reach the highest recorded numbers since at least 2005.

(iii) Though acknowledging the need to place 2014 data into the context of long term improvement.

This Council requests that the Drive Smart Board consider the 2014 data alongside the previous years' data and any other National information available, including the current 2015 data, in order to make recommendations to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board as to how best to promote road safety in a holistic way, in order to reduce the numbers of people killed and seriously injured on Surrey's roads.

67/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the Report of the Cabinet meetings held on 29 July and 22 September 2015. Members had an opportunity to comment on the report.

Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Annual Report of the Shareholder Board
- Quarterly report on decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 July – 30 September 2015

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 29 July and 22 September 2015 be adopted.

68/15 APPOINTMENT OF A VICE-CHAIRMAN OF EDUCATION AND SKILLS SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 11]

Vice-Chairman of Education and Skills Scrutiny Board

It was:

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Moseley be appointed as Vice-Chairman on the Education and Skills Scrutiny Board for the remainder of the council year 2015/16.

69/15 PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE [Item 12]

Mr Hodge, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee introduced the committee's report.

RESOLVED:

That the Constitution be amended to institute a formalised arrangement for the appointment of senior managers to the Orbis Joint Partnership, where Surrey County Council is the authority paying for the post, to allow a Member of East Sussex County Council to sit on and participate in the Appointments Sub-Committee as a co-opted Member without the ability to exercise voting rights.

70/15 AMENDMENT TO SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015 - 2016 [Item 13]

This item was withdrawn and will be brought back to the next County Council meeting in December.

71/15 CONSTITUTION UPDATE REPORT [Item 14]

This report sought Council's approval for changes to the Scheme of Delegation relating to a change in name for the Surrey Pension Fund Board (now to be known as the Surrey Pension Fund Committee). Also, in line with Article 6.04 it also formally reported the appointment of a new Cabinet Associate.

Mrs Watson wished it to be noted that she was opposed to an additional Cabinet Associate post because she considered Cabinet Associates were an unnecessary, additional expense to the Authority.

RESOLVED:

1. That the changes to the Constitution regarding the name change of the Surrey Pension Fund Committee (formerly known as the Surrey Pension Fund Board) be approved.
2. That the appointment of a new Cabinet Associate by the Leader of the Council be noted.

72/15 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 at: 12.50pm]

Chairman