

COUNTY COUNCIL**COUNCIL MEETING - 8 DECEMBER 2015**

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 8 December 2015 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Sally Marks (Chairman)

Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman)

*	Mary Angell	David Hodge
	W D Barker OBE	Saj Hussain
	Mrs N Barton	David Ivison
	Ian Beardsmore	* Daniel Jenkins
	John Beckett	George Johnson
	Mike Bennison	Linda Kemeny
*	Liz Bowes	Colin Kemp
*	Natalie Bramhall	Eber Kington
	Mark Brett-Warburton	Rachael I Lake
	Ben Carasco	Yvonna Lay
	Bill Chapman	Ms D Le Gal
	Helyn Clack	Mary Lewis
*	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	Mr D Munro
	Robert Evans	Christopher Norman
	Tim Evans	* John Orrick
	Mel Few	Adrian Page
	Will Forster	Karan Persand
*	Mrs P Frost	Chris Pitt
*	Denis Fuller	Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
	John Furey	Denise Saliagopoulos
	Bob Gardner	Tony Samuels
	Mike Goodman	Pauline Searle
	David Goodwin	Stuart Selleck
	Michael Gosling	Michael Sydney
*	Zully Grant-Duff	Keith Taylor
	Ramon Gray	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
		Mrs V Young

*absent

73/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Angell, Mrs Bowes, Mrs Bramhall, Mrs Coleman, Mrs Frost, Mr Fuller, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Hickman, Mr Orrick and Mr Wilson.

74/15 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 13 October 2015 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

75/15 ELECTION OF A COUNTY COUNCILLOR [Item 3]

The Chief Executive formally reported that Mr Karan Persand was duly elected as the new County Councillor for the Epsom West division following the by-election held on 19 November 2015.

76/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- The sad news of the passing of Richard Rothwell, former County Councillor for Epsom & Ewell North East from 1993-2001. Members stood in silent tribute.
- That Surrey Public Health Lead, Maya Twardzicki recently received a national award from the Royal Society of Public Health for outstanding and innovative contributions to Arts and Health practice and research. The award was presented by General the Lord Dannatt on 18 November at the Royal Society of Public Health in London, to all the Home Front project partners.
- That Denise Le Gal had been recognised as Elected Member of the Year at the Local Government Chronicle Investment (LGC) Awards. In addition, the Surrey County Council Pension Fund won 'fund of the year' for funds above £2billion.
- That Lynne Owens, who had been Chief Constable of Surrey Police since February 2012, had just been appointed Director General of the National Crime Agency. She informed Members that she would be writing to her to offer her congratulations.
- HRH Prince Edward, the Earl of Wessex's had recently unveiled the new peace garden at the Woking Muslim Burial Ground and said this was part funded by the Community Improvements Fund.
- That she had attended the Surrey Sports Awards ceremony at the H G Wells Centre last week to present a Disability Sport Award, on behalf of the County Council, to Paul Phillips of Frensham Pond Sailability in Farnham.
- SEND 2020 programme – she advised Members that officers working to improve the experiences of families, children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities were keen to hear from Members and there would be a team of officers outside the Ashcombe Suite at lunchtime.

- That she would be replacing David Munro as the Chairman of the Surrey Civilian Military Partnership Board, and thanked him for his work in this area.
- That Surrey had recently successfully hosted the County Council Network (CCN) Conference in Guildford.

77/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

There were none.

78/15 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:

- The 2% rise on council tax to help fund Adult Social Care in 2016 and that the system will operate differently in two tier authorities and therefore, it was requested this matter be brought to the Government Minister's attention.
- That acquisition of investment properties by the Council should be confined to purchasing properties within Surrey.
- Following the motion at the last County Council meeting in relation to the migration crisis, an update on the position relating to the number of Syrian refugees accepted by the County was requested.

79/15 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

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:

(Q3) Mrs Watson asked the Leader of the Council if the route for the Prudential Ride London event could be varied each year and was informed that the route would be agreed with the London Marathon company but that the County Council would take into account the best route for the event. He also reminded Members that the event had generated £1.2m for local sporting and recreational charities.

(Q7) Mr Harrison suggested that the threat of possible closures of some Community Recycling Centres (CRCs), as part of the proposals to make savings, was a sham and asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning if he agreed. The Cabinet Member said that possible closures had formed part of the consultation process. Details of all proposals for savings had been analysed and there would be a further report to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board in January.

(Q8) Mr Barker asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning why no data relating to Guildford Borough was included in the table. He was advised that this information had been requested but not yet received. It was also noted that

there was a problem with the tabulation of the table and the Cabinet Member agreed to re-issue it to all Members.

Mr Beardsmore drew the Cabinet Member's attention to the high pollution in the Sunbury Cross / Staines area of Spelthorne, where he said there was the highest concentration of schools in Surrey and said this was of concern to him.

(Q9) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health if she intended to lobby Government for fairer funding for public health in Surrey. She confirmed that this would happen, as she had stated at the last Cabinet meeting.

(Q10) Mr Robert Evans said that whilst a facsimile copy of the 1297 Magna Carta would be welcome, he was interested in pursuing and obtaining the original copy from the Australian Government and asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health for her views. She considered that the original would cost a great deal of time, effort and money and that the County's priorities were to concentrate on providing services for Surrey residents. However, she hoped that a facsimile copy would be possible and this could be displayed at County Hall in the future.

(Q12) Mr Sydney asked if this response could be shared with his local residents. This was confirmed in the verbal response from the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing. Mr Sydney also considered that the Internal Audit team's report on the Community Partner Libraries (CPL) had contained a number of inaccuracies which he would be taking up outside the meeting. He also questioned the success of CPLs, saying that they were running at a lower footfall than before. The Cabinet Member considered that he had provided a factual response and assured Mr Sydney that he would continue to update him on the future arrangements for Lingfield library.

(Q14) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning what investment would be required to deliver the proposed £8m savings for Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) and was advised that SWP did not normally invest in capital so the Council would be re-looking at how the budget was allocated to enable Surrey to achieve its recycling targets.

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

Members made the following comments:

- Good wishes and thanks to Dave Sargeant, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care, who had worked in the service in Surrey for 32 years and would be retiring at the end of December 2015. Members wished him a long and happy retirement. They also welcomed the appointment of Helen Atkinson as Head of the combined Adults and Public Health Services.
- Rail – three priority options identified in the 2013 Surrey Rail document were set out in the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning's briefing. He was asked if there was a similar document for South West trains and its on-going consultation. The Cabinet Member agreed to make this available to Members.
- Community Recycling Centres – the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning was asked about negotiations taking place to transfer these centres to Boroughs and Districts. The Cabinet Member informed Members that the matter was still being considered by the Strategic Director and that he had no updates to report at present.

- On behalf of the Spelthorne area, thanks were expressed to the local Highways team, who had responded to 8,000 calls since January, most of which had been satisfactorily resolved.

80/15 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were no statements from Members.

81/15 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 Cooksey moved the motion which was:

'This Council notes:

(i) the findings of the most recent Footways Network Survey, showing that a third of all the county's footways are either "functionally or structurally impaired".

(ii) that models produced by the Council's highways team show that the current low levels of capital investment in the county's footways will lead to a continued deterioration in their condition, with 40% of the county's footways expected to be "functionally or structurally impaired" by 2028.

In light of these worsening conditions, this Council requests the Cabinet to give much higher priority to the funding of footway resurfacing, re-paving and repair to improve the condition of Surrey's footway network for the benefit of pedestrians.'

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

- That most footways were in a deplorable state and little maintenance was undertaken to improve them.
- The County's footways were a hazard for residents to contend with on a daily basis.
- The Footways Network Survey provided data which demonstrated that one-third of the County's footways were in an unacceptable condition.
- There was insufficient funding in the highways budget for footway improvements and there would be a continued deterioration of their condition.
- Project Horizon focussed on highway and not footway improvements.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Goodwin, who said that footways were an integral part of the highways and should be a higher priority for maintenance and repairs. He said that although some Members, including himself, had used their local allocations for repairing footways in their divisions, there was insufficient funding for local committees to undertake this work in many instances.

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

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

'This Council notes:

(i) the findings of the most recent Footways Network Survey, showing that a third of all the county's footways are either "functionally or structurally impaired".

(ii) that models produced by the Council's highways team show that the current low levels of capital investment in the county's footways will lead to a continued deterioration in their condition, with 40% of the county's footways expected to be "functionally or structurally impaired" by 2028.

In light of these worsening conditions, this Council requests the Cabinet to give **as great a priority as it can** ~~much higher priority~~ to the funding of footway resurfacing, re-paving and repair to improve the condition of Surrey's footway network for the benefit of pedestrians **within the context of the Council's challenging funding circumstances.**

Mr Furey spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- The highways network was used by most Surrey residents and businesses every day.
- There was a statutory requirement to maintain the highways network and the County Council had made a significant investment to both maintain and improve it.
- The amendment was the right approach for the County Council to take.
- The technical jargon used in the report to describe footway conditions was as required for formal returns to Government.
- That the Council's footway network was no worse than many other highway authorities.
- That a strategic approach was important to any investment and that the service was in the process of finalising a new 15 year Asset Strategy for the highway network, which included footways. This approach would complement the good work undertaken by local committees.

Nine Members spoke on the amendment and made the following comments:

- That there had been a major investment in improving the pavement in West Street, Dorking.
- As there were limited funds for footway improvements, it was requested that officers engage with local Members and also local residents to maximize the best use of resources.
- The modeling exercise, which had been demonstrated at a recent Member seminar was useful, this illustrated the 'cause and effect' of moving funding within the Highways Budget.
- That poorly maintained footways created difficulties for wheelchair users.
- Footways should be given a higher priority in the budget because poorly maintained pavements were a trip hazard which then impacted on the NHS.
- A balancing act was needed to decide the best way forward for funding footway re-surfacing, re-paving and repair – this would be discussed at the relevant Scrutiny Board and local committees.

The amendment was put to the vote with 56 Members voting for and 8 Members voting against it. There were two abstentions.

Therefore, the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Two Members spoke on the substantive motion before, under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Kington moved:

'That the question be now put'.

The Chairman considered that there had been adequate debate, agreed to the request, with the support of the Chamber, and the debate was wound up.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 60 Members voting for and 7 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes:

- (i) the findings of the most recent Footways Network Survey, showing that a third of all the county's footways are either "functionally or structurally impaired".
- (ii) that models produced by the Council's highways team show that the current low levels of capital investment in the county's footways will lead to a continued deterioration in their condition, with 40% of the county's footways expected to be "functionally or structurally impaired" by 2028.

In light of these worsening conditions, this Council requests the Cabinet to give as great a priority as it can to the funding of footway resurfacing, re-paving and repair to improve the condition of Surrey's footway network for the benefit of pedestrians within the context of the Council's challenging funding circumstances.'

ITEM 9(ii)

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

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

'This Council warmly welcomes a new Conservative Government which is listening to the voice of Local Government and is now setting out an agenda of reforming business rates, devolving power and responding to the funding needs of adult social care.'

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

- There had been a shift in emphasis in the working relationship between Central Government and County Councils, due partly to the Government's engagement with local Council Leaders and also the changing world that we live in.

- Devolution of power would be good for the area because issues in the South East would be different from those in the north of England and resources could be targeted to specific areas of need.
- This County Council was making excellent progress in developing partnership working and new ways of working.

This motion was formally seconded by Mr Brett-Warburton who made the following points:

- A request that all Members supported this motion
- Surrey County Council's Leadership had played an active part in lobbying Government for reform of business rates, devolution and responding to the funding needs of Adult Social Care and Members should be proud that the Government had listened to the Council.
- There were many examples of collaborative work.
- The importance of standing together as Surrey County Councillors, regardless of political parties.

Under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Robert Evans moved:

'That the question be now put'.

Twenty Members stood in support of this request. The Chairman considered that there had not been adequate debate and refused the request. She said that she would allow the four Members who had indicated that they wished to speak to do so before taking the vote on the motion.

These Members made the following points:

- The importance of politicians listening to the needs of residents.
- The work undertaken to date and on-going by the Senior Management Team to drive forward the efficiency and value for money agenda.
- A need to wait for the detailed budget allocation for the Council because the 'devil could be in the detail'.
- That the Care Act reforms were now postponed until 2020.
- That there would be an additional 2% on all council tax bills next year to help fund Adult Social Care.
- The Leader should be commended for his successful lobbying of Government and should continue to lobby for fairer funding for Surrey for 2016.

The motion was then put to the vote with 49 Members voting for and 16 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this Council warmly welcomes a new Conservative Government which is listening to the voice of Local Government and is now setting out an agenda of reforming business rates, devolving power and responding to the funding needs of adult social care.

ITEM 9(iii)

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

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

Supporting LGA Climate Local Initiative

'Surrey County Council takes note of the International Climate Talks currently taking place in Paris and takes this opportunity to reaffirm the importance of its leadership role in this area by committing to sign up to the Local Government Association's Climate Local initiative, and call on other Councils to do the same.'

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

- The importance of focussing on what needs to be done today to combat climate change – he also referred to the terrible flooding in Cumbria.
- That violent conflicts had nearly doubled in the last ten years.
- Referred to the International Climate talks taking place in Paris and that investment and action was required to address the issues.
- Acting to address climate change was a shared responsibility, and also a shared vision.
- He considered that Surrey's flood defences were a higher priority than airport expansion because 20% of Surrey homes were at risk of flooding.
- Surrey should be prepared to take the voluntary lead in the Local Government Association's Climate Local Initiative and work together with the County's partners.

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

Four Members, including Mr Forster made the following points:

- Concern that if global climate change continued, one in six species would face extinction.
- Political will was needed to make the changes required to combat climate change and it was hoped that all Members would support this motion.
- The County Council investment to support schools in reducing their energy bills.
- That the County Council worked in partnership with Boroughs and Districts to reduce carbon emissions.
- Encouraging residents to insulate the least efficient homes.
- The Council's sustainable travel programme and also the commitment to reducing food waste.
- An invitation from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning for Mr Essex to partake in a working group, starting in January to look at various options.
- Climate change was a challenge that needed to be tackled now.
- A request that the Cabinet Member included regular updates on the County Council's progress in this area as part of his Cabinet Member briefings.

The motion was then put to the vote with 64 Members voting for it. No Member voted against it but there were three abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That Surrey County Council takes note of the International Climate Talks currently taking place in Paris and takes this opportunity to reaffirm the importance of its leadership role in this area by committing to sign up to the Local Government Association's Climate Local initiative, and call on other Councils to do the same.

ITEM 9(iv)

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

Mrs Watson made a short statement giving reasons why the motion should not be referred. She considered that it was an important motion because the surface dressing of roads caused them to become noisier, which then affected the quality of life for many residents across the county.

The Leader made a short statement stating that it would be inappropriate to debate this matter today because evidence needed to be gathered before the Council could have a debate on this issue and, therefore, he proposed referring this motion to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board for detailed work and scrutiny.

The majority of Members voted against debating the motion today.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this motion be referred to the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Scrutiny Board for determination. Under Standing Order 12.6, the Scrutiny Board must report back to County Council at the earliest appropriate meeting.

82/15 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the Report of the Cabinet meetings held on 27 October and 24 November 2015. Members had an opportunity to comment on the report.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A School Organisation Plan

RESOLVED:

That the School Organisation Plan 2015/16 – 2024/25 be approved.

B Revision of Procurement Standing Orders

RESOLVED:

That the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders, as set out in Appendix 3 of the Cabinet report, be approved.

Reports for Information / Discussion

The following report was received and noted:

- Orbis Three Year Business Plan

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 27 October and 24 November 2015 be adopted.

83/15 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR COUNCIL OVERVIEW BOARD [Item 11]

The Chief Executive announced that he had received one nomination, Steve Cosser, for Chairman of the Council Overview Board.

It was:

RESOLVED:

That Mr Cosser be appointed as Chairman of the Council Overview Board for the remainder of the council year 2015/16.

84/15 AMENDMENT TO SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2015 - 16 [Item 12]

To comply with Section 40 of the Localism Act 2011 all local authorities are required to agree and publish an annual Pay Policy Statement. The Council's current pay policy statement was approved by Council on 17 March 2015 and is published on the Council's website. Pay policy statements may be amended during the course of the financial year to reflect changes or developments in an authority's pay policy.

Mr Hodge, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee informed Members that, following the meeting of the committee on 27 November 2015, the committee had requested that the following two additions be included in the final Pay Policy Statement 2015-16 for Surrey. These were:

- a statement that makes clear that the Surrey Pay arrangements apply to support staff working in schools
- a recognition that there is an entitlement for payment for the County's Returning Officer during elections.

RESOLVED:

That, following the update from the Chairman of PPDC, the revisions to the Surrey Pay Policy Statement 2015–16, as set out in Annex 1 to the submitted report and including the two recommendations as set out above, be approved.

85/15 CONSTITUTION UPDATE REPORT - FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE AMENDMENTS [Item 13]

This report noted changes to the Scheme of Delegation (Cabinet and Officers) relating to fees and charges, academy balance transfers on conversion and the management of Trust Funds.

As a result of these changes to the scheme of delegation and after a short discussion in which the changes proposed to Fees and Charges were clarified and the management of Trust Funds, where the Council was a corporate trustee, were discussed, Members approved the amendments to the Financial Regulations.

RESOLVED:

1. That the changes to its Constitution regarding fees and charges, academy balances and trust funds be noted.
2. That the changes to the Financial Regulations, regarding fees and charges, be approved.

86/15 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: 12.35pm]

Chairman