

COUNTY COUNCIL**COUNCIL MEETING - 12 JULY 2016**

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 12 July 2016 commencing at 10.00 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Sally Marks (Chairman)

Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman)

	Mary Angell		Margaret Hicks
	W D Barker OBE		David Hodge
*	Mrs N Barton		Saj Hussain
	Ian Beardsmore		David Ivison
	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		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		Denise Turner-Stewart
	Ken Gulati		Richard Walsh
	Tim Hall		Hazel Watson
	Kay Hammond	*	Fiona White
	Mr D Harmer	*	Richard Wilson
	Nick Harrison		Helena Windsor
	Marisa Heath		Keith Witham
	Peter Hickman	*	Mr A Young
		*	Mrs V Young

*absent

39/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Nikki Barton, Graham Ellwood, Mel Few, David Goodwin, Linda Kemeny, Colin Kemp, Peter Martin, John Orrick, Fiona White, Richard Wilson, Alan Young and Victoria Young.

40/16 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 17 May 2016 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

41/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

She informed Members of the recent deaths of former county councillors:

- Mr Graham Lambert, who was the County Councillor for Frimley Green and Mytchett from 1981 to 1985, had passed away on 16 May.
- Mrs Elizabeth Compton, who was the County Councillor for St John's and Brookwood from 1997 until 2011, had passed away on 30 June.
- Mr Jim Smith, who was the County Councillor for Bookham and Fetcham West from 1997 until 2009, had passed away on 28 June.

Members stood in silent tribute.

Recent events that were mentioned were:

- HM Queen's celebration – County Service at Guildford Cathedral
- Local Government lunch with the new Mayor and Chairmen of Surrey
- SCC Long Service Awards
- Cross Border Military meeting with LGA
- Launch of Lingfield Community Library
- 'Over the Top' Battle of the Somme commemoration
- Kent, Surrey and Sussex Air Ambulance Trust event at Loseley Park

Clare Curran and Paul Bowen recently attended a Duke of Edinburgh event held at Buckingham Palace. At the event a plaque was awarded to the County Council in recognition of our status as a long-standing Department of Education (DofE) licensed organisation. The Chairman presented the award to Clare and to Frances Trench, who has worked in the county's DofE team for more than 30 years.

Her Majesty the Queen's Birthday Honours List 2016 and the Queen's Awards for Voluntary Service – the full lists were included within the agenda. However, the Chairman drew attention to the honours received by:

- Wendy Varcoe, Executive Director, Community Foundation for Surrey
- John and Wendy Palczynski, Surrey foster carers

On behalf of the County Council, the Chairman congratulated the Chief Executive and his wife on their recent wedding.

Attention was drawn to David Munro's resignation as County Councillor for Farnham South, which took effect on 23 June.

42/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

Mr Will Forster declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 6.1, 6.2 and 8(ii) as he was employed as a staff member for a Member of the European Parliament.

Mr Robert Evans declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8(ii) as he was a lecturer at Royal Holloway College.

43/16 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:

- Issues regarding gaps in the budget and a lack of ideas on how to make further savings.
- Requesting that the new Police Crime Commissioner provides more mobile speed cameras.
- Hope that the new PM listens to the public following Brexit.
- That local government members and officers will have a role following any devolution.
- That everyone actively encourages people to foster children in care.
- Rail transport issues and try to get better service and look at franchises with a view to having more control over who gets them and how to take them away if they don't perform.
- Tribute paid to volunteers around the county.

44/16 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Notice of nine 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) Mrs Coleman asked if the county council would work with the boroughs, Network Rail and the train operators in looking at issues of commuter parking/traffic.

Mrs Turner-Stewart asked that the Cabinet Member bear in mind the Magna Carta site, which is close to zone 6, and to negotiate its inclusion in zone 6.

Mr Pitt asked if a Cabinet Member could sit on the Blackwater Valley Advisory Committee to increase its status, which he felt was lacking, especially considering that council officers, bus and train operators all attended the meetings regularly.

Mr Essex asked that stations outside of zone 6 also be considered as, for example, stations up to Gatwick had more expensive ticket prices than those inside zone 6. The Cabinet Member responded that there needed to be a business case for including any area in zone 6 and that he would continue to work with transport operators. He said that parking was not an easy problem to resolve and that he would like to see more buses linking up with stations. He also stated that it was not appropriate for a Cabinet Member to sit on the Blackwater Valley Advisory Committee but that with the work taking place, of which this group was a part, many improvements had taken place. He understood the issue of franchises and would

continue to work with transport operators and boroughs to improve the service for residents.

(Q2) Mrs Watson was disappointed with the Cabinet Member's written response to her question and asked that she be given details of EU funding that the county council currently received.

Mrs Searle sought assurances that charities would be kept in mind for future funding as a response to the withdrawal of any EU funding they received. The Leader said that details of EU funding were in the council budget book and would have this extracted and sent to Mrs Watson. He also said that the Secretary of State believes that whatever EU funding is currently being used to fund local areas should be redirected through to councils.

(Q4) Mr Cooksey asked for details of the roads where night lighting would be reduced and sought clarification regarding residents and members having an opportunity to have their say on proposals.

Mr Harrison requested details of savings gained by cutting night lighting.

The Leader asked if the Cabinet Member would agree that Mr Cooksey did not understand the budget pressures that the council was under.

The Cabinet Member responded that dimmed lights had been used in certain areas for the past two and a half years with no comments or problems. He confirmed that there would be full consultation. £240k of savings were sought for this year but that would not be achieved due to the consultation. He said the Liberal Democrats had not made any budget proposals and had left that to the Conservatives.

(Q5) Mr Essex asked the Leader to confirm which meetings had been held in public and whether there was a plan to consult the public before making decisions.

The Leader said that a 3SC meeting had taken place at Horsham yesterday and they had agreed to proceed to look at all the options to put to the public. A website was also to be set up to keep the public informed. A report would go to Cabinet and Council where Members would decide if they were happy to go forward with the consortium.

(Q6) Mr Sydney asked for a response to his question which he said the Cabinet Member appeared not to have read. The Cabinet Member stated that the Council did not have a policy of withholding information from library staff and thought he had made this clear in his written response.

(Q9) Mr Essex asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that the council were paying agency rates, if annualised, of £148k per year and provide a breakdown of savings if all the positions were filled by full time staff.

Mr Kington requested that the Cabinet Member provide details of the 10 highest paid agency staff in terms of annual total salary costs and how long those staff have been in post.

The Leader asked what savings were achieved by employing agency staff.

The Cabinet Member responded that there were areas of specialist work that agency staff were recruited for, such as IT, and there was also a national difficulty regarding social work recruitment. She would provide annualised details and length of employment information to Members.

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

Members made the following comments:

CM Business Support and Resident Experience – Agreed that the new pay and reward package would improve recruitment and retention of the people with necessary skills and thanked all involved for the hard work.

CM Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement – The 10 year forecast for Reigate and Banstead birth rates was reported as static and Mr Harrison was concerned that this was not the case, especially with movement of people from London. In the absence of the Cabinet Member the Chairman stated that the question could go to the Board.

CM Highways, Transport and Flooding – poor street repairs and checks – That all work was checked at least once and at the end of construction. It was also a role of local councillors to take this forward and the Cabinet Member asked Mrs Mason to provide the exact location of the pavement works she claimed had only lasted three days.

CM Environment and Planning – The Cabinet Member was asked if he could take forward putting Surrey on the same footing as London with regards to rail and bus passes. The Cabinet Member explained that there needed to be a business case and that it would be difficult for the Council to fund such a scheme. It was also confirmed that the Council would apply for funding from the £60m scheme launched last week for sustainable travel in town centres. In response to a question from Mrs Bowes regarding works in the Woking area the Cabinet Member replied that he had heard from the BID Team that Woking was on the list but as yet no confirmation of when the works would take place.

CM Wellbeing and Health – Agreed that the Surrey P&G games were a huge success and support had been committed for another four years. There were other big international games coming to Surrey and there was an opportunity for Members to look into volunteering.

CM Localities and Community Wellbeing – Agreed to send Members information regarding the dementia drop-in cafes.

45/16 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There were no local Member statements.

46/16 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 Will Foster moved the motion, which was:

‘This Council welcomes the principles outlined in the Bus Services Bill and the opportunity it could give local councils to improve services. These include powers that will allow authorities to set standards of service, incorporating branding, ticketing and frequency. This Council remains concerned that powers to franchise services, similar to those of Transport for London, will only be made available to areas that have chosen to have a directly elected mayor, unless they get special permission from the Transport Secretary.

This Council believes that:

- these powers should be accessible for all councils, including Surrey County Council which manages bus services which are of crucial importance for people who live in isolated and rural areas of the county, which are of crucial importance for countering traffic congestion in our towns, and which are of crucial importance for improving connectivity across the county;
- these reforms, particularly over franchising, are a golden opportunity to halt the decline in bus usage and help ensure that services are sustainable and should be made available to all councils by default;
- the Government should ensure that councils are given support to enable the costs of setting up a franchise to be met;

and calls upon the Cabinet to make representations to Surrey's MPs and the Secretary of State for Transport for this Council to have the power to franchise without having to have a directly elected mayor.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Cooksey.

Mr Forster said that:

- Surrey was the poor cousin to London with regard to bus services and received a second rate service. This was because bus services in London were regulated, unlike outside of London, and that led to inequalities.
- Bus operators had no democratic accountability and cherry picked which services to provide, choosing services that suited them and not their customers.
- London buses come into the fringes of Surrey along its border but only take those residents into London, therefore damaging the economy of Surrey's town centres.
- Whilst he looked forward to the Bus Bill as a good thing he was totally opposed to the requirement of a directly elected mayor in order to obtain devolution.

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

This was formally seconded by Mr Hall.

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

'This Council welcomes the principles outlined in the Bus Services Bill and the opportunity it could give local councils to improve services. These include powers that will allow authorities to set standards of service, incorporating branding, ticketing and frequency.

This Council ~~remains~~ is concerned that powers to franchise services, similar to those of Transport for London, will only be made available to areas that have chosen to have a directly elected mayor, unless they get special permission from the Transport Secretary.

This Council notes the good working relationship between SCC and its bus providing partners, which means that SCC is unlikely to make use of additional powers proposed in the Bus Bill.

However

This Council believes that:

- these powers should be accessible for all councils, ~~including Surrey County Council~~ which manages bus services which are of crucial importance for people who live in isolated and rural areas of the county, which are of crucial importance for countering traffic congestion in our towns, and which are of crucial importance for improving connectivity across the county;
- these reforms, particularly over franchising, are a golden opportunity to halt the decline in bus usage and help ensure that services are sustainable and should be made available to all councils by default;
- the government should ensure that councils are given support to enable the costs of setting up a franchise to be met;

~~and supports any representations to calls upon the Cabinet to make representations to Surrey's MPs and the Secretary of State for Transport for this Councils to have the power to franchise without having to have a directly elected mayor.'~~

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

- Whilst the benefit of good bus services was recognised, the Council was not in a position to be able fund bus services. However, the Council was working with bus service providers and would continue to do so to improve services.
- Officers have been working in partnership with bus providers and would continue to do so. This relationship has enabled council to provide the service it does to its customers. The economic and social benefits of bus services were recognised.
- In terms of importance to bus users, information was second only to reliability. The Council was working with bus operators to improve the information to residents.
- A number of amendments to the Bus Bill were proposed and they were to include authorities that do not have or want a directly elected mayor.
- The LGA was also in support of the removal of Section 21 of the Bill which prevented local authorities from setting up their own bus company.
- Whilst there may be changes to the Bill it was certain that councils would not be given any extra money.

Mr Hall as seconder to the amendment made the following points:

- The Council's transport team were a very good team with good working relationships with bus providers.
- He had been recently involved in meetings where changes had been made to improve the resident experience.
- Recent changes included provision of better information on ticketing and services offered. He stated that many people were reliant on paper timetables and hoped these would not be cut in future.
- He commended the good work done by the transport team.

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

- That the third paragraph was sending a negative message to residents by completely shutting the door on the Council making use any additional powers proposed in the Bus Bill.
- Not to lobby Surrey MPs was unthinkable.
- The linking of having a franchise with a directly elected mayor was no longer relevant as this was originally a way of ensuring local government worked more in line with European counterparts. Brexit meant that this would no longer be the case.

The amendment was put to the vote with 48 voting for and 8 voting against.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 55 voting for and 5 against.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council is concerned that powers to franchise services, similar to those of Transport for London, will only be made available to areas that have chosen to have a directly elected mayor, unless they get special permission from the Transport Secretary.

This Council notes the good working relationship between Surrey County Council (SCC) and its bus providing partners, which means that SCC is unlikely to make use of additional powers proposed in the Bus Bill.

However,

This Council believes that:

- these powers should be accessible for all councils which manage bus services which are of crucial importance for people who live in isolated and rural areas of the county, which are of crucial importance for countering traffic congestion in our towns, and which are of crucial importance for improving connectivity across the county;
- these reforms, particularly over franchising, are a golden opportunity to halt the decline in bus usage and help ensure that services are sustainable and should be made available to all councils by default;
- the government should ensure that councils are given support to enable the costs of setting up a franchise to be met;

and supports any representations to the Secretary of State for Transport for Councils to have the power to franchise without having to have a directly elected mayor.'

ITEM 8(ii)

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

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

'This Council notes that whilst Surrey voted 52 - 48% to remain in the European Union, the UK as a whole voted the opposite way. We respect the fact that five of Surrey's eleven districts voted to leave, with six to remain and that the younger generation voted far more heavily to remain.

This Council believes that following this referendum, there is a need for a listening exercise to repair the divisions, and with tolerance and respect, to try to re-unite the people of Surrey.

Therefore this Council resolves to:

- explore ways of bridging divisions in our communities, through inter-generational dialogue and increased understanding.
- seek reassurance from the Government that the four-year funding deal offer to local government is ring-fenced from any future budget changes following this referendum vote.
- ask the Government to take steps to ensure that staff and students from EU countries can continue to work and study at our three universities, Surrey, Royal Holloway College and the University of the Creative Arts.

work with all the boroughs and districts to ensure that no racist or xenophobic behaviour is tolerated.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans.

Mr Essex said that:

- Following the Brexit vote it was now more important than ever to listen to people on both sides of the debate.
- Issues of affordable homes and immigration were some of the issues highlighted by Brexit.
- This was now a time to work together and heal together and the Council should have a say on how to take this forward.
- The Council should not have to pay for any misinformation from the Brexit campaigns.
- Hate crime had increased in Surrey since Brexit and there was a need to reconnect politics to people.

Mrs Helyn Clack moved an amendment which was tabled at the meeting. This was formally seconded by Mrs Kay Hammond.

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

'This Council notes that whilst Surrey voted 52 - 48% to remain in the European Union, the UK as a whole voted the opposite way. ~~We respect the fact that~~ It also notes that five of Surrey's eleven districts voted to leave, with six to remain and that the younger generation probably voted far more heavily to remain.

~~This Council believes that following this referendum, there is a need for a listening exercise to repair the divisions, and with tolerance and respect, to try to re-unite the people of Surrey.~~

Therefore this Council resolves to:

- ~~explore ways of bridging divisions in our communities, through inter-generational dialogue and increased understanding.~~
 - ~~seek reassurance from the Government that the four-year funding deal offer to local government is ring-fenced from any future budget changes following this referendum vote.~~
 - ~~ask the Government to take steps to ensure that staff and students from EU countries can continue to work and study at our three universities, Surrey, Royal Holloway College and the University of the Creative Arts.~~
- ~~work with all the boroughs and districts to ensure that no racist or xenophobic behaviour is tolerated.'~~

Following the referendum and as before it, this Council resolves to:

- Continue to support efforts to bridge divisions in our communities
- Continue its dialogue with Government regarding both short-term and long-term budget certainty
- Support the view that our 4 universities should continue to attract staff and students from overseas including the EU
- Agree that Surrey should continue to be a place of tolerance and respect, free of racist or xenophobic behaviour.

This amendment was not accepted by Mr Essex and therefore Mrs Clack spoke to the amendment, making the following points:

That the Council were already doing a great deal of what Mr Essex spoke of, including:

- Working with the Equality Policy
- The Leader of the Council continued to work with Government
- Universities should still continue to attract people from overseas
- Speaking of tolerance, respect and diversity in all we do

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

- The Brexit vote had divided some families as well as communities and it was important for all agencies to work together and share information.
- That immigration was the biggest issue raised on the doorstep and it was naive to think that we can still attract staff/people from outside of the UK.
- That the amendment suggests that the Council will do no more than it is already doing.
- Listen and respect are two values of Surrey County Council.
- There had been a high turnout of young people in the vote and it was important to listen to them.
- The new Prime Minister was once a councillor and this was an opportunity to seek benefits for the county.

The amendment was put to the vote with 57 voting for, 5 voting against and 4 abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

After which, under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Eber Kington moved:

‘That the question be now put’

The Chairman considered that there had been adequate debate, and the proposal was supported by a sufficient number of Members so the debate was wound up.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 62 voting for and 3 voting against.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes that whilst Surrey voted 52 - 48% to remain in the European Union, the UK as a whole voted the opposite way. It also notes that five of Surrey’s eleven districts voted to leave; with six to remain and that the younger generation probably voted far more heavily to remain.

Following the referendum and as before it, this Council resolves to:

- Continue to support efforts to bridge divisions in our communities
- Continue its dialogue with Government regarding both short-term and long-term budget certainty
- Support the view that our 4 universities should continue to attract staff and students from overseas including the EU
- Agree that Surrey should continue to be a place of tolerance and respect, free of racist or xenophobic behaviour.

ITEM 8(iii)

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 congratulates Sadiq Khan on his election as Mayor of London and urges him to work closely with Surrey County Council on all cross-border issues of joint interest and mutual benefit to all our residents.’

Mr George Johnson formally seconded the motion.

Mr Evans said that:

- Mr Khan has the largest mandate of any politician.
- It should be celebrated that he is the first Muslim Mayor.
- Surrey has many cross border issues with transport, fire and emergency services and the health service, which means the county council will have many opportunities where it will wish to work closely with the Mayor of London and vice versa.

Two Members spoke in favour of the motion and Mr Furey requested it be put to the vote.

Mr Johnson had nothing further to add.

The motion was put to the vote where a majority voted for and there was one abstention.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council congratulates Sadiq Khan on his election as Mayor of London and urges him to work closely with Surrey County Council on all cross-border issues of joint interest and mutual benefit to all our residents.

47/16 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 24 May 2016 and 21 June 2016.

Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- A) Travel Assistance Policies for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities
- B) Annual Report of the Shareholder Board
(Mr Harrison declared disappointment on the lack of information within the report and in particular requested more information on lending, especially to Surrey Choices, and urged the Cabinet and Board to set targets and work to them. These comments were repeated by Mrs Watson.)
- C) Sustainability and Transformation Plans
- D) Quarterly Report On Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 April – 30 June 2016

RESOLVED:

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

48/16 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report and commended the updated strategies, Risk Management Strategy (Annex 1 to the submitted report), plus the updated Code of Corporate Governance (Annex 2 to the submitted report) to Members. In response to a Member question about why he was not inclined not to take up the four year funding deal from Government the Leader of the Council explained that the fourth year's funding drops significantly. The Leader further explained that negotiations were still taking place with the Exchequer and there would be further debate and discussion at the Council meeting in October.

RESOLVED:

1. That the updated Risk Management Strategy, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.

2. That the Code of Corporate Governance, attached as Annex B to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.

Reason for decision:

To maintain the annual review and update of these strategies.

49/16 REVIEW OF CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS [Item 11]

The Chairman of the Constitution Review Group introduced the report and particularly highlighted the need to improve openness by declaring significant personal interests as well as the disclosable pecuniary interests. He was asked if this would also refer to partners/spouses, to which he replied that the test was whether or not that interest could skew the debate and it was up to individual Members to make that decision.

Resolved:

That the revised Member Code of Conduct, attached at Annex 1 to the submitted report, be agreed so that:

- (a) Members are required to register pecuniary interests as outlined in Schedule B and significant personal interests as outlined in Schedule E.
- (b) Members are required to register gifts and hospitality to the value of £100 or more that they have accepted.
- (c) Where a Member has a disclosable or non disclosable interest that is prejudicial in any matter to be considered at a meeting of the Council, the Cabinet, a committee, sub-committee or joint committee of the Council, he or she is required to declare it at the meeting or to notify the chairman of the reason for withdrawing from that meeting.

Reason for decision:

To promote local rules to ensure that there is confidence that councillors are putting the public interest first and demonstrating transparency about their financial affairs

50/16 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 12]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report by stating that, in line with Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, a new independent remuneration panel needed to be appointed to review the existing Scheme and make recommendations to Council in order for a new Scheme to take effect from May 2017.

The Cabinet Member for Business Services supported the recommendations.

RESOLVED:

1. That an Appointments Panel, consisting of the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council and the Conservative, RA/Independent and Surrey Opposition Forum Group Leaders be established to appoint a new Independent Remuneration Panel in line with the timetable set out in paragraph 7 of the report.

2. That the Independent Remuneration Panel should consist of three members.
3. That, for the 2016/2017 review of Members Allowances, a fee of £1,500 plus travel expenses be paid to the Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel, and a fee of £1,000 plus travel expenses be paid to the other Panel members.

Reason for decision:

To comply with the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003.

51/16 REVISED TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2016/17 [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Business Services presented the report and stated that the revised Treasury Management Strategy has come about as a result of changes in the economic environment, specifically the combination of increased counterparty risk and a longer than predicted lower interest rate environment. This has resulted in consideration of a more focused strategy of internal borrowing over the short term, combining a move away from long term borrowing towards short term borrowing to maintain cash balances above zero. Such a strategy would require monitoring to ensure that the Council can act responsively in the event of a sustained change in the economic forecast.

RESOLVED:

That changes be approved to the Council's Treasury Management Strategy for 2016-21 (shown as Annex 1 to the report), which includes:-

- the revised borrowing strategy for long term capital funding; and
- the revision of the Council's minimum cash balance to above zero.

Reason for decision:

Changes that have developed over the medium term to the economic and financial environment in which the Council operates has led to a review of the existing borrowing strategy. An increased opportunity in relation to an expectation that interest rates will remain lower for longer than initially anticipated and investment security have resulted in a proposal to amend the Council's borrowing strategy with immediate effect to ensure it reacts appropriately and with flexibility to these changes in conditions.

52/16 REPORT BACK FROM ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD SCRUTINY REPORT [Item 14]

The Chairman of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board introduced this report for information. A petition was submitted to the Council on 17 May 2016 to improve road safety on Bridge Street where it was resolved that this issue and any proposals should be scrutinised by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board. It was mooted that this was a good example of when petitions should be referred to the appropriate scrutiny board.

RESOLVED:

That the report the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board be noted.

53/16 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 15]

No notification had been received by the deadline from Members wishing to raise a question or make a statement on any of the matters in the minutes.

[Meeting ended at: 12.47 pm]

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank