

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 11 OCTOBER 2016 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	*	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		Christopher Norman
Jonathan Essex		John Orrick
Robert Evans		Adrian Page
* Tim Evans		Karan Persand
Mel Few		Chris Pitt
Will Forster		Wyatt Ramsdale
Mrs P Frost		Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
Denis Fuller	*	Denise Saliagopoulos
John Furey		Tony Samuels
Bob Gardner	*	Pauline Searle
Mike Goodman		Stuart Selleck
David Goodwin		Michael Sydney
Michael Gosling		Keith Taylor
Zully Grant-Duff		Barbara Thomson
Ramon Gray		Chris Townsend
Ken Gulati		Denise Turner-Stewart
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

#### **54/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Bramhall, Mr Ellwood, Mr Tim Evans, Mrs Hicks, Mr Johnson, Mrs Searle, Mrs White and Mr Witham.

#### **55/16 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 12 July 2016 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

#### **56/16 ELECTION OF COUNTY COUNCILLOR [Item 3]**

The Chief Executive formally reported that Mr Wyatt Ramsdale was duly elected as the new County Councillor for the Farnham South division following the by-election held on 18 August 2016.

#### **57/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

She informed Members of the death of former County Councillor, Mr Richard Butcher, who was the County Councillor for Caterham Hill from 1989 until 1992. Members stood in silent tribute.

##### **Recent events that were mentioned:**

- Her hospice fundraising event, which so far had raised £18,000 to support to hospices of Surrey. The Chairman's Surrey Cow Parade cow was yet to be auctioned but had so far achieved a bid of £10,000 and therefore, nearly £30,000 has been raised.
- The official opening of Woking Fire Station
- Volunteer Reception where Members' nominated 'local heroes' were honoured at an evening reception last month
- She had taken part in the Service for the Judiciary in Guildford, hosted by the High Sheriff, on Friday 7 October
- HRH Countess of Wessex had visited Moor House School in Oxted, a specialist school for children and young people with speech and language difficulties, on Monday 10 October to open the three new residential houses
- On Wednesday 12 October, that she would receive, on behalf of the county, the Military of Defence 'Employer Recognition Gold Award'. Surrey was the only Council to receive the Gold award and joined organisations such as the Royal Bank of Scotland, Nationwide & Keir Group in receiving this award.
- She welcomed Cllr Michael Ensor, Chairman of East Sussex Council to the meeting.
- The Vice-Chairman had officially opened: Camberley Library's new services, Cranmere Primary School's new building and nursery school and the 'Surrey Prepared' conference in Leatherhead which had focused on community resilience in the event of flooding.

Finally, she informed Members that the authority was in the process of recruiting a new Independent Person to assist the authority and Members in allegations and investigations about councillor conduct and asked Members to publicise this role if they knew of any potentially suitable candidates.

## **58/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]**

There were none.

## **59/16 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 6]**

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

Members raised the following topics:

- He was asked how long it would be before this local authority ceased to exist and that there was a three southern counties Mayor.
- Mrs Watson welcomed the initiative to integrate health and social care and declared that she would be willing to work with the Leader to move it forward, for the benefit of Surrey residents.

## **60/16 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT [Item 7]**

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report, the fourteenth of the Chief Executive's reports to Members. He said that included in the report were some outstanding examples of Surrey County Council achievements.

Members made the following comments:

- The report highlighted the excellent work of the County Council, particularly for Looked After Children and young care leavers. It was hoped that this work would help enable them to achieve a good start in life.
- The Health and Social Care Integration Plans would be a topic for a future Member seminar, and that Borough / District councillors would be invited.
- Congratulations to the Chief Executive and his wife on their wedding which had taken place in July at County Hall.
- Attention was drawn to one of the case studies concerning the Streets Ahead programme in Elmbridge and the need to secure Government funding for these projects.
- That the innovative work being undertaken to divert and reduce the number of women being prosecuted in the criminal justice system was welcomed.
- Members enjoyed the case studies.
- A request that the Leader kept all Members informed about the progress being made in the Children's Service, as the implementation of changes following the Ofsted report from June 2015 came to fruition.
- The importance of recognising the quality of staff at the County Council and that staff were thanked for their work.

### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the report of the Chief Executive be noted.
- (2) That the staff of the Council be thanked for the progress made during the last six months.
- (3) That the support for the direction of travel be confirmed.

## 61/16 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 8]

Notice of 18 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** drew attention to the following indices in the Prudential Survey on the Quality of Retirement Index: (i) Disability Free Life Expectancy, (ii) Access to Health Care, and (iii) Crime Levels, and asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health to consider options to improve these areas for Surrey residents. The Cabinet Member made reference to the Health and Wellbeing Board, which she considered had done an excellent job in the last two years. She agreed to take the points raised by Mr Evans into account when the Surrey Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy was refreshed.

**(Q2) Mr Kington** asked the Leader of the Council for details of any opposition Member who had requested that the Council produced a summary version of the Annual report. **Mr Young** asked the Leader of the Council if he agreed that the booklet reflected the views of all councillors.

The Leader of the Council said that the County Council has a duty to produce this information and considered that it was a useful document for Members to use when engaging with residents in their divisions.

**(Q4) Mrs Watson** said that she remained concerned about certain aspects of risk relating to the County Council's investment in commercial buildings and their residual value. She asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience for more information. The Cabinet Member provided a detailed response, including stating that capital appreciation was not taken into account in these assessments.

**(Q5) Mr Forster** expressed disappointment that nearly £10K had been spent on fifty Blackberry devices which were now not used and asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing for the current location of the devices. She agreed that the outcome for their use had been disappointing and confirmed that the devices were held by the Council but were unsaleable.

**(Q6) Mr Forster** considered that it was unacceptable that Surrey residents had such short notice to alterations to the bus service provision in North West Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning sympathised with the situation, which he said was not the fault of the County Council. He said that Abellio had decided to terminate nine bus services with effect from 31 December 2016. The County Council had now re-tendered the routes but the timescales were challenging and there would be insufficient time for a full consultation. However, he provided assurance that he would be working to obtain a satisfactory solution for Surrey residents.

**(Q7) Mr Beardsmore** requested that the Leader of the Council re-considered his response and said that he had already approached his MP to press for a more balance transition for changes to state pension arrangements for this group of women.

**(Q8) Mr Sydney** said that he had not seen a copy of the tender documents which had probably been drawn up several months after officers' visit to the farm in

January 2016. It was his view that the farm buildings must be repaired by September and that the Council was not acting in the best interest of its farming community. The Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience disagreed, stating that she did value the work of Surrey's farming communities. She said that Property Services officers were doing everything they could to expedite this issue, which was complex.

**(Q9) Mr Hussain** asked the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Health for assurance that the ambulance station in Knaphill, a very congested area, would not close until a risk assessment had been undertaken. The Cabinet Member confirmed that she had written to Northwest Surrey CCG and hoped for a robust reply, which she would share with him.

**(Q10) Mr Essex** asked whether this Council would consider linking up with other County Councils to ensure that the Government provided adequate funding for Adult Social Care because the Council needed a better deal for its residents.

**Mr Mallett** was concerned about the lack of clarity in relation to the revenue losses being proposed by Government and asked the Leader for a table setting out gains / losses, which could be circulated to Members.

The Leader of the Council said that there would be an opportunity for Members to make their views known on the Government's proposed four year settlement offer later in the agenda. He also confirmed that he would continue to lobby Government for a better funding deal for Surrey and that the Budget meeting in February 2017 would be the right time to consider options.

**(Q11) Mr Young** asked the Leader of the Council, who agreed, that all Members of the County Council should abide by the Council's new Customer Promise.

**(Q12) Mr Robert Evans** invited the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to accompany him on a cycling trip across North West Surrey so that he could experience the issues relating to cycling, including some disjointed cycling lanes. The Cabinet Member said that officers were currently working on developing new standards for a cycling infrastructure so that funding could be secured to develop high quality and joined up cycle routes. He agreed to accept Mr Evans' invite.

**(Q14) Mr Beardsmore** requested that the Cabinet Member for Business Services and Resident Experience provided him, outside the meeting, with details relating to the number of tenants in Surrey's investment properties that had a Grade A credit rating and also to include the length of their tenancy agreements. She agreed to this request.

**(Q15) Mr Essex** asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning whether the fixed term, one year appointment of an enforcement officer could be made a permanent appointment. The Cabinet Member explained that this officer would be co-ordinating with Boroughs and Districts to consider the issue of fly-tipping. He confirmed that whilst it was a Criminal Act and a serious issue, the number of incidents so far had not increased since the introduction of charges at the Community Recycling Centres.

**(Q16) Mr Young** asked the Leader of the Council if all Members should abide by the Seven Principles of Public Life and in particular, those relating to Openness and Leadership. The Leader read out the seven Nolan Principles and informed him that a copy of them was on the wall in the Cabinet room. He hoped that all Members would abide by them and he would ask the Democratic Services Lead Manager to re-circulate them to all Members.

**(Q17) Mr Essex** asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence to clarify the differing percentage figures in paragraph 2 of his written response, which he did.

**(Q18) Mr Young** expressed his thanks to the Surrey Arts team and in particular to key officers within the team and invited the Leader of the Council to add his appreciation. The Leader referred Members to his response, in which he had already expressed his thanks.

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

Members made the following comments:

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning:** Concern was raised about Abellio's decision to downsize their operation for bus service provision in Surrey, particularly in the Weybridge / Walton / Esher area. The Cabinet Member was urged to work closely with Elmbridge Borough Council to mitigate the impact. He acknowledged the challenging issue and said that negotiations were still on-going with Abellio and agreed to keep all Members informed of the outcome.

A request was also made to have further discussions with St Peter's hospital in relation to the bus service no. 557.

On future proposals for rail schemes, when asked whether any work had been undertaken on the actual spare capacity and demand against it, the Cabinet Member confirmed that there was very little spare capacity on Surrey's rail lines. He also informed Members that work on various proposals for a southern rail access to Heathrow airport from Surrey should be completed in November and would be shared widely with Members.

That since the changes made at the Community Re-cycling Centres, there had been an increase in the number of complaints relating to bonfires so did the Cabinet Member have any suggestions to help residents? He responded by advising of the importance of working together with both boroughs and the police to resolve this issue.

**Deputy Leader** – agreed to discuss Mrs Lake's question concerning MIPIM UK outside the meeting.

**Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing** – in relation to the Ofsted inspection (31 August – 1 September 2016), the Cabinet Member confirmed that the County Council was maintaining a sharp focus on those areas where it was known that further sustained improvement was required and this was monitored through the Improvement Board.

**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding** was asked how Members could suggest schemes for inclusion in the Pavement Horizon programme. The Cabinet Member informed the County Council that an email was sent to all Members in May inviting their suggestions.

## **62/16 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 9]**

There was one local Member statement, from Mrs Pat Frost, concerning traffic congestion in Farnham.

## **63/16 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 10]**

### **Item 10(i)**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Hazel Watson moved the motion, which was:

'Council recognises:

- i) the important role that the County Council's youth centres have to play in providing positive activities and support for young people to help overcome their problems, as well as a safe space for them to meet and socialise;
- ii) the role that youth centres play in providing early help and preventative support for children and young people that Ofsted has identified as lacking in Surrey, following its report into Surrey's Childrens' Services published in June 2015.

Council regrets:

- i) the poor use of County Council resources in maintaining youth centres that are closed for many hours a week and the reduction in budget that the Youth Service has suffered in recent years.

Council calls for:

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing to urgently review Youth Service provision in the county with a view to extending youth centre opening hours where appropriate, and consideration being given to either voluntary providers or other community organisations sharing buildings so that greater and more efficient use is made of County Council resources.'

Mrs Watson made the following points:

- The important role of youth centres because they provided a safe place for young people.
- The Ofsted report into Surrey's Children Services in June 2015 and its comments relating to youth provision.
- The reduction in the youth service budget and the £200k underspend.
- That the Council's youth centres were only open for a limited number of hours, which could result in difficulties in meeting young people's needs - she considered that the centres should be open for longer.
- Vacancies within the service were also an issue.
- Missing IT equipment and the need to ensure that resources were not misused.

- Finally, she urged the Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing to review the current arrangements and extend the opening hours of its youth centres.

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

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing made the following points:

- That she was disappointed that this motion was on the agenda because the County Council had moved away from a 'place based' youth provision – she highlighted the positive outcomes achieved and gave reasons for rejecting the motion.
- The county had a low rate of both NEETs and first time entries into the criminal justice system.
- There had been an increase in the number of apprenticeships.
- Surrey's youth service had received both national and international recognition and the service had received visitors from other authorities wishing to learn from the Surrey model.
- During the re-commissioning of services, officers had ensured that the views of the young people had been included and had shaped the service provision.

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

- Agreement with the views of the Cabinet Member.
- The importance of celebrating the success of the youth services
- Consideration of the proposed budget reductions had been undertaken by a cross party review, which had included Members and young people
- It was 'community' youth work because the County Council worked closely, and in partnership, with Boroughs, Districts and faith groups
- The operational changes to the service had caused some problems
- The youth service budget should have been fully used
- The importance of working with voluntary providers
- Staffing issues and whether there was a specific staff recruitment programme in place
- That there was much positive work being undertaken – it was the staff rather than youth centres who did youth work
- In debating this issue, the County Council could re-assure its residents that it had a modern approach to youth service provision
- The under-utilised buildings could be earmarked for Early Help Hubs, as part of a joined up family support service
- The importance of continuing to provide a Value for Money youth service provision, despite budget pressures
- Reference to the Internal Audit report on Surrey Youth Centres, which highlighted areas of concern within the service
- That the motion was not about requesting additional funding for the service, it was about using resources effectively to provide early help and preventative support for young people.

The motion was put to the vote with 7 Members voting for and 50 Members voting against it. There were 10 absentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

## **Item 10(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 Surrey County Council is now recognised by the minerals industry, the nature conservation organisations and other councils as being a lead in best practice achieved through restoration-led planning and enhancement of mineral sites.

This Council believes that it is vital that such full restoration following mineral operation, as a temporary use of sites, is an important part of the way we plan to protect and enhance our Green Belt and countryside going into the future.

This Council agrees to ensuring such proactive approaches and high standards are supported and sustained on all sites across Surrey County Council in the future.'

Mr Essex made the following points:

- This motion was about what happened after the mineral operation had ended because there should be a pro-active enforcement approach to the restoration of these sites
- Acknowledgement that the processes did not always go according to plan and he illustrated this point with two examples in his area
- That Surrey County Council was recognised as being a lead in best practice for restoration led minerals planning and county officers had been recognised for their work.

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

Six Members spoke on the motion and made the following comments:

- The motion was supported
- That restoration and enhancement of mineral sites should always be part of these planning applications and their consent
- The Surrey style / approach had been recognised and the restoration programme had been underpinned by four key principles
- The need to work closely with local committees / Members to achieve the best results
- Although the processes generally worked well, there were still problems with some landowners, a particular issue in the Molesey area was highlighted by the local Member and drawn to the attention of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
- The motion was about going forward and the adoption of good practice for restoration led minerals planning.

The motion was put to the vote and unanimously supported.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

This Council notes that Surrey County Council is now recognised by the minerals industry, the nature conservation organisations and other councils as being a lead in best practice achieved through restoration-led planning and enhancement of mineral sites.

This Council believes that it is vital that such full restoration following mineral operation, as a temporary use of sites, is an important part of the way we plan to protect and enhance our Green Belt and countryside going into the future.

This Council agrees to ensuring such proactive approaches and high standards are supported and sustained on all sites across Surrey County Council in the future.

**64/16 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 11]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 14 July and 20 September 2016.

**Recommendations on a Policy Framework Document**

**A Formation of Spelthorne Joint Committee**

**RESOLVED:**

1. That it be agreed to establish the Spelthorne Joint Committee to deal with both executive and non-executive functions from 1 December 2016 in place of the current Local Committee in Spelthorne, which will cease to function from that date.
2. That the following changes to the scheme of delegation be approved:
  - to delegate the executive functions to the Spelthorne Joint Committee as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report
  - to delegate the non-executive functions to the Spelthorne Joint Committee as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report
  - the advisory functions that will come under the remit of the Spelthorne Joint Committee as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report.
3. That the functions that Spelthorne Borough Council has agreed to delegate to the Spelthorne Joint Committee, as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report, be noted.
4. That the Spelthorne Joint Committee Terms of Reference, including the Standing Orders under which it will operate, as set out in Appendix A of the submitted report be agreed, and authority be delegated to the Director of Legal, Democratic and Cultural Services to agree to any minor amendments to the Terms of Reference that may be required.
5. To recommend the appointment of a Chairman of the newly formed Spelthorne Joint Committee from 1 December 2016 (refer to item 12).

## **AJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.35pm and resumed at 1.45pm with all those present who had been in attendance at the morning session except for Mrs Barton, Mr Beckett, Mrs Clack, Mrs Coleman, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Goodwin, Mr Kington, Ms Le Gal, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mountain, Mr Norman, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

### **Reports for Information / Discussion**

- **Financial Sustainability and Budget Planning 2017 – 2022**

The Cabinet at its meeting on 20 September 2016 considered this report and agreed that prior to the Leader taking a decision on whether to accept or decline the Government's four year settlement offer, it would welcome the views of all Members.

Members made the following comments:

- That the proposed final Local Government settlement for Surrey was the worst one that Members had seen.
- That Surrey was handicapped by the formula and its calculation, which did not support the demographic changes in the county.
- The recent Member seminar on the financial issues facing the Council had been well received by Members.
- The County Council needed to publicise to its residents the reasons for declining the Government's four year settlement and that the fourth year of the settlement would be a negative RSG for the Council.
- That this Council was an important provider of revenue for the Conservative Government.
- The Authority should refuse the offer, however, there were concerns about any possible adverse implications for the Council.
- That this Council should work with other County Councils and submit one joint response to Government.
- A request for an update on the Government's Fair Funding Review, the changes to Business Rates and also the Better Care Fund.
- Members were aware that many of Surrey's Boroughs and Districts Councils were likely to accept their offers.
- There had been meetings at County Hall to discuss the county's financial pressures, with several Surrey MPs and the Cabinet.
- Paying over £17m in the fourth year of the settlement would not be regarded favourably by Members and residents.
- Usually a four year settlement would be preferable due to the certainty of funding but not this time because this settlement would result in funding cuts.
- That the Leader should try and negotiate a better four year settlement because he had previously been successful in his funding negotiations with Government.
- That the Council should be protecting services for Surrey residents.
- It appeared that Central Government was not prioritising the funding for Local Government.
- That this Council required an additional £24m per year for Adult Social Care (ASC).
- If the County Council accepted the deal, then there would be the assumption that the Council could manage with less funding in the future.
- The importance of continuing to lobby for a fair deal for Surrey.

- Due to their Scrutiny Board work, all Members were aware of the budget savings required.
- This settlement related to the RSG and not other funding streams received by the Council.
- That a previous 'black hole' in the ASC budget had been met from Reserves. However, this action was not sustainable.
- If the County Council was given flexibility to set its own council tax precept, there could be a possibility that it could consider accepting the four year settlement.

Based on the views of the Members who spoke, the sentiment amongst the Council was to decline the Government's four year settlement offer.

The Leader thanked Members for their comments and said that he would reflect on their views before taking a decision on Wednesday 12 October whether to accept or decline the Government's four year settlement.

- **Quarterly Report on Decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements (July – September 2016)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the above reports were received and noted.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 14 July and 20 September 2016 be adopted.

**65/16 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE [Item 12]**

The Chief Executive announced that he had received one nomination, Denise Saliagopoulos, for Chairman of the Spelthorne Joint Committee.

It was:

**RESOLVED:**

That Mrs Saliagopoulos be appointed as Chairman of the Spelthorne Joint Committee, with effect from 1 December 2016 and for the remainder of this council year.

**66/16 APPOINTING AN EXTERNAL AUDITOR [Item 13]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report, which recommended that the Council's external auditor was appointed through opting into a sector led appointment provided by Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd.

**RESOLVED:**

That opting in to the sector led appointment for the appointment of the Council's external auditors be approved.

**67/16 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL [Item 14]**

The Chairman of the Council introduced the report and informed Members that she had chaired the interview panel for the positions on the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel. She drew attention to the update on the successful candidates tabled at the meeting (Appendix D).

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the appointment of the Independent Remuneration Panel members, Carolyn Deakins (Chairman), Paul Eaves and Bryan Ingleby, agreed by the Appointments Panel, be approved.
2. That the Terms of Reference of the Independent Remuneration Panel, as set out in the Annex to the submitted report, be approved.

**68/16 WELLBEING AND HEALTH SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 15]**

The Chairman of the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board presented this report. He also drew Members' attention to the Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) and said that Surrey was covered by three STPs: Surrey Heartlands, Frimley and Sussex & East Surrey. He said that all Members of the Council would be welcome to attend the next meeting of the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board on 10 November 2016, where there would be presentations on the STPs.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report of the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board be noted.

**69/16 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 16]**

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: 2.40pm]

---

**Chairman**

