

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 6 DECEMBER 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

70/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Mark Brett-Warburton, Mr Ben Carasco, Mr Denis Fuller, Ms Marsha Moseley, Mr John Orrick and Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos.

71/16 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 11 October 2016 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

72/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

She reminded Members to complete the Members' Allowances IRP questionnaire.

Recent events that were mentioned:

- She had attended the Buckingham Palace for the presentation of the Gold award in the Military Employer Recognition Scheme, in national recognition of Surrey County Council's commitment to the Armed Forces. It was available to view.
- An Orbis Award had been awarded to the Programme Team for Culture and was presented to the Deputy Chief Executive. The award was in recognition for outstanding organisation culture.
- A fascinating visit to Surrey Satellite Tech Ltd with Princess Anne & Lord-Lieutenant on 22 November. They make 40% of all satellites in the world.
- The official opening of Salfords Fire Station on 18 November.
- The official openings of two youth centres – Redhill Youth Centre on 14 November and Phoenix Youth Club at Tadworth on 24 November.
- She had attended a fundraising dinner at Loseley for hospices which had raised £23k to be divided between the five hospices in Surrey.
- Congratulations were given to the successful Cow Parade and thanks given to Mr Goodman for taking the idea forward.

73/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

Mr Mike Bennison declared a non-pecuniary interest in that his son worked at Heathrow.

Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin declared a non-prejudicial interest in that she received a pension from BAA Heathrow.

74/16 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members raised the following topics:

- There was much support for the sentiments and recognition that it was down to all Members to write MPs.
- The London Borough of Sutton was to become Oxfam's landlord following investment and the question was asked why Surrey could not invest outside of the County.

- A question was put as to how much development was unsustainable due to roads and traffic being beyond capacity.

75/16 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Declarations of interest:

None

Questions:

Notice of 22 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 stated that residents were horrified that the busiest fire station in Surrey was to be closed, that the number of incidents had risen and in the last consultation 92% of residents were opposed to the closure. Mr Ian Beardsmore asked what would happen if the bridge was gridlocked? The Cabinet Member stated that there were very difficult decisions to be made, that the fire service was changing year on year, and that only 20% of the total number of calls to the service related to fires. He also pointed out that North West Surrey had four stations in close proximity with another four nearby.

(Q3) Mrs Carol Coleman requested that the Cabinet Member look into staffing at the centre for dementia, stating that staff/client ratio was 2/10 and this was a safeguarding issue. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence replied that he would meet with Mrs Coleman to discuss her concerns.

(Q5) Mr Stephen Cooksey stated that the definition of DIY waste was not included in the response and that residents needed to know precisely what was meant by DIY waste. The Cabinet Member replied that extensive messages had been sent out regarding DIY waste. He also stated that the Council actions were within the law and other local authorities were following suit.

(Q6) Mrs Hazel Watson asked if actions could be taken sooner to which the Cabinet Member response was that it was not possible.

(Q8) Mr Ian Beardsmore stated that the response to his question gave no thought on forms of government and that the more liability the Council takes on, the less the budget the Council received. The Leader directed Mr Beardsmore to the section of his response which stated that decisions on governance could only be made when the details of any deal was known.

(Q10) Mrs Fiona White stated that pharmacies in less advantaged areas may be at risk of closure and residents needed good access. Mr Keith Witham requested to be kept informed of any updates and asked the Director for Public Health to report to the Social Care Services Board. The Cabinet Member stated that she would ensure information was circulated when she received it and that the issue would be raised at the Wellbeing Board.

(Q12) Mr Jonathan Evans stated that, whilst money for community support had increased, the money for individuals had reduced and he was of the belief that community support funding was to boost that for the individual. The Cabinet Member stated that the Council now had to rely more on voluntary organisations to perform some functions.

(Q14) Mr Stephen Cooksey asked if Skanska were interested in making replacements of the street lights. The Cabinet Member stated that safety was paramount for the Council, that consultation did take place and if something new came up he would respond. He also pointed out that to replace current lighting with LED lights would be very expensive and time consuming as each light column would need work.

(Q17) Mr Bill Barker asked about the Council approving planning applications and allowing HGV's to ruin the County's roads. The Cabinet Member had spoken with parish council about further work that they could take on and fund from their precept but they had been silent on this.

(Q18) Mr Will Forster asked for details on the number of refugee families being supported, to which the Cabinet Member responded that the Council were working with districts to support over 130 families.

(Q19) Mr Will Forster stated that he was very unhappy with the Cabinet Member's response to his question. The Cabinet Member stated that he thought the Liberal Democrats did not support censorship.

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

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing: A statement was made that children and families services were dependent on early help and a request was made for an update on the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH). The Cabinet Member reported that the MASH went live on 6 October 2016 and that delivery of the new operation had been challenging but much work had been done to bed in the new work and overcome teething problems. IT issues were overcome and the backlog and delay was now reduced. At present the daily work was being accomplished and the backlog being reduced.

Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning was asked if the work with buses was just a sticking plaster with further cuts coming in the next year, and that flytipping seemed to be increasing on the ground, which made a mockery of the statement that it was decreasing. The Cabinet Member reported that he was happy with the progress made with Abellio and explained that the county needed fair funding in the future. He also reported that flytipping tonnage was down, that the number of flytipping incidents would be available one month after tonnage figures, and that if they had indeed risen that he would work with enforcement on this.

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence was asked if he would consider funding from the Investment Strategy being used to pay for accommodation for extra care facilities. The Cabinet Member responded that site research was being undertaken and that funding would be provided if a site is found.

Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding: Concern was expressed about the policy on road safety in small communities. The Cabinet

Member explained that Drive Smart keep a close eye on the number of fatalities and where they occur. They would also look at the causation of fatalities. He would also request that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning look at this.

76/16 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There was one local Member statement, from Mr Michael Sydney, concerning future housing development on green belt land.

77/16 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 Mike Goodman moved the motion, which was:

‘Given the decision by the Government to support a new runway at Heathrow, this Council reaffirms its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in July 2013.

The Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

This Council remains strongly of the view that expansion requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council wishes to work constructively with the Government, the airport, relevant national agencies, other local authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships on the expansion plans in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey residents and businesses.

However, this Council considers that the proposals and commitments, including on surface access, that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be prioritised nor that adequate funding will be committed.

This Council considers that any expansion will only be a success for Surrey residents and businesses and for the wider South East if there is a clear and agreed framework for the necessary infrastructure, including southern rail access, and other measures to be in place before any new runway comes into operation.

This Council calls on the Government to take the lead in developing such a framework.’

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Martin.

Mr Goodman said that:

- The future expansion of airports would benefit Surrey’s economy.
- Service access to Heathrow was not good from Surrey. Only 4% travelled by rail and the majority by road, which was unsustainable.

- The Leader had written to and awaited a meeting with Chris Grayling MP.
- There was a need to ensure good connectivity with Surrey and reduce emissions around the airport site.
- He had spoken with Lord Ahmad about night flights and residents' need for respite.

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

This was formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans.

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

~~'Given the decision by the Government to support a new runway at Heathrow, this Council reaffirms its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in July 2013.~~

The Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

This Council remains strongly of the view that expansion requires the climate change, noise, air pollution and environmental and surface access issues, as well as housing needs to all involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council wishes to work constructively with the Government, the airport, relevant national agencies, other local authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships ~~on the expansion plans~~ in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey residents and businesses.

~~However, this~~ This Council considers that the current proposals and commitments, including on climate change, noise, air pollution and surface access aspects that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be fully addressed ~~prioritised~~ nor that adequate funding will be committed.

This Council considers that ~~any expansion will only be a success for Surrey residents and businesses and for the wider South East if~~ the proposed southern rail access and other surface access schemes should be progressed now, there is a clear and agreed framework for the necessary infrastructure, including southern rail access, and other measures to be in place before any new runway comes into operation.

This Council calls on the Government to take the lead in progressing the improved Southern Access to the airport, and ensuring that the climate, environment, air pollution and surface access issues remain as preconditions which must be met before any expansion is considered. ~~developing such a framework.'~~

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

- Whilst he sympathised with the original motion, the amendment aimed to match the aspiration of surface access issues.

- The amendment sets out what is meant by improvements.
- That the air pollution limits were already being breached and 40,000 people were being killed slowly each year by pollution. The only answer being to fly less.
- The issue of freight by road was not dealt with.

Mr Evans reserved his right to speak later.

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

- That the speech given by the mover of the motion reflected the amendment more than the original motion.
- It was reported that the Heathrow expansion would create another 20,000 jobs but there was no mention of where those additional workers were going to live. Therefore it was a threat to the Green Belt.
- The economic benefits were overstated.
- Nitrous oxide limits were already exceeded around the airport.
- Station improvements were needed at Woking before it could have access to Heathrow.
- That 10,000 Surrey residents were employed at Heathrow and Surrey was home to many international businesses. Therefore the economic benefits were real and the importance of expansion should not be diminished.

Mr Evans, as seconder, made the following points:

- The amendment strengthened the original motion.
- The 10,000 jobs already provided to Surrey residents would not be lost – they would continue to be there.
- Surrey's surface access was the worst in Europe.
- This was a missed opportunity to sort out the transport issues.
- That pollution at Stanwell could be tasted at times and the noise was terrible.
- Surrey had a housing problem which would be exacerbated by the expansion due to the properties that would be demolished to make way for it.
- The bus link 555 to the airport was to be reduced.

The amendment was put to the vote with 12 voting and 48 voting against. The amendment was lost and the original motion then discussed.

Eight Members spoke to the motion and made the following points:

- At the Heathrow seminar members had called upon airlines to adhere to regulations.
- The Surrey case for adequate funding had been well made.
- Expansion was needed at both airports.
- There maybe people working at airports wishing to live in Surrey and current residents may wish to move out due to the noise.
- Support was voiced for a rail link from Guildford.
- East Surrey were having a rail consultation. Connections were needed from east as well as west Surrey.
- It was important for Surrey to have input into the redesign of Heathrow.
- There was a disconnect between the motion and the speech given.
- Imbalance would increase if expansion went ahead. Additional housing was needed.

- Although Spelthorne and Guildford were geographically close to Heathrow, it could take a long time to travel from there to the airport due to the 8mph average road speed in those areas.

Mr Goodman stated that he was championing rail access and informed Council that there was to be a flight path consultation and members and residents would hear from the districts when the consultation started.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 55 voting for, 9 voting against and 3 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

Resolved:

Given the decision by the Government to support a new runway at Heathrow, this Council reaffirms its position on airport expansion set out in the resolution agreed in July 2013.

The Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

This Council remains strongly of the view that expansion requires the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council wishes to work constructively with the Government, the airport, relevant national agencies, other local authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships on the expansion plans in order to protect and promote the interests of Surrey residents and businesses.

However, this Council considers that the proposals and commitments, including on surface access, that have so far been made by the airport and by the Government associated with the preferred approach to expansion at Heathrow are inadequate. In particular they give neither confidence that the necessary measures will be prioritised nor that adequate funding will be committed.

This Council considers that any expansion will only be a success for Surrey residents and businesses and for the wider South East if there is a clear and agreed framework for the necessary infrastructure, including southern rail access, and other measures to be in place before any new runway comes into operation.

This Council calls on the Government to take the lead in developing such a framework.

Item 8(ii)

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

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

‘The Council notes the difficulties in recruiting and retaining skilled staff to work for the County Council, the high cost of agency staff and that the situation is becoming critical as the council’s financial position worsens.

This Council has previously agreed that more emphasis should be given to key worker housing as one approach to dealing with this problem.

The Council now agrees to support a new investment strategy that sees increased emphasis on acquiring key worker housing for Surrey, to help recruit and retain more skilled staff whilst reducing agency spend.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Hazel Watson.

Mr Beardsmore said that:

- Newly qualified staff would not move to Surrey due to the costs and wanted a change of emphasis on human infrastructure.

Ms Denise Le Gal moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

This was formally seconded by Mrs Mary Lewis.

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

'The Council notes the difficulties in recruiting and retaining skilled staff to work for the County Council, the high cost of agency staff and that the situation is becoming critical as the council's financial position worsens.

This Council has previously agreed that more emphasis should be given to key worker housing as one approach to dealing with this problem.

The Council now agrees to explore the options available to enhance the provision of key worker housing in Surrey in order to ~~to support a new investment strategy that sees increased emphasis on acquiring key worker housing for Surrey,~~ to help recruit and retain more skilled staff whilst reducing agency spend.'

Ms Le Gal stated that the amendment allowed the Council to explore the various options in dealing with this issue.

This amendment was accepted by Mr Beardsmore and thus became the substantive motion.

Mrs Lewis made the following points:

- Other government agencies appeared able to pay more for skilled staff than Surrey were.
- Young professionals wanted to be able to buy their home so there was a need for a range of schemes such as part ownership. There was also a need for a variety of housing.
- Social workers were asking for reduced caseloads and more reflective supervision. The Council was making progress in this regard with its Safer Surrey approach.

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

- Welcomed Ms Le Gal's statement that the public estate would be used for key worker staff.
- Increased agency costs were being paid for social workers, planners and highway engineers.
- There was an increase in cost of living in Surrey.
- The Investment Strategy needs changing rather than paying for investment properties outside of Surrey.

The motion was put to the vote with the majority voting for.

Therefore, it was:

Resolved:

The Council notes the difficulties in recruiting and retaining skilled staff to work for the County Council, the high cost of agency staff and that the situation is becoming critical as the council's financial position worsens.

This Council has previously agreed that more emphasis should be given to key worker housing as one approach to dealing with this problem.

The Council now agrees to explore the options available to enhance the provision of key worker housing in Surrey in order to help recruit and retain more skilled staff whilst reducing agency spend.

The Council adjourned for lunch at 12.53~~pm~~ and reconvened at 14.00~~pm~~.

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 the many teachers, support staff, parents, governors and children who have enabled the vast majority of Surrey's schools to be judged, by Ofsted, as 'good' or 'outstanding'. Council is very proud that Surrey has so many excellent schools at every phase of education.

Surrey County Council takes great pride that as an education authority, it has for many years, been at the forefront of innovative, progressive education and setting high standards in schools.

There have been many changes in the format of schools in recent years, with for example, academies and free schools being created. Council therefore believes that a period of stability would be beneficial and is concerned that the Government is considering yet further changes.

Council expresses confidence in its teachers and headteachers to continue to deliver a high quality education under the current system.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Essex who reserved his right to speak later.

Mr Evans said that:

- That there were good schools in Surrey with good results and good teaching.
- Pupils receiving free school meals were underrepresented at grammar schools.
- Surrey provided a good mix of specialist schools.
- He was opposed to the 11+ exam and any further major changes to schools.

Mrs White moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting.

This was formally seconded by Mr Forster.

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

‘This Council congratulates the many teachers, support staff, parents, governors and children who have enabled the vast majority of Surrey’s schools to be judged, by Ofsted, as ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’. Council is very proud that Surrey has so many excellent schools at every phase of education.

Surrey County Council takes great pride that as an education authority, it has for many years, been at the forefront of innovative, progressive education and setting high standards in schools.

There have been many changes in the format of schools in recent years, with for example, academies and free schools being created. Council therefore believes that a period of stability would be beneficial and is concerned that the Government is considering yet further changes.

Council expresses confidence in its teachers and headteachers to continue to deliver a high quality education ~~under the current system~~ without introducing grammar schools or any further major reorganisations.’

This amendment was not accepted by Mr Evans and therefore Mrs White spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- That grammar schools were divisive.
- Another organisation was setting up grammars.

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement made the following points:

- Selection was already taking place in secondary schools e.g. with post codes.
- Agreed there should be a period of stability
- Surrey received £450 less per pupil than London boroughs across the border.
- There was a need to work with schools without setting conditions.

At this point Mrs White withdrew her amendment.

Four Members spoke to the substantive motion and made the following points:

- Opposes the motion especially as it was shutting down the means to modernise. There was a need to modernise the selection process to allow a better mix of pupils.
- Congratulations to the schools in Surrey which were good schools providing good education.
- There was agreement with the Cabinet Member's speech regarding selection.
- It was down to schools to challenge.
- There was a need for technical colleges.
- There was a need for some stability for the next few years.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 48 voting for, 5 voting against and 6 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

Resolved:

This Council congratulates the many teachers, support staff, parents, governors and children who have enabled the vast majority of Surrey's schools to be judged, by Ofsted, as 'good' or 'outstanding'. Council is very proud that Surrey has so many excellent schools at every phase of education.

Surrey County Council takes great pride that as an education authority, it has for many years, been at the forefront of innovative, progressive education and setting high standards in schools.

There have been many changes in the format of schools in recent years, with for example, academies and free schools being created. Council therefore believes that a period of stability would be beneficial and is concerned that the Government is considering yet further changes.

Council expresses confidence in its teachers and headteachers to continue to deliver a high quality education under the current system.

78/16 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 18 October and 22 November 2016.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A School Organisation Plan

One Member stated that the 1% margin of error in Surrey goes against what was said at the previous meeting.

RESOLVED:

1. That the School Organisation Plan 2016/17 – 2025/26 be approved.
2. To note that at present the funding for the increased number of school places within this Plan has not been fully identified.

Reports for Information/ Discussion

One Member stated that the action plan should have measurable and bigger targets to which the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning responded that the plan sets out what the intentions are.

B Smarter Working for the Environment: Policy Statement and Action Plan

RESOLVED:

That the Smarter Working for the Environment: Policy Statement and Action Plan be noted.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 18 October and 22 November 2016 be adopted.

79/16 PAY POLICY STATEMENT [Item 10]

The Leader presented this report and stated that members, officers and trade unions had worked closely together to get this Statement more focussed on awarding high performance and gave more flexibility for staff and modernised work practices.

RESOLVED:

That the Pay Policy Statement for 2016 – 2017 be agreed.

80/16 RECRUITMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSON [Item 11]

The chairman of the selection panel presented this report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council agrees the recommendation of the selection panel and appoints Mr Bernard Quoroll as the Independent Person for Surrey for a four year term ending on 5 December 2020.
2. That the Council authorises the Monitoring Officer to identify an appropriate alternative Independent Person appointed by a Surrey District or Borough Council to fulfil the role should Mr Quoroll be unavailable or unable to act.

81/16 CONSTITUTION UPDATE REPORT [Item 12]

The Leader submitted this report and its appendices to the Council.

RESOLVED:

That the Council approves the following recommendations with immediate effect:

1. The non-executive changes to the Scheme of Delegation within the Constitution.
2. Notes the executive changes to the Scheme of Delegation that were approved by the Leader on 9 November.
3. Notes that Part 6 of the Constitution (Codes and Protocols) has been updated following administrative changes and will be published on the Council's website.

82/16 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 13]

Mr Alan Young referred to the Cabinet Member's response to a public question regarding roads in Tandridge. He asked to see mileage percentage figures for the road network in each area and the percentage of total road funding to each area.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding would ensure Mr Young received the figures but also pointed out that the important data would be the condition of the roads and not the mileage.

[Meeting ended at: 2.40 pm]

Chairman