

COUNTY COUNCILCOUNCIL MEETING – 11 DECEMBER 2012

MINUTES of the Meeting of the County Council held at the County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on Tuesday 11 December 2012 commencing at 10:30am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mrs Sealy – Chairman
Mr Munro – Vice-Chairman

* Mr Agarwal	Mr Ivison
* Mr Amin	Mrs Kemeny
Mrs Angell	* Mrs King
Mr Barker OBE	Mr Kington
* Mr Beardsmore	Mr Lake
* Mr Bennison	Mr Lambell
Mrs Bowes	Mrs Lay
* Mr Brett-Warburton	Ms Le Gal
Mr Butcher	* Mr MacLeod
Mr Carasco	Mr Mallett MBE
* Mr Chapman	Mrs Marks
Mrs Clack	Mr Marlow
Mrs Coleman	Mr Martin
Mr Cooksey	Mrs Mason
Mr Cooper	Mrs Moseley
Mr Cosser	* Mrs Nichols
Mrs Curran	Mr Norman
* Mr Elias	* Mr Orrick
* Mr Ellwood	* Mr Phelps-Penry
Mr Few	Mr Pitt
Mr Forster	Dr Povey
Mrs Fraser DL	Mr Renshaw
Mr Frost	* Mrs Ross-Tomlin
Mrs Frost	Mrs Saliagopoulos
Mr Fuller	Mr Samuels
Mr Furey	Mrs Searle
Mr Gimson	Mr Skellett CBE
* Mr Goodwin	Mrs Smith
Mr Gosling	Mr Sydney
Dr Grant-Duff	Mr Colin Taylor
Dr Hack	Mr Keith Taylor
Mr Hall	Mr Townsend
Mrs Hammond	Mrs Turner-Stewart
Mr Harmer	Mr Walsh
Mr Harrison	Mrs Watson
Ms Heath	Mrs White
Mr Hickman	Mr Witham
Mrs Hicks	Mr Wood
Mr Hodge	Mr Young

*absent

96/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Agarwal, Mr Bennison, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Chapman, Mr Elias, Mr Ellwood, Mr Goodwin, Mrs King, Mr MacLeod, Mrs Nichols, Mr Orrick and Mrs Ross-Tomlin.

97/12 MINUTES [Item 2]

The Minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 16 October 2012, were submitted, confirmed and signed.

98/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- Urgent item – Frances King

RESOLVED:

That Mrs Frances King may continue to be absent from meetings by reason of her ill health, if necessary until May 2013 and looks forward to welcoming her back in due course.

- Remembrance Events – it had been a successful remembrance season with Councillors getting involved in their communities and also with the service at the cathedral.
- She considered that the Olympics and HM Queen's Diamond Jubilee had resulted in this being a fantastic year for Surrey and for public service. In particular, she mentioned her interest in the disability agenda and the recent Royal visit to Moor House School.
- The importance of the preventative agenda and community safety and working together with other organisations.
- Keith Robson from Surrey Enterprise Park was the lunchtime speaker today.
- That the Chairman's Christmas reception had been successful and that the Members Christmas lunch was on 13 December 2012.

99/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

100/12 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members were invited to make comments and ask questions.

101/12 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT JULY - DECEMBER 2012 [Item 6]

The Leader introduced the Surrey County Council Progress Report – June - December 2012, the seventh of the Chief Executive's six monthly reports to Members and welcomed the latest report and its findings. He was pleased to report the continued strong progress.

The report had been discussed with the Chief Executive at a recent Members' seminar where the debate had focused on the number of extraordinary events and challenges over the last six months, including the significant task of running a safe and successful Olympics and Paralympics. The report also highlighted a wide range of stories and examples across the council.

Members made the following key points:

- A request for the Leader's plans on the future economic prospects for Surrey.
- That the report illustrated the strength of SCC staff and the political leadership and the scrutiny process.
- That the County Council was effective and worked hard for its residents.
- The importance of investing in early intervention and prevention in Adult Social Care, which could save money in the long term.
- That 61% of residents felt that they could not influence council decisions.
- The roll out of Broadband would shortly begin in earnest and therefore increased use of video links should reduce the need for business travel across the county.
- The importance of strengthening SCC's capacity and capability to innovate.

After the debate, it was:

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.

102/12 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 16 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 Watson said that there was no room for complacency as she considered was demonstrated in the Cabinet Member for Children and Learning's response and asked her to comment further. The Cabinet Member disagreed and said that the key driver to school improvement were Headteachers and holding them to account. She quoted statistics from the recent OFSTED inspection outcomes of maintained schools inspected between 1 September 2011 to 31 August 2012 and highlighted nationally accredited Surrey schools such as Esher High, George Abbot and South Farnham Schools.

(Q2) Mr Forster requested that the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment ensured that the correct signs and legal processes outlined in his answer were available for the next parking reviews, to be considered at local committees in June. This was agreed.

(Q4) Mrs White requested that the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, who agreed, that the presentation of the Peer Review of partnership arrangements in Children, Schools and Families was circulated to all Members.

(Q8) Mr Kington said that the response had not addressed the issue of additional funding and asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment whether he would agree to use part of the £0.5m underspend in the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate to fund his request. The Cabinet Member declined to give this undertaking but agreed to bring this issue to the attention of highways officers and then respond with a timescale for the work, outside the meeting.

(Also, Q8) Mr Mallett asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment about the legality of zigzag lines outside schools that no longer existed and whether he could authorise their removal. The Cabinet Member agreed to provide the legal details for him. He also informed him that officers from the parking team were in the process of visiting all Surrey schools and changes would be made after consultation locally.

(Q9) Mr Colin Taylor asked the Chairman of the Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee for clarification on the timescale for a review of the democratic structures and was advised that it could take place during the first year of the new Administration.

(Q10) Mr Butcher asked the Leader of the Council whether he would welcome an investigation into Members being informed of matters relating to their division. The Leader confirmed that the Cabinet had already agreed a process for communications with Members and cited the work of the Public Value Review and the work being taking forward on the theme – Think Councillor, Think Resident.

(Also Q10) Mrs Frost sympathised with Mr Butcher and welcomed the work being done to improve communications with Members. **Mr Lake** made reference to a protocol concerning Members visiting in other Member divisions.

(Q11) Mrs Watson asked the Leader of the Council for assurance that all options would be considered before a final decision was made about a Magna Carta Visitor Centre. She was advised that the decision taken by the Cabinet was 'in principle' and that officers had been instructed to do further work on this topic and report back to Cabinet.

(Q12) Mr Forster asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, who confirmed, that in future accurate information was provided to Members in response to questions.

(Q13) Mr Colin Taylor requested a list of the 10 Community Partnered Libraries (CPLs) with the timescales for their implementation programme. The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games said that the timescales had changed. She also said that it was her intention to visit all CPLs to help them deliver their goals. Finally, she offered to circulate the revised timescales to Members and to meet with Mr Taylor outside the meeting to discuss any of his concerns.

(Q14) Dr Povey referred to the option, taken up by the newly elected Police Commissioner, to appoint a Deputy Commissioner and asked the Leader of the Council whether he would agree that residents would rather have extra police officers. The Leader responded by stating that it was important that the Police Commissioner made his own decisions.

(Q16) Mr Lambell made reference to a new fire station in Burgh Heath, which was not mentioned in the written response and Mr Wood asked for confirmation about plans to move an extra pump to Epsom. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety informed Members that the consultation had only just started and no decisions had been made. The Chairman of the Communities Select Communities informed Members that this matter would be discussed at his select committee on 16 January 2013.

103/12 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were two local Member statements:

- Mr Young in relation to Highways issues in his local area of Cranleigh and Ewhurst.
- Mr Gimson in relation to a fatal accident on A31 (Hogs Back) close to the villages of Puttenham and Wanborough in his division. (Appendix C)

104/12 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

ITEM 9(i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Mary Angell moved the motion which was:

‘Following the recent Ofsted Inspection of SCC's arrangements for the protection of children, this Council:

1. Congratulates the Children’s Service on the result of the inspection that children at risk of harm in Surrey are responded to quickly and effectively;
2. Welcomes this result against the backdrop of a tougher inspection regime and an increased level of public concern regarding the safety of vulnerable children;
3. Recognises the Service’s good strategic leadership and the hard work of its staff, as acknowledged by the inspection; especially in the context of the ever- rising demands placed upon it;
4. Celebrates the many valued aspects of the Service which impressed the inspectors, particularly in the context of the difficulty of recruiting qualified and experienced social workers;
5. Accepts the need for a continued focus on improved partnership working, both internally and externally, and
6. Urges Members to support the Service by working with it to establish “early-help” for children and communities in Surrey where prevention would be better than cure.’

Mrs Angell began by saying that a brand new methodology had been used by Ofsted and to date four authorities had been inspected under this tougher regime – Surrey had been judged as ‘adequate’ and the other three, ‘inadequate’. She said that the Inspectors had highlighted many good points but acknowledged that there was more work to be done. However, Surrey County Council already had an action plan in place for all the areas identified for improvements and the actions would be completed within three months.

She also referred to the large number of referrals from the Police that had been received by the contact centre. Finally, she said that Ofsted had highlighted a number of strengths, in particular, that Children were safe in Surrey and that the Council showed a real understanding of their needs. Overall, she was proud of the staff that worked in these challenging areas and commended the motion to Members.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr David Hodge.

Mrs Fiona White tabled an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mrs Watson) which was:

'Insert the following new 1 and 2 after "...for the protection of children, this Council:"

1. Notes that Ofsted judged the overall effectiveness of Surrey County Council's arrangements to be "Adequate",
2. Aspires to improve the service as soon as possible to attain a rating of "Good" as a first step to progressing to "Outstanding",

Renumber existing paragraphs 1 – 6 so that the **Motion as amended reads:**

Following the recent Ofsted Inspection of SCC's arrangements for the protection of children, this Council:

1. Notes that Ofsted judged the overall effectiveness of Surrey County Council's arrangements to be "Adequate",
2. Aspires to improve the service as soon as possible to attain a rating of "Good" as a first step to progressing to "Outstanding",
3. Congratulates the Children's Service on the result of the inspection that children at risk of harm in Surrey are responded to quickly and effectively,
4. Welcomes this result against the backdrop of a tougher inspection regime and an increased level of public concern regarding the safety of vulnerable children,
5. Recognises the Service's good strategic leadership and the hard work of its staff, as acknowledged by the inspection; especially in the context of the ever- rising demands placed upon it,
6. Celebrates the many valued aspects of the Service which impressed the inspectors, particularly in the context of the difficulty of recruiting qualified and experienced social workers,
7. Accepts the need for a continued focus on improved partnership working, both internally and externally, and

8. Urges Members to support the Service by working with it to establish “early-help” for children and communities in Surrey where prevention would be better than cure.

Mrs White made the following points:

- That the original motion had many good points which she did not want to detract from, however, the Ofsted report did list areas for improvement which needed to be resolved before the next inspection.
- She did acknowledge the difficulties of recruiting social workers.
- The amendment was not a criticism of the services but she considered that clear timescales for the action plan were needed.

Ten Members spoke on the amendment, with the following points being made:

- An over reliance on locum staff
- A widespread lack of understanding of social care thresholds and performance management was inconsistent.
- A desire that Members support the need to move from ‘adequate’ to ‘outstanding’.
- A reminder that all Members were corporate parents and the care of children was an important issue.
- A concern for those people not in the system, such as the homeless with babies/small children.
- Congratulations to staff for their achievements.
- A large number of staff, including those in partner organisations, were involved in working constructively with families, often in difficult circumstances.

The amendment was put to the vote, with 14 Members voting for and 40 Members voting against it. There was one abstention.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the original motion, on which a further five Members spoke, making the following points:

- A request to vote on each recommendation separately.
- Improvements can only be achieved by stronger partnership working. There was already a cross party Member steering group set up to develop this.
- Thanks to staff and the Cabinet Member for Children and Families for the achievements to date.
- The increased caseload of social workers was noted. Also, reference was made in relation to locum staff, it was considered preferable to use them to fully meet the needs of the service.

- Budgetary constraints.
- That Ofsted may not award any local authority a 'good' rating due to the 'baby P' effect.
- That this Administration was committed to doing the best it could for the children and the Inspection was only part of it.
- That the Children Services team was highly motivated and staff went the extra mile.
- An invitation for any Member to discuss the report further with the Cabinet Member for Children and Families.

Mrs Marks requested a recorded vote and ten Members stood in support of this request.

The following Members voted in support of the motion:

Mrs Angell, Mr Barker, Mr Butcher, Mrs Clack, Mrs Coleman, Mr Cosser, Mrs Curran, Mr Few, Mrs Fraser, Mr Frost, Mrs Frost, Mr Fuller, Mr Furey, Mr Gimson, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Dr Hack, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Mr Harrison, Ms Heath, Mr Hickman, Mrs Hicks, Mr Hodge, Mr Ivison, Mrs Kemeny, Mr Kington, Mrs Lay, Ms Le Gal, Mr Mallett, Mrs Marks, Mr Marlow, Mr Martin, Mrs Mason, Mrs Moseley, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Dr Povey, Mr Renshaw, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Skellett, Mr Sydney, Mr Keith Taylor, Mr Townsend, Mrs Turner-Stewart, Mr Walsh, Mr Witham and Mr Young.

The following Members abstained:

Mr Cooksey, Mr Cooper, Mr Forster, Mr Lambell, Mrs Searle, Mrs Smith, Mr Colin Taylor, Mrs Watson, Mrs White and Mr Wood.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That following the recent Ofsted Inspection of SCC's arrangements for the protection of children, this Council:

1. Congratulates the Children's Service on the result of the inspection that children at risk of harm in Surrey are responded to quickly and effectively;
2. Welcomes this result against the backdrop of a tougher inspection regime and an increased level of public concern regarding the safety of vulnerable children;
3. Recognises the Service's good strategic leadership and the hard work of its staff, as acknowledged by the inspection; especially in the context of the ever- rising demands placed upon it;

4. Celebrates the many valued aspects of the Service which impressed the inspectors, particularly in the context of the difficulty of recruiting qualified and experienced social workers;
5. Accepts the need for a continued focus on improved partnership working, both internally and externally, and
6. Urges Members to support the Service by working with it to establish “early-help” for children and communities in Surrey where prevention would be better than cure.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.50pm and resumed at 2.10pm, with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning except for Mr Barker, Mr Butcher, Mr Carasco, Ms Heath, Mrs Hicks, Mr Lake, Mrs Moseley, Mr Pitt, Mr Samuels, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Walsh, Mr Wood and Mr Young.

ITEM 9(ii)

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

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

‘This Council notes that:

- i) reducing speed limits on roads where appropriate reduces the number and severity of road traffic accidents

and

- ii) only three 20mph speed limit schemes have been implemented in Surrey since May 2006

Council requests the Cabinet to amend the Council’s speed limit policy to make it easier for local committees to introduce 20mph limits, using terminal and repeater signs (rather than physical traffic calming measures), where evidence says they are required and they are supported by local residents.’

In support of this motion, Mr Cooksey said that: (i) the County Council had approved a reduction in speed limits in May 2006 and further research had confirmed that reducing the speed limit from 30 to 20 mph reduced fatalities, (ii) that only three 20 mph speed limits had been introduced since 2006, (iii) over 40 local authorities now had a significant programme for introducing 20mph speed limit, including Kingston which had an extensive network, (iv) insurance premiums were less in 20 mph speed limit areas, (v) there was popular support from residents and many Members would like more 20 mph

speed limits introduced, (vi) this motion was a genuine means to improve road safety.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Will Forster who said that new rules and guidance had meant that it was now easier to introduce 20 mph speed limits. He said that there were an increasing number of these schemes throughout the UK and that high traffic speeds made pedestrians unsafe. He believed that local committees should have the discretion to implement the speed limits in their areas if it was the appropriate. He cited the figures for road traffic fatalities and injuries on UK roads.

Key points made during the debate, in which six Members spoke were:

- Roads need to be safe for all road users – pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.
- The current speed limit policy was put in place after debate and agreed at full Council and the power had been delegated by the Leader to local committees.
- Reducing speed limits doesn't always work as people can lose concentration and multi-task when driving at 20mph.
- Localism applies to Surrey and 20mph speed limits were within the remit of the local committee, in consultation with highways officers and police. They also needed the support of local residents.
- To ensure any reduction in speed limit did not heighten the risk for road users.
- A proliferation of signs and traffic calming measures could be confusing.
- The main concern was the speed limits outside schools and the congestion at drop off and pick up times.
- A reference to the large number of 20 mph speed limits in London Boroughs.
- Concern that the 20mph speed limit could not be enforced by local police.
- Casualty reduction had been reduced as a result of car design and also safety awareness such as Safe Drive, Stay Alive campaigns.
- 20mph speed limits could be divisive, contentious and the benefits not proven.

Mrs Fraser requested that 'the question be now put'. this request was agreed by the Chairman and twenty Members stood in support of this request.

Mr Cooksey responded to the points made in the debate and the motion was put to the vote, with 18 Members voting for and 30 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

ITEM 9(iii)

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

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

'This Council recognises the importance of providing respite care for families with disabled children to support them in carrying out their caring role.

Council requests that:

- i) the document "Shorts Breaks Statement for parents and carers of disabled children and young people in Surrey, October 2012" be amended to include clear eligibility criteria to clarify which families are entitled to different forms of respite care

and

- ii) that information provided by Surrey County Council for parents about the availability of respite care services for disabled children, whether provided by the County Council or external providers, is more accessible and comprehensive

and

- iii) geographical coverage of residential respite care should, as far as is reasonable, be equitable to minimise journey times for children and parents.

Council calls on the Cabinet to provide respite care for more Surrey families of disabled children and to review its policy that "no child under 10 years of age should be accessing residential short break provision except in exceptional circumstances.'

Mr Lambell began by stating that his motion had been prompted by the proposed closure of The Beeches respite centre in Surrey, which provided respite for complex cases. He said that this centre provided much needed care and cited the difficulties, including transport issues, that the proposed closure would cause. He mentioned the eligibility criteria and requested that the Cabinet reconsider its policy on respite care for children under 10 years old.

Mrs Hazel Watson formally seconded the motion.

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

- That Surrey County Council had a commitment to support families with disabled children and referred to the funding in last year's Budget package, which had been protected.
- A reference to Section 17 of the Children's Act 1989 and confirmation that the Council fully complied with the guidance.

- That every child and their needs was unique and that each child went through a full assessment to ensure that their needs and those of the wider family were understood. It was not possible to have a simple tick list.
- Referring to the geographical coverage of residential respite care, she said that there were 7 facilities, that had all been inspected by Ofsted and these were graded 'good' or 'outstanding'.
- She said that it was easy to request respite care for more Surrey families and disabled children. The number of child protection cases had increased by 47% but she gave an assurance that, regardless of budget pressures, any family who had been assessed as needing support would receive it because the welfare of the child was paramount.
- The provision of respite care for under 10 year olds was good practice not a policy and she believed most children's needs were best met within their family environment with support.
- Finally, she thanked Children's Services officers for their excellent work.

The motion was put to the vote with 9 Members voting for and 33 Members voting against it. There was one absention.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

ITEM 9(iv)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Fiona White moved the motion which was:

'The UK Living Wage is an hourly rate, reviewed annually, that is calculated nationally (except for London, where the GLA sets a London Living Wage) by the Centre for Research in Social Policy in association with a charity known as 'the Living Wage Foundation'.

The Living Wage ensures low paid workers earn enough to provide for themselves and their families.

Surrey County Council recognises the cost of living has risen significantly in the last few years, without an accompanying national wage increase for employees. This has hit those on the national minimum wage disproportionately.

Council agrees that:

Surrey County Council will commit to ensuring that no county council employee will be paid less than the UK Living Wage, which is currently £7.45 per hour. Those performing work on behalf of the council should likewise ensure that none of their employees are paid less than the living wage and future contracts will reflect this.'

Mrs White defined what is meant by a living wage and made the following points in support of her motion: (i) that the County Council should be paying workers enough to live on, (ii) this made good business sense and would assist with staff retention rates, (iii) the motion didn't request making London's Living Wage, (iv) that the council should pay all contractors enough to live on.

Mr Will Forster formally seconded the motion and reaffirmed the points made by Mrs White.

During the debate in which 4 Members spoke, the following points were made:

- A reference to People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) where this would be discussed at their next meeting.
- With effect from April 2013, 25,970 out of 26,000 staff would be on the living wage.
- This motion would restrict the ability of the County Council to appoint to apprenticeships and internships.

The motion was put to the vote with 11 Members voting for and 26 Members voting against it. There was one absention.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

ITEM 9(v)

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 notes that Surrey County Council is a party to the High Court proceedings by Europa Oil and Gas to quash the Planning Inspector's decision to dismiss the appeal to allow oil and gas exploration at Bury Hill Wood in Coldharbour.

Council instructs the County Council's officers and legal team to proactively defend the arguments raised by the Planning Inspector including protection of the Green Belt in support of the Planning Inspector and the Treasury Solicitors defence of the Planning Inspector's decision to dismiss the appeal.'

Mrs Watson provided Members with the background to the 2009 planning application to allow oil and gas exploration at Bury Hill Wood in Coldharbour. She considered that the County Council should support the views of the Planning Inspector and be supportive of local residents.

Mr Stephen Cooksey formally seconded the motion.

The Leader of the Council made a statement in which he stated that the Conservative Group would not be supporting the motion.

The motion was put to the vote with 8 Members voting for and 29 Members voting against it. There were no absentions.

Therefore, the motion was lost.

105/12 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet's meetings held on 23 October and 27 November 2012.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care introduced his statement in relation to the Adult Social Care Local Account which had been included in the agenda. He thanked Adult Social Care staff.

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A School Organisation Plan 2012 – 2021

Members had an opportunity to ask questions and comment on the Plan. It was considered very comprehensive and was well received.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Learning reminded Members that they had all received a copy of the Plan. She also said that the Chairman of the Education Select Committee had requested that all local committees considered the Plan at their local meetings and advise officers of any refinements or changes required. She thanked officers from the School Commissioning Team for their work. She also agreed to respond to Mrs White outside the meeting in relation to her question on whether the effects of major developments close to but outside the county boundary had been addressed in the Plan.

RESOLVED:

That the School Organisation Plan 2012- 2021 be approved.

B Supporting the Economy through Investment in Transport and Infrastructure 2012 – 2019

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment drew attention to the new funding and financing sources from the Government and how the County Council bid for it. He also said that the County Council had also been successful in attracting £20m of funding

through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund and that as schemes go forward, there would be input from the local and select committees.

Members commented on the schemes in their divisions.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the revised list of Surrey County Council Major Schemes, as laid out in Annexes 1 and 2 of the submitted report, be endorsed.
- (2) That the choice of Major Schemes to be progressed in any given year to be taken by the Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.
- (3) That the “New Homes Bonus” funding be used to provide for that proportion of the preparatory work relating to the schemes, which is not recoverable from capital funding. The estimated cost of this for the 2012-15 period is c. £1.2m.
- (4) That the Cabinet be provided with a high-level update on the Major Schemes programme every 2 years, except where significant developments require immediate referral.
- (5) That support continues to be given to Highways Agency (HA) and National Rail (NR) schemes in Surrey as detailed in their programmes, in Annexes 3 and 4 of the submitted report.
- (6) That delegated authority be given to the Strategic Director for Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to approve changes to the list of schemes where these are individually valued at less than £5 million.

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Public Value Review Programme Closing Report
- One County, One Team – Strengthening the Council’s Approach to Innovation

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 23 October and 27 November 2012 be adopted.

106/12 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSON [Item 11]

The Vice-Chairman of the Council introduced the report, which was in two parts:

(a) The Recruitment of the Independent Person

This report summarised the outcome of the recruitment process and recommended the following appointment.

RESOLVED:

That Professor Michael Joy OBE be appointed as the Independent Person for Surrey County Council for a period of four years, ending on 11 December 2016

(b) The Interim Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

Mr Harrison (in the absence of Mr Frost) proposed an amendment to the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel which was to propose that a sentence is added at the end of the current recommendation as follows:

‘Travel expenses should be based on those applicable to Members as laid down in the Guide to Members’ Allowances and Expenses applicable at the time the expense is incurred.’

Members agreed the amendment. Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Independent Person be paid travel expenses only in relation to their work with the Member Conduct Panel, but that this position be reviewed after one year once the workload and responsibility of the role has been established.
- (2) Travel expenses should be based on those applicable to Members as laid down in the Guide to Members’ Allowances and Expenses applicable at the time the expense is incurred.

The Leader of the Council proposed a further amendment to recommendation (1) – to insert £1000 pro-rata so that recommendation (1) now reads:

‘That the Independent Person be paid £1000 pro-rata and travel expenses in relation to their work with the Member Conduct Panel, but that this position be reviewed after one year once the workload and responsibility of the role has been established.’

The majority of Members voted for the amendment but three Members voted against it. Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Independent Person be paid £1000 pro-rata and travel expenses in relation to their work with the Member Conduct Panel, but that this position be reviewed after one year once the workload and responsibility of the role has been established.
- (2) Travel expenses should be based on those applicable to Members as laid down in the Guide to Members' Allowances and Expenses applicable at the time the expense is incurred.

107/12 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION - FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE [Item 12]

RESOLVED:

That the amendment to the Scheme of Delegation in relation to the Fire and Rescue Service agreed by the Leader be noted.

108/12 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF CABINET [Item 13]

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

[Meeting ended at: 4.10pm]

Chairman