

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 19 MARCH 2019 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

Tony Samuels (Chairman)  
Helyn Clack (Vice-Chairman)

	Mary Angell		Naz Islam
	Ayesha Azad	*	Colin Kemp
	John Beckett		Eber Kington
	Mike Bennison		Graham Knight
*	Amanda Boote		Rachael I Lake
	Chris Botten		Yvonna Lay
*	Liz Bowes		David Lee
	Natalie Bramhall		Mary Lewis
	Mark Brett-Warburton		Andy MacLeod
*	Ben Carasco		Ernest Mallett MBE
	Bill Chapman		David Mansfield
*	Stephen Cooksey		Peter Martin
	Clare Curran		Jan Mason
	Nick Darby		Cameron McIntosh
*	Paul Deach		Sinead Mooney
	Graham Ellwood		Charlotte Morley
	Jonathan Essex	*	Marsha Moseley
	Robert Evans		Tina Mountain
	Tim Evans		Bernie Muir
	Mel Few		Mark Nuti
	Will Forster		John O'Reilly
	John Furey		Tim Oliver
	Matt Furniss		Andrew Povey
	Bob Gardner		Wyatt Ramsdale
	Mike Goodman		Mrs Penny Rivers
	Angela Goodwin		Becky Rush
*	David Goodwin	*	Stephen Spence
	Zully Grant-Duff		Lesley Steeds
	Alison Griffiths		Peter Szanto
	Ken Gulati		Keith Taylor
	Tim Hall		Barbara Thomson
	Kay Hammond		Rose Thorn
	David Harmer		Chris Townsend
	Jeffrey Harris		Denise Turner-Stewart
	Nick Harrison		Richard Walsh
	Edward Hawkins		Hazel Watson
	Marisa Heath		Fiona White
	Saj Hussain		Keith Witham
	Julie Iles		Victoria Young

\*absent

### **13/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Stephen Spence, Ben Carasco, Liz Bowes, Amanda Boote, Paul Deach, Stephen Cooksey, Colin Kemp, Marsha Moseley and David Goodwin.

### **14/18 MINUTES [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 5 February 2019 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

In regards to Item 7 (minute 7/19), a Member of the Council stated that going forward it would be beneficial to share responses from Cabinet Members to supplementary questions that were responded to after the meeting.

### **15/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Cllr Rachael I Lake declared a non-pecuniary interest for item 9 as her son works for Surrey County Council.

Mr Nick Darby declared a non-pecuniary interest on item 9 as his daughter works for Surrey County Council.

Mr Keith Witham declared a non-pecuniary interest on item 9 as his step-daughter works for Surrey County Council.

### **16/18 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

The Chairman:

- highlighted to Members that the Chairman's Announcements were located in the agenda front sheet.
- informed Members that a Personal Trainer would be visiting County Hall on 20 March 2019 to discuss the opportunity of holding exercise sessions before each meeting of the County Council.
- informed Members that the Surrey County Council Analytics Hub had received an Ise Innovation Award at a 2019 Public Sector Transformation Event. The Chairman presented Sara Dicerio, Senior Commissioning Manager, with the award.
- informed Members that the Surrey Children's Rights Apprentices had received first prize at the National Crimebeat Awards for their work with Surrey Police Officers, training them to have "Total Respect" for care experienced young people. The Chairman presented Lewis Mead, Children's Rights Apprentice, with the award.
- sent best wishes on behalf of the Council to former county councillor Mr John Orrick, who was ill in hospital.
- led a silent tribute in remembrance of Mr Peter Hickman, a former county councillor, who had died recently.

## 17/18 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:

- That the Leader should consider how ordinary Members could contribute to policy when reforming the Council's scrutiny function.
- Raised concern that the critical Inspection Report on the Fire and Rescue Service had not been subject to debate in a select committee.
- That they welcomed positive changes to Children's Services and the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
- That there was a need for mental health services for children.
- That they welcomed the commitment that no Surrey County Council-owned properties would be left empty.
- That a fundamental change was needed to make sure residents and Members could engage positively with the Council.
- That fewer select committees would mean less representation for the opposition.
- Congratulated the Leader of the Council on the recent reporting of the Council's budgetary situation.
- Requested the Leader's view on the Fairer Funding review in Central Government.
- Highlighted that there was an opportunity to enhance the use of long distance communication tools to improve efficiencies across the Council.
- Welcomed the initiative to move County Hall into Surrey.
- Highlighted the importance of ensuring partnerships were mutually beneficial for all parties involved.
- That there was a need to lobby Central Government on the comprehensive spending review.

## 18/18 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

### Questions:

Notice of seven questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in a supplementary agenda on 18 March 2019.

A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below:

**(Q3) Mr Robert Evans** not did ask a supplementary question.

Mr Mallet asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste to circulate the relevant documents outlined in the response.

The Cabinet Member stated that he would ensure the latest information was available to Members but noted it would take time as the consultation feedback was still being reviewed.

**(Q5) Mrs Fiona White** asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience if feedback from Fire & Rescue staff would be given additional weight due to their experience and knowledge on the subject.

The Cabinet Member stated that the consultation was being taken seriously and that all views would be taken into consideration. It was noted that extensive staff engagement was being conducted and that staff recognised the value of the proposals.

**(Q6) Mrs Hazel Watson** did not ask a supplementary question.

Mr Townsend asked the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families for further clarification on the section of the response which stated that the Council would maximise the potential of youth centre buildings wherever possible.

Mr Essex asked if the Cabinet Member agreed that at least some of the gaps referred to in the response were due to the service halving the number of youth workers in the county and, in order to address this, the Council would need to reinstate some youth workers in Surrey.

Mr R Evans asked if the Cabinet Member shared his concerns on the reduction in youth services at a time when young people faced increasing issues related to knife crime and radicalisation.

Mrs Curran urged the Cabinet Member to look into re-providing youth services at the Bookham Youth Centre.

Mrs Jan Mason asked if the Cabinet Member had fully understood the implications of the withdrawal of youth centres on deprived areas.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that there was an ongoing review of the service so she was therefore unable to give extensive details. The Cabinet Member went on to state that the youth offer review was a review in partnership with key stakeholders and would be shaped around the things that young people value the most. It was confirmed that there would be a meeting on 1 April 2019 with the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) to discuss the future of the Edge Youth Centre in Watersedge, Epsom. It was further confirmed that a drop-in session would be held on 16 April 2019 for Members to discuss with officers the youth offer in their individual divisions.

**(Q7) Mr Robert Evans** asked the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire and Resilience if they shared his concern that reducing fire cover at night time would lead to a higher risk of danger to citizens. He further asked for confirmation on when the Fordbridge Fire Station was due to open and its cost to the Council.

The Cabinet Member assured the Member that mitigation work was underway to reduce the impact of proposals which included the reallocation of resources. The Fire & Rescue Service was also working to better protect residents with a number of activities related to prevention. It was further confirmed that the Fordbridge Fire Station was due to open either at the end of April or in May. Due to ongoing minor works, Members would be informed of the station's costs following its opening.

**Cabinet Member Briefings:** these were also published with the supplementary on 18 March 2019.

Members made the following comments:

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste:** received thanks for the work that was carried out to find a replacement bus operator following an issue with functionality in the previous week. The Cabinet Member confirmed that, to avoid any further issues, the service would monitor providers business plans to ensure they were sustainable.

Members made further comments related to the third runway at Heathrow Airport and the potential for increased flights over Epsom & Ewell. The Cabinet Member stated that consideration of the responses to the recent consultation on Heathrow expansion was still underway and that no decisions had yet been made. It was further noted that Members would be informed on how they could be involved in the next phase of consultation.

**Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire and Resilience:** on the risks the Fire & Rescue Service faced when dealing with emergencies and the significance of correct allocation of resource when considering need.

**Cabinet Member for Highways:** was thanked for the work undertaken to re-surface a road in Guildford.

**Cabinet Member for Adults and Public Health:** on the savings achieved in older people's services and how they would directly impact service users. The Cabinet Member confirmed that savings had been found by considering the number of service users as well as keeping costs of care minimal in residential and nursing homes.

**Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning:** on the success of the Surrey Performing Arts Library and its work to support various cultural activities in the county.

**Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families:** on the Edge Youth Centre in Epsom & Ewell and the work that was needed to identify provision to support its efforts. The Cabinet Member highlighted that there was ongoing engagement with young people to identify their needs and how best they can be supported.

#### **19/18 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]**

There were none.

#### **20/18 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 Chris Botten moved the motion, which was:

This Council:

- believes in the importance of equitable wage ratio;
- notes the 60+ consultants currently appointed on interim contracts;

- recognises that interim contracts are often far more costly than those of permanent staff, with the Programme Manager currently being recruited for with a potential salary of £98,000/year on a two year fixed term contract;
- acknowledges that many residents within Surrey are struggling to make ends meet and facing higher Council Tax bills;
- notes the ongoing cuts to essential Council services including children's centres, Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) provisions and bus subsidies;
- notes that a number of senior appointments are not being approved by the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) where they ought to be.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- adopt a policy of recruiting to permanent positions where appropriate;
- work with the Surrey Boroughs and Districts to share talent and resource where possible to contain the overall Surrey payroll costs.

Mr Botten made the following points:

- That the Council was providing high salary interim posts while parents and carers spent their time fighting for special needs packages for their children.
- That the optics of high salary interim posts were damaging to the Council's credibility.
- That the Council needed to employ in a cost effective way.
- Residents needed to have confidence in the employment process.
- The Council needed to look into how it could share appointments with districts and boroughs.
- That there was a need to maximise resource already available in the public sector.

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

Mr Kington moved an amendment, which was formally seconded by Mr Darby.

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

This Council:

- believes in the importance of equitable wage ratio;
- notes the 60+ consultants currently appointed on interim contracts;
- recognises that interim contracts are often far more costly than those of permanent staff, with the Programme Manager currently being recruited for with a potential salary of £98,000/year on a two year fixed term contract;
- acknowledges that many residents within Surrey are struggling to make ends meet and facing higher Council Tax bills;

- notes the ongoing cuts to essential Council services including children's centres, Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) provisions and bus subsidies;
- notes that a number of senior appointments are not being approved by the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) where they ought to be.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- adopt a policy of recruiting to permanent positions where appropriate;
- work with the Surrey Boroughs and Districts to share talent and resource where possible to contain the overall Surrey payroll costs.
- **amend the Terms of Reference of the PPDC to provide for the monitoring of the costs of senior management salaries, interim appointments and redundancies.**

Mr Kington made the following points on the amendment:

- That residents had always taken an interest in the Council's service spend.
- That details of pay were not published on the website in any meaningful way.
- That the cost of top paid staff was of interest to residents.
- That Conservative Members had prevented PPDC from looking into all staffing pay.
- The amendment did not prevent the Chief Executive from deciding staffing structures.
- That Members had the right to look over the total costs of staffing.
- That individual select committees had never scrutinised staffing budgets.
- That the Council's expenditure should be open and transparent.

Mr Darby, as seconder to the amendment, made the following comments:

- That the Council supported transparency.
- That the amendment was not suggesting becoming involved in operational issues.
- The Council should not support a culture of secrecy.

Mr Botten accepted the amendment and therefore it became the substantive motion.

Four Members made the following comments:

- That they could not agree the amendment to the original motion.
- That the Council would be considering the Surrey Pay Policy at the current meeting.
- It was the Chief Executive's responsibility to organise the Council's workforce.
- That the Council should not be run on interim arrangements.
- That the focus should be on ensuring the right people conducted the transformation exercise.

- That the details of the Council's top staffing wage structure were the subject of rumour.

Mr Forster, as seconder to the substantive motion, made the following comments:

- That there was a need for more permanent staff in the Council.
- It was a double standard that the Council was making cuts to services while offering high salaries to interim appointments.
- There was an opportunity to share posts with districts and boroughs.

The Chairman invited Mr Botten to conclude the debate. He made the following comments:

- That the Council should show pride in what it provides.
- That he felt that many of the decisions had already been made before any meetings of the PPDC.
- That it was always better to be transparent.

In accordance with Standing Order 28.1, Mr Kington requested a recorded vote to be taken on the third resolution of the motion. At least ten Members showed support for this request by standing. The Chairman agreed to call a vote on each resolution separately.

The first resolution was put to a vote and received unanimous support.

The second resolution was put to a vote and received unanimous support.

The third resolution was put to a recorded vote. The following Members voted for it:

Mr Beckett, Mr Botten, Mr Darby, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mrs Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Kington, Mr Lee, Mr MacLeod, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mrs Rivers, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson, Mrs White

And the following Members voted against it:

Mrs Angell, Ms Azad, Mrs Bramhall, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Tim Evans, Mr Few, Mr Furey, Mr Furniss, Mr Gardner, Mr Goodman, Miss Griffiths, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Gulati, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Mr Harris, Mr Hawkins, Miss Heath, Mr Hussain, M Iles, Mr Islam, Mr Knight, Rachael Lake, Mrs Lay, Mrs Lewis, Mr McIntosh, Mr Mansfield, Mr Martin, Mrs Mooney, Ms Morley, Mrs Mountain, Mrs Muir, Mr Nuti, Mr Oliver, Mr O'Reilly, Dr Povey, Mr Ramsdale, Mrs Rush, Mr Samuels, Mrs Steeds, Dr Szanto, Mr Taylor, Ms Thomson, Mrs Thorn, Ms Turner-Stewart, Mr Walsh, Mr Witham, Mrs Young.

There were no abstentions.

Therefore the third resolution of the motion was lost, with 17 votes for and 52 against.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:



This Council:

- believes in the importance of equitable wage ratio;
- notes the 60+ consultants currently appointed on interim contracts;
- recognises that interim contracts are often far more costly than those of permanent staff, with the Programme Manager currently being recruited for with a potential salary of £98,000/year on a two year fixed term contract;
- acknowledges that many residents within Surrey are struggling to make ends meet and facing higher Council Tax bills;
- notes the ongoing cuts to essential Council services including children's centres, Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) provisions and bus subsidies;
- notes that a number of senior appointments are not being approved by the People, Performance and Development Committee (PPDC) where they ought to be.

This Council therefore resolves to:

- adopt a policy of recruiting to permanent positions where appropriate;
- work with the Surrey Boroughs and Districts to share talent and resource where possible to contain the overall Surrey payroll costs.

#### **Item 8 (ii)**

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

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

Full Council believes that:

1. Surrey County Council and all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to limit the negative impacts of Climate Breakdown, and local governments that recognise this should not wait for their national governments to change their policies. It is important for the residents of Surrey to commit to carbon neutrality as quickly as possible. Bold climate action can deliver economic benefits to Surrey in terms of valuable new jobs, essential economic savings and much needed market opportunities (as well as improved well-being for people worldwide).

Full Council to:

1. Declare a 'Climate Emergency' in Surrey;
2. Pledge to make Surrey carbon neutral by 2030, and strive to work with Surrey's borough and district Councils in taking a leadership role, taking into account both production and consumption emissions;
3. Call on the Government to provide the powers and resources to make the 2030 target possible;
4. Report to County Council within six months with the actions the Council will take to address this.

Mr Essex made the following points:

- That that the international panel on climate change had reported that there were only 12 years to change how people lived globally.
- Shared recent environmental news, such as that January was the warmest month in Australia ever and that the polar vortex had destabilised.
- The Council needed to recognise the seriousness of the climate emergency.
- That everyone needed to come together to deal with the situation and that the motion called for a sufficient response from the Council.
- That the motion called for Surrey to be carbon neutral by 2030.
- The Council had an important role of being local leaders.
- Some businesses in the county had already pledged to be carbon neutral by 2030.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs White, who made the following comments:

- That the county had made progress towards increasing recycling but that more needed to be done.
- The country should lead in international efforts to combat climate change.
- That the county should lead by example by improving appropriate insulation in Council owned buildings.
- Climate change would lead to extreme weather events which would disproportionately effect those on lower income.
- That it would be the younger generation who face the repercussions.

Mr Goodman moved an amendment which was formally seconded by Mr Ellwood.

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

Full Council believes that:

Surrey County Council and all governments (national, regional and local) ~~have a duty~~ should seek to limit the negative impacts of Climate Breakdown, and local governments that recognise this should not wait for their national governments to change their policies.

The Council recognises the work that has already been done to tackle Surrey's carbon footprint and it is important for the residents of Surrey to ~~commit to carbon neutrality~~ work towards reducing their carbon footprint as quickly as possible.

**Bold climate change** action can deliver economic benefits to Surrey in terms of valuable new jobs, essential economic savings and much needed market opportunities (as well as improved well-being for people worldwide).

The UK has a world-first Climate Change Act with a legally-binding target of an 80 per cent emissions cut by 2050, and shorter-term national carbon budgets ensuring year-on-year emissions cuts.

The Government has made a commitment to be the first generation to leave the environment in a better state than we inherited it and we welcome the Environment (Principles and Governance) Bill, the first in over twenty years, which will be an essential step towards this goal. The Government has pledged to support increased biodiversity and thriving plants and wildlife and to continue to clean up our air and our water, creating a healthier environment.

Full Council to therefore resolves that:

- ~~1. Declare a 'Climate Emergency' in Surrey;~~
- ~~2. Pledge to make Surrey carbon neutral by 2030 and strive to work with Surrey's borough and district Councils in taking a leadership role, taking into account both production and consumption emissions;~~
- ~~1. It will continue to work Surrey will continue to work with Boroughs and Districts to reduce the Surrey-wide carbon footprint to meet the Government's targets work towards zero emissions;~~
- ~~3. Call on the Government to provide the powers and resources to make the 2030 target possible;~~
- ~~2. It will continue to work with the Government on environmental issues and to agree any new powers to assist delivery of the carbon targets;~~
- ~~3. It will be proactive in contributing to the many consultations that have been launched on reducing carbon emissions.~~
- ~~4. Report to County Council within six months with the actions the Council will take to address this.~~

Full Council also notes that the Cabinet will receive the updated SCC Carbon and Energy Policy for 2020-2025 in December 2019, replacing the current 2015/19 policy.

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

- That Surrey's 2030 Vision stated that residents wanted to live in a clean, safe and green community.
- That Surrey was one of the greenest counties in the country.
- There was more work to be done with districts and boroughs and the government to achieve zero carbon emissions in the country.
- The government's target was a 60% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030.
- That the Council's carbon and energy policy was due to be updated at the end of 2019.
- Highlighted various Council policies which promoted energy efficiency.
- Announced that the Council would be the first Council in the country to use exclusively paper straws.
- That improving air quality was everyone's responsibility.
- That he would be writing to Mr Michael Gove MP on the contents of the motion and the issues that face Surrey County Council. It was agreed to circulate the letter to Members of the Council.

Twelve Members made the following points on the amendment:

- They felt the motion negated the original motion.
- The original motion should have had cross party support.
- Climate change was one of the biggest issues of the age.
- That more needed to be done to mitigate the risk.
- That the Council had committed to a single-use plastic policy.
- The amendment was not in the interests of Surrey.
- It was the Council's duty to respond to climate change and that more ambition was needed.
- That the Environment Agency had reported that there would be a water crisis due to population increase and climate change.
- The original motion would fail due to its extreme language.
- That it was not for politicians to debate if climate science is true.
- That they wanted to commit to realistic outcomes.

Mr Ellwood, as seconder of the amendment, made the following comments:

- That the Council had introduced electric buses for park and ride services.
- The Council encouraged employees to use shared transport.
- That he was introducing a scheme that would allow children to monitor the air quality at pick up and drop off times.
- That targets should be manageable.

The Chairman asked Mr Goodman to conclude the debate. He made the following comments:

- That everyone agreed that something needed to be done to improve the climate situation.
- That he would discuss the benefits of an Environment Select Committee Task Group on the Council's carbon policy.
- The time was not right to commit to a 2030 deadline for neutral carbon emissions.
- That he accepts that there is still more to be done.

In accordance with Standing Order 28.1, Mr Essex requested a recorded vote to be taken on the amendment to the motion. At least ten Members showed support for this request by standing.

The following Members voted for it:

Mrs Angell, Ms Azad, Mr Beckett, Mr Bennison, Mrs Bramhall, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mrs Curran, Mr Ellwood, Mr Tim Evans, Mr Few, Mr Furey, Mr Furniss, Mr Gardner, Mr Goodman, Miss Griffiths, Dr Grant-Duff, Mr Gulati, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Mr Harris, Mr Harrison, Mr Hawkins, Miss Heath, Mr Hussain, Mrs Iles, Mr Islam, Mr Kington, Rachael Lake, Mrs Lay, Mrs Lewis, Mr McIntosh, Mr Mansfield, Mr Martin, Mrs Mooney, Ms Morley, Mrs Mountain, Mr Nuti, Mr Oliver, Mr O'Reilly, Dr Povey, Mrs Rush, Mr Samuels, Dr Szanto, Mr Taylor, Ms Thomson, Mrs Thorn, Ms Turner-Stewart, Mr Walsh, Mr Witham, Mrs Young

And the following Members voted against it:

Mr Botten, Mr Darby, Mr Essex, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Forster, Mrs Goodwin, Mr Lee, Mr MacLeod, Mr Mallett, Mrs Mason, Mrs Rivers, Mrs Watson, Mrs White

The following Members abstained:

Mr Townsend

Therefore the amendment was carried by 52 votes to 13 and the amended motion became the substantive motion.

The motion was put to a vote with 49 members voting for, 10 against and 3 abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

**RESOLVED:**

Full Council believes that:

Surrey County Council and all governments (national, regional and local) should seek to limit the negative impacts of Climate Breakdown, and local governments that recognise this should not wait for their national governments to change their policies.

The Council recognises the work that has already been done to tackle Surrey's carbon footprint and it is important for the residents of Surrey to work towards reducing their carbon footprint as quickly as possible.

Bold climate change action can deliver economic benefits to Surrey in terms of valuable new jobs, essential economic savings and much needed market opportunities (as well as improved well-being for people worldwide).

The UK has a world-first Climate Change Act with a legally-binding target of an 80 per cent emissions cut by 2050, and shorter-term national carbon budgets ensuring year-on-year emissions cuts.

The Government has made a commitment to be the first generation to leave the environment in a better state than we inherited it and we welcome the Environment (Principles and Governance) Bill, the first in over twenty years, which will be an essential step towards this goal. The Government has pledged to support increased biodiversity and thriving plants and wildlife and to continue to clean up our air and our water, creating a healthier environment.

Full Council therefore resolves that:

1. Surrey will continue to work with Boroughs and Districts to work towards zero emissions;
2. It will continue to work with the Government on environmental issues and to agree any new powers to assist delivery of the carbon targets;
3. It will be proactive in contributing to the many consultations that have been launched on reducing carbon emissions.

Full Council also notes that the Cabinet will receive the updated SCC Carbon and Energy Policy for 2020-2025 in December 2019, replacing the current 2015/19 policy.

## **21/18 SURREY PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2019/20 [Item 9]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and stated that a large amount of work had been put into creating a fair policy.

Cllr Rachael I Lake, Mr Nick Darby and Mr Keith Witham all declared non-pecuniary interests in this item.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the Pay Policy Statement for 2019/2020 be agreed.

## **22/18 A THRIVING COMMUNITY OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IN SURREY. A STRATEGY FOR THEIR EMOTIONAL WELLBEING AND MENTAL HEALTH [Item 10]**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and stated that mental health was a key part of the Surrey Health Plan. It was noted that pages 73 & 74 of the agenda outlined outcomes which measured how Surrey would make an impact. The Leader of the Council undertook to ensure that the strategy would be regularly reviewed by the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Members made the following comments:

- That it was positive that mental health was being spoken about publically.
- The Council wanted those in need to have access the appropriate services.
- That the Council should be aware of the negatives of maintaining too many strategies and that funding should be concentrated on children and their wellbeing.
- That the service was investigating best practice at other local authorities.
- They were pleased that there was a positive discussion at the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- That proposals were to give access to those who interact regularly with young people with an expert team to provide mental health for support.
- The young people of Surrey had said that mental health services were a priority.
- Further detail was requested on the circumstances around the Child Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) within the Council's transformation. The Cabinet Member for All Age Learning confirmed that plans were in place and that a full response would be circulated outside of the meeting.
- They were pleased that the strategy supported early intervention.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Council approved the strategy.

## **23/18 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 11]**

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 26 February 2019.

**Reports for Information/ Discussion**

- A) Surrey Performing Arts Library – Evaluation of NewSPAL Business Plan
- B) Surrey County Council Preparations for Exiting the European Union (Brexit)

**RESOLVED:**

That the report of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 26 February 2019 be adopted.

**24/18 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 12]**

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.55 pm]

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank