

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT WOODHATCH PLACE, 11 COCKSHOT HILL, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 8EF, ON 13 JULY 2021 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:

Helyn Clack (Chair)
Saj Hussain (Vice-Chair)

Maureen Attewell	Eber Kington
Ayesha Azad	Rachael Lake
Catherine Baart	Victor Lewanski
Steve Bax	David Lewis (Cobham)
John Beckett	* David Lewis (Camberley West)
Jordan Beech	Scott Lewis
Luke Bennett	Andy Lynch
Amanda Boote	Andy MacLeod
Liz Bowes	Ernest Mallett MBE
Natalie Bramhall	Michaela Martin
Stephen Cooksey	Jan Mason
Colin Cross	Steven McCormick
Clare Curran	* Cameron McIntosh
Nick Darby	* Julia McShane
Fiona Davidson	* Sinead Mooney
* Paul Deach	Carla Morson
Kevin Deanus	Bernie Muir
Jonathan Essex	Mark Nuti
Robert Evans	* John O'Reilly
Chris Farr	Tim Oliver
Paul Follows	Rebecca Paul
Will Forster	George Potter
* John Furey	Catherine Powell
Matt Furniss	* Penny Rivers
Angela Goodwin	John Robini
* Jeffrey Gray	Becky Rush
* Alison Griffiths	Tony Samuels
Tim Hall	* Joanne Sexton
David Harmer	Lance Spencer
* Nick Harrison	Lesley Steeds
Edward Hawkins	Mark Sugden
Marisa Heath	Richard Tear
Trefor Hogg	Chris Townsend
Robert Hughes	Liz Townsend
Jonathan Hulley	Denise Turner-Stewart
* Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Hazel Watson
Frank Kelly	Jeremy Webster
Riasat Khan	Buddhi Weerasinghe
Robert King	Fiona White
	Keith Witham

*absent

43/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Paul Deach, John Furey, Jeffrey Gray, Alison Griffiths, Nick Harrison, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis (Camberley West), Cameron McIntosh, Julia McShane, Sinead Mooney, John O'Reilly, Penny Rivers and Joanne Sexton.

44/21 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 25 May 2021 were submitted and confirmed.

45/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Robert Hughes declared an interest as he was the Chief Executive for the charity, Sight for Surrey, which operated two contracts for Surrey County Council for adult social care and one contract for education; and stated that he would not participate in items concerning the above.

John Robini declared an interest regarding item 8: Original Motions, 8 (i) concerning street lighting as he worked for Surrey Police as a Crime Prevention Design Advisor and helped Surrey to plan its present policy.

46/21 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chair:

- Referred to her announcements as published in the supplementary agenda and led a minute's silence to remember Donald Thwaites and Dorothy Mitchell.

47/21 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:

- Noted highways as an area of concern which affected all residents and on which Members received a large volume of correspondence; further noted concern that Members were not consulted upon regarding the major changes proposed in the Highways Service noting concern in the loss of local knowledge in the Highways team and the lack of information provided by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure.
- Highlighted Your Fund Surrey as an area of concern, that proper governance was critical noting that the rules setting out the detail on the spend of the £100 million had been delayed and queried when the change in the Advisory Panel making the final decision on shortlisted applications was made.
- Noted supported living units as an area of concern, ensuring value for money was vital; further noted Cabinet's recent approval for a feasibility costs for four sites of which £1 million of the £1.9 million feasibility costs was for demolition and queried why no formal valuation report was taken to Cabinet on the £16 million purchase of the Dakota building in Brooklands.

- That as a 'critical friend' it was right to highlight the above issues of concern to the Council's current Conservative Party administration recognising the balance with Covid-19 recovery and looking out for the disadvantaged.
- That with the upcoming lifting of Covid-19 restrictions, questioned whether the Leader would encourage residents to continue to wear face masks in the absence of legal requirements.
- Welcomed the Leader's mention of the recent Ofsted visit and full inspection by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Services of Surrey Fire & Rescue Service, hoping that the relevant select committees would review the reports.
- Disagreed that the public would struggle to meet the Council's climate change commitments as many members of the public were urging local and national authorities to tackle the climate emergency; offered cross-party support to meet that commitment and hoped that the ambitions set out in the updated Surrey Transport Plan - LTP4 would be followed up with action and funding.
- Noted that Covid-19 showed the need to get ahead of the curve, crucial with the upcoming lifting of Covid-19 restrictions on 19 July as infection rates and hospital admissions increase; asked the Council to lobby the Government to ensure that the vulnerable were protected.
- That early intervention was in health was vital by reversing the Council's underfunding of public health querying what plans there were to support those with long Covid-19 and the wider mental health needs in Surrey.
- Queried how the Leader's call to encourage more residents to 'join up and join in' applied to children's early intervention, supporting families and the provision of universal youth support.
- Asked how the social care system would be transformed from an early intervention approach, addressing the systemic underfunding of children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).
- On early intervention regarding roads, asked whether the Leader had approached the Department for Transport for funding as Surrey had received a £400 million cut for local road maintenance; Government funding was needed to realise the Surrey Transport Plan - LTP4 focusing on road safety and sustainability measures not at the expense of Government funding on international road expansion and house building on Surrey's green belt.
- Asked whether the Leader would call on the Government to reduce handouts for incineration, early intervention on waste was crucial in order to boost plans to eliminate single-use plastics in Surrey and to reuse and recycle ensuring a green economy.
- That earlier intervention on climate change was critical, going further than reversing earlier cuts to building maintenance towards retrofitting schools, buildings and transport networks.
- Early intervention and the reversal of funding for late intervention was vital, asked the Leader to reset the approach to fairer funding for Surrey by lobbying for sufficient long-term sustainable funding for all councils.
- On the Surrey Transport Plan - LTP4, welcomed the Leader's commitment to increase bus services and asked whether that meant a reversal in cuts in routes and timetables over the past decade and an improvement in transport links across Surrey going forward.
- Referred to a previous original motion adopted by the Council which stated that Surrey would not approve any further expansion of Heathrow Airport until there was a firm commitment to ensuring adequate train links to Surrey

and asked whether the Leader would reiterate his commitment to a train route improving transport links between Heathrow Airport and Surrey.

- Noted that many members of staff found the journey to Woodhatch Place, Reigate longer than their previous route to County Hall, Kingston; asked whether the Leader would put in place a policy to encourage car sharing or a method to facilitate easier access to and from Reigate train station.

48/21 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Questions:

Notice of twenty-two questions had been received. The questions and replies were published in the supplementary agenda on 12 July 2021.

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

The Chair explained that in light of the unique set-up of the meeting due to Covid-19, the supplementary questions were to be grouped by the relevant Cabinet Member who would respond to all the supplementaries together:

MARK NUTI, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES

(Q5) Catherine Powell asked whether the Cabinet Member could provide the Council with a map of the applications for Your Fund Surrey (YFS) overlaid on a colour-coded map of the Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) to highlight the deprived areas at greatest risk of being left behind, so intervention can be targeted.

She further asked whether the Cabinet Member could provide a list of all of the applications that had been made to YFS including an additional column on the Index of Multiple Deprivation.

In response the Cabinet Member noted that he would look to get the requested information and explained that YFS was not designated specifically for deprived areas but for communities as a whole recognising that some areas required more help and services than others.

He urged Members to talk to their communities and to help them with projects that would benefit their areas. There were at present over one hundred and forty applications to the YFS website, a low number in respect of the aim of YFS to get communities involved. Whilst it was too early to provide data with the funding process to start later in the month, over the next year the applications would be monitored and areas would be identified where greater resources were needed to bring forward projects.

(Q8) Robert Evans noted that even before the last round of cuts to the SFRS under the Making Surrey Safer Plan, Home Office statistics showed that Surrey had seen the sharpest rise in the number of deaths in house fires. He asked the Cabinet Member whether it was the case that there were no plans to restore the number for firefighters in Surrey or if he could rule out further cuts in the numbers over the next few years.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that there were more firefighters coming through with a passing out ceremony taking place on 25 July. The

combination of more firefighters, ensuring a service fit for purpose, utilising new and effective technology meant that Surrey was safe and was getting safer daily, he reassured Members and residents that the SFRS protected Surrey and prevented fires from happening.

Robert King asked whether the Cabinet Member could rule out further closures to fire stations across the county in the future.

The Cabinet Member explained that since the 2018 report which stated that SFRS was not fit for purpose, SFRS over the past eighteen months had been revamped but noted that there was more work to do. He emphasised that the number of fire stations was irrelevant, what mattered was the safety of Surrey's residents with fire appliances and engines constantly moved to high risk areas.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

(Q1) Jonathan Hulley welcomed the Cabinet's decision to promote the HGV (Heavy Goods Vehicle) Watch scheme and welcomed the recent election of Lisa Townsend as the new Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (PCC). He asked the Cabinet Member what steps he intended to take to ensure that the PCC and Surrey Police would provide the operational support needed to ensure that the scheme was a success initially in the pilot areas and then across Surrey.

In response, the Cabinet Member welcomed the election of the new PCC and noted the work between the Highways Service and Surrey Police, noting the Government announcement on local authorities outside of London able to levy fines on moving traffic offences from the autumn. He noted the collaborative work on Drive SMART, operational support from Surrey Police including their powers to fine repeat offenders; the additional powers granted from the Government would allow the Highways Service to a greater role on enforcement.

Robert King asked whether the Cabinet Member would commit to reviewing the diversionary routes - many through residential areas, noting speeding incidents - for the mandatory HGV routes for when the M25 was closed. He asked whether he would consider a review with Highways England and the provision of additional safety measures.

The Cabinet Member noted that he would raise the issue on the HGV diversion routes in relation to the closure of the M25 again with Highways England. He noted that concerns about speeding should be raised with Surrey Police, or to liaise with him regarding establishing a local HGV Watch.

(Q4) Nick Darby had no supplementary question.

Chris Townsend responded to the Leader's earlier comment by noting that answering highways queries from residents was part of Members' duty. Referring to the proposed Highways reorganisation he noted dissatisfaction with the response given at the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure Decisions, he asked the Cabinet Member to explain how the reorganisation would improve the service delivered to residents and how the increased centralised structure would improve that.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that following the conclusion of the staff consultation, the proposals would be shared with Members and he

emphasised that the purpose of the restructuring was to increase the engagement, quality, capacity and consistency of all the Highways services provided to Members and residents.

In a later comment the Leader clarified that Members unfortunately had to spend a substantial amount of time dealing with residents' highways issues, noting that he hoped the Highways reorganisation and additional funding would deliver the required improvements.

(Q7) Lance Spencer noted that in the past two months he had received fifty pieces of casework the majority related to Active Travel and asked whether the Cabinet Member would consider setting up a fund for Active Travel similar to that of YFS, in order to provide additional capital funds for projects that would encourage Active Travel to reduce car journeys in line with the Surrey Transport Plan - LTP4 and Surrey's Greener Future action plans.

In response, the Cabinet Member noted the existing similar website for the Active Travel Fund, in which a significant number of suggestions had been received from residents for improvements. He explained that the Government awarded Surrey just under £6.5 million in the second round of Active Travel funding and Surrey's bid for a third round was underway and would look to include what additional financial measures would be required to take forward one hundred of the schemes proposed by Surrey's residents.

Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member whether he could confirm that the new highways specification would be updated when the new Future Highways contract was set so that local failures such as the collapse of speed humps could be included as defects. He further suggested the strengthening of the contract by having an early intervention approach addressing issues such as the delay of filling potholes until they were at least forty millimetres deep undermining road integrity and increasing the need for re-surfacing; and asked if it was possible to separate the contract for pothole filling.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that the Future Highways contract was in its final stage with information on bidders included in his Cabinet Member Briefing. He noted that the Highways Service was constantly reviewing how improvements could be made, policies were set by the Highways Service who sought to achieve best value for money for Surrey's residents and not by the contractor. He noted that the forty millimetre threshold for pothole filling was a national average for highway authorities across the UK and was one of reasons that Surrey installed artificial intelligence (AI) cameras in all highways vehicles so it could identify potholes before they reached that depth. He did not agree with the suggestion of separating funding out for particular elements.

(Q9) Catherine Baart noted that she had asked specifically for a list of twenty miles per hour speed limit zones and dates proposed to the Local Committees and dates when the first signs went up and requested a written response providing that detail.

In response, the Cabinet Member noted that it was important to set out the most recent twenty miles per hour speed limit schemes approved by Surrey, he noted that he would provide the list to all Members of the ten most recent twenty miles per hour speed limit zones and the dates introduced.

(Q18) Robert Evans noted the need for greater co-operation such as through joint initiatives or bodies with London Boroughs bordering Surrey such as Hounslow, Hillingdon and Slough. Noting the re-election of Sadiq Khan as the Mayor of London, he asked whether the Cabinet Member thought the Council should have better formal links with the Mayor of London and Member-to-Member links with the Greater London Assembly (GLA).

In response, the Cabinet Member noted the further difficult discussions going forward with the Mayor of London and the GLA on the possible Greater London Boundary Charge. The Highways Service would look to foster better relations with the Mayor of London and GLA, but noted disappointment that announcements were often made without Surrey being briefed.

(Q20) Jonathan Essex understood that from the response it meant that there would be an additional £3 million in funding to meet the backlog of forty-nine out of seventy-eight school safety measures outstanding since 2014 concerning the Road Safety Outside Schools policy, and asked whether the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure could confirm when that £3 million would be available to meet the backlog. He noted that the report explained that there would be an additional twenty-one assessments scheduled and in addition to the £3 million one-off funding to address the backlog, whether the Cabinet Member would propose additional capital funding to ensure that when measures came up for school safety audits they would be responded to without delay.

In response, the Cabinet Member noted that it was his intention to remove the capital funding stream for school safety from the Local Committees and to provide a dedicated fund to the school safety team so it could use the funding without competing with other local requests received through the Local Committees.

CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

(Q6) Fiona White noted that the response highlighted the substantial funding cuts to the Children's Service and asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families whether she agreed that children's futures must be a priority and that early intervention was key for families and children, in turn placing less strain on public funding. She asked the Cabinet Member whether she reviewed the high workload of family support workers who had limited time available for each family.

In response, the Cabinet Member stressed that early intervention and prevention were fundamental principles across the work of the Children's Service, supported by increased funding and resources. She noted that the Service had worked to build an effective Early Help network. Detailed information about the number of families who approached the system and were stepped up and down from statutory services as well as on the caseloads of all staff were regularly monitored.

George Potter noted that the responses to parts b) and c) of the question did not answer the points raised, part b) asked about the measurement of progress in achieving the effective provision of services through the Family Centre models following the closure of Children's Centres. Part c) asked for the steps taken to assess the impact of the withdrawal of support through the Children's Centres. He noted a closure in a Children's Centre adjacent to his division which meant an hour journey to the nearest Family Centre.

He asked to have qualitative and quantitative data on whether the goal of effective service provision had been achieved from the move to the Family Centre model and whether families and children in need had been left behind or not.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that the work of Family Centres was targeted to those families most in need of those services, families who did not meet the criteria for Early Help were sign-posted to universal services in communities. She echoed the comment in the Leader's Statement about compassionate communities and local networks of support. She noted that Family Centres worked on the basis of outreach and for the Member to liaise with her on a specific example.

(Q10) John Robini asked the Cabinet Member whether there would be a cohesive children's and families plan across the county, as it appeared that some communities like his division - particularly those disadvantaged - did not have the universal models in place.

In response, the Cabinet Member noted the hard work of the commissioning team to ensure a county-wide provision of youth services which it monitored closely. She noted that in addition to the commissioning of universal services in buildings owned by the Council, in every Borough and District there were other local providers of youth work, highlighting the Leatherhead Youth Project and Bookham Youth Project.

(Q11) Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member whether the review of the Surrey County Council youth estate in the autumn would include the estate locations where Community, Voluntary and Faith Sector (CVFS) organisations were not using Council buildings in order to see if a new dedicated facility for youth work was required and if not the case he queried how the gap in the provision of universal youth work by CVFS organisations and others could be closed in order to prevent a postcode lottery.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained within the review of the youth estate there would be a detailed review of the usage of the buildings and the provision across the county by providers including the third sector. She invited all Members who knew of local youth work provision by other external providers in their divisions to be involved in that review.

(Q22) Jonathan Essex asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm who the Council was contracting the Family Centres to, when the contract would run to and how the contract was monitored.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that she would provide written answers on the above in relation to the contracts, reiterating that the all the work in the Family Centres was closely monitored, quarterly at the level of individual Family Centres and monthly across the Children's Service.

Lance Spencer noted that it was clear that the closure of the Sure Start centres would lead to an increase in demand for mental health services, he asked the Cabinet Member whether the Cabinet Member could say how long on average and what the maximum time was for children have to wait to get an assessment through the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and whether those times had increased since those closures.

In response, the Cabinet Member disagreed that the closure of any Sure Start centres would have impacted on the emotional health and wellbeing of children, as those centres were for young families. Provision for youth emotional health and wellbeing support was delivered through Youth Havens, youth workers and schools as well as early intervention and prevention support through the new I-Thrive model in operation since April. She noted that she would provide a written response containing the details of waiting times and any historic delays regarding CAMHS assessments.

MARISA HEATH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT

(Q2) Jeremy Webster welcomed the recent arrangements set out in the response allowing pedestrian access at certain times and asked the Cabinet Member that once Covid-19 restrictions were relaxed whether the Caterham Community Recycling Centre (CRC) and other similar CRCs would return to mixed vehicular and pedestrian access in normal hours.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that the aim would be to return to pre-Covid-19 hours and access, noting the importance of encouraging people to access the CRCs. That in the next couple of months she would be working to ensure that pedestrian access could be done safely through a pedestrian gateway and would keep the Member informed.

(Q12) Trefor Hogg noted that as the Chair of Surrey Tree Warden Network charity, he asked what was being done regarding trees - particularly street trees. He praised the first-year achievement of the planting of nearly a quarter of a million trees and asked the Cabinet Member how many trees were expected to be planted in 2021 and how voluntary organisations would be helped to participate in the effort.

In response, the Cabinet Member suggested that she and the Member have a separate meeting to address the above points raised. She explained that Surrey's New Tree Strategy which included the planting of 1.2 million trees by 2030 would be reviewed to consider how trees were managed across the county and Surrey's highways, ensuring that as many trees as possible would be protected.

TIM OLIVER, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

(Q3) Eber Kington noted that he would continue to ask questions on the issue of highly paid directors as it was a concern of his residents. Unsatisfied with the written response, he asked the Leader to provide a written answer to part II. of his question concerning the Council's future plans for its workforce.

In response, the Leader using the example of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, assumed an average of two or in some cases three senior officers earning above £100,000 across all of Surrey's Borough and District Councils, which equated to twenty-four compared to twenty-six officers in Surrey County Council earning above £100,000. Across a population of 1.2 million residents and a £1 billion budget, that was not disproportionate. He highlighted that there was full transparency on the publication of senior salaries, as those were published in the Statement of Accounts.

The Leader noted that part II. of the question had been answered in his written response referring to the third paragraph which stated that the only planned

recruitment to PS18 was for the permanent appointment to the Executive Director - Customers and Communities.

Under SO 16.1 (c) Eber Kington stated that his question did not relate to the transparency concerning senior officer salaries, but the rising number of officers with salaries over £100,000.

NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND PROPERTY

(Q21) Catherine Baart asked the Cabinet Member whether an officer was working to a deadline for the delivery plan - regarding the Woodhatch Place travel plan - which would be delivered to the Cabinet Member.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that an officer was working to a deadline and she would share the delivery plan once received.

Cabinet Member Briefings: these were also published in the supplementary agenda on 12 July 2021.

There were no questions asked by Members.

49/21 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

Keith Witham made a statement on the illegal waste site at Stoney Castle in Pirbright, urging the Council to continue to work with partners to decontaminate the site and bring those responsible to justice.

Jan Mason made a statement on the lack of youth provision in West Ewell, referring to the Watersedge Estate and the local Edge Youth Centre noting concern that it was only open one evening a week; Youth Centres were vital to health of young people.

50/21 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

Item 8 (i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Eber Kington moved:

This Council notes that:

- Following the tragic murder of Sarah Everard on the evening of 3 March 2021, ensuring the right to feel safe walking our streets at night has become a major requirement for political action across the country.
- Women have made their voices heard, and too many of them express the view that they do not feel safe walking alone in public places.
- Speaking in March, Dame Cressida Dick, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police said, "Right now, 80% of women report being harassed in public spaces, but 90% of them don't bother reporting it because they don't think anything will happen if they do."

- The immediate Government response to Sarah’s murder included an additional £25 million to councils around the country to help enhance street lighting in areas of poor illumination, as well as improving CCTV coverage.
- The issue of feeling safe at night has also been raised by Surrey residents who are night-time workers, late night commuters out of London, those attending late night music venues, and those walking home after meeting family and friends.

This Council further notes that:

- Surrey County Council has a policy that sees Surrey streetlights switched off at night, at a time when the political debate and majority opinion is clearly calling for streetlighting to be improved as one of the positive moves that can be taken towards residents feeling safe in our streets.
- Surrey County Council is investing £19.9 million over a 3-year period to convert all Surrey’s streetlights to LED, with a target saving of £2 million a year.

In light of the factors listed above, this Council calls upon to the Cabinet:

- I. To make a commitment to end the streetlight switch-off as soon as is practicable, but as a matter of urgency.
- II. To fund the additional costs out of the £2 million saving on the switch to LED streetlights.

Eber Kington made the following points:

- Noted the failure by the Council’s administration to put forward a speaker to defend its part-night lighting policy on BBC Radio Surrey, instead providing a statement.
- That it had taken tragic events to highlight the injustices and fears faced by many and for their voices to be heard to inspire national and international action; noting the political and social movements following the sexual abuse cases brought against Harvey Weinstein - #MeToo - and murders of George Floyd - Black Lives Matter - and Sarah Everard - Reclaim These Streets.
- That the right to feel safe on the streets had become a major requirement for action by the Government providing an additional £25 million for councils to enhance street lighting and improve CCTV, the Metropolitan Police deployed twenty-five female neighbourhood officers in Lambeth and Southwark to hear the common concerns of women.
- Noted national action to address the issue of better street lighting and disappointment with the Council’s response to switch street lights back on if Surrey Police requested it, as opposed to residents’ requests.
- That 87% of women at some point in their lives did not feel safe at night and wanted those in power to respond and take action.
- Noted the Council’s outdated policy and inactive approach on street lighting launched in 2016 which did not address the fears of many, compared to national action through the Safer Streets Fund.

- That the Council was currently spending £3.5 million on energy use, by converting to light-emitting diode (LED) street lighting 60% less energy would be used so saving £2 million annually also reducing light pollution.
- That the cost of keeping all the street lights on all night in Surrey once converted to LED would be £113,000, a small sum towards safer streets.
- Recognised that improved street lighting alone would not result in safer streets, physical changes such as moving bus stops were also important, but such changes were worthless if men's attitudes did not change.
- That whilst he could not speak on behalf of women's direct experiences, such experiences were all too common to be ignored - it was vital to support policy decisions and actions that would lead to change.
- That support of the motion would signal the Council's acknowledgement of the voices calling for safer streets and it would end the part-night lighting policy.

The motion was formally seconded by Catherine Powell, who made the following comments:

- Emphasised that all residents had the right to feel safe so that their emotions and behaviours led them to thrive rather than survive.
- Highlighted that not all incidents of sexual harassment were reported to the police, an investigation by UN Women UK found that 97% of women aged 18-24 years had been sexually harassed and a further 96% did not report those incidents because of the belief that nothing would change.
- That the Council was working towards empowering communities, to address inequalities and improve health and wellbeing; and so all had a right to feel safe when walking the streets, yet most women felt unsafe when walking home at night when street lights were switched off.
- That there had been little improvement to women's feeling of safety in the last thirty years, noting sadness in needing to share advice on key holding for self-defence to her daughters.
- Reiterated the small cost to the Council of £113,000 to keep the street lights switched on all night - once converted to LED Surrey-wide.
- Recognised the need to address climate change and the issues caused by light pollution but noted that the mental and wellbeing of young women was paramount.
- Urged the Council to support the motion to stand up for the silent majority and to build thriving and unfearful communities.

Catherine Baart moved an amendment which had been published in the supplementary agenda (12 July 2021), which was formally seconded by Robert King.

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

This Council notes that:

- Following the tragic murder of Sarah Everard on the evening of 3 March 2021, ~~ensuring the right to feel safe walking our streets at night has become a major requirement for political action across the country.~~
- ~~W~~women have made their voices heard, and too many of them express the view that they do not feel safe walking alone in public places. Speaking in March, Dame Cressida Dick, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police said, "Right now, 80% of women report being harassed in public spaces, but 90% of them don't bother reporting it because they don't think anything will happen if they do."
- The immediate Government response to Sarah's murder included an additional £25 million to councils around the country to **fund innovative and creative proposals to improve the safety of public spaces including improving** ~~help enhance~~ street lighting in areas of poor illumination, ~~as well as improving~~ **and** CCTV coverage, **education and awareness raising (Safer Streets Fund Round 3 – Protecting Public Spaces Guidance for Bidders, June 2021).**
- The issue of feeling safe at night has also been raised by Surrey residents who are night-time workers, late night commuters out of London, those attending late night music venues, and those walking home after meeting family and friends. **In contrast, light pollution is widely recognised as having impacts on both sleep patterns and on nature.**
- **Further investigation into what makes everyone safer in all streets at night as well as at specific locations is warranted.**
- **Surrey's street lights can now be turned on and off individually, and as they are LED lights are now able to be dimmed to lower lighting levels than before, and could be activated using motion sensors, as successfully trialled elsewhere.**

This Council further notes that:

- Surrey County Council has a policy that sees Surrey streetlights switched off at night, at a time when the political debate and majority opinion is clearly calling for streetlighting to be improved as one of the positive moves that can be taken towards residents feeling safe in our streets.
- Surrey County Council is investing £19.9 million over a 3-year period to convert all Surrey's streetlights to LED, with a target saving of £2 million **and 7,700 tonnes of carbon emissions** a year; **as agreed in the 2021/22 budget and medium term financial strategy.**

In light of the factors listed above, this Council calls upon to the Cabinet:

- To make a commitment to end the streetlight switch-off as soon as is practicable, but as a matter of urgency, **by making full use of the LED street light technology available to have selected lights back on, with a range of brightness settings.**
- ~~To fund the additional costs out of the £2 million saving on the switch to LED streetlights.~~

III. **To set out how changes to streetlight settings can be targeted in areas with higher of Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) and areas of higher public safety need, in line with the guidance for the Safer Streets Fund, through engagement with residents and the police.**

Catherine Baart spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- That in her direct experience men who decide to harass women do not wait to night-time or darkness, instead they were influenced by others around them likely to intervene.
- Stressed that solely switching all street lights back on all the time would not make both women and men feel safe, awareness raising and education about behaviours to help others feel safe on the streets at night was vital.
- That it was important to acknowledge the disadvantages to having street lights on all night including light pollution, harming sleep and nocturnal wildlife.
- That when deciding to alter levels of illumination the Council should listen to its residents and acknowledge that crime data held by Surrey Police did not always reflect residents' feelings of safety, often harassment incidents were not reported.
- That active travel at night would help people's feeling of safety and the new LED street light technology should be used intelligently and flexibly.

The amendment was formally seconded by Robert King, who reserved his right to speak.

Mark Nuti left the meeting at 12.00 pm

Eber Kington did not accept the amendment and therefore the amendment was open for debate.

Four Members made the following comments on the amendment:

- Expressed concern on the fourth bullet point concerning light pollution as a counter to the motion, noting a past experience where conventional street lighting was shown to be adjustable in its direction and voltage; and questioned whether that was the case with LED street lighting.
- Noted that not feeling safe walking the streets at night-time was applicable also to children.
- Stressed that crucial to the debate was both the feeling and perception of safety. Referring to LED street lights, queried whether they would 'be activated using motion sensors' in the additional sixth bullet point.
- That in the second resolution, noted the omission of the word 'levels' in the sentence 'higher [...] of Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG)' and that it was wrong to suggest that there could be a justifiable level of violence.
- That in the second resolution it was incorrect to target 'areas of higher public safety need', referred again to the feeling and perception of safety.
- Agreed with the proposer of the original motion that street lighting was not the sole action to remedy public safety at night, a culture was needed in which people felt safe and able to report incidents to the police.

- Stressed that continuing to work closely with Surrey Police was crucial and the original motion and first amendment did not go far enough in its collaboration, it was vital to ensure that the Surrey Police and Crime Panel was raising the issue of public safety with the PCC.
- Had sympathy with the amendment which recognised the importance of education in schools on personal safety for all, rather than instilling fear such as holding keys as a weapon.
- That it was crucial to stop the inherited fear of the dark.
- That when the Council first implemented its policy on switching off some street lights between 1am - 5am back in 2016, Members were asked on which roads street lights should remain on and noted that all twenty-eight requests in her division from residents were upheld and that option remained available.

Eber Kington noted the following comments in response to not accepting the amendment:

- That it was not possible to agree a compromise between the motion and amendment as the national debate was centred on both the feeling and perception of safety particularly by women on the streets at night-time.
- That the amendment ran a risk inherent in the current policy which allowed the politicians and police to determine what was right for residents regardless of their own perceptions.
- That it was important that people expressed their own experiences.
- Reiterated the call for change by the motion by recognising the 80% of women who did not feel safe at night or at some point in their lives in public spaces and the 96% of women who did not report such incidents.
- That the focus must not be on educating women not to fear, questioning why men could not be educated so their actions do not lead to women feeling unsafe.
- Questioned the deletion in the first bullet point on 'ensuring the right to feel safe walking our streets at night has become a major requirement for political action across the country'.
- That the addition in the first resolution on switching on 'selected lights' fell into the trap of current policy making decisions before looking at the evidence.
- Questioned how the second resolution could be supported regarding targeting changes to street light settings in areas of higher violence levels.

Robert King, the seconder of the amendment, made the following comments:

- Noted that due to his on gender and age he had different experiences to women and other individuals of a different age.
- Noted that whilst the concerns by women, shift workers and NHS workers in his division who did not feel safe on the streets at night were not solely related to street lighting, it played an important role in relation to CCTV cameras.
- That the Council must not shirk its responsibility over public safety, recognising that police resources were stretched proving it challenging for Members to get street lights turned on, the amendment sought greater engagement.

- That the original motion was based on the study by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine in 2015 which tried to link street lights being turned off to crime rises, but there was no conclusive link found.
- That crime prevention was as much about public awareness and the perception of crime so actions must be taken including but not limited to turning street lights on in affected areas.

The Chair asked Catherine Baart, as proposer of the amendment to conclude the debate:

Noted that she had no further comments to add.

The amendment was put to the vote with 16 Members voting For, 51 voting Against and 1 Abstention.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

Returning to the substantive motion, Matt Furniss moved an amendment which had been published in the supplementary agenda (12 July 2021), which was formally seconded by Tim Hall.

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

This Council notes that:

- Following the tragic murder of Sarah Everard on the evening of 3 March 2021, ~~ensuring the right to feel safe walking our streets at night has become a major requirement for political action across the country.~~ **by an officer of the Police has left the public and everyone in policing feeling betrayed. It is never right for, talented young woman who had her whole life ahead of her to have it snatched away.**
- Women have made their voices heard, and too many of them express the view that they do not feel safe walking alone in public places.
- Speaking in March, Dame Cressida Dick, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police said, "Right now, 80% of women report being harassed in public spaces, but 90% of them don't bother reporting it because they don't think anything will happen if they do."
- The immediate Government response to Sarah's murder included an additional £25 million to councils around the country to help enhance street lighting in areas of poor illumination, as well as improving CCTV coverage. **And that Surrey County Council welcomed the new round of the Safer Streets Fund announced by the Government this week.**
- The issue of feeling safe at night has also been raised by Surrey residents who are night-time workers, late night commuters out of London, those attending late night music venues, and those walking home after meeting family and friends.

This Council further notes that:

- ~~Surrey County Council has a policy that sees Surrey streetlights switched off at night, at a time when the political debate and majority opinion is clearly calling for streetlighting to be improved as one of the positive moves that can be taken towards residents feeling safe in our streets.~~
- Surrey County Council is investing £19.9 million over a 3-year period to convert all Surrey's streetlights to LED, with a target saving of £2 million a year.
- **As of 2021 Surrey has converted in excess of 26,000 lights to LED.**
- **Surrey's Street lights are currently only switched off between 1am and 5am and those on main roads and town centres remain on all night. Lights on pedestrian routes at train stations, hospitals and Universities etc. go off an hour after the last train or 1am if later.**
- **The requests this Council has received regarding Part Night-time Lighting from members of the public and Surrey Police are as follows:**

<u>Calendar Year</u>	<u>Total Streetlight Enquiries recorded</u>	<u>Police Requests</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>2017</u>	<u>377</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Commencement of Part Night-time Lighting, most enquiries relate to appeals or initial objection/support</u>
<u>2018</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>1</u>	
<u>2019</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>3</u>	
<u>2020</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>2</u>	
<u>2021</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	

- **That any crime or safety concerns received, this Council always refers them to Surrey Police to log.**
- **That if Surrey Police formally ask this Council to turn lights back on (either permanently or for a defined period of time), we do so. These requests need to come from the Borough Commander, and they will provide reasoning and rationale.**
- **Surrey County Council takes safety and crime prevention very seriously. We always want to listen to residents and work together to provide the safest environment possible.**
- **If Councillors have concerns about high pedestrian traffic areas they can raise this with Highways Team and the Cabinet Member to make the case for lights to remain on longer. This has happened with routes at train stations, hospitals and Universities etc routes will need clear reasoning, rationale with a majority resident support and consideration of local environmental impact to extend lighting over Police views.**

In light of the factors listed above, this Council calls upon to the Cabinet:

- I. ~~To make a commitment to end the streetlight switch-off as soon as is practicable, but as a matter of urgency.~~ **To raise the concerns of public safety at night with the Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable of Surrey Police in order to continue to support the Police in their role in keeping Surrey residents safe; and to see if there are any areas disproportionately affected by neighbourhood and acquisitive crime in which we can support a Surrey Police or a joint Surrey Police and SCC bid for prevention interventions such as home security new and street lighting.**
- II. ~~To fund the additional costs out of the £2 million saving on the switch to LED streetlights.~~ **To review Part Night-time Lighting once the LED rollout has been completed and factor in environmental and safety grounds in addition to financial benefits.**
- III. **To inform Divisional Councillors of locations where a Part Night-time Lighting safety request is made by a Surrey resident so they too can raise any points with Surrey Police.**

Matt Furniss moved an amendment to his amendment above, which was formally seconded by Tim Hall.

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

This Council notes that:

- Following the tragic murder of Sarah Everard on the evening of 3 March 2021, ~~ensuring the right to feel safe walking our streets at night has become a major requirement for political action across the country.~~ **it is important to ensure that people feel safe walking our streets. Women have made their voices heard about feeling unsafe walking alone in public places.**
- ~~Women have made their voices heard, and too many of them express the view that they do not feel safe walking alone in public places.~~
- Speaking in March, Dame Cressida Dick, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police said, "Right now, 80% of women report being harassed in public spaces, but 90% of them don't bother reporting it because they don't think anything will happen if they do."
- The immediate Government response to Sarah's murder included an additional £25 million to **Safer Streets Fund to fund innovative and creative proposals to improve the safety of public spaces including improving street lighting,** councils around the country to help enhance street lighting in areas of poor illumination, as well as improving CCTV coverage, **education and awareness raising all of which is welcomed by Surrey County Council.**
- The issue of feeling safe at night has also been raised by Surrey residents who are night-time workers, late night commuters out of London, those

attending late night music venues, and those walking home after meeting family and friends.

- **In contrast, light pollution is widely recognised as having impacts on both sleep patterns and on nature.**
- **Further investigation into what makes everyone safer in all streets at night, as well as at specific locations is warranted, in partnership with Surrey Police.**
- **Surrey’s streetlights can now be turned on and off individually, and as they are LED lights are now able to be dimmed to lower lighting levels than before.**

This Council further notes that:

- ~~Surrey County Council has a policy that sees Surrey streetlights switched off at night, at a time when the political debate and majority opinion is clearly calling for streetlighting to be improved as one of the positive moves that can be taken towards residents feeling safe in our streets.~~
- Surrey County Council is investing £19.9 million over a 3-year period to convert all Surrey’s streetlights to LED, with a target saving of £2 million a year, **and 7,700 tonnes of carbon emissions a year, as agreed in the 2021/22 budget and medium term financial strategy.**
- **As of June 2021 Surrey, has converted 37,546 street lights to LED with a 70.73% energy cost saving.**
- **Surrey’s Street lights are currently only switched off between 1am and 5am and those on main roads and town centres remain on all night. Lights on pedestrian routes at train stations, hospitals and Universities etc. go off an hour after the last train or 1am if later.**
- **The requests this Council has received regarding Part Night-time Lighting from members of the public and Surrey Police are as follows:**

<u>Calendar Year</u>	<u>Total Streetlight Enquiries recorded</u>	<u>Police Requests</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>2017</u>	<u>377</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Commencement of Part Night-time Lighting, most enquiries relate to appeals or initial objection/support</u>
<u>2018</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>1</u>	
<u>2019</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>3</u>	
<u>2020</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>2</u>	
<u>2021</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>0</u>	

- **Surrey County Council always refers crime or safety concerns, that it receives, to Surrey Police to log.**

- That if Surrey Police formally ask this Council to turn lights back on (either permanently or for a defined period of time), we do so. These requests need to come from the Borough Commander, providing reasoning and rationale.
- Surrey County Council takes safety and crime prevention very seriously, and always wants to listen to residents and work together to provide the safest environment possible.
- If Councillors have concerns about public safety in pedestrian traffic areas they can raise this with Highways Team and the Cabinet Member to make the case for lights to remain on longer. This has happened with routes at train stations, hospitals, Universities etc. Routes need clear reasoning and rationale with a majority strong resident support and plus consideration of local environmental impact, to extend lighting over Police views.

In light of the factors listed above, this Council calls upon to the Cabinet:

- I. To make a commitment to ~~end~~ review the streetlight switch-off as soon as is practicable and factor in environmental and safety grounds in addition to financial benefits., ~~but as a matter of urgency.~~
- II. To engage the public and raise the concerns of public safety at night with the Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable of Surrey Police in order to continue to support the Police in their role in keeping Surrey residents safe.
- III. ~~To fund the additional costs out of the £2 million saving on the switch to LED streetlights.~~ To see with Surrey Police, if there are any areas with higher rates of Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) and areas of higher public safety need, plus areas disproportionately affected by neighbourhood and acquisitive crime in which we can support a Surrey Police or a joint Surrey Police and SCC bid for prevention interventions such as home security and new street lighting.
- IV. To inform Divisional Councillors of locations where a Part Night-time Lighting safety request is made by a Surrey resident so they too can raise any points with Surrey Police.

Matt Furniss spoke to his amended amendment, making the following points:

- Re-emphasised the need to improve public safety which must be done in partnership with Surrey Police and through resident engagement.
- Noted the need to look at the number of requests regarding the part-night lighting policy received by the Council from residents and Surrey Police over the past few years.
- That the Council referred any crime or safety concerns received to Surrey Police and the Council would switch street lights back on night if requested by Surrey Police - either permanently or for a defined period of time.
- Stressed that the Council took crime and safety seriously, if Members or residents had concerns they could raise those with him as Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure and the Highways Team.

- That at the request of Members with support by residents, several routes in town centres, hospitals and key transport routes around train stations had street lights which stay on longer for people get home safely.
- That the perception of safety on streets was important irrespective of the time of day, the Council must continue to engage with Surrey Police as it was responsible for upholding public safety, engaging with the new PCC and the Chief Constable, as well as residents.
- That his amended amendment went further than the motion by providing defined actions.
- That referring to the third resolution he was happy to remove the wording of 'higher' used twice, however it was still vital to work with Surrey Police to identify further areas of concern.

The amended amendment was formally seconded by Tim Hall, who reserved his right to speak.

Eber Kington did not accept the amended amendment and therefore the amended amendment was open for debate.

Nine Members made the following comments on the amended amendment:

- Noted concern in the sentences removed and the unnecessary addition in the first bullet point as the importance of people feeling safe walking the streets was indisputable.
- That the seventh additional bullet point referring to 'further investigation' highlighted that the Council was good at deferring rather than taking action.
- That the table referencing figures for 2021 was misleading alluding to lower enquiries and requests as the figures could not be for the full year.
- Questioned why the part-night lighting policy could not be ended rather than reviewed as noted in the first bullet point, the Council to sought to delay the matter rather than make a decision.
- Welcomed the proposer of the amendment's agreement to remove the two references to 'higher', its original inclusion was a concern.
- That the safety of people on Surrey's streets particularly women was vital for the Council and the Borough and District Councils to take seriously.
- Supported the amendment as the tragic murder of Sarah Everard being attached to an ill-thought through motion was disturbing.
- Supported the amendment as it recognised the facts, noting the study in 2015 by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine in 2015 in which no evidence of a link between reduced street lighting and increased crime and traffic accidents was found in the fourteen years of data from sixty-two local authorities.
- Welcomed the additional bullet point referring to light pollution as raised in the first amendment.
- Noted that whilst the figures shown in the table implied a reduction in the number of requests over the years, the reasons for reduction were unknown, they could be either the contentment with the current part-night lighting policy at night-time or a belief that nothing would change so requests were not made.

- That whilst acknowledging that the link between street lighting at night and crime and accidents was inconclusive, stressed that both the feeling and perception of feeling unsafe must be addressed.
- Noted that whilst residents in many parts of Surrey enjoyed having street lights switched off at certain hours, it was wrong that the current part-night lighting policy took a once size fits all approach.
- That street lighting was first introduced in the country because people felt unsafe to go out at night.
- That street lighting in the county was the Council's responsibility as opposed to Surrey Police's.
- Noted that the decision to switch to LED street lighting was one based on the need to act economically and ecologically efficient.
- That where there was a need on safety grounds to switch some street lights back on the Council would do so, the wholesale street light switch on would not be the right way to proceed.
- That whilst the murder of Sarah Everard had left the nation in mourning, it was distasteful to align her murder with policy decisions particularly as street lighting was not an issue in her murder.
- That locally the majority of burglaries took place during school pickup times and were monitored by the Borough Commander, night-time street lighting was not a contributing factor to burglaries.
- Noted that the amendment was correct apart from the order, in that the Council should 'review' the part-night lighting policy once 'further investigation' and engagement with residents and Surrey Police had been carried out, only then a decision should be made on the current policy.
- Questioned that if the amendment was to be carried how would the situation in the future differ to the current one, hoping that it would lead to tangible change, referring to table showing resident enquiries and Surrey Police requests regarding street lights in 2021, asked how many of those enquiries and requests in 2020 were accepted.
- Referring to the first resolution, asked what 'as soon as is practicable' meant concerning the review of the part-night lighting policy, would it be a few years or at the next feasible Cabinet meeting in the autumn.
- That residents - particularly shift workers - living in deprived areas and with houses close together had to walk a diversionary route to the main road to their home or work, which was made difficult during the hours of the part-night lighting switch off.
- Thanked the motion's proposer for raising the issue and responses showed that the Council took the matter seriously.
- That the point in the original motion by the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police was confusing as the '80% of women report being harassed in public spaces' did not indicate when such incidents occurred as noted that personally they had been in daylight.
- That having confidence in policing was important so that incidents of harassment were reported to the police, so that was why the amendment was correct as partnership working between the Council and Surrey Police was crucial in order to ensure wider enforcement and public safety not just concerning street lighting.
- Emphasised the importance of cultivating biodiversity against the light pollution at night caused by street lighting.
- That public engagement was vital, noting a positive local example between the Council and the student union at Royal Holloway, University of London which had identified several roads to keep the

street lights switched on at night, urging the need to make decisions on street lighting on a case-by-case basis.

Eber Kington noted the following comments in response to not accepting the amended amendment:

- That the proposer of the amendment repeated the need to work with Surrey Police, engagement with residents was an afterthought.
- Explained that Sarah Everard's tragic death emboldened women nationally to speak about their fears, the motion sought to articulate those fears in order to seek changes to the Council's policy.
- Could not support the amendment due to the deletions, noting the partial deletion in the first bullet point and the removal of the entire second bullet point.
- That the reduction in the number of enquiries by residents over the years as noted in the table, was due to people choosing not to make such reports rather than their satisfaction with the Council's policy.
- That rather than 'review' as added to the first resolution, the Council must take action and as the policy maker it must not shift the responsibility for ensuring public safety on to Surrey Police.
- Referring to the third bullet point, no level of Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) was acceptable.

Tim Hall, the seconder of the amended amendment, made the following comments:

- That the discussions had so far appeared to mix the two issues of street lighting and community safety - street lighting was only a small part of community safety.
- That the amendment recognised the need to work with Surrey Police and local police teams who were tackling issues public safety issues such as street drinking.
- Recognised that light pollution was a serious issue.
- Commended the amendment as it was practicable, based upon partnership working.

The Chair asked Matt Furniss, as proposer of the amended amendment to conclude the debate, he made the following comments:

- Noted the misrepresentation of his amendment by previous speakers, highlighting the additional sentence stating that 'it is important to ensure that people feel safe walking our streets. Women have made their voices heard about feeling unsafe walking alone in public places.'
- That the amendment recognised the importance of working together, engaging with residents and key partners such as Surrey Police in order to lead to action.
- That the reference to the 'review' of the street light switch off was included only once.
- That the issue of public safety was wider than that of street lighting.

The amended amendment was put to the vote with 37 Members voting For, 30 voting Against and no Abstentions.

Therefore the amended amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 49 Members voting For, 12 voting Against and 3 Abstentions.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

- Following the tragic murder of Sarah Everard on the evening of 3 March 2021, it is important to ensure that people feel safe walking our streets. Women have made their voices heard about feeling unsafe walking alone in public places.
- Speaking in March, Dame Cressida Dick, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police said, "Right now, 80% of women report being harassed in public spaces, but 90% of them don't bother reporting it because they don't think anything will happen if they do."
- The immediate Government response to Sarah's murder included an additional £25 million to Safer Streets Fund to fund innovative and creative proposals to improve the safety of public spaces including improving street lighting, CCTV coverage, education and awareness raising all of which is welcomed by Surrey County Council.
- The issue of feeling safe at night has also been raised by Surrey residents who are night-time workers, late night commuters out of London, those attending late night music venues, and those walking home after meeting family and friends.
- In contrast, light pollution is widely recognised as having impacts on both sleep patterns and on nature.
- Further investigation into what makes everyone safer in all streets at night, as well as at specific locations is warranted, in partnership with Surrey Police.
- Surrey's streetlights can now be turned on and off individually, and as they are LED lights are now able to be dimmed to lower lighting levels than before.

This Council further notes that:

- Surrey County Council is investing £19.9 million over a 3-year period to convert all Surrey's streetlights to LED, with a target saving of £2 million a year, and 7,700 tonnes of carbon emissions a year, as agreed in the 2021/22 budget and medium term financial strategy.
- As of June 2021 Surrey, has converted 37,546 street lights to LED with a 70.73% energy cost saving.
- Surrey's Street lights are currently only switched off between 1am and 5am and those on main roads and town centres remain on all night. Lights on

pedestrian routes at train stations, hospitals and Universities etc. go off an hour after the last train or 1am if later.

- The requests this Council has received regarding Part Night-time Lighting from members of the public and Surrey Police are as follows:

Calendar Year	Total Streetlight Enquiries recorded	Police Requests	Comments
2017	377	2	Commencement of Part Night-time Lighting, most enquiries relate to appeals or initial objection/support
2018	82	1	
2019	54	3	
2020	45	2	
2021	18	0	

- Surrey County Council always refers crime or safety concerns, that it receives, to Surrey Police to log.
- That if Surrey Police formally ask this Council to turn lights back on (either permanently or for a defined period of time), we do so. These requests need to come from the Borough Commander, providing reasoning and rationale.
- Surrey County Council takes safety and crime prevention very seriously. and always wants to listen to residents and work together to provide the safest environment possible.
- If Councillors have concerns about public safety in pedestrian traffic areas they can raise this with Highways Team and the Cabinet Member to make the case for lights to remain on longer. This has happened with routes at train stations, hospitals, Universities etc. Routes need clear reasoning and rationale with a majority strong resident support and plus consideration of local environmental impact, to extend lighting over Police views.

In light of the factors listed above, this Council calls upon to the Cabinet:

- I. To make a commitment to review the streetlight switch-off as soon as is practicable and factor in environmental and safety grounds in addition to financial benefits.
- II. To engage the public and raise the concerns of public safety at night with the Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable of Surrey Police in order to continue to support the Police in their role in keeping Surrey residents safe.
- III. To see with Surrey Police, if there are any areas with rates of Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) and areas of public safety need, plus

areas disproportionately affected by neighbourhood and acquisitive crime in which we can support a Surrey Police or a joint Surrey Police and SCC bid for prevention interventions such as home security and new street lighting.

- IV. To inform Divisional Councillors of locations where a Part Night-time Lighting safety request is made by a Surrey resident so they too can raise any points with Surrey Police.

Item 8 (ii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Will Forster moved:

This Council notes that:

In Boris Johnson's first speech as Prime Minister in July 2019, he promised to fix the crisis in social care once and for all "with a clear plan we have prepared to give every older person the dignity and security they deserve."

This Council also notes that:

In October 2019 it unanimously passed a motion proposed by Lib Democrat Members that spoke to the situation in Surrey:

"With concern that, owing to Government policy, Surrey residents who pay for their own elderly care significantly subsidise the residents who rely on County to pay for their care. This is a result of an unjust and inequitable funding regime which is itself a result of inadequate government funding."

With the corresponding resolution (I.):

"This council accordingly calls on the government to bring forward urgently a sustainable solution so that councils can restore equity and enable a sustainable market for social care provision in Surrey and across the country."

This Council further notes that:

In the absence of the promised plan, leaders of social care organisations from across the country recently wrote to the Prime minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for Health and Social Care to urge the Government to act now on reform of England's social care system and publish its proposals before the summer recess.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Express its disappointment that despite repeated promises, no proposals have as yet been brought forward; and
- II. To robustly renew its call for a sustainable solution to the funding of adult social care and write to the Government and Surrey's Members of Parliament urging them to honour their promise to urgently tackle this long-term crisis, which leaves many vulnerable residents without the support they need whilst others face catastrophic costs.

Will Forster made the following points:

- That he tabled the original motion to get the Council to redouble its efforts to stand up to the Government over their failure to deliver the previously promised reforms of the adult social care system.
- Noted that the adult social care system was broken, suffering from chronic and systemic underfunding exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic.
- That it was vital to acknowledge the country's ageing population and expense of adult social care costs.
- That adult social care was rationed leaving many vulnerable people without the support they need, with many having to pay catastrophic costs.
- Stressed that the country needed a long-term sustainable solution for addressing the real crisis in adult social care.
- That no action had been taken since Rt Hon Boris Johnson's MP first speech as Prime Minister in July 2019 where he promised to fix the crisis.
- Noted that last month the leaders of social care organisations across the country wrote to the Government urging them to act on the reform of England's adult social care system and to publish its proposals before the summer recess.
- That the Council was in a good position to urge the Government for cross-party change, noting Surrey's influential Members of Parliament and the Leader's role as chairman of the County Councils Network (CCN).

The motion was formally seconded by Liz Townsend, who made the following comments:

- Quoted from the Prime Minister's first speech in July 2019 where he said that his job was to protect individuals from the fear of selling their homes to pay for the costs of care.
- Noted that under the current system people with assets over £14,250 had to pay for part of their care costs, those with assets over £23,250 had to meet the bills in full.
- That in their letter the leaders of organisations that represented adult social care highlighted the importance in the reform debate of helping people to avoid catastrophic care costs and selling their home to pay for care.
- That the Health and Care Bill contained no clear proposals for the reform of adult social care or for its investment, leaving many with the fear of having to sell their own home to avoid high care bills.
- Highlighted research conducted by Age UK in 2019 which showed that the number of older people with some level of unmet need stood at 1.5 million, likely to have increased due to the pandemic.
- Stressed that Members had a responsibility to residents to renew the call for a sustainable funding solution, ensuring that vulnerable residents are not being left behind.

Bernie Muir moved an amendment which had been published in the supplementary agenda (12 July 2021), which was formally seconded by Luke Bennett.

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

This Council notes that:

In Boris Johnson's first speech as Prime Minister in July 2019, he **highlighted the importance of reforming the** ~~promised to fix the crisis in~~ social care **system** once and for all "with a clear plan we have prepared to give every older person the dignity and security they deserve."

~~**This Council also notes that:**~~

~~In October 2019 it unanimously passed a motion proposed by Lib Democrat Members that spoke to the situation in Surrey:~~

~~"With concern that, owing to Government policy, Surrey residents who pay for their own elderly care significantly subsidise the residents who rely on County to pay for their care. This is a result of an unjust and inequitable funding regime which is itself a result of inadequate government funding."~~

~~With the corresponding resolution (1.):~~

~~"This council accordingly calls on the government to bring forward urgently a sustainable solution so that councils can restore equity and enable a sustainable market for social care provision in Surrey and across the country."~~

This Council further notes that:

~~In the absence of the promised plan Leaders of social care organisations from across the country recently wrote to the Prime minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for Health and Social Care to urge the Government to act now on reform of England's social care system. and publish its proposals before the summer recess.~~ **That is why this Government has responded to the need for a modern health and care system through its Health and Care Bill. This Bill builds on proposals to bring health and care services closer together to build back better and improve care for our communities.**

This Council resolves to:

- ~~I. Express its disappointment that despite repeated promises, no proposals have as yet been brought forward; and~~
- ~~II. To robustly renew its call for a sustainable solution to the funding of adult social care and write to the Government and Surrey's Members of Parliament urging them to honour their promise to urgently tackle this long-~~

~~term crisis, which leaves many vulnerable residents without the support they need whilst others face catastrophic costs.~~

- I. **Continue to use formal channels, by working with the Local Government Association, County Councils Network, our Surrey MPs and Government Ministers to find a long-term, sustainable solution to social care, in turn tackling health inequality and ensuring no-one is left behind.**
- II. **Support the Government's commitment to working with councils and the social care sector to enhance existing assurance frameworks that support the drive to improve the health outcomes and experiences of residents.**
- III. **Work closely with Surrey Heartland and Frimley ICS to implement the Health and Care Bill to deliver a truly integrated approach to health and social care.**

Bernie Muir spoke to her amendment, making the following points:

- Noted general agreement on the need for reforms in adult social care.
- That the Rt Hon Boris Johnson MP in his first speech as Prime Minister in July 2019 noted the need to fix the crisis “once and for all”, the 2019 Conservative Party manifesto stated that it would seek a cross-party consensus to bring forward proposals for reform - delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic - re-stated in the Queen’s Speech in May.
- The Council was using formal channels, working with the Local Government Association (LGA), the CCN, Surrey’s MPs and Government ministers to find a long-term sustainable solution to adult social care.
- That it was clear that the demand for adult social care was rapidly increasing, noting the 6% increase since 2015/16.
- That in order to effectively deliver the required services it was key to: secure predictable sustainable long-term funding; acknowledge the exponential demand, take into account the demographic changes; recognise pressures that would further lead to increasing demand.
- That in addition to meeting future demand, policies were needed to address the pressures to recruit and retain the workforce, noting the need for the parity of esteem for care workers with NHS staff.
- Noted that the Government had expressed the commitment to enable local government to be equal partners in an integrated care system, noting the Council’s strong position to drive change through its partnership with Surrey Heartlands, the Transformation Programme and the effective work of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- That the aim was to tackle health inequality and focus on preventative healthcare in order to deliver for those who needed support using innovative solutions to bring services into the community.
- Noted that the Council’s objectives were integrated into the Health and Care Bill, such as the NHS and local Government coming together to plan health and care services around patients’ needs.

- Noted that the main benefits of the Health and Care Bill was the removal of bureaucratic and transaction processes, freeing up the NHS to focus on what mattered to patients: preventative healthcare, supporting the ageing population, tackling health inequality, supporting the diverse needs of local populations and enhancing patients' safety.

The amendment was formally seconded by Luke Bennett, who reserved his right to speak.

Will Forster did not accept the amendment and he made the following comments:

- That the amendment watered down and re-wrote the original motion by removing: reference to the Prime Minister's promise to fix the social care crisis, reference to the previously passed motion on social care and reference made by the leaders of social care organisations in their letter asking for the Government's proposals to be published before the summer recess.
- That the Council needed to be strong willed in demanding the reforms from the Government, the amendment went contrary to that.

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

- Noted that in the two years since the last general election and eleven years of Conservative Party administration, past governments had failed to bring forward sensitive plans for adult social care reform.
- That since the Prime Minister's speech in July 2019, two million people had applied for support and had their requests refused.
- That the Covid-19 pandemic had highlighted that frontline carers were essential to a properly functioning society and economy yet two thirds did not earn a real living wage.
- Denounced the excuse by the mover of the amendment who suggested that the Covid-19 pandemic had been a distraction for the Government not to act, noting the passing of the Education Act 1944 during the Second World War.
- Stressed that a proper vision for adult social care across the country was needed that was based on need and was publicly funded, that empowered the users of adult social care as well as its workers many poorly paid, prioritised home first care and supported unpaid carers.
- Noted that the Health and Care Bill outlined a major top-down reorganisation in adult social care through the loss of local control and inclusion of measures making it easier to give contracts to the private sector - the amendment was a disservice to Surrey's residents.
- Echoed disappointment with the amendment highlighting the changes to the 'resolves to' section which removed the Council's expressing of its disappointment at the repeated promises and delays, replaced by writing to the Government and Surrey's MPs, and continued use of formal channels - ineffective over the last decade.
- That the amendment sought to re-write history through its removal of the previously passed motion on social care, which went contrary to the value of honesty.
- Noted caution in the use of language alleging dishonesty and the re-writing of history, as events had moved on since that motion was passed.

- That the Council's administration was aware of the need for a long-term sustainable solution for the funding of adult social care.
- Explained that the Health and Care Bill was part of the long-term funding solution as it integrated the health system and local government, noting the hard work in Surrey over the past three years to integrate Surrey Heartlands and Frimley Integrated Care Systems - with joint appointments and a joint vision.
- Stressed the importance of formal channels, he used his role as Leader of the Council each time he spoke with Surrey's MPs, as chairman of the CCN and at LGA meetings.
- Noted that there was no simple solution to the long-term funding of adult social care, he looked to future reform by the new Secretary of State for Health.
- The Leader provided notice that he would bring an original motion to the next Council meeting on what the Cabinet and partners across Surrey were doing concerning the Safer Streets Fund.

Luke Bennett, the seconder of the amendment, made no comments.

The Chair asked Bernie Muir, as proposer of the amendment to conclude the debate, she made no further comments.

The amendment was put to the vote with 37 Members voting For, 25 voting Against and 1 Abstention.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 37 Members voting For, 13 voting Against and 16 Abstentions.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council notes that:

In Boris Johnson's first speech as Prime Minister in July 2019, he highlighted the importance of reforming the social care system once and for all "with a clear plan we have prepared to give every older person the dignity and security they deserve."

This Council further notes that:

Leaders of social care organisations from across the country recently wrote to the Prime minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for Health and Social Care to urge the Government to act now on reform of England's social care system. That is why this Government has responded to the need for a modern health and care system through its Health and Care Bill. This Bill builds on proposals to bring health and care services closer together to build back better and improve care for our communities.

This Council resolves to:

- I. Continue to use formal channels, by working with the Local Government Association, County Councils Network, our Surrey MPs and Government Ministers to find a long-term, sustainable solution to social care, in turn tackling health inequality and ensuring no-one is left behind.
- II. Support the Government's commitment to working with councils and the social care sector to enhance existing assurance frameworks that support the drive to improve the health outcomes and experiences of residents.
- III. Work closely with Surrey Heartland and Frimley ICS to implement the Health and Care Bill to deliver a truly integrated approach to health and social care.

51/21 REVIEW OF CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES – REMOTE MEETING [Item 9]

The Leader introduced the report:

- Which set out the review of the recommendations and removal of delegations put in place in respect of remote meetings as agreed by Council on 16 March 2021.
- Noted that the Government was consulting on local authority remote and hybrid meetings and the Council would await the outcome, in the meantime it was appropriate that the Council reverted back to the previous delegations set out in its Constitution in which all formal committees requiring decisions would take place in public.
- Noted that since 7 May 2021 the officer delegated decisions had only been used once for the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board - Informal in June.
- Flagged that the special dispensation for all Members concerning the non-attendance of Council meetings for a six-month period in light of Covid-19, would be reviewed by the Council on 12 October 2021.

Members made the following comments:

- Thanked the Leader for listening to the concerns made by the Residents' Association and Independents Group regarding the measures.
- Highlighted that the reversal of the Constitutional changes did not stop the practice of removing decision-making items from formal committee meeting agendas and holding virtual meetings excluding the public from seeing key information; he sought reassurance that such a practice would not continue.
- Noted that millions of fellow individuals aged under thirty were still awaiting their second Covid-19 vaccination and were unable to be fully vaccinated despite having to attend in person committees or working at a Council office.
- Welcomed the extension of the special dispensation for the non-attendance at Council meetings until October, asking whether the Leader would consider making a further provision so that any Members who felt unable for safety or health reasons to attend meetings during that time could still participate virtually even if not able to vote.
- Queried what Covid-19 related risk assessment or rules would be in place for in person meetings after the national restrictions were to be lifted on 19 July 2021.

In response the Leader explained that all formal committee meetings held in public previously would continue to be held in public and that where the technology allowed a hybrid option would be possible for Members to join remotely although they would not be allowed to vote. That the Public Health team (SCC) would issue further guidance on Covid-19 risk assessments in due course.

RESOLVED:

That Council agreed:

1. To redefine the definition within the Council's Constitution to define Cabinet as a formal meeting of Cabinet.
2. To remove the delegation for all non-executive decision making to be delegated to the Proper Officer in consultation with the relevant committee chairman and for any non-executive decision making to be undertaken in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.
3. To review the dispensation for non-attendance at meetings in relation to the six-month rule as set out in section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 at 12 October Council meeting.
4. To note that the Council has provided a full response to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's call for evidence in relation to the future of remote local authority meetings.

52/21 CHANGES TO CABINET PORTFOLIOS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES [Item 10]

The Leader introduced the recommendations, highlighting the appointment of Luke Bennett as the new Cabinet Member for Health. He noted the importance of the focus on health in light of the Health and Care Bill to be granted royal assent next year, the Bill would re-structure the health and social care system and would introduce Integrated Care Boards and Integrated Care Partnerships.

RESOLVED:

1. Council noted Luke Bennett's appointment by the Leader as the Cabinet Member for Health on 29 June 2021.
2. That as a result of the above, appointments were made to the Resources and Performance Select Committee, the Planning and Regulatory Committee and the Surrey-Wide Commissioning Committees in Common for the remainder of the 2021/22 Council Year:
 - Rebecca Jennings-Evans was appointed to the Resources and Performance Select Committee.
 - Bernie Muir was appointed to the Planning and Regulatory Committee as a substitute.
 - Luke Bennett was appointed to the Surrey-Wide Commissioning Committees in Common in place of Tim Oliver.

3. Council delegated authority to the Monitoring Officer to make the necessary changes to the Terms of Reference for the Surrey-Wide Commissioning Committees in Common and to update the Constitution accordingly.
4. Council noted the following changes to the committee memberships for the remainder of the 2021/22 Council Year:

CHILDREN, FAMILIES, LIFELONG LEARNING AND CULTURE SELECT COMMITTEE

Andy Lynch in place of Lesley Steeds.

RESOURCES AND PERFORMANCE SELECT COMMITTEE

Lesley Steeds in place of Andy Lynch.

SURREY PENSION FUND COMMITTEE

Mark Sugden in place of John O'Reilly.

JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE FOR THE SURREY HILLS AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (“SURREY HILLS BOARD”)

Marisa Heath in place of Denise Turner-Stewart.

53/21 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 11]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 1 June 2021 and 29 June 2021.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents:

29 June 2021:

- A. Variation to Admission Arrangements for Surrey's Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools for September 2021 and September 2022

Reports for Information/Discussion:

1 June 2021:

- B. Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman Public Report Regarding the End of Life Care Provided by a Commissioned Care Home
- C. Pendell Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) Camp, Merstham

29 June 2021:

- D. Surrey County Council Strategy and Delivery – 2021 and Beyond
- E. Improving Mental Health Outcomes, Experiences and Services in Surrey
- F. Supported Independent Living - Feasibility Study
- G. Quarterly Report on Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 25 May 2021 - 13 July 2021

RESOLVED:

1. That Council approved the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools and co-ordinated schemes (as set out in the Cabinet paper from 29 June 2021):
That, subject to the new School Admissions Code coming into force on 1 September, the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for 2021 and 2022 are varied to give top priority for children adopted from state care outside England, alongside looked after children and other previously looked after children.
2. That Council noted that there had been one urgent decision in the last two months.
3. That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 1 June 2021 and 29 June 2021 be adopted.

54/21 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 12]

One notification of a question on the minutes had been received, Jonathan Essex submitted an amendment to change the wording on item 128/21: Surrey's Greener Futures Climate Change Delivery Plan (CCDP), page 64/487 which had been agreed.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet on 29 June 2021 would be updated:

Item 128/21, page 64/487: 'The delay to the plan was ~~welcomed~~ **noted**'.

Chair's concluding remarks:

The Chair thanked Members for their patience and cooperation, welcomed the interesting debates held, urged all to take a break over the summer and hoped that the October meeting of the Council would be held in the new Council Chamber.

[Meeting ended at: 13.28 pm]

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank