



## OFFICER REPORT TO COUNCIL

### **RATIFICATION OF ORIGINAL MOTIONS FROM INFORMAL REMOTE COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING ON 18 JANUARY 2022**

#### **KEY ISSUE/DECISION:**

Due to the public health situation with the omicron variant of Covid-19, a decision was taken to postpone the 14 December 2021 County Council meeting.

It was agreed that an informal remote County Council meeting would be held on 18 January 2022 to allow members to debate the Leader's Statement, Member Questions, Statements by Members and the five Original Motions that had been submitted for the 14 December meeting.

The informal remote meeting took place on 18 January 2022 and this report sets out the outcome of the debate on Original Motions and asks Council to formally ratify these.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

As the Council is unable to hold formal remote committee meetings, the meeting held on 18 January 2022 was held as an informal remote meeting. As the meeting was classified as an informal meeting, formal decision items were not able to be considered however Group Leaders' agreed that they would like to hold an informal meeting to consider the Leader's Statement, Members' Question Time, Statements by Members and to debate the five Original Motions that had been submitted to the 14 December 2021 Council meeting.

#### **Leader's Statement, Members' Question Time and Statements by Members**

The Leader presented his statement at the meeting and Members were invited to respond to this.

Members were able to submit questions in advance of the informal meeting and responses to these were provided along with the opportunity for all members to ask supplementary questions. A total of 16 questions were received.

Members were also given the opportunity to put forward a local member statement and there were two members that did this.

The agenda and papers for the meeting were published on the Council's website and the meeting was webcast to the public in order to be transparent.

The minutes from the informal remote Council meeting held on 18 January 2022 can be found at **Annex A** and Council is asked to agree that these are a true record of the informal meeting.

### **Original Motions**

There were five Original Motions that were informally considered and at the 18 January 2022. The following paragraphs set out the outcomes of the debate.

#### Motion 4(i)

Motion 4(i) standing in the name of Lance Spencer and seconded by Angela Goodwin was debated and an amendment was submitted from Matt Furniss and seconded by John O'Reilly. This amendment was debated and then put to the vote and won by 47 votes for to 31 votes against and became the substantive motion.

The final motion was put to the vote and won by 46 votes for to 31 votes against and therefore was resolved as follows:

#### **This Council notes that:**

In the last few years there has been a sharp increase in walking and cycling in Surrey. Slower traffic in residential and busy pedestrian streets such as shopping areas and outside schools help encourage more active travel by walking and cycling. These include improved road safety; calmer, steadier traffic flows leading to increased confidence amongst residents in being able to walk and cycle more safely.

#### **This Council further notes:**

That as the highway authority Surrey County Council has the legal power to set speed limits in Surrey.

Surrey County Council's "Setting Local Speed Limits" policy supports introducing signed only 20 mph speed limits where the existing speeds are 24 mph or less. There are likely to be lots of residential roads and busy shopping streets where it would be possible to introduce signed only 20 mph speed limits in Surrey. Members are allocated with local budgets for highway improvements that they can direct towards assessments and implementation of signed only 20 mph speed limits. Where the existing speeds are above 24 mph, then additional measures to reduce speeds should be considered to ensure the new lower speed limit is successful.

In addition to the local highway budget, Community Infrastructure Levy funding could be used to assess and implement lower 20 mph speed limits. Assessment and implementation of lower 20 mph schemes could also be considered as part of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) being developed in each of Surrey's Boroughs and Districts.

**This Council resolves to:**

Request the Leader and Cabinet to:

- I. Reaffirm that Surrey County Council supports signage of only 20 mph zones in residential roads, outside schools and on high streets that currently have a 30 mph limit, where the existing average mean speeds are 24 mph or less, and where there is member and community support for the change.
- II. Reaffirm that additional supporting measures will be needed to ensure the new lower 20 mph speed limit is successful if the existing mean average speeds are above 24 mph.

Motion 4(ii)

The motion 4(ii) standing in the name of Catherine Baart and seconded by Catherine Powell was debated next and was put to the vote and was lost by 30 votes for and 46 votes against.

Motion 4(iii)

This original motion was standing in the name of Catherine Powell and at the meeting Councillor Powell requested Council's permission under Standing Order 20.3 to alter her motion. The request to alter the motion was put to the vote and lost with 29 votes in favour and 46 votes against. As a result Councillor Powell decided to withdraw her motion.

Motion 4(iv)

Motion 4(iv) standing in the name of Bernie Muir and seconded by Trefor Hogg was debated and then put to the vote. This was carried by unanimous support and it was therefore resolved as follows:

**This Council notes that:**

- Mental health issues are experienced by old and young alike across all walks of life, and many either do not seek help, struggle to get help or do not necessarily get the help they need.

**This Council further notes that:**

- Greater numbers of Surrey residents, of all ages, are experiencing pronounced mental health problems, which have been exacerbated by

Covid-19, national and tiered lockdowns, social distancing and the effects of trauma, bereavement, and economic insecurity.

- The negative impact this has on society, the economy, employment and education of the people of Surrey, that it increases health inequality, with those experiencing mental health problems experiencing physical health problems, likely to smoke, be overweight, use drugs and drink alcohol to excess, fall into poverty, and are overrepresented in the criminal justice system.
- This Council re-affirms the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board's declaration that, "By 2030, we want Surrey to be a uniquely special place where everyone has a great start to life, people live healthy and fulfilling lives, are enabled to achieve their full potential and contribute to their community and no one is left behind."
- This Council welcomes the actions of the Adults & Health Select Committee in establishing a Mental Health Journey Task Group, which consulted widely amongst people of Surrey with lived experience of mental health problems. This ultimately led to a Surrey Integrated Mental Health Partnership Board and the Council endorses their key aims of their Surrey Mental Health Plan, including:
  - Improving and expanding crisis services, including increasing bed capacity and support;
  - Expanding our GP Integrated Mental Health Services – which provides specialist mental health access and support in primary care settings;
  - Transforming our community mental health teams;
  - Better, post diagnosis dementia support;
  - Expanded perinatal mental health services;
  - Reducing the number of out of Surrey placements;
  - Taking advantage of digital innovation to improve services;
  - Improved support for our BAME communities;
  - Implementing our Mental Health Partnership Board improvement plans for children and young people;
  - An additional £6m investment in a new Emotional Wellbeing Mental Health contract for children and young people with a focus on early intervention, work in schools and reduced service backlogs;
  - The provision of high acuity eating disorder beds within Surrey;
  - Focused action on suicide prevention and reduction of self-harm.

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

- I. Call for urgency in delivering the recommendations of the Mental Health Journey Task Group.
- II. Encourage all partners in the Integrated Mental Health Partnership Board to give assurances that they will fully fund and resource the plan

to ensure that the full plan, the recommendations and all parts of the co-production are delivered to ensure the optimum outcome.

- III. Call for the employer organisations and employers, Surrey-wide, to get engaged in order to provide opportunities for people with mental health problems and to establish mental health friendly environments.

#### Motion 4(v)

The final motion was standing in the name of Rebecca Paul and seconded by Jeremy Webster. The motion was debated and put to the vote where it received unanimous support. It was therefore resolved as set out below.

#### **This Council notes that:**

- Looking after and protecting children and young people is not just up to the lead member or director of children's services – we need everyone looking out for our most vulnerable children and young people, and every councillor has a role to play in embedding corporate parenting principles and doing all they can to support children in care to live meaningful and fulfilling lives.

#### **This Council further notes that:**

- The Children and Social Work Act 2017 set out corporate parenting principles for the council as a whole to be the best parent it can be to children in its care. The Act introduced seven principles of corporate parenting for looked after children or care leavers. These include acting in their best interests and promoting their health and wellbeing; helping looked after children and care leavers to gain access to and get the best use of the services provided by the local authority and its partners; promoting high aspirations and preparing them for adulthood and independent living.
- Despite a motion previously agreed by this council, there are still two district and borough councils in the county yet to exempt care leavers from council tax. This is an unfair situation for some of the most disadvantaged groups of young people living in Surrey.
- One of the ways that health and wellbeing can be promoted is by offering looked after children, their carers and care leavers free access to leisure centres across the county. The need for a fair and consistent offer across the county of Surrey is important, as children are placed with foster carers or in our own children's residential homes in every district and borough. Six of the district and borough councils make no leisure offer for looked after children and care leavers. Moreover, the leisure offers available in the five other district and boroughs differ greatly in eligibility and choice causing an unwelcome postcode lottery.

- All Members share the duties and responsibilities of being a corporate parent. There is much that we can do to support our looked after children to live fulfilling lives – in the same way that we would do for our own children, grandchildren or those close to us.

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

- I. Work with the outstanding district and borough partners to secure exemption from council tax for all of our care leavers.
- II. Work with all of our district and borough council partners to secure free access for all of Surrey’s looked after children and care leavers at all of the leisure and sports facilities that they own or manage.
- III. To ask all Members individually to do all they can to support children in care to live meaningful and fulfilling lives by seeking out and securing opportunities for employment, work experience, sport and leisure activities and cultural and educational opportunities. In addition, by making and securing contributions to our own Surrey County Council Looked After Children’s Celebration Fund.

**Record of the debate and decisions made**

The remote informal Council meeting held on 18 January was webcast live to the public and a copy of the recording is available on the Council’s website for reference. Any member that was not in attendance for the informal remote meeting is able to view this recording and have access to all contributions made during the debate on the original motions as set out above.

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
-------------------------

Council is asked to agree the following:

1. That the County Council approves the minutes (Annex A) as a true record of the informal remote County Council meeting held on 18 January 2022.
2. That the County Council formally approves the following outcomes from the debate on Original motions held at the informal remote Council meeting on 18 January 2022:
  - i. Motion 4(i) as amended by Matt Furniss was supported and approved.
  - ii. Motion 4(ii) standing in the name of Catherine Baart was lost.
  - iii. Motion 4(iii) standing in the name of Catherine Powell was withdrawn.
  - iv. Motion 4(iv) standing in the name of Bernie Muir was supported and approved.
  - v. Motion 4(v) standing in the name of Rebecca Paul was supported and approved.

---

**Lead/Contact Officers:**

Paul Evans, Monitoring Officer  
[paul.evans@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:paul.evans@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Sources/background papers:**

Papers from the informal remote County Council meeting – 18 January 2022

---

This page is intentionally left blank