

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY 16 JULY 2013

MINUTES of the meeting of the Council held at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN on 16 July 2013 commencing at 10.30 am, the Council being constituted as follows:

Mr Munro – Chairman
Mrs Marks – Vice-Chairman

Mrs Angell	*	Mr Ivison
Mr Barker OBE		Mr Jenkins
Mrs Barton		Mr Johnson
Mr Beardsmore		Mrs Kemeny
* Mr Beckett		Mr Kemp
Mr Bennison		Mr Kington
Mrs Bowes		Mrs Lake
Mrs Bramhall		Mrs Lallement
Mr Brett-Warburton		Mrs Lay
Mr Carasco		Ms Le Gal
Mr Chapman		Mrs Lewis
Mrs Clack		Mr Mahne
Mrs Coleman		Mr Mallett MBE
Mr Cooksey		Mr Martin
Mr Cosser		Mrs Mason
Mrs Curran		Mrs Moseley
Mr Ellwood		Mrs Mountain
Mr Essex		Mr Norman
Mr Robert Evans	*	Mr Orrick
* Mr Tim Evans		Mr Page
Mr Few		Mr Pitt
Mr Forster		Mrs Ross-Tomlin
Mrs Frost		Mrs Saliagopoulos
* Mr Fuller (am only)		Mr Samuels
Mr Furey		Mrs Searle
* Mr Gardner		Mr Selleck
Mr Goodman		Mr Skellett CBE
Mr Goodwin	*	Mr Sydney
* Mr Gosling		Mr Keith Taylor
* Dr Grant-Duff		Ms Thomson
Mr Gulati		Mr Townsend
Mr Hall		Mr Walsh
Mrs Hammond		Mrs Watson
Mr Harmer		Mrs White
Mr Harrison		Mr Wilson
Ms Heath		Mrs Windsor
Mr Hickman		Mr Witham
* Mrs Hicks	*	Mr Young
Mr Hodge	*	Mrs Young
Mr Hussain		

*absent

50/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Beckett, Mr Evans, Mr Fuller (am only), Mr Gardner, Mr Gosling, Dr Grant-Duff, Mrs Hicks, Mr Ivison, Mr Orrick, Mr Sydney, Mr Young and Mrs Young.

51/13 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 21 May 2013 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

52/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- That Her Majesty The Queen's Birthday Honours List 2013 was included within the agenda.
- The official opening of Walton Bridge took place on 10 July 2013 and was attended by three Cabinet Ministers: the Secretary of State for Transport, the Secretary of State for Defence and the Chief Secretary to the Treasury.
- The lunchtime speaker was Peter Milton, Head of Cultural Services who spoke about the forthcoming World War 1 commemorations.
- Stop Smoking Film competition for young people – sponsored by Trading Standards. The five shortlisted films were shown in the Chamber during the lunch break and Members were encouraged to watch them.

53/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

54/13 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 5]

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

Members were invited to make comments, ask questions and made the following points:

- The investment in superfast broadband was welcomed, as was the creation of 500 additional apprenticeships next year. However, he was asked what steps were in place to address Surrey's skill shortages.
- Project Horizon was a welcome investment for Surrey Highways but it was a long term programme and residents may consider that it was too long to wait for their road improvements.
- Surrey County Council was the only county council in the UK that was increasing its road maintenance budget this year.
- A need to engage Members in the Innovation programme, as had happened in the previous Administration with the Public Value Review programme.
- Concern that the A244 road could not absorb any increased traffic flow.
- The opening of Wellbeing Centres – Surrey now had four, including the centre in Walton which had opening on 15 July.

- The importance of partnership working, particularly with Boroughs and Districts.

55/13 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROGRESS REPORT: JANUARY - JUNE 2013
[Item 6]

The Leader presented the Surrey County Council Progress Report – January - June 2013, the eighth of the Chief Executive’s six monthly reports to Members. He stressed the importance of recognising the progress that the County Council had made in recent years and drew attention to the case studies in the report.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Chief Executive be noted.
- (2) That the staff of the Council be thanked for the progress made during the last six months.
- (3) That the support for the direction of travel be confirmed.

56/13 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Notice of 20 questions had been received. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix B.

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

(Q1) Mr Taylor referred to the recently opened micro-library in Shere (in his division) and asked the Cabinet Member for Community Services to provide an update on any further micro-libraries. The Cabinet Member said that the service was looking for other opportunities and invited Members’ suggestions for suitable locations for more micro-libraries.

(Q2) Mrs White made reference to the vacancy rate given in response to question 15 which she considered would impact on providing information to ‘self-funders’. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care referred to the various ways that information was provided and highlighted the user hubs. He also said that a particular challenge was to reach people who did not approach Adult Social Care to ensure that they had the necessary information to meet their needs.

(Q5) Mr Kington considered that it was important to have a debate when electing a new Council Leader, particularly when the Authority was dominated by one party. The Leader of the Council said that there had not been any nominations for this position from any of the opposition groups and that the rules and regulations as laid down in Standing Orders had been followed.

(Q6) Mrs Coleman asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care to provide hearing loops in all Surrey County Council buildings and also to widely publish a phone number that could be used, by the hard of hearing, for texting. The Cabinet Member noted her request and agreed to report back to her in due course.

(Q8) Mrs White asked whether the views of People, Performance & Development Committee (PPDC) would be presented to a future County Council meeting. The Leader of the Council referred to the tabled response and said that there was currently no reason to bring the decision made at PPDC relating to chief officers pay to County Council.

(Q9) Mr Forster asked the Leader of the Council to go further and block other inappropriate payday lender websites from Surrey County Council networks. The Leader noted this request and said that he would refer it to the IMT service for consideration.

(Q10) Mr Hall said that only 10% of Surrey residents read local newspapers and asked the Cabinet Member for Business Services if there was a more effective and cost effective way to advertise Public Notices. The Cabinet Member advised him that there were some proposed changes but it would require Government legislation to alter the current arrangements.

(Q11) Mr Robert Evans referred to Surrey County Council's job vacancy website, which currently had several jobs advertised at less than £8 per hour. He asked the Deputy Leader for his views and was advised that he would be willing to discuss this with him outside the meeting.

(Q12) Mr Hickman objected to the stickers on the green Broadband cabinets and said that it was similar to flyposting and should not be encouraged. The Deputy Leader disagreed – he considered that it was a good way of communicating the service to residents. However, he would check if they required planning permission.

(Q13) Mrs Lallement asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning about the purpose of the current school place planning process which she considered did not give sufficient time for objections to be properly considered. The Cabinet Member said that the Authority undertook a huge amount of forecasting. However, it was not a precise science and applications were still being received for school places, which made predictions difficult. She also said that this year the council was providing 3000 additional places.

(Q14) Mr Harrison requested that the Cabinet Member continued to keep Members informed of any developments of the Better Services, Better Value programme. In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Health and Wellbeing, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care agreed to this request.

(Q15) Mrs White referred to the budget difficulties of Adult Social Care in the last financial year and asked the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care whether the service would be using the large number for unfilled vacancies as one option to reduce any possible budget overspend. The Cabinet Member confirmed that this was not the case and that the service did not have a policy to keep vacancies unfilled to fulfil budget requirements.

(Q16) Mrs Watson asked the Cabinet Member for Schools and Learning what action would be taken if there was a shortfall between provision and demand for the free school meals for 2 year olds in September. As the figures currently available were only an indication, it was difficult for the Cabinet Member to comment.

(Q17) Mr Harrison considered that the fitting of sprinklers in Anchor and Care UK Homes should be progressed as soon as possible. The Cabinet Member for Adult

Social Care agreed and said that he would monitor the progress and would encourage care providers to install fire sprinklers.

(Q18) Mrs Watson asked the Leader to confirm whether the Cabinet Associate posts would receive a Special Responsibility Allowance. The Leader said that the Independent Remuneration Panel had not yet completed their work and therefore he was unable to comment.

(Q20) Mrs Watson requested that the guidance was made available to all Members and published on the county council website. The Leader of the Council considered that it had all been fully covered in this written response.

57/13 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 8]

There were no statements by Members.

58/13 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 9]

ITEM 9(i)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mrs Hazel Watson moved the motion which was:

'In the Coalition Agreement, the Government made a commitment to strengthen councillors' powers to vote on large salary packages for council officers. In addition, the Government has taken necessary steps to increase transparency about how taxpayers' money is used, including in the pay and reward of public sector staff.

The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency published on 29 September 2011 enshrines the principles of transparency in rewarding senior staff. Sections 38 - 43 of the Localism Act 2011 place a legal obligation on Local Authorities to publish an annual Pay Policy Statement with specific requirements regarding Chief Officers pay and other benefits.

The Surrey County Council Pay Policy Statement 2013 - 14 presented to this Council in March 2013 by the Leader states:

Chief Officers' and Chief Executive's Remuneration

Chief officers are on all-inclusive single status Surrey Pay contracts i.e. there are no variable pay salaries or bonuses paid. The council has not provided any grade related benefits in kind, such as Annual Leave, Private Medical Insurance or Lease Cars since 2007. Chief Officers receive the same allowances as other members of staff and access to the same voluntary benefits scheme, while any expenditure on business travel is reimbursed at the same rate for all grades.

The Chief Executive is on a contract which is like Chief Officers i.e. he is on an all-inclusive single status Surrey Pay contract and there is no variable pay or bonuses made. He is however paid a specific additional allowance for duties carried out in support of the Lord Lieutenant of the County.

This Council reaffirms this policy without any exceptions.'

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Fiona White.

Mrs Watson referred to the Surrey County Council Pay Policy Statement approved by the County Council in 2012 and updated and approved by County Council in March 2013. She considered that only the full Council could debate this issue. Her motion was not about individuals, it was about fairness, transparency and the need for all staff to be treated equally. She hoped that the whole Council would support her motion.

After a short debate in which four Members spoke on the motion, it was put to the vote with 64 Members voting for it and no Member voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

That this Council reaffirms this Pay Policy Statement without any exceptions.

ITEM 9(ii)

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

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

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

Given the vital importance of these airports for the continued success of the Surrey economy, this Council opposes any proposals that would serve to reduce their capacity or the role of Heathrow as a hub airport.

This Council remains of the view that expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council calls on Government and the aviation industry to prioritise investment in road and rail connections to the airports to reduce congestion and overcrowding.'

Mr Martin began by saying that the economy of Surrey was growing and that the residents of Surrey enjoyed living in such a vibrant county, which had good schools, jobs and businesses. There was easy access to London and two international airports adjoining the county. He also said that the top 200 companies are clustered within 25 miles of Heathrow. He provided detailed statistics, including the number of Surrey residents directly employed at Heathrow and acknowledged that the airport factor had a catalytic effect on jobs at both Heathrow and Gatwick. He considered that both airports were essential to Surrey's success and made reference to the Davies report on aviation and its interim report, due in December 2013. He believed that if Heathrow lost its 'hub' status it would be catastrophic for Surrey's economy. Any uncertainty was bad for jobs and businesses and therefore, he urged Members to support his motion.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Furey, who made the following points:

- Airport capacity was one of the most difficult questions for the county, with strong feelings on all sides.
- Residents who lived close to the airports were rightly concerned about noise and air pollution, the impact on the environment and land being taken for building new runways.
- Surrey's economy would be devastated if the Government decided to invest in a Thames Estuary airport or Stansted.
- Successive Governments had not made a decision on the future of aviation in the UK – this was damaging for Surrey's economic competitiveness and disconcerting for residents.
- The Government must act to: (i) make a rapid and clear decision, (ii) maintain the capacity of Heathrow and Gatwick and to support the role of Heathrow as a hub airport.
- Better road and rail links to both Heathrow and Gatwick, such as a southern rail access to Heathrow from Surrey and electrification of the North Downs link to Gatwick.
- Airport development, roads and railways must be co-designed with businesses and residents working together in partnership.

Mr Essex moved an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans), which was to add the following sentence to Mr Martin's motion:

'However, this Council is concerned that any new runways at either Heathrow or Gatwick would have seriously detrimental effects to many Surrey residents and the environment.'

Mr Essex made the following points:

- He considered that his amendment did not alter the main thrust of Mr Martin's motion.
- Most freight was brought to the airports by road
- All airports were due to submit their proposals to the Davies Commission within the week.
- There was a need for one hub airport for London.
- Surrey already had a robust economy and the success of Heathrow and Gatwick was a reflection of Surrey rather than the other way round.

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

- Concern re. infrastructure problems, and in particular the A244 road.
- That the debate was about hub changes and not about airport expansions.
- Concern for residents living near Heathrow and the stacking system for aeroplanes.
- Reference to the Environment and Transport Select Committee's May 2013 meeting, where Members debated airports including hub options and advocated examining future options for Gatwick.
- The effect of expansion at Gatwick on Charlwood village and recognition that Mole Valley District Council would have difficult decisions to make if / when they had to consider a planning application for airport expansion.
- Residents would appreciate the rail improvements to airports but would not support their further expansions.
- Stanwell Moor could be demolished if Heathrow expanded.

- It was behoven on this Council to look for and consider sensible solutions for the airports.
- A blanket approach was not appropriate – there was a need to wait for the actual proposals and then develop a formal response to them.

The amendment was put to the vote, with 21 Members voting for and 42 Members voting against it. There were two abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was lost.

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

- For the last 20 years, the UK had no airport strategy and was in danger of being left behind by other countries.
- Areas close to Heathrow airport were being blighted.
- Heathrow was the biggest hub airport in the world with 80 airlines using it and 1000 young people undertaking training there.
- Surrey had good relationships with businesses but they wanted better access links to Heathrow.
- Recognition of the importance of Heathrow airport and the huge number of residents from north Surrey that were dependent on it – either directly or indirectly.
- A desire for Surrey County Council to develop a robust aviation policy.
- A need to understand the importance of airports on the economy and that the size of Heathrow and Gatwick airport was critical to Surrey's economy.

The original motion was put to the vote, with 59 Members voting for and 3 Members voting against it. There were three abstentions.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

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

Given the vital importance of these airports for the continued success of the Surrey economy, this Council opposes any proposals that would serve to reduce their capacity or the role of Heathrow as a hub airport.

This Council remains of the view that expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council calls on Government and the aviation industry to prioritise investment in road and rail connections to the airports to reduce congestion and overcrowding.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.50pm and resumed at 2.05pm with all those present who had been in attendance in the morning session except for Mrs

Coleman, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Hodge, Mrs Kemeny, Mr Mallett, Mrs Moseley, Ms Thomson and Mr Witham.

ITEM 9(iii)

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

Under Standing Order 12.1, Mr Will Forster moved the motion, which was:

'Whilst the average age for leaving home is 24, only one in 20 young people in foster care stay with their carers beyond their 18th birthday. Many young people leaving foster care end up homeless and in a crisis that could be avoided.

This Council:

1. Asks the Cabinet to support the "Don't Move Me" campaign to persuade the Government to change the law and provide funding to ensure that all young people in foster care can stay with their foster families when they turn 18, if both parties agree
2. Until such time as the Government provides funding, asks Cabinet to do all it can to help young people in foster care to stay with their foster families when they turn 18, if both parties agree.'

In support of his motion, Mr Forster said that young people were generally staying at home longer than before but this change had not been reflected in the foster care system. He considered that it was critical for the Council to support its obligation to children in foster care and to provide them with a better chance for success. He urged all Members to vote for this motion and to think of it as an 'Invest to Save' option.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Ian Beardsmore.

Mrs Mary Angell tabled both the Department for Education's 'Charter for Care Leavers' and an amendment at the meeting (formally seconded by Mrs Curran) which was:

(N.B. Using the original motion, any additional words were underlined and the deletions crossed through)

'Whilst the average age for leaving home is 24, nationally only one in 20 young people in foster care stay with their carers beyond their 18th birthday. In the UK many young people leaving foster care end up homeless, and in a crisis that could be avoided.

In Surrey we have worked hard to address these issues, and currently our Fostering Service is supporting 47 young people, who are 18 plus, to remain in family-based care.

This Council:

1. Asks the Cabinet to support the "Don't move me Campaign" aimed at persuading to persuade the Government to change the law, and to provide adequate funding that will ensure young people, for whom it is appropriate,

can ~~remain stay~~ with their foster families when they turn 18, provided all if all parties agree.

- ~~2. Until such time as the Government provides funding, asks Cabinet to do all it can to help young people in foster care to stay with their foster families when they turn 18, if both parties agree.~~
2. Asks the Council to acknowledge that the Cabinet is both committed to supporting the National Charter for Care Leavers, and active in supporting the Corporate Parenting Board in ensuring that all young people leaving care have a statutory plan (pathway plan) in place, which will support them as they move into adulthood. This will include the choice to remain with their foster family after they turn 18, provided this is the right option for them.
3. Asks all members in their role as Corporate parents to continue their endorsement and support of the Corporate Parenting Board's innovative workstream launched in May 2013 entitled "Moving On ... from the Council's care to Independent Living", which was facilitated by the Shift Team.
4. Asks the Council to congratulate the Children in Care Council for their exemplary commitment and hard work in partnership with the Corporate Parenting Board and Care Leavers' Service to ensure that the opinions of young people are both listened to and acted upon to shape services.

Both Mr Forster and Mr Beardsmore (the seconder) agreed to support the amendment to his motion.

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families spoke to the amended motion and acknowledged the difficult issues that these young people needed to resolve when they left foster care. She confirmed that Surrey County Council was committed to them remaining with their carers until they had completed their education and said that currently 47 young people were being supported by the council. She also referred to paragraph 4 of the amended motion, in which the Council was asked to congratulate the Children in Care Council for their exemplary commitment and hard work.

Six more Members spoke on the motion as amended, making the following points:

- That the County Council continued to provide free school meals and a free travel card for foster children.
- Assistance was given to ensure that they had access to good housing and developed good housekeeping skills.
- Reference to the matched funding savings scheme for children in care.
- Praise for the fostering panels and Surrey's processes and the way that the council took its responsibilities seriously.
- That no children in care had been excluded from school or entered the youth justice system during the last two years.
- A desire to build on the achievement to date and provide opportunities for these young people to move into higher education and lead independent lives.

- That supporting this motion was a long term investment with enormous benefits.

The amended motion was put to the vote and agreed, with no Member voting against it.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

Whilst the average age for leaving home is 24, nationally only one in 20 young people in foster care stay with their carers beyond their 18th birthday. In the UK many young people leaving foster care end up homeless, and in a crisis that could be avoided.

In Surrey we have worked hard to address these issues, and currently our Fostering Service is supporting 47 young people, who are 18 plus, to remain in family-based care.

This Council:

1. Asks the Cabinet to support the “Don’t move me Campaign” aimed at persuading the Government to change the law, and to provide adequate funding that will ensure young people, for whom it is appropriate, can remain with their foster families when they turn 18, provided all parties agree.
2. Asks the Council to acknowledge that the Cabinet is both committed to supporting the National Charter for Care Leavers, and active in supporting the Corporate Parenting Board in ensuring that all young people leaving care have a statutory plan (pathway plan) in place, which will support them as they move into adulthood. This will include the choice to remain with their foster family after they turn 18, provided this is the right option for them.
3. Asks all Members in their role as Corporate parents to continue their endorsement and support of the Corporate Parenting Board’s innovative workstream launched in May 2013 entitled “Moving On ... from the Council’s care to Independent Living”, which was facilitated by the Shift Team.
4. Asks the Council to congratulate the Children in Care Council for their exemplary commitment and hard work in partnership with the Corporate Parenting Board and Care Leavers’ Service to ensure that the opinions of young people are both listened to and acted upon to shape services.

59/13 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 10]

The Deputy Leader presented the reports of the Cabinet meetings held on 28 May and 25 June 2013.

(1) Statements / Updates from Cabinet Members

Libraries Changes Lives Award - the Cabinet Member for Community Services tabled a statement advising Members that the Surrey Libraries Service had won the 2013 CILIP Libraries Change Lives Award. (Appendix C)

(2) Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A *Confident in Our Future – Corporate Strategy 2013/2018*

The Deputy Leader presented the report and commended it to Council.

RESOLVED:

That *Confident in our Future – Corporate Strategy 2013 – 2018, Annex 1 to the submitted report, be agreed.*

(3) Reports for Information / Discussion

The following reports were received and noted:

- Quarterly Report on Decisions taken under Special Urgency Arrangements – 1 April 2013 to 30 June 2013

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 28 May and 25 June 2013 be adopted.

60/13 CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION - CABINET ASSOCIATES [Item 11]

In the absence of the Leader, the Deputy Leader presented the report and informed Members that the Leader had announced the appointment of four Cabinet Associates at the County Council meeting on 21 May 2013 and that this report set out the changes required to the Constitution to ensure clarity of the role.

Concern was expressed by some Members both about the possible additional cost of these roles to the Council and also that no limit had been set for the number of Cabinet Associate posts.

Mr Kington said that he would be voting against the recommendations and requested a recorded vote.

The following Members voted for:

Mrs Angell, Mr Bennison, Ms Bowes, Mrs Bramhall, Mr Brett-Warburton, Mr Chapman, Mrs Clack, Mr Cosser, Mrs Curran, Mr Few, Mrs Frost, Mr Fuller, Mr Furey, Mr Goodman, Mr Gulati, Mr Hall, Mrs Hammond, Mr Harmer, Miss Heath, Mr Hussain, Mr Kemp, Mrs Lake, Mrs Lay, Ms Le Gal, Mrs Lewis, Mr Mahne, Mrs Marks, Mr Martin, Mrs Mountain, Mr Munro, Mr Norman, Mr Page, Mr Pitt, Mrs Ross-Tomlin, Mrs Saliagopoulos, Mr Samuels, Mr Skellett, Mr Taylor, Mr Walsh, Mr Wilson.

The following Members voted against:

Mr Barker, Mrs Barton, Mr Beardsmore, Mr Cooksey, Mr Essex, Mr Forster, Mr Goodwin, Mr Harrison, Mr Hickman, Mr Jenkins, Mr Johnson, Mr Kington, Mrs Lallement, Mrs Mason, Mrs Searle, Mr Selleck, Mr Townsend, Mrs Watson, Mrs Windsor

Therefore it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That amendments to Article 6, as outlined in Annex1 of the submitted report, be approved.
- (2) That the role profile for Cabinet Associates, attached as Annex 2 of the submitted report, be included in the appendix to the Member / officer protocol.

61/13 AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION [Item 12]

RESOLVED:

That the amendments, agreed by the Leader, to the Scheme of Delegation be noted.

62/13 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 13]

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

[Meeting ended at: 2.50pm]

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank