

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 11 JULY 2017 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:

Peter Martin (Chairman)
Tony Samuels (Vice-Chairman)

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

*absent

43/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Bennison, Mr Carasco, Mr Ellwood, Mrs Goodwin, Mrs Mason, Mr Nuti, Mrs White, Mr Wilson and Mrs Young.

44/17 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 23 May 2017 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

45/17 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- Her Majesty the Queen's Birthday Honours' List, the Queen's Award for Enterprise and the Queen's Award for Voluntary Service were set out in the agenda.
- Since becoming Chairman of Surrey County Council he had attended nearly 40 appointments, including five civic services throughout the county and also two royal visits.
- HRH The Princess Royal visited both the Queen Mary's Sailing Club in Ashford to celebrate 20 years of Sailability, and the prize day of the Royal School in Haslemere, where she was a patron.
- The month ahead would see further royal visits.
- The flag raising ceremony for Armed Forces Day was held at County Hall last month. It was well attended by officers and also by Deputy Lieutenant Martin Gerrard, numerous members of the Royal British Legion, including a 98 year old veteran, as well as military personnel.
- Sadly, we have had three recent acts of remembrance for the victims of the recent terrorism atrocities.
- Along with the Community Partnerships' team, he had hosted a reception for Surrey's Reservists at Guildford Fire Station, as a thank you for the tremendous work that they do to protect our country.
- That Surrey Fire and Rescue had assisted at the terrible Grenfell Tower fire and supplied the aerial platform ladder.
- That following representations from some Members, and in consultation with Group Leaders, item 11, the Amendments to the Constitution – Articles, will be withdrawn and the Vice-Chairman would meet with Group Leaders over the summer, with a view to bringing it back to Council for decision in October.
- Finally, he informed Members that Anne Gowing, from Democratic Services would be retiring in August and this was her last meeting.

46/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were none.

47/17 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:

- Whether the Green Belt would be protected in future housing strategy plans.

- Whether there was a timescale from Government, in relation to progressing fairer funding for Surrey.
- The new joint waste contract – there were issues, particularly in Elmbridge, which it was hoped would soon be resolved.

48/17 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Notice of 22 questions had been received. The questions and replies were published as a supplementary agenda on 10 July 2017.

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

(Q2) Mr Robert Evans asked the Leader of the Council if he would release the content of the letter that he had written to the Chancellor. The Leader agreed to the request and also informed Members that he was still waiting for a response.

(Q3) Dr Povey did not consider that his question had been answered and asked what was the relative cost of a ton of recycling if the waste was put into wheelie bins or fly-tipped? The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport agreed to provide the details outside the meeting. He also informed Members that there had been many changes to recycling in Waverley and reported that there had been a 40% reduction in fly-tipping incidents in that District.

Mr Essex raised both the issue of distance for residents to travel to recycling centres if four centres were closed and also that, as a result of the increased distances, recycling targets could decrease, which could result in financial loss to the Council. The Cabinet Member said that the proposals on the future of the Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) were still out for consultation. However, he informed Members that if the proposed closure of four CRCs went ahead, 95% of Surrey residents would still have a CRC within six miles of their home.

(Q5) Mrs Watson asked the Leader of the Council if he would be 'third time lucky' in his lobbying of Government for fairer funding for Surrey. The Leader considered that her supplementary question did not relate to her original question.

(Q7) Mr Forster said that the Woking Local Plan relied on local rail capacity and he was concerned that there was a lack of clarity from Government on their commitment to Crossrail 2 because there had not been any reference to it in the recent HM Queen's speech.

Mrs Muir, divisional Member for Epsom West, agreed that clarity on Crossrail 2 was also needed for her residents.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport agreed that Crossrail 2 was desperately needed in Surrey to help alleviate overcrowded trains. He informed Council that he had written to Government asking whether Crossrail 2 would go ahead.

(Q8) Mr Botten asked if the Cabinet Members would agree that nearly 50% of the families who use the Beeches have yet to find alternative provision. The Cabinet Member for Children responded by stating that the Council had communicated extensively with the families over a long period of time, and that the social care team were working with those affected families to find the best solutions.

Dr Grant-Duff referred to the number of SEND children benefitting from short breaks in Surrey and asked what benefits the re-commissioning of this service would have for all SEND children and young people in Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Children said that for many SEND children, the re-provision of services would provide a better offer, and often closer to home, particularly in relation to play and leisure. Finally, she thanked Members for their interest in the Short Breaks provision in Surrey and reminded them that a report for decision would be presented to Cabinet on 18 July 2017.

Mr Harrison asked the Cabinet Member for Children to confirm whether the overnight provision at Applewood would be reduced and was advised that it would be unchanged.

(Q9) Mr Botten referred to a previous speech of the Leader of the Council in which he highlighted the high number of adults in Surrey with Learning Difficulties and the historical reasons behind it. He asked whether the funding for Housing Related Support should reflect this. The Cabinet Member for Adults said a funding decision would not be made until after the consultation.

(Q11) Mrs Rivers asked the Leader of the Council if the assistance provided by the Local Government Association (LGA) proved that membership of the LGA was good for Surrey taxpayers and whether SCC should continue to be a member.

Mr Robert Evans referred to the £20m that was invested in Icelandic Banks and asked the Leader of the Council if an internal investigation had been undertaken and whether there had been any resignations as a result of the incident. He also made reference to SCC's current investment strategies and asked if there were safeguards in place to prevent any future issues with investment.

Mr Townsend asked why SCC was leaving the LGA because he considered that it was a 'strong vehicle' for influencing Government.

The Leader of the Council expressed disappointment about Members asking questions about the LGA and said he had made it clear in February that the new Council would decide what organisations the Council would affiliate to.

(Q12) Mr Essex asked what impact the transfer of services to Surrey Choices had on the residents' experience. The Cabinet Member for Adults confirmed that complaints were monitored and that no adverse comments had been received about the service.

(Q14) Mr Robert Evans asked the Cabinet Member for Highways if the £9m reduction in the Medium Term Financial Plan for the road repairs budget would have an adverse effect on the condition of Surrey's roads. The Cabinet Member confirmed that the highways were constantly monitored in Surrey and therefore that should not happen.

(Q16) Mrs Watson asked the Leader of the Council if he would be proposing a 15% increase in council tax at next year's Budget meeting. The Leader responding by stating that the Budget was set by the full Council.

(Q17) Mr Forster questioned whether the £42 billion core budget for schools by 2019/20 would include the recently announced teachers' pay rise. The Leader of the Council suggested that he wrote to the Secretary of State for a response to this question.

(Q18) Mr Botten queried whether the Cabinet Member for Education was aware that the headteacher of a school in Dorking was considering moving to a four-day week and also would she consider making representations to Government in relation to the 1% pay rise announced for teachers. The Cabinet Member informed Members that the School Teachers Review Body had agreed the 1% increase and that she considered that it would be upto the Chancellor in his Autumn Budget review in November to present his views on public sector pay. On the issue of a four-day week, she said that she had attended a Faith Chairs Headteachers meeting recently and none of the schools had talked about moving to a four-day week.

(Q19) Mr Lee asked whether the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport agreed with the Warlingham Conservatives' statement and would he be opposing the Bond Road site closure? The Cabinet Member informed Members that the consultation was on going and nothing would be decided before the proposals had been to the scrutiny committee and then to Cabinet for decision. He said that, whilst the County Council did not want to close any Community Recycling Centres, it was facing severe budgetary pressures and that savings had to be made in the service.

(Q20) Mr Essex asked about the Capital Safety Defect Programme and whether another budget could fund the 'in between' work (namely funding local structural repair on all roads) now that the funding to local committees had been withdrawn. The Cabinet Member for Highways confirmed that would be the case.

Cabinet Member Briefings: these were also published with the supplementary agenda on 10 July 2017.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Education: On improvements to the SEND provision and the issues of recruiting Educational Psychologists, plus the importance of supporting schools at the early intervention stage.

She was also asked about the new way of working as the schools-led improvement system developed and said that she considered that the Regional Schools Commissioner would play a significant role.

Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport was praised for the success of the local bus transport review and the savings delivered, whilst at the same time, improving services in some areas – this was a 'good news' story that should be publicised.

On the Air Quality Action Plan, it was requested whether the letter sent to Michael Gove MP could be made public. This was agreed.

Cabinet Member for Children was asked to expand on the comment in her statement relating to the inconsistency of practice and to explain to Members the work undertaken by the MASH (Multi-agency Safeguarding Hub). She said that her aim was to have a high quality of service disseminated across Surrey. She also informed Members that Ofsted would be visiting Surrey in the next month, to look specifically at the MASH.

Cabinet Member for Health: Members were pleased that health and care organisations had signed a devolution pledge with the Surrey Heartlands Sustainability and Transformation Partnership (STP). She was asked about plans to

monitor its progress and also for assurance about equality of service for all Surrey residents and not just for those in this area.

Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport on Community Recycling Centres and the consultation. Given the significant amount of interest and the large number of responses, he was asked if there could be an extension to the consultation. However, this request was rejected.

Additional item

The Chairman agreed that the Leader of the Council could make a statement.

The Leader informed Members that Mr David McNulty, the Chief Executive would be retiring at the end of September. He paid tribute to the significant contribution to Surrey that Mr McNulty had made since becoming Chief Executive in 2009.

49/17 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

Three Members made statements:

- (i) Mr Eber Kington read the poem – ‘Light versus Darkness’ relating to Epsom.
- (ii) Dr Andrew Povey in relation to the Cranleigh Community Recycling Centre.
- (iii) Mr John O'Reilly in relation to the bus services in his division, in particular, the improved service to Whiteley Village.

50/17 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

Item 8(i)

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

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

‘Council sends its deepest condolences to the family and friends of those killed, injured and missing in the Grenfell Tower tragedy in North Kensington.

Council recognises and thanks Surrey Fire & Rescue Service for the assistance they gave to the London Fire Brigade in tackling the blaze.

In view of the Grenfell Tower tragedy, this Council resolves:

- to ensure that Surrey Fire & Rescue Service is properly funded and resourced in order for it to keep the residents of Surrey safe;
- that fire safety audits are carried out in Surrey at least every 12 months on buildings with a communal entrance, including residential blocks, offices, shops and factories;
- that Surrey Fire & Rescue Service has the necessary equipment to reach the tallest buildings in the County, to ensure fires at all levels of buildings can be tackled effectively;
- that Surrey Fire & Rescue Service work closely with the districts and boroughs within the County to inspect housing blocks which are also at risk of a similar incident and to check any external cladding used on them and;
- to endorse the Fire Brigades Union and National Union of Teachers campaign that each new school built in England should be automatically fitted with a sprinkler system.’

Mr Goodwin made the following points:

- Paid tribute to those people who had lost their lives, their families and friends and acknowledged that support was needed to help people come to terms with the effect of the tragedy.
- Paid tribute to the Emergency Services, especially the Fire & Rescue Service who ran towards the fire.
- Considered that fire safety would now be higher priority for this Council.
- That there was no aerial ladder high enough to reach the top floors of the tower block.
- Everyone deserves to work and live in a safe environment and that changing nature of the London skyline.
- The importance of sprinklers, particularly in high buildings and that he would be supporting the Fire Brigades Union for sprinklers to be fitted in new buildings.
- The cladding issues were very frightening.
- All Surrey buildings needed regular audits.
- The importance of investing in the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Botten who reserved his right to speak.

Mrs Turner-Stewart moved an amendment which was tabled at the meeting. This was formerly seconded by Mr Kemp.

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

‘Council sends its deepest condolences to the family and friends of those killed, injured and missing in the Grenfell Tower tragedy in North Kensington.

Council recognises and thanks Surrey Fire & Rescue Service for the assistance they gave to the London Fire Brigade in tackling the blaze **fire and for their support in subsequent days to provide officers, vehicles and equipment.**

In view of the Grenfell Tower tragedy, this Council resolves:

- to ensure that **continue to consider the funding for and resourcing of** Surrey Fire & Rescue Service ~~is properly funded and resourced in order for it to keep the residents of Surrey safe.~~ **The Council notes that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service officers are developing a comprehensive Integrated Risk Management Plan for consultation, setting out how they can continue to deliver efficient and effective prevention, protection and response with resilience into the future.**
- **to consider national guidance on fire safety audits and whether funding and resources allow and are necessary, for more regular** ~~that fire safety audits are carried out in Surrey at least every 12 months on buildings with a communal entrance, including residential blocks, offices, shops and factories.~~
- ~~that Surrey Fire & Rescue Service~~ **to continue to effectively use** ~~has the necessary equipment to reach the tallest buildings in the County, to ensure fires at all levels of buildings can be tackled effectively. This includes their~~

turntable ladder and aerial ladder platform, which at 42 metres high is the tallest in England and used at the recent Grenfell Tower fire.

- ~~that Surrey Fire & Rescue Service~~ to **continue to** work closely with the districts and boroughs **and other agencies** within the County to inspect housing blocks which are also at risk of a similar incident and to check any external cladding used on them **in accordance with Government guidance issued.** ~~and;~~
- to ~~endorse~~ **consider** the Fire Brigades Union and National Union of Teachers campaign that each new school built in England should be automatically fitted with a sprinkler system.'

Both Mr Goodwin and Mr Botten agreed to accept the amendment to this motion and therefore, it became the substantive motion.

Mr Robert Evans moved a further amendment, which was also tabled at the meeting. This was formerly seconded by Mr Essex.

His amendment proposed including the following additional wording at the end of the motion.

'Furthermore Council is deeply concerned that Surrey Fire Brigade Union (FBU) has passed a motion of no confidence in the Surrey fire authority, arguing that should 'these cuts go ahead, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service will no longer be able to perform its duty effectively'.

Council notes that by 2022 if the planned cuts are implemented, SFRS will have suffered a 69% drop in firefighter posts, since 2010.

Council therefore agrees to review all planned cuts to fire cover including their equality impact assessment, pending the outcome of the Grenfell public enquiry and to demand immediately additional money for fire safety from the government.'

Mr Robert Evans made the following points:

- Expressed disappointment with the amendment to the original motion.
- Extended his deep condolences to the residents of Grenfell Tower.
- The fear, shock and horror of the tragedy and that the firefighters went towards it without a care for their own safety.
- That he had visited Staines Fire Station to thank the crews that had assisted their London colleagues.
- The Council had a tremendous responsibility for Surrey Fire and Rescue and that was why he had included a reference to the Fire Brigade Union passing a motion of no confidence in the Surrey Fire Authority if further cuts went ahead.
- Concern about the reduction in the number of firefighter posts, particularly in the Spelthorne area if the number of fire stations was reduced from two to one, and the effect for fire safety in the locality, which included Heathrow airport and the M25.
- That the Council should agree to review all planned cuts to fire cover.

Nine Members spoke on the amendment to the substantive motion and made the following comments:

- The local Member for Farnham North has been contacted by firefighters at his local station who had expressed their concern about the proposed cuts to their service and the Council needed to pay attention to them.
- Reference to the Leader's statement in which he mentioned that this Council had made £500m cuts since 2010.
- The proposed cuts for fire cover were too severe and needed to be reviewed.
- That Cabinet were aware of the FBU views.
- Mrs Turner-Stewart's amendment to the original motion added in the development of the Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) which would set out how the service would continue to deliver its services in the future.
- Mr Robert Evans' amendment could not be accepted because it asked the Council to wait for the outcome of the Grenfell Public inquiry which could take several years.
- SF&R did have some of the best equipment, including defibrillators in the country.
- The purpose of the IRMG (otherwise known as the Public Safety Plan) was to look at the risks for the whole county and nothing had changed since the last one was approved.
- There was an annual requirement to send a Statement of Assurance to Government in relation to the service's effective performance.
- That it was usual practice for firefighters to write their names on their hats and the person managing the entry to the fire to record their names.
- A belief that SF&R service was adequately funded – no one liked making cuts but the budget needed to balance.
- The Council should be concerned if the FBU had passed a motion of no confidence.
- That the Chief Fire Officer had already reviewed the planned cuts to the fire service.
- Was the 42 metre aerial platform (supplied by SF&R for the Grenfell Tower fire) high enough to reach the floors of all high rise blocks in Surrey.
- Delaying any review could be catastrophic
- This county had a well equipped fire service and tribute was paid to the efforts of Surrey firefighters at Grenfell Tower.
- The importance of regular audits and that points made by councillors in the debate should feed into the budget discussions for 2018/19.
- That this amendment was sensible, reasonable and that the Council should be concerned about comments from the FBU.
- Concern about further planned cuts.
- That all schools should be fitted with a sprinkler system and not just new schools, as proposed by the Government, but this would require additional funding.

Finally, Mr Robert Evans responded to the comments raised by Members and his amendment was put to the vote with 17 Members voting for and 55 Members voting against it. There were no abstentions.

Therefore, the amendment to the substantive motion was lost.

Returning to the substantive motion, there were two further speakers, who made the following comments:

- The importance of getting the correct tone of the motion and also not to make it too complacent. However, it needed to demonstrate humility.
- That there should be consensus across the Chamber.
- A need to bring all parties together including SF&R and FBU so that the best way forward could be achieved.
- That SCC had invested in equipment including breathing and cutting apparatus for SF&R and that this had been well used at the Grenfell tragedy.
- Confirmation that SCC had the necessary equipment for what is required in this county.
- Prevention was better than cure.
- SF&R already advised businesses in relation to safety.
- This Council needed to support firefighters – it was important to move forward with new ways of working such as co-responding.

The Leader of the Council then moved that:

‘the question be now put’

Ten Members stood in support of this motion and the Chairman accepted that there had been sufficient debate. He asked Mr Goodwin, as the proposer of the original motion to wind up the debate.

The substantive motion was put to the vote with 69 Members voting for and no Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions.

Therefore it was:

RESOLVED:

That Council sends its deepest condolences to the family and friends of those killed, injured and missing in the Grenfell Tower tragedy in North Kensington.

That Council recognises and thanks Surrey Fire and Rescue Service for the assistance they gave to the London Fire Brigade in tackling the fire and for their support in subsequent days to provide officers, vehicles and equipment.

In view of the Grenfell Tower tragedy, this Council resolves:

- to continue to consider the funding for and resourcing of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service in order to keep the residents of Surrey safe. The Council notes that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service officers are developing a comprehensive Integrated Risk Management Plan for consultation, setting out how they can continue to deliver efficient and effective prevention, protection and response with resilience into the future.
- to consider national guidance on fire safety audits and whether funding and resources allow and are necessary, for more regular fire safety audits in Surrey on buildings with a communal entrance, including residential blocks, offices, shops and factories.

- to continue to effectively use the necessary equipment to reach the tallest buildings in the County, to ensure fires at all levels of buildings can be tackled effectively. This includes their turntable ladder and aerial ladder platform, which at 42 metres high is the tallest in England and used at the recent Grenfell Tower fire.
- to continue to work closely with the districts and boroughs and other agencies within the County to inspect housing blocks which are also at risk of a similar incident and to check any external cladding used on them in accordance with Government guidance issued.
- to consider the Fire Brigades Union and National Union of Teachers campaign that each new school built in England should be automatically fitted with a sprinkler system.

Item 8(ii)

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

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

“Council regrets the proposed closure of 4 Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) in Surrey, as well as the increase in charges and reduced opening hours at other sites, which will be detrimental to the environment.

Council notes that Surrey County Council previously consulted the public on closures and reduction of hours for CRCs but subsequently scaled back their plans in response to concerns raised by residents. Council further notes the high value residents place upon this service and their desire to retain and improve it.

Council calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to work with the Boroughs and Districts and Surrey Waste Management Ltd to explore alternatives before any closure plans for CRCs are finalised, in order to maintain these vital services for Surrey residents.’

Mr Essex made the following points:

- Referring back to the consultation in 2015 on proposed changes to CRCs, where some changes had been implemented but others had not.
- Also, a petition with 7000 signatures objecting to the changes had been received at that time.
- These 2017 changes had not been through the Scrutiny or Cabinet process yet, neither had an Equality Impact Assessment been completed so this motion provided an opportunity for public discussion.
- Proposing closure of four CRCs could affect up to 400,000 residents who would be expected to drive further to recycling centres, and if the remaining centres operated reduced opening hours, residents had a increased risk of turning up at CRCs when they were closed.
- The importance of achieving the 70% recycling target plus the need to encourage residents to increase their recycling.

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Robert Evans.

Mr Goodman moved an amendment which was tabled at the meeting.

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

'Council regrets the need for the current consultation with Surrey residents on ~~a~~ the proposed closure of four Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) in Surrey, as well as the increase in charges and reduced and possible changes to opening hours at other sites. ~~which will be detrimental to the environment.~~

Council notes that Surrey County Council previously consulted the public on closures and reduction of hours for CRCs but subsequently scaled back their plans in response to concerns raised by residents. Council further notes the high value residents place upon this service and their desire to retain and improve it for these to remain in place.

Council calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport to work with Members of Parliament, the Boroughs and Districts, Parishes, Joint Waste Solutions and Surrey Waste Management Ltd Partnership to explore and assess alternatives before any closure plans for CRCs are finalised. ~~in order to maintain these vital services for Surrey residents.'~~

Both Mr Essex and Mr Robert Evans agreed to accept the amendment to this motion and therefore, it became the substantive motion.

Six Members spoke on the substantive motion and made the following comments:

- The significant financial challenges facing the Council.
- All Members regretted having to make proposed changes to CRCs but there were challenging savings targets to achieve in the service, including £1.8m from CRCs.
- Acknowledgement of Members' and residents' concerns. However, assurance was given that the County Council would work with partners to mitigate any changes to residents.
- Work was on-going to reduce costs.
- If, after the consultation four CRCs closed (Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking and Cranleigh), 95% of Surrey residents would still have a CRC within six miles of their home.
- There was no evidence that fly tipping would increase. However, some Members remained concerned about it and considered that the Fly Tipping Strategy was fundamental. Also, there were no statistics on fly tipping on private land, such as National Trust land.
- There were several commercial companies that would collect waste.
- A need for more accurate data.
- A two day media campaign setting out the proposed changes would be launched in August.
- 20 years ago, there was practically no recycling so huge steps had been made to achieve the current percentage of recycling.
- Residents did not always think that they should recycle.
- Residents were urged to participate in the consultation.
- The CRCs were a success story with an 83% satisfaction rate.
- The Cabinet Member was asked if there was any flexibility to make changes as part of the consultation process, including exploring whether Districts / Boroughs could take over the responsibility for CRCs.

- An invite was extended to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to visit Spelthorne Borough to observe the fly tipping issues in the area.
- It was hoped that the Cabinet Member would carefully consider views of residents before the final recommendations are considered by Cabinet.
- Concern that 'detrimental to the environment' and reference to increased charges had been deleted from the amendment.
- That the proposals should be scrutinised by the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee.
- Finally, that there was money to be made from recycling and therefore there should be investment in the service and residents should be encouraged to recycle their unwanted goods free of charge.

The motion was put to the vote and received unanimous support.

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

Council regrets the need for the current consultation with Surrey residents on a proposed closure of four Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) and possible changes to opening hours at other sites.

Council notes that Surrey County Council previously consulted the public on closures and reduction of hours for CRCs but subsequently scaled back their plans in response to concerns raised by residents. Council further notes the high value residents place upon this service and their desire for these to remain in place.

Council calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to work with Members of Parliament, the Boroughs and Districts, Parishes, Joint Waste Solutions and Surrey Waste Partnership to explore and assess alternatives before any closure plans for CRCs are finalised.

Item 8(iii)

Mr Robert Evans agreed to withdraw his motion because the Grenfell Tower disaster had been discussed in Motion 1.

Item 8(iv)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.
Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Furey moved the motion, which was:

'This Council recognises the significant and growing contribution made by the county of Surrey to Her Majesty's exchequer.

This Council also believes in the paramount need for a system of fair funding for local government.

This Council notes the very significant additional funding being made available to people in Northern Ireland for schools, hospitals, infrastructure and public services. This Council believes that the need for investment in those areas is equally important in Surrey.

The Council mandates the Leader of Surrey County Council to use all endeavours to ensure that Government understands the need for further investment in Surrey.'

Mr Furey made the following points:

- A reference to the snapshot of the County in June 2015 which was carried out by AECOM consultants and carried out again this year.
- These five themes were addressed: (i) new homes required, (ii) incoming residents, (iii) required infrastructure, (iv) funding gap, (v) jobs created.
- 59,000 new jobs were created in Surrey between 2015-2017 but the new homes requirement was not met. Therefore, the large increase in new residents had increased pressure on housing, education and health services in the county.
- The infrastructure issues had deteriorated since 2015 - Surrey roads were more congested and required a high level of repair.
- No additional funding had been given to Surrey and there appeared to be a lack of sustainability caused by the Government perception that Surrey was a rich and successful county.
- Businesses needed both skilled and non-skilled people who required affordable housing and public transport at a reasonable price.
- The effect of congestion on Surrey's roads.
- That Surrey had the largest fiscal balance of revenue generated in the country.
- Comparison examples of other areas were given to illustrate the value of each resident / revenue contribution and the net contribution to the Treasury of each resident.
- The continued focus on city economies and the role of regional devolution by Government.
- Finally, that Government had provided a grant of several billion pounds to Northern Ireland in exchange for parliamentary support which was contrary to the growth agenda.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Lewis who made the following points:

- That this motion had built on much of what had been discussed in the Council Chamber today.
- The importance of making a compelling case to Government.
- The Conservative administration of Surrey County Council was not afraid to stand up to a Conservative Government.
- Surrey was a 'powerhouse' in the South East and the Government needed to support the county and therefore its 11 MPs would continue to be lobbied for a fairer funding deal for Surrey, so all Members were urged to support this motion.

Four Members spoke on the motion and made the following comments:

- Disappointment that the Leader had left the Local Government Association and that the County Council may withdraw from it but it was hoped that the Council would continue to work with the Association to achieve fairer funding for Surrey.
- That, to date, the Leader had not managed to obtain more funding for Surrey and that the business rate pilot was no longer going ahead.

- Some of the funding announced for Northern Ireland would have helped to alleviate Surrey's budgetary pressures.
- Surrey MPs were ineffectual and so far had not achieved a better funding deal for Surrey residents.
- All Members, regardless of party had been fighting hard for a fairer funding deal for Surrey.
- The difficulty of balancing the budget due to increased demand and therefore in order to help achieve this aim, services needed to be re-shaped.
- That the Government needed to reform the system for funding local Government.

The motion was put to the vote with 62 Members voting for and no Members voting against it. There were 5 abstentions.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

This Council recognises the significant and growing contribution made by the county of Surrey to Her Majesty's exchequer.

This Council also believes in the paramount need for a system of fair funding for local government.

This Council notes the very significant additional funding being made available to people in Northern Ireland for schools, hospitals, infrastructure and public services. This Council believes that the need for investment in those areas is equally important in Surrey.

The Council mandates the Leader of Surrey County Council to use all endeavours to ensure that Government understands the need for further investment in Surrey

51/17 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 30 May 2017 and 27 June 2017.

Reports for Information / Discussion

- A) Quarterly Report On Decisions Taken Under Special Urgency Arrangements: 1 April – 30 June 2017

RESOLVED:

That the report of the Cabinet be agreed.

52/17 REPORT OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE [Item 10]

The Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee introduced the report. He said that both updated strategies had been scrutinised by his committee and commended them: the Risk Management Strategy and Plan (Annex A to the submitted report), plus the updated Code of Corporate Governance (Annex B to the submitted report) to Members.

RESOLVED:

1. That the updated Risk Management Strategy and Plan, attached as Annex A to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.
2. That the updated Code of Corporate Governance, attached as Annex B to the submitted report, be approved for inclusion in the Constitution.

53/17 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION - ARTICLES [Item 11]

These item was deferred and will be included on the County Council agenda for its 10 October 2017 meeting.

54/17 MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET [Item 12]

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 June 2017 were published as a supplementary agenda on 4 July 2017.

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

[Meeting ended at: 1.05pm]

Chairman