

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 5 DECEMBER 2017 COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS FOLLOWS:

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

*absent

68/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from John Furey, Richard Wilson, Stephen Spence, Penny Rivers, Mark Brett-Warburton, Mike Bennison, Marsha Mosley, Jeff Harris and Matt Furniss.

69/17 MINUTES [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 10 October 2017 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

70/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Will Forster declared a non-pecuniary interest in Question 6 of Members' Questions as he worked for the European Union.

Mrs Fiona White declared a personal interest in item 8 (ii) as her grandson was a special education needs student at Guildford College.

Mrs Angela Goodwin and Mr David Goodwin declared a personal interest in item 8 (ii) as their daughter received a Surrey County Council care package and attended Guildford College.

Rachael I Lake declared a non-pecuniary interest for item 8(iv) as her son worked for Surrey County Council.

71/17 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

- The Chairman paid tribute to Ann Charlton, Monitoring Officer and Director of Legal, Democratic and Cultural Services, who would be retiring after nearly 30 years of service at the Council.
- He highlighted the spectacular light display of falling poppies that lit the front of County Hall as an act for remembrance on 10 November 2017.
- Members were reminded to nominate a resident for the Chairman's Volunteer Award which was for those who they believe deserve recognition for their services in the Voluntary Sector. The deadline for nominations had been extended to 8 December 2017.
- He reminded those present of the Members' Christmas Lunch on 14 December 2017.
- A silent tribute was held in remembrance of Mr Denis Bailey, a previous County Councillor.

72/17 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:

- How to engage residents with a new approach.
- Actions taken to ensure the use or let of vacant Council owned properties.

- Implications to the Investment Strategy following the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) consultation on the proposed changes to prudential framework on capital finance.
- What the Council are doing to support unaccompanied asylum seeking children.
- Changes to providing services with a new approach.
- Unhelpful responses from MPs after requesting extra funding for the Council.
- The potential use of Pond Meadow in Guildford for better health and youth services in the community – the Leader confirm that they were currently out to tender.
- How the place agenda will be different and how Members can play the role of game changers.
- Current progress of extra care accommodation within Adult Social Care.

73/17 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Notice of 17 questions had been received. The questions and replies were published as a supplementary agenda on 1 December 2017.

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

(Q2) Mr Andrew Povey asked the Leader if he felt tax payers' money was spent in the best possible way. It was highlighted that a large number of high street businesses were forced to close and that Government was pressing for 300,000 houses to be built. The Leader of the Council expressed the need for affordable housing in the County and highlighted the importance of building a variety of house sizes.

(Q3) Mr Jonathan Essex asked if it would be appropriate for the Council to respond to the consultation of the Revised Airports National Policy Statement in order to reassert the importance of following commitments and ensuring that they are reflected in the forthcoming strategy. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport highlighted that there would be a Member Seminar on the Heathrow Airport expansion on 11 December 2017 and stated that the Council would consider its reply to the consultation.

(Q4) Mrs Hazel Watson asked if details of the settlement would ever be made public and if the Cabinet Member for Health would agree to a scrutiny investigation to ensure flaws are identified and did not reoccur. The Cabinet Member reaffirmed that she could not comment.

(Q5) Mr Stephen Cooksey asked for clarification on timescales and requested that the report be considered by the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee. The Cabinet Member for Highways confirmed that the report would be considered by Cabinet in early 2018 and that he would be happy for it to be considered at Select Committee.

(Q6) Mr Chris Botten asked the Cabinet Member for Highways to confirm if he trusted Parish Councillors to honour a five year agreement for street lighting. The Cabinet Member expressed that he did trust the work of Parish Councillors but could not exclude Parish Councils from Part Night Lighting due to various issues associated with area boundaries and driver visuals.

(Q8) Mr Will Forster asked if the Leader was concerned that there would not be sufficient certainty for Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and County Councils in order to plan for infrastructure if consultations were to take place in spring 2018, and if he would agree to write to Government to bring forward the consultation. The Leader of the Council stated that if Government gave him the opportunity then he would do so.

(Q10) Mr Jonathan Essex asked if plans would be revisited if the removal of £4 million of recycling credits did not accelerate recycling rates in the County. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport stated that he did not believe that it would lead to a decrease in recycling and expressed the importance of working together with Boroughs and Districts.

(Q11) Mrs Fiona White asked the Cabinet Member for Adults if he was disappointed that Government did not recognise the need for additional funding for Adult Social Care in the Autumn Budget. The Cabinet Member stated that he was concerned with the rising number of duties and limited funding to the County Council.

(Q12) Mr Robert Evans asked if the Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services would consider producing an annual statement to the Council to highlight the progress being made on becoming a Fair Trade council.

Mr Jonathan Essex asked if Surrey County Council was officially recognised as a Fair Trade Council and highlighted that some coffee provided to Members in the Council was not Fair Trade.

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services agreed to provide an update to Council on an annual basis regarding the authority's progress to becoming a Fair Trade Council. It was highlighted that the Ethical Procurement Statement and Supplier Code of Conduct would soon be published. The Cabinet Member agreed to confirm whether the County Council was already an official Fair Trade Council after the meeting.

(Q15) Mr Will Forster asked if the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport could elaborate on his reply. The Cabinet Member highlighted the work the Council had done to maintain many bus services despite the financial issues. It was further stated that the Council had been in discussions with Hampshire on this matter.

(Q16) Mr Jonathan Essex asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to confirm where the three additional incinerators would be placed in the County. The Cabinet Member highlighted that this was a consultation and that there would be no commitments until after the consultation had taken place.

(Q17) Mrs Hazel Watson asked if the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport would review the County Council's policy to enable people with learning disabilities to retain their concessionary bus passes. The Cabinet Member highlighted that the Council did in some areas give more than they were statutory obligated to do. It was stressed that the Council was in a very serious financial situation.

Mr Will Forster declared a person interest in Question 6 of Members' Questions as he worked for the European Union.

Cabinet Member Briefings: These were also published with the supplementary agenda on 4 December 2017.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport was asked if parking displacement would be taken into consideration when considering the potential introduction of parking fees to rural car parks in Surrey. He responded by highlighting that the money would be used to protect the Surrey countryside and that Members would be working with Officers to consider parking displacement.

Cabinet Member for Highways was asked if the technical difficulties had been overcome and if the streetlights would be left on for both Christmas and New Year celebrations. He responded by confirming that the streetlights would be left on for both Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve in order to support residents who are out late for the celebrations.

Cabinet Member for Children was asked how they saw the development of Early Help Boards in each of the Borough and Districts of Surrey through the work of the Local and Joint Committees. She responded by highlighting that Early Help was a critical element for improvement in the County and that it was a way of dealing with problems at the earliest possible stage. Members were said to have the responsibility for developing Early Help in their area as they know their local area best.

Cabinet Member for Children was asked if she could expand on the recent letter received from Ofsted. The Cabinet Member stressed that she was very perturbed by the letter and that it was clear that recent improvements had not had the effects they wanted. There would be an immediate review of all open cases in order to highlight where responsibilities were not being met. The Director of Children Services had recently met with every front line Social Worker to ensure they are aware of their responsibilities in order to create one clear picture of the work that needs to be done.

Leader of the Council was asked for an update on progress with extra care accommodation for the elderly. The Leader of the Council stated that the Pond Meadow site in Guildford had been earmarked for extra care and that the Council was in the process of tender negotiations.

Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport was asked what he would do if the 166 bus was cut as it was heavily relied upon by both the young and elderly. He responded by stating that the bus was run by Transport for London (TfL) and that the Council was in discussion with them and would work hard to ensure that the route was maintained.

74/17 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

There were none.

75/17 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 8]

Rachael I Lake declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8(iv) as her son worked for Surrey County Council

Item 8(i)

The Leader of the Council proposed that this motion be referred to the Audit and Governance Committee due to there not being sufficient information for debate.

Dr Povey agreed to the referral of the motion.

Therefore it was:

RESOLVED

To refer the motion to the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on 22 January 2018.

Item 8(ii)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion. Mr Botten proposed a revised motion which was agreed and therefore, it became the substantive motion.

Under Standing Order 12.1 Mr Botten moved the revised motion (with additional words underlined and deletions crossed through): which was:

'The Council notes that:

- (i) Significant numbers of children who are either in the care of the County Council or children with special educational needs are being placed in residential care or special schools outside Surrey. This means that children are either living a long way from family and friends or have to travel long distances to get to and from school which is detrimental to children and their families and;
- (ii) The County Council is projecting to overspend its special needs transport Budget by £1.2 million in 2017/18.
- (iii) This Council supports plans to develop travel training for young people with special educational needs and to encourage the take up of the parental travel allowance.

This Council agrees that there is a lack of County Council provided residential place and special needs places for children within Surrey and the County Council ~~must urgently~~ will invest in providing more of such places for children in Surrey as soon as practicable.'

Mr Botten made the following points:

- That the Council had not provided sufficient care for children in need.
- The current efforts had resulted in a lot of stress for children.
- Cabinet had previously agreed to support children to travel more independently.

- There was growing demand for special needs services in the County.
- That the motion was asking for it to be actioned 'as soon as practicable'.
- The Council needs to be more demanding with service providers and not accept inadequate service.
- Members have the responsibility to be game changers.

Members should endorse good practice and not tolerate long waiting times.

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

- Many families experience an uphill struggle when dealing with various services.
- Each stage resulted in less support from the Council.
- The Local Authority should be more proactive and invest in quality services for children.
- There should be more provision for carers so they can have their own lives outside of caring.
- Investment in special needs education needs to be holistic.

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

- As corporate parents Members should not accept the current situation for children.
- Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) should be receiving the right support at the right time.
- The Council is committed to working with all partners to ensure children receive the services they need in their local communities.
- Over the last four years the Council has provided £24 million of capital funding to increase special educational needs school places.
- Partnerships with services require very strong leadership.
- There had been some progress from the previous year.
- The Council was faced with very high travel costs for children.
- That the Council should strengthen its relationships with partners.
- All special educational needs schools in the county were rated either good or exceptional.
- Finally, it was stressed that many families do not receive sufficient support.

The Chairman asked Mr Botten, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate.

- He stated that it was clear that Members had a passion to get things right.
- As game changers Members should work differently and promote good practice.

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

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

The Council notes that:

- (i) Significant numbers of children who are either in the care of the County Council or children with special educational needs are being placed in residential care or special schools outside Surrey. This means that children are either living a long way from family and friends or have to travel long distances to get to and from school which is detrimental to children and their families and;
- (ii) The County Council is projecting to overspend its special needs transport Budget by £1.2 million in 2017/18.
- (iii) This Council supports plans to develop travel training for young people with special educational needs and to encourage the take up of the parental travel allowance.

This Council agrees that there is a lack of County Council provided residential place and special needs places for children within Surrey and the County Council will invest in providing more of such places for children in Surrey as soon as practicable.

Item 8(iii)

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

‘This Council notes that the County Council does not currently have a road sign inspection policy and that it relies upon members of the public to notify the County Council of missing and damaged road signs.

This Council agrees:

- (i) to develop a sign inspection policy with regular inspections to be carried out by Council officers to identify missing and damaged road signs and to implement such a policy; or
- (ii) alternatively if the County Council is expecting members of the public to notify it of missing or damaged road signs, to provide an interactive map showing which road signs should be in place to enable them to more effectively perform their role.

Mrs Watson made the following points:

- Many Surrey roads were missing road signs.
- Road signs were needed to make Surrey roads safer.
- Surrey relied on residents to inform the County Council of missing road signs.
- The County Council needs to develop a road sign inspection policy as the current system is not working.

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

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

- There was over 3,000 miles of road in Surrey with close to 120,000 signs.

- A map of road signs would be out of date before it was published and would require a large financial commitment.
- Members should use their local knowledge and report missing road signs.
- Many councils were decluttering roads by removing signs.
- Finally, the Council should improve the response time for the maintenance of road signs.

Mr Cooksey, as seconder to the motion, made the following comments:

- That the system was not working properly
- Many neighbouring counties had systems in place similar to that proposed.

The Chairman asked Mrs Watson, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate

- She stated that this was an important issue and that the Council should not rely on residents to report missing road signs.

The motion was put to a vote with 10 Members voting for and 52 Members voting against. There were 5 Abstentions.

Therefore it was:

Resolved:

That the motion was lost.

Item 8(iv)

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

‘Surrey Council recognises the huge contribution made to the County by all its employees.

Council notes that:

- local government pay is amongst the lowest in the public sector;
- in real terms, basic pay across local government has fallen by around 21% since 2010;
- Surrey CC workers have now had eight years of below-inflation pay increases;
- there are growing equal and fair pay risks resulting from this situation.

This council recognises that local government pay should not be allowed to fall further behind other parts of the public sector, so therefore supports the aim of restoring fair pay on behalf of council and school workers and calls for an immediate end to public sector pay restraint.

Additionally, this council notes the drastic ongoing cuts to local government funding and calls on central government to provide the additional funding

needed to fund a decent pay rise for its employees.

Surrey County Council therefore calls on the Leader of the Council, as Chairman of the People, Performance and Development Committee to:

- a. write to the Prime Minister and the Chancellor supporting the National Joint Council (NJC) and other locally determined local government pay claims and to seek additional finance to fund a decent pay rise.
- b. call immediately on the Local Government Association (LGA) to make urgent representations to central Government to fund the NJC and other locally determined local government pay claims and then to report back on their action in this regard.
- c. meet with local Surrey County Council union representatives to convey support for their claim for a fair pay increase.'

Mr Evans made the following points:

- Many Surrey staff find it hard to live on their current wage.
- Surrey had some of the best employees of any Local Authority.
- Many Surrey staff were very involved with their local communities.
- The motion asks for a decent pay rise by calling on central government to provide the additional funding.
- Research shows the treasury would save half the total cost of the proposed pay rise.
- That this was a sensible proposal.
- Asked the Leader of the Council to write to central government to seek additional finance to fund a decent pay rise.
- Asked the Leader to meet with local union representatives to support their claim.

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

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

- The Pay Policy Statement, item 11 of the meeting's agenda, lays out the Council's policy.
- Surrey County Council was not a member of the National Joint Council.
- The motion was not a valid reason to change the current framework.
- Surrey County Council would not retain good staff if they do not provide a good pay offer.
- Finally, that the People, Performance and Development Committee would be a more suitable forum for this discussion.

Mr Essex, as seconder to the motion, made the following comments:

- It was important to recruit and retain good staff.
- Housing costs have risen faster than wages in Surrey.
- This motion would be a game changer.

The Chairman asked Mr Evans, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate.

- He stated he was disappointed with some of the reactions from Members.
- Trade unions support the discussed motion.
- There needs to be improvement with the current policy.

The motion was put to a vote with 11 Members voting for and 52 Members voting against. There were 4 Abstentions.

Therefore it was:

Resolved:

That the motion was lost.

Item 8(v)

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 notes:

That on the 16 November 2017 the Council Overview & Budget Scrutiny committee agreed that our property investments should be guided by an environmental and social governance (ESG) policy, agreed and confirmed in writing, as does our pension fund investments.

Council resolves:

That an ESG policy be agreed with a commitment that this should be applied to all of the property-related investment decisions made by Surrey County Council, both through its local authority property company Halsey Garton and by itself, including for its developments on publically owned sites in Surrey, and that this policy includes specific commitments to:

- genuinely affordable housing;
- investments to reach BREEAM rating of Excellent or higher;
- reaffirm our existing commitment to protect the green belt; and
- for these commitments to be scrutinised in public.’

Mr Essex made the following points:

- Surrey has a £1billion property investment strategy.
- Property investments should be governed by clear guidelines on environmental, social and ethical issues.
- He stated the motion was proposing what the content of an environment, social and ethical policy should be..
- This policy would send a signal to the property market about the environmental standards that the Council expects.

- The policy should be reflected in a plan to improve the environmental standards of the Council's property portfolio.
- Such a policy would recognise that Surrey is an unaffordable place to live for many and new homes should be genuinely affordable.
- A policy would ensure that the County leads on environmental standards.

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

- It should not be controversial that the Council's property investments should be guided by an ethical standards policy.

Mr Oliver moved an amendment which was tabled at the meeting. This was formerly seconded by Mr Hawkins.

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

'Council notes:

That on the 16 November 2017 the Council Overview & Budget Scrutiny committee agreed that our property investments should be guided by an environmental and social governance (ESG) policy, agreed and confirmed in writing, as does our pension fund investments.

Council resolves:

That an ESG policy be agreed with ~~a commitment~~ **an aspiration** that this should be applied to all of the property-related investment decisions made by Surrey County Council, both through its local authority property company Halsey Garton and by itself, including for its developments on publicly owned sites in Surrey. ~~and that this policy includes specific commitments to:~~ **In addition, this Council:**

- **reaffirms its commitment to provide** genuinely affordable **housing on suitable sites and in compliance with the requirements of the local planning authority;**
- **agrees that** investments reach BREEAM standards ~~rating of Excellent or higher~~ **as appropriate for each application determined by the Local Planning Authority;**
- reaffirms ~~our~~ **s** our existing commitment to protect the green belt **in accordance with both national and local policy;** and
- agrees that these commitments continue to be scrutinised in public.'

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

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

- BREEAM is a method brought about to assess, rate and certify the sustainability of buildings which is now beginning to be seen as a blunt tool.
- We cannot have a one size fits all policy.
- Council needs a balanced approach when providing affordable housing.
- It is important to work in partnership to ensure that the district/boroughs housing needs are met.
- Finally, that both national and local policies on protecting the green belt are changing.

The Chairman asked Mr Essex, as proposer of the original motion, to conclude the debate.

- He was heartened that Surrey County Council is committing to providing genuinely affordable housing.
- He was concerned that the amended motion did not commit to any specific environmental standards.
- He stated he looked forward to Surrey's property investment delivering social value for the county.

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

Therefore, it was:

RESOLVED:

Council notes:

That on the 16 November 2017 the Council Overview & Budget Scrutiny committee agreed that our property investments should be guided by an environmental and social governance (ESG) policy, agreed and confirmed in writing, as does our pension fund investments.

Council resolves:

That an ESG policy be agreed with an aspiration that this should be applied to all of the property-related investment decisions made by Surrey County Council, both through its local authority property company Halsey Garton and by itself, including for its developments on publicly owned sites in Surrey. In addition, this Council:

- reaffirms its commitment to provide genuinely affordable housing on suitable sites and in compliance with the requirements of the local planning authority;
- agrees that investments reach BREEAM standards as appropriate for each application determined by the Local Planning Authority;
- reaffirms our existing commitment to protect the green belt in accordance with both national and local policy; and
- agrees that these commitments continue to be scrutinised in public.'

76/17 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 9]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 31 October 2017 and 28 November 2017.

Recommendations on Policy Framework Documents

A – Procurement Standing Orders

The Cabinet Member for Property and Business Services introduced the report and outlined the amendments to the Procurement Standing Orders.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed changes to Procurement Standing Orders be approved, as set out in Annex A to this item.

Reports for Information / Discussion

The following report was received and noted:

B – Local Government Ombudsman Report.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 31 October 2017 and 28 November 2017 be adopted.

77/17 REPORT BACK FROM THE PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ON REFERRED MOTION [Item 10]

Members noted the report.

78/17 PAY POLICY STATEMENT REPORT [Item 11]

The Leader of the Council presented the report.

RESOLVED:

That the Council agree the Pay Policy Statement for 2017 - 2018.

79/17 APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE [Item 12]

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and highlighted that a long process had been carried out in order to identify a high calibre Chief Executive. It was noted that the People, Performance and Development Committee had agreed the salary of £220,000 per annum.

Members made the following comments:

- It was important to recognise the rigorous process carried out in order to identify a new Chief Executive.
- Hope that the new Chief Executive was able to enhance and strengthen the Council's delivery of services.

- The salary of the new Chief Executive was a good deal in return for her experience and skill.

RESOLVED:

That the appointment of Joanna Killian as Chief Executive and Head of the Council's paid service be approved.

80/17 APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM MONITORING OFFICER [Item 13]

The Leader of the Council presented the report and highlighted that the appointment will take effect from 11 December 2017.

RESOLVED:

That the County Council appoints Sarah Baker as Interim Monitoring Officer of Surrey County Council with effect from 11 December 2017.

81/17 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 14]

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

[Meeting ended at: 12.35 pm]

Chairman