

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT1 2DN ON 10 JULY 2018 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

49/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mary Angell, Tim Evans, Fiona White, Victoria Young, Matt Furniss, Chris Townsend, Eber Kington, David Mansfield, Tony Samuels and Marisa Heath.

50/18 MINUTES [Item 2]

It was agreed that minute 31/18 be amended to include reference to the Cabinet Member for Children's statement.

The minutes of the meeting of the County Council held on 22 May 2018 were submitted, confirmed and signed.

51/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Dr Andrew Povey declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a trustee for the Surrey Hills Society.

52/18 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman:

- Informed the Council that over the past month he had been involved with various royal visits, Borough and District events and visits to schools and charities.
- Paid tribute to the men and women of the Armed Forces for their outstanding contribution to the county.
- Highlighted that he had attended a local event in celebration of the 70th anniversary of the founding of the NHS.
- Highlighted that the Vice-Chairman of the Council was absent from the meeting as he was representing Surrey County Council at the 100 year celebration of the Royal Air Force.
- Drew Members' attention to the fact that the meeting would include an urgent report regarding the interim arrangements for the Section 151 officer.

53/18 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 there were plans for the Leader of the Council to meet with the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government.
- The Council's need for a 10 year plan for services and a focus on front line delivery.
- Funding for Public Health and why the Council does not raise the budget higher than statutorily required.
- Devolution of Health and Social care in Councils.
- Difficulties with joint commissioning and the opportunity for a new health & care performance system.
- That it was positive to see early intervention services for mental health.
- The short-notice departure of the Section 151 officer.

- That a report on health and social care would be debated at the Surrey Heath Conservative Policy Forum.
- Whether the Leader would contribute to the Green Paper on social care.

54/18 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Questions:

Notice of 10 questions had been received. The questions and replies were published try in a supplementary agenda on 9 July 2018.

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

(Q1) Mr Robert Evans asked if the Cabinet Member for Community Services was concerned with the number of short-staffed Fire Stations in the County.

Mr Hussain confirmed details of various fire safety measures which had been incorporated into the residential high-rise buildings in Woking.

Mr Harrison asked for confirmation on how many high-rise buildings there were in Surrey and how many raised similar cladding concerns as those raised during the Grenfell Tower enquiry.

Mr Gardner asked if the Cabinet Member agreed that all Surrey Fire Stations had full cover due to the cooperated approach from neighbouring fire services.

The Cabinet Member for Community Services confirmed various emergency situations were neighbouring fire stations mobilised with the Surrey Fire Service to deal with a fire event in a coordinated approach. She also stated that the Surrey Fire Service was equipped and capable of dealing with emergency events in Surrey. Mr Harrison would receive a response to his question outside the meeting.

(Q2) Mr Chris Botten requested clarification on when a partner health organisation had imposed a change following advice from Ofsted.

Mrs Curran asked if the Leader of the Council agreed that it was also a Member role to hold partner organisations to account.

The Leader of the Council confirmed that the Improvement Board would now be independently chaired by the Chief Executive of Hampshire County Council in order to provide increased challenge to partners and services.

(Q3) Mr Stephen Cooksey asked if he could be informed once a final date was set to commence works on the former Education Building on Dene Street. The Cabinet Lead Member for Place confirmed that he was happy to liaise with the Local Member and that the build was now part of the Joint Venture.

(Q5) Mrs Hazel Watson asked for confirmation on when Members would be informed of which Council properties would be developed. The Cabinet Lead Member stated that details could be found in the Cabinet papers and that work was still ongoing.

(Q6) Mr Jonathan Essex asked if it would still be possible to receive the data on how many pupils were placed in non-maintained and independent schools outside of Surrey for each of the last 10 years.

The Leader of the Council stated that officers should not be spending a significant amount of time collating information that would not be helpful.

The Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning clarified that data was still being collated and that she would contact the Member with further information outside the meeting. It was stated that the Council was aware that too many children with Special Educational Needs and Disability were being sent out of the county for services and that they were working to improve this.

(Q7) Mr Robert Evans asked if the Cabinet Lead Member for Place was aware that many potholes were not being repaired when in the same vicinity as others being repaired.

Mr Essex asked if it would be possible to amend the protocol for potholes being repaired to ensure more are filled sooner.

Mr Harrison asked for clarification on the inspection process to ensure pothole repairs were fit for purpose.

Mr Hawkins asked if the Cabinet Member was disappointed with the number of signatures on the petition to Government on fairer funding for Surrey's roads.

The Cabinet Member stated that the pothole repair contractor had achieved a large number of repairs in a very short amount of time. He further stated that the overall reason for the issues on Surrey's roads was because they were underfunded. In response to Mr Hawkins, the Cabinet Member stated that he was disappointed with the number of signatures on the petition and that he would be doing further work to promote it. In response to Mr Harrison, the Cabinet Member said that he would confirm the information outside the meeting.

(Q9) Mrs Hazel Watson noted that the number of tenant voids were at 5% and asked how it would affect the County Council financially. It was also asked if the risks for investing in the commercial sector were included in the Council's risk register. The Leader of the Council said that it was inevitable that investment statistics would fluctuate throughout its preliminary timeline.

Cabinet Member Briefings: these were also published with the supplementary agenda on 9 July 2018.

Members made the following comments:

Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning: on the current status of the Crossrail 2 project. The Cabinet Member recognised the significance of the project and confirmed he would continue to urge Central Government to make it a priority.

It was also asked if the Cabinet Member had been involved in the review of the Surrey Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Cabinet Member said that he had been involved with the consultations and that he would also continue to work towards the area being recognised as a national park.

Members also made comments on the status of the Eco Park project. The Cabinet Member confirmed that they were now in the position to commission and that it would be operational later in the year.

Cabinet Lead Member for Corporate Support: on the vision for Surrey in 2030 and the importance of consulting with residents. The Cabinet Member agreed and confirmed that there were a number of ways Members could promote the consultation with residents.

Members also made comments on the positive work of the Blue Badge Team and the possible consequences of opening the blue badge scheme to people with hidden disabilities. The Cabinet Member raised the importance of digital transformation.

Cabinet Lead Member for Place: on the benefits additional £20m investment in Surrey's roads.

55/18 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 7]

One Member made a statement:

- (i) Mr Chris Botten in relation to the response to flooding in his division and the benefits of countywide planning for flood mitigation.

56/18 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 Robert Evans moved the motion, which was:

'Surrey County Council is proud that our new Chief Executive, the most senior officer of the staff, is a woman. However, Council notes that the average female Surrey CC employee is paid 14.7% less than the average male employee.

Similarly, Council notes that the average woman employed by Surrey Police is paid 12.2% less than the average man in the force.

Surrey County Council is committed to equality and recognises that this is an issue that needs to be faced.

This Council hereby resolves to adopt measures that will attempt to address this differential gap in future.'

Mr Evans made the following points:

- Provided various examples of organisations with large gender pay gaps
- That the motion asks that Surrey County Council addresses its gender pay gap
- Jobs could be made more convenient for women with children by providing more high level job share and part-time opportunities
- Talent scouts could be used to identify more women for high level positions
- More could be done to promote STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) subjects to women in school.

- The actions and commitment of the Council is the only way to make an improvement.

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

Six Members made the following points:

- That a gender pay gap was different to equal pay for equal work.
- That equal work will always match equal pay in SCC.
- That the median gender pay gap in Surrey is 14.7%.
- 73% of the workforce in Surrey Council are women.
- Over 50% of SCC leadership roles are filled by women.
- That this was a false motion.
- In Surrey Police, women are paid on average 12.2% less than a male colleague.
- That Surrey should attract talented women to all levels of the organisation.
- 36% of Surrey County Councillors are women, and 43% of Cabinet roles are filled by women.
- There are many other diversity groups that should also be considered.
- That the motion was based on an outdated report that was published in March 2017.
- That it is important to seek talent no matter what gender.
- That a large portion of Social Workers job share.
- That the motion was a waste of time.

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

- That equality of opportunity is just as important as equal pay for the same job.
- That the motion is highlighting that there are opportunities for improvement.
- That the greatest factor was the percentage of women working in the bottom 25% of pay grades.
- That job roles in care, cleaning and catering are paid lower than other roles and undervalued.
- Surrey could sign up to the Ethical Care Charter to help address the gender pay gap issue.

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

- That patterns of work and flexibility need to be equal for all jobs.
- That the motion is about equal opportunities for women for all jobs.

The motion was put to a vote with 13 members voting for, 56 voting against and 3 abstentions.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

The motion was lost.

Item 8(ii)

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

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

Council recognises that it has failed to anticipate demand for a number of services, including CAMHS and for Special Needs such as Autism Spectrum Disorder, where demand is growing at a considerable rate and which no-one foresaw.

Council further recognises that the current CAMHS arrangements are inadequate and notes the current remedial action plan is still failing to meet the needs of many Surrey children, and that an alternative provider may very well need to be found.

Council notes that in order to deliver the sustainable vision for 2030 it is essential that demand for such crucial services is anticipated so that it can be met.

Accordingly, Council resolves to establish a partnership with the University of Surrey to examine and understand the drivers of demand in CAMHS and special needs such as ASD, and aims to create a world-leading source of expertise in predicting and managing demand for these crucial services between now and 2030.

Mr Botten made the following points:

- That many are angry with the service provided to Surrey's children.
- Simple contract management would not solve the issues going forward and more needed to be done.
- The Council needed to understand why demand is growing and in what areas demand is growing in order to commission for the future.
- That services need to be commissioned based on intelligence and understanding in order to resource appropriately.
- Members cannot go on accepting the failures to children in the county.
- The motion proposes forming partnerships to enable research into the reason why needs are developing.

The motion was formally seconded by Mrs Angela Goodwin, who reserved the right to speak.

Mrs Curran moved an amendment, which was tabled at the meeting. This was formally seconded by Mr Harris.

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

*Council recognises that it ~~has failed to anticipate~~ demand for a number of services, including CAMHS and for Special Needs such as Autism Spectrum Disorder **(ASD)**, where demand is growing ~~at a considerable rate~~ **has grown** at a considerable rate, which no-one foresaw.*

Council further acknowledges that the existing CAMHS service does not fully meet the high expectations that we have for our children, young

people and their families. The interim plan is in place to support the existing service and is being closely monitored to ensure that vulnerable children's needs can be met. ~~recognises that the current CAMHS arrangements are inadequate and notes the current remedial action plan is still failing to meet the needs of many Surrey children, and that an alternative provider may very well need to be found.~~

Council notes that in order to deliver the sustainable vision for 2030 it is essential that demand for such crucial services is understood and anticipated so that it can be met **children and young people can access the right help at the right time.**

Accordingly, Council resolves to establish a partnerships, including with the University of Surrey to examine and understand research and evaluate the drivers of demand in CAMHS and special needs such as ASD, and aims to for specialist services with the intention of creating a world-leading source of expertise in predicting and managing demand for these crucial services between now and 2030.

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

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

- All Members are concerned with the impact on Surrey's children.
- There is an interim plan in place to continue the work of services.
- Not all CAMHS services are under performing.
- No resident should be discouraged from seeking the help that they need.
- Commissioning must be focused on outcomes and not processes.
- A joint approach with the NHS will lead to a stronger CAMHS service and will have a focus on early intervention.
- The Council needs greater influence on how services are run and monitored.
- Asked that any future research does not duplicate any current research being carried out by Adult Social Care in partnership with the University of Surrey.
- Highlighted the reshaping of the corporate strategy and ensuring the strategy is focussed on those most in need.
- Provided examples of when the Council had proven it could forecast appropriately to ensure needs for resources are met.
- Confirmed that services were still ongoing during the interim arrangements.

Mrs Goodwin, as seconder of the motion, made the following comments:

- That urgent change was needed in the CAMHS service.
- Competitive tendering had led to inadequate services.
- That there was a need to plan for future demand and a need to hold services to account.

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

- That it was the right strategy to pave the way to improvement

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

Council recognises that demand for a number of services, including CAMHS and for Special Needs such as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), has grown at a considerable rate, which no-one foresaw.

Council further acknowledges that the existing CAMHS service does not fully meet the high expectations that we have for our children, young people and their families. The interim plan is in place to support the existing service and is being closely monitored to ensure that vulnerable children's needs can be met.

Council notes that in order to deliver the sustainable vision for 2030 it is essential that demand for such crucial services is understood and anticipated so that children and young people can access the right help at the right time.

Accordingly, Council resolves to establish a partnerships, including with the University of Surrey to research and evaluate the drivers of demand for specialist services with the intention of creating a world-leading source of expertise in predicting and managing demand for these crucial services between now and 2030.

Item 8(iii)

Under Standing Order 12.3 the Council agreed to debate this motion.
Under Standing Order 12.1 Cllr Rachael I Lake moved the motion, which was:

There is growing evidence to suggest a link between air quality and health, and poor air quality is said to contribute to 40 thousand premature deaths per annum in the UK. Surrey has already assessed its air quality and has established 25 Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the county. The Government recently published its Clean Air Strategy, which has wide-ranging implications, including for Local Government.

In this context, Council notes that Surrey County Council has:

- Developed clean air and Electric Vehicle (EV) strategies that are currently being consulted on as part of the Local Transport Plan
- Secured funding for investment in EV charge points
- Secured funding to switch Guildford Park & Ride to a fully electric bus fleet
- Procured the UK's first EV fire engine
- Initiated dialogue with the EV sector to develop the county's EV provision.

This Council:

1. Recognises its leading role in tackling air quality, particularly in its public health, highway and transport roles.
2. Will continue to work with the Districts and Boroughs, and other partners to develop a countywide strategy to improve air quality.
3. Commits to work with government to secure funding and to develop and deliver its Clean Air Strategy.

Mrs Lake made the following points:

- That poor air quality is said to contribute to 40,000 premature deaths per annum in the UK
- That Surrey has already assessed its air quality and has established 25 Air Quality Management Areas
- Highlighted the details of the motion

The motion was formally seconded by Mr Ernest Mallett, who made the following comments:

- Highlighted environmental concern over the Heathrow Airport expansion.
- Confirmed details of a letter to Central Government from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, which highlighted the Council's air quality concerns.
- That by agreeing this motion the Council would align itself with previous stated concerns.

Mr Essex moved an amendment, which was rejected under Standing Order 20.1, therefore the original motion was discussed.

Three Members made the following points:.

- Raised air quality concerns over the Heathrow Airport expansion.
- That there was a need for more air quality monitoring sites in Surrey.
- That poor air quality results in around 5% of deaths in Surrey.
- That more research was needed on its effects on health.
- Asked that Members consider how the Council could do more to face Air Quality concerns.
- That Farnham had air quality issues due to traffic in the area.
- Highlighted environmental impacts on the Council and residents.
- The Council's commitment to reducing single use plastics.
- That environmental education will be taught in Surrey schools from September 2018.
- That Surrey has 25 air monitoring sites where carbon dioxide exceeds safety limits.

Under Standing Order 23.1, Mr Brett-Warburton moved the motion that the question be now put, which was carried.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

There is growing evidence to suggest a link between air quality and health, and poor air quality is said to contribute to 40 thousand premature deaths per annum in the UK. Surrey has already assessed its air quality and has established 25 Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the county. The Government recently published its Clean Air Strategy, which has wide-ranging implications, including for Local Government.

In this context, Council notes that Surrey County Council has:

- Developed clean air and Electric Vehicle (EV) strategies that are currently being consulted on as part of the Local Transport Plan
- Secured funding for investment in EV charge points
- Secured funding to switch Guildford Park & Ride to a fully electric bus fleet
- Procured the UK's first EV fire engine
- Initiated dialogue with the EV sector to develop the county's EV provision.

This Council:

4. Recognises its leading role in tackling air quality, particularly in its public health, highway and transport roles.
5. Will continue to work with the Districts and Boroughs, and other partners to develop a countywide strategy to improve air quality.
6. Commits to work with government to secure funding and to develop and deliver its Clean Air Strategy.

57/18 FORMATION OF GUILDFORD JOINT COMMITTEE [Item 9]

RESOLVED:

That Council:

1. Agreed to the establishment of the Guildford Joint Committee.
2. Delegated the non-executive functions to the Guildford Joint Committee.
3. Approved an addition to the Council's Scheme of Delegation (Annex A).
4. Approved the Constitution for Guildford Joint Committee (Annex B).
5. Appointed the County Councillors representing divisions in the Guildford borough area to serve on the Guildford Joint Committee for the Council year 2018/19
6. Appointed Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, as the SCC Cabinet Member to serve on the Guildford Joint Committee for the 2018/19 municipal year.

58/18 REPORT OF THE AUDIT & 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.

59/18 URGENT REPORT - APPOINTMENT OF AN INTERIM STATUTORY S151 OFFICER [Item 10a]

This report was considered under urgency and was circulated to Members on 9 July 2018.

The reason for urgency was that the Council was statutorily required to have a Section 151 officer in place to be responsible for the proper administration of its financial affairs.

RESOLVED:

It was agreed that Kevin Kilburn be appointed as interim s151 Officer from 10 July 2018.

60/18 REPORT OF THE CABINET [Item 11]

The Leader presented the report of the Cabinet meetings held on 29 May and 26 June 2018.

Reports for Information/ Discussion

- A) formation of Guildford Joint Committee
- B) Capital Carry Forward Requests from 2017/18 and Finance Position Statement as at 30 April 2018
- C) Prudential RideLondon-Surrey Event In 2020
- D) Surrey Performing Arts Library
- E) Surrey County Council Public Bus Contract Retendering 2018

RESOLVED:

That the report of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 29 May and 26 June 2018 be adopted.

61/18 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETINGS [Item 12]

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 12:35pm]

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Mr Chairman and members -

Over recent weeks the nation has quite rightly been celebrating the NHS's 70th birthday with much fanfare. I'm in no doubt that we all share in the joy that such a treasured institution has stood the test of time – so far.

Another birthday celebration that has slipped under the radar in comparison is the 130th birthday of local government. I wonder if the NHS would have reached such a grand old age were it not for the existence and support of Local Government

I was intrigued last week to see a news report on a doctor who was there at the birth of the NHS say it was created in the belief of making people fitter and healthier and that there would be a reduction in long-term costs to the country.

But, he also went on to say that, if anything, it's been a victim of its own success and the impact of an ageing population now means that social care costs are spiraling out of control.

Mr Chairman, I believe he was right.

That's where Local Government comes in, because both Public Health and Social Care Services are fundamental to the success of the NHS, now and in the future.

We cannot keep talking about the NHS Hospitals as being the only thing that matters. It is my challenge to Government and Parliament to talk about the NHS and Local Government in the same breath.

While I am delighted the Prime Minister has reaffirmed her government's unwavering support for the NHS with a pledge of an extra twenty billion pounds in future funding, we should be in no doubt that this will not solve all of the health service's problems.

Funding cannot simply be poured just into hospitals – when too little consideration is being given to the other vital elements of healthcare. Namely prevention and social care. The government needs to decide how it is going to fund our social care system and public health prevention services, and not just the acute aspects within the NHS.

But the Government seems reluctant to take the necessary action to invest adequately in these two vital elements of our nation's health and wellbeing. This risks leaving councils up and down the country, as well as the voluntary, community and faith sector – who all perform vital roles – powerless to ease the pressure on the NHS. And without that help there may be no birthday cake in another seventy years' time. In fact I doubt there will be a birthday cake in as little as 10 years' time.

My real concern is that Government and Parliament will miss the opportunity that is staring them in the face – by providing the necessary support and funding for prevention services and social care services that the public needs.

Mr Chairman, local government has made a lasting difference to generation-after-generation. Tackling poverty, building social housing, introducing universal education and – of course delivering public health and social care services.

Indeed, some of its achievements even predate the Local Government Act of 1888. Among these magnificent achievements are the health benefits resulting from Joseph Chamberlain's reforms to housing and the water system in Birmingham. They show that it would be wrong to assume local government is a new-comer to the health agenda.

If we are to save Britain's healthcare system – and we **must** – then Local Government needs fair and equal resources to improve Public Health and Social Care in our country.

There needs to be public scrutiny of the entire healthcare system, and today there is still no democratic governance oversight of the local doctors and community health services. I call upon government to empower Local Government to become the public scrutiny body for these vital front line services.

I also call on the government to give Councils responsibility for commissioning all public services that deliver health and well-being services in our communities.

I would urge Ministers to allow those councils who are willing, to be given the opportunity to pilot this approach.

It is our intention to present Joint Health and Social Care commissioning plans to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care in September for approval. We want to be in the vanguard of change for our residents.

As a first step I firmly believe that there should be:

- 24 hour access to doctors during evenings and weekends, to release the strain on Accident & Emergency departments.
- Resources being made available to schools and other organisations to help identify mental health issues and signpost those with need to the appropriate area for early intervention.

When Local government was handed back responsibility for public health several years ago, funding was promptly cut but responsibilities remained. We can't continue with such huge disparities across the country. Indeed the public health grant for Local Authorities has fallen by 17% over the past five years,

and as you know, Mr Chairman, Surrey is one of the authorities hardest hit.

While funding the heart of the health service may win positive news headlines for Government and MPs, failing to resource many of the other key services that are accessed by large numbers of the population risks far worse news headlines in the future.

Mr Chairman, many of my Local Government Leader colleagues believe that the government is taking way too long to produce its Green Paper on adult social care.

There is also genuine concern that the paper will simply follow the same format as one of the dozen or so of its predecessors over the past two decades and be little more than warm words with no action and no long term solutions.

How can this possibly be good for the health of the nation?

Surely the Green Paper needs to be co-terminus with the NHS 10 year plan as they depend on each other, and the people who deliver the services on the ground **must** be invited to contribute.

Mr Chairman , I strongly believe Local Government needs much greater input into the green paper. Social Care services won't be delivered by MPs or Whitehall officials - they'll be delivered by Local Government - in our communities - with the many dedicated staff we have.

Over the last ten years we have all seen a huge transformation in Local Government services despite the significant financial challenges.

So there is a great deal the NHS can benefit from by working with Local Government to respond to the changing circumstances of local people. We know and understand the needs of our communities and are best placed to deliver the foundations of good health and wellbeing.

In order for Health and Social Care to work more effectively and efficiently together, I suggest Government needs to :-

- Ensure equalisation of public health funding across England
- Enhance funding for local GP and community services, enabling better access when people need it

- Design a stronger governance model, enabling local government to be more accountable for setting priorities and joint commissioning.

These actions will then reduce the numbers needing unplanned Hospital care.

Mr Chairman, our long-term vision should be

- A Public Health system that leads to real sustained life changing opportunities for all
- well-funded local GP and community services that become more effective and are more accountable to local people through Local Government
- Fewer people going into hospital when they don't need to
- Ensure the country has enough doctors, nurses, social care workers to increase the effectiveness of the health service system in this country.
- And appropriately resourced local social care services to ensure residents can return to their own homes as soon as possible.

Mr Chairman, we often hear about a chronic bed shortage at hospitals. It is our job to get as many people sleeping in their **own** bed as quickly as we possibly can.

That is what the guiding hand of local government can achieve.

When all the components of Health and Social Care systems are working smoothly together, there will be less of a call on Hospital services. Not only will this improve the quality of life for our residents but also we will have created a system that is both sustainable and financially affordable for the next generation and beyond.

The challenge now for Government and Parliament is to let local government do what it does best and come to the aid of the NHS so that both the NHS and Local Government can celebrate birthday after birthday.

To summarise Mr Chairman and members , I believe :_

- We all want an efficient and effective Health and Social Care system for everyone.
- We need investment in public health programmes to reduce demands on health services

- We need excellent local GP services with more evening and weekend services
- We need proper governance and accountability over local Health services
- We need to reduce the number of patients arriving and entering Hospitals for unplanned care, especially at weekends
- We need a local solution for Social Care services to ensure that all patients can be supported to return home and then enabled to live independently.

Finally and above all

- We need a health service that works closely with local government to do more to prevent chronic illness and to create a joined up system that recognises and addresses health needs as soon as possible

After all Mr Chairman, it is the public that fund these services and I suggest we have a right to expect everyone in Central Government, the NHS and Local Government to work together for the health of our Nation.

This page is intentionally left blank