

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL - INFORMAL**  
**HELD REMOTELY VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS, ON 18 JANUARY 2022**  
**COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM, THE COUNCIL BEING CONSTITUTED AS**  
**FOLLOWS:**

Helyn Clack (Chair)  
Saj Hussain (Vice-Chair)

Maureen Attewell	Rachael Lake
Ayesha Azad	Victor Lewanski
Catherine Baart	David Lewis (Cobham)
Steve Bax	David Lewis (Camberley West)
John Beckett	Scott Lewis
Jordan Beech	Andy Lynch
Luke Bennett	Andy MacLeod
Amanda Boote	Ernest Mallett MBE
Liz Bowes	Michaela Martin
Natalie Bramhall	Jan Mason
Stephen Cooksey	* Steven McCormick
Colin Cross	Cameron McIntosh
Clare Curran	Julia McShane
Nick Darby	Sinead Mooney
Fiona Davidson	Carla Morson
Paul Deach	Bernie Muir
Kevin Deanus	Mark Nuti
Jonathan Essex	John O'Reilly
Robert Evans	Tim Oliver
Chris Farr	Rebecca Paul
Paul Follows	George Potter
Will Forster	Catherine Powell
John Furey	Penny Rivers
Matt Furniss	John Robini
Angela Goodwin	Becky Rush
* Jeffrey Gray	Tony Samuels
Tim Hall	Joanne Sexton
David Harmer	Lance Spencer
Nick Harrison	Lesley Steeds
Edward Hawkins	Mark Sugden
Marisa Heath	Richard Tear
Trefor Hogg	Alison Todd (née Griffiths)
Robert Hughes	Chris Townsend
Jonathan Hulley	Liz Townsend
Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Denise Turner-Stewart
Frank Kelly	Hazel Watson
Riasat Khan	Jeremy Webster
Robert King	Buddhi Weerasinghe
Eber Kington	Fiona White
	* Keith Witham

\*absent

## **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Jeffrey Gray, Steven McCormick and Keith Witham.

### **1 LEADER'S STATEMENT [Item 1]**

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

Members raised the following topics:

- Looked forward to the upcoming Member Development Session on the Final Budget Proposals; noting the intended 4.99% increase in Council tax.
- Welcomed the announcement of the reinspection of Children's Services next week following the inadequate rating in 2018 and noted that progress had been made; welcomed the £2 million spend on eight children's homes.
- Welcomed the reassessment of the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS), following the inadequate rating in 2018; progress had been made.
- Highlighted the Greater London Boundary Charge which the Council had opposed in a previous original motion, the charge had been shelved and the new proposal by the Mayor of London was for a charge per mile.
- That the Council must put pressure on the Government to enact primary legislation to hold remote meetings, highlighted the costs involved of holding socially distanced in-person meetings despite the Covid-19 pandemic.
- That remote meetings align with the Council's green agenda by reducing carbon emissions through minimising travel.
- Noting the move to agile offices, Members must be agile and remote meetings would help to diversify the demographics.
- That despite lobbying the Government for legislation to allow remote meetings, local government and its decision-making was taken for granted.
- Noted concern in the proposed 4.99% increase in Council Tax, the Council must consider those on modest incomes and support vulnerable residents.
- Urged the Leader to heed a recommendation by the Resources and Performance Select Committee concerning those in Surrey on very low incomes who receive benefits but not Council Tax reduction.
- Questioned how the Council can have £100 million to spare to make communities better, yet money was not being spent on Surrey Highways maintenance as requested by residents.
- Questioned when the Council would work up a joint plan to retrofit Surrey's homes working with the Borough and District Councils, when the Council would help residents to respond to the imminent gas price rises and when the Council would stop drilling for gas.
- Emphasised the need to reflect on what politics with integrity means for the Council, to respect one another rather than political point score through original motions and questions.
- That the Leader highlighted the Council's ambitious agenda yet recognised that Surrey has critical funding needs.
- That according to the Resolution Foundation families would face an average hit of £1,200 annually to their incomes due to rising energy bills, tax increases and high inflation.
- Highlighted that the Leader also spoke of improved bus services and the need to tackle climate change through real investment, asked how many

issues highlighted in his statement the Leader can deliver by next year and whether he could provide examples of how he would deliver those.

- Asked whether there had been any unforeseen financial implications of the move to Woodhatch Place and the sale of County Hall brought about by the pandemic.

*Michaela Martin left the meeting at 10.30 am*

## **2 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 2]**

### **Questions:**

Notice of sixteen questions had been received.

The questions and replies were published in the supplementary agenda on 17 January 2022 (Items 2 and 4). A number of supplementary questions were asked and a summary of the main points is set out below.

**(Q1) Robert Evans** noted that currently in Surrey there were 451 full time equivalent (FTE) firefighters and asked whether the Cabinet Member for Community Protection was aware that in 2011 there were 641 FTE firefighters and every year since then the number of FTE firefighters has decreased annually. During that ten-year period Surrey's population has increased and roads have got busier, he asked how residents can feel safe when there has been a 30% in firefighters and crewing levels on fire engines have been cut from five to four.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Community Protection restated that Fire and Rescue Services have been transformed through an emphasis on prevention, protection and changing work practices leading to a reduction in the number of fires by 45% nationally and 30% in Surrey. He was happy to respond to the Member in writing on any specific points.

**(Q2) John O'Reilly** welcomed the £1 million generated by the scheme. He asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure for clarification on whether prior to the new Lane Rental Scheme the Council was not getting any money apart from covering its costs from the former scheme.

He further asked the Cabinet Member what sort of projects would be funded using the surplus generated from the Lane Rental Scheme.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that the permit scheme did not generate a surplus as it was cost neutral, he was pleased that the surplus money from the Lane Rental charges could be used for anything that reduced congestion on the network such as ducting by utility companies as suggested by the Department for Transport (DfT). He noted that whilst he was in office Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP changed the criteria so that money generated from the scheme could be used to repair utility pothole defects, to improve lighting and signalling to reduce congestion. Those options were being considered and the Council would be working with the utility operators.

**(Q3) Jonathan Hulley** was pleased to hear the steps taken by the Council to promote the carbon literacy agenda and reaching out to the Carbon Literacy Trust. He asked the Cabinet Member for Environment about what steps the Council has taken to promote the carbon literacy agenda amongst community groups and Residents' Associations, or in partnership with others.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment corrected her written answer noting that Members currently did not have access to the Carbon Literacy training on Olive so the Climate Change team was seeking to address that as the training would aid Members in their scrutiny and when talking to residents. She noted that officers have been speaking to key environment and community groups about how they can get better training. She would liaise with Members once they have access to the training.

**(Q4) Trefor Hogg** asked whether the Cabinet Member for Communities could confirm that staff in community hubs would be given the appropriate training so that they can guide residents and local businesses as they seek to harness renewable energy and reduce their carbon emissions, as well as providing access to information resources.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Communities praised the work of Surrey's library staff who provided a wide range of services, noting that staff would be provided with training in response to the roll out of initiatives such as around mental health as well as guiding people through business information. That having the knowledge to spot when someone needs help was crucial; he provided assurance that library staff are there to help the public and communities.

**(Q5) Tim Hall** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure whether there was money included in the upcoming budget for supporting the Planning Enforcement Team and their legal and other costs.

**Jonathan Hulley** noted that he was pleased that the Council sought to expand its Planning Enforcement Team, he highlighted the increase in unlawful waste activity and fly tipping over the past two years and urged the team to tackle that behaviour.

He further asked the Cabinet Member whether he would agree that the Council can and should be doing more to lobby the Government for increased powers similar to those held by the Environment Agency.

**Nick Harrison** asked whether some of those extra staff resources could be used to address the issues concerning the Chalk Pit site.

**Bernie Muir** endorsed the suggestions made and looked forward to further progress as the issues raised had implications for Surrey's residents.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure highlighted that there was a dedicated planning enforcement allocation within the upcoming budget. The increase in the Planning Enforcement Team was positive and the escalation route was being reviewed.

He responded that the Council was lobbying the Government for increased powers similar to those held by the Environment Agency who for example had the power to seize vehicles conducting illegal activity.

He noted the Chalk Pit site and responded that having an increased Planning Enforcement Team and working with Surrey's partners such as the Borough and District Councils and the Environment Agency, would mean that the dedicated budget would aid the delivery of enforcement.

**(Q7) Will Forster** noted that despite buying the two assets, the Council in five years had lost nearly £50 million in their value. He asked whether the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste thought that to be value for money.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste highlighted that online and high street retail were on an uneven playing field. That the Council was a long term owner of the two assets: Malvern Retail Park was fully let and provided a positive income, whilst the lease of the former Debenhams site in Winchester would expire on 31 January 2022, the Council was working with Winchester City Council and is looking at an options appraisal including disposal, reletting or redevelopment. She reminded the Member that investments can increase and decrease.

**(Q8) Lance Spencer** asked whether the Cabinet Member for Environment provide assurance that the responsible officers within public health and the Environment Agency have undertaken an assessment of the treatment works and water plants that supply Surrey residents. The United Kingdom (UK) has some of the worst rivers in Europe in terms of the amount of sewage and chemicals.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment agreed with many of the points raised and emphasised that she was not in a position to assure residents as it did not fall within her remit.

**(Q9) Paul Follows** asked the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources whether there was a forecast figure for those indirect National Insurance (NI) cost increases.

He further asked the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member whether there were plans to address the annual ongoing revenue cost of the NI increase.

He also asked whether the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member could give an indication of when and whether the Health and Social Care Levy would be a net contributor to the Council's budget.

In response, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources would liaise with the Finance Team to provide the Member with the requested forecast figure of the NI indirect costs such as those on suppliers.

She responded that going forward the annual ongoing revenue costs from the NI increase would be funded through the additional Government funding rolled forward into next year and through Council's proposed Council Tax increase.

She responded that the challenge was the future uncertainty around the Health and Social Care Levy, which was being considered in the Medium Term Financial Strategy and through a responsible approach to budgeting, the Council continues to improve its financial resilience through its reserves position.

**(Q10) Jonathan Essex** asked the Cabinet Member for Communities for a breakdown of the reasons why sixty-four applications have been rejected, seeking clarification of what ineligibility or not making a positive change to people's lives meant.

**John O'Reilly** noted that at the upcoming March meeting of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee the principal item would be on Your Fund Surrey since its inception and he asked whether the Cabinet Member would

agree that any Member who wishes to have an input to that meeting could contact him.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Communities explained that eligibility was dependent on a minimum application of £10,000, projects must demonstrate community support and furthermore a project fails to be eligible if the applicant does not tick a required box reflecting whether the project supports the Council's Community Vision for Surrey in 2030. He would liaise with officers on providing a spreadsheet to the Member concerning those sixty-four rejected applications. He explained that no application was rejected without a thorough examination, the team had advised applicants and helped applicants look for funding elsewhere.

He further responded that the information requested would be available at the March meeting of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee.

**(Q11) Robert Evans** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure whether he wished for Surrey to have the same powers as London concerning obstructions on pavements such as parking. He noted that reporting obstructions was not always the solution as the needs of those requiring the pavement were often immediate.

He further asked the Cabinet Member whether he agreed that the culture of vehicle parkers needed to change, asking whether he would agree to a publicity campaign working with the Borough and District Councils to highlight the issue.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure agreed that greater powers around inappropriate parking on pavements were needed as such obstructions were a danger to pedestrians, cyclists and damaged the pavement. The Council had responded to the Government consultation and was awaiting the outcome; the Council did not support a blanket ban of pavement parking and would need to consider the areas where to apply a pavement parking ban. That moving the power away from the police to councils to fine pavement parking obstructions was vital to tackle the issue proactively.

He further responded that working with the Borough and District Councils on enforcement as well as Surrey Police was key and he would liaise with his team about the publicity campaign and the Member in due course.

**(Q12) Will Forster** recognised that whilst 90% of children on the Child Protection Plan were up to date with their visits, the remaining 10% not was a concern and he asked the Cabinet Member for Children and Families how that compared with similar councils such as Hertfordshire County Council.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families noted that she would liaise with the service on whether they held such comparative information from statistical neighbours and would follow up with the Member in due course.

**(Q13) Jonathan Essex** noted that he would take up the offer made by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure to review the details of the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) lists - both budgeted and not budgeted across Surrey.

He asked the Cabinet Member whether he agreed that in line with the Council's new sustainable transport strategy that it was important to share information and have public debates with residents on sustainable transport.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure highlighted that the ITS lists were publicly available and were discussed at each of the Council's Local and Joint Committees. He noted that the lists could be collated into a single document, he would liaise with the team to respond to the Member.

He further responded that information was available publicly around transport sustainability and all new schemes in the county. He added that once approved the Council would comply with the measures set out in the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) and the Surrey Street Design Guide, as well as national guidance on cycleway and footway improvements.

**(Q16) Will Forster** asked the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure whether the written response implied that no progress had been made and the Council would not implement any School Streets pilots until the Government gave Surrey further powers.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure explained that the Council did intend to introduce School Streets pilots and it was applying for two sites and powers to enforce moving traffic offences. Once those sites had been approved by the DfT, authorities could choose future sites and the Council would be accelerating School Streets and would use greater enforcement powers once available in other areas such as HGV and yellow box enforcement.

**Cabinet Member Briefings:** these were also published in the supplementary agenda on 17 January 2022 (Items 2 and 4).

There were no questions asked by Members.

### **3 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS [Item 3]**

Clare Curran made a statement on Bookham Blue Hearts wildflower verges, a community project to encourage wildflowers to grow on road verges. She thanked the community volunteers and officers involved. Following last year's success, she looked forward to more wildflower verges in 2022.

Eber Kington made a statement on a local highways matter having been contacted last November by residents concerned about the potential for future accidents on a four-way junction. He stated that the Council must do better to devolve decision-making to the lowest level and it should not be for a Cabinet Member to decide on the spend of a Member's highways allocation costing around £300.

### **4 ORIGINAL MOTIONS [Item 4]**

Eber Kington raised a point of order under Standing Order 2 highlighting that it was not a formal meeting so neither resolutions nor decisions could be made by the Council. He noted that the suggested process of taking a report on the original motions to February's Council meeting appeared to be designed to circumvent the current law that does not allow for formal decision-making at remote meetings, and that absent Members who had not heard the debate could not legitimately be entitled to vote on the outcome at the ensuing formal Council meeting.

In response the Chair explained that the meeting was informal due to the current health risk of meeting in person and confirmed that whilst the Council cannot make formal resolutions, Members have an opportunity to discuss the original motions and those absent can view the webcast and minutes. She explained that Members

would receive a report at the next Council meeting in February asking the Council to formally adopt the outcome of the original motions and could comment and vote.

**Item 4 (i)**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Lance Spencer moved:

**This Council notes that:**

That communities are increasingly recognising the benefits of slower traffic in residential and busy pedestrian streets and outside schools. These include improved road safety; calmer, steadier traffic flows leading to increased confidence amongst residents in being able to walk and cycle more safely; the resulting reduction in traffic volumes that improves air quality. Ultimately 20 miles per hour (mph) zones lead to better physical and mental health outcomes for residents who live and travel in those areas.

That speeds of 20 mph are less likely to lead to death or serious injury and have support from disability groups.

That schemes for signed 20 mph zones are more affordable, quicker and easier to implement at pace and a growing number of authorities are implementing them across the country.

**This Council further notes:**

That Surrey County Council supports the implementation of 20 mph limits, but the current piecemeal approach and inadequate level of funding will not deliver on the step change required to affect residents' travel choices to the extent needed to meet the ambition of the draft Local Transport Plan and Greener Futures' delivery plan.

That as the highway authority Surrey County Council has the legal power to set speed limits in Surrey, however its current policy is unfit for purpose.

That 20 mph zones marked solely by signs accompanied by minimal enforcement have already been piloted elsewhere. This Council can decide to join the growing number of local authorities and regions who are already trialling this model or risk becoming an outlier in this space.

That over time, implementation of such schemes will likely lead to future cohorts of drivers coming to regard 20 mph as the new 30 mph.

**This Council resolves to:**

Request the Leader and Cabinet to:

- I. Agree in principle the implementation of signage only 20 mph zones in residential roads, outside schools and on high streets that currently have a 30 mph limit and where there is member and community support for the change.



- II. Agree to an amendment of the current speed policy to allow for implementation of schemes in appropriate areas even where mean speeds exceed 24 mph.
- III. Agree to establish a dedicated funding pot to provide adequate resources for the scheme to be implemented equitably across the county.

Lance Spencer made the following points:

- That it was an opportunity for the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure to support the proposed community-based approach to delivering 20 miles per hour (mph) zones across Surrey in support of the Local Transport Plan (LTP4).
- That New Year's Day 2022 was the hottest on record, 2021 was the fifth hottest year on record out of the past seven hottest years on record.
- That the residents of Surrey contributed about 20 million tonnes of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere each year.
- That to meet the Greener Futures Greener Futures Climate Change Delivery Plan 2021-2025 (CCDP) of net zero carbon emissions by 2050, emissions would need to be reduced by 1 to 3 million tonnes by 2025.
- That of Surrey's 6.6 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emitted per year from direct activities, 46% came from transport.
- That 20 mph zones brought a direct reduction in those emissions and helped people feel safer in active travel, walking and cycling.
- That 90% of car journeys in Surrey were local journeys less than five kilometres.
- That under the Council's current policy by the time the costs are considered, the proposed 20 mph zones were deemed financially unviable.
- That 28 million people in the UK lived in areas currently where there was a 20 mph zone or where such zones had been proposed.
- Highlighted examples across the UK of signed only 20 mph zones such as in Wales, Cornwall and the Scottish Borders which saw a 3 mph decrease.
- That Horsell Village had a signed only 20 mph zone and saw a 2 mph reduction in speed.
- Sought support from the Cabinet and called for the Council to be bold and to take the lead to address climate change.
- That he wanted to be able to say to his grandson when he was older that the Council did take action to deliver a greener future.

The motion was formally seconded by Angela Goodwin, who made the following comments:

- That road safety and addressing excess speeding was a key issue to residents with many deterred from cycling or walking as a result.
- That each 1 mph reduction in speed in an urban setting delivered a 6% reduction in casualties and 20 mph limits across wider areas delivered 20% fewer casualties.
- That 20 mph limits increased active travel bringing mobility benefits.
- Recommended Members to read articles by Scarlett McNally who noted that exercise was the miracle cure, preventing many diseases.
- Highlighted an article by the British Medical Journal which stated that physical activity could help avoid unnecessary social care.

- That the Council would not achieve the objectives in the new Local Transport Plan 4 and the Healthy Streets for Surrey policy without 20 mph priorities.
- That 20 mph limits created a breadth of benefits that Members must enable.

Robert Evans raised a point of order under Standing Order 21.2 noting that he believed the amendment by Matt Furniss formed a negative of the original motion and should not be allowed, particularly concerning resolutions one and two.

In response the Chair allowed the amendment, explaining that she did not consider it clear that the amendment negated the original motion as it could be read as adding qualifications to the proposal in the original motion.

Matt Furniss moved an amendment which had been published in the supplementary agenda on 17 January 2022 (Items 2 and 4), which was formally seconded by John O' Reilly.

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

**This Council notes that:**

~~That communities are increasingly recognising the benefits of~~ **In the last few years there has been a sharp increase in walking and cycling in Surrey.**  
~~Slower traffic in residential and busy pedestrian streets~~ **such as shopping areas**  
~~and outside schools~~ **help encourage more active travel by walking and cycling.** These include improved road safety; calmer, steadier traffic flows leading to increased confidence amongst residents in being able to walk and cycle more safely; ~~the resulting reduction in traffic volumes that improves air quality. Ultimately 20 miles per hour (mph) zones lead to better physical and mental health outcomes for residents who live and travel in those areas.~~

~~That speeds of 20 mph are less likely to lead to death or serious injury and have support from disability groups.~~

~~That schemes for signed 20 mph zones are more affordable, quicker and easier to implement at pace and a growing number of authorities are implementing them across the country.~~

**This Council further notes:**

~~That Surrey County Council supports the implementation of 20 mph limits, but the current piecemeal approach and inadequate level of funding will not deliver on the step change required to affect residents' travel choices to the extent needed to meet the ambition of the draft Local Transport Plan and Greener Futures' delivery plan.~~

~~That as the highway authority Surrey County Council has the legal power to set speed limits in Surrey, however its current policy is unfit for purpose.~~

~~That 20 mph zones marked solely by signs accompanied by minimal enforcement have already been piloted elsewhere. This Council can decide to join the growing number of local authorities and regions who are already trialling this model or risk becoming an outlier in this space.~~

~~That over time, implementation of such schemes will likely lead to future cohorts of drivers coming to regard 20 mph as the new 30 mph.~~

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

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

**This Council resolves to:**

Request the Leader and Cabinet to:

- I. ~~Agree in principle the implementation of~~ **Reaffirm that Surrey County Council supports** signage **of** only 20 mph zones in residential roads, outside schools and on high streets that currently have a 30 mph limit, **where the existing average mean speeds are 24 mph or less,** and where there is member and community support for the change.
- II. ~~Agree to an amendment of the current speed policy to allow for implementation of schemes in appropriate areas even where mean speeds exceed 24 mph.~~ **Reaffirm that additional supporting measures will be needed to ensure the new lower 20 mph speed limit is successful if the existing mean average speeds are above 24 mph.**
- III. ~~Agree to establish a dedicated funding pot to provide adequate resources for the scheme to be implemented equitably across the county.~~

Matt Furniss spoke to his amendment, making the following points:

- Highlighted the Council's aim to set speed limits that were successful in managing vehicle speeds that were appropriate for the road's use.
- That reducing speeds may make communities more pleasant places to live.
- That the desire for lower speeds had to be balanced against the need for reasonable journey times.
- That 20 mph limits may be appropriate in residential areas, high streets and near schools.
- That changing from the national speed limits of 30, 60 or 70 mph would require a change in the road conditions.
- That a 20 mph signed only solution often only resulted in up to 2 mph lower speeds.
- That there should be no expectation that the police would be able to provide regular enforcement if the speed limit was set too low.

- That 20 mph limits and zones were included within the Setting Local Speed Limits policy and since 2014 Surrey had introduced 93 formal 20 mph zones and a number of informal zones; the mean speed in such zones was 24 mph.
- That experience showed that changing to lower speed limits would not on their own slow down traffic, other measures were needed such as traffic calming.
- That mandatory variable 20 mph speed limits that only apply at certain times of the day were not effective at managing vehicle speeds.
- That areas in Wales were consulting on roads to be kept at 30 mph and Oxfordshire County Council's 20 mph signed only zones would be complemented by £8 million in traffic calming.
- That the Council had made a significant number of changes to traffic speeds through signage and through having appropriate road conditions.
- That it was not the policy that needed to change but Members' willingness to prioritise 20 mph limits and zones over other schemes.
- That the Council was putting an additional £1 million into road safety over the next three years to tackle concerns particularly outside Surrey's schools and areas with higher pedestrian movements.

The amendment was formally seconded by John O'Reilly, who made the following comments:

- Welcomed the additional £1 million for road safety.
- Noted the call for a 20 mph zone in Hersham in order to improve road safety.
- That the original motion called for 20 mph limits which would make pedestrians and cyclists feel safer; that was true with the current policy where a speed limit of 20 mph could be introduced without other measures where the average speed was 24 mph or less.
- Noted concern in arbitrarily reducing the speed limit to 20 mph - without other measures such as traffic calming - where the natural speed was 30 mph as it would give a false sense of security particularly to pedestrians.
- That even if 90% of drivers adhered to a reduction in the speed limit from 30 mph to 20 mph, 10% may not and may cause an accident.
- Urged caution in increasing the amount of 20 mph zones in Surrey if the police were not able to enforce them.

Lance Spencer did not accept the amendment and he made the following comments:

- Noted that the previous Cabinet Member for Transport and Member for his division was responsible for getting a 20 mph speed limit which was only implemented on a small section of the High Street in Horsell Village due to the cost of traffic calming and engineering.
- That the Council's policy must change in order to implement a wider 20 mph zone in Horsell Village, the original motion called for that change through requesting 20 mph signage costing around £20,000 compared to traffic calming costing £100,000.
- That the additional paragraphs in the amendment around Members' being allocated local budgets for highway improvements and the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to implement 20 mph speed limits and zones would divert money - that could be used to fill potholes and improve pavements - towards pointless traffic calming schemes.

- That the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure appeared to support 20 mph whilst ensuring that the 20 mph zones cannot be implemented across Surrey.
- That the issue would be reoccurring until a cost-effective way of implementing 20 mph zones was found.

Eleven Members spoke on the amendment and made the following comments:

- That the text of the amendment in the second resolution formed a negative of the original motion and should have been disallowed, those not in support should simply vote against the original motion; as rather than amend the current policy as noted in the original motion the amendment sought to reaffirm the need for additional supporting measures concerning mean speeds above 24 mph.
- That the 24 mph threshold and all speed limits were arbitrary, there was no natural speed limit.
- That the original motion provided a chance for the Council's Conservative Party administration to support 20 mph speed limits.
- That the amendment was a business as usual approach, nullifying the intent of the original motion.
- Noted the difficulty in getting new 20 mph zones to be considered, Members must be responsive to what their local communities requested.
- Encouraged Members to jointly speak to the Monitoring Officer to clarify the interpretation of Standing Order 21.2.
- Welcomed the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure's restatement of his promise to tackle the backlog of measures concerning school road safety audits.
- Highlighted an example where a damaged 20 mph zone sign was replaced with 20 mph painted on tarmac, the zone could have been extended so drivers slowed down sooner.
- That the Council could actively highlight road safety and the carbon reduction benefits of 20 mph speed limits in residential areas, supporting their introduction through working with schools and communities.
- That alongside enforcement, behaviour change was vital.
- That the original motion's proposed change of policy would make Surrey better by making residential roads around schools and villages safer.
- That implementing 20 mph speed limits would cost money similar to implementing HGV weight restriction orders and pedestrianising town centres which would see a shift to a more sustainable transport system, less road surfacing costs and meeting the climate change commitments.
- That the amendment went against the wishes of many residents, who had concerns over speeding vehicles on residential roads, the current 30 mph speed limit is highly inappropriate on many local roads.
- That walking and cycling to school was beneficial for the health of children, parents were reluctant to encourage that due to road safety concerns.
- That it was inappropriate to put 20 mph speed limits and zones in competition with other ITS schemes - whose funding have been reduced.
- That the original motion was carefully worded so it did not automatically apply to every road.
- That a signed only 20 mph zone in Fetcham was dangerous and so traffic calming was implemented.
- Noted confusion in the original motion which mixed issues around climate change, road safety and what residents would like, a 20 mph zone itself was not safe as it must be implemented safely for all road users.

- That the Council's policy was designed for road safety, disregarding it and labelling it artificial was odd as 20 mph speed limits were also arbitrary.
- Supported the amendment's call for targeted 20 mph speed limits rather than blanket zones.
- Was seeking to get a 20 mph speed limit in the High Street in Chobham which was important in terms of school children's safety around the crossing, a 20 mph speed zone throughout the village would be inappropriate.

Ayesha Azad raised a point of order under Standing Order 22, procedural motion: "that the question be now put".

In response, the Chair explained that as previously stated in reference to the point of order raised under Standing Order 21.2, she would allow the debate to continue.

- Noted that the 30 mph speed limit was introduced in 1934 where roads and the number of vehicles differ to today.
- That the Council must look at up-to-date legislation and advice from DfT such as the 2013 circular which emphasised that it was up to the local authority to look at 20 mph speed limits and zones to ensure greater safety.
- That it was not DfT that was enforcing traffic calming measures when speed limits exceed the 24 mph mean, but the local authority.
- Urged the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure to look at a 2018 Atkins report outlining the widespread use of 20 mph sign only limits.
- That due to the pandemic making use of outdoor spaces has become more important.
- That traffic calming was expensive and thwarted many 20 mph sign only limit requests.
- That the Council cannot encourage walking and cycling through the business as usual approach as noted in the amendment, the Council must update current speed limits.
- That the amendment suggests using CIL money, yet a number of Borough and District Councils have not collected a sufficient amount of CIL money.
- That physical traffic calming such as speed humps were environmentally damaging as they caused increased particulates.
- That sign only 20 mph speed limits were an appropriate mechanism suited to residential streets for example in Brent in Camden.
- Highlighted the statistics around road casualties whereby a child is three times more likely to die if hit in a 30 mph vehicle collision compared to a 20 mph vehicle collision.
- Noted some discomfort with the word zones, highlighting the blanket implementation on certain main roads in neighbouring London Boroughs.
- That it was vital for the Council to look at the evidence of successful 20 mph schemes implemented across the UK.
- That the Council should trial 20 mph zones with signs only where there was Member and community support.
- That there was support from residents in Haslemere for a 20 mph speed limit particularly in appropriate areas such as the High Street where older buildings are affected by speeding traffic.
- That fines were not effective to bring about the change from new legislation, it was educating young people that was vital.
- That Surrey must act now through putting up 20 mph signs, with behaviour change promoted through advertising and other means.

The Chair asked Matt Furniss, as proposer of the amendment to conclude the debate, he made the following comments:

- That there had been some confusion in the debate, he clarified that there already were signed only 20 mph zones within Surrey in accordance with national guidance and as permitted by the existing policy - where mean speeds were below 24 mph.
- That it was vital to ensure the most appropriate speed at the most appropriate location, 20 mph zones in Surrey were supported where appropriate by signs or by engineering methods.

The amendment was put to the vote with 47 Members voting For, 31 voting Against and no Abstentions.

Therefore the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Under Standing Order 28.1 ten Members demanded a recorded vote, the substantive motion was put to the vote with 46 Members voting For, 31 voting Against and no Abstentions.

The following Members voted for it:

Maureen Attewell, Ayesha Azad, Steve Bax, Jordan Beech, Luke Bennett, Liz Bowes, Natalie Bramhall, Helyn Clack, Clare Curran, Paul Deach, Kevin Deanus, John Furey, Matt Furniss, Tim Hall, David Harmer, Edward Hawkins, Marisa Heath, Trefor Hogg, Robert Hughes, Jonathan Hulley, Saj Hussain, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Frank Kelly, Riasat Khan, Rachael Lake, Victor Lewanski, David Lewis (Cobham), David Lewis (Camberley West), Scott Lewis, Andy Lynch, Cameron McIntosh, Sinead Mooney, Bernie Muir, Mark Nuti, John O'Reilly, Tim Oliver, Rebecca Paul, Becky Rush, Tony Samuels, Lesley Steeds, Mark Sugden, Richard Tear, Alison Todd, Denise Turner-Stewart, Jeremy Webster, Buddhi Weerasinghe.

The following Members voted against it:

Catherine Baart, John Beckett, Amanda Boote, Stephen Cooksey, Colin Cross, Nick Darby, Fiona Davidson, Jonathan Essex, Robert Evans, Chris Farr, Paul Follows, Will Forster, Angela Goodwin, Nick Harrison, Robert King, Eber Kington, Andy MacLeod, Ernest Mallett MBE, Jan Mason, Julia McShane, Carla Morson, George Potter, Catherine Powell, Penny Rivers, John Robini, Joanne Sexton, Lance Spencer, Chris Townsend, Liz Townsend, Hazel Watson, Fiona White.

Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that:

**This Council notes that:**

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

**This Council further notes:**

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

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

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

**This Council resolves to:**

Request the Leader and Cabinet to:

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

**Item 4 (ii)**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Catherine Baart moved:

**This Council notes that:**

- The Local Government Association forecasts 700,000 new jobs in the Green economy by 2030, and that the Green economy will grow at a higher rate than the economy as a whole.
- Delivering the Council's Climate Change Strategy and Delivery Plan will need more people employed in 'Green Jobs' in Surrey.
- The UK has a green skills shortage, highlighted for example by the shortfall in trades needed for energy efficient retrofit of UK buildings.



- There is an opportunity to Build Back Better after the pandemic, through workers reskilling to move into green jobs, and apprenticeships in low carbon industries, particularly in:
  - areas with higher unemployment;
  - for younger people; and
  - for people living near Heathrow and Gatwick airports who have been impacted by the reduction in flights.

**This Council agrees that:**

- Taking the lead on developing new training and skills opportunities would support Surrey County Council's Greener Futures ambitions and a more resilient, sustainable Surrey economy.
- Taking this lead should involve working with Surrey's further education colleges and universities, as well as with appropriate businesses
- Training and skills development should be inclusive, fully accessible regardless of income, or background, as well as for those with disabilities.

**This Council resolves to:**

Request the Leader and Cabinet to:

- I. Produce a place-based, costed Green Skills & Jobs Plan to support Surrey's Climate Change Delivery Plan, initially targeting areas with higher youth unemployment.

Catherine Baart made the following points:

- That green jobs and skills in Surrey were not just necessary to meet the Council's climate change targets, but they represented a new job sector and presented a new opportunity for the Council to address its other ambitions of tackling inequality and ensuring that no one is left behind.
- That the Greener Futures CCDP whilst wide-ranging, was not a plan for developing green jobs and skills.
- That a plan for green jobs and skills in Surrey cuts across all areas of the Council's responsibilities and required coordination between services outside of the Greener Futures team such as children and families, education and learning, levelling up and pathways for employment such as for Care Leavers.
- Noted awareness in the work underway with the University of Surrey and some of the Borough and District Councils, but was not clear on what the terms of reference for those activities were.
- That by agreeing the original motion Members would signal support for coordinated action to obtain long term benefits from green jobs and skills for Surrey.

The motion was formally seconded by Catherine Powell, who reserved the right to speak.

One Member made the following points:

- Welcomed the positive original motion and recognised the wider environmental work undertaken by the motion's proposer.

- Noted that the Council has recognised that there was a huge opportunity for Surrey's employers and residents to play a key role in meeting the skill gaps in the green job market and have a competitive edge to accelerate its ability to meet the net zero targets and adapt to the future.
- That research by the Local Government Association highlighted that the local carbon and renewable energy economy was likely to produce 28,000 additional jobs in Surrey by 2050.
- That the Council was leading on the commissioning of further research.
- Highlighted that the Greener Futures CCDP recognised the importance of being ready to meet the future needs of the green economy; such as through developing a Green Skills Academy.
- Highlighted priority three of Surrey's Economic Strategy to maximise opportunities within a balanced, inclusive economy; the Council was working closely with partners to deliver a skill system fit for the future and to ensure that building green growth was central to the Council's work.
- Highlighted that the Council has a lead role in the One Surrey Growth Board and noted the production of a county-wide Surrey Skills Improvement Plan; and a lead role to test innovative ideas through pilots such as the installation of low carbon heating options such as gas pumps.
- That whilst the principle of the original motion and supporting comments were right, in her capacity as the Cabinet Member for Environment she could not support the original motion as the Council was already taking action as outlined in the Greener Futures CCDP and continued to develop its approach through the Greener Futures Reference Group.

Catherine Powell, the seconder of the motion, made the following comments:

- Welcomed the Leader's openness as noted in his statement in calling for Members to raise issues to be addressed.
- That a green and sustainable economy that would benefit everyone had an ecological, an economic and a social pillar.
- That the Council's child poverty policy being formulated talked about focusing on addressing the root causes of poverty so that one is left behind and she stressed that it must not simply include mitigations.
- That growth in the green economy offered an opportunity for the Council to promote green skills; achieved through producing a place-based costed Green Skills and Jobs Plan to support the Greener Futures CCDP.
- That whilst the Greener Futures CCDP had many good initiatives within it, there was mention only about developing a Green Skills Academy.
- That a plan was needed that looked at the needs of young people particularly in areas of high unemployment and sought to link those young unemployed people with skills and opportunities to benefit the county.
- That although the Council was developing its approach around the Greener Futures CCDP as noted by the Cabinet Member for Environment, she commended the original motion as the place-based element was currently missing in the Greener Futures CCDP.

The Chair asked Catherine Baart, as proposer of the motion, to conclude the debate:

- Endorsed the points made by the original motion's seconder, highlighting that the green economy was a new sector and provided an opportunity for the Council to do things differently.

- That the green economy was not just an opportunity for greener futures, but for social sustainability through levelling up to ensure that no one is left behind.
- That a place-based system was vital to address the pockets of inequality in Surrey.

The motion was put to the vote with 30 Members voting For, 46 voting Against and no Abstentions.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

The motion was lost.

#### **Item 4 (iii)**

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

Under Standing Order 20.3(a) Catherine Powell moved a proposed alteration to the original motion standing in her own name.

The proposed alteration to the motion was as follows (with additional words in bold/underlined and deletions crossed through):

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

Surrey Highways devotes a great deal of time and resource working with utilities companies to identify unmarked assets requiring repair **and making sure that they are kept temporarily safe until the utility makes a permanent repair to their asset.**

The ~~two year~~ **six month** grace period granted to utility companies to leave in place temporary repairs before making permanent repairs can often have an adverse and unreasonable impact on residents and businesses.

**Therefore, this Council requests the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure to call upon the Leader and Cabinet to resolve to:**

- I. Lobby the Government to:
  - a. **Reduce the interim reinstatement period from 6 months to 1 month.**
  - b. **Extend the 2-year guarantee period of utility repairs undertaken by utility companies to 5 years.**
  - c. **Introduce a timescale for repairs for 'Section 81' (of NRSWA) for Defective Apparatus, so that utilities must complete repairs in a short time period once reported of no more than 3 months.**
  - d. Introduce a statutory requirement for local authorities and private utility companies to work in partnership and to use technology such as RFID (radio-frequency identification) in order to record the location, service history and other data of an asset, and to record and share asset data going forward **to continue to improve the efficiency of work going forward.**
- II. ~~Lobby the Government to reduce the two-year period for permanent repairs to less than a year, and for utility companies to maintain a register~~

~~of all such temporary repairs to be shared regularly with the relevant highway authority.~~

The proposed alteration to the original motion was put to the vote with 29 Members voting For, 46 voting Against and no Abstentions.

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

The Council voted Against the proposed alteration of the original motion.

Eber Kington raised a point of order under Standing Order 12.2 noting that if the original motion was not moved the notice would lapse.

The Chair responded that the proposer of the original motion may withdraw her original motion and may bring it back to the next meeting of the Council.

Catherine Powell withdrew her original motion, noting that she required further information from the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure before she would bring it back to Council.

Nick Harrison raised a point of order under Standing Order 11.6 noting that the next Council meeting in February was the Annual Budget meeting where the presumption was against original motions.

The Chair responded that accepting original motions at the Annual Budget meeting was at the Chair's discretion and noted that the original motion had not been moved.

*The meeting was adjourned for a comfort break at 12.59 pm*

*The meeting was resumed at 13.07 pm*

Eber Kington raised a point of order under Standing Order 13.1 asking how long was left to debate the remaining original motions out of the 1 hour 30 minutes time limit.

The Chair responded that there was around 20 minutes left not including the time to conduct the roll calls, the time limit was at her discretion.

#### **Item 4 (iv)**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Bernie Muir moved:

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

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

**This Council further notes that:**

- Greater numbers of Surrey residents, of all ages, are experiencing pronounced mental health problems, which have been exacerbated by Covid-19, national and tiered lockdowns, social distancing and the effects of trauma, bereavement, and economic insecurity.
- The negative impact this has on society, the economy, employment and education of the people of Surrey, that it increases health inequality, with those experiencing mental health problems experiencing physical health problems, likely to smoke, be overweight, use drugs and drink alcohol to excess, fall into poverty, and are overrepresented in the criminal justice system.
- This Council re-affirms the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board's declaration that, "By 2030, we want Surrey to be a uniquely special place where everyone has a great start to life, people live healthy and fulfilling lives, are enabled to achieve their full potential and contribute to their community and no one is left behind."
- This Council welcomes the actions of the Adults & Health Select Committee in establishing a Mental Health Journey Task Group, which consulted widely amongst people of Surrey with lived experience of mental health problems. This ultimately led to a Surrey Integrated Mental Health Partnership Board and the Council endorses their key aims of their Surrey Mental Health Plan, including:
  - Improving and expanding crisis services, including increasing bed capacity and support;
  - Expanding our GP Integrated Mental Health Services – which provides specialist mental health access and support in primary care settings;
  - Transforming our community mental health teams;
  - Better, post diagnosis dementia support;
  - Expanded perinatal mental health services;
  - Reducing the number of out of Surrey placements;
  - Taking advantage of digital innovation to improve services;
  - Improved support for our BAME communities;
  - Implementing our Mental Health Partnership Board improvement plans for children and young people;
  - An additional £6m investment in a new Emotional Wellbeing Mental Health contract for children and young people with a focus on early intervention, work in schools and reduced service backlogs;
  - The provision of high acuity eating disorder beds within Surrey;
  - Focused action on suicide prevention and reduction of self-harm.

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

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

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

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

Bernie Muir made the following points:

- Highlighted that there were those whose lives were severely impacted by mental health issues, either directly or indirectly and they needed multi-agency support to intervene in crises to facilitate early intervention and to work to prevent mental health problems.
- That poor mental health impacts physical health and has adverse outcomes such as being more likely to use drugs and alcohol to excess.
- That greater numbers of Surrey residents of all ages were experiencing more pronounced mental health issues, having been exacerbated by the impacts of Covid-19.
- That poor mental health had broad ramifications individually and to society, worsening health inequalities and in response the Health and Wellbeing Board has set three outcomes within Priority Two to support mental health and emotional wellbeing.
- That it was vital for Surrey to establish a more comprehensive employability scheme and engage with employers Surrey-wide to create opportunities and more sympathetic working environments.
- That the right approach could make a difference to people's lives, noting the experiences heard at last year's Mental Health Task Group, the Task Group made nineteen multi-agency recommendations which resulted in the Surrey Mental Health Summit.
- That following the Summit the multi-agency, integrated Surrey Mental Health Partnership Board (MHPB) was created and produced a Surrey Mental Health Improvement Plan.
- That the Improvement Plan highlighted that greater investment was needed in preventative measures that would promote and enable positive emotional wellbeing.
- Highlighted the importance of the voluntary sector's role in delivering mental health services, providing occupation and human relationships, reducing isolation and stigma, resulting in prevention and resilience.
- That supporting employees was also key as noted by Professor Dame Carol Black, businesses must create a culture in which mental health was valued and disclosure was encouraged.
- That it was essential that the commitment of all partners on the MHPB continued and was replicated Surrey-wide as ensuring good mental health is a responsibility of all in the system.

The motion was formally seconded by Trefor Hogg, who made the following comments:

- Sought to define mental illness as health conditions involving changes in emotion, thinking and behaviour that cause distress or problems functioning in social, family or work activities.
- That healthy social networks and daily interactions had a key role to play in maintaining good mental health.

- That mental health conditions usually begin in childhood as a result of traumatic events that carry on into adulthood, or such conditions occur in adulthood from traumatic events such as those faced by veterans.
- That the pandemic had added to the pressures causing social isolation and anxiety for many, anti-social behaviour, domestic violence and economic hardship have also increased.
- That poor mental health was estimated to cost the nation £100 billion annually, outcomes included lower educational attainment and lost income.
- Emphasised that not enough was being done to address the issue, 75% of those with diagnosable mental illnesses receive no treatment; the original motion calls for urgent funding and engagement on mental health to ensure that no one is left behind in Surrey.

Five Members made the following points:

- Commended the proposer of the original motion in her capacity as the Chair of the Adults and Health Select Committee and commended the Select Committee as a constant champion for mental health.
- Highlighted that following the second Covid-19 lockdown in 2021, in Adult Social Care there was a 45% rise in referrals to home treatment teams, psychiatric liaison and intensive support teams, referrals and pressures remained high and it was a similar picture in Children's Services.
- Noted that progress had been made as over the past six months the Health and Wellbeing Strategy had been reviewed and refreshed to reflect the impact of the pandemic including a more explicit focus on reducing health inequalities.
- That Priority Two of the Strategy remains focused on supporting mental health and emotional wellbeing, through prevention and early intervention which was key to the MHPB's Improvement Plan and the Early Intervention and Prevention Group.
- That the MHPB's progress review to the Health and Wellbeing Board in December highlighted that more needed to be done; such as a review of mental health spend across the system, a joint Strategic Commissioning Convener for Mental Health had been appointed and the refreshed Health and Wellbeing Strategy focused on the wider determinants of health.
- That the Strategy's Empowered and Thriving Communities was key to address inequalities.
- That more needed to be done, the Health in All Policies (HiAP) approach undertaken by the Health and Wellbeing Board provided an opportunity for all areas to maximise their positive impact on health through their policy and strategic decisions.

*Alison Todd left the meeting at 13.20 pm*

- Stressed that mental health was currently a serious issue within the UK exacerbated by the pandemic, highlighted figures from the charity Mind on those suffering from mental health conditions such as one in four people would experience a mental health problem annually in England.
- That mental health was complex particularly as a person's diagnosis may change during their lifetime.
- That the original motion highlighted the need to improve the level of support being provided within the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) community and to tackle the stigma and cultural barriers, and to raise awareness around mental health such as through GP referrals.

- Praised the work of the Mental Health Journey Task Group.
- That having worked with the NHS for a number of decades, noted that mental health was seen as the poor relation to general nursing and learning disabilities, with the closure of many of the long-stay large mental institutions those in crises were moved away from their support network.
- That in supporting the original motion the Council would be at the centre of helping to reshape and reinvigorate mental health services and was pleased to see the range of services offered to residents such as social prescribing and out of hour GP services.
- That the Council needed to ensure that people with learning and mental health needs could contribute to their communities.
- That it was vital that no group or children should be left behind, highlighting an NHS survey concerning the levels of self-harm between girls and boys aged between 11-16 and 17-19 years of age.
- Queried whether the resolutions in the original motions were already underway as the Adults and Health Select Committee in October reported that the implementation of the Task Group's recommendations would continue at pace.
- Asked whether there was a problem in delivery by the Council or its partners, querying whether resolutions two and three were strong enough.
- Noted concern in the length of time that it was taking for assessments of children's mental health needs and putting in place the appropriate packages, the Council must address this.
- Praised the work of young carers but highlighted that many feel isolated and so it was vital that they and those that they care for were supported.
- That the Council must address the issue around recruiting the right staff to work within mental health services.

The Chair asked Bernie Muir, as proposer of the motion, to conclude the debate:

- Noted that the Council had an ambitious agenda and as part of that had been a key player in the production of the MHPB's Improvement Plan.
- That it was encouraging that the Council was committed to system-wide leadership working in partnership and it was vital that the Council and its partners put mental health at the centre of their work.
- That the Council had a new contract in Children's Services to support children's mental health, a new team in Adult Social Care and new strategies for all ages.
- That culture change and perception were being addressed by the Council who was also developing its employability programme to create employment opportunities and mental health friendly environments.
- Highlighted a statement by Professor Dame Carol Black who said that more than many other illnesses, mental health conditions were often undiagnosed or diagnosed only when they had become severe.
- Noted that the stigma and discrimination around mental health prevented people from seeking help.
- That mental ill health impacts both the individual and those around them, it had wide-ranging costs to society such as exacerbating health inequalities.
- That partners who had signed up to the Improvement Plan must be committed, provide resourcing and must deliver at pace.

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



Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

**This Council notes that:**

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

**This Council further notes that:**

- Greater numbers of Surrey residents, of all ages, are experiencing pronounced mental health problems, which have been exacerbated by Covid-19, national and tiered lockdowns, social distancing and the effects of trauma, bereavement, and economic insecurity.
- The negative impact this has on society, the economy, employment and education of the people of Surrey, that it increases health inequality, with those experiencing mental health problems experiencing physical health problems, likely to smoke, be overweight, use drugs and drink alcohol to excess, fall into poverty, and are overrepresented in the criminal justice system.
- This Council re-affirms the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Board's declaration that, "By 2030, we want Surrey to be a uniquely special place where everyone has a great start to life, people live healthy and fulfilling lives, are enabled to achieve their full potential and contribute to their community and no one is left behind."
- This Council welcomes the actions of the Adults & Health Select Committee in establishing a Mental Health Journey Task Group, which consulted widely amongst people of Surrey with lived experience of mental health problems. This ultimately led to a Surrey Integrated Mental Health Partnership Board and the Council endorses their key aims of their Surrey Mental Health Plan, including:
  - Improving and expanding crisis services, including increasing bed capacity and support;
  - Expanding our GP Integrated Mental Health Services – which provides specialist mental health access and support in primary care settings;
  - Transforming our community mental health teams;
  - Better, post diagnosis dementia support;
  - Expanded perinatal mental health services;
  - Reducing the number of out of Surrey placements;
  - Taking advantage of digital innovation to improve services;
  - Improved support for our BAME communities;
  - Implementing our Mental Health Partnership Board improvement plans for children and young people;
  - An additional £6m investment in a new Emotional Wellbeing Mental Health contract for children and young people with a focus on early intervention, work in schools and reduced service backlogs;
  - The provision of high acuity eating disorder beds within Surrey;
  - Focused action on suicide prevention and reduction of self-harm.

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

- I. Call for urgency in delivering the recommendations of the Mental Health Journey Task Group.
- II. Encourage all partners in the Integrated Mental Health Partnership Board to give assurances that they will fully fund and resource the plan to ensure that the full plan, the recommendations and all parts of the co-production are delivered to ensure the optimum outcome.
- III. Call for the employer organisations and employers, Surrey-wide, to get engaged in order to provide opportunities for people with mental health problems and to establish mental health friendly environments.

**Item 4 (v)**

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

Under Standing Order 12.1 Rebecca Paul moved:

**This Council notes that:**

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

**This Council further notes that:**

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

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

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

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

Rebecca Paul made the following points:

- Looked After Children and Care Leavers were the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in Surrey's community, many were in care due to facing abuse, neglect or family breakdown and it was vital for the Council to provide them with the right and equitable support.
- Looked After Children and Care Leavers were more likely to have a mental health issue, to do less well at school, to have additional or special educational needs and Care Leavers were less likely to be in education, training, or employment.
- The Council and partner agencies have a Corporate Parenting responsibility over those in care, children and young people in care have the same needs as children not in care to be loved and cared for.
- The Children and Social Work Act 2017 sets out Corporate Parenting principles that local authorities must have regard to whenever they exercise a function in relation to Looked After Children and Care Leavers; such as promoting physical and mental health and wellbeing.
- The Council and Borough and District Councils should embed such principles into their culture and policies.
- Regarding the first resolution, since the time of writing the two outstanding Borough and District Councils had now committed to deliver Council Tax exemption for Care Leavers - ensuring a consistent county-wide approach.
- Regarding the second resolution, exercise and team sports were vital for physical and mental wellbeing, and so removing that financial barrier for Looked After Children and Care Leavers was crucial. Five of the eleven Borough and District Councils had leisure offers, it was vital to ensure consistency in the offer county-wide.
- Carers and their families should have easy access to leisure facilities alongside their child; the cost of which would be low noting that there were around 600 Looked After Children and 400 Care Leavers in Surrey.

- Regarding the third resolution, Members were asked to do all they could for Looked After Children in providing opportunities and financial support such as contributing to the Council's Looked After Children's Celebration Fund.
- Urged Members to support the motion to better support and improve the lives of Surrey's Looked After Children and Care Leavers.

The motion was formally seconded by Jeremy Webster, who made the following comments:

- That the Council had a unique Corporate Parenting responsibility to Looked After Children and Care Leavers to promote recovery, resilience and wellbeing.
- The official guidance encouraged local authorities to work together to apply the Corporate Parenting principles, to lead through policy change and to consider how they support Looked After Children and Care Leavers to improve their physical, emotional and mental health.
- That recently Tandridge District Council had made Care Leavers exempt from Council Tax up to the age of 25.

Five Members made the following points:

- That the matter of child poverty and the health and wellbeing of vulnerable children and young people was an important matter which the Member raised in 2019 at Surrey Heath Borough Council; and welcomed the exemption in Council Tax to Care Leavers across Surrey.
- That physical activity had a wide range of positive health impacts beyond disease prevention such as improving cognitive functions, providing social benefits and improved job opportunities.
- Asked Members to ask their Borough and District Councils to look at their leisure provision for Looked After Children, Care Leavers and carers across Surrey to provide a consistent approach.
- That it was important to understand the term Looked After Children, to take time to consider how one would want their child or grandchild entering care to be well treated and valued.
- That all Members shared the duties of being a Corporate Parent. The original motion advocates Members not just saying but showing that as Corporate Parents they care.
- That the original motion made specific asks of Members - particularly twin-hatters - to work with their Borough and District Councils to remind them of their Corporate Parenting responsibilities by committing to offer free leisure activities for Looked After Children and Care Leavers.
- Emphasised that it was not a party-political issue as all had a duty to work together to secure the best interests of Surrey's children, previous original motions on Corporate Parenting had been given cross-party support and the Corporate Parenting Board had cross-party representation.
- That many Care Leavers were marginalised and vulnerable and used physical activity daily to manage their emotional wellbeing and their physical health.
- Urged Members to reflect on what they could do to support Looked After Children and Care Leavers through identifying work, recreational or sporting opportunities, through donations to the Council's Looked After Children Celebration Fund or through joining the Grand Mentor Scheme.

- That hearing the experiences of Looked After Children and Care Leavers first-hand was invaluable, they highlighted the financial and accessibility barriers and inconsistent offering across the county.
- That although not mentioned in the motion, transport was a key barrier and the provision of free bus passes would help Looked After Children and Care Leavers to access the leisure facilities.
- Noted the value of team sports, having reached out to Surbiton Hockey Club they would be providing free courses in the half-term holiday and had offered free tickets to Care Leavers to watch some of their games; the Member had also reached out to a local employer about employing a Care Leaver.
- Supported the motion alongside Liberal Democrat colleagues, noting that the original motion followed on from a previous original motion agreed a few years ago on Care Leaver exemption from Council Tax and it was positive that there was a consistent approach across Surrey; thanked his predecessor Chris Botten for getting Tandridge District Council to commit to that exemption.

The Chair asked Rebecca Paul, as proposer of the motion, to conclude the debate:

- Thanked all Members who spoke in support of the original motion which sought to improve the lives and wellbeing of Surrey's Looked After Children and Care Leavers.
- Noted the comment made about transport as a barrier, that seeking to provide the leisure facilities offer to carers and their own children may help with the transportation issue; she recognised that the Council needed to explore transport in more detail.
- Commended the work of Catherine Powell as she went the extra mile in her Corporate Parenting responsibilities.
- That as Corporate Parents Members had a role to play in ensuring that Surrey's Looked After Children and Care Leavers were given the best start in life, support and opportunities for growth; working in partnership with the Borough and District Councils to ensure that no one is left behind.
- That a good start had been made and greater progress was needed going forward to deliver an improved and consistent offering across the county, ending the postcode lottery.

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

Therefore, it was **RESOLVED** that:

**This Council notes that:**

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

**This Council further notes that:**

- The Children and Social Work Act 2017 set out corporate parenting principles for the council as a whole to be the best parent it can be to children in its care. The Act introduced seven principles of corporate

parenting for looked after children or care leavers. These include acting in their best interests and promoting their health and wellbeing; helping looked after children and care leavers to gain access to and get the best use of the services provided by the local authority and its partners; promoting high aspirations and preparing them for adulthood and independent living.

- Despite a motion previously agreed by this council, there are still two district and borough councils in the county yet to exempt care leavers from council tax. This is an unfair situation for some of the most disadvantaged groups of young people living in Surrey.
- One of the ways that health and wellbeing can be promoted is by offering looked after children, their carers and care leavers free access to leisure centres across the county. The need for a fair and consistent offer across the county of Surrey is important, as children are placed with foster carers or in our own children's residential homes in every district and borough. Six of the district and borough councils make no leisure offer for looked after children and care leavers. Moreover, the leisure offers available in the five other district and boroughs differ greatly in eligibility and choice causing an unwelcome postcode lottery.
- All Members share the duties and responsibilities of being a corporate parent. There is much that we can do to support our looked after children to live fulfilling lives – in the same way that we would do for our own children, grandchildren or those close to us.

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

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

[Meeting ended at: 13.59 pm]

---

**Chair**