

Cabinet – Supplementary Papers



Date & time
Tuesday, 29
October 2019 at
2.00 pm

Place
Ashcombe Suite,
County Hall, Kingston
upon Thames, Surrey
KT1 2DN

Contact
Vicky Hibbert or Angela
Guest
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020
8541 9075

Chief Executive
Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:
[@SCCdemocracy](https://twitter.com/SCCdemocracy)

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or
angela.guest@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Members: Mr Mel Few, Mr Matt Furniss, Mr Mike Goodman, Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Mrs Julie Iles, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mrs Sinead Mooney, Mr Tim Oliver and Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members: Mrs Natalie Bramhall, Miss Alison Griffiths and Mr Mark Nuti,

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 9698, fax 020 8541 9009, or email vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or angela.guest@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Vicky Hibbert or Angela Guest on 020 8541 9229 or 020 8541 9075.

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions (Pages 1 - 6)

Member's questions with responses are attached.

b Public Questions (Pages 7 - 10)

Public questions with responses are attached.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Tuesday, 29 October 2019

CABINET – 29 October 2019**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Andrew Povey (Cranleigh & Ewhurst):**

Cranleigh Primary School:

There is considerable concern within Cranleigh regarding this proposal. In particular the proposed new site has a very constrained access. It is felt that children will be put in danger because of the lack of access, the road design and the considerable congestion caused by the position of the access, the proximity of other schools and the extra traffic generated by the proposed new housing.

Can the cabinet reassure parents that the planning application for this proposed new school will include a detailed, comprehensive, legally enforceable travel plan that satisfies parents concerns?

What are the predicted numbers of primary school children going forward? (The last update to Waverley local committee showed no increase)

Reply:

The proximity of the other schools is a challenge currently, with the same schools being present now, and in the future. The design for the relocated school has taken into account the issues around travelling to and from the school site.

Cabinet can reassure parents that the planning application for the relocated school does include a detailed and comprehensive school travel plan. It is usual that planning conditions issued, as part of any decision granting permission, dictate that travel plans are implemented and updated on a regular basis. It must be borne in mind that schools have the ability to influence parental behaviours when travelling to and from school, but cannot enforce parental behaviours. It is for all members of the community to ensure that we all take responsibility for our behaviours, and act considerately and appropriately.

Dr Povey has previously asked for and received information around place planning and timescales. The forecasts show the primary numbers in the Cranleigh area are increasing mid –year currently and year on year into the future. Reception places are near capacity and will be above capacity potentially in 2020 and persistently above from 2022/23. Although higher than the current PAN the forecast reception numbers are only slightly above, with the biggest impact seemingly from new homes within year groups 1 to 6. We will carefully monitor reception admissions until the Cranleigh scheme is completed and provide emergency or bulge additional places as necessary.

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
29 October 2019

Question (2) Andrew Povey (Cranleigh & Ewhurst):

On behalf of my residents I would like the Council to provide a proper comparison of the proposed new build versus the refurbishment of the existing primary site. The head assures

me that there is sufficient space in the current middle school to accommodate the children from the infant school.

If the infant school site was sold towards the cost of refurbishment the figures given in the part two paper suggest that it would be considerably cheaper to refurbish the existing school rather than pursue the new site.

My understanding is that this is the preferred option for the school, Parish Council and residents.

Reply:

A response which contains exempt information under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act has been provided.

Question (3) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

The Prudential RideLondon Cycle Event, and the associated professional cycle event, has been approved up until 2020. There is a significant lead time required to organise the event and the date for the following year's event is known when the current year event takes place i.e. the approvals for the 2021 event will need to be in place by Spring 2020 at the latest.

The County Council committed to Surrey residents that there would be a detailed consultation on the future of the event through the normal County Council process, with advertising on the website, libraries, etc, before any agreement to hold the event beyond 2020 was signed. The consultation has been developed by the Communications Team of the County Council and is ready to be published. It is expected to take eight weeks. The submission of the Cabinet papers relating to the future of the event beyond 2020 (as confirmed to me) will not happen until the County Council's consultation with residents has been completed and the results assessed and thus the necessary approvals cannot be given until the consultation has taken place.

It is now urgent that this consultation takes place so that Surrey residents can give their views both on the event and how the disruption caused by the event can be alleviated and so that the event organisers have clarity on the future of the event and any actions that they will need to take for 2021 and beyond. As such, can the Cabinet Member please confirm the timing for this consultation?

Reply:

Thank you for your question.

We are currently in discussion with Transport for London with regard to the continuation of the event beyond 2020. No commitment has been made from 2021 onwards. Once discussions have concluded, we will go out to public consultation to ensure that the views of residents inform the report to Cabinet for decision on the continuation of the event.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
29 October 2019

Question (4) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

Earlier this year the Leader of the Council indicated that this Autumn he would be reviewing parking charges on the Countryside Estate before deciding whether or not such charges should be abolished. Has a decision been whether or not to abolish these charges and if so when will it be made public?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. We will be bringing a report to Cabinet for decision in November in response to the Car Park Charging Review.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
29 October 2019

Question (5) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

In April 2018, I brought my concerns about the reduction in the funding of qualified youth workers across Surrey to this Cabinet and at that time it was confirmed that, the number of hours of open access youth services would be reduced to 618 hours per week across Surrey.

More recently, at the October 2019 council meeting Cllr Chris Townsend asked for an update on universal youth services.

Quoting from the response to that question, the county council stated:

- a) 'There is **no statutory duty** for SCC to provide open access universal youth work";
 - b) 'the Council **is not now able to fund open access youth services**; and
 - c) These new services **do not deliver universal, open access youth work**.
1. Would the Cabinet member for Children now confirm that in under 18 months, the county council's universal youth services have effectively been withdrawn and the fact that members have had to submit questions to establish this, means that councillors have not been fully briefed on these changes before they have taken place?
 2. In the October council response it was stated that 'Open access youth is provided in some areas by the existing Surrey County Council Youth Service'. Would the Cabinet Member please confirm in which areas this is still happening, where it has already stopped happening and clarify what the future is for these local services.
 3. Given the above stated aim that the future delivery of these crucial services is now proposed to lie in the hands of voluntary and community sector can the Cabinet Member give her assurance that the universal provision in the future is indeed universal, and that an equality impact assessment will be conducted to ensure that there are the new provision does not limit access based on religion, ethnicity or gender.

Reply:

1. The Universal Youth Work provided by Surrey County Council (SCC) has not changed in the last 18 months. Children's Services have been widely restructured in the last 12 months, but there were no changes made at all to universal youth

workers, who were unaffected as the restructure focussed on targeted and specialist Youth Services.

2. As was stated at the October Full Council, whilst the Council is not now able to fund 'open access' Youth Services, it does own a number of buildings and it is our intention to make these buildings available to local communities and voluntary sector organisations as a base to provide Youth Services. It is our intention to put in place a process over the next six months that will see our buildings brought into use in a way that will provide vibrant services to our young people.

Officers and I will be setting out shortly the process to develop the conversations that will enable these important services. It is likely that SCC will maintain a small, flexible and mobile service that can target services in the short term where new need emerges. The specifics and potential impact for each centre will be discussed at a local level with stakeholders including young people during the engagement sessions. The existing arrangements that are in place will continue during the consultation and engagement.

3. An equality impact assessment will be undertaken as part of the consultation and engagement over the next six months before any decisions are then taken by Cabinet. Any future arrangements will also set out the outcomes that are expected if the buildings are utilised by the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector. Clearly where the County Council owns existing youth work buildings, it will be easier for us to establish open access Youth Services. In other areas where we do not have buildings, we will do everything possible to enable open access Youth Services to develop, for instance by negotiating for the use of other community buildings, including schools.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families
29 October 2019

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 29 October 2019**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Public Questions****Question 1: Jonathan Rainer, Resident**

It would be inappropriate to sell the existing land and lose what is an ideal location for the school in terms of access and safety, nuisance and many other factors that have all been submitted to the planners.

I would like to ask a couple of questions relating to the financial viability of the project:

The Sequential and Exception Test Report dated August 2019 states that 75% of the existing school is located in Flood Zones 2&3 and this is given as the main reason for not re-developing the school at its current location. If one assumes this same premise is applied to future development of the site for houses, should the land be sold? I imagine the land value will be reduced significantly.

Has the fact that flooding will restrict the development of the land and significantly increase any costs for any developer, and viability of selling property built in flood zones been factored into the financial viability for the project?

The Sequential and Exception Test Report also states that Asbestos is present on the site. Has the cost of removal of the asbestos been included in the financial assessment?

Reply:

All three questions are focussed on the financial assessment of the project in relation to specific aspects

1. The redevelopment on the existing sites and associated land values
2. Financial viability of the project as impacted by flood zones
3. The presence of asbestos containing material.

All of these have been considered as part of the overall financial planning for this project, and it has been concluded that the project is financially viable.

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
29 October 2019

Question 2: Mr Heather Rainer, Resident

If approximately 75% of the existing school site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 with just a small percentage of the ground covered by a school building, what is the justification of selling the land for housing, which will have far a greater impact on flooding as it will cover the majority of the land displacing the water?

The proposed Glebelands site is a playing field at present, so by relocating the school to this site, a sports amenity will be lost. The installation of a 3G football pitch should be in addition to the existing playing field, not instead of it, especially as pupil numbers are nearly doubling. What is the justification for selling the school site for housing when it is in a flood zone, and disposing of a playing field, when pupil numbers are increasing?

Will the approval of this business case for the rebuilding of the school on the Glebelands site take flooding and loss of playing fields into account?

Reply:

There are three questions here focused on the project in relation to specific aspects:

1. The redevelopment on the exiting sites
The proposed project is to provide a modern educational facility for the families of Cranleigh, both now and in the future, which requires significant capital investment in Cranleigh CofE Primary School. In order to do this in a financially sustainable manner the only viable option is to dispose of the existing sites in order to redevelop the school. The location of the flood zones has been carefully investigated and the proposal for the relocated school and residential development takes all this information into consideration. In the future, a detailed drainage scheme will need to be submitted as part of a detailed planning application for the residential development on the existing sites. This will be the responsibility of the developer, and does not form part of the proposal at this time.
2. Changes to playing field provision.
Although the current playing field at the junior school site will be lost, this will be mitigated by the provision of 2 new sports facilities. At the relocated primary school site there will be an all-weather pitch. This will allow the school to use the pitch throughout the year, rather than the limited time available solely for a grass pitch. This will have the effect of increasing the amount of outdoor physical education and sports the school can undertake. In addition the provision of a 3g pitch at Glebelands School will have a similar effect. This will also create appropriate future provision for Glebelands pupils. Both of these all-weather, all year round facilities, also provide for the increase in pupil numbers.
3. Business case considerations
The business case for the relocation of the school does take into account flooding and the provision of year round sports pitches

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
29 October 2019

Question 3: Katherine Higgins, Resident

With regards to access for the suggested relocation of Cranleigh School – the overgrown footpath that runs alongside our property begins at our entrance/ exit gates. Our access to our property is very narrow and we have to reverse our cars out every morning exactly when children would be arriving for school. Our cars are Teslas and as such are completely silent, meaning pedestrians have to be extremely careful if they are passing our gates. We then need to perform a five-point turn manoeuvre to turn our cars round to drive down our drive and on to the main road. All this is done during the school run periods twice daily and more. With regards to this - has a safety study been carried out on the risk to child life as a result of

the proximity of this path to our (and our neighbours' entrance/exits) and can you assure us that this footpath will NOT be used by either parents or school children for access the school?

Reply:

Thank you for your question which details specific issues that you believe you will encounter around access to your property, and use of the public right of way. These comments are not a matter for Cabinet to consider and will need to be considered as part of the planning application process. A full travel assessment, along with a travel plan will form part of that planning application and details will include proposed measures in relation to traffic and access. It is suggested that you submit your comments as part of the planning application consultation for due consideration.

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
29 October 2019

Question 4: John Oliver, Resident

At the 24 September 2019 Cabinet meeting, Cllr Goodman said, with the regard to the draft 2020-2025 Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan, that "It's a five year [plan]. That is the programme that we abide by for all AONBs. It's right that we do".

I have written to the National Association of AONBs about the timing of AONB Management Plans. In his response, the Chief Executive said, "there is no policy for five-year plans per se, it's the review cycle that is every 5 years". (copy of response available on demand)

The Glover report makes numerous demands about the strengthening of Management Plans. For example, at page 45, Glover states that ""National landscapes should take a leading role in the response to climate change through their Management Plans National Parks and AONBs must be clear how they will support these ambitions, securing natural beauty as this happens".

Given that Cllr Goodman was completely wrong in his assertion, does the Council now agree that the 2020-2025 Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan, which Cllr Goodman accepted as being "light touch" and which does not address climate change in any meaningful way:

- should be reviewed immediately in order to set out robust plans for investigating the likely effects of, and dealing with, climate change and global warming, rather than just having "a vision";
- should be for a period of not less than 25 years, measurable, and accountable for, for the whole of that period; and,

if the Council does not agree, could you please explain why?"

Reply:

Thank you for your question. Surrey County Council fully supports the need to take a long term view of the impact that climate change will have on our countryside. I want to reassure you therefore that the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan sets out a 25 year vision and policy framework. However, in line with other AONB local authorities in England, the 6 Surrey Hills local authorities publish and adopt a reviewed AONB Management Plan no less than every 5 years. The reviewed Plan (2020 - 2025) has already been formally adopted by four of our Surrey local authorities.

As you are aware the current draft AONB Management Plan (2020 - 2025) has been subject to a robust Environment Report and Habitat Regulations Assessment which have been appraised by Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England. No substantive concerns were raised in regards to addressing climate change. Indeed the policies largely help to mitigate and adapt to the impacts. We are also doing some national work on Nature Recovery through test and trialling Defra's new Environmental Land Management System (ELMS). The AONB Director, Rob Fairbanks, can brief you on this when you meet.

The Glover Review makes 27 substantive proposals to Government. Surrey County Council and the AONB Board would very much like to work with you to secure central Government's support for Glover's recommendations through guidance, legislation and a better funding settlement for the Surrey Hills AONB. We look forward to your support with this.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
24 September 2019