

# Cabinet – Supplementary Papers

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 26  
November 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**

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,

## Supplementary Papers Attached:

### 4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

#### a Members' Questions

(Pages 1  
- 2)

Response to Member question is attached.

#### b Public Questions

(Pages 3  
- 4)

Response to public question is attached

### 5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

(Pages 5  
- 8)

Cabinet responses to the following Task Group reports are attached::

- a) Moving Closer to Residents Task Group (Resources & Performance Select Committee) – linked to items 10 & 14 on the agenda – report attached.
- b) Surrey's Greener Future Task Group (Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee)

### 9 REVIEW OF CHARGES FOR PARKING IN COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE CAR PARKS

(Pages 9  
- 16)

An amended Equalities Impact Assessment is attached.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee]*

**15 COMMERCIAL PROGRAMME (WASTE) UPDATE**

(Pages  
17 - 26)

A Part 2 update to the submitted report is attached.

*[The decisions on this item can be called in by the Communities,  
Environment & Highways Select Committee]*

**Joanna Killian**  
**Chief Executive**  
Tuesday, 26 November 2019



This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET – 26 NOVEMBER 2019****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Chris Botten (Caterham Hill):**

Could the Deputy Leader please indicate what steps are being taken to ensure that CIL monies which fall to boroughs, districts and parishes are properly re-directed towards the funding of the infrastructure for which the County is responsible? Will he consider pressing the new government to amend the legislation to enable the contributions for County services to be placed on a statutory footing?

**Reply:**

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a charge on new development in an area where the levy has been adopted by the local authority.

The Government have directed that only the local planning authority for an area can collect CIL. County councils can only collect the levy charged by district councils on developments for which the county council gives consent, for example, waste and minerals sites where there is a liability for the levy.

Homes England, urban development corporations and enterprise zone authorities can also be collecting authorities for development, with the agreement of the relevant charging authority, where they grant planning permission.

The Government have amended the CIL Regulations several times since their inception, but have chosen not to alter the Regulations in relation to who can charge CIL, despite the concerns expressed by County Councils

The Government consider that local authorities in two tier areas should work closely together to determine the infrastructure spending priorities for their areas and how CIL receipts can fund a proportion of the costs of that infrastructure.

We will continue to lobby any government on the need for better clarity and direction on how CIL is spent and in the mean time we will continue to engage and work with our borough and districts to identify and help deliver the infrastructure needed to support local housing.

These decisions are made by members at a borough and district level, but as a reminder to all members below is a description of how CIL should be used.

**What can the Community Infrastructure Levy be spent on?**

The levy can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure, including transport, flood defenses, schools, hospitals, and other health and social care facilities.

This definition allows the levy to be used to fund a very broad range of facilities such as play areas, open spaces, parks and green spaces, cultural and sports facilities, healthcare facilities, academies and free schools, district heating schemes and police stations and other community safety facilities.

This flexibility gives local areas the opportunity to choose what infrastructure they need to deliver their relevant plan (the Development Plan and the London Plan in London). Charging authorities may not use the levy to fund affordable housing.

Local authorities must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and they will decide what infrastructure is needed.

The levy can be used to increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure, if that is necessary to support development.

A percentage should be spent within the community it is raised, the percentage and how this is done depends on the local area.

## CIL and Neighbourhood Planning

Parish council ✓ Neighbourhood Plan ✓ = 25% uncapped, paid to Parish	Parish council ✓ Neighbourhood Plan X = 15% capped at £100 / dwelling, paid to Parish
Parish council X Neighbourhood Plan ✓ = 25% uncapped, local authority consults with community	Parish council X Neighbourhood Plan X = 15% capped at £100 / dwelling, local authority consults with community

Mr Colin Kemp  
 Deputy Leader  
 26 November 2019

**CABINET – 26 NOVEMBER 2019**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Public Questions**

**Question 1: Mr Ian Thirlwall, Resident**

This is a question regarding the Highways England A23 widening proposed through Hooley. This will have a negative impact on the residents of Hooley, particularly those living and working on the Brighton Road stretch of the proposed widening. We are concerned about the development in three areas:

- Firstly, because we believe it will have a negative impact on air pollution, which will impact our health. There are already high levels of traffic exhaust fumes which are the highest in the county, and this widening could increase traffic in this location.
- Secondly, the scheme proposes to build on the verges and pavements, which will have a negative impact on pedestrians and cyclists, bringing cars within “brushing distance “. This could increase accident risk to pedestrians and cyclists. It is not clear how this will be managed (in terms of adverse impacts on our livelihoods and local businesses) both during the twelve month construction programme and in the long-term.
- Thirdly, will the scheme address the traffic-accident-waiting-to-happen at the unofficial makeshift ‘turnaround’ on the A23 at the junction with Starbucks.
- Finally, it is unclear why this is the best option – as the benefit according to Highways England is only to the M23/ M25, rather than also providing any local benefits for the £4m cost to the taxpayer.

Surely it would be better to spend (significantly less) money on traffic management in Hooley and neighbouring Chipstead where traffic accidents are waiting to happen and reduce speeding on local roads such as Star Lane, Elmore Road, High Road and Coulsdon Lane.

In light of this:

1. Please can you confirm Surrey County Council’s view on this scheme in terms of: air pollution impact, traffic impact (particularly the way the scheme will help Surrey’s transport to become more sustainable) and the proposal to invest £4million in this way rather than on local transport improvements?
2. Please can you provide full details of the consultations with Surrey County Council to date and how the scheme has been changed to reflect local views. Please can the responses that Surrey County Council have given to Highways England on the finalised scheme also be made public?
3. How much of the £4m is being allocated to local improvements as noted above?

**Reply:**

1. This section of the A23 is a trunk road and Highways England, as the highway authority for this road, are responsible for the development, design and delivery of schemes at this location. The £4million referred to is Highways England funding, which means Surrey County Council is not able to use this funding on County local transport improvements.

Highways England have responded to previous correspondence and a Freedom of Information request about these matters, including about air quality. A meeting is being

arranged with Highways England representatives to enable resident representatives to discuss these issues further with them.

Due to a Highways England review of schemes set to be delivered this financial year (2019/20), the A23 Brighton Road Hooley improvement has been delayed.

2. A public information event took place on the 27th and 28th July 2018 and Highways England have subsequently completed their proposed scheme design following a second public information event on 15th and 16th March 2019. The Reigate & Banstead Local Committee received a question about this scheme on 3rd June 2019.

The County Council was made aware of the scheme and the proposals by Highways England, but as the proposed works are within the Highways England road network Surrey County Council's comments made to the public information event were primarily from a works coordination/concerns on traffic flows during construction phasing perspective. It was suggested that the addition of average speed cameras to the scheme would help to achieve compliance to the new lower speed limit and also help smooth traffic flow. There is no further information available.

Highways England have listed the changes to the scheme, because of the Public Interest Events, on their website.

3. As set out in question 1, the £4million referred to is Highways England funding and as such Surrey County Council is not able to use this on County local transport improvements.

**Mr Matt Furniss**  
**Cabinet Member for Highways**  
**26 November 2019**

**CABINET 26 NOVEMBER 2019****REPORT OF MOVING CLOSER TO RESIDENTS TASK GROUP (Resources & Performance Select Committee)****Item under consideration: Moving Closer to Residents: Delivering Our Ambition****Date considered: 8 November 2019**

1. At its meeting on 8 November 2019, members of the Moving Closer to Residents Task Group considered the Moving Closer to Residents: Delivering Our Ambition report.
2. The Task Group heard from the Executive Director for Transformation, Partnerships and Prosperity, who explained the benefits relating to the proposed relocation of the Council's Civic Heart to Midas House, Woking, and a move to greater agile working, as well as associated risks. Measures put in place to mitigate those risks were explored by Members, who also heard details about other buildings in both Woking and Guildford that had been considered during the identification phase.
3. The Executive Director for Transformation, Partnerships and Prosperity explained that Midas House was chosen as the Council's new Civic Heart due to its close proximity to Woking train station and town centre, the young age of the building and its open plan design, financial considerations relating to both the cost of purchase and refitting, and the good amount of space available. The Task Group heard that there would be enough space for both meeting rooms and 820 workstations, the former of which would be created flexibly by using moveable acoustic screens.
4. The Task Group were informed that a Member Task Group would be established to support the planning and design of civic spaces and functions. They noted their concern that councillors from the east of the county may struggle to get to Woking and feel neglected as a result, and they sought assurance that a wide range of members would be consulted throughout the planning and design phase.
5. The Task Group highlighted risks associated with agile working and IT infrastructure, and emphasised the need for the Council to ensure all staff members are fully supported throughout the transformation period. It was noted that the move to Midas House was reliant on there being a widespread adoption of agile working practices by Council staff.
6. Concerns were expressed over the possibility of higher than expected staff attrition and the potential difficulties that could arise when recruiting. The Task Group heard that targeted recruitment local to Woking was going to take place and research had been undertaken regarding the local labour market.
7. A conversation was had about the proceeds from the future sale of County Hall in relation to the costs associated with the purchasing and refitting of Midas House. The Task Group asked about the possibility of an independent valuation being undertaken to ensure that the Council was paying a fair price for Midas House.

**Recommendations:**

8. The Task Group agreed the following recommendations:
  - a. That an independent property valuation of Midas House is undertaken to ensure best value.
  - b. That the Council ensures all members of staff receive support and training before, during and after the move to Midas House and transformation to greater agile working.

- c. That the Council consults with other local authorities and organisations that have moved to an agile way of working, including in regard to ranges of full-time equivalents/desk ratios, to ensure a smooth transition.
- d. The Task Group asks for assurance from the Cabinet that the future sale of County Hall will raise sufficient funds required to purchase and refit Midas House.
- e. That the Cabinet Member for Finance brings together all aspects in a full cost benefit analysis for the Cabinet.

**Will Forster**  
**Chairman of the Moving Closer to Residents Task Group**

---

**Cabinet Response:**

I am grateful to the Task Group for their consideration and scrutiny of this hugely important project for the Council. In response to the specific points raised:

- a. An independent valuation of Midas House has been commissioned.
- b. Significant work is being done to communicate with, engage and support staff through the transition to agile working and move to Midas House, e.g. face-to-face 'listening and engagement' events are being held across the County and an active Jive page along with other communication channels and platforms are used to promote dialogue and discussion, as well as the creation of an Agile Champions Group and comprehensive set of FAQs. A new Agile Working Policy Framework is under development, which will include practical support to help staff transition to new ways of working, alongside a new agile leadership development programme designed to support managers leading teams in an agile environment. With regard to technical support, on-line training and specific 'agile' IT support will be rolled out in the New Year.
- c. Members of the MCTR project team have been visiting other Councils (e.g. Wiltshire, Westminster) to learn from their experiences. These have already led to some changes in our approach, notably around the proposed office environment, support and best practice tools.
- d. We are doing all we can to ensure that the receipts generated through the future sale of County Hall are maximised, although they will be subject to a number of variables (e.g. planning status, market conditions, future use mixes, etc.). We are working with the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames on planning matters and are in close contact with an interested potential purchaser. Reasonable, mid-range estimates indicate that receipts generated by the sale of County Hall, some adjacent Council properties and the Bittoms car park should match the acquisition and indicative fit out costs for Midas House, which will be further refined as more detailed survey and design work is undertaken.
- e. A financial analysis has been produced and presented to Cabinet in a Part 2 report.

**Reply from Mr Tim Oliver,**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**26 November 2019**

**CABINET 26 NOVEMBER 2019**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO SURREY'S GREENER FUTURE TASK GROUP REPORT  
(Communities, Environment & Highways Select Committee)**

**Recommendations of the Surrey's Greener Future Task Group**

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Endorses the Call For Action (Annex 1) that is recommended to council for approval
2. Considers the full range of opportunities identified in the Select Committee report and agrees that these are taken forward as part of the wider strategy development to test the deliverability
3. Includes sufficient investment within the Medium Financial Term Strategy to support climate change programmes and initiatives, reviewing this on an annual basis
4. Supports the proposal that the council works together with Districts and Boroughs through the Surrey Environment Partnership to develop and deliver a joint zero carbon strategy and action plan, to be approved by April 2020
5. Agrees that the council continue to support the emerging Surrey Climate Commission
6. Under chairmanship of the Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste sets up a Member Reference Group to take the work forward and develop a zero carbon climate strategy
7. Supports a call for increased powers and resources to enable local authorities to lead on delivering on the commitment for the UK to be net zero by 2050 and asks officers to build a case for change with clear asks for the new government

**Andy MacLeod**  
**Chairman of the Surrey's Greener Future Task Group**

---

**Cabinet Response:**

The Cabinet would like to thank the Greener Future Task Group for its detailed and important report and the very thorough work which sits behind it.

The Cabinet supports the Call for Action, in particular statement 2, which sets out the ambition to be zero carbon across our own organisational emissions by 2030. While this will be challenging, it is within our abilities to deliver this target and it will send an important message to our residents and partners that we are committed to taking serious action against climate change.

The report will form the basis of Surrey's climate change strategy which, in conjunction with the districts and boroughs, businesses, residents and other partners, we will launch in April 2020. To ensure our collective approach is effective, we are working with the Surrey Climate Commission and University of Surrey to set a baseline of emissions that we can then monitor and report against each year.

While we are developing a comprehensive strategy, Surrey County Council has already allocated funding and resources to take action to tackle climate change, however the scale of change will require financial support and direction from Government to enable the Council to deliver our ambitious target for Surrey to be carbon neutral by 2050. We will also test new and emerging financing models where appropriate.

Cabinet welcomes the creation of a cross party Member Reference Group to support the next stage of strategy development. In order to ensure that the strategy achieves the zero

carbon target, it is now essential that the recommendations set out in Annex 1 of the report are reviewed, analysed, consulted upon and costed. Beneath the strategy will sit an action plan which will include the initiatives that we will deliver alongside our partners. This action plan will include targets and timescales and will be measured and updated annually.

It is noted that the issue of culture change sits behind many of the statements in the Call for Action. The Cabinet believes that this is crucial and acknowledges the importance of involving our residents and communities in the co-design and delivery of the strategy, building upon the success of the Greener Future Design Challenge.

Council Members have a key role in involving residents and communities in this crucial work, and in developing the right collective response to climate change. It is therefore important that all councillors have the opportunity to engage with, and understand, this broad and complex issue.

Finally, Cabinet recognises that the issue and impacts of climate change are far reaching and will affect all of the areas which fall under the Council's control and many aspects of our resident's lives. It is not possible to act upon climate change in isolation and therefore work is already being undertaken to link the Greener Future work with Surrey's Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Community 2030 Vision.

**Reply from Mr Mike Goodman,  
Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste  
26 November 2019**

<b>EIA Title</b>	Review of Charges for Parking In Countryside Estate Car Parks			
<b>Did you use the EIA Screening Tool?</b> (Please tick or specify)	Yes (Please attach upon submission)		No	X

## 1. Explaining the matter being assessed

<b>What policy, function or service change are you assessing?</b>	<i>The Council is considering removing charges for parking at 15 countryside car parks because the charging regime no longer aligns with the council's health &amp; well-being strategy, its Greener Futures programme or the findings of the national review of national parks and AONBs (The Glover Review)</i>			
<b>Why does this EIA need to be completed?</b>	<i>The current policy of charging visitors to park at 15 Countryside Estate car parks has been identified as a potential reason for key groups e.g. families with children and low-income households from visiting the countryside</i>			
<b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b>	<i>All visitors to Surrey Countryside Estate land (residents and non-residents).</i>			
<b>How does your service proposal support the outcomes in <a href="#">the Community Vision for Surrey 2030</a>?</b>	<i>Everyone lives healthy, active and fulfilling lives, and makes good choices about their well-being</i>  <i>Residents live in clean, safe and green communities, where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities.</i>			
<b>Are there any specific geographies in Surrey where this will make an impact?</b> (Please tick or specify)	County Wide	X	Runnymede	
	Elmbridge		Spelthorne	
	Epsom and Ewell		Surrey Heath	
	Guildford		Tandridge	
	Mole Valley		Waverley	
	Reigate and Banstead		Woking	
	Not Applicable			
<b>Briefly list what evidence you have gathered on the impact of your proposals?</b>	County Divisions (please specify if appropriate):			
	<i>The Caring for the Countryside Survey (October – November 2018) identified the following:</i>  <i>40% of respondees wanted to see free car parking</i>  <i>33% of respondees stated that parking charges were a barrier to access to the countryside</i>			

## 2. Service Users / Residents

There are 10 protected characteristics to consider in your proposal. These are:

1. Age including younger and older people
2. Disability
3. Gender reassignment
4. Pregnancy and maternity
5. Race including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
6. Religion or belief including lack of belief
7. Sex
8. Sexual orientation
9. Marriage/civil partnerships
10. Carers protected by association

*Though not included in the Equality Act 2010, Surrey County Council recognises that socio-economic disadvantage is a significant contributor to inequality across the County and therefore regards this as an additional factor.*

*Therefore, if relevant, you will need to include information on this. Please refer to the EIA guidance if you are unclear as to what this is.*

## AGE

**What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?**

Age  
Low income households  
Families with children

**Impacts**  
(Please tick or specify)

Positive

**X**

Negative

Both

**Impacts identified**

**Supporting evidence**

**How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?**

**When will this be implemented by?**

**Owner**

*A policy of car parking charge has applied to 15 countryside car parks since July 2018. Visitors to the Surrey countryside did reduce significantly in the initial post-implementation period. Visitor numbers have improved but are not now expected to achieve the levels predicted at the time the policy was implemented*

*Consultation surveys have identified the cost of parking as a barrier to accessing the countryside*

*Removing all charges for parking in countryside car parks will remove a barrier to access.  
Free parking is likely to encourage more visitors to the countryside which promotes healthier lifestyles.*

*1 April 2020*

*Surrey CC in partnership with Surrey Wildlife Trust*

**What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents?  
Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of**

*If so, please detail your awareness of whether this will exacerbate impacts for those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions that will be taken to limit the cumulative impacts of these changes.*

**Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why**

*Identifies negative impacts that can't be mitigated, together with evidence.*

***You will need to repeat the box below (copy and paste) for each of the protected characteristics likely to be impacted.***

## 3. Staff

### AGE

**What information do you have on the affected staff with this characteristic?**

***Not Applicable***

Impacts	Positive		Negative		Both	
<b>Impacts identified</b>		<b>Supporting evidence</b>	<b>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</b>		<b>When will this be implemented by?</b>	<b>Owner</b>
<i>What impacts have you identified? Add more rows if you need to</i>		<i>What are you basing this on?</i>	<i>Actions to mitigate or enhance impacts</i>		<i>Due date</i>	<i>Who is responsible for this?</i>

**What other changes is the council planning that may affect the same groups of staff?  
Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of**

*If so, please detail your awareness of whether this will exacerbate impacts for those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions that will be taken to limit the cumulative impacts of these changes.*

**Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why**

*Identifies negative impacts that can't be mitigated, together with evidence.*

***You will need to repeat the box below (copy and paste) for each of the protected characteristics likely to be impacted***

## 4. Amendments to the proposals

CHANGE	REASON FOR CHANGE
<i>What changes have you made as a result of this EIA?</i>	<i>Why have these changes been made?</i>
None	Not Applicable

## 5. Recommendation

Based your assessment, please indicate which course of action you are recommending to decision makers. You should explain your recommendation in the in the blank box below.

Outcome Number	Description	Tick
<b>Outcome One</b>	<b>No major change to the policy/service/function required.</b> This EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been undertaken	X
<b>Outcome Two</b>	<b>Adjust the policy/service/function</b> to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?	
<b>Outcome Three</b>	<b>Continue the policy/service/function</b> despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to advance equality identified. You will need to make sure the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You need to consider whether there are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact</li> <li>• Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact.</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome Four</b>	<b>Stop and rethink</b> the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination (For guidance on what is unlawful discrimination, refer to the Equality and Human Rights Commission's guidance and Codes of Practice on the Equality Act concerning employment, goods and services and equal pay, available <a href="#">here</a> ).	
<i>Please use the box on the right to explain the rationale for your recommendation</i>		

## 6a. Version Control

Version Number	Purpose/Change	Author	Date
V1	Final Draft	Alan Bowley	12/11/19

The above provides historical data about each update made to the Equality Impact Assessment. Please do include the name of the author, date and notes about changes made – so that you are able to refer back to what changes have been made throughout this iterative process. For further information, please see the EIA Guidance document on version control.

## 6b. Approval

	Name	Date approved
<b>Approved by*</b>	<i>Gillian Steward, Executive Director of Highways, Transport and Environment</i>	14/11/19

<b>EIA Author</b>	Alan Bowley
-------------------	-------------

\*Secure approval from the appropriate level of management based on nature of issue and scale of change being assessed.

## 6c. EIA Team

Name	Job Title	Organisation	Team Role

If you would like this information in large print, Braille, on CD or in another language please contact us on:

Tel: 03456 009 009  
 Textphone (via Text Relay): 18001 03456 009 009  
 SMS: 07860 053 465  
 Email: [contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank