

Cabinet- Supplementary Agenda

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 24
November 2020 at
2.00 pm

Place

Remote Meeting

Contact

Vicky Hibbert or Huma
Younis
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020
8213 2725

Chief Executive

Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:
@SCCdemocracy

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or
huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

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

Deputy Cabinet Members: Miss Alison Griffiths, Mr Edward Hawkins, Miss Marisa Heath, Mr Mark Nuti and Mrs Becky Rush

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions

(Pages 1
- 4)

Four Member questions have been received. Two questions from Mr Will Forster and two questions from Mr Jonathan Essex. A response from Cabinet is attached.

b Public Questions

(Pages 5
- 8)

Two public questions have been received. A response from Cabinet is attached.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Monday, 23 November 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 24 November 2020**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Will Forster (Woking South):**

At the start of this year, the Council confirmed that there was a total of 5,400 secondary school places in Woking Borough.

Please can the Council confirm it has done an assessment on the capacity of colleges and school sixth forms in the Woking area? Does the Council believe these institutions can cope with the number of pupils currently at secondary school?

Reply:

The Council have a statutory duty to shape and influence further education and training provision for young people. This is delivered by maintaining a strategic overview of the provision available and work with post 16 providers to resolve gaps in provision. Funding for further education and training provision is provided directly to the schools, colleges and training providers by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA). The Council does not have a responsibility for the place planning of further education colleges.

FE Colleges are a critical contributor to the sufficiency of post-16 education provision and are a popular choice for young people. An assessment of capacity and current utilisation has been undertaken for further education providers within the Woking area. This activity highlighted that Woking College is a popular college and is regularly oversubscribed and providing more places at the college would be welcome. To date it has not been possible to secure access to capital funding to facilitate a proposed expansion of Woking College. Officers will be writing to the ESFA to support expansion at the college.

The Council is very aware of increasing secondary pupils across the County and for these secondary pupils there is a need to be able to offer increased education, employment and training. Officers have already written to the Regional Schools Commissioners about the increase in post 16 numbers and intend to lobby the appropriate offices, that is ESFA and FE Commissioners, for government funding to provide additional places in colleges.

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
24 November 2020

Question (2) Will Forster (Woking South):

The former Manor School in Byfleet was closed in 2008 and has not been used since. The County Council confirmed in 2017 that the site was no longer required for future service use and was looking at options for the site.

Please can the Council confirm what the latest plan is, if any, for the former Manor School in Byfleet?

Reply:

The site is under review for a use which will contribute to the well-being agenda. Due to commercial confidentiality, I am unable to provide further information but as soon as I am able Divisional Councillors will be briefed.

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
24 November 2020

Question (3) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

Please confirm in bringing minerals and waste planning together under a joint Surrey Minerals and Waste Local Plan (SMWP), the starting point for the waste element will be the Surrey Waste Local Plan (SWLP), which was recently approved by Cabinet. So while the whole of the Surrey Minerals Plan (2011) will be reviewed, for waste this will start with the Aggregates Recycling DPD, rather than reconsulting on the Surrey Waste Local Plan?

Reply:

The County Council has traditionally produced separate minerals and waste plans. As the proportion of recycled aggregate produced in the County has increased and the sources of available primary aggregate have diminished, the inter-relationship between the two disciplines has grown. Currently this is addressed through the Aggregates Recycling DPD which sits between both plans. Given this increasing synergy however, it is considered that the planning of future minerals and waste development in the County will be best served through the production of a combined minerals and waste plan. Whilst a number of other County Councils have been doing this for some time, this is a new approach for Surrey.

In order to produce a combined plan however, it will be necessary to review all elements of minerals and waste planning in the County. By necessity, that will need to include a review of our approach to waste planning. Although the Waste Plan has been reviewed recently, it is necessary that review the evidence and sites in the Plan to ensure they are as up to date as possible and to allow a us to move to this more holistic approach. Much of the background assessment work from the production of the Surrey Waste Local Plan can be reused, so the focus of the background data collection is predominantly around minerals and aggregate recycling. Waste, minerals and climate change are all fast changing policy areas and this approach will ensure that the Council's planning approach is forward looking and as up to date as it can be. The issues and options consultation currently scheduled for June 2021 will give residents the opportunity to shape the future approach to minerals and waste planning.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
24 November 2020

Question (4) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

Cabinet item 11 notes the introduction of between 70 and 80 ultra- low or zero emission buses, alongside over 50 community transport mini buses. Please confirm what is meant by the 'vehicle cascade being as high as 1 to 1, and whether this constitutes all buses in Surrey, if not what percentage will be left? In addition, what allowance has been made for electrifying

more buses in line with coping with the climate emergency? Finally, please confirm that an EIA has been completed for this scheme and all these new vehicles will be fully accessible.

Reply:

The Surrey Ultra-Low and Zero Emission Scheme for buses and community transport is an exciting proposition that will accelerate the delivery of clean vehicle technology into Surrey, demonstrating the councils commitment to tackle the declared climate emergency.

Our scheme is set to deliver between 70 and 80 ultra-low and zero emission buses, plus over 50 ultra-low and zero emission community mini buses. When these new clean vehicles are introduced they will replace existing diesel buses and mini buses operating in Surrey. If the displaced vehicles are the less-polluting models of a 'Euro 6 or 5' emissions rating, we will work with operators to cascade these throughout their fleet operating in Surrey to replace higher-polluting models with 'Euro 3 and 4' emissions ratings. The level of cascade and numbers of higher-polluting models to be removed will become clear when we evaluate operator bids to the scheme in early 2021. However, it could be as high as one for one. It is anticipated that the introduction of the community transport ultra-low and zero emission vehicles will, in the main, be managed as part of the ongoing fleet renewal programme by our partners, replacing the oldest and most polluting vehicles first.

Approximately 700 diesel buses are used on bus services in the county, although not all at the same time. The number of new buses to be delivered by our scheme will lead to the removal of around 11% of existing diesel buses on Surrey routes. Further fleet replacement with direct operator investment in future years is expected to result in an even higher percentage being removed.

The scheme has no material impact on existing equalities policy and, importantly, all new vehicles will be accessible to all.

An Environmental Sustainability Assessment will be developed as part of the detail of the Surrey Ultra-Low and Zero Emission Scheme.

Mr Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Transport
24 November 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 24 November 2020

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Public Questions

Question (1): Ms Sally Blake

Your report “Greenhouse gas emissions from the estate and operational activities of Surrey County Council - Reporting period: 2018/19” says your total net greenhouse gas emissions for that year were 34,118 tonnes of CO2.

The answer to a Freedom of Information request stated that 2,722 tonnes of wood were felled in the Surrey Countryside Estate in 2018/19 and supplied as wood chip for burning. Most of this went to a power station. Using the Government’s recommended ‘out of scopes’ factors, this would have emitted 3,636 tonnes of CO2.

The Government’s guidance notes say “outside of scopes factors should be used to account for the direct carbon dioxide (CO2) impact of burning biomass” and “All fuels with biogenic content ... should have the ‘outside of scopes’ emissions reported to ensure a complete picture of an organisation’s emissions is created”.

A letter sent to Surrey County Council, before the 2018/19 report was published, pointed this out and asked that these emissions be included. They represent nearly 11% of the published figure. Providing a transparent picture of CO2 emissions is critical with the climate change emergency.

Please could you explain how these emissions are being reported to ensure a complete picture of Surrey County Council’s greenhouse gas emissions? It would be helpful if your answer could include:

- I. whether you agree the emissions figure of 3,636 tonnes of CO2, or advise what the corrected figure should be and the basis for its calculation;
- II. whether the emissions from biomass burning were included in the 2018/19 report, and if not why the Government’s guidance was ignored; and whether the report will be amended to include them.

Reply:

Thank you for your email and attached documentation which we have reviewed. Following engagement with various officers in our environment, arboriculture and land and property teams, as well as colleagues at the Surrey Wildlife Trusts, we would like to raise the following in relation to points i) and ii) you have raised.

Ash dieback is a plant health issue that is facing the entire country: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-54373214>

We, and other land owners and managers will be dealing with this disease for the foreseeable future. We will need to use a range of methods to cope with the disease as it causes the death of trees across our estate. In reference to the works that were carried out on Norbury Park during 2018/19, this site was managed and run by our partner Surrey Wildlife Trust. SWT have a tree safety inspection and maintenance programme that led to them making an intervention

on the site for public safety. Whilst they were amongst the early adopters of this strategy it is actions like this that helped bring forward the Tree Council's Toolkit on dealing with the disease: <https://treecouncil.org.uk/science-and-research/ash-dieback/local-authority-ash-dieback-action-plan-toolkit/>

There are significant costs to dealing with this disease; you can see in the BBC article above that the National trust are appealing for funding to help them cope. When SWT went out to tender for the required safety works the most competitive quote was to remove the arisings for biomass. It is important to note that not all of the timber went to energy production. Where the Ash felled was of sufficient quality it went to furniture production or other uses. It was the poorer quality material that went to energy production. This is standard forestry practice but we will of course keep this under review to ensure our approach is appropriate.

Our voluntary organisational carbon emission reporting is for scope 1 and 2 emissions only at present, and as the energy produced from the power plant was not directly used by Surrey County Council, we have not included it within our 2018/19 emissions inventory.

Having published our Climate Change Strategy for Surrey County earlier this year, we are currently working with our partners to develop a delivery process and to embed climate change across our services. This includes reviewing our current emissions reporting, with a view to potentially restating our baseline and scope in future years due to the changing nature of our operations. However, we would like to assure you that we will be considering the transfer of material to biomass power plants as part of that work.

I hope this helps to provide clarity in this matter.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
24 November 2020

Question (2): Mr Paul Kennedy

Surrey County Council's daily coronavirus update is potentially very helpful but the data are 5 days out of date. I note the explanation that recent days are subject to change because of late reporting. Nevertheless, publication with a delay of 5 days is potentially misleading, particularly when used to alert communities and partner agencies to a surge in cases, as happened recently in Mole Valley. I note that the council's weekly intelligence summaries are slightly less out of date, which can be confusing when they are published on the same day. Would it not be better to publish a daily update with more up to date case numbers, suitably qualified for late reporting, and can you please confirm that information which is shared with partner organisations does include more up to date information?

Reply:

Both the Intelligence Summary Report and the Daily Dashboard use the Public Health England (PHE) public-facing dashboard as their data source and show cases by specimen date (the date the test was completed). These cases are subject to reporting delays and therefore latest available data can show artificially low case numbers. In order to mitigate the impact of potentially misleading idea that case numbers are dropping when that might not be accurate, we use data that is "complete" which means it is not subject to fluctuation or reporting delays.

For example, as of today (18th November, data updated on the 17th November) the cases that have been reported for Mole Valley are shown below for select dates. You will see that it shows on 17/11/2020 there were 0 cases reported. This is unlikely and should be look at this data in 5 days time we will see the number of cases reported on 17/11/2020 to be greater than zero. This is because the effect of reporting delays is picked up in the data over 5 days.

Specimen date	Daily cases	Cumulative cases
17-11-2020	0	1,807
16-11-2020	8	1,807
15-11-2020	12	1,799
14-11-2020	15	1,787
13-11-2020	21	1,772
12-11-2020	31	1,751

As noted, there are two slightly different time periods reported in the Intelligence Summary and Daily Dashboard. The Intelligence Summary compares cases and rates between geographical areas and provides further insight, while the Daily Dashboard compares case numbers to the previous 7-day period for each district/borough.

When investigating how Surrey compares with other geographical areas for the same time period (Intelligence Summary), we can use slightly more up to date data. But when comparing with the previous 7-day period (Daily Dashboard) it is important that case numbers are more “complete” (i.e. all data is received), otherwise the impact of the most recent missing data (due to reporting delays) may incorrectly show that case numbers are reducing where this may not be accurate. For this reason, the Daily Dashboard has a slightly longer delay than the Intelligence Summary.

When discussing Intelligence and Surveillance with Partner agencies we provide the most recent data and also complete data, together with in depth robust epidemiological analysis. This is mostly “Official Sensitive” data which we are not approved to publish in the public domain. The intelligence, together with insight from partner agencies is used to appropriately inform/guide next steps.

We hope this information is helpful.

Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
24 November 2020

This page is intentionally left blank