

Cabinet- Supplementary Agenda



Date & time
Tuesday, 30 March
2021 at 2.00 pm

Place
MS Teams, Remote
Meeting

Contact
Vicky Hibbert or Huma
Younis
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 Matt Furniss, Mrs Julie Iles OBE, Mr Colin Kemp, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mrs Sinead Mooney, Mr Mark Nuti, Mr Tim Oliver, Mrs Becky Rush and Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members: Miss Alison Griffiths, Mr Edward Hawkins and Miss Marisa Heath

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions

(Pages 1
- 4)

There are three Member questions, one question from Mr Chris Botten and two from Mr Jonathan Essex. A response from Cabinet is attached.

c Petitions

(Pages 5
- 8)

One petition with 4,381 signatures has been received. It requests that Surrey County Council preserve and protect Norbury Park Sawmill and Workshop. A response to the petition is attached.

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

(Pages 9
- 12)

Cabinet to consider the following:

- A. County Hall Move and Agile Programme Task Group Report
(Cabinet response attached)

7 COVID- 19: DELEGATED AND URGENT DECISIONS TAKEN

(Pages
13 - 16)

A. Introduction Of Additional Waste Materials At Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking And Cranleigh Community Recycling Centres (Urgent Item)

Cabinet is asked to decide whether to re-introduce containers for non-recyclable waste at Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking and Cranleigh community recycling centres for a twelve- month period with immediate effect.

This report will be dealt with under the Special Urgency procedure (SO56)

as it has not had the required 28 days' notice on the Forward Plan. The Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee has been notified of the intention to make this decision and has waived the right to call-in.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Monday, 29 March 2021

CABINET – 30 MARCH 2021**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Chris Botten (Caterham Hill):**

During the Full Council meeting on 16th March, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change announced that after “exhausting other options available, we have now entered legal proceedings with Suez to resolve our issues. We hope to bring this to a swift conclusion to allow us to move forward with the Eco park and resolve the matter.”

Once the legal proceedings have finished, please will the Council agree to commission an external audit report into the Eco Park so the Council can understand what went wrong?

Reply:

At the end of last year, our external auditors reviewed the accounting treatment of and the council’s management of the delays at the Eco Park. They confirmed in their November 2020 report, “We are satisfied that the Council’s arrangements to manage the impact of the delays to the delivery of the Eco Park are adequate and that it is utilising the full range of external advisors to ensure that it takes appropriate advice in relation to its duties and responsibilities under the contract”. In line with the Cabinet report providing an update on the Eco Park contract in November 2020, a wider review of the contract has been undertaken with the Council’s legal and financial advisers specifically in response to the delays experienced in the delivery of facilities by the contractor, which has resulted in the legal process now underway. However, once this legal process is complete, I can confirm that we will be reviewing the contract and the lessons learned.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
30 March 2021

Question (2) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

Future use of Eco park assets

In light of Surrey County Council entering legal proceedings with its waste contractor Suez and writing off the asset value of the gasification plant at the Charlton Lane Eco Park, will the Council investigate alternative uses for the large steel shed constructed to house the plant equipment? In particular, given that around one third of the household recycling already goes to Charlton Lane and that the Greener Futures pipeline provides for a Material Recycling Facility (MRF) to sort the recycling into different types, could some of the budget for this be used to repurpose this building for material sorting?

Reply:

Given that the Council has commenced legal proceedings with our contractor SUEZ regarding the delivery of the Eco Park, it would be premature to make any confirmed decisions about the future of the site. However, I can confirm that given the expiry of the Suez contract in 2024, the council are giving thought to the longer term waste asset and infrastructure strategy, and

will be looking at all options for providing the waste infrastructure we need to support a more sustainable management of the county's waste in the future.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
30 March 2021

Question (3) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

The programme work for external auditor Grant Thornton for year ending March 2021 includes a focus on PFI contracts for waste, street lighting and care homes, and will look at the 'value for money' aspect of the governance arrangements of these long term contracts.

Please confirm:

- a. that this approach will be extended to an overall Value for Money assessment of alternative delivery models
- b. whether similar external audits will be carried out on the current highways contract and the Places for People property joint venture
- c. whether the option of locking Surrey County Council into long term contracts such as the 25 year PFI for waste and the proposed up to 20 year contract for highways is the best way to deliver value for money over such a long period.

Reply:

Audit Approach

Our External Auditors, Grant Thornton review our arrangements for securing value for money for Surrey residents, covering:

- Improving economy, efficiency and effectiveness
- Arrangements for Financial Sustainability
- Arrangements for Governance and decision making

The most recently concluded audit highlighted significant improvements in our arrangements, particularly in our financial sustainability and noting that "the success of the Finance Improvement Plan appears to have greatly improved the Council's ability to achieve Economy, Efficiency, and Effectiveness in use of its resources".

The audit for 2020/21 brings with it new and more extensive auditing requirements in respect of Value for Money, which we wholeheartedly welcome. The [external audit plan for 2020/21](#) was approved by Audit and Governance Committee on the 23rd March 2021 and provides more detailed information on the areas of focus, including the Council's arrangements in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, and our governance arrangements for working with key partners. The audit will focus on contracts and external partnerships of material value, identified through the auditor's understanding of the Council and the environment in which we operate. The Places for People joint venture will not be material to the external audit.

The external audit regime is only part of the overall approach taken to review our arrangements for good governance and works alongside internal auditing and the wider governance process. [The Internal Audit Strategy and Annual Audit Plan 2021-2022](#), also approved by Audit and Governance Committee on 23rd March 2021 sets out the full details of the plan for 2021/22. The approach of Internal Audit is to use risk-based reviews, supplemented in some areas by the use of compliance audits and themed reviews. All audits have regard to management's arrangements for:

- Achievement of the organisation's objectives;
- Reliability and integrity of financial and operational information;
- Effectiveness and efficiency of operations and programmes;
- Safeguarding of assets; and
- Compliance with laws, regulations, policies, procedures and contracts.

In delivering the audit strategy and plan, liaison will take place with the external auditors to ensure that the use of audit resources is maximised, duplication of work is avoided, and statutory requirements are met.

Highways and Waste Contracts

The proposed term for the highway maintenance contract is 10 years, followed by a series of potential extensions linked to performance, up to 21 years. The reasons for that were set out in the report to Cabinet on 29 September 2020, and include the initial investment that a contractor would need to make (e.g. vehicles and plant), and also to allow sufficient time for the Council and contractor to work in partnership to address wider objectives such as carbon reduction and improved management of highway defects. Mechanisms will be put in place to ensure periodic review of prices and value for money over the contract term.

The Waste PFI arrangements are under review by Grant Thornton and by the Waste Assurance Board with expert, external advice sought to ensure that the current contract delivers the best possible value for money for the remainder of the term. Lessons learned will be fed into the arrangements to re-tender the Waste contract from 2024, preparation for which is already underway. The new contract will be very different in as much as it will not take the form of a PFI contract.

Mrs Becky Rush
Cabinet Member for Resources and Corporate Support
30 March 2021

This page is intentionally left blank



Petition to: Preserve and Protect Norbury Sawmill and Workshop

4c

The Petition

"We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Preserve & Protect Norbury Park Sawmill & Workshop".

We would like Surrey County Council to continue their historic support of the countries last remaining Sawmill & Workshop. Which will help maintain the heritage and traditional techniques employed and taught in this ethical enterprise. Hand built wood items are the last 100% sustainable products available for anyone to buy and use. This threatened enterprise receives whole English Native felled trees and produces the finished bench/table/signpost for millions across the country to enjoy. Their products are demanded & treasured by The Royal Parks and the Wildlife trusts, in the knowledge that they have used English trees for products used by all, ethically sourced and hand built locally. It is also a trusted & safe environment for work experience for vulnerable young people (apprenticeships) and wounded service personnel, they also "employ" an army of unpaid elderly volunteers. The Council have continually agreed and encouraged the sustainable, ethical and community led old school techniques and business model used here, but within the last month they have executed a complete 180 direction change giving the personnel only 6 weeks notice to cease.

Submitted by Mr Anthony Bainbridge

Response:

1. Norbury Park Sawmill is a business run by Surrey Wildlife Trust operating commercially for profit in a competitive market-place. Although the sawmill provides some social value, the request to continue to fund the sawmill is one which asks the Council to effectively subsidise a commercial venture. It is not the role of a local authority to provide funds to subsidise the ongoing performance of one particular commercial business.
2. The sawmill was established to service the needs of the Council whilst restoring the Basingstoke Canal using timber from Norbury Park, where the mill is located. This project has been completed, and there is very little timber now remaining in the park that can be extracted for wood products and services. In an attempt to create a successful business, timber has been imported from elsewhere (in the UK) for processing at the sawmill which is then used in the carpentry workshop. However, there is no longer a need for timber to be brought on site specifically to be milled at this location, which is surrounded by highly protected landscapes, particularly when other sawmills in Surrey also provide this service.
3. The workshop at the sawmill site incorporates traditional crafts and skills, but their products are not completely 'hand-built' (unless they are small items by volunteers). They are 'hand-finished' after employing machinery to carry out the majority of the work. This traditional technique is also practised by other carpenters locally.
4. One apprentice is currently supported by the sawmill business. Apprenticeships can be hard to find as these crafts are often carried out by sole traders. Our soft market testing indicates there is an opportunity to support more than one small wood-based business on the site which will strengthen our ability to support a more comprehensive apprentice programme in the same location.

5. The Council was not able to discuss possible closure publicly in advance of announcing the closure date, so as not to compromise in any way the business's reputation, current orders or its future investment potential. However, assessment of the current viability of the sawmill has been carefully considered over the last 12 months (since Surrey Wildlife Trust indicated they would not be continuing to run the business), and the decision to close the operation has not been taken lightly.
6. In the last nine years, the sawmill has made an average loss of £13,500 per annum.
7. Over the last four financial years, the Sawmill has made cumulative losses of £18,500. In addition, however, during this period the business has not been charged any rent by SCC for occupation of the Sawmill site, which is estimated to be £10,000 per year in its current condition. Also, Surrey Wildlife Trust have provided further subsidies in the form of buying stock and new equipment. If these additional costs were included, losses would be even greater.
8. Despite an increase in turnover this year, the sawmill is still not forecast to make a profit.
9. The company Norbury Park Wood Products Ltd, which hosts the business, has made profits over the equivalent period, but Surrey Wildlife Trust has confirmed these were generated from other income streams. The Sawmill is one part of Norbury Park Wood Products Ltd and its business unit within this entity makes a loss.
10. In considering the future potential of the sawmill, the latest trading data was used to forecast a five-year Business Plan, produced by the current management team. This was reviewed by an independent business consultant from *Let's Do Business*, a business management consultancy commissioned by the Council. The review estimated continued losses over the next 5 years.
11. The Sawmill Business Plan and associated financial forecasts also did not incorporate any rent payments to Surrey County Council for occupation of the site, financing costs such as hired purchase for equipment or sufficient management, or overhead costs.
12. In addition to the concerns over profit margins used for the Business Plan forecast, our independent financial analysis identified the following key risks:
 - Concerns over the sawmill's ability to deliver on the revenue growth targets assumed
 - Concerns as to whether the production capacity would be sufficient or was capable of being grown to required levels if such growth was achieved
 - Concerns as to whether the sawmill would be able to finance investment in equipment and stock, and any losses
 - Potential price increases for raw materials - due to Brexit and Covid, we have already seen a 10% increase in the cost of timber this year.
13. Further, taking on the sawmill, even for a short period of time, has a significant contractual cost to the Council. At an estimated £280,000 capital investment, it is equivalent to half the annual capital budget for managing all the Council's natural assets. This investment relates to purchase of stock from SWT and basic site investment in utilities and amenities.

14. However, although the current financial position was a consideration in the decision for SCC not to take on the sawmill, it was not the only factor. Other considerations included further investment needed in the site, planning considerations, fit with the role of a local authority and SCC corporate objectives, resources needed to manage it, and additional staff needed to develop the business.
15. More positively, the Council has been approached by a number of entities who would like to consider operating wood-based businesses at the site. These offers will be considered as part of plans for the future of the sawmill.
16. SCC are keen to support the development of a woodland and rural industry hub that supports traditional techniques, training and volunteering. The Council has already introduced opportunities for the Youth Offending Teams to work at Norbury Park learning woodland craft skills, and research carried out so far shows there is reason to be extremely positive about the benefits the site can continue to provide for business and residents. We expect to consult on proposals at the end of May.

Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change
30 March 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET- 30 March 2021

COUNTY HALL MOVE AND AGILE PROGRAMME TASK GROUP REPORT

Recommendations:

The Task Group recommends that:

- i. The Resources and Performance Select Committee receive the Council's Office Strategy on an annual basis, ensuring in particular that the carbon neutral targets are achieved;
- ii. The Executive Director of Resources studies the cost and size of office estates in statistically similar authorities and report back to the Resources and Performance Select Committee;
- iii. As the Council, after the pandemic, continues to promote agile working, it also discuss and study how attendance at meetings can still be possible remotely. The Leader to lobby the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government for remote meetings to continue and make a case to the relevant Minister, and any other relevant opinion makers, using the County Councils Network or similar organisations as appropriate;
- iv. The Task Group is satisfied with the bidding process for selling Kingston County Hall and that it provides value for money in the current market. However, completion of sale, and the final move out of Kingston County Hall and into Woodhatch Place should continue to be monitored by the Executive Director of Resources, including a settling-in period to ensure as seamless a transition as possible;
- v. The Director of Land and Property continues to work on plans to achieve value for money from the Bittoms car park;
- vi. The Task Group endorses the principle of a bus route between Reigate and/or Redhill and Woodhatch. Before a final decision is taken, Members of the Task Group should be consulted (by email as the Task Group work has now concluded) on the route and frequency. This is to help address transportation concerns and to ensure it is monitored annually as an integral part of the Council's Office Strategy reporting to the Resources and Performance Select Committee by the Executive Director of Resources;
- vii. The lessons from previous strategies similar to the Agile Office Estate Strategy (various past strategies may have been developed but not delivered due to changes in Cabinet membership or staff) are reflected in the Agile Office Estate Strategy;
- viii. It is made clearer in the Agile Office Estate Strategy which buildings could comprise the four hubs, as well as the use of any satellite buildings. The Executive Director of Resources to conduct a review of the overall cost, benefit, and savings by December 2021, including both capital and revenue elements of the Civic Heart move and the four hub arrangements;

- ix. Residents' participation, community engagement, improvement to service standards, and ease of access to Woodhatch Place office buildings, be regularly evaluated by the Corporate Leadership Team/Executive; and
- x. There is a need to encourage discussions with multiple stakeholders to maximize the use of Woodhatch Place.

Mr Will Forster
Vice- Chairman of the Resources and Performance Select Committee

Response:

- i. The exit from County Hall in Kingston upon Thames was the start of a new approach to the management of our estate. It is our intention that an annual estate performance report will be developed (include monitoring against carbon neutral targets) and shared annually with the Task Group.
- ii. The final Agile Office Strategy to be presented to Cabinet in Q2 will include comparable benchmark data.
- iii. As a Council we do not intend to revert to old ways of working. As an Agile Organisation we will continue to develop our office technology to enable a blend of both virtual and physical attendance in meetings. About formal decision-making meetings the government has disappointingly chosen not to extend the explicit power for remote meetings beyond 7 May 2021. We will submit a response to the announced consultation supporting the ability to hold remote meetings in the future.
- iv. The organisation has several workstreams in place to enable staff relocating to Woodhatch Place and other areas to be orientated into the buildings and that regular Temperature Checks will be undertaken to address any issues that may arise. We will adopt a test and review approach to make sure that we are refining our ways of working and office environment as we accelerate our move to agile working.
- v. Following Cabinet approval in January 2021 officers are preparing the Bittoms site for disposal.
- vi. The provision of enhancements to public transport provision continues to be reviewed, work is ongoing and will be shared with the task group once we have a proposed solution.
- vii. A review of previous reviews has been undertaken with lessons learned incorporated in the approach being taken. The council has made a clear commitment to seeing through the current strategy and will report to the Select Committee on progress.
- viii. It is intended that the final Agile Office Estate Strategy (which will include a full financial case to show cost/ benefits / savings as well as a final model of the remaining estate) will be incorporated in the annual report to the Select Committee.
- ix. The Corporate Leadership Team/Executive will continue to monitor and review the use of our public estate, to ensure it is fit for purpose, accessible and delivers best

value to residents and performs and will report progress in the annual report to the Select Committee.

- x. I am pleased to report that the facility is already supporting the Covid testing and vaccination efforts of the NHS. Further discussions are underway to look at opportunities for collaboration with other public sector and 3rd Sector bodies that will also be encouraged across all hubs where possible. Updates will be provided once agreements are reached but good progress is being made so far.

**Reply from Mr Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
30 March 2021**

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 30 MARCH 2021**

REPORT OF CABINET MEMBER: MRS NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

LEAD OFFICER: KATIE STEWART EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

SUBJECT: INTRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL WASTE MATERIALS AT BAGSHOT, WARLINGHAM, DORKING AND CRANLEIGH COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES (URGENT ITEM)

ORGANISATION STRATEGY PRIORITY AREA: GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY SO EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT/ ENABLING A GREENER FUTURE

Purpose of the Report:

In order to reduce the risk of COVID transmission, it has been necessary to introduce social distancing controls at our community recycling centres. This has resulted in a reduction in capacity and throughput of the sites which in turn has given rise to problems with queueing at a number of community recycling centres.

A potential solution to mitigate the queuing at our larger sites would be to reintroduce containers for non-recyclable waste at the four sites which currently only accept recyclable materials. These sites are under-utilised and increasing the range of materials would help to reduce the demand at the other community recycling centres.

Cabinet is therefore being asked to decide whether to re-introduce containers for non-recyclable waste at Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking and Cranleigh community recycling centres for a twelve-month period with immediate effect. Restrictions on materials will be re-introduced at a later date following the removal of COVID controls as necessary.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Agree to the reintroduction of services for non-recyclable wastes at Bagshot, Warlingham, Cranleigh and Dorking community recycling centres for a twelve month period and delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change in consultation with the Leader to decide on when to reintroduce the exclusion of non-recyclable materials at these sites following the removal of COVID controls.

Reason for Recommendations:

To mitigate issues of queueing on the highway as a result of reduced throughput at our community recycling centres caused by the introduction of controls to make the sites COVID secure. The reason for urgency is to enable changes to be put in place as soon as possible

over the busy Easter period. The changes should reduce overall queuing times and provide a more convenient service for residents

Executive Summary:

Background

1. On 29 January 2019 Cabinet resolved to retain the CRCs at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham until 30 September 2019, but restrict their use to accepting recycling material only. During this period the council would assess whether different models for operating and funding these four sites could achieve the same saving as closing them.
2. The removal of non-recyclable waste containers at the four sites took place on 7 May 2019, following a period of pre publicity.
3. On 29 October 2019 Cabinet considered the report of a special scrutiny task group and resolved that the Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham be kept open on their current operational days and that they revert to accepting wood in addition to the current types of recyclables.
4. The Cabinet report of 29 October 2019, included an analysis of the data on visitor numbers and waste volumes during the 'recycling only site' trial period from the beginning of May 2019 and officers concluded that whilst there had been a general reduction in overall waste tonnages during this period it was difficult to establish whether the changes in tonnages and visitor numbers had occurred as a consequence of the recycling-only trial or as a result of other ongoing initiatives.

Proposal

5. It is proposed to reintroduce containers for non-recyclable black bag and bulky wastes at the sites as soon as possible with the aim to have these in place for the Easter Bank Holiday on 2 April 2021.
6. It is not proposed to reintroduce containers for rubble, soil, plasterboard or tyres, which are now only accepted at community recycling centres where we have facilities to accept these chargeable wastes.
7. Information will be updated on the council's website and officers will undertake to advertise the changes in an appropriate way.
8. A decision on when to reverse these changes at an appropriate time in the future will be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate change in consultation with the Leader or on the expiry of the twelve- month period.

Consultation:

9. Due to urgency, consultation has been limited to the Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change who are both supportive of the proposal.

Risk Management and Implications:

10. There is a risk that the tonnage of residual waste could increase as a result of the reintroduction of residual waste facilities at the four sites, however during the initial trial, officers were not able to demonstrate with any certainty that there was a link between the change to recycling only sites and a reduction in overall waste tonnages.
11. There is also a risk that the four sites could get busier to the extent that queuing issues start to arise on these sites as well. Officers will monitor the situation with queuing and take mitigating action as necessary

Financial and Value for Money Implications:

12. There is not expected to be an additional cost to reintroduce non- recyclable materials at these sites. Additional cost would only occur if the change resulted in additional non-recyclable material to dispose of however, as stated in the previous section, officers have not been able to establish a definitive causal link between the change to recycling only sites and reduction in waste volumes.

Section 151 Officer Commentary:

13. Although significant progress has been made over the last twelve months to improve the Council's financial position, the medium- term financial outlook beyond 2021/22 remains uncertain. The public health crisis has resulted in increased costs which may not be fully funded. With uncertainty about the ongoing impact of this and no clarity on the extent to which both central and local funding sources might be affected in the medium term, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority in order to ensure stable provision of services in the medium term.
14. Reintroduction of non-recyclable materials at selected community recycling centres is not expected to lead to an additional cost unless the change results in an overall increase in waste volumes. Officers will continue to monitor the situation closely. As such, the Section 151 Officer supports the recommendations

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer:

15. The twelve month adjustment to existing waste recycling arrangements through the re-introduction of containers for non-recyclable waste at Bagshot, Warlingham, Dorking and Cranleigh community recycling is a necessary response to the impact of COVID restrictions to alleviate pressure on sites elsewhere as summarised in the report. The adjustments are made for a twelve- month period which will be kept under review by officers and the Cabinet member.

Equalities and Diversity:

16. An Equality Impact Assessment was included in the Cabinet report of 29 January 2019 and reviewed as part of the Cabinet paper of 29 October 2019. The re-introduction of non-recyclable materials to the four community recycling centres will have no material impact on the findings of the earlier Equality Impact Assessments.

Other Implications:

17. The potential implications for the following council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	None.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	None.
Environmental sustainability	None. Residents will continue to be encouraged to recycle as much waste as possible through provision of comprehensive recycling facilities at all community recycling centres and non- recyclable waste will continue to be treated in the most sustainable way, avoiding the use of landfill where possible.
Public Health	None.

What Happens Next:

- a. Non-recyclable waste containers will be reintroduced at Bagshot, Warlingham, Cranleigh and Dorking community recycling centres as soon as practicable.
- b. Surrey County Council's website information will be updated and officers will publicise the new arrangements.

Report Author: Richard Parkinson, Environment Delivery Manager, Surrey County Council
Tel 07968 832517

Consulted:

Cllr Natalie Bramhall, Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change

Cllr John O' Reilly, Chairman of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

Paul Evans, Director of Law & Governance, Surrey County Council.

Annexes:

None

Sources/background papers:

SCC Cabinet Report and Minutes 29 January 2019

SCC Cabinet Report and Minutes 29 October 2019
