

# Cabinet- Supplementary Agenda



**Date & time**  
Tuesday, 1 June  
2021 at 2.00 pm

**Place**  
Council Chamber  
Woodhatch Place  
11 Cockshot Hill  
Reigate  
Surrey, RH2 8EF

**Contact**  
Vicky Hibbert or Huma  
Younis  
Tel 020 8541 9229 or 020  
8213 2725  
  
vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or  
huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

**Chief Executive**  
Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:  
@SCCdemocracy

**Cabinet Members:** Becky Rush, Clare Curran, Denise Turner-Stewart, Marisa Heath, Mark Nuti, Matt Furniss, Natalie Bramhall, Sinead Mooney, Tim Oliver (Chairman)

**Deputy Cabinet Members:** Edward Hawkins, Kevin Deanus, Maureen Attewell, Steve Bax

## 4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

### a Members' Questions

(Pages 1 - 2)

A Member question has been received from Mr Will Forster. A response from Cabinet is attached.

### b Public Questions

(Pages 3 - 4)

One public question has been received. A response from Cabinet is attached.

Joanna Killian  
Chief Executive  
Tuesday, 01 June 2021

## **QUESTIONS, PETITIONS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

The Cabinet will consider questions submitted by Members of the Council, members of the public who are electors of the Surrey County Council area and petitions containing 100 or more signatures relating to a matter within its terms of reference, in line with the procedures set out in Surrey County Council's Constitution.

**Please note:**

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to the meeting. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and so cannot relate to "confidential" or "exempt" matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual – for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of this agenda).
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman's discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

## **MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE**

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, Surrey County Council has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

*Thank you for your co-operation*

**CABINET – 01 JUNE 2021****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Will Forster (Woking South):**

The Local Government Association has recently reported that bringing forward the reporting deadline for pupils becoming eligible for the pupil premium from January 2021 to October 2020 would result in a funding loss of £118m across the country. Schools in England will not receive funding for those primary and secondary pupils who qualified for the extra payment between October 2020 and January 2021 until October 2021, with schools having to bridge the gap.

1. Would the Cabinet Member confirm the number of pupils in Surrey affected by the change and the corresponding shortfall in funding?
2. Will the Cabinet Member agree to lobbying the Government to reverse this decision?
3. Will the Cabinet Member commit Surrey County Council to providing financial support to any schools adversely affected by the change of deadline?

**Reply:**

I would like to thank the County Councillor for Woking South for his question as it draws attention to a cohort of children that the County Council has gone to great lengths to support through this pandemic. Children eligible for pupil premium are also eligible for free school meals which for some children provides the sole nutritious meal of their day. Over the Christmas, February half term, Easter and May school holidays (6 weeks in total) we have provided supermarket vouchers to all children eligible for pupil premium and free school meals so that they would not go hungry in the school holidays. In total, we have supported 20,000 children to be fed with funding of £2.5million.

1. We have been monitoring the impact of the Department for Education's decision to calculate eligibility for pupil premium from October 2020 rather than January 2021 on our schools in Surrey, both individually and collectively. Our estimates are that the loss of funding collectively is £1.1million, and this relates to approximately 900 Surrey pupils. Clearly, taken as a whole, this is a significant financial impact, although when broken down to individual school level, the financial consequences vary by setting depending on the number of pupils attending who fall into this category.
2. I will raise this issue with Ministers in the Department for Education so that they are aware of the impact of this decision and have the opportunity to review it.
3. The Council is prevented by national policy to use its general funds to subsidise school funding and thus we are unable to fund the gap for schools that has been created. We will however discuss with the Schools Forum what mechanisms we have through the schools funding formula to mitigate financial impacts on individual schools.

**Mrs Denise Turner-Stewart**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**01 June 2021**

This page is intentionally left blank

**CABINET – 01 JUNE 2021****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Public Questions****Question (1): Mr James Dennison****Pendell Gypsy Roma Traveller (GRT) Camp, Merstham**

Although the business case has not been provided, the details presented raise a number of concerns about the viability and sustainability of the proposal. Can the Cabinet please confirm the following points, critical to the business case, have been taken into account:

- i. Does the capital funding include improvements to the roads approaching the site which are exclusively either single track or in a very poor state of repair?
- ii. As Pendell Camp is on a country lane and has no access to pavements or public transport needed to reach essential services, can you confirm such improvements are included in the budget?
- iii. Pendell Camp was reduced in size from 15 pitches to 4 because SCC were unable to manage anti-social behaviour on the site, what cost has been included in the budget for additional policing?
- iv. The business case includes only rent and a £7.5k contribution to cover running costs, can you please confirm this would cover all running costs including site manager, waste removal, sewage removal, maintenance of the site, refurbishment, processing and admin fees?
- v. A key risk identified in the business case is 'communication with local residents', so why has no communication or public consultation happened (as other councils have done) to mitigate that risk?

**Reply:**

The capital funding for this scheme, funded jointly by Surrey County Council and the District and Boroughs (except Tandridge District Council, as the host authority) is for the development of the transit pitches on the site. The Council has agreed to fund the design, remediation works and site infrastructure; the District and Boroughs have committed to funding the construction costs. To address the points raised:

- i. Road improvements come under Highways and are subject to the Highways strategic model of works. At this time, the approach roads to Pendell Camp are considered to be in a satisfactory condition, both the Merstham Road/ Bletchingley Road (a two-lane road) and the road into the site itself. However, when the scheme is submitted to planning, Planning Committee members may recommend or make it a condition that local road(s) are improved in respect of this proposed scheme. A recommendation or condition for any such improvements will be addressed at that time, as will any associated costs.
- ii. No such requirements have been identified at this time. However, as per point (i) above, should any requirements emerge during the planning process, then they will be addressed accordingly.
- iii. The Council is working with the District and Borough Councils and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner to reduce the impact of unauthorised encampments across the county as a whole, as well as to jointly develop a robust

strategy for the ongoing management of Pendell Camp site. This partnership and collaborative approach is expected to lighten rather than increase police workload regarding any anti-social behaviour.

- iv. There is an agreement in principle with the District and Borough Councils to each contribute £7.5k per annum (total of £82.5k per annum). Discussions with the District and Boroughs are ongoing, but it is expected they will enter into a formal Project Agreement with the Council by the end of September 2021. It is expected that the rental income from the sites will cover the majority of the site's running costs, the additional contribution from the Districts and Boroughs is to cover any excess running costs. The contributions from the District and Boroughs will be assessed annually to ensure the requirement and value remain appropriate and necessary.
- v. Surrey County Council is committed to public engagement and looks forward to hearing from residents and others about this proposed scheme. The scheme will be subject to a robust planning process later this year and as part of this process, members of the public will be able to comment both before an application is made, and when the formal application stage takes place.

**Mrs Natalie Bramhall**  
**Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Property**  
**01 June 2021**