

# Cabinet - Supplementary Agenda

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 26 April  
2022 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  
07866899016

**Chief Executive**

Joanna Killian



**We're on Twitter:**  
**@SCCdemocracy**

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

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

**Deputy Cabinet Members:** Maureen Attewell, Steve Bax, Jordan Beech and Rebecca Paul

## 4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

### a Members' Questions

(Pages 1  
- 10)

There are eight member questions. A response from Cabinet is attached.

### b Public Questions

(Pages  
11 - 14)

There are three public questions. A response from Cabinet is attached.

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

(Pages  
15 - 18)

Cabinet is asked to consider the following:

- A. Report on the Home To School Travel Assistance Policy (Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee). A response from Cabinet is attached.

## 9 SURREY'S GREENER FUTURES GRANT PROGRAMMES

(Pages  
19 - 26)

Table 1 'Grant funding programme details' and the Reasons for Recommendations section within the report have been slightly amended. A revised report with these updates is attached.

**Joanna Killian**  
**Chief Executive**  
Monday, 25 April 2022

## 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 – 26 APRIL 2022

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Members Questions**Question (1) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):**

The government is consulting on amending legislation so that householders cannot be charged for bringing waste from DIY projects to recycling centres. Please confirm how much money has been charged in Surrey for DIY waste at recycling centres for each of the last 3 years. Please confirm who has use of these monies ultimately. Please also provide the cost of clearing fly-tipping on public land (to borough and district councils) over the same time period.

**Reply:**

The table below shows the income received in each of the last three years for the disposal of rubble, soil, plasterboard and tyres at our community recycling centres. Figures for 2021/22 are being finalised.

Year	Income received from charging
2020/21	£87K
2019/20	£235K
2018/19	£264K

The income that is received offsets the disposal costs for these materials and the administration of the charging scheme. Ultimately, it is the Surrey taxpayer that benefits from the reduced costs of disposal.

We do not hold information on the cost to district and borough councils of clearing fly tipping on public land, although the county council is responsible for disposing of any materials collected by a borough or district council. The tonnage of material recorded as fly-tipped and delivered to the county council for disposal and the approximate costs of disposal for the past three years are set out below.

Year	Tonnes of fly tipped material handled	Disposal cost
2020/21	3857 T	£474K
2019/20	3425 T	£416K
2018/19	4163 T	£477K

It is important to note that the vast majority of fly tipped material will comprise waste from commercial premises or waste that could have been disposed of at a community recycling centre free of charge.

A study undertaken by Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) in 2021 compared fly-tipping rates in authorities that had introduced charges with similar authorities that had not introduced charges. Using a regression model to control for a range of confounding variables, such as levels of deprivation, WRAP did not find evidence that charging is associated with higher rates of fly-tipping, and indeed,

concluded that it appears unlikely that there is an association between fly-tipping and charging at Household Waste Recycling Centres.

**Marisa Heath**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment**  
**26 April 2022**

**Question (2) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):**

In the full Council meeting of July 2019 members passed a motion to work with borough and district councils to review and reduce the frequency of highway verge cuts and to assist in the management and timing of verge cuts in order to promote more wildlife habitats. Verge management contracts with the borough and district councils were originally up for renewal this month. However, in the most recent Council meeting this year, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure informed members that the council is offering a one-year extension to boroughs and districts until the final changes to their verge cutting contracts are made. As the extension is until April 2023 this means it will take, at the very least, almost 4 years to implement an agreed policy change intended to support wildlife, while biodiversity continues to decline.

Please explain the reasons for the decision to offer the extension on the contract. Please explain why the decision to extend the contracts, and therefore to delay implementation of the agreed policy, was not sent to the Communities Environment and Highways Select Committee for scrutiny before being made.

**Reply:**

It is not correct to imply no changes have been made since July 2019. There are a number of areas where the District & Boroughs (and the County Council where we directly manage the service) have reduced cutting to support wildlife and Officers from the County Council have continued to engage with their District & Borough peers to highlight the concern. In addition, the County Council has actively been supporting the "Blue campaign". This is a national campaign which includes promotion of not cutting verges, helping nature develop and encouraging biodiversity. Areas of verges are left uncut and can be marked by a blue plaque. Residents are encouraged to suggest areas where they think there is local support for not cutting, and if feasible this is something we support and encourage the districts and boroughs to action.

The decision was taken to extend the agreements by one year to give sufficient time to review available options and best practice. This is not a new contract period but an extension, and as there is no general policy change, it would not automatically be considered by the Select Committee. As well as supporting biodiversity, environmental maintenance is very important to the feel of a "place", and it is imperative arrangements continue to remain in place to provide this service whilst the future options are reviewed.

**Matt Furniss**

**Question (3) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):**

Please report on the trial of environmentally more friendly alternatives to glyphosate-based herbicides agreed in the Council meeting of July 2019. Please provide the volume of glyphosate-based herbicides used on the council's estate for each of the last 3 years. What is the council's intention for its future use of glyphosate-based herbicides on the council's estate?

**Reply:**

On the Council's 10,000 acres of Countryside Estate and 3,500 km of public rights of way, less than 10 litres a year of glyphosate-based herbicides have been used for conservation and maintenance purposes in the last three years. It is usually only applied by paintbrush to individual stumps or stems are injected to reduce the need to spray.

In addition, 6 locations on the Countryside Estate and 14 on public rights of way are being treated by contractors for Japanese Knotweed. This is an invasive weed which is subject to legislative controls under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Roundup Pro-Vantage MAPP 15534, a foliar glyphosate-based spray or a stem injection glyphosate-based herbicide is used for this purpose. Given the importance of controlling this weed, glyphosate remains the main herbicide used. Specifically, 5.075 litres was used by SCC's contractors, JKW Ltd, in the last 12 months on SCC estate land to treat Japanese Knotweed. Herbicides are not used near to water or environmentally sensitive sites and the size of area under treatment is reducing year on year as treatment progresses.

On the Council's Land and Property portfolio, consisting of over 270 operational sites, glyphosate-based ecoplugs are used to kill tree stumps when regrowth is undesirable. The plugs contain a 300mg granular glyphosate compound and 437 plugs were used on SCC land between October 2020 and October 2021. During the same period, 49.4 litres of Gallup Biograde Amenity MAPP 17674, a glyphosate based product, was used for grounds maintenance purposes. Less than 50 litres was used in the preceding two years.

Glyphosate products are only on used on Council land by qualified contractors adhering to regulations set by the Government's Health and Safety Executive's for Control of Substances Harmful to Health (COSHH) and the safety guidelines provided by manufacturers. All operatives applying herbicide product are trained in PA1 and PA6, certified by City of guilds or LANTRA, as a minimum.

On the Countryside Estate land, recent alternatives trialled include the use of tree poppers to completely remove small saplings. These are a viable alternative for treating small saplings as they remove the whole plant including the root but are not

viable for treating larger trees or stumps. Volunteer groups continue to use them regularly to remove smaller vegetation.

Weed control on the highway is managed by the County Council in three districts and under agency agreements with the relevant Districts & Broughs in the others. Glyphosate is used to control injurious weeds and applied to areas of general weed growth on the highway – to maintain the street scene and help protect the infrastructure from damage. Use of Glyphosate has reduced considerably in recent years, with less weed spray treatments undertaken. As some of this work isn't undertaken directly, the exact quantity cannot be confirmed. But based on data we do have, it is estimated it is the region of 2500 litres per annum.

Officers from the Highways Service have considered various options to replace glyphosate including manual removal of weeds, citric treatment and foamstream. A substantive trial of the foamstream process was undertaken last season with overall positive results. Foamstream effectively controls unwanted vegetation by using heat in hot water, insulated by a biodegradable foam blanket. The foam stops the heat escaping to the atmosphere keeping the heat longer on the plant. In theory the process can be used in all conditions except very heavy rain (as it washes away the foam before the heat has time to take effect). It was found to be an effective but lengthy and costly solution. It takes approximately three times as long as conventional spraying and requires a significant amount of water, with the water tank needing to be filled twice per working day. Travelling to replace the water adds to the carbon footprint, as does the diesel engine required to provide heat to the water. Access can be problematic where there are parked vehicles.

Officers continue to engage with innovative solutions and learn from other authorities. We regularly consult with independent experts for advice on weed control and related issues, to ensure that we are fully up-to-date with changes in legislation, herbicide recommendations and commercial practice.

Looking to the future, the Council is currently producing a Land Management Policy which will set out how it manages its land to support ecosystem processes and maximise environmental and social outcomes. Whilst the Council already minimises its use of glyphosate, the policy will consider the use of alternative herbicides and set out plans for future use. This is due to be considered by the Council's Cabinet in the autumn.

**Marisa Heath**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment**  
**26 April 2022**

<b>Question (4) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):</b>
--

Residents of Surrey travelling to Woodhatch Place by public transport to attend meetings – for example Home to School transport appeals – have to walk from the

Angel bus stop (6 minutes) or Sandhills (8 minutes). County council staff are provided with a shuttle bus to and from Woodhatch Place itself.

Please give the current estimated annual cost of providing the shuttle bus for staff. Please provide data on the number of staff using the shuttlebus. Please explain why Surrey residents using public transport to travel to Woodhatch Place from Reigate or Redhill stations cannot use the shuttlebus, alongside staff?

**Reply:**

In line with the opening up of our offices following the pandemic, the shuttle bus started operation in late February 2022, connecting Woodhatch Place with Reigate and Redhill Station. The bus has been commissioned to promote use of public transport and primarily to give staff the opportunity to travel to Woodhatch by train. There are many staff who are based in the surrounding area of Kingston because of the location of our previous County Hall building. Currently the bus is carrying between 50 and 75 people per week and this number will grow as more staff make use of our office buildings following the pandemic. We will also now be starting to promote free use of the bus to residents who have an appointment at Woodhatch Place.

The bus costs £320 per day and is run by East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership. A commercial alternative would have cost in the region of £500 per day.

As part of the overall Agile Office Estate Strategy, there will be more public facing services operating out of the building from the start of January 2023. In anticipation, we are currently looking at more sustainable and cost-effective public transport options to link Woodhatch Place with the surrounding area.

**Tim Oliver**  
**Leader of the Council**  
**26 April 2022**

**Question (5) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):**

According to last month's Council meeting, based on current methods of data collection about one third of Education Health and Care Plans, for children with additional needs in Surrey are currently not amended within statutory timescales by the county council. This frequently causes much anxiety and stress for the families of children with additional needs.

What is the county council's target for the percentage of EHC plans it will amend in accordance with statutory deadlines from now on, and what is the timescale for achieving this target? Will additional staffing be required to achieve the target and then maintain meeting the statutory deadlines?

**Reply:**

The statutory guidance detailed in the current Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) code of practice: 0-25 sets out clearly the timeframes for reviewing EHCPs and this is the measure that Surrey County Council uses to ensure that we are

working towards full compliance with the statutory requirements. A recent High Court ruling has provided additional clarity to confirm the timescales relating to the annual review process, which may have been interpreted in different ways by local authorities and legal practitioners across the country. Currently, our data confirms that we have 68% of annual reviews that are either up to date or due this month.

This equates to over 8,000 timely annual reviews of the circa 12,000 plans currently maintained. However, the timely completion rate is significantly higher for children who are about to move to a new phase of education, and it is important that these reviews are timely as the majority will lead to a change in the ECHP as children move into a new provision. The Primary/Secondary Key Stage transfer annual review completion rate within the statutory timescales is 88%. The Secondary /Post 16 transfer annual review completion rate is 90% on time. This ensures that children and young people do move into their next educational phase with an updated plan matching their needs to their new provision.

Schools are responsible for convening an annual review to use this as an opportunity to actively monitor a child's or young person's progress towards their outcomes and longer term aspirations. The local authority has the responsibility to ensure that the reviews take place, and based on the outcome of the review, determine if there is a change required to the plan, such as a change in the description of the child's need, provision required or proposed outcomes. Based on the review, the local authority may maintain the plan unchanged, it may issue an updated plan or cease the plan.

We are working toward full compliance with these statutory timescales. We recognise that we have not yet reached that target and understand that for families where a plan requires changing, a delay can be stressful. There is currently a review of SEN systems and processes to look at how efficiencies can be found in the annual review process which will lead to a great percentage of annual reviews completed on time and determine if any further resources are required. While we make these improvements, the SEN teams are ensuring annual reviews for our most vulnerable children, such as children in care or children missing education, and children at key stage transfers are updated as a priority.

**Denise Turner-Stewart**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**26 April 2022**

**Question (6) Lance Spencer (Goldsworth East and Horsell Village):**

The "Home to School Transport Consultation" that has recently been run is aimed at improving the efficiency of these services and reducing the costs.

The recently agreed budget shows a budget efficiency saving in financial year 2022/23 of £1.4 million in the schools transport budget. How much of these savings will come from the elements being considered in the consultation?

It is clear that significant reductions in support for Home to School transport will further increase the number of appeals coming through to the Members Appeals Panel. The most recent Appeals Panel was dealing with appeals that had started as far back as

August 2021. What plans are there to deal with the increased level of appeals that will inevitably arise?

**Reply:**

The Home to School Travel Assistant Policy (H2STA) Policy sets out the way in which the Council discharges its statutory and discretionary powers and responsibilities in relation to school and college transport assistance available for pupils aged up to 25 years of age, both with and without additional needs. The changes proposed will ensure that the County Council continues to support those who most need help, manage increasing costs and demand within the overall resources available and increase the options for children and young people who qualify for H2STA, encouraging environmentally friendly travel and support independent travel as a means of preparing young people for adulthood. Surrey's Home to School Travel Assistance Policy will support delivery of the £1.4m efficiencies required in the Council's Financial Plan.

Proposed changes to the appeals process is one of the changes recommended in the updated policy. This will allow appeals to be heard more rapidly and regularly than is currently the case. Ensuring a wider pool of panel members in line with the proposal will mean that appeals can be quorate and proceed in cases of ill health or lack of availability of councillors.

**Denise Turner-Stewart**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**26 April 2022**

**Question (7) Lance Spencer (Goldsworth East and Horsell Village):**

It is noted that the Local transport Plan 4, which is now called the Surrey Transport Plan, will be going to Cabinet for approval in May 2022 instead of the previously stated December 2021.

Why was the plan delayed in going to Cabinet, considering it is a key part of the Greener Futures Delivery Plan?

Is the Cabinet member for Transport concerned that many of the questions in the consultation had fewer than 300 responses, which really does call into question the ability of Surrey County Council to gain traction and get real engagement with communities on key projects and transformations?

**Reply:**

Consultation on the Surrey Transport Plan (LTP4) was first conducted from July to October 2021, meeting the Council's statutory obligations set out in the Local Transport Act 2008 and the Transport Act 2000. Given the significant engagement and the socialisation of LTP4 during this period through the wider Greener Futures engagement plan, there were 1,437 contributions from 549 different respondents received, coupled with 8,355 visits to the Common Place web-based engagement

platform. Benchmarking of other Local Authorities revealed similar levels of responses to similar policy-based consultations during lockdown conditions over the same period.

However, post-consultation analysis highlighted that certain demographic groups, including younger people, women, disabled people and businesses had not responded in sufficient numbers to gauge their views on the Plan from the original consultation, which was meant to be reporting to Cabinet in December 2021. As the Council has prioritised improving the way in which we engage with our communities, the decision was taken to postpone the Cabinet's consideration of the Plan and the consultation to allow for further engagement, and specifically, a more demographically targeted engagement with a wider range of Surrey residents.

This additional consultation was conducted using a range of engagement techniques including online, postal and face to face interactions, plus stakeholder interviews. A total of 1,762 people took part, and critically, form a representative sample of the county's population. Many were also new to engaging with the Council, with some requesting feedback and/or ongoing involvement. Overall, the responses received were in line with those of others who had commented in the initial consultation process; however, the results provide the Council with a richer picture of how we might engage with different demographic groups in implementing the aims of the LTP4.

The research reveals high levels of support for tackling climate change across the wide range of participants. There is also support for the transport hierarchy, and there is clearly an awareness that reducing carbon will require a mix of both popular and unpopular policies, although inevitably there is a tendency to favour the former.

Further engagement and consultation will naturally take place with communities as and when specific initiatives are progressed. Experience shows that this is when greater responses from the community are generated on more locally specific proposals.

**Matt Furniss**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure**  
**26 April 2022**

**Question (8) Lance Spencer (Goldsworth East and Horsell Village):**

The Public Accounts Committee said that there is 'no reliable estimate of what the process of implementing the net zero policy is actually likely to cost British consumers, households, businesses or government itself'.

They said that certainty for business and consumers is critical and have noted repeatedly in recent reports that the government has 'too often pursued stop-start strategies'.

According to the committee, this undermines confidence for business, investors and consumers in committing to measures which would reduce carbon emissions, especially when some green alternatives are still significantly more expensive than current options.

To deliver the Greener Futures Delivery Plan in Surrey it is estimated a total of £3.4 - £4.2bn is required by 2025 to ensure that we are on track to deliver both the 2030 and 2050 targets.

In the absence of clear direction and associated funding from Central Government, what alternative funding approaches is the Cabinet Member looking at to create the funding required to deliver the plans?

**Reply:**

The first Greener Futures Finance Strategy (2021) included an evidence-based, estimated cost based on current knowledge, data and modelling for the net zero pathways set out in Surrey's 2050 Climate Change Delivery Plan 2021-25 and SCC's 2030 target. A more comprehensive second version of the Strategy will be completed by end of this financial year.

The capital costs of the Council's 2030 net zero carbon programme are estimated to be between £65m and £71m. It is expected that the capital costs will be offset over the lifetime of the measures through operational energy savings (resulting from energy efficiency measures within buildings and fuel reduction from switching the Council's fleet to EV) as well as energy generated by renewable energy installations (from roof mounted solar and larger ground mounted solar arrays). The cost to the Council will be reduced by the attraction of grant funding; for instance, to date £4.3m has currently been secured through the Government's Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund (PSDF). A further 31 buildings attracting potentially £16.6m have been identified and this is an ongoing process.

The Greener Future Finance Strategy also included the estimated costs required to achieve the county's carbon reduction target by 2025, which, as referenced by Councillor Spencer, is in the region of £3.4bn to £4.2 bn. While it is important to note that the majority of this cost will fall to the consumer, there is a role for the Council to facilitate the financial mechanisms and policy drivers at a local level to support partners, residents, businesses etc to make the necessary changes to their homes, buildings and transport, as well as lobbying Government to put in place financial mechanisms and policies at a national level. This is a key element of the Greener Futures Lobbying Strategy.

To that end, the Council is positioning ourselves to be able to draw in funding from public, community and private sector investors. In the last two years, the Council has drawn in £65m grant funding for programmes which will result in carbon reduction including active travel schemes, local cycling and walking infrastructure plans (LCWIPs) and the decarbonisation of low income housing. To maximise these external funding opportunities, we are continually developing a pipeline of investment ready projects.

In addition, the Council is exploring a number of new finance mechanisms and a framework to generate investment opportunities and develop a range of co-benefits to unlock decarbonisation investment across agendas, organisations and sectors. This includes;

- Launching a support programme to enable community groups to develop their own local energy schemes which could include a community energy investment fund or green bond mechanism harnessing both public and residents' money;
- Exploring the development of interest-free loans and a revolving loan fund for decarbonisation measures for schools and private sector landlords;
- Launching a roof top solar scheme to offer residents access to solar PV at a subsidised rate
- Exploring the development of a renewables investment fund open to local authority partners to develop renewables on non public sector land, brownfield sites and industrial estates in partnership with business, land owners
- Exploring the developing a carbon offset and biodiversity nature recovery fund – linking climate, carbon and nature

With regard to private sector finance, the Council has recently been chosen to represent the Enterprise M3 LEP area in a South East Energy Hub funded programme to explore the development of a Net Zero Development Vehicle. The concept is that the Vehicle will be a service that connects private sector lenders, investors and financial institutions to a pipeline of bankable net zero and clean growth investments from the public sector. Although the work is still in its infancy, there are huge opportunities to develop an approach which aligns with the Government's Shared Prosperity Fund.

Finally, the Council has now recruited a Carbon Economics Programme Manager, who will be leading on this work and is developing a longer-term Greener Futures Finance Strategy, which will be completed by the end of this financial year.

**Marisa Heath**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment**  
**26 April 2022**

## CABINET – 26 APRIL 2022

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

4b

**Item 4(b): Public Questions****Question (1): Malcolm Robertson**

At the last meeting of Cabinet, I asked whether Surrey County Council would phase out incineration of its municipal waste. I received a reply, which is a matter of public record - you will see it in the Minutes. There were however a number of inaccuracies, which need to be addressed, particularly as the new Waste Plan will be drawn up using information such as that:

I was told if the plant were in breach of its emission limits, then 'it could and would be shut down by the Environment Agency'. However, I can find no record of any incinerator burning municipal solid waste being permanently shut down by that organisation.

The County proclaimed, 'Waste minimisation, reuse and recycling will remain the preferred approach before waste is sent for incineration...'. Unfortunately this neglects to mention that a few years ago the County's contractor withdrew the facility to recycle hard plastics, apparently because there was no money in it. However other companies in Surrey do accept hard plastic waste. Additionally, many major stores are now encouraging the recycling of soft plastics and plastic film. But the County is not involved in this scheme either. Inaction speaks louder than words.

The public was always led to believe the 'eco park' at Shepperton would be 'green'. We now learn that the Anaerobic Digester plant uses a back-up boiler fuelled by gasoil. It also flares off to atmosphere the excess gas the digester produces. Environmentally friendly designs do not use climate changing fossil fuel like gasoil, nor do they waste valuable digester gas by destroying it in a gas flare.

Nor was a reply made about the eco park's colossal use of fossil fuel, although over a third of a million litres of gasoil were used by the Anaerobic Digester's back up boiler, and to incinerate just under one sixth of the incinerator's capacity.

Do you wish to comment for the record?

**Reply:**

With regard to your first point on the role of the Environment Agency, I can confirm that the Environment Agency does have and does use powers to suspend an Environmental Permit for the operation of any plant that is in breach of its emissions limits and ultimately to revoke the permit for the operation. Modern thermal treatment plants are carefully designed and operated to ensure that emissions are within the required limits and therefore any intervention by the Environment Agency is likely to be required infrequently.

We work very closely with our contractor SUEZ, to find recycling markets for new materials. The reason why we had to cease recycling of hard plastics from our community recycling centres, was not one of cost. It was simply that we could find no market for the sort of mixed hard plastics that we collect. However we continue to look for new outlets for this material and we will divert it to a recycling outlet should one become available. In respect of plastic film, our officers are in constant dialogue with the large companies that deal with the majority of Surrey's kerbside collected recyclables and they all say that they have struggled to find sustainable outlets for soft plastics and film. More often than not, the only outlet for these materials is to send them to an energy from waste plant where value can be recovered in the form of energy. We are currently working with the Surrey Environment Partnership to try and establish what proportion of the plastic film collected by supermarkets is recycled and where the material is sent to for recycling.

Surrey residents already recycle 55% of their waste, which makes us one of the top performing counties in respect of recycling rates; however, we know that a lot more could be achieved simply by encouraging residents to more fully utilise their existing kerbside collection systems. To this end, we are working with the Surrey Environment Partnership to deliver education and engagement campaigns to improve both the quantity and quality of recycling collected.

Like all anaerobic digestion plants, the plant at Shepperton has a flare which is only used for safety purposes if the gas engines are out of service through planned or unplanned shutdown. In normal operation, the gas engines are more than capable of managing all of the gas generated by the plant.

Gas oil is used both to fire a back-up boiler for pasteurising digestate, in the event the gas engines are off, or as a start-up fuel to raise the temperature of the gasification process before the introduction of any waste. This is something that is common to other energy from waste plants. The use of gas oil will be monitored through ongoing performance reporting.

**Natalie Bramhall**  
**Cabinet Member for Property and Waste**  
**26 April 2022**

<b>Question (2): Paul Kennedy</b>
-----------------------------------

I have met a significant number of residents over the last few weeks whose children have not been offered a school place for September, because Surrey County Council either cannot or will not provide a suitable funding package to meet their special education, health and care needs.

Many of these families are taking proceedings against Surrey County Council over this failure, which they are likely to win, incurring further wasted costs for council taxpayers.

In view of the recent announcement of a £100 million Government bailout of Surrey County Council's SEND provision, can the administration provide any indication of

when those families currently left in this limbo can expect to be offered a school place for their children?

**Reply:**

There are over 12,000 children in Surrey with an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) and the vast majority of these children are accessing education. Fewer than 25 children currently do not have provision in place and we are working closely with the families and providers to put suitable provision in place for them.

There are times when we are unable to meet parental preference for a school placement. This may be due to the setting being unsuitable for the age, ability, aptitude or special educational needs (“SEN”) of the child or young person; or the attendance of the child or young person would be incompatible with the provision of efficient education for others; or the attendance of the child or young person would be incompatible with the efficient use of resources. These are all reasons why parental preference cannot be met set out in the current Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) code of practice: 0-25.

There are also times when we would like to place a child or young people in a specialist maintained provision but there are not places available. For this reason, there has been an investment in the expansion of specialist school places with £139m committed since 2019. This has delivered 440 additional specialist places in the last three years and is on track to deliver another 290 specialist places for September 2022 with more to follow in subsequent years.

1,476 pupils with an ECHP went through the statutory school age key stage transfer process this year. The local authority must name a school, or type of provision by 15 February of the academic year preceding their school transfer. Of these 1,476 pupils, by 15 February 2022, 1299 had an offer at a named school for a September 2022 start and 177 pupils had a type of provision named. This number has now reduced to 136 pupils, as the additional places created by the capital programme are becoming available.

We recognise that, for these children and families waiting for a placement decision, this is a worrying time. We are working closely with them to confirm places in good time for September 2022 as further specialist places become available.

Finally, the outcome of the recent “Safety Valve” negotiations is that the Department for Education will contribute a further £100m towards SCC’s High Needs Block budget over the next 5 years. This funding is conditional on the delivery of Surrey’s existing strategy and improvement plans, including the provision of additional specialist school places, and has to be used to reduce the financial deficit.

**Denise Turner-Stewart**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**26 April 2022**

**Question (3): Elizabeth Daly**

It is great news that Surrey County Council is at last introducing safer speed limits in rural South-West Surrey. Since highways functions are no longer delegated to Local Committees, can the Cabinet Member please explain why Surrey County Council is not giving similar priority to the clearly inappropriate speed limits in the Bookham area, including in particular:

- a. Dorking and Polesden Roads, where the speed limit is still 60mph despite increasing shared use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders;
- b. Chapel Lane, where there is no change from 60mph indicated for a winding steeply descending single track country road;
- c. The lack of 20mph speed limits around Bookham schools, near the village centre and in residential roads used as ratruns such as East Street, which I was told at the Mole Valley Local Committee in January was one of many that are suitable for a 20mph speed limit?

**Reply:**

Speed limits are the maximum permitted speed a vehicle may travel on a road, if conditions permit. There are many country lanes across the whole of England which are subject to a 60mph limit; however, this does not mean it is always reasonable or safe to drive at that speed, and drivers are accountable for their actions.

Divisional members can promote speed limit reductions using a proportion of the budget that is available to them, if this is a priority for their area. Any change in speed limit would need to conform with the County Council's "Setting Local Speed Limits" policy. Speed limit changes may also be introduced as part of Integrated Transport Schemes or through other countywide initiatives.

If a Divisional Member wishes to consider a speed limit change, this can be progressed by Officers subject to sufficient funding available. For example, East Street has been identified as a local priority and it is proposed to reduce the speed limit to 20mph this financial year, subject to consultation.

In support of delivering lower speeds, Surrey Police are providing £100,000 from the Drive SMART Road Safety Partnership to review and implement lower speed limits on rural roads in the south of Surrey. This is being implemented on a proactive, strategic and area-wide basis. The first phase of this project covers an area bounded by the A24 in the east, the A25 in the north, the county boundary in the south and a line roughly between Cranleigh and Shere in the west. The additional £3m of Council funding to tackle speed and road safety Surrey wide offers an opportunity to extend this work even further.

**Matt Furniss**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure**  
**26 April 2022**

**CABINET- 26 April 2022****Cabinet Response to the Home to School Travel Assistance Policy (Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee)****Recommendations to Cabinet:**

The Select Committee agreed the following recommendations:

1. The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning ensure the Home to School Travel Assistance Policy reflects the following recommendations before it is referred to Cabinet for agreement:
  - a) The 45-minute maximum intended journey time for primary-aged pupils contained in statutory guidance be maintained and only exceeded in exceptional circumstances, such as journeys which enable a child to attend the setting which best meets their needs or where it would be impractical or disproportionately expensive for a journey to be shorter than 45-minutes – journeys should always enable children to arrive at school ready for a day of study and be suitable, safe and reasonably stress free.
  - b) Collection points be situated in locations which protect the safety and wellbeing of children.
  - c) In the case of an appeal against a withdrawal of travel assistance, assistance not be withdrawn until the appeal is complete.
  - d) There be no change to the appeals panel membership; and that steps be taken promote member attendance at appeals panel meetings.
  
2. That Cabinet agree the reported changes to the Home to School Travel Assistance Policy subject to the changes recommended in recommendation 1.

**Chris Townsend, Vice-Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee (on the behalf of the Chairman of the Committee)**

---

**Cabinet Response:**

I'd like to thank the Chairman and members of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee for their time in considering our proposals for changing Surrey's Home to School Transport Assistance (H2STA) Policy which is being considered by the Cabinet today for a decision. I welcome the feedback and debate about the changes proposed and consulted on.

The H2STA Policy sets out the way in which the Council discharges its statutory and discretionary powers and responsibilities in relation to school and college transport assistance available for pupils aged up to 25 years of age, both with and without additional needs. The changes proposed will ensure that the County Council continues to support those who most need help, manage increasing costs and demand within the overall resources available and increase the options for children and young people who qualify for H2STA, encouraging environmentally friendly travel and support independent travel as a means of preparing young people for adulthood.

The recommendations from the Select Committee have been considered carefully as the Cabinet report has been drafted. With regards to each recommendation the following action has been taken:

- a. The Cabinet report has been updated following reflection on the consultation and feedback at Select Committee. The proposal is now that:

The size and characteristics of Surrey means that it can be challenging to adhere to the statutory guidelines on journey time limits in practice. Surrey is geographically one of the largest local authorities in England covering an area of 648 square miles with close to 500 schools and colleges and other alternative provisions, including 25 specialist schools. Surrey has a distinctive character with large rural areas and conversely, in its larger conurbations, traffic density and congestion very similar to inner London. Surrey's current policy (updated in 2020) provides flexibility to make a decision to depart from the statutory guidance on recommended travel times following a careful assessment of the needs of every individual child, giving consideration to age and additional needs.

The proposal is that for some journeys, the upper limit on journey times may be varied in order to make suitable and sufficient arrangements for all children. This means that in planning routes, the maximum time guidance of 45 minutes for primary school children and 75 minutes for secondary school children would not override all other considerations. The Council will also take into account the benefits of allowing children and young people who could potentially share transport to do so in appropriate circumstances, the promotion of independent travel, more environmentally friendly travel, and the economic use of resources. Parents will have the right to appeal.

If the Council departs from the statutory guidelines on journey times, this decision must ensure the planned route is not of such duration that the pupil is unable, because of stress and strain, to learn properly (whether at school or at home). We will take into consideration the child's age and stage of development. The 45-minute maximum planned journey time for primary-aged pupils contained in statutory guidance will be maintained and only exceeded in certain circumstances, such as journeys which enable a child to attend the setting which best meets their needs.

- b. Collections points. Having considered the feedback from Select Committee, the following is being proposed. The safety of a collection point will be critical to the decision making on where the collection points will be situated.

It is proposed that where a route has been identified as suitable for collection points to be introduced, a further 4 week consultation will be undertaken with the families, children and young people on that route to ensure that the proposed arrangements are appropriate, for example the location of the collection point. Before the 4 week consultation, the Council will also assess the individual circumstances or needs which may mean that a collection point is not appropriate for an individual pupil to use. Following a decision to introduce a collection point, the Council will provide not less than 6 weeks notification to families (which includes any school holidays that fall in the 6 week period) before the collection point is established. It is proposed

that once a collection point route has been established, that route will remain a collection point route and no further specific consultation will be undertaken. This means that any pupils joining the route will be informed that it is a collection point route, and they will be expected to use the collection point. Parents will have the right to appeal.

- c. Withdrawal of assistance. Having considered this recommendation, it is not proposed to make any changes to this currently as it would represent a change in the current practice. Currently we notify the parent of the proposal to withdraw transport with a notice period and advise that there is a right of appeal. However, we do not continue to provide assistance beyond the end of the notice period if the appeal has not yet taken place.
  
- d. It is proposed to continue with a two-stage process and that the stage two panel will be independent of the first, but the membership of the stage two panel will now include council officers in the future. This is in line with the DfE national guidance and will strengthen the experience and knowledge of the panel. The DfE's recommended appeals process is set out here: [Department for Education \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/department-for-education-appeals-process) This will also allow appeals to be heard more rapidly and regularly than is currently the case. Ensuring a wider pool of panel members will mean that appeals can be quorate and proceed in cases of ill health or lack of availability of councillors. However, it is still the intention to ensure that councillors remain a key component of appeal hearings and this change is not proposing to withdraw councillors from the appeals process. Taking account of the public consultation, in which the majority of respondents were either neutral or in favour of the proposal, it is recommended that this proposal is agreed.

**Denise Turner-Stewart**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**26 April 2022**

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET****DATE: 26 APRIL 2022****REPORT OF CABINET MEMBER: MARISA HEATH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT****LEAD OFFICER: KATIE STEWART, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE****SUBJECT: SURREY'S GREENER FUTURES GRANT PROGRAMMES****ORGANISATION STRATEGY PRIORITY AREA: GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY SO EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT/TACKLING HEALTH INEQUALITY/ENABLING A GREENER FUTURE****Purpose of the Report:**

The Council has committed to work with partners to enable the county to be net zero carbon by 2050 and to ensure its own estate to be net zero carbon by 2030. It has been recognised that external funding will be essential to the delivery of these targets, and that Government grants are a key source of additional funding. The purpose of this report is twofold: first, to seek approval for the receipt of a number of specific funds with which SCC have already been successful, and secondly to get approval for similar decisions for future applications.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Approve the receipt of funding into the Council's capital pipeline from Government net zero carbon grant funding programmes, specifically the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS3) and the Sustainable Warmth Programme (which includes the Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery (GHGLAD3) and Home Upgrade Grant (HUG1))
2. Note the use of match funding from the approved Corporate Capital Maintenance Programme, subject to the Capital Programme Panel (CPP) approving business cases for individual sites.
3. Approve the request to competitively procure the Sustainable Warmth Programme and PSDS3 services under separate contracts, in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contracting Standing Orders.
4. Approve the receipt of future funding schemes for the purposes of delivery of the Greener Futures ambition, including future tranches of the PSDS schemes and Sustainable Warmth programmes as well as, but not limited to, the schemes included in Appendix 1. Receipt of funding will be subject to Capital Programme Panel approval.

**Reason for Recommendations:**

The recommendations in this report will enable the Council to:

- Draw down Government funding of £14.85m. This includes £2.652m from PSDS3 to decarbonise buildings in the SCC estate and schools and £11.9m from the Sustainable

Warmth Programme, which includes £8.3m for GHLAD3 and £3.6m for HUG1, which will be used to decarbonise homes of residents on low incomes.

- Be as agile as possible to maximise the attraction of future external grant funding sources.

### Executive Summary:

1. In October 2021, Cabinet approved the Greener Futures Climate Change Delivery Plan, which set out the requirement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the county by at least 20% by 2025, in order to meet the net zero 2050 target within Surrey's carbon budget. Cabinet also approved the Council's 2030 net zero carbon plan for its own operations.
2. The Council's 2030 net zero target is based upon a principle of a presumption to adopt net zero solutions including net zero new builds and/or the replacement of heating systems with net zero solutions (e.g. heat pumps) unless there are specific business case or site-specific reasons why this is not possible.
3. When the Climate Change Delivery Plan was agreed, it was recognised that significant external funding, including grants, would be essential to enable delivery of the targets due to the scale of the change needed and, possibly more expensive nature of low carbon technologies in the short term. It was therefore agreed that wherever possible, external grant funding would be sought to minimise the financial draw on SCC.

### Current Funding Success – Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund GHLAD, HUG (1)

4. To date, ETI has attracted in £65m in external funding to deliver Surrey's Greener Futures targets.
5. **Table 1** details the current round of funding applications that are in the process of being agreed. Cabinet is asked to approve the receipt of the funding from these grants as detailed in the table.
6. Cabinet is also asked to note the use of match funding of up to £1.367m, as estimated in the table below in relation to the PSDS3 grant to replace fossil fuel boilers with heat pumps. This is to be financed from the Corporate Capital Maintenance Budget by using the amounts already allocated to cover the cost of boiler replacements.

**Table 1. Grant funding programme details**

Grant programme	Description	Funding awarded	Estimated match funding	Outcomes	Procurement route	Delivered timescales
<b>Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS3)</b>	Funding to replace old fossil fuelled boilers with heat pumps and energy efficiency/thermal insulation measures. The grant recipient is required to provide the 'like for like' costs of replacing the boiler with a fossil fuel replacement and the grant funding covers the additional costs associated with the heat pump installation (the funding is capped at £325 per tonne carbon saved)	£2.652m (funding is capped at £325 per tonne carbon saved)	<b>Up to £1.367m</b> this will come from the Corporate Capital Maintenance Programme	Heat pumps and energy efficiency measures installed in 10 buildings in the corporate estate and 5 schools. List of sites included in Annex 2.	Running a mini competition from the LHC framework to procure a turnkey installer. This framework has been assessed by colleagues in Procurement and Legal as a suitable procurement route.	Measures installed by March 2023
<b>Sustainable Warmth – GHLAD3</b>	Funding to install decarbonisation measures in low-income households (with a total income of approximately £30,000 or less), living in the most inefficient homes (homes with	£8.6m	N/A however the Council has a top up fund (£330k) to enable	949 homes receiving decarbonisation measures	An Open OJEU tender for a managing agent with a local installer network,	Measures installed by March 2023

	an Energy Performance Certificate EPC rating of D, E, F or G). The measures have been fully funded (with a cap of £10k per household) and have included energy efficiency measures, thermal insulation, heat pumps and solar PV.		more costly decarbonisation measures to be installed.		
<b>Sustainable Warmth – Home Upgrade Grant (HUG1)</b>	As above, however this funding is for low in-come households in off-gas communities, the funding cap is higher at £20k.	£3.6m		154 homes receiving decarbonisation measures	

### Accessing Future Grant Funding

7. Due to the often short deadlines associated with these national funding streams, the competitive nature of such funding and the need for rapid delivery, SCC needs to be as agile as possible in order to maximise funding drawn in and enable procurement and delivery of services funded by the grant within the often constrained delivery timelines. It is not always possible to include funded projects in the Annual Procurement Forward Plan (APFP), as was the case with the programmes included above.
8. Cabinet is therefore also being asked to approve in advance the development of future applications for and receipt of grant monies from funding sources that support the delivery of the Greener Futures ambition, including but not limited to the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme and the Sustainable Warmth Programme which includes the Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery (GHGLAD) and Home Upgrade Grant (HUG). **Appendix 1** outlines some of the known funds for information. Individual projects will remain subject to review and approval by the Council's Capital Programme Panel.

### Consultation:

9. The Cabinet Members responsible for Property, Finance and Environment were notified of the PSDS funding application on 4 October 2021 and expressed support.
10. All SCC members were updated on the Sustainable Warmth Programme at a Member Development Seminar focussing on Decarbonising Surrey's Homes and Tackling Fuel Poverty on 13 December 2021.
11. The Greener Futures Member Reference Group, which is a subset of Communities, Environment and Highways (CEH) Select Committee, was updated on the progress of these grant programmes during their session on 10 February 2021.
12. In addition, climate change leads from the Boroughs and Districts have been kept up to date with the progress of the Sustainable Warmth Programme via the monthly Greener Futures Network meetings.

### Risk Management and Implications:

13. There are numerous risks relating to the delivery of decarbonisation schemes, including risks associated with the installation and operation of measures as well as programme related risks, such as delays resulting from supply chain issues.
14. The risks relating to these programmes have been captured in a risk register, which sets out the risk owners and mitigation strategies. The risk registers will be kept up to date by

the relevant delivery teams, and key risks and issues will be reported to the Council's Greener Futures Board, which will have oversight of these programmes.

15. Risk mitigation is included in the grant terms and conditions of these programmes and will be built into the contracts with the managing agent/turnkey installers. Contract documents will be signed off by the Council's Legal and Procurement teams.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications:**

16. The Initial Greener Futures Finance Strategy sets out a process for defining how the Council's Climate Change Delivery Plan for 2021 to 2025, and subsequent plans, will be financed and where there are currently gaps in funding.
17. The Finance Strategy recommends that, where possible, the Council should draw in external funding to reduce the pressure on the Council's capital borrowing and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). It also recommends that existing budgets should be utilised, where appropriate, to fund decarbonisation activities, especially where a return on investment can be generated.
18. To ensure that grant programmes offer value for money, the Council's Procurement team will support the development of competitive procurement exercises to ensure the Council secures the most favourable rates.
19. With regard to the PSDS funding, Cabinet is asked to note the use of the Corporate Capital Maintenance Budget to provide match funding of up to £1.367m for the PSDS3 grant funding. Amounts currently allocated in this budget for boiler replacement will be repurposed to provide this funding and enable the installation of heat pumps and energy efficiency/thermal insulation measures. There is therefore no request for additional capital funding to enable these works.
20. The ongoing revenue costs associated with heat pumps may increase costs in the first instance creating a revenue pressure in the short term; however, the costs over time should reduce. Fortunately, current modelling on the selected sites does not suggest that the costs in the short term are any greater in the case of this programme of work. Regardless, each site will be assessed individually and any resultant running cost pressures will be mitigated by the installation of solar panels. Once these more detailed site by site assessments are completed, a business case will be presented to the Capital Programme Panel for approval. The business cases will set out the full financial implications of replacing boilers with heat pumps, and any necessary mitigations through solar initiatives.

#### **Section 151 Officer Commentary:**

21. Although significant progress has been made to improve the Council's financial position, the medium term financial outlook beyond 2022/23 remains uncertain. With no clarity on central government funding 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.
22. The Section 151 Officer supports the recommended acceptance of grant funding into the Council's capital pipeline, and the application of match funding from approved property capital budgets. Schemes will proceed following approval of detailed business cases by the Council's Capital Programme Panel, including an assessment of ongoing running costs.

**Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer:**

- 23. The Council will need to meet any grant terms or conditions further to the award of grants. Legal services will advise on, and complete, any agreements that are required.
- 24. The agreement of any future matched funding proposals will be subject to approval through the Capital Programme Panel as set out in the report.

**Equalities and Diversity:**

- 25. These projects are included within the scope of the Equalities Impact Assessment which was produced for the Climate Change Delivery Plan which was approved by Cabinet in October 2021.
- 26. These projects were not found to have any negative impacts upon any groups of residents. In fact, the Sustainable Warmth Programme will have a positive impact by reducing the fuel bills of Surrey’s lowest income households. The PSDS3 project will have a positive impact by reducing operational energy costs and increasing thermal comfort for five schools.
- 27. Further funding bids will be subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment.

**Other Implications:**

- 28. 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.

<b>Area assessed:</b>	<b>Direct Implications:</b>
<i>Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children</i>	No significant implications arising from this report.
<i>Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults</i>	No significant implications arising from this report.
<i>Environmental sustainability</i>	No significant implications arising from this report
<i>Compliance against net-zero emissions target and future climate compatibility/resilience</i>	The delivery of this project will result in carbon reduction from low income households in Surrey, helping to meet Surrey’s net zero carbon targets and mitigate climate change.
<i>Public Health</i>	The delivery of this project will have public health benefits through the reduction of the number of households living in fuel poverty which is linked to increased winter deaths and morbidity

**What Happens Next:**

- 29. The next steps include

- a. Procuring managing agent/turnkey installers for the PSDS3 and Sustainable Warmth Programme.
  - b. Developing site specific business cases for each of the 15 sites for which we have been awarded PSDS funding, to be approved at CPP.
  - c. Developing risk management and communications plans for the programmes.
  - d. Preparing for funding applications for future grant funding opportunities.
- 

**Report Author:** Katie Sargent, Greener Futures Group Manager, 07754 387029

**Consulted:**

The following consultation has taken place:

Internal

- Cabinet Members for Environment, Property, Finance & Resources.
- SCC Members (through Members Development Seminar focusing on Decarbonising Surrey's Homes and Tackling Fuel Poverty on 13 December).
- CEH Select Committee (through Greener Futures Member Reference Group).
- Service leads for relevant teams.

External

- Engagement with Borough and District Environment Directors and Climate Change officers.

**Annexes:**

*Annex 1 – List of potential funding sources*

*Annex 2 – List of sites receiving PSDS3 grant funding*

**Sources/background papers:**

*Not applicable*

**Annex 1 – List of potential funding sources**

<b>Fund</b>	<b>Funding provider</b>	<b>Description</b>
Sustainable Warmth	Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	Funding to install decarbonisation measures in low-income households living in the most inefficient homes. Additional funding available for off-gas homes. The measures have been fully funded (with a cap of £10k per household) and have included energy efficiency measures, thermal insulation, heat pumps and solar PV.
Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS)	Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	Government’s PSDF is a competitive funding stream which provides capital investment for public sector organisations to decarbonise their buildings. The fund prioritises the installation of heat pumps and covers the additional cost of converting end of life boilers to heat pumps (the like for like cost is covered by the public sector organisation)
Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Grant in Aid (FCERM GiA) and Local Levy	Environment Agency	The FCERM GiA forms part of the EA’s 6 year capital programme and is prioritised using the EA’s Partnership Funding process. “Local Levy” funding from the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (TRFCC) is also available for schemes and is again administered through the EA. Both sources of funding are used to supplement SCC’s own Capital Flood alleviation Programme.
UK Shared Prosperity Fund Investment Framework	Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities	The UKSPF has been designed to replace the EU Structural and Investment Funds. It is due to be launched in 2022.
Active Travel Fund	Department for Transport	Government’s Active Travel Fund provides Local Transport Authorities with funding for walking and cycling facilities.
Bus Service Improvement Plan	Department for Transport	Government’s bus service improvement funding allocated through the national bus strategy, ‘Bus Back Better’
Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Fund (LEVI)	Office for Zero Emission Vehicles	Funding of up to £500m across England to assist with upscaling commercial projects to install local EV chargepoints to those without access to off-street charging. The fund includes On-street residential chargepoint funding and a £50m pot to support resource with authorities.
Local Authority Treescapes Fund	Forestry Commission	The LATF provides capital funding for the establishment of trees in non-woodland settings.
Farming in Protected Landscapes Fund (FiPL)	Department of Farming, Environment and Rural Affairs	Funding for farmers and land managers in areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) for projects which support nature recovery and mitigate the impacts of climate change

**Annex 2 – List of sites receiving PSDS3 grant funding**

These buildings were selected in October 2021 following a process of prioritisation against the grant funding criteria and were determined in consultation with the Land and Property Service and Agile team. Where subsequent decisions have been made by the Council regarding disposal of

any of the buildings below, we will discuss options with Salix, who manage the PSDS3 programme on behalf of Government.

9

<b>Building name</b>
Keswick Care Home
Leatherhead Library
Chertsey Fire Station
Oxted Library
Frimley Green Library
Rylston Registry Office
Caterham Hill Library
Leatherhead Fire Station
The Bridge Youth Centre
Clifton Hill School
The Orchard Infant School
Lingfield Primary School
Oatlands School
The Pines – Surrey Arts
Dorking Nursery School