

# Cabinet- Supplementary Agenda

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 27  
September 2022 at  
2.00 pm

**Place**

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

**Contact**

Andre Ferreira or Huma  
Younis  
Tel 07816 096705 or  
07866899016

andre.ferreira@surreycc.gov.uk  
or huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

**Chief Executive**

Joanna Killian



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

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

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

## 4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

### a Members' Questions

(Pages 1  
- 10)

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

### b Public Questions

(Pages  
11 - 18)

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

**Joanna Killian**  
**Chief Executive**  
Monday, 26 September 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 – 27 SEPTEMBER 2022****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Hazel Watson- Dorking Hills**

The Surrey County Council website section on Adult Education has details of courses in Camberley, Esher, Farnham, Guildford, Molesey, Sunbury and Woking – all of which are in the west and north of the County. There is no mention of any courses in the east of the county where, in around 2010, the County Council gave the funding, operational and strategic responsibility for adult learning to East Surrey College.

Furthermore, there has been a higher focus on core skills (English and Maths), Digital, Employability skills, Personal development and Wellbeing including courses to promote good mental health and ESOL in the courses provided by East Surrey College whilst these courses are provided alongside the more traditional courses such as foreign languages and art related courses by the County Council in West Surrey.

As the courses provided by East Surrey College are run on behalf of the County Council, can an explanation be given as to why East Surrey College is only listed on the website as one of a number of “colleges and universities” in Surrey, why the Adult Education courses that they provide are not detailed on the County Council website, and why places on these courses cannot be booked via the County Council website when the courses in West and North Surrey can be booked via the County Council website?

In addition, will a commitment be made to list all the Adult Education courses at East Surrey College that are provided for on behalf of the County Council on the County Council website by December 2022 with links from the County Council website to facilitate the easy booking of these courses?

The need to “Level Up” applies across Surrey as well as the Regions of the United Kingdom as the Leader of the County Council has stated when making the County Council’s submission for a unitary Surrey. It is never too early to start levelling up across the County and will a further commitment be given to enable all residents in Surrey to have equal access to all courses, including language and art related courses, close to where they live by the Spring Term 2023?

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council through Surrey Adult Learning works in close partnership with East Surrey College to ensure our adult learning funding and curriculum offer meets the needs of Surrey adult learners.

Adult learning is funded through the Adult Education Budget which is administered and accessed from the Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) who are part of the

Department for Education. The ESFA provide funding to Surrey Adult Learning for the west and north of the county and to East Surrey College for the rest of the county. The adult learning provision at East Surrey College is not directly or indirectly delivered on Surrey County Council's behalf nor are we involved in East Surrey College's marketing or communication operations; that is evaluated and monitored by the ESFA as the funding body.

However, we have recognised that we do need to provide a link on our website to the East Surrey College curriculum offer to support all learners in the County. We meet regularly with the senior team at East Surrey College and collaborate on programmes or projects to assist learners across the county. For instance, we have supported each other's English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) provision to meet the immediate and short term needs of Ukrainian refugees who want to learn English to access work. We appreciate this is a confusing picture and are working with East Surrey College to make it clearer and more cohesive.

We view adult learning as a vital component of the levelling up agenda. It is often the first step of learning for many adults as they progress towards improving their mental health, achieving the job of their dreams, developing their community involvement, and simply learning to improve their knowledge and wisdom. It has a primary role in the levelling up agenda for the Surrey community and it aims to provide high quality, inclusive and inspirational learning.

The focus on core skills is driven by DfE policy and legislation. The Post 16 and Skills Act 2021 and recent changes to the Adult Education Budget funding criteria give extra weight to job outcomes and further training that leads to a more sustainable job. It is imperative in Surrey to ensure we have the right mix and balance of community learning provision such as modern foreign languages and arts and crafts with adult skills provision such as English and Maths GCSEs, digital entitlement and learning English as another language.

**Clare Curran**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**27 September 2022**

**Question (2) Angela Goodwin – Guildford South West**

Recent reports suggest that the war in Ukraine has led to a shortage of essential materials, pushing up costs and delaying highway repairs.

Would the Cabinet Member confirm the extent to which works in Surrey are being affected and explain what the council is doing to mitigate the resulting impact on highway budgets and work schedules.

**Reply:**

Whilst there may be some isolated examples over recent months relating to particular specialist products, for example those related to activities such as Traffic Signals or Structures, the Council has not generally experienced any shortages of materials in delivering highway maintenance activities. In order to mitigate impacts on our programmes, officers have been working with our key contractors to ensure that we

have robust and varied supply chains in place for specialist activities. Furthermore, officers are ensuring that they take a long term view when planning schemes so that any schemes that have items with longer than usual lead in times for delivery are programmed to give sufficient time for materials and equipment to be available.

Prices have however been affected with increases in some highway sectors as high as 20% or more since January and this is particularly prevalent in surfacing activities where the oil prices and availability of bitumen have a significant impact on the end products in the form of asphalt. The Council has taken a pragmatic approach to how it manages these increases by paying the actual price each month as work is carried out rather than agreeing an inflated rate for the whole year which could result in overpaying when prices start to stabilise and reduce.

By implementing an “actual price” approach the Council has been able to secure the resource and supply chain to continue to deliver the programme of work without the risk of overpaying as a result of the hyperinflation being experienced in the sector.

With all of our highways programmes of work, officers carefully review and consider the works programmes and costs provided at the planning stage and work with our contractors to challenge material choices and design options to ensure the best value for money is achieved for all highway activities.

**Kevin Deanus**  
**Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience**  
**27 September 2022**

<b>Question (3) Catherine Baart – Earlswood and Reigate South</b>
---

- a) Please can you confirm how many Surrey children are either waiting for a decision on transport provision or organisation of agreed transport from the Home School transport team?

How many children are currently not attending school as a result?

- b) Please can you confirm what the latest situation is with regard to provision of school places for this current academic year. Have all children now been awarded school places, and if not how many of these are Ukrainian refugees?

**Reply:**

- a) There are 525 applications waiting to hear the outcome of their application for transport provision, the longest outstanding application was received in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week in August. As of 23 September, 149 are awaiting transport provision, but these figures are currently changing on a daily basis as applications are assessed and travel assistance provision is assigned to those waiting for their arrangements. A small number of these are those who have been successful in their appeal, but the majority are new approved applications.

No child should be missing their education while they wait for a decision on transport provision or agreed transport to be organised. It is the school's responsibility to ensure that the child continues to receive education. We

expect the school to work with a family on the best means of delivering education, which could include remotely, during this interval. Schools are well-practised in delivering remote education as a consequence of the Covid-19 pandemic.

- b) Surrey has one of the largest school-aged populations in the country at 199,000 children. In the state-funded sector, there are 298 primary schools, 57 secondary schools, 25 specialist schools and 13 colleges. Approximately half of our schools are academies, with the remaining half maintained by the local authority. Data released by the Department for Education in August also confirmed that Surrey has the largest number of children in the country who have arrived from Ukraine. Between 1 March and 31 August, 935 Ukrainian children and young people aged between 2 and 18 years have been accommodated in Surrey.

Within this context, our School Admissions team coordinated just over 29,000 applications for children who started in Reception, Junior or Secondary school in September 2022, known as Key Stage Transfers (KST); all received an offer on the primary and secondary national offer days in the spring. We also processed a further 1,500 late KST up to the end of August 2022.

Added to this, since the start of July, our School Admissions Team have processed in excess of 1,600 in-year applications. This is an unprecedented demand, due largely to new arrivals in Surrey, many from abroad not only from Ukraine, but also Hong Kong and Afghanistan. All applications received to the end of August 2022 have now been processed.

Our School Admissions team are currently processing the 140 children who have applications outstanding that were submitted during September 2022, and we expect to have achieved this within the 15 school days recommended by the Department for Education. All applications from vulnerable learners, including children recently arrived from Ukraine, are escalated to ensure these are processed as quickly as possible.

**Clare Curran**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**27 September 2022**

**Question (4) Catherine Baart – Earlswood and Reigate South**

Southdown Buses has suspended parts of its service in Reigate and Horley because the road surface on a number of roads is of such a poor quality it is causing damage to its buses. Given the new priorities of road users introduced by the new Local Transport Plan (LTP4), please can you advise the frequency of monitoring of road surfaces on bus routes, and whether this is changing with the introduction of the LTP4. Is there a specific central fund to ensure roads are bus routes are maintained to the required standard? What more is being done to avoid suspension/re-routing of other bus routes in Surrey due to road maintenance defects?

**Reply:**

The current Highway [hierarchy](#) includes consideration of regular/busy bus routes and the roads in question are categorised as 4a according to our Surrey Priority Network rating. 4a category roads are subject to [safety inspections](#) every 3 months and any safety defects identified during the inspection will then be scheduled for repair. Officers have confirmed that the inspection and repair of any safety defects has been carried out on these roads as expected.

Officers are reviewing a range of highway policies following the introduction of LTP4 to determine any changes that should be made to align them with the aspirations of LTP4. This review is ongoing and will include how public transport and active travel assets are inspected and maintained.

There is no specific central fund to ensure that bus routes are maintained, however the Surrey Priority Network rating is included as a prioritisation category within the Highway [Prioritisation Criteria](#) and therefore when determining our Horizon programme of road maintenance, a bus route would receive a higher score than a road of similar condition and priority which was not part of a bus route.

All of the roads on the bus routes that have been affected have been reviewed and where required maintenance works are being planned. Resurfacing of Holly Road is planned for October 2022, Hornbeam Road and Blackthorne Road will receive patching works where needed in the coming months and Upfield and Cheyne Walk are being assessed for any required patching works.

The course of action from the bus operator to alter routes is highly irregular and unfortunately has negatively impacted on the service provided to residents on this occasion. Officers continue to have regular engagement with bus operators and encourage the reporting of road maintenance issues as early as possible to enable further assessment and remedial works to be planned where this is considered necessary.

**Matt Furniss**

**Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth**

**27 September 2022**

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

Felling of trees at the former Friends Provident site at Pixham Lane, Dorking, may have increased the value of this site, which is part of the Surrey County Council's property investment vehicle. As this site is being disposed of by Surrey County Council, please provide details of the latest site valuation and confirm what increase in value is anticipated for the site?

**Reply:**

Unconditional contracts have already been exchanged to sell the whole campus, therefore any increase or decrease in the value of the site after exchange is not a consideration in relation to the disposal. The trees which were removed did not

have Tree Protection Orders at the exchange date, therefore the purchaser is likely to have considered this to be developable area, therefore the full value for the site has already been secured.

The sale price of the site is commercially sensitive (Part 2 exempt) but this can be provided to Cllr Baart separately and in confidence.

**Natalie Bramhall**  
**Cabinet Member for Property and Waste**  
**27 September 2022**

**Question (6) Jonathan Essex – Redhill East**

How has the transport modelling required by Surrey County Council changed as a result of the approval of the new Local Transport Plan (LTP4), including that commissioned to inform the design of road infrastructure improvements? In particular, how is the carbon impact of investments in the road transport now modelled? To what extent is transport modelling now required to quantify how investments prioritise public transport, in accordance with the changed hierarchy of road users, detailed in LTP4?

**Reply:**

Transport modelling methodology is governed by the Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) issued by the Department for Transport, which includes how carbon impacts are measured: therefore, the modelling approach remains unchanged by LTP4. SCC's county transport model conforms to this guidance and allows us to quantify the effects of implementing measures and deliberate different scenarios. Consequently, the modelling is an informative tool to help consider which interventions may be best to achieve SCC's LTP4 ambitions, including changes in carbon emissions and choice of travel.

**Matt Furniss**  
**Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth**  
**27 September 2022**

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

The Lakers Centre site in Goldsworth Park, Woking had been empty for a number of years after a fire, before being demolished earlier this year. Can the Cabinet Member give an update on what the site is going to be used for, when a decision will be made, and whether there will be any community consultation before final decisions are implemented on its eventual use.

**Reply:**

The Lakers Centre site has been identified by the Council's Adult Social Care service for potential development as a site for Short Breaks (respite care). A business case is being prepared which is expected to go to Cabinet by the end of 2022. A Stakeholder Community Involvement exercise will take place as part of the

overall planning process to make residents aware of the plans and give them the opportunity to comment and raise questions.

**Natalie Bramhall**  
**Cabinet Member for Property and Waste**  
**27 September 2022**

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

Part of the Greener Futures Delivery Plan it was envisaged that a number of solar farms would be deployed across Surrey to meet the needs of the council in reducing the energy costs, and potentially generating income for sales of spare capacity.

As the cost of energy has risen dramatically since these plans were envisaged, and hence the business case must have improved dramatically what plans does the council have to expedite the roll out of the solar farms and further solar panel installations on council owned land and properties.

**Reply:**

Councillor Spencer is correct that the business case for the installation of solar has improved due to the increase in the cost of electricity, despite the additional significant increases in materials and labour for solar PV as well as other measures.

The Council remains committed to installing solar PV on council owned land and properties in order to meet our 2030 net zero carbon target, reduce the Council's corporate electricity expenditure and to generate income where possible which can be used to fund more costly decarbonisation measures and provide additional income for the Council.

The Council recently installed PV on 5 buildings with funding from Governments Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS), this included the installation of a 100kWp solar canopy at Quadrant Court and 4 solar rooftops with a total installed capacity of 176kWp. A second 100kWp solar canopy has been granted planning permission for Woodhatch and will be installed before the end of the year.

The Council has been working with consultants to identify the Council owned land most suited for solar farms. Initially 64 suitable sites were identified, these sites have been shortlisted and are being assessed for suitability by the District Network Operator (DNO) and Planning. Once this exercise has been completed the three most suitable sites will be taken forward for design and the development of a business case. Other potential sites will be considered in later phases. The Council plans to install a minimum of 30MWp of solar capacity in solar farms by 2030.

In addition to the ground mounted solar arrays the Council is also moving forward will roof mounted solar. We are currently working on the procurement of solar rooftops or carports in 13 SCC buildings and 5 schools, with the expectation that

installation will be completed in mid-2023. Additionally, we are currently developing a specification for a turnkey solar installer to design and install solar PV on a 30 further rooftops. Additional solar installation will be incorporated into the scope of Project Indigo, the outsourcing of FM services, which will enable future tranches of buildings and schools to receive solar PV.

In addition to council owned land, the Council's recent Solar Together scheme resulted in the installation of 5.6MW solar on domestic rooftops across the county in just over a year, mobilising around £8m in private investment. This equates to approximately 50% of Surrey's total domestic installed PV capacity. The Council is preparing for future schemes to enable households to access subsidised solar PV.

The intention is to look at how we can expand our solar PV programme beyond what we have already factored in. This will include: a policy of all SCC buildings having solar PV where appropriate if we are not selling them; exploring at scale bulk schemes and financing for schools and potential joint investment or financing schemes for projects with other buildings/land owners including other local authorities/parishes, businesses, business parks, farms and community buildings.

**Marisa Heath**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment**  
**27 September 2022**

<b>Question (9) Lance Spencer – Goldsworth East and Horsell Village</b>
---

Can the Cabinet Member state how many cases are now waiting to be reviewed by the Home to School Appeals Panel, and how many were outstanding at the start of the new term. What is the average wait time from appeal request to appeal being heard by the Panel and how old is the oldest appeal request.

**Reply:**

There are currently 138 outstanding Stage 1 appeals (Pre 16 and Post 16 eligibility). 106 appeals had been submitted before the start of term. There are 14 outstanding stage two appeals. We aim to hear all outstanding stage one appeals by the 30 September with outcomes issued to parents and carers. All parents affected have been notified of this deadline.

Based on the 250+ appeals received in 2022 the average waiting time is between 15-60 working days. Some appeals have taken a lot longer to consider, whereas some have been considered within 5-10 working days. Factors impacting on timeframe include at what point during the academic year an appeal is submitted, as we receive a higher number in the spring and summer terms.

The earliest appeal request is from June 2022. National Guidance advises that stage one appeals should be considered within 20 working days, although in some cases where a case is complex, this deadline may be extended. We also advise that appeal deadlines may be extended during very busy periods.

**Clare Curran**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**

**Question (10) Lance Spencer – Goldsworth East and Horsell Village**

There are a number of children who should be attending school but who unfortunately are not able to because of Emotionally Based School Non Attendance. Can the Cabinet Member state how many children fall into this category across Surrey and whether the number of children has increased since the Covid issues.

**Reply:**

We know that the emotional and mental health needs among young people in Surrey have been exacerbated by both the pandemic and the impacts of social media. This is a national issue.

Our response in Surrey has been both proactive and multi-agency, reflecting the complexity of the factors that influence whether a child feels able to attend school. A recent Family Voice survey (our Parent Carer Forum) indicated that even highly anxious children can attend school with the right support. Mindworks, our mental health provider for children, has developed a specific school-based service which we have supplemented with Emotionally Based School Non-Attendance (EBSNA) training for schools. Our Educational Psychology Service has developed a range of resources and tools to support children with anxiety and mental health needs who are or are at risk of avoiding school. These provide strategies that schools can use to re-engage children back into education.

We have also established an innovative multi-agency working group to lead our response to children experiencing EBSNA. It is made up of representatives from schools, support services, Third Sector organisations, Health, Early Help and Children Service. The group has mapped services against levels of need and provides schools with a Directory of services which can offer support to children experiencing EBSNA. It has provided good practice examples of interventions which have successfully supported children and young people experiencing EBSNA. It also ensures services regularly check in with parents and children who are experiencing EBSNA to know if we are making a difference.

There is no national definition of 'EBSNA' and DfE does not require schools to identify if a child is absent for emotionally based reasons. From our and our partners' experience, EBSNA can cover a range of behaviours and needs – from those who are on a Neuro-developmental pathway (this can mean the identification and assessment of additional needs linked to ASD or ADHD) to children who have suffered trauma. Defining whether a child or young person is experiencing EBSNA can often be subjective. One of the aims of the multi-agency group is developing a better definition of EBSNA and a recording mechanism across services to identify the numbers of children experiencing EBSNA.

We have experienced a 28% increase in referrals from schools for non-attendance since September 2021, over the last academic year. This is an addition of 500 referrals over the previous 2020/21 academic year. At the end of the Academic

Year the Inclusion Service were actively working with 1805 families. We have also experienced an increase in referrals to our Access to Education service from schools citing 'child or young person being unfit to attend school.' Access to Education are working with 46 children who are currently medically unfit to attend school, the majority are CYP experiencing EBSNA.

Regardless of whether a child is identified as EBSNA, support such as that described above is available. We also provide support to the families of children who are electively home educated, which may be a consequence of EBSNA. Surrey, like many other areas, did experience an increase in the numbers of children and young people being withdrawn from school to be Electively Home Educated during the pandemic. This trend has now slowed down and there is evidence to suggest children are returning to school; 245 children returned to a school roll in academic year 2021/22.

**Clare Curran**  
**Cabinet Member for Education and Learning**  
**27 September 2022**

## CABINET – 27 SEPTEMBER 2022

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

4b

Public Questions**Question (1): Anne- Marie Griffin**

11 women a day die from ovarian cancer in the UK. Less than 1/4 are diagnosed in early stage when the cancer is easier to treat.

Unfortunately there are some myths around the symptoms of ovarian cancer, such as they cannot be identified until it is too late, but this is not correct in most cases. The main 4 symptoms are:

- Bloating tummy
- Always feeling full
- Needing to wee more
- Tummy pain

Awareness of the symptoms is key to reducing late diagnosis and unnecessary deaths.

Surrey Heartlands CCG 2015-2017 statistics showed:

- 326 women were diagnosed with ovarian cancer.
- Only 27% of women were diagnosed early, stage I or II.

Nationwide:

- Over 4,000 women lose their lives each year.
- if diagnosed at the earliest stage, 9 in 10 women will survive. But 2/3s are diagnosed late, when cancer is harder to treat.
- Nearly half of GPs (44 per cent) mistakenly believe symptoms only present in the later stages of ovarian cancer.

I am an ovarian cancer survivor of stage 1A, yet my diagnosis took a very long time, and I was forced to pay for a private scan as my then GP failed to recognise that the 20cm tummy mass and other symptoms all indicated ovarian cancer. At that point I could barely breath due to the tumour pushing up against my lungs, yet I was left waiting for a scan for over 7 weeks as a non urgent case. Even when the private scan identified the 20cm tumour, the GP told me, it was nothing sinister as the blood tumour marker CA125 had been normal. Up to 20% of ovarian cancers do not show on CA125 tumour marker blood tests, so they cannot be relied upon as a sole indicator. I had however been exhibiting growing symptoms for around 2 years and presented them repeatedly.

I have been in contact with Surrey Heartlands CCG, for a year regarding this, and they have so far not been willing to change anything about their current ovarian cancer communications or awareness raising. I have instead received a list of the activities they carry out, but with no acknowledgement that this is not having a positive impact on reducing the amount of women diagnosed in late stage or diagnosed late.

I have also asked for Mr Crispin Blunt MP, to assist me in raising awareness, but he appeared unwilling to speak up on my behalf to the CCG or anywhere else and responded referring me to the CCG and NHS England. I had already submitted a question to the CCG Board Meeting at that point. It took 10 months, and with chasing, for the CCG to provide the answer to me that they had stated they would provide to me in the June 2021 board meeting. I am not aware that they have taken any action at all to improve earlier diagnosis in response to my communication, not even to review it.

The CCG were made aware that Target Ovarian Cancer, the charity, offer a professional toolkit to GPs and healthcare professionals for free and also support and advice. This could not only save lives but also healthcare costs. We really need urgent action.

Does Surrey County Council run any awareness projects on Ovarian Cancer, and do they measure the outcomes of such projects, if not would they be willing to look into ways of raising ovarian cancer awareness in Surrey?

**Reply:**

Firstly, I would like to thank Ms. Griffin for the information provided about Ovarian Cancer and in sharing details of her own personal experience. We were concerned to hear of the difficulties she experienced and that on behalf of the Council we wish her well with her recovery.

We recognise the importance of early cancer detection. Surrey County Council's Public Health Team Service Plan 2022-23 includes strategic and operational objectives to promote early cancer awareness and to support communication campaigns on cancer prevention. A link to the Service Plan is below: [Public Health Service Plan 2022-23 \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/public-health/service-plan-2022-23). The Public Health Team also work closely with NHS partners, specifically the Surrey and Sussex Cancer Alliance and the Surrey Heartlands Cancer Screening & Early Diagnosis Sub-Group on this important area.

Currently awareness campaigns are not specific for ovarian cancer and therefore we are not able to report on any related outcomes. To help improve this, through close partnership with the Surrey Heartlands Cancer Screening & Early Diagnosis Sub-Group, the Surrey County Council Public Health Team will look into increasing awareness of ovarian cancer, and other cancers, as part of their health promotion campaign plan, utilising various media outlets and linking to various organisations and charities such as the NHS, Macmillan cancer support, Cancer Research UK, Ovacom, Target Ovarian Cancer and Eve Appeal. A cancer awareness page on the

[Healthy Surrey](#) website will also be developed, where information, advice and campaign information can be accessed.

All the activities will be monitored and evaluated to assess impact.

**Mark Nuti**  
**Cabinet Member for Adults and Health**  
**27 September 2022**

**Question (2): Malcolm Robertson**

The County Council and its contractor Suez operate 15 recycling centres across Surrey. Some incorporate bulking facilities, however there is only one so called 'eco park' at Charlton Lane, Shepperton.

To make it an 'eco park', the site incorporates an incinerator - also known as a gasifier, and an anaerobic digester. Although they generate electricity from waste, they use vast quantities of climate changing fossil fuel called gasoil ( - a type of heating oil or diesel) to do so.

Neither process is environmentally friendly. The incinerator needs gasoil to start up the fire, keep it up to temperature, and even to shut it down. During the first five months of this year it used over 380,000 litres of fuel, the equivalent of the tanks of almost 7,000 medium sized cars. In effect what comes out of the chimney are the pollutants from the burnt waste together with the exhaust from thousands of diesel cars.

Surprisingly the anaerobic digester isn't self-supporting, and needs gasoil to fuel the backup heater of its food waste. There is insufficient gas storage and so, on occasion, excess gas is flared off, sending unfiltered exhaust gases skyward, in a process considered illegal in some countries.

To call it an 'eco park' is greenwash. It's a practice to which the County should never have stooped. It was dreamt up to persuade local people to accept the presence of an incinerator in their community. To accept the unacceptable. The plant is unsustainable, and uses colossal amounts of fossil fuel to contribute to climate change.

Now that it can be seen 'eco park' is a description which should be consigned to the dustbin of the past, will the County Council remove the name 'eco park' from all literature and property it possesses, and as a first step and sign of good faith, arrange for the 6.5 metre tall sign erected on Surrey land outside the site to be removed forthwith.

**Reply:**

The Eco Park development at Charlton Lane is an important contributor to meeting the strategic waste objectives of Surrey County Council as set out in the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. The anaerobic digester and gasifier at the

4b

Eco Park treat waste which would otherwise be landfilled (or incinerated elsewhere) and both facilities generate electricity in the process. The use of gasoil is for the safe heating of the equipment prior to feeding in waste and for cooling it down slowly to allow maintenance.

The visible 'smoke' seen coming out of the chimney (or 'stack') is mostly treated ('cleaned') water vapour which is more visible in colder temperatures, and any residual emissions remaining after treatment are only those permitted by the Environment Agency and are constantly and carefully monitored.

The Council has no immediate plans to rebrand the Eco Park or remove current signage but is considering how best to develop the wider site now that the construction phase of the main facilities is complete. The Council will engage with the local community to look at opportunities to develop these plans including additional landscaping.

**Natalie Bramhall**  
**Cabinet Member for Property and Waste**  
**27 September 2022**

**Question (3): Paul Kennedy**

In terms of NHS services and public health provision, Mole Valley is one of the most deprived and underfunded districts in Surrey, with a widespread perception that its residents are taken for granted by national Government and MPs.

Given Surrey County Council's responsibility for commissioning and coordinating public health services in Mole Valley, will Cabinet authorise its Local Committee to establish a working group consisting of local county and district councillors, and others as appropriate, to take the lead in:

- addressing the lack of GP provision in Mole Valley, tackling waiting times and securing effective access to secondary/tertiary care;
- working with local integrated health and care partners to assess and secure Mole Valley's neighbourhood and preventative care needs?

**Reply:**

Thank you for your question and for highlighting the importance of ensuring we focus on areas of deprivation and the resulting inequality that do unfortunately exist across Surrey. The contributory factors to this are clearly wide ranging and as you rightly indicate it is important that a collaborative approach is adopted if we are going to have any chance of making a difference. Encouragingly the recently refreshed [local health and wellbeing strategy for Surrey](#) provides a focus on reducing health inequality through specifying a number of priority populations including particular areas across Surrey. Alongside this, it also highlights the importance of communities

needing to have a lead role within this if any action taken is going to have a real impact.

In relation to greater collaboration on this work, this is being taken forward through the new local integrated arrangements that are forming across the county at a more local level. Having shared your question with colleagues in the area they recognize all the points you are making and have confirmed that work is happening to strengthen the relationship between Mole Valley Borough Council and Surrey Downs Place (Health) both in relation to membership on the place board and also establishing a local neighbourhood / Mole Valley integrated leadership group. Rather than establishing a new working group therefore, the latter is encouragingly already in the process of forming and will be the most appropriate place to hold these partnership discussions to address the points you raise whilst also ensuring they include and engage communities and use this insight to understand how best to improve the multiple factors that drive such inequality and factors of deprivation.

**Mark Nuti**  
**Cabinet Member for Adults and Health**  
**27 September 2022**

**Question (4): Sally Blake**

In late July/early August, about 70 mature tree trunks were cut down in Blackberry Wood, Norbury Park, in an area of Ancient Woodland and Priority Habitat, with no public Rights of Way. The wood is alongside a Site of Special Scientific Interest and Special Area of Conservation. Many of the trees were more than 100 years old, and the cut wood shows they were healthy. They supported complete ancient woodland ecosystems, so ecologically they were invaluable. The Council has confirmed they were not felled due to ash dieback. They were felled to prevent the possibility of damage to a tenant farmer's barbed wire fence, to protect sheep, even though there are no roads nearby.

These trees had a large value left in place. Mature trees sequester far more carbon, now, if retained, than large numbers of small whips being planted under the Council's New Tree Strategy. Many of the whips will not have survived Surrey's drought. The others will not reach maturity for many years - future droughts willing. Ancient trees support massive biodiversity. Mature trees cleanse the air of pollutants.

As set out in the Greener Futures Strategy, climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution should be prioritised in all decisions in the Council's nature sites. Otherwise, they will cause an increasing number of deaths and costs from heatwaves, droughts, food and water shortages, diseases, floods, sea level rises and wildfires.

This exercise in Norbury Park did not prioritise these issues in that

- the trees were cut down rather than the fence being replaced with a more robust one

- the cut wood may now be burned as biomass and emit greenhouse gases, rather than being left in place, environmentally better
- there was no tree survey to determine trees to be felled, with their characteristics and location, and balancing their value to climate change, biodiversity and pollution against their risk to sheep
- there was no ecological survey when there are rare plants, insects and birds, and protected bats, dormice and badgers, living there
- the work was carried out at a time when birds were still nesting and at prime time for bat activity
- the contractors were employed by a third party who wanted the trees felled, which would not have satisfied the Environmentally Sustainable Procurement Policy you are considering today.

Please would you advise why the Council handled this exercise in this very concerning way and provide reassurance that projects at this and other Surrey nature sites will in future be handled professionally to prioritise climate change, biodiversity and pollution.

**Reply:**

On the 1st August 2022 approximately 25 diseased (predominantly ash) trees were removed from Blackberry Wood in Norbury Park. Blackberry Wood is located next to, but not within the park's Site of Special Scientific Interest or the Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment Special Area of Conservation.

Following initial discussions with the Countryside Operations Team the works were carried out by a contractor employed by one of our tenant farmers to repair damaged fencing and prevent further damage to fencing as a result of failed or failing trees located along the fence line. The farm is operational, and the fencing prevents grazing sheep from straying and protects them from such things as dog attacks.

A felling license was in place and the necessary works took place outside the defined season for bird nesting. The site of operation falls outside the boundary of the SSSI and therefore Natural England consent is not a requirement. Only dead or dying trees, and then only those that could damage or threaten the integrity of the fence, were removed. Not all trees with ash die back are leafless or look diseased to the untrained eye. Signs of the disease are more commonly found in the branch nodes so a tree can easily be mistaken for not being affected by the disease when, in fact, its structural integrity has already been undermined, posing a threat to safety or property.

However, the Council does recognise that permission for tree removal on its sites requires a more rigorous approval process due to proximity to sensitive areas which should include an ecological assessment. A revised process, which will require Director sign off before any felling occurs, will be for immediate implementation. The full process will be outlined in the Council's new Land Management Policy which will be consulted upon in the Spring.

The felling was not part of the Council's ash die back programme due to commence this autumn. Works under this programme continue to be drafted in consultation with the Forestry Commission, Natural England and the Norbury Park Community Forum. A

specialist Ecologist is currently being recruited to oversee contractual works and the Council's arborists are advising on which trees it will be absolutely necessary to remove from the park. Residents and stakeholders will be invited to informative walks about ask die back tree removal on Council owned sites from late November this year.

4b

**Marisa Heath**  
**Cabinet Member for Environment**  
**27 September 2022**

This page is intentionally left blank