

## **CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS**

**March 2016**

### **(I) AMALGAMATION THE WILLOWS AND WEY VALLEY COLLEGE**

#### **Details of decision**

That the Statutory Notice stating the Local Authority's intention to amalgamate the two Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) is determined, such that there will be one PRU in the south west area from 1 April 2016. The single establishment will be based across two sites: the primary provision at the Pewley Hill site and the secondary provision at the Southway site.

#### **Reasons for decision**

This will lead to streamlined PRU provision in the south west area of Surrey which replicates that in the south east area. All pupils at risk of permanent exclusion in the area will be supported under the same leadership

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement - 3 March 2016).*

### **(II) PROPOSED EXPANSION OF FURZEFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL**

#### **Details of decision**

That the Cabinet Member determines the Statutory Notice, thereby bringing into effect the formal expansion of Furzefield Primary School by 1 Form of Entry (1 FE) for September 2016.

#### **Reasons for decision**

There is an increasing demand for primary school places in Merstham as well as the wider Reigate and Redhill area, which reflects a rise in the primary-age population over recent years. In order to meet this demand, there is a need to expand school capacity in the area. The proposal to expand the capacity of Furzefield Primary School by 1 FE is a core element of Surrey County Council's (SCC) strategy in this respect. In line with this, SCC has undertaken the requisite statutory consultation to inform the decision making process and a single formal objection was received as part of this. For these reasons, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member determines the Statutory Notice (appended to this report as Annex 1), so as to bring the expansion of the school formally into effect.

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement – 3 March 2016)*

### **(III) PETITION CONCERNING PROPER PLANNING ANALYSIS**

#### **Details of decision**

That the response attached as Appendix 1 be agreed

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petitions.

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning – 8 March 2016)*

**(IV) PETITION CONCERNING COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES**

**Details of decision**

That the response attached as Appendix 2 be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning – 8 March 2016)*

**(V) PETITION CONCERNING EXCETERA BUSES**

**Details of decision**

That the response attached as Appendix 3 be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding – 9 March 2016)*

**(VI) PETITION CONCERNING TRAFFIC MODELLING STATISTICS**

**Details of decision**

That the response attached as Appendix 4 be agreed.

**Reasons for decision**

To respond to the petition.

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding – 9 March 2016)*

**(VII) REVIEW OF A322 SPEED LIMIT DECISION TAKEN BY SURREY HEATH LOCAL COMMITTEE**

**Details of decision**

That the Cabinet Member does not endorse the decision taken by Surrey Heath Local Committee to reduce the speed limit to 30mph and that the speed limit remains at 40mph.

### **Reasons for decision**

The decision taken by the Surrey Heath Local Committee is contrary to existing County Council policy and the professional views of both Surrey Highways officers and Surrey Police.

Based on comparative is likely to result in an increase in vehicle speeds and an increased risk to pedestrians and other highway user groups.

Without physical traffic calming measures, which are largely not appropriate for this class of road, this would also lead to high levels of non-compliance, and ongoing enforcement issues for Surrey Police.

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding – 9 March 2016)*

### **(VIII) EMERGENCY SERVICES COLLABORATION – INTEGRATED FUEL MANAGEMENT**

#### **Details of decision**

That the Cabinet Member for Localities and Communities Wellbeing approve the implementation of the integrated fuel management solution through:

- Rationalising bunkered fuel sites across the Emergency Services Collaboration Programme (ESCP) partners, replacing those required;
- enabling access between the ESCP partners to each others' sites for refuelling;
- The joint procurement of bulk fuel with the ESCP partners through an existing Crown Commercial Services' Framework; and
- The joint procurement with the ESCP partners of fuel controller units for the bulk fuel tanks and a fuel management system.

#### **Reasons for decision**

This work forms part of and is aligned to the wider public services reform agenda and it is important to note that whilst the proposal can be delivered independently, it supports and enables a wider inter-linked series of activities. Aligning these processes and procedures offers the opportunity to facilitate a future Integrated Transport Function between partners.

*(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Localities and Communities Wellbeing – 9 March 2016)*

**Appendix 1**

**RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING PROPER PLANNING ANALYSIS**

**The Petition**

We the undersigned request that Surrey County Council officers who are consulted by Borough Council Planning Officers regarding current planning applications, conduct a proper analysis of the circumstances relating to that planning application, in order to give a full and informed response. A review of the information supplied by developers or their agents should not be the sole means of assessing the issues prior to making comments or advising that the officer has no objections. The investigations should include a site visit at the most sensible times (e.g. during peak travel periods for traffic related issues), and Officers should request further time to conduct surveys or source further information where required. Due regard should also be given to relevant issues raised in representations from local members of the public.

Submitted by Dianne Doney

Signatures: 202 signatures

**Response**

Surrey County Council are a Statutory Consultee of each of the 12 local planning authorities within Surrey. The Transport Development Planning Team have the responsibility to respond on those applications which are "likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic entering or leaving a classified road of proposed highway, and development involving the formation, laying out or alteration of any means of access to a highway.....and development which consists of or includes the laying out or construction of a new street." This criteria on which a consultation is based is reasonably tight, and often the team comment on a considerably wider scope of development to better meet with the expectations of the wider public and local residents who expect a greater involvement. The comments which are finally made to the local planning authority are the result of often extensive analysis of a combination of information. The starting point has to be the application as submitted, which has to be assessed, and this has to be accepted. Having said that, we do use a wealth of information to inform the analysis. That information is derived from the County's own data bases of traffic flows and accidents. We also make use of the nationally accepted TRICS database, which is the UK and Ireland's national system of trip generation analysis, containing over 7,150 directional transport surveys at over 110 types of development. It enables us to challenge and validate assumptions about the transport impacts of new developments, and where such assessments are undertaken, this is frequently done.

Where the sites are not previously known, site visits are always undertaken. For practical reasons, they cannot always be carried out at peak times, but officers are very much aware of the different conditions that occur at Peak times. The important point to understand is that the analysis is always undertaken at peak times. If further information is required, then this is requested of the applicant. Likewise, relevant representations made by the public are considered by the team. Frequently, the contents of these representations reflect the starting point of the County's concerns.

The final response is made in the light of the fact that objections can only be raised where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. It needs to be understood, that though a local network might be congested, even heavily congested at peak times, unless the net impact of a development is deemed to be severe, the proposal cannot be refused on those grounds. It is therefore better to expend resources in securing a damage limitation solution through appropriate mitigation.

**Mr Mike Goodman**

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning**

**8 March 2016**

**RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES****The Petition**

We call upon Surrey County Council and its District Councils to reconsider the proposals to charge for DIY 'non-household waste' from private individuals homes and/or reduce opening hours at Surrey Community Recycling Centres (CRCs). We ask that neither of these proposals is implemented. We ask that CRC opening hours remain the same and the current policy of no charges for 'non-household waste' remain in place. We do not believe the current consultation on these matters is adequate since it only offers these 2 unacceptable options and is therefore not a genuine consultation. The consultation will provide no valid conclusion and is set up only to give the answer desired. We believe that implementing a charge

Submitted by Clayton Wellman

Signatures: 1580 signatures

**Response**

Increased demand for essential services, coupled with reduced government funding, means Surrey County Council needs to reduce its spending on community recycling centres. The proposed changes are intended to help Surrey County Council make critical savings while still maintaining a comprehensive service for residents. The changes were agreed by the councils Cabinet in November 2015 after carefully considering the results of the public consultation. A 'do nothing' option was not included in the consultation as this would not achieve any savings.

Many of our neighbouring authorities have either implemented or are considering similar changes to the operation of their recycling centres. We do not believe that the changes will result in any increase in fly tipping but we will monitor this closely. We are already working with district and borough councils, the police and the Environment Agency to develop a county-wide fly tipping prevention strategy which will improve our response to this anti-social crime.

**Mr Mike Goodman**

**Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning**

**8 March 2016**

**RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING EXCETERA BUSES**

Excetera buses are the contractors for the school buses to St Andrews school in Ashtead - the service and communication has been mostly appalling from the start of the school year. We have seen the fares double in price and yet still the bus drivers are not trained to an acceptable and safe standard with drivers not knowing the routes and missing out sections of bus stops until the children point this out to them. The service is often late because of the above and therefore unreliable resulting in the children being left at bus stops for long periods of time with no idea when a bus may arrive and missing the start of school on a very regular basis. The communication with the company is poor - emails are never responded to and calls to the office often go unanswered when trying to complain. We believe this service is unacceptable for our children and too expensive to continue to pay for unless some drastic improvements are made.

Submitted by Anna Smith

Signatures: 139 signatures

**Response**

The local bus services to St Andrews School, Ashtead provided by Buses Excetera are operated on a wholly commercial basis. Surrey County Council does not contract or fund these bus services and therefore it has no direct control over their operation or delivery. However, the County Council does understand the concerns expressed by parents and has entitled pupils allocated to these services so also wishes to improve the delivery of these important local bus services. A meeting is therefore proposed, facilitated by the Council, between Buses Excetera, parent representatives together with St Andrew's School to discuss the concerns highlighted in the petition and to agree how collectively improvements can be made and the services grown to benefit pupils and St Andrew's School in the future.

Looking specifically at the issue of fares, during the summer of 2015 Buses Excetera reviewed all their local bus services. The company maintained that in order to keep these services operating commercially they needed to increase their revenue. As a result the company decided that they had been charging below the average fare charged by most other operators in the County and implemented a fares review. Although the County Council has no jurisdiction over commercial bus operations, the Council suggested to the company that two smaller fares increases be implemented, however they choose to implement one large fares increase. The initial increase was therefore implemented in September 2015.

The current weekly pass for school children is £15 (£3 per day) and is also valid for travel at weekends on Buses Excetera services.

The 'annual Excetera plus pass' is £510 per year (£2.68 per day). Termly and half termly passes are available at £180 or £90 respectively, which is equivalent to £2.84 per day. These passes also offer the following benefits:

- Season ticket that will save you money
- Stop having to find cash for your children each day
- Valid during half term to travel on Buses Excetera regular bus services
- Valid weekends to travel on Buses Excetera regular bus services
- Photographic Excetera School Plus ID.
- Free Travel for pass holder & ONE friend on any of Buses Excetera's regular bus services at weekends.

**Mr John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Planning**  
**9 March 2016**



**RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING TRAFFIC MODELLING STATISTICS****The Petition**

We the undersigned call upon Surrey County Council to agree to undertake traffic monitoring around all new development sites: 1 month after release of each phase for large, phased developments, or completion for smaller sites and again 3 months after full occupation, to validate the data provided by the developer at the time of the application and to assess whether the input data was accurate or flawed, or whether the modelling software used by developers requires to be adapted. This information should include a manual count travel direction survey for larger sites of 50+ new homes, and large retail, school, offices or similar buildings. The results are to be compiled into a report, to include accident statistics in the vicinity of the new development, and the incremental traffic increases since the last traffic surveys in the vicinity. The report is to be published on Surrey County Council's website within two calendar months of each survey and provided to all SCC Highways Officers responsible for assessing the suitability of planning applications, and all Borough Councils' planning departments, for informing their decisions regarding new planning applications.

Submitted by Diane Doney

Signatures: 128

**Response**

This is a pertinent issue and something that comes up from time to time. It is not a practical suggestion, even taking the view that it might be a good idea. It would involve SCC in a great deal of expense at a time when SCC needs to make savings.

It would be impossible, impractical, and too expensive for Surrey to initiate such a data collecting exercise after every development over a certain size was fully opened. However, on those large scale developments with travel plans, we do ask for post opening surveys, that do provide some information that could be used as an after study to compare the forecast with the predicted. However, where these are carried out, there is never any analysis undertaken to compare the original Transport Assessment, with what actually happens on site. To do this would require an unenforceable condition, so we could never require it of a developer.

Surrey are co-owners of TRICS, which is the world's largest database of exactly the sort of information that the petition is seeking. The database is a very comprehensive collection of counts of all sorts of development related traffic and people movements, but does not specifically look back at original Transport Assessments that justified the development in the first instance. TRICS information is used as a matter of course in every planning application of any scale to assess exactly what the likely traffic impacts might be. However it is unlikely that outcomes derived from a post opening survey would exactly coincide with the modelled flows from the planning application, as flows are never going to be replicated in their entirety for a whole variety of reasons. It is always understood that the TRICS output data will provide a starting point for any assessments, and a before and after comparison could generate disputes that were beyond the control of the planning system. We don't therefore ask for after TRICS surveys unless they're required as part of the travel planning monitoring process, or to trigger a piece of mitigation or financial contribution.

Having said that, TRICS is looking to potentially research whether post studies could usefully draw any comparison with Transport Assessments undertaken in support of an application, and if there is an opportunity to require such work to be done as follow up to an application then this will be considered.

**Mr John Furey**  
**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Planning**  
**9 March 2016**