

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

April 2016

(I) PUBLIC QUESTIONS**Details of decision**

That the responses set out in Appendix1 be agreed.

Reasons for decision

To respond to the questions asked by members of the public..

Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement - 11 April 2016).

(II) AMALGAMATION OF SEND COFE (FOUNDATION) FIRST SCHOOL WITH ST BEDE'S COFE (VOLUNTARY AIDED) JUNIOR SCHOOL**Details of decision**

The Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement approved St Bede's CofE Junior (Voluntary Aided) School becoming a primary school, extending its age range to 4 to 11 years in September 2016 with a reception Published Admissions Number of 60 from September 2017 and approved the closure of Send First CofE Infant Foundation School) from September 2016.

Reasons for decision

The amalgamation of would provide continued, secure progression of primary phase education in the Send locality.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Educational Achievement - 11 April 2016).

(III) PETITION CONCERNING PROPOSED CHANGES TO LOCAL BUS SERVICES**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 – 12 April 2016)

(IV) PETITION CONCERNING COMPTON BUS REVIEW**Details of decision**

That the response attached as Appendix 3 be agreed

Reasons for decision

To respond to the petitions.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning – 12 April 2016)

(V) COMMUNITY BUILDING GRANTS SCHEME**Details of decision**

That the proposed grant funding totalling £146,840 set out in Appendix 4 is approved and that the clear reasons are given to unsuccessful applicants as to the reasons why their bid was unsuccessful.

Reasons for decision

Each year the Council commits £150,000 to the Community Building Grant Scheme. This is a tripartite grant scheme and grants are awarded for refurbishment and renovation of community buildings to widen access for community use. Any grant the County Council awards requires match funding from the Borough or District Council in which the community building resides and from the applicant organisation themselves. The scheme is administered and managed on behalf of the County Council and Borough and District Councils by Surrey Community Action.

Each year the scheme generates in excess of £500,000 of capital funding to renovate community buildings which sit at the heart of vibrant and active communities. By providing this funding there are huge benefits for the residents of Surrey in terms of community cohesion, addressing social isolation and improving the health and wellbeing of the communities.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing – 13 April 2016)

Appendix 1**CABINET MEMBER FOR SCHOOLS, SKILLS AND EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT
11 APRIL 2016****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Public Questions****Question (1) Claygate Class Action Group:**

In a BBC radio interview in 2013, Ms Kemeny stated that additional funding could be made available to Hinchley Wood to resolve the admissions issue, but expressed concern that any additional places created would go to children out of borough. Why, therefore has SCC not introduced a further admissions criteria stipulating that Surrey residents are prioritised for Surrey schools before places are offered out of Borough?

Reply:

The legal ruling referred to as The Greenwich judgement (1989) established that admission authorities must not give priority to children on the basis of whether or not they live within the LA's administrative boundaries. Whilst the subsequent Rotherham judgement (1997) established that admission authorities may operate specified catchment areas as part of their oversubscription criteria, this was on the proviso that such catchment areas were not in breach of the Greenwich judgement. In this way it would be unlawful for any admission authority to give priority to applicants on the basis of the local authority in which they live.

In any case, Hinchley Wood School is an Academy and has been so since before 2013, therefore the Governing Body is responsible for admissions to the school and for setting its own admission criteria and catchment area. Both of these are fully compliant with the Schools Admissions Code and it is therefore outside the remit of Surrey County Council to determine which children should be prioritised for a place. Nor can Surrey County Council impose different admissions criteria on an academy.

Question (2) from Claygate Class Action Group:

Given the particular circumstances of this year's intake numbers, why were year 7 numbers not under serious consideration and options consulted with parents? Surely the economic equation for funding an additional form at Hinchley Wood Secondary school is favourable to the economics of funding transport for Claygate's children daily to a school out of borough?

Reply:

Surrey County Council has a legal duty to ensure a sufficiency of school places within its area of jurisdiction. It can confirm that, overall, there are sufficient secondary school places in Elmbridge borough for September 2016. Additional places were agreed in consultation with all schools after admissions had closed but before any places were allocated. These places enabled us to meet the demand and make every parent an offer of a school place. We are mindful that every year there is around a 15% fall out from pupils not taking up places in Elmbridge schools and therefore we are likely to have some surplus places in

September. As such there was no need to consider options for additional classes after the offer day or to consult with any particular group of parents.

The law states that the local authority (ie Surrey County Council) has a duty to ensure that a school place is available for every child who wants one and we have met this duty. Whilst the Local Authority should have due regard to parental preference there is no legal requirement to offer a place at a preferred school.

Surrey County Council has no plans to expand Hinchley Wood Secondary School as this school is now an academy. Academies own or lease their buildings and land and are their own admissions authority; Surrey therefore no longer manages these schools or their sites so is not able to expand them at will. Also, from our previous experience, we suggest that there may be significant planning opposition if Hinchley Wood attempted to increase in size. The school is in a residential area, on a very restricted site and there would be increased traffic considerations; all these points would make further expansion there extremely challenging.

Question (3) from Claygate Class Action Group:

Why, when we live in KT10, attending a feeder school have we been bypassed by children out of borough? Have SCC considered annexing Claygate (as is the case with other Surrey schools) to ensure Claygate pupils are not subjected to this annual disadvantage, being denied a place at their local school?

Reply:

The admission arrangements for Hinchley Wood Secondary School provide for priority to be given to children as follows:

1. Looked after and previously looked after children
2. Exceptional circumstances
3. Siblings
4. Children who attend a feeder school who live within the catchment area
5. Other children who live within the catchment area
6. Any other applicant

It is therefore possible for some children who live in Kingston to be allocated a place under criteria 1, 2 or 3 ahead of other children in criterion 4. In addition, as the catchment area for Hinchley Wood extends slightly across the County boundary in to Kingston, (which is permissible under the Schools Admissions Code and underpinned by the Greenwich and Rotherham Judgements) it is possible for some children who live in Kingston and who attend a feeder school, to be offered a place under criterion 4, ahead of other children who live in Surrey but who live further away from the school. The setting of admission criteria is the responsibility of the school.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, under the current Schools Admissions Code to make a special case for Claygate residents to have priority admissions to Hinchley Wood over any other group of local residents.

Question (4) from Claygate Class Action Group

Can SCC give us other examples of children in Surrey who are being asked to travel in excess of 80 mins, out of borough, on public transport to attend school, passing their local school on the way?

Reply:

Surrey records the offers it makes according to the home to school distance, measured in a straight line between the child's address and the address coordinates for the school. Journey times and travel modes vary from case to case and these are not recorded on a per pupil basis. As such we are unable to provide this information. However it should be noted that many parents make applications to schools across borough boundaries and which entail journeys by public transport.

Question (5) from Claygate Class Action Group

Have SCC conducted a specific travel audit from Glebelands Claygate to Epsom and Ewell School offered to Claygate pupils? What were the results?

Reply:

No audit has taken place.

Question (6) from Claygate Class Action Group

Will SCC commit to home to school transport for Claygate children offered Epsom and Ewell to safeguard the well-being of our children?

Reply:

The Local Authority has a statutory duty to provide home to school transport to secondary aged children who travel more than three miles to school (measured by the shortest safe walking route) where they were not eligible for a place at a nearer school. Surrey will assess each child's eligibility to home to school transport according to its home to school transport policy but it is not possible to extend a commitment to every child without consideration of their circumstances.

Appendix 2Petition

It states: “**Object to the proposed changes to local bus services (paper petition)**

We object to the proposed changes to local bus services concerning residents of Dormansland which are likely to have serious consequences as we rely on hospitals, banks, building societies, supermarkets, social life/events in East Grinstead'. Bus 281- withdrawing the section of route between Lingfield and East Grinstead. Bus 509 - reduce services from East Grinstead - Lingfield - Caterham (Caterham Dene Hospital).”

Submitted by Mrs Gudrun Cundey

Signatures: 292

Response

Thank you for your petition concerning proposed changes to local bus services, in particular routes 281 and 509. In regards to concerns raised over service 281, this is a commercial route, run by Metrobus, which means that it is not funded by Surrey County Council. The reason why it was included within the public consultation, which ran from 20 January until 14 March 2016, was to inform residents and bus users as to what Metrobus plans to do. It is the prerogative of the bus operator to make the changes, which can be made with 56 days notice to the Traffic Commissioner. We have limited opportunity to influence these decisions, but all feedback received during this consultation process has been passed onto Metrobus for their consideration.

With regards to service 509, this is a service that the County Council financially supports. We welcome your feedback, and would like to assure you that all comments, responses and petitions received in the Local Transport Review public consultation will be considered when drawing up the final proposals with bus operators. Surrey County Council wishes to have services in place which are both affordable and offer best value for money for Surrey residents. The final proposals currently being drawn up will be put before Cabinet, the council's main decision body at the meeting on 24 May 2016. All agreed proposals will then be widely communicated from mid-June 2016 and will come into effect from early September 2016.

Mr Mike Goodman

Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning

12 April 2016

Appendix 3**Petition**

It states: “**Retain a public bus service in Compton Village (E-petition)**

The savings from the proposal to merge the 46 and 72 bus services have not been outlined but whether the route taken is via Compton or Peasmarsh, is unlikely to have a significant financial impact. Any savings would not make up for the negative effect on the individuals and small businesses that rely on the 46. We suggest the route taken continues to turn left onto the B3000 (from Binscombe) instead of the newly-proposed right turn via Peasmarsh, which is already serviced by other bus routes. This would ensure that the Street and Down Lane in Compton continues to receive a regular public bus service. The new proposal would mean that staff (including voluntary and low-paid) may be unable to get to work. This will affect Watts Gallery, Watts Studios at Limnerslease (newly opened), Watts Chapel, BUPA Care Home, Lemongrass Restaurant (newly opened), the Withies Inn, other small businesses and the Club and Village Hall. Some residents will be unable to access shops and places of work in Godalming and Guildford.”

Submitted by Fiona Curtis

Signatures: 516

Response

Thank you for your petition concerning the public bus service in Compton and in particular the proposal to merge routes 46 and 72. We welcome your feedback, and would like to assure you that all comments, responses and petitions received in the Local Transport Review public consultation will be considered when drawing up the final proposals with bus operators. Surrey County Council wishes to have services in place which are both affordable and offer best value for money for Surrey residents. The final proposals currently being drawn up will be put before Cabinet, the council’s main decision body at the meeting on 24 May 2016. All agreed proposals will then be widely communicated from mid-June 2016 and will come into effect from early September 2016.

Mr Mike Goodman

Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning

12 April 2016

Appendix 4

LOCAL AUTHORITY AREA	Surrey Community Buildings –Tri-Partite	Application Amount	Awarded by LA	APPROVED BY SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL	COMMENTS
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL	BLETCHINGLEY CHURCH HOUSE	7,500	7,500	7,500	Approved by DC
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL	SOPER HALL, CATERHAM	10,000	Possibly approve 10,000	10,000	Grant award from Surrey County Council is subject to match funding from Tandridge District Council.
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL	ASHTREAD PEACE MEMORIAL HALL	5,300	5,300	5,300	Approved by DC
MOLE VALLEY DISTRICT COUNCIL	GIRL GUIDING FAUREFOLD	25,000	25,000	25,000	Approved by DC
WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL	ST PETERS CHURCH	27,500	Possibly approve 27,500	27,500	Grant award from Surrey County Council is subject to match funding from Woking Borough Council.
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL	ST ANDREWS REFORMED CHURCH	20,000	20,000	20,000	Approved by BC
SURREY HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL	BISLEY VILLAGE HALL	15,540	15,540	15,540	Approved by BC
GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL	PEASLAKE VILLAGE HALL	13,908	Possibly approve 13,000	13,000	Grant award from Surrey County Council is subject to match funding from Guildford Borough Council.
GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL	WORPLESDON MEMORIAL HALL	23,784	Possibly approve 23,000	23,000	Grant award from Surrey County Council is subject to match funding from Guildford Borough Council.
GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL	CHARLOTTESVILLE JUBILEE TRUST	11,000	Unlikely to be approved	£0	AWAITING DECISION
GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL	EFFINGHAM VILLAGE RECREATION TRUST	15,880	Unlikely to be approved	£0	AWAITING DECISION
OVERALL TOTAL		173,720	146,840	£146,840	