

CABINET – 29 October 2019**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Andrew Povey (Cranleigh & Ewhurst):**

Cranleigh Primary School:

There is considerable concern within Cranleigh regarding this proposal. In particular the proposed new site has a very constrained access. It is felt that children will be put in danger because of the lack of access, the road design and the considerable congestion caused by the position of the access, the proximity of other schools and the extra traffic generated by the proposed new housing.

Can the cabinet reassure parents that the planning application for this proposed new school will include a detailed, comprehensive, legally enforceable travel plan that satisfies parents concerns?

What are the predicted numbers of primary school children going forward? (The last update to Waverley local committee showed no increase)

Reply:

The proximity of the other schools is a challenge currently, with the same schools being present now, and in the future. The design for the relocated school has taken into account the issues around travelling to and from the school site.

Cabinet can reassure parents that the planning application for the relocated school does include a detailed and comprehensive school travel plan. It is usual that planning conditions issued, as part of any decision granting permission, dictate that travel plans are implemented and updated on a regular basis. It must be borne in mind that schools have the ability to influence parental behaviours when travelling to and from school, but cannot enforce parental behaviours. It is for all members of the community to ensure that we all take responsibility for our behaviours, and act considerately and appropriately.

Dr Povey has previously asked for and received information around place planning and timescales. The forecasts show the primary numbers in the Cranleigh area are increasing mid –year currently and year on year into the future. Reception places are near capacity and will be above capacity potentially in 2020 and persistently above from 2022/23. Although higher than the current PAN the forecast reception numbers are only slightly above, with the biggest impact seemingly from new homes within year groups 1 to 6. We will carefully monitor reception admissions until the Cranleigh scheme is completed and provide emergency or bulge additional places as necessary.

Mrs Julie Iles
Cabinet Member for All-Age Learning
29 October 2019

Question (2) Andrew Povey (Cranleigh & Ewhurst):

On behalf of my residents I would like the Council to provide a proper comparison of the proposed new build versus the refurbishment of the existing primary site. The head assures

me that there is sufficient space in the current middle school to accommodate the children from the infant school.

If the infant school site was sold towards the cost of refurbishment the figures given in the part two paper suggest that it would be considerably cheaper to refurbish the existing school rather than pursue the new site.

My understanding is that this is the preferred option for the school, Parish Council and residents.

Reply:

A response which contains exempt information under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act has been provided.

Question (3) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

The Prudential RideLondon Cycle Event, and the associated professional cycle event, has been approved up until 2020. There is a significant lead time required to organise the event and the date for the following year's event is known when the current year event takes place i.e. the approvals for the 2021 event will need to be in place by Spring 2020 at the latest.

The County Council committed to Surrey residents that there would be a detailed consultation on the future of the event through the normal County Council process, with advertising on the website, libraries, etc, before any agreement to hold the event beyond 2020 was signed. The consultation has been developed by the Communications Team of the County Council and is ready to be published. It is expected to take eight weeks. The submission of the Cabinet papers relating to the future of the event beyond 2020 (as confirmed to me) will not happen until the County Council's consultation with residents has been completed and the results assessed and thus the necessary approvals cannot be given until the consultation has taken place.

It is now urgent that this consultation takes place so that Surrey residents can give their views both on the event and how the disruption caused by the event can be alleviated and so that the event organisers have clarity on the future of the event and any actions that they will need to take for 2021 and beyond. As such, can the Cabinet Member please confirm the timing for this consultation?

Reply:

Thank you for your question.

We are currently in discussion with Transport for London with regard to the continuation of the event beyond 2020. No commitment has been made from 2021 onwards. Once discussions have concluded, we will go out to public consultation to ensure that the views of residents inform the report to Cabinet for decision on the continuation of the event.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
29 October 2019

Question (4) Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills):

Earlier this year the Leader of the Council indicated that this Autumn he would be reviewing parking charges on the Countryside Estate before deciding whether or not such charges should be abolished. Has a decision been whether or not to abolish these charges and if so when will it be made public?

Reply:

Thank you for your question. We will be bringing a report to Cabinet for decision in November in response to the Car Park Charging Review.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
29 October 2019

Question (5) Jonathan Essex (Redhill East):

In April 2018, I brought my concerns about the reduction in the funding of qualified youth workers across Surrey to this Cabinet and at that time it was confirmed that, the number of hours of open access youth services would be reduced to 618 hours per week across Surrey.

More recently, at the October 2019 council meeting Cllr Chris Townsend asked for an update on universal youth services.

Quoting from the response to that question, the county council stated:

- a) 'There is **no statutory duty** for SCC to provide open access universal youth work";
 - b) 'the Council **is not now able to fund open access youth services**; and
 - c) These new services **do not deliver universal, open access youth work**.
1. Would the Cabinet member for Children now confirm that in under 18 months, the county council's universal youth services have effectively been withdrawn and the fact that members have had to submit questions to establish this, means that councillors have not been fully briefed on these changes before they have taken place?
 2. In the October council response it was stated that 'Open access youth is provided in some areas by the existing Surrey County Council Youth Service'. Would the Cabinet Member please confirm in which areas this is still happening, where it has already stopped happening and clarify what the future is for these local services.
 3. Given the above stated aim that the future delivery of these crucial services is now proposed to lie in the hands of voluntary and community sector can the Cabinet Member give her assurance that the universal provision in the future is indeed universal, and that an equality impact assessment will be conducted to ensure that there are the new provision does not limit access based on religion, ethnicity or gender.

Reply:

1. The Universal Youth Work provided by Surrey County Council (SCC) has not changed in the last 18 months. Children's Services have been widely restructured in the last 12 months, but there were no changes made at all to universal youth

workers, who were unaffected as the restructure focussed on targeted and specialist Youth Services.

2. As was stated at the October Full Council, whilst the Council is not now able to fund 'open access' Youth Services, it does own a number of buildings and it is our intention to make these buildings available to local communities and voluntary sector organisations as a base to provide Youth Services. It is our intention to put in place a process over the next six months that will see our buildings brought into use in a way that will provide vibrant services to our young people.

Officers and I will be setting out shortly the process to develop the conversations that will enable these important services. It is likely that SCC will maintain a small, flexible and mobile service that can target services in the short term where new need emerges. The specifics and potential impact for each centre will be discussed at a local level with stakeholders including young people during the engagement sessions. The existing arrangements that are in place will continue during the consultation and engagement.

3. An equality impact assessment will be undertaken as part of the consultation and engagement over the next six months before any decisions are then taken by Cabinet. Any future arrangements will also set out the outcomes that are expected if the buildings are utilised by the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector. Clearly where the County Council owns existing youth work buildings, it will be easier for us to establish open access Youth Services. In other areas where we do not have buildings, we will do everything possible to enable open access Youth Services to develop, for instance by negotiating for the use of other community buildings, including schools.

Mrs Mary Lewis
Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families
29 October 2019