

CABINET – 29 October 2019**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Public Questions****Question 1: Jonathan Rainer, Resident**

It would be inappropriate to sell the existing land and lose what is an ideal location for the school in terms of access and safety, nuisance and many other factors that have all been submitted to the planners.

I would like to ask a couple of questions relating to the financial viability of the project:

The Sequential and Exception Test Report dated August 2019 states that 75% of the existing school is located in Flood Zones 2&3 and this is given as the main reason for not re-developing the school at its current location. If one assumes this same premise is applied to future development of the site for houses, should the land be sold? I imagine the land value will be reduced significantly.

Has the fact that flooding will restrict the development of the land and significantly increase any costs for any developer, and viability of selling property built in flood zones been factored into the financial viability for the project?

The Sequential and Exception Test Report also states that Asbestos is present on the site. Has the cost of removal of the asbestos been included in the financial assessment?

Reply:

All three questions are focussed on the financial assessment of the project in relation to specific aspects

1. The redevelopment on the existing sites and associated land values
2. Financial viability of the project as impacted by flood zones
3. The presence of asbestos containing material.

All of these have been considered as part of the overall financial planning for this project, and it has been concluded that the project is financially viable.

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

Question 2: Mr Heather Rainer, Resident

If approximately 75% of the existing school site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 with just a small percentage of the ground covered by a school building, what is the justification of selling the land for housing, which will have far a greater impact on flooding as it will cover the majority of the land displacing the water?

The proposed Glebelands site is a playing field at present, so by relocating the school to this site, a sports amenity will be lost. The installation of a 3G football pitch should be in addition to the existing playing field, not instead of it, especially as pupil numbers are nearly doubling. What is the justification for selling the school site for housing when it is in a flood zone, and disposing of a playing field, when pupil numbers are increasing?

Will the approval of this business case for the rebuilding of the school on the Glebelands site take flooding and loss of playing fields into account?

Reply:

There are three questions here focused on the project in relation to specific aspects:

1. The redevelopment on the exiting sites
The proposed project is to provide a modern educational facility for the families of Cranleigh, both now and in the future, which requires significant capital investment in Cranleigh CofE Primary School. In order to do this in a financially sustainable manner the only viable option is to dispose of the existing sites in order to redevelop the school. The location of the flood zones has been carefully investigated and the proposal for the relocated school and residential development takes all this information into consideration. In the future, a detailed drainage scheme will need to be submitted as part of a detailed planning application for the residential development on the existing sites. This will be the responsibility of the developer, and does not form part of the proposal at this time.
2. Changes to playing field provision.
Although the current playing field at the junior school site will be lost, this will be mitigated by the provision of 2 new sports facilities. At the relocated primary school site there will be an all-weather pitch. This will allow the school to use the pitch throughout the year, rather than the limited time available solely for a grass pitch. This will have the effect of increasing the amount of outdoor physical education and sports the school can undertake. In addition the provision of a 3g pitch at Glebelands School will have a similar effect. This will also create appropriate future provision for Glebelands pupils. Both of these all-weather, all year round facilities, also provide for the increase in pupil numbers.
3. Business case considerations
The business case for the relocation of the school does take into account flooding and the provision of year round sports pitches

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

Question 3: Katherine Higgins, Resident

With regards to access for the suggested relocation of Cranleigh School – the overgrown footpath that runs alongside our property begins at our entrance/ exit gates. Our access to our property is very narrow and we have to reverse our cars out every morning exactly when children would be arriving for school. Our cars are Teslas and as such are completely silent, meaning pedestrians have to be extremely careful if they are passing our gates. We then need to perform a five-point turn manoeuvre to turn our cars round to drive down our drive and on to the main road. All this is done during the school run periods twice daily and more. With regards to this - has a safety study been carried out on the risk to child life as a result of

the proximity of this path to our (and our neighbours' entrance/exits) and can you assure us that this footpath will NOT be used by either parents or school children for access the school?

Reply:

Thank you for your question which details specific issues that you believe you will encounter around access to your property, and use of the public right of way. These comments are not a matter for Cabinet to consider and will need to be considered as part of the planning application process. A full travel assessment, along with a travel plan will form part of that planning application and details will include proposed measures in relation to traffic and access. It is suggested that you submit your comments as part of the planning application consultation for due consideration.

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

Question 4: John Oliver, Resident

At the 24 September 2019 Cabinet meeting, Cllr Goodman said, with the regard to the draft 2020-2025 Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan, that "It's a five year [plan]. That is the programme that we abide by for all AONBs. It's right that we do".

I have written to the National Association of AONBs about the timing of AONB Management Plans. In his response, the Chief Executive said, "there is no policy for five-year plans per se, it's the review cycle that is every 5 years". (copy of response available on demand)

The Glover report makes numerous demands about the strengthening of Management Plans. For example, at page 45, Glover states that ""National landscapes should take a leading role in the response to climate change through their Management Plans National Parks and AONBs must be clear how they will support these ambitions, securing natural beauty as this happens".

Given that Cllr Goodman was completely wrong in his assertion, does the Council now agree that the 2020-2025 Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan, which Cllr Goodman accepted as being "light touch" and which does not address climate change in any meaningful way:

- should be reviewed immediately in order to set out robust plans for investigating the likely effects of, and dealing with, climate change and global warming, rather than just having "a vision";
- should be for a period of not less than 25 years, measurable, and accountable for, for the whole of that period; and,

if the Council does not agree, could you please explain why?"

Reply:

Thank you for your question. Surrey County Council fully supports the need to take a long term view of the impact that climate change will have on our countryside. I want to reassure you therefore that the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan sets out a 25 year vision and policy framework. However, in line with other AONB local authorities in England, the 6 Surrey Hills local authorities publish and adopt a reviewed AONB Management Plan no less than every 5 years. The reviewed Plan (2020 - 2025) has already been formally adopted by four of our Surrey local authorities.

As you are aware the current draft AONB Management Plan (2020 - 2025) has been subject to a robust Environment Report and Habitat Regulations Assessment which have been appraised by Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England. No substantive concerns were raised in regards to addressing climate change. Indeed the policies largely help to mitigate and adapt to the impacts. We are also doing some national work on Nature Recovery through test and trialling Defra's new Environmental Land Management System (ELMS). The AONB Director, Rob Fairbanks, can brief you on this when you meet.

The Glover Review makes 27 substantive proposals to Government. Surrey County Council and the AONB Board would very much like to work with you to secure central Government's support for Glover's recommendations through guidance, legislation and a better funding settlement for the Surrey Hills AONB. We look forward to your support with this.

Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Fire & Resilience
24 September 2019