

Annex 1

CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS 26 APRIL 2022

CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING DECISIONS

1. PETITION: PRESERVE THE FUTURE OF ST PETER AND ST PAUL C OF E INFANT SCHOOL IN CHALDON

(i) Details

The Cabinet Member for Education & Learning accepted the following petition. The lead petitioner was not present at the meeting to present the petition. The Cabinet Member response to the petition as set out below was published as a supplement to the agenda.

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to fulfil their duty to preserve the future of our school by supporting the expansion to accommodate Primary Education to Key Stage 2 (7-11 year olds).

Justification:

St Peter and St Paul is a Church of England school located at the heart of the village of Chaldon village in the Surrey Hills. Historically, the school has developed a strong reputation of high quality education, care and community spirit that we believe to be unique amongst a wider community hugely dominated by Trust schools.

In 2021 the school co-operated with a request from Surrey County Council to accept. bulge year, which has resulted in more members of the community recognising the strengths of our school.

As a church school we enjoy a special sense of belonging welcoming all cultures and religious denominations into our school and our Christian ethos provides a rich backdrop in which all our children flourish.

As parents and carers we feel very strongly that our school is the best environment for our children to continue their educational journey until their transition into secondary school. We have learnt to trust in staff team that cares passionately about the school and we are confident that they can offer the best possible opportunity for through Primary Education in the area.

We therefore request that Surrey County Council honour the "Change in Age Range Consultation" that was agreed in October 2021 and needs to now be reflected in the physical expansion of the school.

Cabinet Member Response:

The change in age range at St Peter and St Paul Church of England School will be implemented for September 2022. The school are admitting Year 3 pupils from September 2022 and internal alterations to the existing building will provide the additional space for pupils.

Some planning and highway matters were raised as part of the planning application originally submitted in June 2021. Since then, supplementary information to the original planning application has recently been submitted to address the concerns. Subject to

planning permission being granted the physical expansion of the school will take place with a target date for completion of September 2023.

2. PROPOSAL TO EXPAND MANOR MEAD SCHOOL & CHANGE SCHOOL DESIGNATION FROM A SINGLE DESIGNATION OF SEVERE LEARNING DIFFICULTIES (SLD) TO A DUAL DESIGNATION OF SEVERE LEARNING DIFFICULTIES (SLD) AND AUTISTIC SPECTRUM DISORDER (ASD)

(i) Details of Decision:

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning determined the statutory notices thereby bringing into effect the formal commencement of the proposal to:

1. Expand Manor Mead School onto a satellite site at Church Road, Virginia Water, increasing the number of places from 83 to 143.
2. Change school designation from a single designation of Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) to a dual designation of Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) and Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD).

This was approved without modification.

ii) Reason for decision:

The proposed permanent expansion of Manor Mead School supports Surrey's ambition to ensure sufficient maintained special school placement availability for primary age autistic pupils and those with communication and Interaction needs and severe learning difficulties.

The Cabinet Member for Education and Learning's approvals and recommendations completes the statutory process in accordance with the DfE guidance "Making significant changes ('Prescribed Alterations') to Maintained Schools".

(Cabinet Member for Education & Learning – 26 April 2022)

LEADER DECISIONS

3. PETITION: BRING SURREY CHOICES BACK INTO SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

i) Details of petition:

The Leader considered a petition from Unison requesting that Surrey Choices be brought back in house. The full petition text and formal response were published as a supplement to the agenda.

Mr Barney Wakefield presented the petition and stated his case and asked several questions:-

1. Why were terms and conditions not the same as the Council's?
2. Was it considered that the consultation was adequate for the closure of hubs?
3. Was it fair to expect Surrey Choices to be a first class provider when the council were implementing a £3m budget cut?
4. Should the Council take a more active role in Surrey Choices?
5. What action is the Council taking to lobby central government about social care funding?

The Leader stated that there was a mixed picture over the last five years regarding performance of Surrey Choices. There had been a change in the business model which had not happened at the speed one would have wanted and this was consulted on at the time. The reduction in funding was to match the change in the model, which saw a shift to providing care in the community, a large reduction in overheads rather than the money spent on front line delivery services. There was a broader issue around recruitment and retention for the Council and work was ongoing to look at allowances and this would be discussed with Unions and partners on how this could be collectively progressed. Surrey Choices as an arm's length organisation had its own business model and set their own terms and conditions but maybe there needed to be a conversation including the Legal Team about whether an arm's length organisation was the correct way to go.

The Leader also explained that the council were working very hard explaining to government the impact of changes to social care funding. With regard to council taking an active role in Surrey Choices he explained that the Cabinet Member was Chair of Surrey Choices until recently and he would routinely meet with Surrey Choices every six months.

The Leader, in listening to officers advice, was encouraged that things were improving. The focus needed to be on individuals and the team being rewarded for their role.

Decision:

The published response to the petition still stood but the Leader suggested that there be a further review of the current structure within the next few months.

(Decision taken by the Leader of the Council – 26 April 2022)

CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND WASTE DECISIONS

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

i) Details of decision

There were very many questions submitted in relation to the Priory School petition and under Standing Order 86 the first six questions submitted were taken at the meeting. These questions and the responses to them were published as a supplement to the agenda. Other questions submitted would receive a written response.

5. PETITION: RECONSIDER THE DECISION TO RELOCATE PRIORY SCHOOL, REIGATE TO WOODHATCH PLACE

i) Details of petition

The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste considered a petition requesting the council reconsider its decision to move Priory School to Woodhatch Place. The full petition text and formal response were published as a supplement to the agenda.

Dr Sophia Mitchell presented the petition and highlighted three main concerns:

6. The detrimental impact of travelling on a dangerous A road and the resultant air pollution on both pupils and residents
7. Other detrimental impacts on residents around Woodhatch including parking, congestion, pollution and decreased economic productivity
8. The effect of increased carbon emissions that goes against council policy.

She went on to speak about the current site of the school and stated that she wanted to work constructively with the council to keep the school on its present site.

Catherine Baart spoke as the divisional Member and raised several issues that had not already been raised. She stated the impact on daily lives of the community around the site that this decision would bring and asked for more transparency on the reasons for moving the school to this site, specifically:-

1. Why were the site appraisals not available to the public now and why did they have to wait until the planning committee? This gave the impression that the council were withholding information.
2. Although the site appraisal had already been done the council were still collecting data around traffic etcetera and asked how this further information collected would be fed into the site appraisal?
3. The Angel junction did not have a pedestrian crossing and would be some years before it did have one so therefore had the extra funding needed for infrastructure to be put in place for this move been taken into account?
4. Had there been serious discussions with the DfE about extending Holmesdale School and the two feeder schools to turn them into primary schools? If so, those discussions should be made known to aid transparency.

The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste sympathised with residents that the school could not stay on its present site. She explained that communications regarding expansion of schools came under the remit of the Education Team and not property. Site appraisal and traffic assessments would accompany the planning application. It was confirmed by the Contracts Manager that the site appraisal could not be released early and before statutory consultees for planning purposes. The information needed to be as up to date as possible for the planning decision and therefore it was likely to change.

The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste confirmed that statutory consultation would take place from 9th May and that residents would be invited to submit their concerns as part of that consultation. This would be followed by submission of the planning papers for committee decision in June.

(Decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste – 26 April 2022)

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DECISIONS

6. PETITION: ACCESS FOR ALL - BOOKHAM STATION

i) Details of petition:

Mr Andrew Matthews presented his petition to the Cabinet Member.

Clare Curran spoke as the divisional Member and concluded that she would continue to work with officers and Mr Matthews regarding access at Bookham Station.

The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure confirmed the response to the petition as published.

7. NATIONAL BUS STRATEGY - ENHANCED BUS PARTNERSHIP FOR SURREY

i) Details of decision

1. That the draft Enhanced Partnership Plan and draft Enhanced Partnership Scheme be submitted to the Department for Transport for their review, inclusive of delivery priorities was agreed.
2. That once Department for Transport feedback has been received, a report be taken to Cabinet proposing that the Council enter into an Enhanced Partnership with bus operators, inclusive of governance arrangements was agreed.

ii) Reason for decision:

Responding to the challenge set by Government, the Council issued a formal notice of intent to introduce an EP building on our existing and strong partnership working with bus operators. Doing so has secured continued access to Bus Recovery Grant funding that compensates for Covid depressed patronage, whilst enabling the Council to be bid for future Government funding using the BSIP.

The next step is to approve our draft EP Plan and draft EP Scheme, submitting both to the DfT for their review. The draft EP Plan and draft EP Scheme combined aim to grow bus patronage by improving bus services and infrastructure, whilst enhancing bus user experience.

Government's aspirations align closely with the Council's own aims and objectives as set out in Enabling a Greener Future, our Climate Change Delivery Plan and the emerging new Surrey Transport Plan. A core feature of the latter is to prioritise public transport in the hierarchy of modes, whilst delivering a reduction in carbon and other emissions from the transport sector.

8. SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL RESPONSE TO SURREY'S 2050 PLACE AMBITION CONSULTATION

i) Details of decision:

That the consultation response attached at Annex 1 to the submitted report be approved.

ii) Reason for decision:

Surrey's 2050 Place Ambition presents a collective, long-term ambition and priorities for Surrey local authorities to support and manage growth in a way that helps address the challenges associated with climate change, the existing and future infrastructure deficit, whilst enabling Surrey's economy to grow sustainably and improving the overall quality of the environment and well-being of residents. It provides a framework to align spatial plans, programmes, and infrastructure priorities, enable cross-boundary solutions to meet development needs and for partners to work together on delivery to achieve 'good growth'.

Over the next 15 to 20 years, the scale and pattern of spatial growth across Surrey will be determined through borough and district local plans and will largely take place through regeneration and/or redevelopment in towns, urban extensions and a number of new communities. SCC is a vital partner in managing and influencing how that planned growth is delivered.

The consultation response supports the Place Ambition and suggests several revisions to promote delivery on all the priority areas of the Council's Organisation Strategy and its Community Vision.

(Decisions taken by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure – 26 April 2022)

STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD

17 MAY 2022

PROPERTY DISPOSAL IN GUILDFORD

This Part 2 report contains information which is exempt from Access to Information requirements by virtue of paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including commercially sensitive information to the bidding companies).

RESOLVED:

1. That the Strategic Investment Board note and record the decision taken to approve disposal of the asset.