

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**TUESDAY 12 JULY 2022****QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1****NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND WASTE****1. TREFOR HOGG (CAMBERLEY EAST) TO ASK:**

I have seen the amount of food thrown away in the cafeteria area at Woodhatch Place on a Monday because it is over its use by date expiring at the end of each Saturday.

Please could the Cabinet Member for Property and Waste confirm if it is possible to arrange for any food from Surrey's various cafeteria systems that is approaching its "use by" date at the end of the week, to be made available on each Friday to a local food bank or similar organisation?

RESPONSE:

Surrey County Council contracts Selecta UK to manage the supply, stock, monitoring and removal of foods in the catering hub at Woodhatch Place. Selecta UK also supplies the ambient foods and sub-contracts a local supplier to provide fresh foods.

In accordance with Regulation 1169/2011 (on the provisions of food information to consumers), Article 24 (l) states "After the 'use by' date a food shall be deemed to be unsafe in accordance with Article 14(2) to (5) of Regulation 178/2002". Fresh food past its 'use by' date is removed from the fridges and cannot be used for human consumption. Currently, surplus fresh food is disposed of, however, officers are working with Selecta UK to move towards zero waste and ensure systems are in place to prevent or limit food waste and ensure packaging is recycled.

Ambient foods are labelled with a 'best before' date and can be safely consumed after this date, but the quality may have deteriorated. Selecta UK works with a national food charity to redistribute ambient foods (there is a cost for this service); officers are exploring this, and other more local options. However, to date, there has been no surplus of ambient foods in the catering hub.

In an effort to minimise waste, officers also monitor the Surrey County Council booking systems to forward plan fresh food orders and check the end of week stocks.

SINEAD MOONEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS AND HEALTH

2. JONATHAN HULLEY (FOXHILLS, THORPE AND VIRGINIA WATER) TO ASK:

In September 2016 Surrey County Council adopted the Motor Neurone Disease Association 5 Point Charter to help those suffering from the disease in Surrey.

Can the Cabinet Member for Adults and Health update this Council on its partnership with the Motor Neurone Disease Association to raise better awareness internally, across the county and its work to better achieve outcomes for Surrey residents living with this disease?

RESPONSE:

I am writing in response to your request for an update on what action at a local level is being taken to achieve better outcomes for Surrey residents living with Motor Neurone Disease (MND).

We are committed to maintaining our support for people with MND, and work closely with our partners, in health, to ensure people experience a personalised response that respects the individual's choices and wishes.

In Surrey we have an extensive network of services that help and support people with MND and their Carers. We work closely with the MND Associations in East Surrey and Southwest Surrey that provide:

- a range of practical, emotional, and social support, including help with communication, social outings and events and home visiting services,
- access to, and the funding of, equipment for people to use in their homes or in their cars
- arranging short breaks for Carers

In addition, the MND Associations are members of the Surrey Long-Term Neurological Group, which is a User and Carer Reference Group (with support where needed) that gives people with MND a voice in:

- Influencing services and improving quality
- Deciding commissioning intentions
- Jointly writing commissioning strategies
- Ensuring the voice and needs of people are fully represented in the work of Surrey County Council and partner organisations

For residents who wish to access further information and support regarding MND please contact:

East Surrey MNDA – eastsurreymnd@gmail.com
Or phone: 0808 8026262

West Surrey MNDA – acurtis.wsmnda@btinternet.com
Or phone: 0777 0875662

In addition, residents can contact Surrey Coalition of Disabled People, phone: 01483 456558; for additional sources of support and information and can find out more about becoming a member of the Long Term Neurological Conditions user and carer reference group.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING / BECKY RUSH, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES

3. ROBERT KING (EGHAM) TO ASK:

The ONS reported in June the UK's CPI inflation rate hit a forty year high of 9.1%, with food retailers warning of up to 20% rises in meat, cereal, dairy, fruit and vegetable products.

Government funding for free school meals however this year has risen by only 7 pence to £2.41 per meal per pupil, or 3%, for pupil in infant schools.

Will Surrey be accepting the inevitable, that the meals children receive will shrink or fall in quality because of this funding gap from central Government, or is there a plan to bridge the gap for all schools, maintained and academies regardless of statutory responsible, to ensure the 1/5 pupils who rely on these meals, like in my own division of Egham, do not go hungry or see lower grade and lower quality meals on their plates?

RESPONSE:

The Department for Education (DfE) funds universal infant free meals (years R,1 and 2) at £2.41 per meal in 2022/23 and funds free meals for other eligible mainstream pupils through the National Funding Formula at £2.61 per day. Funding for provision of free school meals must legally be delegated to schools (maintained or academies) and therefore, Surrey County Council funds schools at the national rate. As the cost of free school meals is a delegated cost the Council is unable to provide funds outside the delegated formula.

Surrey County Council has its own traded catering offer to schools [Twelve15 - Kitchens | Surrey Education Services \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](#) that schools may choose to use to provide free school meals. Twelve15 is working with their suppliers to ensure that they continue to source and receive the ingredients needed to provide children with a healthy, nutritional meal at a cost that matches the available funding. It is not Twelve15's intention to reduce portion sizes or the quality of the meal provided.

The choice of caterer is up to the school, we cannot comment on the provision from other suppliers, and they may not take the same approach. We will work closely with Twelve15 to monitor the impact of cost and inflation on their service and revise financial forecasts of the impact on this year's budget, bringing proposals for re-basing budgets where necessary. Inflationary pressures within both the revenue and capital budget will be closely monitored throughout the financial year and updates on

impacts and required mitigations will be included in future budget monitoring reports to Cabinet.

BECKY RUSH, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES

4. ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:

The early findings of the 2021 national census show that since the last survey the population of Surrey has risen to 1.203 million, an increase of over 70,000 in ten years.

What are the comparative figures for the county's budget over the same period?

RESPONSE:

Surrey's population has increased by 6% over the 10-year period. In comparison the Council's revenue budget, excluding schools, has increased by c5% over the same 10-year period, comparing the 2011/12 revenue budget to the 2021/22 budget. The Council budget has broadly kept pace with population growth, however demand for our services is not directly proportional to the growth in population and there is not a straight-line correlation between these two data sets.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

5. MARK SUGDEN (HINCHLEY WOOD, CLAYGATE AND OXSHOTT) TO ASK:

The Department for Transport has recently encouraged MPs across England and Wales to apply to run trials in their constituency to reduce noise pollution. The scheme involves the installation of innovative noise cameras which will provide police with evidence to take action against disrespectful drivers revving engines and using illegal exhausts. The trials for these cameras will take place in four areas and since the technology is in design phase, MPs are being invited to submit applications to trial the scheme in their local area.

Could the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy confirm whether any sites have been identified in Surrey, if so where and whether a request has been made to any Surrey MP for them to consider and submit an application for consideration by the Department for Transport?

RESPONSE:

Following the Department for Transport's announcement on 30 April 2022, I requested that officers compiled a list of sites where there are known issues of noise related complaints. As the guidance requested for MPs to submit their priorities, and to assist with this, I wrote to MPs in May highlighting the opportunity, confirming the County Council would offer practical support, and suggesting the locations detailed below for consideration.

At this time, the County Council has only heard from Rt Hon Dominic Raab MP that his bid has not been successful, but if a bid is successful this information will be shared with the divisional member.

Sites	Noise Complaint type	Constituency	MP
Horton Lane, Epsom	General noise	Epsom & Ewell	Chris Grayling
College Road, Epsom	General noise	Epsom & Ewell	Chris Grayling
A244 Leatherhead Road, Oxshott	General noise	Esher and Walton	Dominic Raab
A24 London Road/Mickleham bypass.	General noise	Mole Valley	Paul Beresford
A25 Guildford Road, Westcott	General noise	Mole Valley	Paul Beresford
A24 Horsham Road, Mid-Holmwood	General noise	Mole Valley	Paul Beresford
A24 Mickleham Bypass, Mole Valley	Speeding Vehicles	Mole Valley	Paul Beresford
Fordwater Road, Chertsey	General noise	Runnymede and Weybridge	Ben Spencer
A320 Guildford Road, Ottershaw	General noise	Runnymede and Weybridge	Ben Spencer
A318 Brighton Road, Addlestone	General noise & vibrations	Runnymede and Weybridge	Ben Spencer
A318 New Haw Road, Addlestone	General noise & vibrations	Runnymede and Weybridge	Ben Spencer
Vicarage Road and Thorpe Lea Road, Egham	Speeding Vehicles	Runnymede and Weybridge	Ben Spencer
Brooklands Road, Weybridge	General noise	Runnymede and Weybridge	Ben Spencer
A308 Staines Road (East & West), either side of M3 junction	General noise	Spelthorne	Kwasi Kwarteng
Thames Street, Lower Sunbury	General noise	Spelthorne	Kwasi Kwarteng

A325 Farnborough to Frimley roundabout	Speeding Vehicles	Surrey Heath	Michael Gove
A322 Lightwater Bypass, Lightwater	Traffic & motorbikes	Surrey Heath	Michael Gove
A281 Birtley Rd Bramley	General noise	Waverley	Jeremy Hunt
Parvis Road, Byfleet	Speeding Vehicles	Woking	Jonathan Lord
A320 Chertsey Road, Woking	General noise	Woking	Jonathan Lord

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

6. NICK DARBY (THE DITTONS) TO ASK:

- A. Please confirm the actual or intended response of Surrey County Council to the latest Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) consultation exercise, by way of example to ensure appropriate corridors to allow resident access to local hospitals e.g. Epsom/St Helier/Royal Marsden/Kingston, and to access the M3 via Hampton Court Bridge, in all cases without charge.
- B. Does Surrey County Council intend to bring in equivalent measures in Surrey?
- C. Does Surrey County Council intend to make representations on any car scrappage scheme for Greater London residents, without an equivalent scheme for Surrey residents?

RESPONSE:

- A. The Council is in the process of formulating our response to the Ultra Low Emission Zone consultation currently being run by Transport for London. This consultation has a closing date of 29 July.

In formulating our response, it is important that we listen to and consider a wide range of views. This will ensure we understand potential impacts and local issues. The views of Members will be obtained via a Seminar planned for 18 July. The views from our Borough and District Councils are also being sought. This will all help shape our final response.

There are some key points that we will make to Transport for London. These include:

- A requirement to extend the proposed vehicle scrappage scheme to include Surrey. This will support residents transitioning to compliant vehicles.

- That any fines generated within Surrey are retained here and used to fund public transport improvements. This will help residents access local services more sustainably, particularly those without access to a lower emission compliant vehicle.
- That we have clear rules of engagement and processes in place now, including consultation methodology and timelines if any future changes to the scheme are proposed. This is particularly important for vehicle compliance thresholds. We cannot leave a wide-open opportunity for compliance thresholds to be altered in the future without appropriate consultation, engagement and an acceptable time window for change. This needs to be agreed now.

I am in contact with my peer portfolio holders at other county councils bordering London. I am seeking to create a unified pan-London response on the key issues. This will make our collective voice clearly heard by Transport for London on this important issue.

- B. Our new Surrey Transport Plan, which is on the agenda for the meeting today, creates the policy framework for the potential consideration of Ultra Low Emission Zones for Surrey.

Therefore, whilst the introduction of an Ultra Low Emission Zone would be entirely consistent with the objectives of our new Surrey Transport Plan and would help to deliver our climate change targets, the Council is not proposing to implement such a scheme at this time. However, it is important that we continually review all options and opportunities to ensure that we deliver our Greener Futures commitments.

- C. Yes. We will specify a requirement to extend the proposed vehicle scrappage scheme to include Surrey as noted previously.

**NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND WASTE /
MARISA HEATH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT**

7. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:

Please provide details of the company(ies) currently contracted to supply Surrey County Council with energy, or to source its energy suppliers. Please confirm what percentage of this energy purchased is from renewable resources.

RESPONSE:

Surrey County Council's electricity is supplied by EDF and gas is supplied by Total Energies, with the utilities being procured via the Crown Commercial Services framework.

Surrey County Council's electricity is backed 100% by EDF's Renewable for Business, the gas procured is not currently from renewable sources, however, opportunities for renewable supplies will be explored once the existing contract is up for renewal.

BECKY RUSH, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES

8. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:

What does Surrey County Council consider to be a fair profit margin for its contractors? Please provide details of the current three largest contract providers, with the contract's turnover and profit levels (where known), in each of the following three Council directorates: Environment, Transport and Infrastructure; Adult Social Care; and Children, Families and Lifelong Learning.

RESPONSE:

Profit margin is not a criteria routinely used in the Surrey County Council procurement process. How contractors and providers determine their tender price is a confidential matter for them and can depend on many market factors.

The Council's contracts are procured in a compliant way in accordance with the Procurement and Contract Standing Orders to ensure value for money. At the time of tender, a pricing schedule is included, which is considerate to the goods/services being procured, value of the contract and market conditions. The prices received by the suppliers are evaluated in line with the published award criteria. It is important to note that the evaluation panel would investigate any abnormally low/abnormally high bids as part of the due diligence of the process and to ensure fair pricing. The Council is not bound to accept the lowest or any tender made as a result. Ultimately it is about what is sustainable for providers and affordable for the Council, value for money, quality of service provided and other elements such as social value, compliance with our sustainable procurement policies, modern slavery etc.

The top three contracts, commissioned services or framework agreements by Directorate are (approximate total value over contract duration including extensions):

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE

- Ringway - Highways Core Maintenance - £2.6bn (over 21 years)
- Suez UK - Waste Services - £1.25bn (over 25 years)
- Atkins – Highways and Infrastructure Professional Services - £51M (over 9 years)

CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND LIFELONG LEARNING

- NMI School Placements via NASS Contracts – Various Schools - £70M pa (rolling contracts)
- Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Contract – Awarded to SABP - £241M (over 10 years)
- Children's Residential Provision - Various providers via the Southampton Framework - £120M (over 6 years).

ADULT SOCIAL CARE

- Care UK - Residential and Day Care Services - £175M (over 15 years)
- Surrey Choices (TECKAL company, not subject to tendering rules) – Various Services for People with Disabilities - £69M (over 8 years)
- Active Prospects - Residential, supported living, short break care and home-based support for people with disabilities - £8.3M pa (rolling contract)

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

9. WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:

A snapshot of online availability of the bus services run by Stagecoach in Surrey on 29 June showed a total of thirty cancelled services across four routes due to staff shortages.

As this is not an isolated occurrence would the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy please advise:

- A. What discussions are Surrey County Council having with Stagecoach to mitigate the immediate impact on passengers?
- B. What discussions are Surrey County Council having with Stagecoach to ensure the necessary measures are in place to reduce the number of cancellations in the future?

RESPONSE:

Officers are in regular discussion with Stagecoach, and we have been working hard to resolve the ongoing impacts on our residents.

To manage the situation and to ensure that Stagecoach can operate a reliable network, we have recently agreed to support frequency reductions on certain services. This will mean a revised and published timetable can be delivered, giving residents certainty that the bus will turn up when it is supposed to.

For services 1 and 2 running Bushy Hill – Merrow – Guildford - Manor Park - Royal Surrey Hospital – Stoughton – Guildford, the core frequency reduced to every 30 minutes on 11th July. This change removed the 15-minute Manor Park to town centre short journeys, leaving a 30 minute all-day service.

For service 91 running Woking – Sythwood - Goldsworth Park – Knaphill - Brookwood – Pirbright – Guildford, the core frequency will reduce to every 15 minutes on weekdays and Saturdays from 24 July.

The Council would not normally support such action. However, given the circumstances of significant driver shortages, coupled with the time it is taking to recruit and train new drivers, these reductions will free up driver resources that can be directed towards other less frequent routes. The overall impact of this change will

be a reduction in the number of ad hoc cancellations currently being experienced by passengers and the delivery of a reliable Stagecoach network of bus services.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING

10. HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:

In the Summer Term 2022, which Surrey County Council Adult Education courses, stating course name and venue, (other than on-line courses) were provided in person and took place in the Mole Valley District area?

RESPONSE:

Surrey County Council Adult Learning service has operational responsibility for the north and west of the county which does not include the Mole Valley District (except for family learning, which is delivered across the county through family learning centres and local schools).

Surrey County Council receives Adult Education Budget (AEB) funding from the ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency) for the north and west of the county of £2.75m per annum.

The operational responsibility for the rest of the county lies with East Surrey College who receives a similar AEB funding allocation from the ESFA. This will include Mole Valley. We do not therefore hold the data on the courses run in Mole Valley. However, Surrey County Council works collaboratively with East Surrey College to discuss how adult learning provision is meeting the needs of all Surrey residents.

There were 274 learners resident in Mole Valley who were studying at Surrey Adult Learning in the 2021/22 academic year through the north and west sites or online. 23 were studying for an English and Maths GCSE or the ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) qualification and the rest were on the community learning programme mainly studying crafts, fine arts and photography and languages and culture curriculum areas.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING

11. LANCE SPENCER (GOLDSWORTH EAST AND HORSELL VILLAGE) TO ASK:

In the Leader's update on Ukrainian refugees this week it is noted that across Surrey we are expecting 143 Early Years, 657 Primary School, 424 Secondary School and 134 16-18 years old, in total 1,358 additional children for our schools.

Would the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning give an update on the number of children who have been offered places at local schools, and how many of those, in each age group are receiving transport support from Surrey County Council?

Specifically, would the Cabinet Member give the same details for Woking, where the four secondary schools are full, and 48 children are expected in that age group? As many of these children may have been traumatised by their experiences, does the Educational Psychology team have sufficient resource to support them without further extending the lead times for other children to get the mental health support they need?

RESPONSE:

The number of children from Ukraine who have so far been offered a place at a local school is 493 across the primary and secondary sectors. Of those, 58 offers relate to children living in the Woking area.

We currently have 45 Ukrainian pupils accessing travel assistance, 12 are in the primary phase and 33 are in the secondary phase of education, of which less than 5 are located in the Woking area. Not all pupils require travel assistance, many for example will be travelling with children of host families.

It is recognised that children with refugee status will have additional needs and schools require help with meeting these needs. Schools are able to access Educational Psychology support and advice through weekly telephone consultations and bookable psychological consultations for any children they are concerned about. There is also additional training for schools and visiting professionals regarding supporting children and young people who have experienced trauma. This offer is provided alongside the statutory work of the Educational Psychology Service and does not impact upon lead times for mental health support.

The primary source of mental health support however, is provided through Mindworks Surrey which is the Children and Young People's Emotional Wellbeing and Mental Health Service. This service has been subject to enhanced Government funding so that capacity to meet children's mental health needs is met. Given this enhanced resource and the relatively small number of children arriving from Ukraine there should not be an impact upon lead times for mental health support.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

**12. ROBERT KING (EGHAM) TO ASK:
(2nd Question)**

Can the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy give me an update on the request I made to officers over nine months ago to review the mandatory divisions route for HGV traffic from the M25 within my division of Egham?

Whether officers made him aware of my request to review the suitability to divert M25 HGV traffic left rather than right at Kerry Foods roundabout, on Thorpe Lea Road, to avoid Pooley Green and to renew a request for Highways England traffic

officers to improve partnership working with Surrey Police to actively monitor traffic along routes on night-time closures?

RESPONSE:

Along with several other M25 closure diversion routes, officers continue to engage with National Highways colleagues to agree improvements to routes and draw up a revised document for M25 'DRUEs' (Diversion routes for unplanned events).

I am pleased to update that an informal agreement has now been reached to make the change proposed, and revised documentation is being drawn up by National Highways colleagues for official sign off on the changes.

Whilst both National Highways and Police resources remain scarce to actively monitor these routes when in use, the Council's officers have now negotiated the deployment of portable Vehicle Activated Signs by National Highways onto the diversion routes, which register the speed and record the volume of passing vehicles, warning drivers when exceeding the speed limit. The data downloaded from these devices post deployment provides officers with data to better inform future discussions on use of the routes and potential mitigations.

In addition, the Council's officers continue to robustly challenge the need for full closures of the motorway for planned activities, often seeking alternate Traffic Management Provision on the motorway to prevent un-necessary use of the diversion routes. It should be noted however that the nature of some activities/repairs requires a full motorway closure to ensure the safety of both the travelling public and the workforce.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING

**13. ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:
(2nd Question)**

The Surrey Advertiser reported recently that 'nearly 10,000 Surrey primary school children are being taught in classes of over 30'.

Does Surrey County Council have the figures, for each Borough and District?

Bearing in mind the Government has provided capital funding and other initiatives to support local authorities, why has this situation occurred and what is Surrey County Council doing about it?

RESPONSE:

School class sizes remain stable in Surrey. The data for 2021/22 is broadly in line with the pre-pandemic figures of 2019/20.

Overall, the average class sizes for infant and junior aged pupils have reduced slightly since 2019/20, as has the number of classes with over 30 pupils in, both at Key Stage 1 (reception and infant) and at Key Stage 2 (junior).

Class size rules only apply to pupils in reception and Key Stage 1. In January 2022, there were 41 classes with over 30 pupils, representing 1286 children (4% of all children in this key stage). This is a reduction from 51 classes and 1600 children in January 2019

Reception and Key Stage 1 class size

	Number of Classes			Number of Pupils		
	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Total	1185	1170	1152	33466	32905	32171
1 to 30	1134	1140	1111	31866	31958	30885
31 to 35	51	30	41	1600	947	1286
36 plus	0	0	0	0	0	0

There are a number of allowable reasons for infant classes to exceed 30. These include the in-year admission of young people who are looked after or those who have an Education Health and Care Plans.

The Infant class size legislation does not apply to pupils in Key Stage 2, although the Department for Education (DfE) collect the data as below. Schools make their own arrangements about class sizes.

In January 2022 there were 265 classes with over 30 pupils (8422 pupils, 18% of the key stage total).

Key Stage 2 class size

		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Total	Number of Classes	1619	1623	1622
	Number of Pupils	45975	45646	45632
1 to 30	Number of Classes	1328	1377	1357
	Number of Pupils	36700	37822	37210
31 to 35	Number of Classes	291	246	265
	Number of Pupils	9275	7824	8422
36 plus	Number of Classes	0	0	0
	Number of Pupils	0	0	0

There is no requirement for secondary schools to submit data on class sizes.

Nationally, the DfE do not share school-level class size data for academies with local authorities. We therefore only have data at borough and district level for maintained schools.

There are 8 key stage 1 classes with more than 30 pupils:

- 3 classes in Guildford – 1 school
- 2 in Spelthorne – 1 school
- 2 in Runnymede – 1 school
- 1 in Elmbridge – 1 school

There are an additional 14 classes which exceed the 30-pupil limit for allowable reasons such as those listed above. These are located as follows:

- 1 Epsom & Ewell – 1 school
- 1 Elmbridge – 1 school
- 1 Guildford – 1 school
- 4 Runnymede – 2 schools
- 4 Spelthorne – 2 schools
- 3 Waverley – 1 school

Generally, schools make their own arrangements regarding class sizes and we have identified only 4% of Key Stage 1 pupils are subject to classes over 30. We are, over the next five years investing £139m to create more school places. We are also investing £125m in increasing support and school places for pupils with Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

BECKY RUSH, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES

14. NICK DARBY (THE DITTONS) TO ASK: (2nd Question)

What contacts, in writing or otherwise have been made with the Treasury/Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC)/the relevant Government Ministers to achieve an increase in the 45p per mile travel allowance, and with what result?

Is this allowance for business mileage considered adequate bearing in mind inflation and recent increases in the cost of fuel, and that the allowance has not changed since 2012?

RESPONSE:

Since 2011 when the HMRC advisory rates were last increased, petrol prices have risen by almost 50%. I have therefore written to HMRC highlighting the impact that the cost of fuel is having on our staff and requesting that HMRC review the approved mileage rates in line with this.

In addition, we are liaising across our council networks to see if there is also appetite to contact HMRC on this issue on a more joined-up scale to enable a combined approach with a view to this making a greater impact. There is a survey running across county councils currently to compare impacts and assess the appetite.

As it stands, despite the increasing fuel and other costs associated with the running of a car, we've not seen anything that may indicate that HMRC are reviewing the tax-free mileage rates. Our tax advisors have seen examples of applications made to pay fuel-only rates different to HMRC's Advisory rates, but no successful applications to change the Approved Mileage Allowance Payments to date.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

**15. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:
(2nd Question)**

Please explain how all Members and residents can understand how Highways schemes, including Project Horizon schemes for highway maintenance and the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) programme, are assessed and prioritised.

What ensures the selection and prioritisation process is fair and objective and where is this shared publicly?

RESPONSE:

Project Horizon

Comprehensive information detailing how schemes are prioritised for capital maintenance works (Project Horizon) is detailed on our website ([link here](#)). In summary it is as per the Council agreed Capital Prioritisation Policy for Highway Assets (April 2020) which focuses on the following key areas:

- Highway Maintenance / Improvement Issues (condition data)
- Network Hierarchy (road usage)
- Risk (threat to public safety)
- Value for money (using right treatment)
- Network Management (minimising disruption)

Full details are available via the link which explains how the various criteria are scored and future works programmes. Officers would be happy to discuss the detail with individual Members if requested.

Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS)

This year has seen the largest allocation of highway capital money directly under the control of Members (£100,000 per Members). Members can freely use up to £30,000 of this to support their ITS priorities.

In addition to this, there is a countywide budget of £2,950,000 for ITS. At this time a prioritisation process is being developed for use from 23/24. A Member Highways task group of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee will be involved in forming and scrutinising it, prior to formal approval by the Cabinet Member later this calendar year. It is expected that any process will be based on clear and justifiable metrics. To ensure full transparency, each year all ITS schemes

and decisions impacting on the capital allocation under the control of individual Members will be reported to the Select Committee.

MARISA HEATH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT

16. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:

(2nd Question)

In light of the forthcoming household energy cost increase please:

- A. Confirm what is planned to expedite funding and support for household retrofit beyond the current small number of low income and social housing homes.
- B. Provide an update on the work of the new housing team announced at the Council meeting in February 2022.

RESPONSE:

The Council is acutely aware that rising energy prices is putting pressure on many of our residents, particularly those on low incomes. There are a number of initiatives that the Council is undertaking to support residents, including;

- We have delivered Government funded (GHLAD) decarbonisation schemes for fuel poor households resulting in 870 measures installed at no cost in 657 homes.
- We are in the process of procuring a managing agent to deliver future home decarbonisation schemes over the next five years. This includes the Sustainable Warmth programme (for which Surrey has £10.5m allocated in 22/23) to continue to decarbonise fuel poor homes).
- We will continue to apply for all Government funding for decarbonisation of homes, including funds directed at those not on benefits.
- The new contract and managing agent will also enable the Council, working with the Borough and District Councils, to develop our own decarbonisation schemes, such as (but not limited to) collective purchase schemes for able to pay households, often high energy users, for solar PV and/or heat pumps.
- The Solar Together scheme has enabled 1400 Surrey households to invest in and to benefit from 6MW of subsidised solar PV and battery storage, resulting in 29,000 tonnes CO₂e saved over the lifetime of the technologies and £5m investment in solar technology in the county by residents.
- We are continuing to develop financial support mechanisms to support the decarbonisation of the most inefficient housing in the county – this will look at how we can look at all tenures and all income brackets so we can maximise decarbonisation as well as support on the cost of living agenda.
- We are currently supporting ten community groups to develop community owned and managed energy schemes which will help reduce bills and develop decentralised energy. We are looking at how we can roll this out further. This will include looking at a longer-term finance or investment mechanism.
- In August we will launch a campaign to help residents to reduce their energy bills. This will begin with a social media campaign promoting energy saving tips and home energy behaviours to all residents. This targeted campaign will

use a range of both offline and offline communication channels to reach the right audiences in a number of different ways. We will also signpost to other grant funding and advice where appropriate.

The Council has allocated funding for a team of officers who will be responsible for delivering the home decarbonisation, fuel poverty and community energy programmes. The team lead post has been appointed, one officer is already in post and the remaining four posts are currently being advertised. We are also discussing with district colleagues how we can share resources to increase capacity and expertise.

DENISE TURNER-STEWART, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND LEARNING

17. ROBERT KING (EGHAM) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

Does the Cabinet Member for Education and Learning believe removing the consideration of parental choice, in whether to fund school transport or not, harms social mobility?

Do the changes to school transport funding decisions harm disadvantaged parents and children who happen to live in school catchment areas with underperforming schools, compared to those who may have the means to pay or transport their children to schools outside these areas without funding?

What assessments have been made to ensure changes in policy does not have an unfair impact on one group of parents over another and what mitigations is any have been put in place?

RESPONSE:

All changes to Surrey County Council's travel assistance policies were proposed and agreed in-line with the national guidance relating to the delivery of travel assistance arrangements by local authorities and will ensure that the Authority will continue to meet its statutory duty to provide travel assistance to eligible children and young people.

National guidance relating to national school admissions policy does not include criterion relating to underperforming schools when allocating school places or transport assistance.

In terms of the delivery of mainstream travel assistance, the Authority follows national guidance and considers a child eligible if they are attending their nearest qualifying school and live over two miles away (aged 5 to 8) and over three miles away (aged 8 to 16).

In circumstances where the Authority removes travel assistance arrangements on the basis that a child or young person is no longer eligible, parents/carers have a

right of appeal in all cases. If a parent/carer does lodge an appeal, assistance will remain in place until the hearing has concluded.

In cases where a child or young person was previously entitled to travel assistance under extended rights legislation (evidenced by the submission of low-income entitlement such as Free School Meals (FSM)), if it is established that they are no longer entitled under this criteria, the Authority's timeframe for the removal of assistance will be extended and the parent or carer will have the right of appeal. Those who are eligible for travel assistance for example FSM eligibility, would retain their eligibility until the end of the current academic year.

The Authority's Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) was produced and published with the decision report considered at Cabinet when the Home to School Travel Assistance Policy was refreshed this year. Any parent or carer whose assistance is removed will be able to make representations at appeal. The EQIA also included a number of mitigations to inform the actions needed to address inequalities as a result of the proposed policy changes.

92% of schools in Surrey are good and outstanding and so the vast majority of families can access high quality education in their local community.

NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND WASTE

18. ROBERT EVANS (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

Surrey Live reported recently that over 151 'schools in Surrey have buildings in urgent need of repair or replacement.'

Can the Council confirm these figures by Borough and District?

What approaches have been made to the Government for support and additional funding?

How does Surrey County Council seek to address this situation in the short term?

RESPONSE:

The Surrey Live article refers to the national position of the condition of schools, and no reference is made to Surrey County Council. As a result, I am unable to comment on these figures specifically. Surrey County Council's Land and Property function works across the school estate on an ongoing basis to monitor, prioritise and address any condition issues.

Surrey County Council takes part in full in all Department for Education (DfE) requests for school condition data and applies for any appropriate grant or programme funding from DfE as it is announced. Additionally, Surrey County Council receives an annual grant from the DfE for the maintenance of schools for which Surrey County Council retains responsibility. Academy Trusts also receive an annual grant from DfE to maintain their schools.

In the last financial year, Surrey County Council has delivered forty-two capital maintenance projects to improve the condition of schools at a cost of £8.2m. A further, similar programme of works is scheduled for FY 2022/23.

Additionally, the current Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) includes capital investment of £82m over the next five years in relation to the school capital maintenance programme. This is funded in part by a grant from the DfE of c£7m per annum (unconfirmed after 2022/23), with the remaining investment requirement funded by the Council's own capital resources.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

19. NICK DARBY (THE DITTONS) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

Does Surrey County Council intend to review/consider appropriate traffic or other measures to alleviate traffic/transport issues caused by the Hampton Court Flower Show?

What liaison takes place already with the organisers, Police, London Borough of Richmond, local residents, and what traffic enforcement is put in place to ensure safety, and effective compliance with traffic signage/parking restrictions, as well as the general obligation not to obstruct the highway?

RESPONSE:

In light of the specific concerns raised this year by residents in Gladstone Place/Summer Road about the park and ride location operated from the nearby sports ground, officers will meet with Councillor Darby to ensure all areas of concern are captured accurately. Officers will then review the Traffic Order currently in place for Surrey Roads (which does not cover parking restrictions in Gladstone Place) and liaise with the event organisers to see what measures can be put in place to better mitigate the impact of the event on Surrey residents.

As many of the arrangements for the show have not changed significantly for several years, sign-off of plans/proposals have taken place via email exchanges which has previously been sufficient to satisfy stakeholder groups approval for the event. The Council's officers reviewing this year's event proposals were not aware of any previous concerns expressed by residents of Gladstone Place. However, given the concerns highlighted this year, consideration for future events will include a multi-agency Safety Advisory Group (SAG) which can be held to review all event plans including traffic management provisions.

Traffic offences, contravening either the normal rules of the road, or breaching any of the additional measures set out in the Traffic Order for the time of the event each year, can be enforced by either Police Officers or District/Borough Enforcement Officers as appropriate. In light of the concerns expressed this year by residents of

Gladstone Place, should the event seek to utilise the park and ride at this location for next year's event, Surrey Officers will ensure that either through the SAG process, or by other means, suitable consideration will be given to what enforcement resources can be deployed and by whom.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

**20. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:
(3rd Question)**

Please provide details of how Surrey County Council monitors travel plans conditions as part of planning decisions for:

- A. County Council planning decisions; and
- B. Planning decisions by Surrey borough and districts that require a travel plan.

How many travel plans are currently being monitored by Surrey County Council and what is the annual cost of travel plan monitoring? How is the approval of Surrey's new local transport plan expected to change travel plans and their monitoring?

RESPONSE:

Surrey County Council, as the Highway Authority do not monitor travel plan conditions. This responsibility rests with the twelve Planning Authorities. It is important to distinguish between monitoring a condition (i.e. determining whether a Travel Plan monitoring report has been produced) which is the responsibility of the planning authority, and the actual monitoring of that travel plan itself, which is the responsibility of the developer. For both County Planning (Regulation 3 matters) and Surrey Borough and District travel plans, they are monitored by the applicant, which in the case of schools, should be the education authority or individual school.

A: In respect of all Surrey County Council Planning matters where travel plans might be required (including schools), the County, as Planning Authority, do not monitor the outcomes of these plans. It is the responsibility of the applicant to do so, and in the cases of Surrey County Council planning decisions relating to schools, this is sometimes undertaken by the school, supported by our Safer Travel Team who help them produce and maintain their travel plans, using the nationally recognised Modeshift STARS accreditation system. Any monitoring report that might be required by condition on these development related travel plans is then audited by the County Council's Transport Development Planning team, who will make recommendations and work with the school to secure improvements. Sometimes the production of monitoring reports does not occur because of other priorities within the school, and it is then incumbent upon the County as Planning Authority to take appropriate action to secure such outputs.

B: In the case of the majority of development related Travel Plans, these are the responsibility of the eleven borough and district councils. In much the same way as with Surrey County Council County Regulation 3 applications, the Highway Authority's input is only in respect of auditing any monitoring that takes place. It is

the responsibility of the Planning Authority to ensure that the condition requiring the production of the monitoring report is complied with.

There are currently around eighty developments with travel plan requirements, where fees have been secured. As of July 2022, 58 schools have Modeshift STARS accreditation.

Travel plan audit fees – one off payments payable by developers to cover between five to nine years of auditing travel plan monitoring reports - were agreed by Surrey County Council's Executive in 2007. They were originally designed to cover the full costs of delivery, although hourly rates have not been uplifted for some time, so this may no longer be the case. Surrey County Council charges travel plan audit fees of £4,600 and £6,150, depending on development size. This fee funds the Travel Plan Officer role, which sits in the Transport Development Planning team.

The new Surrey Transport Plan (LTP4) and new Travel Hierarchy will help to ensure that all new land use and transport developments for other modes can secure high quality provision for active travel measures, public and shared transport and car clubs ahead of parking provision for new developments.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

21. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK: (3rd Question)

Please provide an update of the Council's plans to 'Bus Back Better' to address the cost of living and climate crises together. Please confirm plans to:

- A. Increase the number of buses and bus routes; and
- B. Encourage greater bus use, such as reduced fares to support Surrey residents switching from cars to public transport this summer.

RESPONSE:

I would like to thank Councillor Essex for his question and for his support for public transport in the county.

It is immensely disappointing that our Bus Service Improvement Plan did not receive any Government funding earlier this year. This is particularly so, as we are committed to maintaining our current level of financial support for bus services, whilst we are also investing our own funding in more ultra-low emission buses, more real time passenger information and more bus priority schemes. That is not the case in other councils, some of whom received Bus Service Improvement Plan funding.

We continue to work with all our bus operators to understand their pressures, patronage levels and thoughts on the future of the network across Surrey. This includes where operators think there is scope for network and patronage growth, during what are challenging operating conditions.

Given our new and still emerging travel and commuting patterns, Officers are working with all bus operators to assess what our future bus network might look like. This work is also considering our planned investment and what it will deliver, alongside the opportunity to maximise innovation, for example, in more digital demand responsive transport, plus ticketing schemes targeted at younger people. Clearly, wider cost of living issues are part of this. However, the financial operating pressures on the bus industry coupled with changing travel habits create an opportunity to look at the current service offer to determine how it might change to best serve residents in the future.

This is very much work in progress. Any proposals for change will of course be shared with Members, including our future investment and innovation.

MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMY

**22. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:
(4th Question)**

The Highway Code in January 2022 changed the priorities for pedestrians and cyclists at junctions. Cycle lanes completed before January 2022 are signed in accordance with previous Highway Code priorities.

What plan does Surrey County Council have for making all cycle routes in Surrey comply with the current Highway Code, to avoid confusion and potential for conflict and accidents? What is the estimated cost of doing this, by when?

RESPONSE:

Cycle lanes are not signed in accordance with the Highway Code but with the Traffic Signs Regulations & General Directions (TSRGD), the latest version of which was enacted in 2016, and which prescribes the lining and signing regime that can be used on the highway. The cycle lane markings and signs are intended to indicate the presence of a cycle lane to both cyclists and other road users and there have been no amendments to the TSRGD following the updates to the Highway Code in January. The changes of priorities at junctions apply at all junctions, whether or not there is a cycle lane present, and are intended to change driver awareness and behaviour and there are no associated prescribed signs. There are therefore no plans to make any changes to the existing cycle lane signs and lines.

All new standards and associated guidance are updated as part of our design process, and therefore any changes will apply to all new schemes that are being designed to the relevant standard which include cycling or pedestrian priorities. Any existing infrastructure can also be upgraded as part of suitable improvements works planned.

NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY AND WASTE

**23. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:
(4th Question)**

Please provide an update on the resolution of the legal dispute regarding the gasification plant as part of the Charlton Lane Eco-Park, plus costs to date and the latest situation with regard to payment of PFI credits by the Government. When is it expected to be completed?

RESPONSE:

The Council and SUEZ are part way through an arbitration process designed to protect the Council's position with respect to the waste PFI contract. The process requires the exchange of arguments and counter-arguments before a hearing next summer and the legal work is currently ongoing.

The costs of legal work to date are £1,123,606 (excluding vat).

The Council were due a total of £205m in PFI credits and to date we have been paid £144m.

A report providing a more comprehensive update is being prepared for Cabinet at its meeting on 26 July 2022 as a Part 2 item, given the commercial confidentiality of this process.

This page is intentionally left blank