

**MEETING OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY 12 DECEMBER 2023**

**QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED UNDER THE PROVISIONS  
OF STANDING ORDER 10.1**

**NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, WASTE AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE**

**1. ROBERT EVANS OBE (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:**

How many Council buildings in Surrey are now believed to be affected by RAAC (Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete) and what are the plans for them?

**RESPONSE:**

Following 139 surveys undertaken to date we have identified a total of six Surrey County Council buildings which are affected by RAAC.

The six properties identified are made up of one managed school and five properties from the corporate property portfolio, of which three are leasehold properties and two are freehold properties:

**Shawfield Primary School:** RAAC was identified in the school roof. Mitigating remedial works have been completed and following verification by independent structural engineers, the school's main hall has been declared safe to use and the school is open as normal. The feasibility study will be completed by the end of the current school term, and roof replacement works will take place during the 2024 summer holiday period.

**Leatherhead Fire Station and Walton-on-Thames Fire Station** (freehold properties): both fire stations remain operational with a management plan developed for each site. The management plan details the requirement to monitor the buildings to ensure that there is no visual deterioration to the RAAC present.

**Staines Library** (freehold property): the library remains operational and has a management plan in place (as above) to monitor the building to ensure that there is no visual deterioration to the RAAC present.

Following structural risk assessments the remaining two properties, which are both leaseholds, **The Bridge Youth Centre and Redhill Library**, have been temporarily closed, until a more intrusive structural survey is undertaken at each building. The results of these surveys will determine the timeframe for re-opening these properties and the work that needs to be completed to ensure both buildings are operationally safe for staff and users.

## **DAVID LEWIS, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES**

### **2. EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL & CUDDINGTON) TO ASK:**

I note that the public consultation on the draft Budget 2024/2025 went live in November. Will the Cabinet Member:

- a) Provide the data on the number of responses to the website public consultation on the draft Budgets in 2021 and 2022.
- b) State what he considers to be the number of responses required to the draft Budget consultation this year to make the outcome statistically valid and meaningful.

### **RESPONSE:**

In 2021, we received 98 responses and in 2022, we received 358 responses. It is important to note that residents who respond to these exercises tend to be self-selecting, and so are not necessarily representative of the views of Surrey's wider population.

This is why we occasionally commission research organisations to carry out statistically representative surveys to complement the open exercises. These tend to use the views of at least 1,000 residents as a meaningful sample.

However, because the research is designed and targets certain demographics in the population, this does not give all residents the opportunity to respond, so it is best practice for us to consult residents on the budget each year. What we have found in previous years is that resident priorities across the representative and open exercises tend to align, for example, protecting spending on services for the most vulnerable has been a consistent theme in recent years.

To give assurance to Members on this year's exercise, I am pleased to say we have made a strong start. At time of writing this response, since we launched the draft budget consultation for 2024/25, 948 residents have responded to date – the largest response rate in recent memory. The closing date for this year's exercise is 5 January 2024, so we anticipate having the views on our draft budget from at least 1,000 residents to inform decision-making for the final budget.

## **MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

### **3. JOANNE SEXTON (ASHFORD) TO ASK:**

Please can the Cabinet Member advise what data is gathered on Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) for hotspots and at District and Borough level; for example how many daily visits to Spelthorne hotspots (Resident permit zones, Clarence Street, Church Street-Staines, Fairfield Avenue-Staines, Elmsleigh Road-Staines, High

Street-Staines, Church Road-Ashford, Woodthorpe Road-Ashford, The Avenue-Sunbury, High Street-Shepperton, Clare Road-Stanwell) are recorded?

**RESPONSE:**

The tables below show the enforcement visits and PCNs issued at the locations mentioned above:

LOCATION VISITS/PCNS								
LOCATION	SEPTEMBER		OCTOBER		NOVEMBER		3 MONTH TOTAL	
	VISITS	PCNS	VISITS	PCNS	VISITS	PCNS	VISITS	PCNS
Clarence Street	21	2	13	1	31	22	65	25
Church Street	100	46	24	12	83	41	207	99
Fairfield Avenue	71	36	20	16	62	33	153	85
High Street (Staines)	6	2	3	1	23	15	32	18
Church Road	8	1	3	0	17	3	28	4
Woodthorpe Road	22	30	9	13	53	32	84	75
The Avenue	6	1	1	0	2	0	9	1
High Street (Shepperton)	1	0	4	1	1	0	6	1
Clare Road	14	2	12	0	29	1	55	3

RESIDENTS PARKING ZONE	SEPT-NOV	
	VISITS	PCNS
C (Waters Rd area)	154	63
E (Church Street area)	212	99
H (Victoria Rd area)	76	8

We will be distributing district and borough specific parking enforcement data each month along with the weekly Highways Bulletin, usually the second or third Friday of the month. These will be in the format most Members will be familiar with from their recent Stakeholder team update.

Members can find out more about on street parking enforcement via our web pages [www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking) or contact [parking@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:parking@surreycc.gov.uk) to report or request information about parking enforcement.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**4. CATHERINE POWELL (FARNHAM NORTH) TO ASK:**

This Council is investing heavily in hydrogen buses.

As of today, green hydrogen infrastructure in the UK is pretty much zero. The Government issued the latest Hydrogen Strategy update to the Market in August 2023 ([Hydrogen Strategy: Update to the market, August 2023 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#))

This strategy document acknowledges that hydrogen transport and storage will be critical enablers for the growth in the hydrogen economy and leverage the estimated £11 billion of private investment required in production, distribution and storage by 2023.

There is a promise of new business models by 2025 and there are proposals for offshore hydrogen pipelines and storage, but as of today there is nothing in place onshore. The report acknowledges the challenges that have been raised by industry:

*“We will continue to work closely with industry and regulatory bodies to consider the issues raised and the suggestions put forward on the suitability of existing regulatory frameworks for hydrogen, with a view to introducing timely amendments where they are needed”.*

Transporting hydrogen via pipeline is technically very challenging and there are no applicable hydrogen pipeline design specifications in existence in the UK today.

Transport of hydrogen by road is significantly more expensive (~ £1.23/kg vs £0.17/kg by pipeline), also very problematic as there are 9 road tunnels in the UK where it is prohibited ([Hydrogen transport and storage infrastructure: government response \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#)). The Government's response to this issue:

*“We are sympathetic to the added journey length that these restrictions cause for transport operations. However, given that there are sufficient alternative routes, we judge that tunnel codes for hydrogen are necessary to save lives and protect important road network infrastructure.”*

In the South East these tunnels include the Dartford Tunnel, Blackwall Tunnel, Limehouse Tunnel, East India Dock tunnel and Rotherhide Tunnel. Depending on where the green hydrogen is shipped into from Rotherdam or according to the Cabinet Member's response to my earlier question Saudi Arabia they could be avoided.

However, concerns regarding hydrogen have lead the large European truck manufacturer – MAN to refocused on electric trucks rather than Hydrogen ([‘Far too expensive’ | Europe’s second-largest truck maker says hydrogen will not be a major road freight fuel | Hydrogen news and intelligence \(hydrogeninsight.com\)](#))

So where are we now and how does this impact on Surrey and the Council's plans:

- There is currently extremely limited green hydrogen manufacture in the UK. There are plans for future development, but they are still some way from delivery. Hydrogen manufactured in any other way will have a higher overall carbon footprint than burning fossil fuels directly.

- There is no potential for pipelines to be installed in Surrey by 2024 / 2025 when the buses are delivered so all green hydrogen will need to be imported (as previously advised by the Cabinet Member) and transported by road.
- How do we avoid what has happened in Liverpool where the buses were out of action due to problems with global hydrogen supply ([Flagship Liverpool hydrogen buses out of action due to 'problems with global H2 supply' | Hydrogen news and intelligence \(hydrogeninsight.com\)](#)).

Can the Cabinet Member please confirm that he is confident that:

- a) Metrobus will be able to run these buses on only green hydrogen that has been transported only using renewable energy.
  - b) Storage and transportation arrangement for the green hydrogen have been planned across the county and will be delivered and operational prior to the delivery of the first bus.
  - c) The hydrogen buses that have been ordered will be able to operate consistently on green hydrogen to the same timetable as the buses they will replace.
- d) Can the Cabinet Member also please advise if he will reconsider the potential introduction of break clauses with each batch of buses to be delivered to ensure that there is a risk mitigation strategy in place to manage the current uncertainties associated with Green Hydrogen generation, distribution and storage?

## **RESPONSE:**

I met with Metrobus as recently as 5 December to discuss progress on our groundbreaking partnership scheme that will replace 54 diesel buses with new hydrogen powered buses, 34 of which are funded by this Council.

Air Products is the provider of hydrogen to Metrobus. They are the only company in the United Kingdom whose product has been independently audited and approved as renewable “from well to wheel”. This certification ensures the hydrogen is renewable and is overseen by a government approved auditor, with certification to be applied to every source used for the Metrobus bus depot in Crawley. This is a contractual obligation in the hydrogen supply agreement between Air Products and Metrobus’s parent company Go-Ahead.

Storage and transportation arrangement for the green hydrogen have been planned across the county. It is planned that the hydrogen will be delivered and will be operational prior to the delivery of the first hydrogen powered bus. I would add, that Metrobus are currently operating hydrogen buses from their Crawley bus depot, so hydrogen storage and transport arrangements are already operational at a low level. Clearly as the need for more hydrogen and associated fuelling facilities grows as more business transfer to hydrogen, the commercial market and potentially central government will respond by providing an increased level of investment, supply and storage.

I can also confirm that the 54 hydrogen buses on order will be able to operate consistently on green hydrogen, and to the same operating timetable as the diesel buses that they will replace. This would not be possible with battery electric buses, as they have a lower mileage range compared to hydrogen powered buses. This higher range is needed for longer distance cross boundary bus routes.

In terms of potential break clauses for batches of buses to mitigate any green hydrogen generation, distribution or storage issues, I believe this concern relates to a hydrogen project in Liverpool. Issues experienced there related to the lack of gaseous tankers in the UK rather than the actual supply of hydrogen. Air Products are not experiencing such issues and have two more high pressure tankers going live in February 2024. The legal agreement with Metrobus and the bus manufacturer has been signed and approved and it is not believed that alterations are required. To support the successful introduction of new buses into service, the 34 hydrogen powered buses that the council has ordered will be arriving on a phased basis between February and December 2024. This phased introduction will help to limit any unforeseen delivery and supply issues and enable us to effectively manage the transition.

The average carbon emissions from the existing Metrobus diesel buses, which will be replaced by hydrogen buses, amounts to 1.61kg per mile. Once in service, the scheduled route mileage for the 34 hydrogen fuel cell buses that this council is buying is 1,867,008 miles per annum. Applying the average of 1.61kg per mile, the Council's investment will deliver a carbon saving of 3,005,883kg per annum.

Our work to 'green' Surrey's bus fleet does not stop here. We are working with West Sussex County Council and Metrobus on a bid to the Department for Transport's zero emission bus scheme known as ZEBRA 2. This bid is for even more hydrogen powered buses. We are also working on a second bid with two Surrey bus operators that aims to introduce more electric buses into the county. I hope to be able to announce the outcome of these two bids in March next year.

All of this demonstrates our work to deliver a greener future for our residents.

**NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, WASTE AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

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

Please explain how Greener Futures/sustainable procurement principles have been reflected in the recent new facilities contract for Woodhatch Place, particularly in provision of catering and waste. Will this be extended to all County Council offices?

**RESPONSE:**

After an extensive procurement programme Macro Ltd has been appointed to deliver our facilities management services across the corporate and schools' estate. This partnership commenced on 20 November 2023.

Macro has committed to putting the Council's 'Net Zero' targets at the heart of their delivery and will implement our sustainability objectives. Macro will deliver over £10m of Social Value in support of the Council's 'No One Left Behind' ambition and support Surrey residents and the local economy by using a range of local sub-contractors based in the county.

Macro is focussing on the initiatives outlined below which will apply to all properties across the estate, including Woodhatch Place.

- Significantly improving the recycling of waste materials, whilst continuing to avoid any materials going to landfill.
- Through a thorough analysis of utilities consumption, reducing CO2 emissions and cost.
- Continuing to implement the replacement of heating systems with renewable technology in the form of air-source heat pumps, where practicable.
- Reduction in water usage.
- Reduction in single-use plastics.
- Implementation of a new biodiversity regime.
- Use of supplier electric vehicles.
- Focus on procurement on more sustainable consumables, e.g. washing up products, paper, printer toner.

In relation to catering, Macro is preparing a paper looking at a new catering provision for Woodhatch Place. The paper will be reviewed by the Council's Client Board in Q4 FY2023/24.

A review and audit of the waste and recycling services is currently under way in order to implement a significant material change to the way that waste is handled across all Surrey County Council offices.

All of these are part of our overall ambition for cost effective, customer-focused facilities management service across the Council's estate.

## **MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

### **6. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:**

Please can you provide an update on discussions with Transport for London (TfL) and the Department for Transport (DfT) about Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) scrappage schemes and expanding travelcard zones into Surrey?

### **RESPONSE:**

Prior to the expansion of ULEZ, I met with TfL to set out our mitigation priorities. These are:

- A car scrappage scheme for Surrey residents.
- Extending the Zone 6 Oyster Card scheme.

- Additional and extended active travel schemes across the London-Surrey border into neighbouring boroughs and districts.
- Additional local bus services across the London-Surrey border into neighbouring boroughs and districts.

As Members will be aware, our asks fell on deaf ears. The Mayor chose to focus his support only on London residents.

The consequences of the Mayor's ULEZ expansion for those living outside of London who, for a variety of reasons, have to drive into the capital have been significant. This has been the case for more than three months since ULEZ was expanded.

I recently wrote to TfL asking for more granular and geographic data on those paying the ULEZ charge, along with those subject to a penalty charge notice who live in Surrey. TfL has not published this data. Seeing it will help us to better understand the impact of ULEZ by area and what we may be able to do to support residents.

I have also asked what funding remains in the vehicle scrappage scheme and if meaningful mitigation can be provided for those living outside of London, noting our stated priorities.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**7. JONATHAN HULLEY (FOXHILLS, THORPE & VIRGINIA WATER) TO ASK:**

In relation to Planning Application 21/0185, approved by the Planning and Regulatory Committee in July 2022, can the Cabinet Member confirm that the Applicant will fully comply with all planning conditions imposed by the Committee, including conditions 6 and 7, designed to ensure the safe and appropriate construction of the M25 Junction 10 roundabout and compliance with British Standard 5837-2012 i.e. that all retained trees and hedgerows within the scheme are suitably protected from all construction activities?

**RESPONSE:**

Planning permission was issued on 27 January 2023 following lengthy consideration of whether the application should be 'called in' or not for determination by the Secretary of State. There were 21 planning conditions listed on the decision notice. As with all applications, irrespective of the applicant, the County Planning Authority would expect the developer to comply with those conditions in the implementation of their planning permission.

**NATALIE BRAMHALL, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, WASTE AND INFRASTRUCTURE and CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, LIFELONG LEARNING**

**8. GEORGE POTTER (GUILDFORD EAST) TO ASK:**

The County Council publishes a Developer Contribution Guide which outlines the infrastructure requirements expected from property developers to meet the needs of the expected 4,357 new homes a year which are expected to be built across the county. The guide notes that the price tag of providing the necessary supporting infrastructure for housing growth by 2031 is estimated as being £5.5 billion. The document includes yield factors which are used to estimate the number of additional early years, primary and secondary school places required as a result of development. These yields assume a requirement of an additional 7 early years places, 25 primary school places and 18 secondary school places for every 100 new homes.

Please could the Cabinet Member(s) explain how these yields have been calculated and why the need for secondary school places is estimated as being 28% lower than the need for primary school places?

**RESPONSE:**

The yields are based on a methodology which used census data on housing characteristics of the population. These gave yields for a local authority area as a whole. The reasons secondary yields are lower than primary yields is mainly because there are fewer year groups at secondary compared with primary 5 versus 7, and also a result of outward migration of older children as well as movement at secondary age outside the local authority area or into the independent sector. We are reviewing the methodology following recent Department for Education guidance on developer contributions. A report will be prepared for Members on the changes to the education information contained in the Developer Contribution Guidance.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**9. HAZEL WATSON (DORKING HILLS) TO ASK:**

The Signage Team at Highways have generally done an excellent job in maintaining the road signs across the county and have delivered replacement signs within what I understand are their Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for this service, a replacement sign ordered in one calendar quarter and then installed in the next calendar quarter.

However, in recent months the responses that I have received in relation to sign maintenance and replacement have been concerning with delivery times slipping.

Responses have been stating:

*“Firstly, I would like to express my sincere apologies for the delay in responding to your report. Our team has been facing staffing constraints, which regrettably impacted our ability to provide a swift response. Please be assured that we are actively addressing this issue and working towards improving our response times.”*

*“I want to assure you that the reported highway issue has recently undergone inspection and consequently, a job has been initiated for the replacement of the sign. I would like to inform you that, despite raising the request, neither I nor my immediate management team have any influence over the prioritization of works which are submitted to the Signs and Lines delivery team. Therefore, regrettably, I am unable to provide you with a specific completion date at this time.”*

and

*“I regret to inform you that at this time, I am unable to provide a specific time-frame for the completion of these works. It is important to note that highway enquirers are prioritized on a case-by-case basis throughout the County, which may cause some variability in the timelines.”*

and

*“I receive a large number of requests for sign maintenance countywide so these have to be prioritised, with the repair of regulatory signs (speed limits, banned turns etc) being the highest priority. The team has been significantly under-resourced which has led to delays, which I appreciate will cause frustration.”*

There are road signs within the Dorking Hills division, including important directional signs and chevrons on the A24, that have been reported and have still not been replaced more than a year after the replacement signs have been requested and apparently have been ordered.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that:

- a) the KPI for replacing road signs remains the case that a replacement sign is ordered in one calendar quarter and then installed in the next calendar quarter or confirm that a new KPI that applies to this service;
- b) the Principal Engineer responsible for street signage will be given the resources necessary to provide the service and meet this KPI and from which date these resources will be made available; and
- c) the backlog in road sign reinstatement and repair will be eliminated by 30 June 2024, that all outstanding work will be completed by this date, and that the KPIs for sign replacement and repair will be met from this date?

**RESPONSE:**

The correct road signs play an important role within the highway network to aid users. Signs that serve a direct safety purpose (such as STOP signs) are prioritised over those that are advisory.

The overall Ringway contract has a suite of challenging KPIs, but it is incorrect to state that a road sign ordered in one quarter must be delivered in the following. The installation of road signs is paid via a daywork rate, where the cost of labour for a day is fixed. Therefore, if there is the need to have a sign installed promptly, installation can occur as soon as the sign is fabricated (subject to road space). In most circumstances it is more cost efficient to batch signs in a local area to maximise the gang's output and gain the best financial value for council taxpayers.

It is accepted there have been unfortunate delays to replacing some road signs, and we are sorry this has been the case recently. These delays are due to a combination of reasons, including staff resourcing levels and new processes that have been adopted. I am pleased to advise that extra resource has been employed to support the lead officer, and that a review is currently being undertaken to ensure that officers can work in the most effective manner to deliver maintenance requests such as these. It is anticipated that with these changes there will be an improvement in delivery.

We expect the current known backlog of signs to be completed in the next few months. In terms of future sign requests, we will continue to progress this as batched work to maximise on the efficiency from this approach, as described above. While committing to deliver in the most efficient manner, with revised processes and the additional officer support, it is expected most signs will be installed within three to four months of being identified as a priority for replacement (subject to road space).

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**10. WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:**

- a) Has the final legal bill with regard to the ULEZ challenge been settled and what was the County Council's total contribution to this action?
- b) Is the Cabinet Member re-considering his decision not to allow the erection of ULEZ signs on Surrey highways?
- c) Does the Cabinet Member have any indication of the numbers of Surrey motorists who have had to pay the new charge?

**RESPONSE:**

The legal bill has been settled with a total contribution from the County Council of £139,528.20. This was made up of £39,528.20 contribution to the costs of the five Council's taking the judicial challenge, and £100,000 contribution to the costs of Transport for London.

In answer to the second question, no, I am not re-considering the decision to stop the erection of the Mayor's ULEZ signs on Surrey's highway. Surrey is not alone in taking this stance. In fact, all county council's bordering London hold the same view. It is not for us to collectively bend to the Mayor's will. It is for the Mayor and Transport for London to come back to the negotiating table with meaningful mitigation for residents outside of London impacted by this tax on the motorist. This

includes mitigation for Surrey residents, which must include a vehicle scrappage scheme funded by ULEZ.

Turning to the third and final question, data on where motorists live who have been subject to this hastily introduced new tax is held by Transport for London. The first Transport for London report published following the expansion of ULEZ included a lot of data. However, it did not include a geographic breakdown of motorists paying the ULEZ charge so, at the current time, I am unable to provide an indication of the numbers of Surrey motorists that have had to pay the new charge.

I have written to Transport for London asking for more granular data and to encourage them once again to reengage on the issue of meaningful mitigation for Surrey residents.

For those Members interested, Transport for London's initial ULEZ expansion report can be accessed via the London Assembly's web site using the following web address:

[London-wide Ultra Low Emission Zone First Month Report | London City Hall](#)

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,  
LIFELONG LEARNING**

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

How many children in Surrey still do not have placements at school? How many of these are at primary school and how many at secondary school? How many have special education needs?

**RESPONSE:**

All mainstream children without an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP), who applied to start school or transfer to junior or secondary school in September 2023, were offered a place by the end of August 2023, with the exception of one junior and four secondary applicants who had applied very late. These five were all resolved in September. Applications for in year admissions outside the normal intake to a school are currently being processed within the statutory timeframe of 15 school days. Where a place cannot be secured through the normal in year process, applicants are referred for placement within 20 school days through Surrey's Fair Access Protocol. Under the mainstream application process, local authorities are not permitted to ask about a child's special educational needs and so it is not possible to report on how many children applying through the mainstream admissions process have special educational needs.

As of February 2023, there were 1,795 pupils with EHCPs going through the annual School Age Key Stage Transfer process, of which, 94% of pupils had a named setting in Section I of their EHCP, and 6% (116 pupils) with a type of setting named. The SEND Code of Practice sets out the statutory duty that by 15 February, the Local Authority must name either a setting or type of setting. 100% of EHCPs were

sent to families for this deadline. 408 additional EHCPs were agreed for pupils in those Key Stage Transfer Year Groups between 15 February 2023 and 22 July 2023. In total, 2,203 pupils went through the statutory process and as of 22 July 2023 there were 58 pupils still requiring confirmation of placement. Whilst placement searches continued, alternative arrangements were being explored with these pupils for September 2023. As of September 2023, 15 pupils still required a specialist placement confirmed, which has reduced further to five pupils as of 7 December 2023.

In addition to the above there are overall 110 children without a school place. The table below shows the breakdown of the cohort by gender and phase.

Children Missing Education				Total
EHCP	53 (48.1%)	57 (51.9)		110
Gender	32 (f)	76 (m)	2 (not stated)	110
School phase	35 primary	75 secondary		110

The number of children who are missing education is a small number and have no provision for a number of reasons. The reasons vary on a case-by-case basis, such as they have moved into the county, they are awaiting placement, or they have been removed from the Elective Home Educated list as it has been assessed that they are not receiving a suitable education or they may be receiving palliative care and are not fit enough to be in education.

In addition to the children who are missing education (CME) there are young people not in school as they are Elective Home Educated at this moment that figure is **2060**. There are several young people (**278**) who are not in school due to a range of reasons such as medical needs, anxiety or because they are waiting for a place in a specialist provision. They receive access to alternative provision and are described as educated otherwise than at school (EOTAS).

## **DENISE TURNER-STEWART, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CUSTOMER AND COMMUNITIES**

### **12. JOHN BECKETT (EWELL) TO ASK:**

On 14 November, funding of £175,658 - £135,933 of which is capital funding - was approved for the Puttenham Community Transport Hub. Puttenham Parish Council (PPC) have contributed just £5,000 towards the scheme, 95% of which will be covered by Your Fund Surrey (YFS).

When the advisory panel met on 20 September 2023, concerns were raised around the percentage being contributed by Surrey County Council and the value for money of the scheme. The report states that: "There are concerns around the materially high value of YFS funding (at 95%) and that the minimal wider funding secured could demonstrate a lack of wider support. Whilst some public benefit can be envisaged

there are concerns about value for money." The project also did not score as highly as other Your Fund Surrey projects in terms of delivering wider community benefit.

This 'hub', which is essentially a car park, will mainly benefit private car users. It is therefore placed at number six out of the seven priorities of the fourth Local Transport Plan (LTP4), as schemes to support walking, cycling and public transport are all more important. Puttenham also has a score of seven in the index of multiple deprivation and is not located in one of the 21 Key Neighbourhoods.

Can the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member therefore confirm why this scheme has been approved?

**RESPONSE:**

The aim of Your Fund Surrey (YFS) is to support community-led projects which lead to wide, and long-lasting, community benefit, which it has done to good effect since it was launched three years ago. It has been, and continues to be, hugely popular with local communities.

Puttenham is a very rural village, and this specific project aims to develop neglected wasteland to enable and encourage residents and visitors to enjoy the existing open spaces, community facilities and village amenities which are currently underutilised. It will also provide much-needed disabled access to various events happening in the village.

The project received significant support from the local community and the majority of the YFS Advisory Panel supported the application. The project fully meets the wider aims and published criteria of the fund.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**13. ROBERT EVANS OBE (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

The drains in many, if not most, of the roads in Stanwell and Stanwell Moor are blocked and have been for ages. This means that the soakaways barely work when it rains, resulting in avoidable flooding.

Does the Council have a plan to address this situation?

**RESPONSE:**

All the gullies in Stanwell and Stanwell Moor, and across the entire county, are included on the optimised cyclical drain cleaning programme so should be cleaned at the correct frequency to keep them functioning. When we are aware of defects impacting the performance of our road gullies, they will be prioritised for repair. There is also a programme of soakaway cleaning. However, if the local water table level is high, as can happen in some locations during winter months, it is unfortunately the case that the soakaways will struggle to function.

Much of Stanwell Moor and Stanwell is due to benefit from the cyclical clean in the early part of the new year, although some specific gullies along Horton Road in Stanwell Moor were cleaned last month, following a resident meeting where the issues were highlighted to the divisional Member, Cabinet Member and Member of Parliament. It was noted some of the weir gullies had sunk, and Officers will be looking to undertake repairs in the new year.

Ditches play an important role in drainage, and it was apparent some in Stanwell Moor would benefit from being cleaned. Ditches are subject to riparian owner responsibility and if not explicitly registered within the title of a land ownership, generally fall to the adjoining landowner. In this location investigations have identified that some are registered to adjoining properties and some remain unregistered. However, they all form part of the main river network which the Environment Agency has enforcement powers and obligations for, and they will be made aware of the issue.

There are approximately 160,000 road gullies recorded on the public highway within Surrey. All of these gullies will be dependent on connecting pipes and an outfall for them to function correctly. If a gully is not working, addressing the situation may not be as straight forward as just undertaking a clean. The County Council has invested additional sums over recent years to tackle defects and following a review by the Cabinet's Task & Finish Group earlier in the summer, I am pleased to confirm that an additional level of investment for repairs has been included in the draft budget for 24/25 and an allocation within this current financial year. This is in addition to the existing budget for routine cleaning and repair of defects, which is a significant investment targeted to directly improve highway drainage. This additional funding will be used across the County, including for the planned repairs in Stanwell Moor.

If you notice a specific problem with highway drainage, please do report this either via our website, or using the dedicated councillor email address. The Highways Maintenance team are happy to investigate any concerns raised.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,  
LIFELONG LEARNING**

**14. EBER KINGTON (EWELL COURT, AURIOL & CUDDINGTON) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

Will the Cabinet Member please set out the specific additional new early intervention and prevention services and short breaks that will be funded within the 2024/2025 Children, Families and Lifelong Learning (CFL) service budget, so as to address the findings of the Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities (SEND) Inspection Review.

**RESPONSE:**

We appreciate all feedback relating to Surrey County Council's short breaks provision, including that received through the SEND inspection and from families

through engagement work, including the Family Voice Surrey survey that we supported over the summer.

In terms of our plans for Short Breaks in 2024/25, Surrey County Council is continuing to maintain its core £2.5 million funding for a range of short breaks services into 2024/25, that fulfils our statutory duties, at a time of real pressure on budgets within children's services, acknowledging their importance to local children and families. This budget is being supplemented by an additional £0.9 million of Short Breaks Innovation Funding from the Department for Education (DfE), which is enabling us to provide a range of additional services for families, including: increased capacity for children and young people who require 1-to-1 support to access their short break; additional overnight respite provision for children with complex needs; and whole-family activity breaks for children with complex needs and their families. We are confident that this funding will continue into 2024/25, including a small increase on the proportion of level of funding that is allocated to additional play and youth places for children with 1-to-1 support needs.

In addition, to support the right children and young people to access services we have recently been engaging with families and providers to explore whether we should introduce eligibility criteria for community-based play and youth schemes, with a view to ensuring the provision available is prioritised for families in most need. As part of this we have also been benchmarking our offer against a number of comparable authorities, which suggests our offer compares well. As well as developing proposals around eligibility, we are also planning a co-production process with families and providers, to begin in spring 2024, to look at a range of areas for service improvement around short breaks, including how waiting lists are managed and how children and families supported to "wait well" ahead of accessing a service they have requested.

The Early Help offer in Surrey is dependent on the contributions of all agencies, partners, and communities. In Surrey we have a mixed economy of in-house and commissioned provision. The outcome of the recent recommissioning process for Family Centres and Family Resilience Services will be shared with bidders mid-December. Service delivery will focus on one-to-one whole family working that is underpinned by the Department for Education (DfE) 10 Supporting Families Outcomes which include specific outcomes relating to children getting a good education, good early years development and improved mental and physical health. Which will help to address the findings of the Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities (SEND) Inspection Review.

Services will still run an outreach offer for families so that support can be provided within the home. There will also be a physical presence in communities so that children, young people, and families can access face to face support in Family Centres and other appropriate locations such as libraries. Provision will be based on local needs and support could be offered through mentoring services, group sessions or other types of evidence-based interventions that will help improve outcomes for children, young people and families.

Additionally, there are a range of early intervention initiatives which aim to support schools including the team around the school initiative and Specialist Teacher for

Inclusive Practice (STIPs) advice. These are funded through the Children, Families and Lifelong Learning (CFLL) service budget and feedback from 208 schools indicates that around 90% of schools reported improved outcomes for pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) following support from the STIPs team. Other initiatives in development include the Enhanced Language and Communication Offer for children in Reception and the Education Inclusion and Intervention Funding (EIIIF) pilot which aims to provide financial support to enhance the school offer at SEN support.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,  
LIFELONG LEARNING**

**15. CATHERINE POWELL (FARNHAM NORTH) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

On 28 November the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lifelong Learning approved the use of the approved Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Capital Funding to uplift project budgets for Epsom Downs Primary School and Dovers Green Primary School's committed Phase 4 Capital projects. I understand that uplift to be around 60% in just eight months since the previous modelling of the projects.

- a) Is the Cabinet Member confident that the full set of 27 projects can be delivered with the draft capital budget and on time to maximise the positive impact to Surrey Children with SEND and their families / carers?
- b) What lessons have been learned from the increases in costs already identified in these two projects that will minimise the potential for further cost increases in the next tranche, and which will ensure that the delivery of the overall programme within the agreed budget is not placed at risk?

**RESPONSE:**

Surrey's Cabinet approved the Medium-Term Financial Strategy for the SEND Capital budget of £180.4m for 2023/24 to 2027/28 in February 2023. On 28 March Cabinet agreed the use of £100.2m of the total approved SEND Capital budget for 20 projects in to 2023/24 tranche with confirmed viable schemes, locations, and costs. Epsom Downs primary School's new SEN Unit and Dovers Green School's existing SEN Unit expansion were two of the 20 projects.

Progress against the 20 projects since the Cabinet approval in March is as follows:

- Five projects have been delivered to time and budget and new accommodation is in use.
- Five projects are in contract and work is in progress on school sites. These are on track to be completed to time and budget.
- Six projects are now in pre-contract, with contract commencement due in the next 4-8 weeks. Temporary accommodation solutions (achieved either through utilising existing capacity on school sites or modular units) are being delivered across all sites to facilitate the necessary school decant of pupils and teaching accommodation to meet safeguarding and health and safety requirements, and

the planned growth of new pupil places to meet local need. This will enable the phasing of building works while the schools are in operation.

- Four of the projects were impacted severely by planning and procurement delays. These are now resolved. Two of the projects are Epsom Downs Primary School and Dovers Green School. Their original budgets plans were affected by:
  - The need to improve the overall fabric and condition of the building as well as the additional reprovision requirements needed to address technical viability and site planning constraints.
  - Poor original technical consultant advice resulting in the schemes' original budgets being under costed and leading to a change in main provider.
  - Costs for school decants and modular classrooms for temporary accommodation from manufacturers increasing within the period.
  - Modular classrooms being required for a longer period due to delays in planning consent and procuring a suitable contractor for the project.

Member approvals on 28 November confirmed the delivery to timescales and within the revised budget.

- Four projects are in development and have been subject to scope change, either at the request of schools, or to achieve technical viability. Temporary accommodation solutions have been delivered or is already planned to facilitate agreed growth of pupil numbers.

The creation of additional specialist school places has been carried out through the successful delivery of 41 of a total of 83 construction projects in schools across Surrey to date. The building projects included the expansion of existing specialist schools and existing Special Educational Needs (SEN) Units in mainstream schools, the construction of new specialist free schools, and the creation of new SEN Units in mainstream schools.

In terms of lessons learned, the 41 schemes delivered in the first four years of the programme have inevitably been the more technically and financially straightforward projects (the 'low hanging fruit'). 2023/24- 2026/27 tranches' committed projects are significantly more complex with higher risk profiles; all require full planning approval and have longer programmes to reflect major and medium new build project scope. As such, these schemes are more exposed to:

- Ongoing fluctuating construction market pressures and inflation.
- Limited market interest from tier 2-4 contractors for smaller to medium sized schemes (typically SEN Units in mainstream schools).
- Additional cost pressures associated with planning approvals, Net Zero Carbon Strategy scope and new Biodiversity Net Gain requirements against approved funding.
- Requirements to re-provide existing specialist accommodation necessary to facilitate technically viable expansion schemes.
- Planning and procurement delays.

SCC's Land and Property department has already invested additional resource in Surrey's Reg 3 team, Procurement and Property Legal teams to mitigate timeliness issues and this continues to be closely monitored and managed with partners.

The Council remains committed to delivering the target number of places in the SEND Capital Programme within the approved budget available. Given the increasing level of risks associated with delivery of the next 37 SEND schemes we have commissioned SCC's newly appointed lead technical consultants AtkinsRéalisis to undertake an in-depth review of up-to-date costs and viability options across the 2024/25-2026/27 tranches. This is due to conclude early in the new year and the output will be reported through Governance to support any necessary reprofile of capital spend and the Service's sufficiency prioritisation planning in the Spring.

**DENISE TURNER-STEWART, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CUSTOMER AND COMMUNITIES**

**16. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

What is the approximate value of Your Fund Surrey (YFS) projects in the pipeline and, given the proposed reduction to £40 million for the fund, please advise how long Members should continue to promote YFS in their divisions?

**RESPONSE:**

The current estimated value of YFS Projects in the pipeline is just over £40 million. We have so far agreed £16 million to support 34 Large Fund projects and a further £1 million to support over 100 Small Fund projects.

The fund was introduced to support communities throughout Surrey, which it has done to good effect. It has been, and continues to be, hugely popular and is already delivering fantastic community benefits. We have supported projects that build community connection, reduce isolation, improve mental wellbeing and support our prevention agenda. We have delivered community hubs where local residents can connect and support each other, provided walking and cycling trails and inclusive sports facilities, and local park facilities for children of all ages to enjoy.

We remain fully committed to supporting our communities through YFS and are proposing to set the overall budget for Your Fund Surrey at a level that reflects affordability for the council.

Engagement with divisional members regarding the YFS scheme will continue as normal.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**17. JONATHAN ESSEX (REDHILL EAST) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

- a) What was the average occupancy rate for the first Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) delivered by Surrey County Council in Mole Valley in terms of the km and % of distance travelled:
- i) with driver only;
  - ii) with one passenger only;
  - iii) with 2-5 passengers;
  - iv) with more than 5 passengers?
- b) i) What was the cost per passenger mile and carbon footprint/mile for running this service and what levels of these would be considered a success in terms of a cost-effective and low carbon service?
- ii) What are the measures of success for the subsequent DDRTs being rolled out?

**RESPONSE:**

Mole Valley Connect DDRT service has an average vehicle occupancy of 2.17 passengers. This is quite high compared to other demand responsive services operating in the UK.

Toward the beginning of the Mole Valley Connect DDRT service, 30% of trips were shared. However, this percentage has grown as patronage has increased. When looking at 2023 data, 50% of trips were shared. Our plan is for this to increase even further.

In considering the highest number of individual bookings at any one time all on one service, since the service launched, we have had a total of 11 people onboard all at once. 11 is in fact the maximum passenger capacity, so the vehicle was full. This has happened several times, which is encouraging in terms of service growth and vehicle utilisation.

In total, since Mole Valley Connect DDRT was launched on 13 June 2022, there have been 26,360 passenger trips completed, which is increasing every day, and we have also covered around 153,000 miles with this service.

In terms of vehicle occupancy for the 26,360 Mole Valley Connect DDRT passenger trips:

- 46% of journeys have been made with one passenger.
- 53% of journeys have been made with 2-5 passengers.
- 1% of journeys have been made with more than 5 passengers.

In considering the time that DDRT vehicles are unoccupied, that is with only the driver onboard, our data shows this happening only 16% of the time since the service launched. Again, as patronage grows this figure will reduce.

Using data from October 2023 for Mole Valley Connect:

- The DDRT service carried an average of 553 passenger each week.
- The contract cost to run the four electric DDRT minibuses (after accounting for on-bus and App bus fares) averaged at approximately £7,480 each week.
- The total mileage completed with passengers on board averaged 1,540 miles each week.
- The average vehicle occupancy is 2.17 passengers.

Therefore, during October 2023, the cost of each operating mile with a passenger on board cost an average of £2.24 for each passenger carried.

By way of further information, the trip distance completed by passenger averaged at just under three miles.

Currently, the Mole Valley Connect DDRT service operates using four electric minibuses. Each electric minibus delivers a CO<sub>2</sub> saving of 12.7 tonnes each year compared to a diesel equivalent. This equates to a saving of 50.8 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> every year across the four-minibus fleet.

In terms of measures of success for subsequent DDRT schemes being rolled out, I would highlight that the main driver has been to deliver on the council's commitment to 'no one left behind'. Our vision for the future is for new DDRT services to be introduced where they can complement the local bus and rail network. This will support residents to make more journeys by more sustainable means. Surrey connect DDRT services are vital in supporting residents to access essential services, such as employment, education and training, health care and essential food shopping, whilst helping the economy of Surrey to thrive.

Our growing network of Surrey Connect DDRT service contribute to our Greener Future ambitions and the Climate Change Delivery Plan, as all Surrey Connect vehicles will be electric, supported by charging points across Surrey. This will help residents to travel more sustainably, helping to reduce carbon emissions. From a carbon emissions perspective the ambition to deliver all Surrey Connect DDRT services with zero emission minibuses is absolutely clear.

From a value for money perspective, patronage across the Surrey Connect DDRT network continues to grow. We will continue to promote the DDRT services, and I encourage all Members to do the same.

DDRT is still relatively new to Surrey. We continue to learn with the existing schemes and as we develop and introduce new services for residents. This learning will help us to determine future success factors for new DDRT services.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**18. JONATHAN HULLEY (FOXHILLS, THORPE & VIRGINIA WATER) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

In relation to Planning Application 21/0185, approved by the Planning and Regulatory Committee in July 2022, can the Cabinet Member confirm that the Applicant will fully comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 180C and the Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan, as appropriate, and specifically when determining established tree categories methodology?

**RESPONSE:**

The National Planning Policy Framework and the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan were both taken into account in respect of a whole range of matters when the planning application was considered by the Planning and Regulatory Committee. That is the correct point in the process to determine compliance with the development plan and national planning policy. The development itself is expected to be undertaken in accordance with the conditions attached to the planning permission.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,  
LIFELONG LEARNING**

**19. WILL FORSTER (WOKING SOUTH) TO ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

- a) Please would the Cabinet Member explain the significance of the increase in school notional Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) funding set out in the report to November Cabinet?
- b) What impact has the County Council's historically lower than average level of notional funding had on a school's SEND services?
- c) Why is it necessary to implement the increase described as neither 'a target nor a constraint', in two stages?

**RESPONSE:**

- a) The notional SEN budget is an identified amount within a schools' budget share that is intended as a guide for a school's spending decisions for its pupils with SEN. DfE are considering linking notional SEN budgets to the proposed national SEND standards, to be developed under the national SEND and Alternative Provision (AP) improvement plan. Surrey identifies a significantly lower proportion of formula funding as notional SEN funding than other similar Local Authorities. An increase will address this and avoid a future budgeting impact of schools through a tapered increase as agreed over two years.
- b) A lower-than-average level of notional funding may lead a minority of schools to spend less on SEN than might be expected of similar schools in comparable Local Authorities, or to consider that they are inadequately funded for SEN. However,

we have been proactive in developing resources and innovative ways of working which ensure that all schools are fully aware of what should be ordinarily available within the current notional funding. The Ordinarily Available Provision offer was co-produced with Surrey schools and is an accurate reflection of what schools should deliver through high quality teaching, their duties under the SEND Code of Practice 2015 and prompts them to consider when they should access the wide range of services and resources available from Surrey Education Services and our partners. Additionally, we have developed innovative approaches to early inclusion and prevention such as the Team Around the School approach and the L-SPA request for support pathways which have no cost to schools but provide valuable help and support.

- c) During September 2023 all Surrey primary and secondary schools (including academies) were consulted on the proposal to bring notional SEND funding into line with the national average. Schools had been asked to support either a one step change to national average or a two-year transition. A majority of schools supported a two-year transition. In October the results of the consultation were shared with Surrey Schools Forum. The Forum supported a two-year transition of notional SEND funding to national average.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,  
LIFELONG LEARNING**

**20. LANCE SPENCER (GOLDSWORTH EAST AND HORSELL VILLAGE) TO  
ASK:  
(2<sup>nd</sup> Question)**

This time last year, there was a significant backlog of Home to School Transport Appeals. Has the backlog now been cleared, and how many children are currently waiting for an appeal to be heard?

**RESPONSE:**

There are currently no appeal backlogs reported in Home to School Travel Service. There are currently 9 new Stage 1 Appeals and all within timescale. There are currently 9 Stage 2 Appeals and are booked onto panels within the 40-day Service Level Agreement.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,  
LIFELONG LEARNING**

**21. ROBERT EVANS OBE (STANWELL AND STANWELL MOOR) TO ASK:  
(3<sup>rd</sup> Question)**

Many residents complain about increasing anti-social behaviour in my electoral division.

What impact does the Council feel the closure of most of the youth service has had on this situation?

Are there any plans to address or improve things?

**RESPONSE:**

Youth services have not closed, we still have an in-house youth service. Since 2021 open access youth work sessions have been delivered by third sector providers within our Youth Centres in place of Surrey County Council led open access youth work sessions. Historically we have always adopted a blended approach to delivery of youth services from our in-house youth services with our third sector providers including delivery of open access youth work sessions, tackling behaviours, educational/skills learning, sports and physical activities, detached and targeted youth work etc. This practice remains in place as collaboration and joined up actions from a range of partners such as police, third sector and other stakeholders gives us the best option of responding to a range of challenges including anti-social behaviours.

The National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC) established that with more people at home during Covid and since, rises in reporting anti-social behaviour are being 'seen'. Some of this was noted to result from targeted work around awareness of what anti-social behaviour was or could be and encouragement to report; evidencing that this work has been successful and the encouragement/ pathway for reporting is being well established.

During 2023 the County's Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) & Community Harm Reduction Partnership which includes SCC, Police, Third Sector, Housing, Health partners have come together to understand what the landscape of ASB looks like in Surrey. In March 2023, Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (PCC) Lisa Townsend launched a public survey around anti-social behaviour. This was followed by a workshop held in June 2023 by ASB Help to capture experiences for the Partnership to develop into plans.

In the background during 2023 as part of those developing plans SCC youth services have been and continue to work with the police and third sector providers at developing targeted detached services using intelligence gathered, for a range of support including detached services, 1:2:1 support, open access youth work and a range of other activities. We are working with Surrey Police for their youth engagement officers to work with our youth services/worker and community youth services/workers in a multi-agency, co-located approach sitting within the community where possible. We are working with borough councils in receipt of PCC's Safer Street Funding from the £42 million core Safer Street Fund launched in 2020. Where the funding tranche offered this year has been allocated by PCC for Councils to decide to spend in any of the three areas: tackling neighbourhood crime, violence against women and children and anti-social behaviours, for some of that funding to be decided by them for allocating to support additional targeted work around anti-social behaviours. If decisions are made by our borough councils to allocate any portion of the Safer Streets Funding into anti-social behaviours, we will work on combined localised approach bringing all partners/stakeholders together for additional targeted approaches.

## DENISE TURNER-STEWART, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CUSTOMER AND COMMUNITIES

### 22. CATHERINE POWELL (FARNHAM NORTH) TO ASK: (3<sup>rd</sup> Question)

In June 2021 I raised concerns that Your Fund Surrey (YFS) would not be accessible to more deprived areas. I asked for:

- A map showing applications on Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs).
- The Index of Multiple Deprivation for the area of the application to be added.

I did get maps they showed no applications in areas of deprivation in Surrey, National Index of Multiple Deprivation 2s and 3s.

Then Surrey deciles for multiple deprivation were introduced, the top three Surrey deciles are all 10 the highest, the lowest Surrey decile lumped all the areas that are national decile 2, 3 and 4 together along with a number that are decile 5, as a new Surrey decile 1.

All schemes are valuable in their own right, but comparing the benefits of one scheme in one area against another scheme in another area or multiple smaller schemes across the County is always going to be challenging and difficult to ensure parity particularly against no one left behind.

Last year the Residents' Association and Independent Group called for a stop in new large YFS applications, as it was clear it was not going to be affordable going forward and the projects were not delivering benefits for the 21 Key Neighbourhoods and the costs of borrowing were increasing.

The overall YFS budget (excluding running costs) was reduced to £60 million in this year's budget approved in February 2023 and £50,000 given to every divisional member to spend on local projects. There was no differentiation between divisions based on deprivation or isolation or even areas which had already had one or more schemes funded. There has been on-going encouragement to promote the Your Fund Surrey and for organisations to invest time and money in submitting bids for funding.

The draft budget papers ([Draft Budget Cabinet Cover Report.pdf \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk)) state:

*“The Council remains committed to Your Fund Surrey (YFS), however in light of the need to prioritise capital investment and based on historic applications, the overall amount made available has been reduced. Significant investment of £40m for the 2023/24 – 2025/26 period remains available to bring community-led place-making or place-improving projects to life at a scale to make a significant impact and deliver a real legacy in communities. This investment includes the Small Community Project Fund which allocates each Councillor £50k to support capital community projects”.*

The need to prioritise capital investment and borrowing on new SEND school places, new children's homes, additional extra care accommodation and our highways is clear. Assuming that £40 million on YFS is affordable what will the budget of £40 million cover:

- Schemes already improved in 2023, including:
  - Two schemes for nearly £3 million each approved by Cabinet
  - A number of schemes between £100 and £500,000 approved by the Cabinet Member and
  - A number of others approved by officers
- Approx. £4 million on small Your Fund Surrey projects in each of the 81 divisions based on (£50,000 per division) by April 2025.
- The schemes already in the pipeline some of which a significant number are for over £1 million.
- Any new schemes submitted going forward.

Your Fund Surrey Governance states “no direct competition between applicants” however, when the available YFS funding is reduced, decisions will need to be made between different bids small and large.

Please can the Cabinet Member advise:

- a) When the large Your Fund Surrey scheme will need to be closed to new submissions based on the new budget and the number of submissions in the pipeline, and how this will be communicated both to applicants in the system and the wider community who may be considering making bids?
- b) Whether there will be any change in funding priorities to deliver schemes in all 21 Key Neighbourhoods over and above the current committed £50,000 small Your Fund Surrey?
- c) Whether there will be any change in the evaluation criteria to ensure balance across the Districts and Boroughs based on their population?

## **RESPONSE:**

Your Fund Surrey (YFS) was always set out as an open, universal fund to support all of our communities in Surrey, recognising that communities define themselves and that people often travel to use community facilities, such as hubs, sports facilities and to access the countryside; YFS projects can, therefore, have benefit to much wider communities.

The fund has so far supported over 150 projects that build community connection, reduce isolation, improve mental wellbeing, and support our prevention agenda, as well as our green and inclusion agendas.

It was recognised that communities in the most deprived areas of the County would potentially need more support with their applications, which is addressed through Community Link Officers (CLOs), and the voluntary sector working with community groups in our key neighbourhoods.

We remain fully committed to supporting our communities through YFS, hence the continuing budget of £40 million through to 2025/26, at a level that reflects affordability for the council.

**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

**23. CATHERINE BAART (EARLSWOOD AND REIGATE SOUTH) TO ASK:  
(3<sup>rd</sup> Question)**

In my division there is a small residential area where two residents successfully applied for disabled spaces outside their homes when they developed long-term debilitating medical conditions. Unfortunately, the spaces were not also made enforceable and able-bodied residents are able to, and do, park in the spaces with impunity. The applications to make the disabled spaces enforceable have been made but are part of the Parking Review process, so there will be a delay of many months before the spaces can be enforceable.

- a) Will Highways agree to automatically make all future disabled spaces requested by residents outside their homes enforceable?
- b) Further, will Highways agree to make all existing disabled spaces, which have been requested by residents outside their homes, enforceable?

**RESPONSE:**

In order to make bays enforceable, we would have to make an amendment to the relevant traffic regulation order in the same way as we have to for any other parking restriction, which we do by way of the parking review process. If we wanted to make all future disabled parking bays enforceable, people applying for them would have to wait until the next parking review in their area, which could delay the installation of the bay by a considerable length of time. By installing a bay that is just an advisory one, we can install them much more quickly. In the vast majority of cases, our experience is that people without blue badges are respectful of the bays and do not park in them, so although advisory, they serve their purpose. Another factor to consider is how enforceable the bays might be. In most cases, these bays are situated in locations where there are no other parking restrictions in the near vicinity, which means that it would be costly and time consuming to carry out even occasional enforcement. Bearing in mind the practicalities of enforcement and the fact that in most cases they are self-enforcing and can be installed more quickly under the current approach, we would not be in agreement with the suggestion to automatically make all future disabled bays enforceable.

For very much the same reasons as mentioned above, we would also not be in agreement to make all existing advisory disabled parking bays enforceable. There are hundreds of these bays all over the county, most of which do not need to be made enforceable and some of which have been in place since before our current records began. It would be a very time-consuming and costly exercise to make them all enforceable, and an approach that we believe is not necessary and would create unreasonable expectations regarding enforcement. Removing disabled bays when

circumstances change would also be more complex and costly if they were all designated with a traffic regulation order.

**CLARE CURRAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,  
LIFELONG LEARNING**

**24. LANCE SPENCER (GOLDSWORTH EAST AND HORSELL VILLAGE) TO  
ASK:  
(3<sup>rd</sup> Question)**

This time last year, there were 988 active Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) requests; of these, 284 requests were known to be over the 20-week period.

- a) How many children are currently waiting to have their EHCP produced?
- b) How many have exceeded the 20 weeks limit?

**RESPONSE:**

- a) At the end of November there were 1571 children with an active request for an EHCP. Around 240 of these are awaiting the initial decision on whether they require an assessment for an EHCP.
- b) In total, 1038 requests have exceeded the 20-week limit at the end of November. Of these, 510 children have received their Educational Psychology (EP) advice and are with the SEND teams to make a decision on whether a plan is required and to issue the EHCP if so. The remaining children are currently awaiting their EP advice to finalise their assessment.

There is a recovery plan in place which aims to reduce waiting times for education Health and Needs assessments. To date this has been successful in halving the numbers of children awaiting an educational psychology assessment and the majority of children who have been waiting since January and February this year have now had the assessments undertaken or these assessments are close to completion. The aim is to reach good levels of timeliness in May 2024 and our recovery plan was endorsed in the recent Ofsted Care Quality Commission (CQC) SEND inspection.