

**London Borough of Sutton
Council: 29 April 2019
Questions under Standing Order 8.6
from Members**

2. Question asked by Councillor Hanna Zuchowska to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Following consultations on Sutton Link, could the lead member share any feedback or consultation result and could he update us on the project and next steps?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you, thank you Councillor Zuchowska for your question on Sutton Link and it's very timely as I think probably since you submitted your question, TFL have finally formally announced the results of the consultation. And the results say that the consultation received nearly six thousand responses across Sutton and Merton, and those that responded confirmed strong support for the tram 80% versus 40% for the bus rapid transport. There was an overall preference for option one the route to South Wimbledon which was the Council's preferred option by a small margin over option two. The full report is on the TFL consultation website which you can access that via the Council website. You asked about next steps, next steps are that TFL are going to review the consultation results and decide what their preferred route is on that basis and on their studies, following that they will issue a Transport Works Order so they can move to implementation of the scheme if all the other factors get the go ahead.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Hanna Zuchowska

Thank you Councillor McCoy. My question is just about whether you could give us an update or confirm whether there are indeed any plans in the future to bring the Sutton Link to Sutton Cancer Hub, and how significant in your view as a Chair would that be for the local transport infrastructure.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you, we've definitely got plans to bring it to the cancer hub that's what we would like to do. Transport for London have concentrated at the moment on phase 1 which is getting it to Sutton town centre and that's what they are committed to. But we are aware that the extension onto the London Cancer Hub the Belmont site is in the Mayor's London Plan so were really pleased to see that there and seen as an opportunity area, and also we know that Transport for London are doing some initial work on the feasibility of extending it there but our view is that we need to get it into Sutton town centre for the first place so were putting all our efforts into that, and that's looking very positive now, and getting it there that unlocks Phase 2. But we have very much been making the case that getting the tram to the Cancer Hub is actually makes the case the whole route all the way there because the benefits it will bring by unlocking the Cancer Hub site we know it's already there its already in

existence it just needs improving and the options of the site are quite exciting. We have got a company reviewing tenders we've received for a development partner for the Cancer Hub site but just having that extra bit of transport infrastructure going that far will just really help unlock that site properly thank you.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Neil Garrett

Thank you very much. You mentioned the link through to the Cancer Hub in my ward, I had a question that's arisen really through discussions with the various different land owners on that site, and it's becoming apparent that there is very little coordination between them, one of whom is the Council about the overall strategic transport planning for that site and I'm concerned that it's all happening in a very piecemeal way with everybody waiting for somebody else to take the lead. So I would just wonder who exactly is responsible for the overall coordination for working out what is the ultimate expected transport demand for that site when its ultimately built out if it is, and coordinating the investment required to actually make that site work so all the people who need to get in and out actually can.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you. We are working jointly with the Institute for Cancer Research, The Royal Marsden, the NHS and Transport for London we are all working together we've got a body and a memorandum of understanding all set up, so we're working together and the Council together with our partners have got a development framework for that site which highlights the transport infrastructure to be delivered there. I don't know which particular bits you are referring to but the whole idea of the tram going there the tram site is safeguarded in the development framework. As I say were reviewing tenders from development partners and that will be a key part of that work. So the whole investment it's a joint partnership with the ICR, the Royal Marsden, the Council, the NHS and TFL have some input on that as well, thank you.

3. Question asked by Councillor Ben Andrew to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

Many of the concerns which residents in Hackbridge have voiced about the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) which was proposed there is about not being able to park over their own dropped kerbs. Having a Permit Parking Area (PPA) instead would stop this being a problem (as the scheme would be regulated just with signs, rather than lines and bays). This system is already proposed in part of Wallington North.

Has this option been considered for Hackbridge too, as well as other areas where residents have similar concerns?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you for your question Councillor Andrew's, and thank you for the work you have been doing over the last few months on parking you've almost been the main challenger on this issue and you have really pushed me and Officers to find better solutions I would say to some of these issues and I welcome that. In response to your question, yes a PPA type of scheme is one of the options that we're considering for some of the areas as you say and some of the main concerns that were raised by residents which are including some of the audience, in the new proposed CPZ's in the last consultation was not being able to park over dropped kerbs and potential loss of parking spaces if we had yellow lines and parking bays, so we looked at the PPA Scheme and we think this can actually tackle some of the concerns. There's four things that I think a PPA would dramatically improve in potential parking areas one is that I mentioned there would be no parking bays or yellow lines except where needed for safely especially at junctions. This would mean the roads would essentially stay as they are at the moment it would just be repeated signs to alert people that they are in a controlled parking area. It would also allow residents to park over dropped kerbs at all times. I was delivering some leaflets in St Helier over the weekend and I noticed once again some of the roads Thornton Road, and so on a lot of dropped kerbs so I think this issue would be resolved if we had a PPA Scheme equally the third reason for a pound a week roughly we would guarantee we would remove non-residential parking and commuter parking during the hours of operation which is I think a win, it would free up some space and as with the CPZ we would maintain the advantage of if you have a driveway which a lot of the roads in the Northern Ward's do have and you park the same the same car on your driveway when you come back from work and during the day you would need a permit. So if you have two cars one that goes on your driveway you don't need a permit you would only need one permit for one car for about a pound a week we'd free up some spaces nothing's changed on the road, so I would urge residents you might get some leaflets in the next couple of weeks, to look at the proposals carefully contact your Councillors and myself and we will provide that information so yeah look forward to hearing from residents and their views on this, this is part of the extra engagement that we promised.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Ben Andrew

Thank you Manuel. So I can't speak to St Helier obviously being St Helier CPZ, I've been doing as I think you know lots and lots of door knocking in Hackbridge particularly because it's quite torn there, and what I've found is that when you say do you want a CPZ some people say yes and some people say no the ones who say no and I ask for their reasons and there reasons seem to be always and especially on the roads that I live on around there dropped kerbs and yellow lines and loss of space. So I am saying to them OK if you were to take away that concern would it be OK and they usually saying yes, but the original guidance we had from Officers was saying that the PPA I may have proposed in Wallington North you would need to have sort of cul-de-sacs, you'd have to have an area which was cordoned off enough that the signs to be meaningful. And to be clear to everyone a PPA is like regulated by signs and not lines and bays. Sorry I'm doing a Nick - so what I'm asking is that guidance is it possible to be more flexible with PPA's because I know it's difficult when you've got signs and it's a bit complicated but surely the complication of a few extra sign's overcomes the

problems of dropped kerbs and the lines and everything else people have been concerned about.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I feel like we're having another one of our discussions that we've had over the last few months. Yes one of the things that we asked challenged Officers to do was to get in touch with DFT Department for Transport and get more details around PPA's and one of the things that the DFT came back with was they have relaxed their guidance when it comes to how large of an area you can have a PPA scheme and how many entry points your allowed to have which were quite pleased to know. It would have been useful to have it before but there we are, in light of that we thought that it would be good to seek peoples views on whether that exactly the same exercise as you've been doing whether that would be acceptable, and that what we're doing.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Richard Clifton

Can I thank Councillor Abellan that is an extremely helpful answer and indeed it's helpful to us in Sutton South and I think Sutton South Councillors will want to ponder on what you've just said. Can I just ask with regard to permit parking area would residents have the same access to visitor parking permits as they do in currently in the current CPZ arrangements.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes they would get their 50 hours of free parking. Mr Mayor can I just ask we had agreed before the meeting that Councillor Crowley would ask a supplementary on this question, I would be more than happy to take a question. Yes 50 hours of free parking, free vouchers for visitors will be given.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley

Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank you for your time and allowing me this supplementary which is going to be a part statement as well in some respects because I tried to as you know try to ask an urgent question and we were then told the best way to do this would be to do it in a supplementary. One of the things that's just come up there which is quite interesting is about PPA's, and the difference in PPA's across the borough, ie some PPA's will be free as were looking about probably in Wallington North and others are going to be chargeable. Well surely they need to all be the same well that was what I was given to understand.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

The PPA will not be free wouldn't be free in Wallington

Reply by Councillor Tim Crowley

Then in all of them then there will be no charge for any residents permits at all ever.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

You will need to pay for a permit in a PPA the same as a CPZ.

Reply by Councillor Tim Crowley

So will you promise not to put them up? anyway that's not really the point I was going to ask, the point I was going to ask here and it's quite a serious one, is that seems to me that a lot of this has been about consultation but not just about consultation it's been about communication and one of the big issues here is how the Council has communicated with members of the public over this and this is what probably started the whole CPZ Residents thing because people were getting different things they didn't understand what was going on we weren't communicating properly. Then last Thursday Councillor Abellan you announced via not a Council website but the Lib Dem website signing off as the lead member for Environment and Neighbourhood that it would be your intention to change the policy on N1 vans which on this side we welcome and we would be right behind you on that. But there obviously has to be a process on that through the Council as to how that may or may not take place. So I'm asking you is this a definite policy change will it happen is it something that you can now turn around to the people in the audience and say that is happening b) how will that happen because the whole parking policy was introduced via ENN in 2017 when as you know we rejected it at the time and we rejected the N1 policy ban plus what other policies are you now thinking of changing within this that might or might not be drip fed out to the great masses of Sutton over the next two or three months thank you.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you for your statement. Yes I imagine that as your a very experienced Councillor you would know that change of policy would probably require a committee report and to go through the normal processes which is what we would intend to do. I made the announcement of my intention last Thursday and I communicated to Officers I haven't had the chance to sit down in detail and discuss the actual process to get it but I would imagine it's a Committee Report and a normal change of policy. The reason I did what I did was I could have waited another six weeks if it has to go to the next E&N meeting and what not, and I promised as I said in my work post some months ago to look at the policy again I had a chance to analyse it in some detail and I came to the conclusion that I came to. I thought it would be helpful if I could re-assure residents early that we will want to change that policy and that all we need to do now is go through the technicalities of doing so, so that they can be some of them were quite worried they can be comforted and re-assured that this is what we are going to do. I think that should be welcomed and we will now just go through the normal processes as soon as I get more details from discussions with Officers, I will share them with colleagues from E&N including Councillor Shields if he's around, I hope the

opposition will welcome the fact that we've listened we have always said that this was a conversation not a confrontation and this is one of the many issues that we are looking at where we have listened.

4. Question asked by Councillor Tom Drummond to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

Does this council have confidence in the ability of Cognus to effectively manage the implementation and ongoing management of the Education Health and Care Needs Assessment process?

Reply by Councillor Marian James

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Drummond I couldn't see you for a minute there. So just to put this into context. The written statement of action clearly indicated that there was poor oversight of quality and impact of the education, health, and care plans in meeting the needs of young children and people. So therefore there was some substantial work to be done throughout the local area including Cognus and the SEN Service, to improve both the understanding and the practice regarding the EHCNA process. Now Councillor Drummond you were present with me last week when we had a meeting with some parents and at that meeting some issues were raised, so going forward I am aware that some of those issues have already been addressed and some of those issues will continue to be addressed. So I hope that working with partners so working with schools and working with the CCG and with parent carers some I know who are in the audience this evening, that we will be able to go forward with Cognus and ensure that we provide a really good service for our children who have got special educational needs and or disabilities.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tom Drummond

Thank you very much Councillor James, and yes we did attend a meeting and in that meeting this was said so I don't think this will come as any surprise to you. The EHCP Guidance Booklet from Cognus was sent to an independent SEN lawyer not one but two and the same for the SEN Strategy Document from Sutton. Both of them independent of one another said there were policies that were unlawful. These yellow tabs represent each one of those policies, we need to take action on this and we need to do it sooner rather than later, so I call on you Councillor James please announce a review of these policies tomorrow and after reading these and reading the case studies that were sent to me I think these families deserve a published apology as well.

Reply by Councillor Marian James

Thank you Councillor Drummond, and indeed those documents were at the meeting last week, and I have to tell you those documents are out of date they are not accurate and I am aware that they were still on the website and I already made representation with Officers

today and they have been removed, so I'm quite happy to apologise to all parents who would have gone to the website to see how to get help with my child and come across those documents, as agreed at the meeting last week I have already set up a meeting with Officers and parents and I think you know me well enough Councillor Drummond to know that I am passionate about our children and young people and I will ensure that everything in my power will be done to make sure that we provide an excellent service to our young people.

Supplementary question by Councillor Param Nandha

Thank you Mr Mayor. I would like to add further to my colleague Councillor Drummond, and I welcome Councillor James Admit that there needs to be further to be done on Cognus and various issues. I would like to bring a couple of fact findings 2018/2019 to the floor. As a person did currently how many applications are being turned down and their first application 2018/2019 64 person. Of all cases that are set to go to tribunal how many are being settled beforehand 2018/19 20%_which is 5 out of 25 and of all cases that reach tribunal how many are being ruled against Sutton Council 2018/19 which is 86% which is six out of seven. That clearly says that Cognus is not fit for the purpose. Will you promise and do a full investigation and review on the Cognus weather is fit for the purpose thank you.

Reply by Councillor Marian James

I think as I've already said the written statement of action is all our partners so it's not just Cognus its schools, it's the CCG, working with the parents carers forum and like I have already said, I want us to go forward together to be positive so that we have good outcomes for our children and as I've said, rest assured that I as the lead member will ensure that happens

5. Question asked by Councillor Param Nandha to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

Sutton Conservatives welcome the London Mayor's Knife Crime Strategy, in which he offers Safe Schools Officers and knife wands to every school in the Boroughs.

How many Safe Schools Officers and knife wands has Sutton Council been able to add to our schools, what feedback from headteachers and parents has the council received so far on these additions?

When does the council expect to have obtained all knife wands and Safer Schools Officers that we can get?

Reply by Councillor Marian James

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor. Just to say that the Council doesn't actually have responsibility or the resource to add knife wands to schools. It's schools themselves

that organise these operations in conjunction with the Metropolitan Police Schools Unit. However, the police have informed the Council that knife wands were offered to all the schools in the borough. I understand that initially that not all the schools took up the offer but now they have an all the wands have been given out and there are no more currently available. But feedback from these initiatives are reported back directly to the Mayor's Office, and the schools unit in the Metropolitan Police have confirmed that all schools have a schools Police Officer.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Param Nandha

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Chair. The reason I raise this question is because we have contributed so much money to Mayor's pot and when they say 2 million pounds available and where we can make the safer Sutton, so I thought we should engage more schools to use this opportunity and get a better system in place rather than of course neighbouring boundaries Croydon and everywhere the knife crime rate is gone up. So we could set a better example to the rest of the borough by using the Mayor's pot.

Reply by Councillor Marian James

So as I've said all the schools have accepted the wands and that I hear what you say about other boroughs but I think it's important to say that crime in Sutton is low and you know we are seen as one of the safer boroughs.

6. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

If Orchard Hill Academy is moved out of Carew Manor what plans have the council for the vacant building?

Reply by Councillor Marian James

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Matthey. The Council as you're probably aware has a buildings utilisation process that is used for determining preferred use for surplus building. So the process would be for Carew Manor should Carew Manor open up a new school that the building would be deemed surplus and an options appraisal would be undertaken and then that would go to Strategy and Resources Committee who will make the decision.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey

I do, can I have an assurance that the building in the event that it does become vacant isn't sold off at a knock down price to any charities involving local MP's or friends of the Liberal Democrats.

Reply by Councillor Marian James

I have just explained the process to you. It will go to Strategy and Resources Committee where the decision will be made. But perhaps I could ask you Councillor Matthey to think seriously about your disgraceful behaviour last week, and that behaviour was done in front of a Councillors children, and I would urge you to take a leaf out of Councillor's Foster's book. Councillor Foster also has strong views and yet him and I managed to have a very reasonable and positive conversation so you need to look at your behaviour.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley

Thank you in this protest that was described will the fact that this is a building with a significant and important history for the London Borough of Sutton is something that has to be taken into account.

Reply by Councillor Marian James

I am sure when it goes to Strategy and Resources that will be part of the report and I'm sure it will be taken into account.

7. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

According to Viridor's published emission data there was a 245% exceedance of the Carbon Monoxide Levels stipulated by Environment Agency. What action if any will the council be taking over this?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

The energy recovery facility at Beddington is still being tested to ensure that the processing equipment performs below the very strict emission monitoring limits that have been set out in its environmental permit. During March there was one instance outside strict operational limits relating to carbon monoxide. Now this was known and part of the commission process to ensure that the measurements when they are taking them are accurate. This is a bit technical but I feel like I need to read it because Councillor Matthey struggles with the details so I will go slowly so he can take notes, and he's a professional fake news man so hopefully he will listen. It's vital that the special equipment taking samples from the flume tanks of the Beddington ERF are operating correctly and taking accurate measurements. To ensure this is the case the Environment Agency put the equipment through a rigorous three stage process testing and quality assurance process. Firstly, in order to meet the requirements of the industrial emissions directive the monitoring equipment must meet certain performance requirements evaluated under the EA'S monitoring certification scheme. The second level of quality assurance calibrates the instruments. An independent test house carries out this

calibration every three years. In addition each year an Annual Surveillance Test is carried out to ensure that the calibration function and viability remain as previously determined, and finally Viridor are required to regularly measure the drift and precision of the monitoring equipment using a specified gas of known composition. Now Councillor Matthey seems to be accusing the Environment Agency of not following the commissioning process properly. He said that the ERF does not pose a threat to human health or the local environment is he saying that the Environment Agency is lying to us?

Supplementary question by Councillor Nick Matthey

Thank you very much for being so patronising. There's actually a van which is not taxed and hasn't got a SORN reference parked in the car park at Wicks at Beddington with two telemetry ariels and it gives a name of a company that doesn't exist. This is the level that Viridor are using to download the data from the two stacks. I realise that I don't have much technical knowledge just a passing knowledge of environmental science and you know - my question is that the testing equipment on top of the stack is purely there to test whether the boiler is working efficiently and it would develop maximum power. What I want to know is where is the equipment going to be that surrounds the incinerator so we know what the pollution levels are especially when we have a school 850 metres away from the incinerator, that is my question.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

The emissions from the Beddington ERF are actually monitored every ten seconds, it's one of the strictest monitoring systems in the country. It will be available online, it's on the website you can go and have a look. We are absolutely transparent about this. Its a modern state of the art facilities. The question that Cllr. Matthey never answers is if he doesn't like the ERF would he prefer to keep a landfill site that pollutes with higher levels of methane gas. Would he not prefer to have one of the largest parklands in London transformed and and energy recovering facility that every single expert agrees is better than landfill.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley

So Councillor Abellan and I'm just a layman, are you seriously trying to tell us from what you just said and listening to what you said and you are read it out from the Environment Agency that they deliberately exceeded their quotas, their own quotas that they set, so that they could test if it was working properly? Because if they are wouldn't you suggest that that is slightly irresponsible?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I would trust the Environment Agency much more than you. This is part of the commissioning process, it was well known, this is all done so that we are able to monitor and that we would know that the steam coming out of it is not contaminating. Viridor is a reliable

company they are professionals, this is a state of the art facilities and again it was interesting at the last E&N meeting when the Opposition stated "we are not against ERF, we just think that it would be best if we didn't have to treat our waste here, we should just truck it somewhere else." I think that is irresponsible.

8. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

As the contract between Viridor and the South London Waste Partnership (SWLP) that Viridor is permitted to incinerate radioactive material will the council be doing anything to prevent this happening. If not why not ?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you Councillor Matthey, you have done another great example of your classic fake news here. The Beddington Energy Recovery Facility, as I have said already, is one of forty such facilities operating efficiently across the UK, it designated to recover safely any energy from non-hazardous residual non recyclable household and commercial waste. This predominantly comes from our brown bins, so there is absolutely none of what you described in your question that will be entering the ERF. You know it full well, you are just spreading absolutely false lies.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey

In the 500 odd page contract written between the Burgess of Croydon and presumably Sutton, it specifically states that Viridor has the right to dispose of radioactive material, presumably isotopes from using cancer treatment at the site. In previous answers Viridor have said that they are not minded to burn radioactive material there, but in light of the fact that at their Colnbrook facility there is pressure that they have said in Parliament that if they move they won't be able to burn radioactive waste. The question is, what are Sutton going to do if Viridor decide to exercise their right written in the contract to burn radioactive waste in Beddington and that is not fake news.

Reply from Councillor Manuel Abellan

It's not true and its spreading such information is actually I think dangerous for communities because some people believe it. What is important here is their permit. In their permit they are not allowed to treat radioactive waste in the ERF and that is a fact. We will talk after the meeting you are mis-informed Councillor Crowley thank you.

9. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Traffic in Beddington Lane has been at a standstill for days on end. Why is this happening after millions of pounds have been spent on so called improvements?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you Councillor Matthey your asking about the traffic in Beddington Lane that has been at a standstill for days, why is this happening after millions of pounds are being spent on improvement. Well the Council is indeed investing 3.5 million in Beddington to improve the Beddington Lane area both for residents and for businesses. We are very aware of the traffic congestion along Beddington Lane but this it not related to any works being undertaken by the Council. What we are aware of is that there is ongoing Transport for London works for the tram stops and the necessary diversions have impacted on traffic, also recently UK Power Networks and Thames Water have all been undertaking works in the vicinity which may have added to the congestion issues. We also have an understanding there have been some works taking place in Merton and they were the key problems that impacted on the situation. Roadworks do tend to be programmed for school holidays as the traffic flows tend to be lighter, but it seems that it's a combination of things and the works in Merton are what's caused the problem nothing to do with the Council.

Supplementary question by Councillor Nick Matthey

I do and thank you very much for allowing me to put it forward. Is it not the truth the reason why the road is being constantly dug up is because the 3 million pounds worth of improvements were nothing to harden the surface or bury the surfaces in Beddington lane any deeper, and as soon as all the traffic the 500,000 tons that is scheduled to go into the incinerator each year according to Viridor, the road is going to be dug up even more often because as we all know the money that should have been spent on Beddington Lane which was about 11 million in order to bring it up to standard. My question is are the Council planning to do anything to bring the road up to standard so that it can deal with all this HGV traffic.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

I would remind Councillor Matthey that this project was undertaken with TFL and I remember going and taking a walk with Councillor Ali at the time and TFL taking a walk down Beddington Lane and talking about the improvements that were needed. And actually we originally said and I remember it came to a local committee a long time ago about 14 million investment was needed in the whole of Beddington Lane area, but obviously TFL can't give out that amount of money so we've done very well to secure the amount what we have and make the improvements that we are doing. The works are ongoing but we have worked very carefully with other organisations to make sure that the work is spread out and doesn't disrupt traffic anymore than is necessary. But we are spending that money wisely but it is

with the supervision and guidance of Transport for London, if you know better than them well maybe go talk to them.

Supplementary question from Councillor Tim Foster

Is it not true that no work is being done in terms of assessing what the capacity of Beddington Lane is we've just had planning permission granted for ProLogis to have a big depot down there and another proposal is coming through and we have bus depots and there is more and more traffic but in spite of constant requests from myself at planning committee no work is being done to assess the overall capacity of the lane, why is that?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you Councillor Foster, as part of the work to look at the HGV restrictions being proposed is TFL have undertaken we have undertaken some traffic studies to look at what the capacity is on the road and TFL is based on a TFL modelling, so yes there has been some work undertaken. Secondly for any planning application there has to be a transport assessment where there is potentially an impact on the roads. So each planning application will have a transport assessment and a review undertaken by the relevant transport officers who will look at the community of impacts of any new businesses in the area and one of the things that has been done with new applications as a result of that work is that traffic any new applications their deliveries their transport routing has to follow a certain route.

The following questions were not reached at the meeting and written responses were provided.

1. Question asked by Councillor Jane Pascoe to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

In a statement by the lead councillor at Full Council in November 2014, this council acknowledged we would need 2 additional secondary schools the first in 2017 and subsequently in 2019. Neither school is ready for our children.

The children who chose to go to the new Greenshaw Learning Trust School (due to open 2018 - now planned for 2022) will be housed in temporary accommodation for at least 2 years. This will affect approximately 500 pupils and staff.

Given that the existing temporary accommodation at Cumbrian House will now be unsuitable, where is this temporary accommodation to be placed?

The Education and Skills Agency will not fund 2 years temporary accommodation, will this be funded by the Basic Need Grant (for all schools) and if so, how much taxpayers money will be wasted in this unnecessary exercise?

Response from Councillor James

The statement in November 2014 indicated a preferred opening date for the first new school in 2017, but a 2018 opening date was considered the more critical delivery date - in line with the expected demand in the borough. Following approval of a business case by the DfE in September 2016, the Council took on the delivery role of the first free school in the Borough - the Harris Academy Sutton. The school opened in 2018 in temporary accommodation in line with the expected demand for secondary school places and the main school site will be ready for occupation in July this year - as expected when the project started back in 2016.

The Council has not taken on the delivery role for the second approved Free School - this is the responsibility of the Department of Education and therefore the Council is not in control of when this school will open. The DfE has approved the Greenshaw Learning Trust to run this school but it should be noted that no children have chosen to go to this school yet because the Department for Education have not confirmed which year the school will open in, nor has the school opened up admissions at this stage. Given the delays on the submission of the planning application and planning risks that exist, and given the expected demand for secondary school places in September 2020, the Council is working with the Department for Education to identify a temporary solution to give them sufficient time to deliver the main project on the Rosehill site given the expected need for secondary school places in the borough.

Cumbrian House is not currently large enough to cater for the second free school, nor is it in a location that is supported by the Greenshaw Learning Trust or the Council. We are therefore carrying out feasibility work on the under-utilised properties at 3 Robin Hood Lane and the Youth Centre on the same road and in the centre of Sutton, as we believe both buildings could accommodate the required numbers of pupils for up to two years if the Department for Education need that time to complete the new school proposed for the Rosehill site. The strong preference of GLT and all parties is to operate from temporary accommodation for as little time as possible. However, as a former school building (and with a three-court sports hall in the youth centre), the temporary school would offer a good solution in the circumstances ensuring sufficient and good-quality school places for our young people. Greenshaw Learning Trust is working with us on the development of the potential temporary school arrangements.

Both the proposed temporary school and the main school site remain subject to planning permission and it is clear that the school cannot open in temporary accommodation until a planning permission has been achieved for the main school site at Rosehill.

With respect to costs, we do not yet know what the costs of the temporary scheme would be though we are working up the proposals to better understand this as we speak. The Council would expect the DfE to cover the majority of these costs as this is in effect their project, but in the eventuality that the Council needs to contribute we would draw this funding from our school expansion capital programme which is partly funded through the Basic Need Grant.

10. Question asked by Councillor Nick Mattey to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

The council after spending £7,500 in legal fees trying to stop financial information about SDEN becoming public is now spending more money in a further attempt to keep this secret, why is this? Can this be described as acting in the public interest and what will this cost ?

Response from Councillor McCoy

The information the Council is being asked to release is commercially sensitive. As SDEN (Sutton Decentralised Energy Network Ltd.) has been set up to be able to operate in a commercial environment, releasing this information will seriously compromise its position in the market. The council therefore needs to fight to preserve its ability to compete in a commercial market.

I believe that the Information Commissioner's Office governing Public Bodies has failed to keep up with the fact that more and more councils are setting up trading companies to provide services in commercial markets and so we are also fighting this case to protect the interests of other local authorities in similar situations. Being required to release commercially sensitive information that private businesses in the market would not be required to do will condemn many Local Authority Trading Companies to fail. The costs incurred to date in appealing the decision are £14,749.60.

I would also note the request for commercially sensitive information has come from a FOI request from Cllr Mattey himself.

11. Question asked by Councillor Nick Mattey to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

Officers from the Department of Education have said that they have been in discussions with Sutton's planning officers over plans to build a school on Sheen Way . This has been denied by planning officers. Who is correct ?

Response from Councillor James

The Planning Service have been in pre-application discussions concerning the proposal to develop this site as a SEN school. The discussions have centred on the suitability of the access to the site from local roads during construction, as well as during the operation phase.

The Planning Service, aware that the Department of Education (DfE) intended to commence their community engagement in advance of a planning application, invited the ward members for Beddington North to a meeting on 11 April to discuss progress in their discussions to date, at which Councillor Mattey was in attendance.

The Planning Service did not deny that they were in discussions with the DfE as that was the whole purpose of arranging the meeting. Officers clarified that a number of parties were also involved in the pre-application discussion, including Kier (the contractor), TP Bennett (planning agent) and Robert West (transport consultants), all of whom are acting for the DfE on this project.

12. Question asked by Councillor Nick Mattey to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

How many children travel by special transport to Carew Manor each year and what is the annual cost.

Response from Councillor James

There are 124 students provided with travel assistance to Carew by the London Borough of Sutton at an approximate cost of £645.3k per annum (as at end-March).

13. Question asked by Councillor Nick Mattey to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

Sutton council has a stated aim of encouraging everyone to use public transport. Yet it has been lending support to moving a school (Carew Manor) 100 metres from bus stops to one 600 metres from bus stops. Why is this ?

Response from Councillor James

The Local Planning Authority is currently engaged in pre-application discussions with the DfE in respect of their proposed development of Sheen Way playing fields as a SEN school and open space. Those discussions are ongoing and it should be borne in mind that the current school facilities need to be re-provided as they do not offer a long-term solution to the requirements of its pupils. The possible alternatives to the current site are limited - as evidenced by the Local Plan site search - and while the proximity to bus stops is noted, this is one of many material considerations that will need to be taken into account in the assessment of the Sheen Way proposal when a planning application is submitted.