

Minutes of a Meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 26th March 2019 at Pippbrook, Dorking, from 7.00pm to 9.40pm

Present:

Cabinet Members: Councillors Vivienne Michael (Leader/Chairman), Charles Yarwood (Deputy Leader), Simon Edge, David Harper, David Hawksworth, Chris Hunt, Metin Huseyin, Corinna Osborne-Patterson and Patricia Wiltshire

Non-Cabinet Members: Councillors David Draper, Paul Kennedy, Stephen Cooksey and Margaret Cooksey

57. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th February 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

58. Apologies for Absence

There were none.

59. Disclosure of Interests

Councillor Simon Edge declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 7, as a signatory to the petition.

Councillor Paul Kennedy declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 4, question 2 as he was a member of the Leatherhead Leisure Centre.

60. Councillor Question Time

The first question, submitted by Councillor Michelle Watson, is attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

2) Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy

“What is the expected timescale for repairing the roof of the Leatherhead Leisure Centre, and generally how satisfied is the Council with the prompt reporting by users/contractors of problems with Council-owned facilities?”

Response from Councillor David Hawksworth, Cabinet Member for Wellbeing

“Contractors attended site on the 8th March to carry out an initial investigation, and as a result arranged for specialist contractors to visit today (Tuesday 26th March) to carry out electronic leak testing to identify the source of the leak in order to determine the best way to resolve it. We will continue to apply pressure to the contractors in order to get the leak fixed as quickly as possible.

Regarding how satisfied the Council is with the reporting of issues at its various facilities, as a consequence of the frequency of monitoring inspections by the Council, regular meetings with contractors, and communication with users, the reporting and identification of problems is generally satisfactory. In this particular incident, as a result of Fusion making their own investigations into what started as a minor and intermittent leak prior to informing the Council, there was a delay in the leak being reported to us. I understand our Officers then contacted the contractors right away, and got them to attend as quickly as they could. I should add that I have been impressed by the dedication of our Officers in endeavouring

to address maintenance issues of concern at the Leatherhead Centre, as a result of which the number of complaints brought to me by users has fallen to zero over the last few months.

Councillor Paul Kennedy asked the following supplemental question, “thank you for that response Councillor Hawksworth, I am interested that you say you have received no complaints, we will redouble our efforts to ensure that you hear about them.”

The third question, submitted by Councillor Clayton Wellman, is attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

4) Submitted by Councillor Stephen Cooksey

“Surrey County Council has indicated that it will be working with local councils to prepare a consultation with specific proposals for the future of its libraries which will deliver cuts of nearly 30%. What steps will the Council be taking to ensure that Mole Valley residents continue to be able to access the services which are currently provided by Surrey County Council's library service?”

Response from Councillor Corinna Osborne-Patterson, Cabinet Member for People and Rural Mole Valley

“The Annual Plan, being considered elsewhere on tonight’s agenda, outlines the actions to be taken forward during 2019/20 in support of the 5 year Council Strategy. It outlines that, during 2019/20, MVDC will agree a way forward to support tourism and the visitor economy. As part of this work we will consider how to monitor progress.”

Councillor Stephen Cooksey asked the following supplemental question, “it seems to me from this answer that there has actually been very little thought given to the development of the strategy. If I remember rightly about three years ago the Scrutiny Committee established a Panel which put forward a number of recommendations which would fit very neatly into this. The Executive, as it was then, indicated that they would look at how to take these forward. Please could you tell me what happened to that report of the Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Osborne-Patterson responded stating that, “I will follow this up and come back to you on this Councillor Cooksey.”

The Leader of the Council commented that, “I remember the Scrutiny Panel’s work very well and, of course, since then we have actually developed the Rural Community Strategy, a much wider ranging strategy than simply tourism. More recently there were some very interesting presentations on this topic at the Rural Summit.

The fifth question, submitted by Councillor Claire Malcomson, is attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

6) Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy

“Surrey County Council has indicated that it will be working with local councils to prepare a consultation with specific proposals for the future of its libraries which will deliver cuts of nearly 30%. What steps will the Council be taking to ensure that Mole Valley residents continue to be able to access the services which are currently provided by Surrey County Council's library service?”

Response from Councillor David Hawksworth, Cabinet Member for Wellbeing

“As Councillor Kennedy will be aware, this statistic has attracted considerable publicity in the last two weeks. I have asked Officers to endeavour to ascertain the situation in Mole Valley compared with other districts and boroughs in the county, and the possible reasons for any discrepancy. They will be looking into this issue with the local Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and the NHS, with a view to determining what steps were taken to invite residents in the District to avail themselves of this facility, and to ascertain how the Council could help increase awareness of the scheme as a part of Mole Valley Life and the Wellbeing programme.”

Councillor Paul Kennedy asked the following supplemental question, “I was just wondering roughly what timescale Councillor Hawksworth expects for a response to these steps and particularly in increasing awareness of the scheme?”

Councillor Hawksworth responded that, “we are still waiting to hear what’s actually been done and until then it is difficult to say what we might do to improve the situation. We need to understand what activities have already been undertaken by the responsible organisations.

61. Report of the Scrutiny Committee

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper, advised that he would inform Cabinet Members of the comments raised by the Scrutiny Committee at its meeting held on 22nd January at the relevant points during the meeting.

62. Report of the Scrutiny Committee’s Planning Panel

The Chairman of the Planning Panel, Councillor Margaret Cooksey introduced the report and advised that the Panel members were content with decisions made and recommendations that came forward.

Councillor Margaret Cooksey advised that the report has been considered by the Planning Improvement Board and the Scrutiny Committee before its consideration at Cabinet. As a result of this it was noted that most Members had had an opportunity to review the report and the recommendations, many of which had already been implemented.

Councillor Margaret Cooksey went on to advise the Cabinet that the Development Control Committee agreed the recommendations taken through the Committee on 6th March 2019. One recommendation debated in detail related to the trial of Member site visits, in particular how to ensure that members of the Committee unable to attend such visits were not disadvantaged and establishing mechanisms to ensure all members of the Committee had access to the same information.

It was noted that there were a number of outstanding issues which were to be considered at a future meeting; (a) the size of the Development Control Committee and (b) whether or not it would be appropriate for members of the Cabinet to sit on the Committee going forward, (c) consideration of those issues that are determined by officers and those by the Committee and (d) those cases where a number of members regularly abstain from voting.

Councillor Chris Hunt, Cabinet Member for Planning Services and Housing noted the comments of Councillor Margaret Cooksey and confirmed the outstanding issues. Councillor Hunt went on to advise the Cabinet that the recent planning training for Members had been well received.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor Paul Kennedy indicated his support for the report, but suggested that further thought be given to risk implications to assist members in making decisions.

Members went on to note that much had been achieved since the peer review and further work would be undertaken to progress this matter further. In the meantime, Members thanked Mr Straw and Mr Turner for their work to date.

The Cabinet went on to consider the two options set out in the report and agreed to support option one.

RESOLVED: that the report of the Scrutiny Committee's Planning Panel on the operation of the Planning Service and the actions agreed by the Planning Improvement Board following its consideration of the Panel's response to the recommendations of the Peer Review be noted.

63. Great Bookham and Little Bookham – Proposed Postal Address Consultation

Councillor Chris Hunt, Cabinet Member for Planning Services and Housing, introduced the previously circulated report. He went on to advise that the petitioner, Mr Grant Woodham, had recently clarified that the intention of the petition was to seek Mole Valley District Council's approval of the change of the address, not the consultation exercise to be conducted by Royal Mail.

Mr Jack Straw, Executive Head of Service, Place and Environment added that in recent discussions between the petitioner and Royal Mail, it transpired that the petition should have asked for the Council's support for the proposal, not the consultation.

Given the rigorous processes in place at Royal Mail, it was recommended that the Council advise Royal Mail of its support for the subject of the petition. Royal Mail would then formally write to Mole Valley District Council to confirm that the Council support the proposal as part of the formal consultation process. The Cabinet supported this approach.

The original recommendation was therefore amended as follows, 'that Royal Mail be advised that Mole Valley District Council supports the proposal set out in the petition by Mr Grant Woodham to change the addresses of properties in the Bookham KT23 postcode to distinguish between Great and Little Bookham.'

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised Members that, given the amendment to the recommendation, this be supported.

The Cabinet indicated its support for the amended recommendation.

RESOLVED: that Royal Mail be advised that MVDC supports the proposal set out in the petition by Mr Grant Woodham to change the addresses of properties in the Bookham KT23 postcode to distinguish between Great Bookham and Little Bookham.

64. Recommendations Arising from the Development Strategy and Viability Study and next steps for the Swan Centre, Leatherhead

Councillor Simon Edge, Cabinet Member for Prosperity, introduced the previously circulated report and advised the Cabinet that in June 2017 the Executive approved the allocation of up to £190,000 from the Transform Leatherhead Regeneration Reserve to commission a Development Strategy and Viability Study, with supporting surveys for the Swan Centre. The

core objective was to deliver a robust, evidence based, fully researched and viable development option for the Swan Centre as a catalyst to revitalise the High Street.

Councillor Simon Edge went on to confirm that there were three considerations to inform the project approach, these were

- Positive Change – contributing to meeting the Transform Leatherhead Masterplan
- Community Benefit – contributing to MVDC's strategic objectives, and producing wider community benefit as well as benefit to Leatherhead
- Economic Sense – proving short / long term benefit to the local economy and a return of MVDC's investment.

Whilst the optimum outcome would deliver against all three of these considerations, it was recognised that some projects may align against two of the three considerations.

To date, it was noted that a number of studies had been undertaken including; an occupier study, a parameter study and three architectural feasibility studies and financial appraisals.

Councillor Simon Edge advised that the Master Plan would ensure a mix of uses, including retail, food and beverage, cinema, hotel, office and residential whilst leaving the current foodstore unaltered. It was noted that this was a concept at present and Members would see more detail on exact proposals and implications as the scheme developed. The proposed number of units within the Master Plan were on the cautious side at present and the project team were comfortable that this was deliverable as a minimum.

In the discussion Members commented that car parking would need to be considered carefully given the anticipated change of usage of the town centre. Additionally Members were concerned about the possible implications for Dorking given that it sat within the catchment area along with the surrounding villages. It was requested that thought be given to the potential impact on these locations and existing facilities.

Councillor Simon Edge noted these comments and advised that the team were looking at ways to rejuvenate Dorking and would be working with the town to understand what the appetite for change was locally.

Councillor Stephen Cooksey, Leader of the Opposition asked for additional information in respect of paragraph 2.17 on page 85 of the agenda and the response is attached in annex one.

The Cabinet went on to consider the three options set out in the report and agreed to support option one.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the recommended Master Plan for the Swan Centre be approved
- (2) That £30,000 be allocated from the regeneration reserves for the purpose of soft-market testing with potential delivery partners and sourcing associated specialist legal and financial/tax advice to mitigate market and delivery risk.

65. A Single Use Plastics Strategy for Surrey

Councillor Patricia Wiltshire, Cabinet Member for Environment introduced the previously circulated report advising that under the umbrella of the Surrey Waste Partnership, Surrey County Council and the eleven Districts and Boroughs had worked together and drawn up a strategy that would contribute to the objective of eliminating single use plastics in Surrey. By working together in this way progress could be made in tackling the problems created by the disposal of single use plastics.

The Strategy had been endorsed by the Surrey Waste Partnership and commended to all the Surrey Councils to adopt. It set out four key objectives for reducing single use plastics and the strategy was accompanied by an ambitious five year action plan which contained a helpful checklist of actions that could be taken to reduce single use plastics.

As a point of clarification, Jack Straw, Executive Head of Service for Place and Environment, confirmed that, at their meeting on 27 November 2018, the Cabinet agreed to give consideration to Mole Valley District Council 'leading a Mole Valley refill scheme and installing outdoor bottle refilling stations in Leatherhead and Dorking'. This would be investigated further following the recruitment of the new Waste Management Co-ordinator.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper advised Members that during the Committee's consideration of this item there was significant support for the recommendations. The Committee indicated that it wished to see some defined targets and delivery timeframes for these actions, together with further details relating to the recruitment of the Waste Management Co-ordinator.

The Cabinet went on to consider the report and the three options therein. The Cabinet agreed to support option one.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Single Use Plastics Strategy for Surrey be adopted
- (2) That, subject to the availability of resources, MVDC contribute to the implementation of the proposals in the Five Year Action Plan
- (3) That progress against the delivery of the Action Plan within Mole Valley be monitored with an annual report presented to the Scrutiny Committee.
- (4) That the Surrey Waste Partnership be encouraged to investigate and learn from plastic reduction initiatives abroad as well as in the UK.

66. Customer Services Strategy 2019-24

Councillor Corinna Osborne-Patterson, Cabinet Member for People and Rural Mole Valley, introduced the previously circulated report and advised that the Customer Services Strategy 2019-24 was a new strategy with the intention of providing a framework for customer service delivery for the Council over the next 5 years.

The Customer Services Strategy supported the delivery of the guiding principles of the approved Council Strategy for 2019-24 including 'Putting People First', 'Openness and Accessibility' and 'Living within our Means'. It set out five guiding principles for customer service delivery together with the three main outcomes deliverable through the implementation of the Strategy over the next five years and sat alongside the Council Strategy (2019-24).

Councillor Osborne-Patterson went on to advise Members that the strategy was developed following a five week consultation period and the responses received informed the final version, as included on page 127 of the agenda.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised the Cabinet that during the Committee's consideration of this item Members had been pleased to note that the Committee's feedback had been incorporated into the report, together with the recommendation regarding the name of the strategy. The Chairman added that discussion at the Committee had also focused on electronic service provision versus face to face provision. Of particular interest was how comments made through Social Media platforms could be utilised to capture comments on planning and council consultations and whether an app would be developed to enable people to report issues directly.

Councillor Osborne-Patterson thanked the Chairman of Scrutiny for the comments and advised that further work was planned, particularly in relation to the website and links with the Destination Management Plan and specifically the promotion of Tourism opportunities.

The Cabinet considered the two options presented in the report and agreed to support Option 1.

RESOLVED: that the Customer Services Strategy 2019-24 be adopted.

67. 2019-20 Annual Plan, Performance Indicators and Strategic Risk Register

Councillor Vivienne Michael, Leader of the Council introduced the report and the three areas of work contained within. The Leader advised that the Annual Plan set out the key areas of work and performance targets to be delivered during 2019-20 in order to advance the priorities set out in the Council Strategy 2019-24. In future years this document would come to Council alongside the Budget Report for consideration and confirmation of Performance Indicators and Risks.

The Leader went on to advise that the current suite of performance indicators had been retained and five new indicators added to reflect key areas of focus. The Strategic Risk Register highlighted eight risks which were being managed.

The Leader advised the Cabinet that an amended version of the Annual Plan had been tabled, this linked to and reflected the clarification given earlier during consideration of Item 9. It was noted an amendment had been made to ENV4, page 143 of the agenda, which now reads

“Implement measures to reduce single use plastics; promote the Refill scheme; and, **consider the introduction of** ~~introduce~~ water bottle refill stations in Leatherhead and Dorking, including working with Surrey Waste Partnership.”

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised the Cabinet that during the Committee's consideration of this item they felt that the three risks relating to ICT were higher than the amber rating reported and asked for this to be reconsidered. Additionally the Strategic Risk Register did not highlight a potential change in Administration which could result in significant organisational changes.

The Chief Executive responded to the concerns advising that there were clear operational reasons for keeping the three ICT risks separately. Two of the risks were not likely to reduce and mitigations were in place. However it was felt that additional work could be undertaken to reduce the third. With reference to a potential risk regarding a change of Administration,

the Chief Executive confirmed that given the Council was very finely balanced most years, this had not been considered as a separate risk.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor Paul Kennedy commented that the Strategic Risk Register was considered by the Audit Committee which had no specific comments other than requesting that the Administration considered showing the risk appetite to enable Members to better understand what was acceptable in terms of each risk.

The Cabinet went on to consider the two options set out in the report and agreed to support option one, to include the agreed amendment to the Annual Plan.

RESOLVED: that

- (1) the 2019-20 Annual Plan and Performance Indicators be approved
- (2) the Strategic Risk Register be noted.

68. Risk Management Policy

Councillor Metin Huseyin, Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Risk introduced the previously circulated report and advised that that policy was last reviewed by the Cabinet in March 2015. The updated policy contained minor amendments and as recommended by the Audit Committee, risk appetite would be added to risks in the future.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor Paul Kennedy welcomed the response to the Audit Committee recommendations and the commitment to a four year review of this policy, recognising the need to review periodically as required.

The Cabinet went on to consider the two options set out in the report and agreed to support option one.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the updated Risk Management Policy be approved
- (2) the Council's risk tolerance level be approved

69. Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy

Councillor Patricia Wiltshire, Cabinet Member for Environment, introduced the previously circulated report and advised that the purpose of the Policy was to outline the Council's approach to securing compliance with legislation pertinent to private sector housing.

The Policy outlined the extent to which the Council would intervene to make use of the powers held under the Housing Act 2004, the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and other legislation, to improve the standards in private housing in Mole Valley. It was noted that the Policy did not replace the general 'Environmental Health and Housing Policy', which outlined the Council's approach to enforcement right across the broad range of Environmental Health activities.

The Council was committed to improving standards in private sector housing, with the aim of ensuring that all private accommodation was well managed, properly maintained, safe and habitable. All privately owned, privately rented and registered provider accommodation was covered by the Policy.

Mole Valley District Council had a vital role to play in tackling irresponsible landlords and letting agents who did not comply with their legal obligations. In order to achieve this, the

Council had a raft of statutory powers and duties to regulate private sector housing, including the Housing Health and Safety Rating System, the mandatory licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation and powers to ensure that landlords provided adequate smoke and carbon monoxide alarms. Information about these was included in the Policy as well as information about the Council's power to charge for the service of formal notices and powers to impose financial penalties under a range of legislation.

In order to regulate private sector housing, the Council's Environmental Health team investigated complaints about poor housing conditions, carried out inspections, process licence applications and promoted good practice. Where appropriate, officers took enforcement action, in accordance with the Policy.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised that the Committee noted the report and questioned whether there were any performance indicators in place to monitor the effectiveness of the policy. They were advised at the Committee that many cases were resolved before formal action was taken as a result of which it would not be possible to provide meaningful indicators.

The Cabinet were in agreement that a campaign to raise awareness of the issues could be developed to assist in promoting the policy and that this would be given further consideration.

The Cabinet went on to consider the two options set out in the report and agreed to support option one.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy and associated policy documents be approved
- (2) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Service (Place and Environment), in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to make minor amendments to the policy that may be necessary when it is reviewed annually.
- (3) the introduction of a charge for the service of Housing Act notices, outlined in section 4.1, set in accordance with the current fees and charges setting principles be noted.

70. Proposed Changes to the Services Delivered by the Shared Environmental Health and Licensing Service

Councillor Patricia Wiltshire, Cabinet Member for Environment, introduced the previously circulated report, explaining that in 2016, the Executive agreed to the establishment of a partnership arrangement with Tandridge District Council for the provision of Environmental Health and Licensing Services. This joint service began in April 2017 with Mole Valley as the host authority.

Tandridge District Council was currently undertaking a restructuring programme as part of a new initiative called Customer First. As a result of this restructuring programme, Tandridge District Council had reviewed the services that were originally not included when the Shared Environmental Health Service was formed.

An Inter Authority Agreement between Mole Valley District Council and Tandridge District Council set out the terms on which the service is delivered. If the provision of additional services was approved by Cabinet, the Inter Authority Agreement would need to be amended accordingly.

The Senior Management Team at Tandridge District Council had requested that the Shared Environmental Health Service undertake the following additional services:

- Private Sector Housing
- Taxi Licensing
- Animal Warden.

The proposed additional services would be delivered by the Environmental Health and Licensing service, but additional posts would be created in order to enable these services to be delivered. These posts would be funded by Tandridge District Council as the additional work would be undertaken within the District of Tandridge and would be cost neutral to Mole Valley District Council.

This would provide the opportunity for Environmental Health to operate fully as a shared service with the development of a single budget and the opportunity to make efficiency savings through improving the recharging process between the Councils.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised the Cabinet that during the Committee's consideration of this item they noted that the Mole Valley District Council logo was not on emails coming from the shared service and the Committee asked that this be rectified. The Committee received a very informative presentation of the changes and the impacts on staffing and equalisation of services, however concerns were raised regarding the risks and it was noted that these did not appear to have been addressed.

Mr David Hine, Strategic Environmental Health Shared Service Manager confirmed that there was a shared logo for the service. However following changes to corporate signatures at Tandridge District Council the logo was removed and work was underway to ensure that the shared service logo was reinstalled.

With reference to the risk implications, Mr Hine confirmed that these had been considered, but, given that the service had been operation since 2017, it was felt that the proposed changes did not warrant a significant change to the risk level.

The Cabinet went on to consider the two options set out in the report and agreed to support option one.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the request of the Senior Management Team, Tandridge District Council to increase the services delivered by the Shared Environmental Health and Licensing Service be approved (subject to an agreement from Tandridge District Council to review the total budget for service delivery across both districts and ensure the appropriate appointment of costs).
- (2) changes be made to the Inter Authority Agreement in order for additional services to be delivered by the Shared Environmental Health and Licensing Service.

.....
Leader of the Council
21 May 2019

Agenda Item 4: Councillor Question Time

Questions Submitted by Councillors not present on 26 March

1) Submitted by Councillor Michelle Watson

“Having attended the recent Rural Summit, I was very impressed by the presentation on Rural Funding, which really homed in on the challenging funding problems the rural areas will face in the future. It was concerning to hear that Rural Economy Growth Funding (REGF) previously worth around half a billion pounds will be lost if transitioned into the new UK Prosperity Fund without any rural proofing or rural ring-fencing, especially as Local Enterprise Partnerships generally seemed to have failed to recognize the importance and value of the rural economy, which is the heart of my district.

Please could Councillor Corinna Osborne-Patterson, Cabinet Member for People and Rural Mole Valley, Leader of Mole Valley District Council and Chief Executive Officer of Mole Valley District Council write to our MP Sir Paul Beresford, Michael Gove, Secretary of State, Lord Cameron of Dillington DEFRA Minister, and Neil Parish, MP Chair of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee to request that funding for rural areas is rural proofed and ring fenced?”

Response from Councillor Corinna Osborne-Patterson, Cabinet Member for People and Rural Mole Valley

“The Summit was incredibly helpful in identifying and exploring some of the issues for those living and working in our rural areas. The issue of funding was of particular concern and I am therefore very happy to confirm that I will write to all those listed above to request that future funding is rural proofed and ring fenced. In addition, once funding arrangements become clearer I will ensure that information is made available across Mole Valley.”

3) Submitted by Councillor Clayton Wellman

“Council Strategic Priority ENV5 is to work with other agencies to lessen the impact of environmental pollution, paying particular attention to air quality and flooding. What is the Council's plan to lessen the impact of air pollution during 2019/20?”

Response from Councillor Patricia Wiltshire, Cabinet Member for Environment

“There are two areas that the Council will concentrate on in 2019/20 and these are monitoring of air quality and planning policy.

With regards to monitoring air quality, MVDC is required regularly to review and assess air quality in the local area. The Council has to determine whether or not air quality meets the objectives set by the Government, or whether they are likely to be achieved. We do this by monitoring Nitrogen Dioxide levels at specific points throughout the district.

Where monitoring indicates that levels might exceed accepted tolerance levels, the Council must declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and then prepare an Air Quality Action Plan. This would set out the measures required to reduce pollution levels to bring them below the accepted threshold.

The Council's record for air monitoring and reporting has been accepted by DEFRA as being good, and we do not, at present, need to declare an Air Quality Management Area. However, because of its importance, air quality is high on the Council's agenda.

For the monitoring year 2019, the Environmental Health team has increased the number of monitoring points by three, and placed additional ones in Bookham, Fetcham, and Leatherhead. They will regularly review the results of all of the 17 monitoring sites to ensure Government objectives are achieved and maintained.

In addition, the emerging Local Plan will include specific policies on environmental quality, and on the emission of greenhouse gases. We intend to minimise the impacts of pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the planning process. New developments will be subject to specific criteria relating to energy standards. New buildings will be required to reduce energy consumption, and to use energy efficiently.

Development will be expected to minimise air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. It should not increase the number of people in the District exposed to poor air quality. The Plan will promote sustainable transport methods to mitigate the adverse impacts of vehicular traffic, and this will include modifying transport infrastructure.”

5) Submitted by Councillor Claire Malcomson

“In October 2017 the Council agreed to install electric vehicle points in Mole Valley car parks. Despite being supplied with information about grants and companies who supply these we have seen little progress. Please can we be updated with the exact plans and a clear timeline for installation? How will the Council measure its performance in increasing the number of electric charging points in the district during 2019/20?”

Response from Councillor David Hawksworth, Cabinet Member for Wellbeing

“The installation of Electric Vehicle Charging Points in Mole Valley’s car parks is a commitment in the Council’s Parking Strategy, and is on the annual plan for the Council in 2019/20. The Scrutiny Parking Panel will be considering this project and its rollout in the new financial year; their current priority of the Panel is, however, the parking permit review. Ahead of the Electric Vehicle Points project, as part of the current improvements being delivered at the Swan Centre and Swan Centre car park, two EV charging points are to be installed on the 6th floor of the Centre; it is anticipated that this will be operated by Chargemaster. Cabling for electric points is also to be installed as part of the £1 million car parks refurbishment programme approved by Council last year, and this is planned to be done for the first of these, the Ashted Peace Memorial Hall car park, this summer. I also understand that SCC will be issuing guidance to boroughs and districts as to the best way going forward in this matter. I should add that this Council is committed to the use of electric vehicles for its own operations wherever possible, and the new JET team will be using electric vehicles. A charging point for those operational vehicles, along with an electric police vehicle, is due for installation at Pippbrook in the next two months.”

THE SWAN CENTRE VIABILITY STUDY

Follow up questions following Cabinet on 26.3.19

Cllr Stephen Cooksey

Requested further information in respect of paragraph 2.17 of Agenda Item 8, Recommendations arising from the Development Strategy and Viability Study and next steps for the Swan Centre, Leatherhead.

'Financial appraisals were undertaken, and this demonstrated that Option 3 (Demolish and Rebuilt) was not viable and, given the site constraints, was not architecturally sensitive.'

Can we have further information on what those financial appraisals were?

Reply

The Brief included a requirement to undertake architectural feasibility studies and financial appraisals. For Option 3, paragraph 2.15 of the report sets out that the Option comprised ***'Demolition and rebuild with foodstore, cinema, retail, F&B, new car park, offices at first floor, six storeys of residential plus roof top vineyard garden.'***

Figure 1 of the report confirms the mix and quantum of uses for this option as:-

| Use | Option 3 |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Retail | 1,500 |
| Food and Beverage (F&B) | 13,000 |
| Food store | 13,000 |
| Cinema | 15,000 (5 screens) |
| Offices | 15,000 |
| Residential | 280 units including 40% affordable |
| Hotel | N/A |
| Community / Unique use | 15,000 rooftop vineyard |
| Car parking | 398 spaces |

The Brief included a requirement to consider the future development value and deduct all development costs including planning, construction costs (estimated by Quantity Surveyors), marketing costs and finance. It also included a requirement to assess the cost of purchasing additional property interests and obtaining vacant possession – ie. surrendering all the existing Leases.

When analysed against the future development value, this Option created an estimated loss in excess of £50m, and was disregarded.