

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 10 September 2019 at Pippbrook, Dorking from 7.00pm to 9.32pm

Present: Councillors Charles Yarwood (Chairman), Tracy Keeley (Vice-Chairman), Lesley Bushnell, Lynne Brooks, David Harper, Paul Potter, Elsie Rosam, Caroline Salmon, Garry Stansfield and Keira Vyvyan-Robinson.

Also present: Councillors Margaret Cooksey, Stephen Cooksey, Claire Malcomson and Clayton Wellman.

14. Minutes

The minutes of the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 11 June 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

15. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Charles Yarwood and David Preedy.

16. Disclosure of Interests

Councillors Margaret Cooksey, Stephen Cooksey, Keira Vyvyan-Robinson and Lesley Bushnell declared that they are members of the National Trust.

17. Council Motion – Don't Be a Tossler Campaign

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The Executive Head of Service was in attendance to answer questions.

Members discussed that littering from vehicles was unacceptable behaviour and that the Council should take action to reduce the issue, although raised concerns that the campaign wording was too aggressive. It was noted that litter picking can be dangerous and therefore it is important to reduce the amount of litter. It was suggested that collaborating with other Local Authorities could be valuable, for example Surrey County Council to display posters on buses.

Concerns were raised regarding the cost of the proposed campaign. It was proposed that a proportion of a Councillor's County Allocation could be used and other sources of funding could be identified. The Committee discussed whether there should be a focus on fines, rather than an advertising campaign and queried whether there was a predicted income from fines. The Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed that there was not currently an anticipated figure.

The Committee suggested that residents could be encouraged to use dashcam footage and report instances of littering from vehicles to the Council, which would include via the "Report It" function on the MVDC website.

The Cabinet Member for Environment suggested that the Council may achieve better value for money if a different campaign was developed. The Committee suggested the use of social media, signatures on emails and messaging on Surrey County Council's highway dot matrix signs. The use of posters in bus shelters was also discussed.

Members discussed how the success of a campaign could be measured, and noted that there would be an associated cost with this. It was suggested that Parish Councils, Residents Associations and the street cleaning contractor could be consulted to measure the success.

The Committee supported a campaign tackling littering from vehicles but suggested that alternatives could be investigated.

RESOLVED that Scrutiny Committee did not support the proposed campaign, and Cabinet is asked to make proposals to meet the concept of the motion within 3 months.

18. Gatwick Airport Development Consent Order

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning and it was noted that an effective means of responding promptly at different stages of the process would be key. The Executive Head of Service was in attendance to answer questions.

The Committee discussed the impact of Gatwick and Heathrow Airports on residents and highlighted concerns regarding noise and the increased pressure infrastructure that would result from the Gatwick Airport proposals.

Members queried which parts of the process would be delegated to the Executive Head of Service in consultation with the Cabinet Member. Officers confirmed that the parts of the process that require a response with 14-28 days would be delegated, such as the Statement of Community Consultation, Environmental Impact Assessment scoping report and adequacy of consultation representation. The Aviation Working Group and Cabinet Member would be consulted as far as possible and this would allow a timely response. It was noted that where possible information can be circulated to members. The substantive Section 42 consultation response and the Local Impact Report, as well as any other representations with a longer timescale for completion would remain with the Cabinet. Concern was raised regarding transparency of information and the importance of input from other members in the processes that were being delegated.

19. Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan 2020-2025

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning. Officers were in attendance to answer questions.

The Committee asked how the amount of AONB that MVDC has, compares to the other Districts and Boroughs. Officers advised that MVDC contains more AONB than Tandridge District Council and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, and less than Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils.

Members queried the notion that off road activities were a threat to the AONB. Officers stated that the approach to potentially damaging activities was to provide well designed and managed facilities that cater for a variety of country pursuits and reduce damage elsewhere, such as a new off-road cycle route from Denbies to Coldharbour which is currently the subject of a grant application. The route would be linked to facilities and services along the way.

The Committee discussed the development of strategies that would encourage sustainable tourism to the AONB.

20. Meeting Calendar 2019-20

The report was introduced by the Leader of the Council. It was noted that the meetings of the Extraordinary Cabinet and Council, previously scheduled for 1 and 15 October respectively have been cancelled. The Local Plan process had been put back to accommodate a possible snap General Election being called for late November. Consequently, an urgent report on the revised Local Development Scheme would be considered by the Cabinet on 24th September. The remainder of the meeting calendar would remain unchanged and would be formally approved at Cabinet on 24 September.

21. Approval to Procure a Development Partner for the Swan Centre and Bull Hill

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Economy introduced the report.

The Committee queried the rationale for equal ownership of the Limited Liability Partnership and it was explained that this was the advice of external lawyers. It would be important due to voting rights and would mean that both MVDC and the development partner would need to agree.

Members discussed the merit of a developer undertaking the work and noted that the Development Management Committee retain decision making on the planning process. It was noted that the developer would take on abortive costs and outline planning would be required. Officers advised

that no firm parameters have been imposed, however all developments would need to comply with planning policy. This would be determined by the Local Plan, which will have been approved by Cabinet, informed by Planning Policy Working Group and examination by the Planning Inspectorate. It was noted that the option to give away control would likely mean that the Council would not be able to deliver on other priorities, such as Transform Leatherhead.

Members asked the value of the site in order to inform decisions on best development value and requested detailed information on the financial risk. Officers advised that this work would require spending and would be undertaken once agreed in principle. It was acknowledged that the Council would require the information to determine the appropriate course of action. An approved contract and procurement strategy would be developed before going to market.

22. Urgent Items

None

23. Exclusion of the Press and Public

RESOLVED that members of the Press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following item of business under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that it: involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972; namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Chairman: Date: