

# Minutes of a Meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2018 at Pippbrook, Dorking, from 7.00pm to 8.05pm

Present:

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

Non-Cabinet Members: Councillors Margaret Cooksey, Mary Cooper, Joe Crome, Elizabeth Daly, Rosemary Dickson, David Draper, Tracy Keeley, Paul Kennedy, Garry Stansfield and Michelle Watson

## 13. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 26<sup>nd</sup> June 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

## 14. Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor David Harper.

## 15. Councillor Question Time

### 1. Submitted by Councillor Tracy Keeley

“Why is it that Mole Valley Planning do not operate a Local Listing of buildings as other Councils across the Country do?”

“The reasoning for this would be to compile a local list to protect the distinctive character of the District, so as to afford key landmarks (places of aesthetic interest, places of social and communal value, buildings of historic and architectural importance) more consideration in the planning process.

“Local listing. Definition.

“Local listing is a concept to ensure the historic and architectural interest of buildings that are of local importance but may not fit the criteria to be of national importance.

“Locally listed buildings do not enjoy the levels of statutory protection afforded to nationally listed buildings. However, local listing means that the interest of the building will at least be considered during the planning process.

“The effect of an application on a non –designated heritage asset is a material consideration when deciding planning applications and local listing strengthens the case for retention of a historic building. In England and Wales local authorities are responsible for drawing up local lists of buildings that they consider to be of local importance and have their own precise criteria. It is estimated that a least half of Councils have a local list”.

### Response from Councillor Chris Hunt

“In the past the concept of a list of buildings of local interest was not recognised in legislation or national policy guidance. Where local planning authorities did have local lists, they could only be given very limited weight in the consideration of planning applications. The use of our limited resources to create a list of local interest was not therefore considered to be a priority.

“However, in 2012 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) included a reference to “non-designated heritage assets” which could include lists of locally important buildings. The 2018 version of the NPPF also refers to non-designated heritage assets and says that the effect of an application on the significance of them regardless of whether or not they are locally listed should be taken into

account in determining the application. It adds that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

“In the light of the NPPF, I recognise the case for a list of buildings of local interest is stronger than it was previously and that local listing provides a sound consistent and accountable means of identifying local heritage assets to the benefit of good planning and for the benefit of owners and developers wishing to fully understand local development opportunities and constraints.

“There would however be significant resource implications in creating a list of buildings in Mole Valley that are of local interest. There would be a huge amount of fieldwork, archive research on each building, communicating with owners and stakeholders, data capture and updating records. Criteria for including buildings in the list would also be required. This is not something that could be achieved within the limited resources that we have with the necessary expertise. It would be necessary to employ contractors to carry out the work for which there is no budget provision. There are over a thousand listed buildings in Mole Valley so the number of buildings of local interest is unlikely to be less and possibly more which gives some idea of the significant scale of the task.

“I am however prepared to consider the benefits and costs of commissioning the creation of a list of buildings of local interest as part of the budget and business planning process for the next financial year”.

Councillor Tracy Keeley asked the following supplemental question, “When we consider planning applications, who will be designating our heritage assets so that certain things can be given protection. I understand that the budget is limited but surely we need to have a list of things that we need to consider in the planning process?”

Councillor Chris Hunt replied as follows, “the case officer, in assessing any application, consults with relevant authorities - that could be with other officers within the authority for their expertise as well as seeking views from the Heritage and Protection Society. Therefore, there is a process in place. Returning to the original question, I am prepared to look at the costings and consider this further. The National Planning Policy Framework gives greater weight now to a building which is not necessarily on a formal list as it specifically says that you have to take of the asset value from a planning perspective”.

## **2. Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy**

“The Prime Minister has stated that the only alternative she is prepared to consider to her 'Chequers' plan is a 'no deal' Brexit. What is the Council's current state of preparedness (including correspondence or advice the Council has received from government or other agencies, impact and risk assessments, and preparations and contingency plans the Council is making or participating in), in case the Government decides to withdraw from the European Union on 29th March 2019 without a transitional deal to protect Britain's access to the single market and customs union and associated cooperation agreements with the European Union and third countries?”

### **Response from Councillor Vivienne Michael**

“I thank Councillor Kennedy for his question and can confirm that officers are identifying any relevant information as it becomes available in order that we can take appropriate action.

“On 13th August the Local Government Association produced its ‘No deal and local government’ briefing. It identified Waste management, Environmental standards, Trading standards and Procurement as amongst the local government services affected by EU rules and regulations and highlighted some of the possible risks for local councils in the event of No Deal.

“The LGA has also recently established a ‘Post Brexit England Commission’ which has published an interim report focusing on non-metropolitan Districts and Boroughs and Counties. This report aims to gain feedback from councils which will help shape a final report to be published in time to inform the next spending review, due to be undertaken during 2019 for implementation from 2020/21.

“This final report is likely to argue that more powers should be delegated to local authorities. Further details are available on the LGA’s website\*.

“The Commission states that this report will “set out a compelling case for change and highlight the once in a lifetime opportunity to chart a new course for public service delivery that draws on the trusted public leadership of councils to achieve better outcomes for communities”.

“The LGA is hosting a series of roadshows with the one for the South East on 18 December in London. We have already requested two places.

“In addition, individual professional bodies are considering the impacts on specific services. For example, in Environmental Health both the Health and Safety Executive and Food Standards Agency have issued advice regarding actions that we will need to take in order to ensure that we can continue to enforce relevant legislation post 29 March 2019.

“We will continue to monitor all guidance closely and will prepare a more detailed briefing for Members over coming months.

\*[https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/27.1%20Post%20Brexit%20England%20Commission\\_v06WEB.pdf](https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/27.1%20Post%20Brexit%20England%20Commission_v06WEB.pdf))

Councillor Paul Kennedy asked the following supplemental question, “My concern is our preparedness for a no-deal Brexit in six months’ time. Are you able to give us an assessment of how confident you are that we will be ready to deal with that eventuality if it occurs and are there any arrangements, if you are not that may cause problems for us that you will alert Ministers to?”

The Leader replied as follows, “we will alert Ministers in advance if we do sense that we are going to be facing a no deal and there is an overall lack of guidance from either central government, the LGA or other appropriate bodies. We will continue to monitor the situation and we will update Members later in the year”.

### **3. Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy**

“The Council’s environmental health enforcement policy was last updated in 2008, and appears to be out-of-date in a number of respects. Paragraph 1.8 provides for an annual review of its implementation and effectiveness, and paragraph 3.2 provides for the publication of standards and annual performance against those standards. Have any of the recent annual reviews been published, what are the principal findings, and are there any plans to review and update the policy to improve its effectiveness?”

#### **Response from Councillor Patricia Wiltshire**

“The Council’s environmental health enforcement policy is indeed out-of-date and a new policy will be written to reflect the current way that the new Environmental Health and Licensing Shared Service operates across both Mole Valley and Tandridge District Councils. The new management team of the shared service have been in post for approximately 12 months and have had to prioritise a number of critical matters during this time including: addressing and responding to the concerns of a national regulator (the Food Standards Agency); clearing a significant back log of statutory food hygiene inspections; recruitment to vacant positions and responding to changes in housing and licensing legislation to name but a few. These priorities have resulted in a delay in the writing a new enforcement policy, but I am assured by the Environmental Health Partnership Manger that this will be undertaken within the next six months and the new policy will be brought before Cabinet Members to seek their approval.

“A Joint Partnership Board for the Environmental Health and Licensing Shared Service has been established and the role of the board is a senior level forum for advice, consultation, resolution of issues and recommendations back to the Councils on all aspects of the delivery of the service. The membership of the Joint Partnership Board consists of a Councillor from each of the Councils, the Head of Service from each Council and the Environmental Health Partnership Manager. The Board meet on a

quarterly basis and review the performance of the Environmental Health & Licensing Shared Service from their Key Performance Indicators and through discussion and challenge with the Environmental Health Partnership Manager”.

Councillor Paul Kennedy asked the following supplemental question, “My question was primarily about the principal findings from any of the reviews that have taken place over the last 10 years, for example my particular concern is in relation to infestation such as feral rats and pigeons”.

Councillor Patricia Wiltshire replied as follows, “I recognise that these issues are an ongoing problem that the team is dealing with. The new team has only been in place for a year and they are working their way through a backlog of work. There are still some existing vacancies and work is underway to fill these. The team fully intends to address the issues that you have raised; please bear with them for a little while longer”.

#### **4. Submitted by Councillor Elizabeth Daly**

“What steps is the Council taking to support and improve activities and services for young people in the Bookham/Fetcham area given the cuts to youth services being implemented by Surrey County Council?”

#### **Response from Councillor David Hawksworth CBE**

“The Council deeply regrets the cuts that continue to be made in youth services across the District. This is also a matter of deep concern to some of our County Councillors who have lobbied for the effects to be mitigated as far as possible. Where the District Council does contribute is by providing support to voluntary groups in the sector. In the case of the Bookham/Fetcham area, the District capital grants fund has already supported Bookham Space to make improvements to their building, and the small grants fund has supported the youth disability group Bookham Challengers. I encourage other groups in Bookham and Fetcham also to apply for grants of up to £5k to support youth activities in the area. The deadlines for applications are 30th September and 31st December. They can be applied for via our website or contact a member of the team to explore possibilities further”.

#### **5. Submitted by Councillor Elizabeth Daly**

“What assessment has the Council made of the feasibility of obtaining and enforcing an injunction against unauthorised encampments in the Mole Valley area similar to the injunction recently obtained by Elmbridge Borough Council?”

#### **Response from Councillor David Hawksworth CBE**

“MVDC has had seven unauthorised encampments on its land this year to date, including one at the Leatherhead Leisure Centre this last weekend; that figure compares with two for the whole of last year. The Council has dealt with these by issuing Direction notices to leave (generally on the day of arrival or the day after), followed by a simultaneous application to a Magistrates Court for an injunction to leave should they not have moved. This is an efficient system and has enabled most such encampments to be removed within 2-3 days. Surrey Police will normally only use their powers to remove encampments if there is evidence of significant community and environmental impacts and 6 or more vehicles are involved. There is a high bar to reach for attaining High Court Injunctions. An expert barrister in this field made clear at a County-wide meeting last Friday, which I attended with Senior Officers, that the High Court only made such orders where there had been excessive numbers of encampments; the small number the District had experienced would not be sufficient to persuade the High Court there was a case for district wide ban. Seven may seem a large number in the District, but has to be seen in the context of 164 being documented since April in the County as a whole, with 27 in Elmbridge as the basis for their 3 month injunction.

“A county-wide approach is envisaged for the future, with issues identified at Friday’s meeting to be passed to Surrey District and Borough Leaders for consideration of what next steps should be taken.

"I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the diligence and professionalism shown by Council staff in dealing professionally and promptly with the incursions the District has experienced this year, and for the measures being put into place to physically prevent such encampments in the future".

## **6. Submitted by Councillor Joe Crome**

"Will the responsible Cabinet member provide an update on progress made in addressing the issues identified by Cllr Kennedy in his question to the Executive meeting on 27th March 2018 relating to bookings and customer service at Leatherhead Leisure Centre?"

### **Response from Councillor David Hawksworth CBE**

"This matter has been taken up with Fusion by the responsible Senior Officer, and as a result they have recruited further reception staff, including a new front of house Customer Relations Manager who started a month ago. Fusion have also improved their company 'app' which now has 3,000 users and their website, both of which customers can use to book sessions and find out information. In view of the concerns, some of which I have personal experience of, I visited the Centre myself last Wednesday along with our Chairman and the responsible Senior Officer. The situation appears to have improved as a result of these actions, to judge from the lack of complaints having been received during the last two months, and I anticipate that this will continue to improve further as the newly appointed staff become increasingly familiar with the bookings and membership arrangements".

Councillor Joe Crome asked the following supplemental question, "In preparation for this meeting I asked a number of residents how they were getting on and some of them had complaints. Who should these be directed to?"

Councillor David Hawksworth replied that complaints should be forwarded to both Fusion and the relevant officer at Mole Valley District Council.

## **7. Submitted by Councillor Joe Crome**

"What steps is the Council taking to ensure that its car parks are competitive with railway station car parks, particularly where season tickets cannot be justified because of flexible working?"

### **Response from Councillor David Hawksworth**

"I am sure that Councillor Crome will appreciate that the Council has no control over the pricing structures at railway station car parks. The Car Park Scrutiny Panel, chaired by Cllr Kendrick, met on 10 September, and is reviewing the current charging structure for pay and display and the current variety and costs of permits offered to businesses and residents throughout the Council car parks in order to develop a charging structure which best supports a range of business and residential needs. The panel would like to ensure that there is a clear and transparent approach to permits throughout the District, which acknowledges the differing needs of the towns and villages in which the car parks are located.

"The Council is actively monitoring the impact of the recent price increases, which have only been in operation since the beginning of August. These are still competitive with neighbouring Districts and Boroughs, and the Council will continue to benchmark and underpin decision making with an evidence-based approach, which I consider essential.

"As a Cabinet we want to better understand how our car parks are being used, including use of pay and display, permits, 30-minute free bays and issues around peak hours and capacity issues. We do not currently anticipate proposing any changes in pay-and-display charges in 2019/20, enabling the Cabinet to commission a study to assess who uses the car parks and when. This will then support the development of a charging scheme for 2020 onwards, in discussion with the Panel, for those charges

and permits which is evidence based and best meets the needs of residents, businesses, and commuters.

"I would also remind Council that the extra income anticipated from increased charges will contribute to much-needed refurbishment and upgrading of the Council's car parks, with a view to work on those identified as in the greatest need of attention being started before the end of the current financial year".

#### **8. Submitted by Councillor Margaret Cooksey**

"What is the current level of retail shop vacancy rates in Dorking town centre and how does that compare with vacancy rates in Reigate, Horsham, Esher, Oxted, Farnham and Cobham?"

#### **Response from Councillor Simon Edge**

"Following the approval of the Economic Prosperity Strategy in March 2018, MVDC has acquired a licence to the online commercial property database, CoStar, which is used in the commercial property industry and tracks on an ongoing basis the status of commercial property buildings; from space becoming available to it being let or sold, tenants moving in and/or leases expiring. CoStar records that as of September 2018, 5.2% of the total retail space (measured in square feet) was available in Dorking Town Centre, compared to 5.5% in Reigate Town Centre, 3.4% in Horsham Town Centre, 3.5% in Esher Town Centre, 4.0% in Oxted Town Centre, 4.3% in Farnham Town Centre and 16.1% in Cobham Town Centre. Other town centres which might also be useful comparators are Leatherhead Town Centre with 4.2%, Addlestone at 20.1% and Epsom at 14.8%. The South-East is recorded as having 3.8% of its total retail space as available".

Councillor Margaret Cooksey asked the following supplemental question, "Dorking Town Forum has been asking for local comparisons for a number of years and have been consistently told they were not available. I am interested in the figure of 5.2% which is lower than the figure given from our own department. Are the measurements the same between our Department and CoStar and would it be possible for the Forum to have these comparisons on a monthly basis as we do with all the other information?"

Councillor Simon Edge replied as follows, "Previously we only had the figures for Dorking and not for the rest of the District. Now that we have signed up with CoStar we do have access to more information on a regional basis and we can provide the information more regularly. The spotlight report is provided on a quarterly basis and any business can sign up to receive this (All Members have been sent a link to the Spotlight report). Our economic development officers are working with their colleagues in other districts and boroughs to make sure that we do have reasonable comparative data available. I think that it is important that we agree the criteria for the purposes of comparable data; this is work in progress but I am very pleased that the Economic Prosperity Strategy is now in place to assist with the provision of this information".

#### **16. Report of the Scrutiny Committee**

The Vice-Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Joe Crome, who was in the Chair for the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> September, advised that in addition to the reports listed on the Cabinet agenda this evening, the Committee had received a Presentation from the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group who updated Members on the Improving Healthcare Together programme. This was an extremely informative presentation and as a result of the Committee's discussion, representatives from the CGG advised that they would be willing to extend their consultation to Residents' Associations throughout the district next year.

Councillor Joe Crome also informed Cabinet Members that the Scrutiny Committee had considered the proposed scope of works of the Planning Scrutiny Panel as a result of the Planning Peer Review. The suggestion was to look at how planning delivered against the corporate strategy, key issues around the enforcement team and review the work of the local plan. The intention was for the Panel to meet as soon as possible with feedback provided by March 2019 and dates for the Panel were

currently being finalised.

The Leader of the Council thanked the Vice-Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee for his report.

## **17. Mandatory Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation**

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Patricia Wiltshire introduced the report and explained that a change in housing legislation would come into effect on 1st October. The new legislation changed the definition of the type of properties which needed to be licensed by the Council to operate as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

The Cabinet Member added that the current definition of a House in Multiple Occupation that required a licence was one that consisted of three storeys or more, was occupied by five or more tenants, and those tenants formed more than one household and shared facilities. Under this definition there were currently only two licensed HMOs operating within MVDC district. Houses in Multiple Occupation were licensed for a period of five years and there was a licence fee payable.

From the 1st of October, to be deemed as licensable, a House in Multiple Occupation no longer needed to consist of three or more storeys. It only needed to meet the other criteria. As an example, a bungalow occupied by 6 people, who were tenants, consisting of a family of four and two single people would need to be licensed.

The Cabinet noted that the extension of the scheme would increase the number of properties requiring a licence to operate in the district. In order to ensure the costs of operating the scheme were recovered, the outdated licence fee of £501 had been reviewed and a new fee of £687 was proposed. This figure had been reached using a structured fee calculation which took account of the officer time spent in administering the licensing scheme and ensuring compliance with licence conditions.

The Vice-Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised the Cabinet of the Scrutiny Committee's consideration of this report which included the following points:-

- The Scrutiny Committee asked how it was possible to predict the number of properties that would require an HMO licence. The Committee noted that the figure had been estimated at approximately 30 and more information would become available once the new requirements were in place
- In response to a query as to how landlords would be made aware of the changes, the Committee had been advised on the Mole Valley Landlord's Forum on 8th October. Furthermore, the MVDC website and social media pages would be used to raise awareness.
- The Committee had asked for further information in relation to the proposed licence fee and had noted that a benchmarking exercise had been undertaken with other local authorities within Surrey. The Committee had been advised that the fee was calculated on a structured basis and took into account administration costs as well as technical officer time, e.g. drawing up a schedule of works, and visiting the premises to ensure compliance with the required works. A sliding scale had not been introduced as most properties were anticipated to include approximately 6/8 lets.
- With reference to rooms rented to lodgers, the Scrutiny Committee had noted that a licence would not be required in all instances. Each case would need to be individually assessed.
- The Team were asked to draw up a list of examples to highlight when licences were/not required and a FAQ sheet had subsequently been sent to all Members for information. Councillor Joe Chrome thanked officers for circulating this information note so promptly.

In response to a query regarding the possible use of other sources to help identify HMO's, such as estate agents and more particularly the electoral roll, the Cabinet noted that this would need to be considered carefully as there could be instances of dealing with sensitive personal data.

Members queried whether mobile homes could fall within the definition of a HMO and were advised that each case would need to be considered in line with the definitions as set out in the Housing Act 2004. Mobile homes and caravans were not included for the purposes of licensing and would need to be dealt with separately.

Cabinet Members also commented that consideration should be given to providing landlords with sufficient time to ensure properties were maintained to a suitable standard. In response, the Environmental Health Team Leader advised that time frames depended on the nature of the condition that needed to be complied with. For example in the case of fire protection, the time frame was three months. In the case of room size and ratio of sleepers, eighteen months might be the maximum time given for compliance.

The Cabinet went on to consider the two options presented and noted that the introduction of mandatory licensing would improve safety and provided greater assurance for tenants. The Cabinet consequently agreed to support option 1.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) that it be noted that the prescribed definition of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) that are required to be licensed by a Local Housing Authority has been broadened to include certain HMOs of less than three storeys, and
- (2) that the revised scheme of licence fees for the mandatory HMO Licensing Scheme be approved and adopted, which will come into effect from 1st October 2018.

**18. Single use plastics and the introduction of a refill scheme in Mole Valley**

The Cabinet Member for Environment. Councillor Patricia Wiltshire introduced the report, advising that ever since the BBC 'Blue Planet 2' documentary highlighted the consequences of plastic pollution, there had been an increased recognition that action must be taken to reduce the amount of single use plastic. The Cabinet asked to be briefed on this matter earlier this year and since then a County wide task group under the umbrella of the Surrey Waste Partnership had been established to come up with ideas for reducing single use plastics.

The motion agreed by Council in February that the introduction of a water bottle Refill scheme should be explored chimed in with the debate around single use plastics in that it had the potential to contribute to a reduction in the number of plastic water bottles in circulation.

Councillor Patricia Wiltshire explained that the report before Members suggested ways that the Council could show its commitment to reducing single use plastics within the organisation. It also explained that there were already businesses in Mole Valley who were participating in the Refill scheme and suggested how the Council could participate itself and be a catalyst for others to set up local schemes. The Cabinet Member added that a good number of Residents' Associations and Parish Councils within the District had indicated their in principle support for participating in a Refill scheme from.

Further to the previous Council motion which asked that consideration be given to the introduction of drinking fountains/bottle refilling stations in Leatherhead and Dorking town centres, Councillor Patricia Wiltshire informed the Cabinet that the report set out the main issues that would need to be addressed before introducing such facilities.

Further to the Scrutiny Committee meeting Councillor Patricia Wiltshire also advised that she had received several examples of contemporary bottle refill stations from Councillor Wellman who promoted the original motion. It was clear that such facilities were becoming increasingly popular in towns cross the country and should be researched further if the Cabinet approved the recommendations before them that evening.

The Vice-Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised the Cabinet of the Scrutiny Committee's consideration of this report which included the following points:-

- The Committee had considered the hygiene of the water fountains, and concluded that taps

were the preferred way forward.

- The Scrutiny Committee had noted that there were associated costs for the installation and maintenance of taps and the idea of sponsorship represented a useful way forward.
- The Committee had requested that a drinking tap be installed in the foyer at Leatherhead Leisure Centre for non-members.
- With reference to the installation of bins with dual purpose, ie waste and recycling, in public locations, the Scrutiny Committee had noted that this would be explored further as part of the new street cleaning contract, which came into effect in 2019.

The Cabinet considered the three options presented and further to the discussion at the meeting, agreed to support option 1.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) Measures be introduced to eliminate single use plastic items in Pippbrook initially and subsequently across the organisation. This would follow an assessment of the implications and take account of the work of the Surrey Waste Partnership Task Group that is examining ways of reducing single use plastics.
- (2) Pippbrook and The Fairfield Day Centre be added to the list of premises in Mole Valley where bottles can be refilled with tap water.
- (3) The operators of the Dorking Sports Centre, Meadowbank cafe and the Leatherhead Leisure Centre are encouraged to make tap water available and join the Refill scheme.
- (4) The existence and location of premises participating in the Refill scheme be publicised through MVDC's social media channels and other appropriate platforms.
- (5) Consideration be given to MVDC leading a Mole Valley Refill scheme and installing outdoor bottle filling stations in Dorking and Leatherhead town centres as part of the 2019/2020 business and budget setting process.

**19. Exclusion of Press and Public**

**RESOLVED:** That members of the Press and public be 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 involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act; 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.

**20. Proposed Marketing and Sale of 255 Guildford Road, Effingham (Thomas Flack Will Trust Fund Property)**

Councillor Mary Cooper, Member of the Thomas Flack Working Group introduced the previously circulated report advising the Thomas Flack Working Group had met in November of 2017 to consider the matter.

Further to the discussion that followed, the Cabinet considered the two options as set out in the report and agreed to endorse option 1.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) Agents be appointed to market 255 Guildford Road, Effingham held in the Thomas Flack Will Trust Fund with Mole Valley District Council appointed as corporate trustee;
- (2) An offer as per the recommendation as advised to the Cabinet be accepted; and

- (3) If an offer as advised to the Cabinet is not achieved, the matter be referred back to the trustees for further consideration.