

Minutes of a Meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 27th November 2018 at Pippbrook, Dorking, from 7.00pm to 9.20pm

Present:

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

Non-Cabinet Members: Councillors John Chandler, Steven Cooksey, David Draper and Paul Kennedy.

29. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 30th October 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

30. Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Simon Edge.

31. Councillor Question Time

The first question submitted by Councillor Margaret Cooksey is attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy

Given the increasing road traffic and rush hour congestion along the Lower Road, A246 and adjoining roads, does the Council have any plans to monitor air quality near any of the schools in Fetcham and Bookham?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Vivienne Michael, on behalf of Councillor Patricia Wiltshire

There is currently an air quality monitoring site in Fetcham approximately 230 metres from Eastwick Infant and Junior School. The annual mean nitrogen dioxide measurement at the site peaked in 2010 and has since shown an overall downward trend. Concentrations at the site are low and are considerably below the national objective.

This also reflects the results of air quality monitoring at measuring sites across the District which have remained below the mean objective for nitrogen dioxide during recent years of monitoring. Long term measuring has shown a continuing overall downward trend over the monitoring period.

There is currently no evidence to suggest that additional sites are required near schools in either Fetcham or Bookham. However, in the light of the Environmental Health Team's annual air quality review, it is proposed to add a new monitoring site in the centre of Fetcham at the junction of the Street and Cobham Road in order to verify concentrations of nitrogen dioxide at this location due to levels of traffic congestion at peak periods.

The DEFRA guidelines do not require monitoring for particulates so we have no data for those. Next year we are holding an Air Quality Seminar when an expert from Kings College will be providing information and answering questions about air quality issues. This will be an opportunity for all Members to be better informed about the complexities of measuring air

pollution, the current air quality monitoring regime and steps that could be taken to reduce air pollution.

Councillor Paul Kennedy asked a supplemental question as follows, "I am surprised that there is no monitoring at all in Bookham as I have seen on many occasions a lot of congestion there. Is there any reason why if it is felt not necessary to undertake air quality monitoring outside schools, then it could be undertaken on the High Street for example?"

The Leader of the Council invited the Strategic Partnership Manager for Environmental Health to respond and he advised that he was not aware of any specific reason as to why air quality monitoring could not be undertaken in the area. He also informed Members that the team did review the locations of the air quality monitors each year and consideration could be given to the inclusion of additional air quality monitoring in Bookham.

Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy

What proportion of households in each ward are currently registered as having a) green recycling bins and b) organic food waste bins?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Vivienne Michael, on behalf of Councillor Patricia Wiltshire

There are currently 13,502 subscribers to the garden waste service. It has not been possible to breakdown the distribution of households using the garden waste scheme as a percentage of all households in each ward in time for this evening's meeting. I am however arranging for the information to be made available as soon as possible.

The food waste collection service was introduced to most homes across Mole Valley in 2010. All new homes that are eligible for a wheeled bin waste collection service are provided with a food caddy.

Presenting food waste for collection is voluntary as some home households prefer to home compost food waste, especially in the rural parts of the District. It is also the case that food waste collection for households living in flats is limited by practical considerations. The Surrey Waste Partnership has however been working across Surrey to identify options for increasing opportunities to provide this service for flats. For example, communal food waste bins are provided for flatted developments where it is practicably possible.

A campaign to promote the service in Mole Valley was run in the summer of 2017 and resulted in a 10% increase in the amount of food waste collected. The Surrey Waste Partnership will be running campaigns in June and July 2019 and January and February 2020 to encourage more households to participate in the food waste collection service.

It is worth noting that between April and October this year, an average 218 tonnes of food waste has been collected each month across the District. It is taken to the waste facility at Randalls Road, Leatherhead and then to an anaerobic digester where it is used to generate electricity.

Councillor Paul Kennedy asked a supplemental question as follows, "is there any reason why no campaign is proposed until next summer?"

The Leader of the Council replied that she would relay this question to Councillor Patricia Wiltshire for a response.

32. 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 the relevant points during the meeting.

33. New Maximum Fare Taxi Tariff for Quarter 4 2018/2019

The Chairman of the Hackney Carriage Consultative Group, Councillor John Chandler introduced the report and informed Members that the Consultative Group had met on 10th October 2018 to consider a request from the trade to increase the hackney carriage fare tariff. Details of the proposed Hackney Carriage Fares were set out in paragraph 2.5 of the previously circulated report. Members noted that if objections to the proposed fares were received, these would be reported to the Cabinet in February 2019 for further consideration. The Cabinet could then decide to proceed with the advertised table of fares, or amend it, having taken into account any objections.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper, advised the Cabinet of the Scrutiny Committee's consideration of this report which included the following points:-

- The fares proposed were higher than those in Guildford.
- The Scrutiny Committee was interested to note that hackney carriage drivers based in Dorking preferred that the tariff remain unchanged, believing that an increase in the tariff could have a detrimental impact on business by increasing the competition from private hire operators.
- The current hackney carriage maximum fare tariff had last been set by the Executive in 2014. Going forwards, consideration should perhaps be given to setting the fare tariff on an annual basis.
- The Scrutiny Committee had noted that it was a condition of all licences that the maximum fare should be displayed within the taxi. This was not always the case and officers would need to give further consideration to this.
- It would be helpful if further consideration could be given to a simplified version of the proposed fare chart as detailed in the previously circulated report.

The Chairman of the Hackney Carriage Consultative Group, Councillor John Chandler advised that the Consultative Group had considered the matter of the clear display of tariffs within vehicles and the Senior Licensing Officer advised Members that once the fares had been finalised, drivers would be provided with multiple copies for display. If fares were not displayed, drivers would be found to be in breach of the conditions of their licence.

Members then went on to note that the fares proposed represented maximum amounts that could be charged and equated to a 10% increase. Although drivers in the Leatherhead area were in support of a near RPI level increase and Dorking drivers were not, it was not possible to introduce separate tariffs within the district.

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

RESOLVED: that

- (1) approval be given to consult on the proposed new maximum fare tariff as set out in paragraph 2.5 of the report.
- (2) if no objections to the proposed tariff are received, or any objections received are subsequently withdrawn, then the proposed advertised maximum fare tariff be adopted with immediate effect.
- (3) following the period of consultation, should any objections be received and not withdrawn, a report be brought back to Cabinet.

(NOTE: Councillors David Hawksworth and Patricia Wiltshire abstained from this decision).

34. Future Mole Valley Local Plan – local housing need and principles of site selection; and updating the Local Development Scheme

The Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Councillor David Harper introduced the report and provided Members with a Powerpoint Presentation, attached at Appendix 2 to these minutes.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper was invited to present comments from Scrutiny on this item and informed Members of the following points:-

- The Scrutiny Committee had noted that the draft plan would require approval by Cabinet and Council before being published for consultation and had expressed concern that the plan would be agreed before the consultation exercise had been undertaken.
- The Committee was also concerned as to whether the actual consultation would include specific sites; it would be helpful to know what level of detail would be included in relation to specific sites.
- It appeared that villages had had an opportunity for a full say on possible sites in their areas but this same opportunity had not been afforded to urban areas which would need to wait until June 2019.
- Some Members of Scrutiny had queried whether it was now too late for communities to put forward views on brownfield sites

In response to the first point, the Leader of the Council advised that, although there was no regulatory requirement for the preferred options plan to be approved by full Council prior to the public consultation, Cabinet Members had agreed that the plan, once approved by Cabinet, would be presented to a special meeting of the Council in June 2019. It was hoped that all Members would agree the draft plan for consultation.

With reference to the query concerning details of specific modest extensions, Councillor David Harper replied that the National Planning Policy Framework required Local Planning Authorities to only use Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances; if more could be achieved through the use of brownfield land, then this would be pursued. The work stream in relation to modest extensions was intended to support the viability of villages and was not really about numbers although these figures would help reduce what needed to be taken out of the green belt for urban extensions. In turn, Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) would then only need to consult on areas that it had to. The Leader added that in the initial consultation, 70 percent of responses were in favour of modest extensions to rural villages to help maintain the viability of the villages.

Members noted that, if MVDC did not prepare a Local Plan or offered a plan that fell shy of 441 dwellings per annum requirement, it could be modified or rejected by the Planning Inspector and in turn could lead to unwanted applications and significant sums of money being spent on planning appeals.

Members went on to comment that whilst some villages welcomed additions, others did not and in some instances vigorously objected to particular sites. In light of this, Members queried if reassurance could be given that sites would not be included that did not have community support of the necessary infrastructure.

The Cabinet Member for Planning Policy advised that at this point the decision had not been taken as to whether all sites would remain or some would be taken out and some responses from Parish Councils were still awaited. The Leader of the Council added that engagement with Parish Councils was continuing and there would be further clarity in the weeks and months ahead. Residents would also have the opportunity to respond to sites put forward in the draft preferred options consultation.

In response to concerns expressed in relation to villages but not urban areas having had the opportunity to comment at this stage, the Planning Policy Manager advised that all would have the opportunity to comment once the draft preferred options plan had been published. In the meantime, Parish Councils did have a statutory role to play in the process and thus there was an opportunity for them to provide a steer at this stage. The Member engagement programme would also continue through the Planning Policy Working Group.

Members went on to express concern in relation to brochures being circulated by developers to residents in connection with urban extensions and queried how this could be managed. The Cabinet Member for Planning Policy replied that it was not possible to prevent the production of these documents even though the location of sites had not been confirmed.

Following the consideration of this matter, the Cabinet considered the four options as set out in the report.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the revised policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the requirement that strategic policies should provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, using the standard method (441 dwellings per annum) be noted;
- (2) the methodology summarised in paragraphs 5.7-5.9 and 5.13-5.25 of the report for assessing sites as part of the greenfield preferred options be agreed; and
- (3) the revised Local Development Scheme 2018 (annex 1) be approved.

35. Financial Scene Setting 2019/2020 to 2021/22

Councillor Metin Huseyin, Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Risk introduced the previously circulated report and explained that this report provided an update to the Medium Term Financial Strategy for the period 2019/20 to 2021/20 based on the latest financial information.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that Mole Valley District Council was facing significant reductions in government funding over the next two to three years and in preparation for this the Council had undertaken the procurement of a joint waste contract and the asset investment strategy each of which was estimated to have financial benefits of more than £1 million per annum. It was important to recognise that the budget still contained a degree of

uncertainty and it was therefore necessary to maintain the principles of caution, prudence and value for money that had characterised the Council's approach to its budget. This was particularly so in relation to the one-off revenue surplus of circa £0.8 million in 2019/2020 which had arisen due to the deferral of the reformed local government funding system for one year. The Council's Medium Term Financial Plan, approved in February, assumed a loss of £0.8m of Business Rates from April 2019. This would now be deferred to April 2020. Consequently the Council would effectively have a "one off" surplus of approximately £0.8 m in 2019/20 with a corresponding savings requirement of £0.8 million in 2020/21.

Members noted that it was recommended that the surplus should largely be used to fund either one off expenditure or added to reserves, possibly earmarked for future one off spending, such as pump priming of regeneration schemes. Any new major ongoing revenue commitments were likely to create a corresponding saving requirement in 2020/21.

The Cabinet Member added that the Council was nearing completion of a significant Capital Programme and going forward MVDC would have an ongoing Capital Programme of about £2 to £3 million, financed by a range of modest capital funding sources.

Any further significant additions to the Capital Programme in future would either require funding from a capital receipt, e.g. sale of a Council asset, or from borrowing. Therefore it would be important to consider the business case for any such capital spending and to understand and accept the impact on the revenue budget.

In his concluding remarks, Councillor Huseyin added that the Cabinet was being asked to note the financial scene setting as a starting point for the detailed Business and budget planning for 2019/20. At the Standing Budget Panel meeting in November there had been discussion of the fees and charges principles, particularly as to when the fees and charges principles would be reviewed. The Panel had indicated that the review would be better placed at the beginning of the process and the report before Cabinet therefore recommended approval of the fees and charges principles as set out in Appendix C.

In the discussion that followed, Members noted that the Surrey Leaders' Group had alerted Government Ministers to the financial situation for Local Government and more particularly for Surrey. Further details of the Government Settlement were awaited. With reference to car park income, the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing advised that estimates would be revised but usage had remained consistent in recent months.

The Cabinet considered the previously circulated report and agreed to approve the recommendations set out in the report.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the financial scene setting report be noted as the starting point for the detailed business and budget planning for 2019/20, and
- (2) the fees and charges principles as set out in Appendix C to the report be approved.

36. Month 7 (October) – 2018/2019 Business and Budget Report

Councillor Metin Huseyin, Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Risk introduced the previously circulated report and explained that there were a number of projects and actions that had contributed to the achievement of the priorities set out in the Council's Corporate Strategy. The Cabinet Member went on to highlight that with reference to the Environment priority, work was progressing on the Local Plan and Members had been provided with a full update (as detailed in the previously circulated report: Future Mole Valley

Local Plan – local housing need and principles of site selection; and updating the Local Development Scheme; minute 34 above refers).

With regard to the Prosperity priority, Councillor Huseyin informed Members that the Transform Leatherhead Forum held in October had been well attended and the first phase of refurbishment works to the Swan Centre had been completed.

In relation to the Council's Community Wellbeing priority, Members noted that a range of wellbeing activities had been delivered, including the successful launch event at Kingston Road Recreation Ground for its new playground and skate park.

With reference to the financial headlines, Councillor Huseyin reported that an overspend of £313,000 was projected against the Council's net revenue budget of £9.1 million. This represented 3.4% of the net revenue budget. The significant variances were in five areas: projected net overspends in Property and Financial Services and a projected under recovery of income for Parking. These were partially offset by net underspends in Development Management and Waste.

The Cabinet Member explained that the position would be closely monitored over the next months to establish whether any corporate action was required. The significant variances would also be considered during the budget preparation for next year. If an overspend remained at year end, then the Council had sufficient reserves to cover it.

On capital, a net underspend of £311,000 was projected against the Council's capital programme of £140.1 million. This represented 0.2% of the capital programme. The month 5 budget monitoring report explained a net underspend of £135k on some major projects that had been completed. In addition to this there were now a further three significant variances against capital projects: a projected overspend on Leatherhead Bypass, and underspends on Minor Estates and Minor ICT projects.

With reference to risk, Members noted that there were currently six strategic risks that were being managed by the Senior Leadership Team in consultation with Cabinet Members. With the mitigation that was in place, they were all within the Councils accepted risk tolerance level.

Cabinet Members went on consider the previously circulated report.

RESOLVED: That the Council's performance and financial position for the period April to October 2018 be noted.

37. Syrian Refugee Vulnerable Person Resettlement Scheme – Update

The Leader of the Council presented the report to Members and explained that in October 2015 the former Executive had agreed a commitment to resettle a number of Syrian refugees through the Home Office Syrian Refugee Vulnerable Person Resettlement (SRVPR) Scheme with accommodation secured locally from the private rented sector and in Clarion Housing's sheltered housing stock for single people and couples over 55, where it was known that there was a surplus of accommodation.

Since June 2016, eleven households had been greeted and commenced the resettlement process in Mole Valley, comprising of a mix of 36 adults and children. To date, the Council had accepted the highest number of households in Surrey compared to other authorities apart from Woking.

Households were progressing well with improving English, children attending school, health needs being met and for some moving into voluntary and paid work. Households were supported by Arabic speaking Refugee Support Workers employed by the East Surrey Family Support Team and the formal network of volunteers that the Team had established. MVDC's Housing Team had secured and prepared the properties provided.

The Leader added that it had been anticipated that, of Mole Valley's commitment of 25 households over five years, 15 households would be single or couples over 55 years old and able to be housed in Clarion's sheltered housing stock where there was a surplus of accommodation. Unfortunately, the Home Office had only been able to refer a few households in this category meaning that , to achieve the total of 25, more family accommodation would need to be provided and this would place pressure on private rented sector accommodation that was needed for the Council to fulfil its duties to house homeless households.

In the light of this and because the Housing Team needed to concentrate on the implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017, it was not proposed to accept further households under the scheme. However, there remained the opportunity to resettle households through the Community Sponsorship Scheme.

Members noted that the Home Office was encouraging Community Sponsorship to enable communities to play a greater role in refugee resettlement. This represented a model that had been used in Canada since 1976 and had been piloted in Australia, Switzerland, Germany and Ireland and more recently in Italy, New Zealand and the UK.

Community Sponsorship enabled local community groups to take responsibility to welcome and support refugees directly into their communities and complemented resettlement work already undertaken by local authorities.

The Leader informed Members that there was a committed multi-faith group in Mole Valley that was keen to become a Community Sponsor and had prepared an application to the Home Office that would first need to be considered for consent by this Council. Consequently, the Leader recommended to the Cabinet that the granting of consent be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council and this delegation could then be used for any further applications from the community.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper commended the number of households who had commenced resettlement in Mole Valley and Members went on to thank the Leader for her personal commitment to the resettlement programme and the Strategic Housing Manager and the team for all their hard work.

The Cabinet went on to consider the options set out in the previously circulated report and indicated their support for Option 1.

RESOLVED: that

- (1) the Council's progress in meeting its commitment to the Syrian Refugee Vulnerable Person Resettlement Scheme and the constraints in meeting the full commitment be noted;
- (2) approval be given to the recognition of Community Sponsorship as an appropriate means to encourage and enable the resettlement of Syrian Refugees under the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme; and

- (3) delegated authority be granted to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to give consent to Community Sponsors subject to them meeting the Home Office criteria (as set out in section 5 of the report) for that consent.

38. Homelessness Strategy 2015 to 2020 Action Plan Update

Councillor Chris Hunt, Cabinet Member for Planning Services and Housing presented Members with the annual update on the Council's homelessness strategy action plan, highlighting that the Council was required by statute to have a five year homelessness strategy. Progress against the action plan was considered annually by the Scrutiny Committee.

The Cabinet Member advised that over the past twelve months there had been a number of significant achievements in both managing and preventing homelessness and good progress had been made against the action plan. These included:-

- The achievement of the Homelessness National Practitioner Support Service Gold Standard; Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) was one of only 16 local authorities in England to achieve it.
- The implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act from 2 April 2018 that reinforced MVDC's already early emphasis on homelessness prevention and customer focus.
- The reduction in the number of families placed in bed and breakfast accommodation. Members noted that there had been no families living in this type of accommodation for 6 weeks or more for more than 12 months. Current weekly figures indicated that the total numbers of households in bed and breakfast and nightly stay accommodation were between 5 and 7.
- Two additional self-contained emergency accommodation properties had been acquired to increase the Council's stock for homeless households.
- Over the lifetime of the strategy the Council had assisted 149 households access accommodation within the private rented sector through the HomeChoice Plus rent deposit bond scheme.
- Alongside this MVDC continued to house around 200 people in housing need from the Housing Register per year with housing associations.
- The East Surrey Outreach Service continued to assist rough sleepers and sofa surfers in the Mole Valley area and neighbouring authorities. Councillor Chris Hunt reminded Members that if they saw any rough sleepers, details should be reported to the Housing Team. In the meantime, MVDC would continue as usual to provide accommodation for rough sleepers when it was very cold.
- A further achievement this year was the renewed Customer Excellence accreditation for the Housing Team.

Members went on to note that the Government grant given specifically for homelessness had been used to increase the staff team so that more Housing Options Officers were available for customers and to make more detailed checks of all housing applications to detect and prevent fraud. The grant was also used to prevent homelessness where appropriate.

The Cabinet Member drew Councillors' attention to paragraph 2.3 in the previously circulated report which provided current statistics on the levels of activity and indicated that the numbers of cases had increased. This was partly due to the Homelessness Reduction Act and as a result of having higher staffing levels there was now time to ensure that every contact was recorded. The main reason for homelessness continued to be due to families no longer willing to keep extended household members in their home.

In terms of challenges for the coming year, these included a continued focus on preventing homelessness, completing the actions contained in the strategy action plan, commencing preparations for the new 2020 to 2025 Homelessness Strategy, together with the ambition to update the customer facing and back office housing software.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper, advised the Cabinet of the Scrutiny Committee's consideration of this report which included the following points:-

- The Committee had noted the estimated increase in the number of new cases, as detailed in paragraph 2.3 of the previously circulated report.
- Paragraph 4.3 of the report indicated that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government had provided funding to assist with the implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act over two years and the additional benefit of the Flexible Homelessness Grant. The grant in 2018/2019 amounted to £174,210 and unspent grant from 2017/2018 had been carried over into this year. The Scrutiny Committee had queried what this unspent amount was and whether this figure, plus the grant for 2018/19 would be sufficient to cover the estimated fairly large increase the number of cases. The Scrutiny Committee also queried what factors may have contributed to the increase in the figures, e.g. increased public awareness or economic factors.
- With reference to the number of emergency accommodation units available, the Scrutiny Committee had been informed that additional units would be found if there was a need that was clear.
- The Scrutiny Committee had gone on to express concerns in relation to the effect of Universal Credit on instances of homelessness and the possibility of increased pressure on the Citizens Advice Bureau as a result of an increase in the number of cases.
- With reference to the proposed flat mate scheme, the Scrutiny Committee had noted that there was still work to be undertaken in connection with checking liabilities. There was also work to be undertaken with reference to the proposed review and update to the customer feedback process, Scrutiny Committee Members had indicated that it would be useful to know when this was going to happen.

In response to the various queries raised by the Scrutiny Committee, the Cabinet Member advised as follows:

- With reference to the increase in the number of cases, this was attributable to the fact that the timeframe for working on cases had doubled from 28 days to 56 days. As a result, the team had a longer time span on which to work on cases.
- With reference to Government grants, Members were advised that £100,000 had been carried over from 2017/2018. At this point, it was not yet known if Government funding for homelessness would carry on after the financial year 2019/2020.
- With reference to possible delays in Universal Credit, the impact on homelessness was currently unknown although the team would be trying to limit this.

- With reference to the potential impact on the Citizens Advice Bureau, additional funding from the Department for Work and Pensions would be provided to assist them in the support that they would be providing.
- In response to the query concerning customer feedback, Members noted that the Team was currently seeking expert advice on this and this would be considered further in due course.

In further consideration of this item, Members noted factors that could increase the number of homelessness applications, such as a sudden change in the economy that could result in mortgage repossessions and private renters losing their homes. Universal Credit had not specifically been identified as a potential risk for causing homelessness, but it had been included in the risk assessment and would be reviewed if necessary.

In response to a query concerning nightly stay accommodation which did not include cooking facilities, Members noted that MVDC used a provider for this, outside of the District, who had worked with the Council for a number of years and had adapted to the Council's specific needs. This ensured that self contained accommodation could be provided for a short period of time until emergency accommodation within the district became available. The possible introduction of nightly stay accommodation within the district would need to be handled carefully to ensure that the private rented sector market was not destabilised, particularly in light of the fact that this sector helped prevent homelessness for over 45% of those households who approached MVDC for support.

Finally, Members also noted that the Customer Services Excellence Scheme was not planned to continue as the Customer Care Strategy was currently under review.

RESOLVED: That the progress made over the last 12 months to achieve the actions contained in the Homelessness Strategy Action Plan 2015-2020 be noted.

39. Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018 – consultation response

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Strategy and Assets and Chairman of the Aviation Working Group, Councillor Charles Yarwood introduced the previously circulated report and copies of the notes of the Aviation Working Group held on 20th November were circulated at the meeting.

Councillor Charles Yarwood advised that as the report set out, Gatwick Airport Limited had published a Draft Master Plan for consultation which set out proposals for the airport's ongoing development and growth over the next 15 years. The plan included three "growth scenarios" – a single runway operation; utilising the existing emergency (standby) runway; and safeguarding land for a fully operational second runway.

The second proposal to use the emergency runway as a full time permanent runway was of particular interest in MVDC. Although the matter was somewhat premature, it did provide the Council with an opportunity to raise issues and concerns. The purpose of the report before Members was to delegate the ability to reply to this initial and rather early consultation, the deadline for which was 5th December, to the Chairman of the Aviation Working Group.

Councillor Charles Yarwood went on to advise that the option to use the emergency runway would need to be considered in line with the nationally significant infrastructure projects procedure and a Development Consent Order would be required. This was expected to come forward in the course of the next year. At this juncture, there were no details available in a variety of areas including environmental impact assessments, noise, air quality and surface access. Once the major consultation had been initiated by Gatwick Airport Limited,

this matter would be considered in further detailed. In the meantime, Councillor Charles Yarwood thanked the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee for agreeing that this item be taken as an urgent item at the Cabinet in order to meet the current consultation deadline of 5th December.

RESOLVED: That the response to the Gatwick Airport draft Master Plan 2018 be delegated to the Chairman of the Aviation Working Group

40. 2019/2020 Council Meeting Schedule

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and informed Members that the proposed meeting schedule had been reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee and in the main, echoed the same meeting cycle as the current year. The schedule also included provisional seminar dates.

The Leader added that in light of the Local Plan process that would occur next year, as discussed earlier, two special meetings had been included: one for Cabinet and one for Council. The special Cabinet meeting would be held on 4 June 2019, followed by a special Council meeting on 18 June 2019. The Local Plan consultation would then take place between 24 June – 2 August 2019.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor Paul Kennedy advised that the proposed dates for the Audit Committee in May and July might require revision but, as it stood, the proposed date for the meeting in July seemed sensible.

RESOLVED: That the council meeting schedule for 2019/2020 be approved

41. 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.

42. Approval to seek a delivery partner for Claire House and James House

The Leader of the Council introduced the previously circulated report and the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper relayed the comments made by Members of that Committee.

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

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the site known as Claire House and James House, Bridge Street, Leatherhead, be marketed in order to seek a partner who will enable the redevelopment of the Claire House and James House site and
- (2) the necessary expenditure for professional fees as set out at paragraph 1.10 of the confidential report be approved.

(A further Cabinet report will be submitted to the Cabinet in 2019 setting out the results of the marketing exercise and recommending any further actions if appropriate).

Chairman: Date:

Agenda Item 4 - Question remaining to be asked

1. The following question was submitted by Councillor Margaret Cooksey:

What plans does the Council have to help tackle the gender pay gap in Mole Valley, and what expectations does the Council have of its suppliers and contractors in this regard?"

Response from Councillor Simon Edge

Although not quantified in the question, the Office for National Statistics publishes a number of useful indicators comparing pay. Their 2018 published datasets report that the median full-time gross weekly pay for a man working (but not necessarily resident in) in Mole Valley is £799.10, compared to £484.90 for a woman. This compares to median full-time gross weekly pay for men working in the South East of £635.00 compared to £521.70 for women; and across England £514.50 for men compared to £512.00 for women.

It is worth noting that the median full-time gross weekly pay for men resident in (but not necessarily working in) Mole Valley is £775.30 compared to £528.10 for women. This compares to median full-time gross weekly pay for men living in the South East of £670.80 compared to £541.90 for women.

As is the nature of macroeconomic phenomenon the reasons for the gender pay gap in Mole Valley are likely to be multivariable. To illustrate this point we can refer to an interesting example: as reported by the FT on 7 November 2018, recent research (Office for National Statistics and Institute for Fiscal Studies) has identified that men in the UK are far more likely to commute long distances for work than women. The longer a commute the more likely it is to be done by a man. Two-thirds of commutes that last longer than an hour are undertaken by men while more than half of commutes that last 15 minutes or less are completed by women. Disparities in commuting patterns between men and women widen after the birth of the first child within a family. According to the report, this is because women are more likely to be responsible for caring for young children than men and may need to be able to return home at short notice. The gender commuting gap may cause some of the pay gap as workers who travel further have a greater range of potential jobs available, which makes it easier to find high paying work. Fishing in a smaller pool of jobs may mean women are less likely to find employment that matches either their skillset or their ambitions. It may also "signal" to employers that female workers have fewer outside options if they are paid less. According to the article, the IFS suggested that employers face less competition from other employers when hiring mothers than when hiring fathers which may give employers bargaining power and enable them to hold down the wages of mothers more than the wages of fathers.

One priority of the Economic Prosperity Strategy is safeguarding quality employment land in order to attract new and retain existing high quality and well paid jobs in our district, which in turn creates an environment where women with caring responsibilities in our district are able to access jobs which match their skillset and/or ambitions as a result of minimising commuting times. Increasing the employment pool may reduce potential downward pressure on wages of mothers. In addition, other projects such as the business reference group (the first pilot of which was trialled in Leatherhead on 20 November) and the schools engagement programme, create an opportunity to help schools develop the skills and experiences for young people in our area to better match those employer's needs, particularly in knowledge intensive businesses.

Members may be interested in noting that to help improve access to stations, the Council has also supported the accessibility grants applied for by Leatherhead and Dorking railway stations. In addition, the Council is also contributing to the North Downs line study with Network Rail on reducing risks around level crossings, which is a step on the way towards the anticipated 3rd train per hour on the line.

All our suppliers are required to comply with equality legislation and these obligations are built into our contracts.