

# Minutes of a Meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2018 at Pippbrook, Dorking, from 7.00pm to 8.25pm

Present:

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

Non-Cabinet Members: Councillors Margaret Cooksey, Steven Cooksey, Elizabeth Dal, David Draper, Paul Kennedy and Allan Reilly.

## 21. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 25th September 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

## 22. Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillors Metin Huseyin, David Harper and Corinna Osborne-Patterson.

## 23. Disclosure of interests

Councillor Chris Hunt disclosed a non pecuniary interest in item 7 as he knew one of the bidders.

### Councillor Question Time

#### Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy

“Are there any more steps or representations outside Transform Leatherhead that we as a District Council can make to help ensure that residents in the Fetcham/Bookham area have an adequate bus service particularly at school times?”

#### Response from Councillor David Hawksworth

“Apart from the work of the Transform Leatherhead team with Surrey County Council to look into the feasibility of introducing a community shuttle bus to connect the Leatherhead business parks and the railway station, I am not aware of any representations that are currently being made about bus service provision in Mole Valley.”

“I am, however, aware that it is anticipated that Surrey County Council will be consulting on options for future possibilities around bus transport later this year. That will give us an opportunity to press for bus services that are fit for purpose right across the District, including the need for services at school times. We have a good track record of advocating our communities’ views to bus service providers and the County Council and I am sure we will respond robustly to future consultations.”

“As part of the Community Transport Strategy, MVDC has developed a range of directly provided services, in our Community Transport and Dial A Ride service, designed to assist those who have transport issues, or who lack transport options. As well as those seven day a week services directly provided by MVDC, the Council has also linked with other community car schemes and transport providers to develop a network of transport options to signpost our communities to.”

“In the meantime, if the existing bus services in Bookham and Fetcham are giving rise to specific issues, I am happy to take up these outside this meeting with the relevant parties.”

#### Submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy

“What are the most recent years' trends in numbers of complaints to the Council about smoke from private bonfires affecting residents, and in the resolution of those complaints including use of

enforcement action?”

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

“The number of complaints received by the Environmental Health team about smoke from bonfires at domestic premises affecting residents has remained fairly consistent over recent years.”

“The figures below show the number of complaints received over the last three years during the period 1st April to 31 March;

2015 – 2016: 51

2016 – 2017: 54

2017 – 2018: 49”

“In this current year, 1st April 2018 to 26 October 2018 we have so far received 39 complaints of this nature.”

“The numbers of complaints tend to increase during the summer months when residents are more likely to have their windows open, and to spend time outside. A nearby bonfire will have more of an impact on the use and enjoyment of their home on these occasions.”

“As we are now into the colder months, we do not anticipate receiving a large number of complaints during the winter and expect the total number of complaints this year will not vary significantly from the previous 3 years.”

“Generally complaints are resolved through informal enforcement action. Officers may visit the site of the bonfire and explain the impact it is having on neighbours and request that it is extinguished, and/or the person responsible for the fire is sent a letter setting out:

- Their responsibilities as good neighbours,
- Requiring them to stop having regular bonfires and advising them of other methods of disposing of garden waste
- The Council’s powers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in respect of investigating and dealing with complaints of bonfire smoke
- Explaining the action the Council will take if it considers that the smoke amounts to a statutory nuisance.”

“It has only been necessary to serve one Abatement Notice so far this year requiring the owner of land not to burn waste on the site.”

“This notice has not been breached and therefore no further action has been necessary by Environmental Health team since its service.”

### **Submitted by Councillor Tim Loretto**

“What representations is the Council planning to make to Gatwick Airport and to the regulators and Ministers concerning the latest consultation on expanding its runway capacity?”

### **Response from Councillor Charles Yarwood**

“I would like to thank Councillor Loretto for drawing attention to the recent publication of a draft Masterplan by Gatwick Airport. As members of the Council’s Aviation Working Group, we have a joint interest in the aspirations of Gatwick Airport and the impacts, both good and bad, that its growth could have on the District.”

“The draft Masterplan includes three growth scenarios for Gatwick Airport. The first proposes that it remains a single runway operation; the second proposes the use of the emergency runway for regular departures in addition to the main runway; and the third proposes to safeguard land to the south of the airport for a second runway should that be needed in the future.”

“This Council has previously opposed a second runway at Gatwick Airport because of the severe impact additional flights would have on the environment and quality of life in the south of the District, and because of the lack of road and rail capacity to serve such an expansion. I remain concerned at that possibility, and at similar harm that use of the emergency runway could bring. I issued a press release setting out those concerns last week.”

“I would like to assure Members that we will be responding to the draft Masterplan consultation in detail once its contents have been considered in full. “

### **Submitted by Councillor Claire Malcomson**

“Now that the Government and Surrey County Council want to forge ahead with promoting electric vehicles, will Mole Valley actually carry out its commitment made last year to invest and install charging points in its car parks now, and not just install cabling (which does not meet the commitment of the Council)? Will MV also ensure a requirement for developers to install EV charging points in new-build developments is included on the Local Plan and add to the S106: 'if a developer does not provide a charge point on a development, they must install one elsewhere in Mole Valley?’”

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

“As previously communicated to Members, infrastructure will be installed at the Swan centre to support a number of electric vehicle charging points. Initially two charging points are being installed, providing facilities for up to four vehicles to ‘plug in’. These works fall into the second stage of the refurbishment which will commence in early January 2019 and are due to be completed by February 2019. Once we have gathered sufficient information from this trial installation, we can take more informed decisions to shape our future provision.”

“There is also significant work being conducted as part of the overall car park refurbishment programme. Electrical consultants have been commissioned to design the layout for the rapid charge/electrical charging points, within priority car parks. It is anticipated that two spaces will be created and infrastructure installed in each of these to enable further charge points to be added as demand dictates. It is envisaged these will be based around the location of the substation and that we will have electric infrastructure to support 20-25 vehicles, should demand increase as anticipated). We prefer to take a prudent approach to ensure we can scale up services as the technology evolves.”

“As Members will know the EV technology is moving at a fast pace and we must ensure our investment is financially viable, future proof and best fits the needs of our community, businesses and visitors. The situation will continue to be monitored by the Car Parking Scrutiny Panel chaired by Cllr Kendrick.”

“Requirements for electric vehicle charging points in new development will be considered as part of the Future Mole Valley Local Plan. The details of those requirements, including any off-site provision, will continue to be a topic for discussion by the Planning Policy Working Group as a new parking strategy is formulated.”

### **Submitted by Councillor Claire Malcomson**

“In an open letter, sixty local authority leaders have pledged an immediate drive to build more council homes after Theresa May promised to lift the borrowing cap on raising money for council houses in her conference speech. The letter signed by Local Government Association members reads:

‘Allowing councils to invest in housing and the required infrastructure will generate revenues alongside wide-ranging benefits for society and the economy. It will allow councils to build homes which are of good quality and affordable, that drive growth and support our local small builders, that reduce homelessness, promote healthy communities and that support home ownership.’”

“Will Mole Valley consider setting up its own residential development company under Mova Holdings to provide desperately needed Social Housing for our residents?”

#### **Response from Councillor Chris Hunt**

“I share Councillor Malcomson’s ambition to develop more new affordable homes and that is why it is a confirmed Council priority.”

“The government’s announcement to lift the borrowing cap is welcome news for the Councils that have retained their traditional Council housing and is something they have campaigned for over many years. It is not a relaxation that this Council can benefit from as we haven’t been a stock holding local authority since 2007.”

“It is an option, as Councillor Malcomson suggests, to develop affordable homes through a housing company within MOVA Holdings and this was considered in a report to Executive in March 2018. That report identified that such a model works best for authorities with more significant land holdings than MVDC and as such may have limited value for this Council. However, it was agreed that officers explore the feasibility of establishing a subsidiary of MOVA for the purposes of a housing company and this will be considered as part of the development of the Affordable Housing Strategy work planned for the New Year.”

#### **Submitted by Councillor Margaret Cooksey**

“What steps is the Council taking to publicise the availability of free advice from the police to residents on reducing the burglary risk at their properties?”

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

“Thank you for your question Cllr Cooksey. Officers work closely with police colleagues both operationally and in terms of shared communications campaigns and we regularly share Police information via our website and social media. We have been publicising the Police’s “In the Know” website for a year, prompting residents to sign up. This website provides updates about the local area, crime prevention advice and other news. I would urge Members to sign up if they haven’t already. There is also currently an offer, available on the Surrey Police website, of 50% off Property Marking kits that the Police recommend. This Council has supported and funded similar schemes in the past in the rural areas. I have asked our Communications team to include this latest offer of a discount in our communications media also. I would be happy to ask officers to make all the web-links available after this meeting.”

“The Council’s own website contains information relating to a range of Community Safety issues and also signposts our community to relevant agencies for further information.”

#### **Submitted by Councillor Emma Norman**

“How satisfied is the Council with the state of cleanliness of Leatherhead Leisure Centre? (There have been a number of complaints.)”

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

“I am aware of these and other issues being raised in relation to Leatherhead Leisure Centre and am working with officers to ensure they are addressed. “

“The Council has a programme of continual contract monitoring which involves regular site visits and contract meetings with the local and regional managers of Leatherhead Leisure Centre. This monitoring covers all aspects of the operation at the Leisure Centre and does highlight cleanliness issues from time to time which we instruct Fusion to resolve. Our monitoring shows that there have been some issues with the quality of cleaning in areas of the Centre which are addressed as they arise; with approximately 750,000 customer visits each year, cleanliness can sometimes be a challenge. “

“As a Council we take any complaints very seriously and appropriate action is taken to ensure that they are raised with Fusion. The Council works closely with them to rectify any issues and will continue our ongoing robust action in relation to adherence to their contract obligations to improve performance and service to customers.”

“We would continue to encourage anyone who has concerns about the Centre and feels they are not being addressed by Fusion themselves, to contact Council officers so that they can be investigated and resolved.”

#### **Submitted by Councillor David Draper**

“Given an increase in complaints from residents, how satisfied is the Council that bins are being left safely after being emptied, and not left in the public highway?”

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

“I have no evidence that there has been an increase over historic levels in complaints from residents about our waste collection service. “

“Where we do receive complaints, they are usually either because the collection crew have not returned the bin to where it had been left by the householder or because the bin has not been taken in promptly and has been moved.”

“The Joint Waste Contract does require the crews to replace bins to their collection point and specifically requires that they should not be left blocking or obstructing driveways or footpaths and are not to be left on the highway. “

“The Joint Waste Solutions Team pass all reports and complaints about bin returns to the Amey supervisors so these can be raised with the relevant collection crews. I have asked that the Joint Waste Solutions Team carry out some spot checks.”

“When a complaint is about a resident leaving a bin out, we send a letter reminding them to take their bin in as soon as possible after it has been emptied.”

#### **Submitted by Councillor Elizabeth Daly**

“What plans does the Council have for developing its land and property holdings in the Lower Shott/Grove Corner area in Great Bookham?”

#### **Response from Councillor Charles Yarwood**

“The Council currently has no plans for development at Lower Shott/Grove Corner.”

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

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper, advised that in addition to the reports listed on the Cabinet agenda this evening, the Committee was also presented with the complaints report for April 2017 to March 2018. Members were informed that the Council was performing at a comparable level to other Surrey authorities. It was advised that although complaints

figures had increased on the previous year, 15-16 and 16-17 figures were lower compared to 13-14 and 14-15. It was noted that most complaints were inevitably in Development Management and Planning Enforcement. The Council learnt from complaints and feedback received and implemented improvements accordingly.

Members also heard how various departments within MVDC were assessed on the customer service excellence (CSE) accreditation. Eight service areas had achieved accreditation so far including the Planning Policy and Planning Support teams.

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

## **25. Financial Assistance Policy for disabled Facilities Adaptation and Private Housing Improvement**

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Councillor Patricia Wiltshire introduced the report and explained that since 1990 local housing authorities have had a statutory duty to provide help with adaptations through the provision of Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs), assisting vulnerable people to carry out essential adaptations to their homes, subject to qualifying conditions. The Cabinet Member gave some examples of the adaptations and explained that the Council's obligations and powers extended beyond the provision of Disabled Facilities Grants and that the Regulatory Reform Order 2002 provided powers for Councils to provide discretionary financial assistance for vulnerable and elderly residents to carry out essential repairs and home improvements, to keep their home environment safe and also provide advice about other support services.

The Cabinet Member added that the Order also stated that before powers contained within it can be used, the authority must formally adopt and publish a policy on how it intended to use them. It was noted that the proposed Financial Assistance Policy replaced the earlier Housing Assistance Policy 2014-15. It was further explained that whilst the Council's obligation has not changed, the types of discretionary grant that are now offered have been reviewed and the policy updated to reflect this. It also reflected recent steer from Surrey County Council regarding types of assistance that best meet the needs of the community and was now in line with the grants offered by other Surrey Districts.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee was then invited to present Scrutiny comments on this item.

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

- Firstly, that the Scrutiny Committee welcomed this report as it had many positive elements, and that he was pleased to see that the policy before Cabinet was a revised version from the one presented to the Scrutiny Committee taking on board a number of comments discussed at that meeting.
- Members asked what would happen to any outstanding work if the budget was spent before the end of the financial year and would MVDC approach the housing associations for assistance. It was advised that the department would constantly monitor the budget. If it appeared that the budget was nearly spent, then outstanding grant applications would be put on hold until the following year. If there was an urgent adaptation required in a property owned by a housing association, MVDC would approach the housing association, although there was no legal requirement for them to assist.
- In response to the means testing process, it was advised that information would be collected on a person's income and fed into computer software by a member of staff which would then show the contribution that the person was eligible to receive towards the cost of the work. The Cabinet Member for Environment also reminded the Cabinet that clients are assisted through this process by a case worker who visited them at home and helped them to locate or obtain all the documents they needed for the assessment.
- The Committee had asked for further information on what MVDC's budget was for discretionary awards. The Environmental Health Team Leader advised that no specific amount was allocated for the current year, under the existing policy. It was anticipated that approximately £50,000 would be allocated next year as a starting point, subject to the

amended policy being agreed at Cabinet. Mandatory disabled facilities grants would take priority. If mandatory disabled facilities grants used the majority of this budget, then the budget available for discretionary assistance would be reduced.

Another area of concern was relating to paragraph 3.5 of the report as detailed in the previously circulated agenda. Some concerns were raised over the fact that Housing Associations did not have any obligation to support their residents. It was explained that Councils were required to administer the Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) irrespective of their tenure, and that applicants who live in properties owned by Housing Associations were also eligible for DFGs, and although there were no requirements for Housing Associations to contribute to the cost of adaptations, the Council aimed to work collaboratively with them, where possible, to contribute towards adaptations within social housing.

Members also questioned the frequency of reviewing the policy as it seemed ambiguous in the report. It was confirmed that the intention was to review the policy annually given its importance.

Members also questioned the process of assessing families with Children with disabilities and it was confirmed that families who had children with needs were not means tested, as per the legislation. A subsequent question relating to the clarification of the definition of 'dependents' in this context was sought and it was explained that 'dependents' referred to children who lived in the same property as their families and not away from their family.

A further query relating to translation services available to clients that might not speak English was raised. It was explained that it was not specifically stated in the policy to offer translation services, however MVDC had access to a translation service when needed.

**RESOLVED:** that the Financial Assistance Policy for Disabled Facilities Adaptations and Private Housing Improvement be approved and adopted.

## **26. Authority to award a contract to deliver a Home Improvement Agency service and a Handy Person Service**

The Cabinet Member for Environment; Councillor Patricia Wiltshire introduced the report, advising that the Council had a statutory duty to award Disabled Facilities Grants and the discretion to provide a wider service to disabled or vulnerable residents to provide advice, support and help to carry out essential repairs to their homes, subject to qualifying conditions. This support enabled people to remain living safely in their own homes for longer. It was noted that the Home Improvement Agency was contracted to provide this service and the Handy Person Service, on behalf of the Council. The Contract with the current providers had expired and Members were reminded that a report was brought before the June Cabinet when they gave approval for a joint procurement exercise to be undertaken with two other Councils (Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and Tandridge District Council). It was confirmed that the procurement exercise had taken place, with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council as the lead procuring authority.

Members noted that the contract was advertised on the procurement portal, a website where potential service providers received information on contracts being tendered and where they could submit interest. Four tenders had been received, and following a full evaluation and moderation of the scores the highest scoring tender had been identified and agreed. It was intended to award a contract on 31 October 2018 to commence on 7 January 2019 for an initial period of 3 years.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee was invited to present comments from Scrutiny on this item.

With reference to paragraph 4.4 as detailed on page 29 of the report, The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, expressed some concerns over the impact this would have on the Council's resources, and asked officers to clarify how many people were employed in delivering these services. The Environmental Health Team Leader advised that there were seven members of staff employed by the current service provider, some of whom were part time, who delivered the service across three Councils (MVDC, Reigate & Banstead and Tandridge) and this formed majority of their business. It was further explained that the team did not envisage that joint procurement would result in any changes from MVDC's point of view as there would still be three different contracts. It was thought that there were some strength in procuring one service provider but the contract managements and

resource would be the same. It was further added that there would be no additional impact on the Council's resources. DFG grants would continue to be approved by the Council and the contract will be managed by Environmental Health through regular joint contract meetings with the service provider to ensure consistency in the service provision.

Member asked for clarification of how the service was being carried out as the current contract had expired and the new one would not come into operation until January 2019. It was explained that there had to be an agreement with the previous contractors to carry out the service until January. It was further questioned why MVDC did not keep the service in-house. Officers advised that the procurement process permitted various companies including MVDC to tender bids for the service, and after some consideration, MVDC had opted not to do so as the current Environmental Health Team were not in a position to take on the volume and technical aspects involved in the delivery of this service.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member and the Environmental Health Team Leader for their update and answers.

**RESOLVED:** That the award of a contract for the procurement of a service provider to deliver both Home Improvement Agency Service and the handy Person Service for Mole Valley District Council be endorsed.

## **27. Progress Update on the Mole Valley Rural Community Strategy (2017-2027)**

In the absence of the Cabinet Member, Councillor Osborne-Patterson, Councillor Edge introduced this report which provided Members with an update on the strategy and action plan. It was noted that the strategy identified six priority issues, as detailed in the report, which are;

### Digital connectivity

MVDC were working on initiatives to provide super-fast broadband to rural parts of Mole Valley including the Surrey Hills, which Guildford Borough Council had contributed £10,000 to. Several businesses had already received fibre broadband connectivity within the district.

### Rural housing

The development of the new local plan would look into the provision of affordable housing in Mole Valley.

### Community safety

Rural councillors were working with police in local areas. Surrey Police had contributed to a grant to support the establishment of a Joint Enforcement Team (JET) which would have powers to tackle environmental crimes such as littering and fly tipping.

### Visitor economy

Funding was in place to secure development of the destination management plan which looked into branding and marketing of the district. Work had also been carried out to understand visitor economy and how this links into employment and income generation. Improvements would be made to the Dorking and Leatherhead webpages.

### Community assets

The Committee were advised that information would be made available to residents on the process of assessment of community value. Members were informed that more information and promotion would be brought to the rural community summit in February 2019. Officers would attend parish council meetings and speak to resident associations to promote the application process further.

### Rural based businesses

Funding was available to businesses in rural areas and a number of successful applications had been received. The Committee heard how the funding streams had now ended and MVDC are waiting for the government to announce what will replace them. More information would be made available at Rural Summit.

It was also explained that the strategy identified areas where MVDC could take direct actions, but also where it could use its role as the local authority to influence the decisions of other organisations that provide services and facilitates to rural communities in Mole Valley.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee was invited to present comments from Scrutiny on this item.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee welcomed this report and updated Cabinet on the Scrutiny Panel's views about it. It was expressed that the panel felt that the strategy was very imaginative and aspirational but not deliverable. It was argued that the strategy was very ambitious and there were many important things being considered and discussed but not actually much had been achieved so far, with the exception of Community safety where there had been some progress in securing a grant for the establishment of the Joint Enforcement Team (JET).

In relation to the Visitor Economy, Members were reminded that it was previously agreed that the Visitor Information Offices be closed as the information would be provided online by dedicated websites. However, the Leatherhead website for examples had been completely down. It was also suggested that MVDC Visitor Information websites should be subsumed under the Surrey Hills website as it was more frequently used- but in any case, it was felt that urgent action was required in this area as little had been done to date.

The Deepdene Trail had been a success; however, Members of the Scrutiny Committee had a concern over the safety of the current parking provision. The entrance and exit to and from the car park was deemed dangerous. The Scrutiny panel suggested that other alternatives would be, for example parking in the former Kuoni site or to have conversations with the Golf Club to come to an agreement.

In response to the parking at the Deepdene Trail, it was explained that Officers were aware of this situation and were looking at a number of possibilities which might depend on an external funding such as the LEP.

**RESOLVED:** That

- 1) The progress made to achieve the action within the strategy and the proposed next steps be noted and
- 2) Support for a Rural Summit, to take place in February 2019 be confirmed.

## **28. Business and Budget Report 2018/2019 (Month 5: August)**

In the absence of the Cabinet Member, Councillor Huseyin, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Vivienne Michael introduced this item. It was explained that the purpose of the report was to update the Council's progress in implementing the priorities contained in the Corporate Strategy (Environment, Prosperity and Community Wellbeing) and the Council's financial position for the period April to August 2018. It was reported that there had been good progress overall as detailed in the report, with 14 of the 18 performance indicators having scored on or above target and four slightly off target, and compared to the same period last year, it was stated that 15 of the 17 performance indicators had either performed better or stayed at similar levels.

It was noted that there had been a number of projects and actions that had contributed to achieving the priorities set out in the Council's strategy, for example, under the Environmental priority; the transition to the Joint Waste Contract which had been completed, under the Prosperity priority; it saw the first 'Mole Valley economic Spotlight' report which went out to businesses by email and on its

dedicated page on the MVDC website at the end of August, and finally under the Community Wellbeing priority; the Council was awarded The National Practitioner Support Service Gold Standard for homelessness.

The report provided further details on the Council's financial position. On revenue, the financial headlines were a projected net overspend of £108k (1.2%) against the Council's net revenue budget of £9.1 million. It was explained that the significant variances were in five areas as detailed in the report at page 43 and Appendix B. It was stressed that the revenue budgets for Waste and Parking will be actively monitored over the forthcoming months to determine the actual performance against budget of the new Joint Waste Contract that came into effect on 6 August 2018 and the increased parking charges that came into effect on 1 August 2018.

On capital, Members noted that there was a projected net underspend of £198k (0.1%) against the Council's Capital programme of £136.1 million. The reasons for the variances are detailed in the report at page 43 and Appendix C.

The report also gave an update on Strategic Risk, which stated that there were six strategic risks that were being closely and actively managed by the Senior Leadership Team in consultation with Cabinet Members. It was stressed that all risks were below the Council's approved risk tolerance level.

The findings of the report were largely welcomed by the Chamber, and Officers were congratulated on their hard work.

In response to a query regarding the projected overspend on parking charges, Members noted that this was attributed to the fact that the new charges were only recently implemented and that there was only a one month's figures available at this point of time. Furthermore, Members were reminded that it was anticipated that there would be an initial dip in revenue as a result of the revised parking charges.

In response to a query regarding the projected overspend of £150k on employee costs of interim staff in Financial services, the Chief Executive of the Council explained that as a result of a high turnover of staff in the Finance team over the last year for a number of reasons, it was agreed not to rush with permanent appointments because management wished to look at the structure closely and see how it could work differently in the future. It was confirmed that a review was underway with a view to being finalised before Christmas 2018.

In response to a query regarding the projected overspend of £131k on the Leatherhead Church Street capital project, the leader of the Council explained that the original figures were based on a feasibility study estimate which preceded a public consultation. These led to changes in design and there were also some unexpected drainage issues, both of which led to an increase in costs but the capital programme wasn't adjusted accordingly. It was stressed that with the exception of a small contribution in the region of £8k, the scheme had not been funded by Mole Valley District Council taxpayers but through grants from various sources such as grants awarded by the Coast 2 Capital LEP, and grants from Surrey County Council.

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

Chairman: ..... Date: .....