

Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive held on Tuesday 6th February 2018 at Pippbrook, Dorking, from 7.00pm to 8.10pm

Present:

Executive Members: Councillors Vivienne Michael (Leader/Chairman), Charles Yarwood (Deputy Leader), Lucy Botting, Simon Edge, Metin Huseyin, Duncan Irvine, David Mir and Corinna Osborne-Patterson

Non-Executive Members: Councillors Stephen Cooksey, David Draper, David Harper, Paul Kennedy and Simon Ling

48. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 28th November 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Leader.

49. Disclosure of Interests

Councillor Simon Edge declared a non pecuniary interest in item 8 as a user of the South Bookham SPACE.

50. Councillor Question Time

1. The following question was submitted by Councillor David Harper:

“Can the Executive please advise what Larkstoke Properties Ltd does for £600K? (Reference: Contracts Register). Their website is extremely vague and it's tendered under an 'unclassified' process and 'other' procedure. Please explain what is being procured and how value for money is guaranteed and provide understandable benchmarks that justify the method of procurement?”

Councillor Metin Huseyin responded as follows:

“I thank Councillor Harper for his question, which has identified an error in our Contracts Register. The line Cllr Harper refers to has confused two separate contracts:

Firstly, a contract for professional services with Faithful and Gould, appointed via the Pagabo framework as approved by the Executive on 26 September 2017, to prepare an outline planning application for Claire House and James House;

Secondly, a £9,999 contract with Larkstoke Properties Limited to provide real estate development advice to inform the Claire House and James House planning process on a call off basis (of which ca. £700 has been invoiced to date). Both were procured in accordance with the Council's contract standing orders.

As a result of this error, officers will verify the accuracy of all manual Contract Register entries. Further, as a result of the forthcoming legislative requirement for all public contracts to be electronically procured by October 2018, contracts of all values will be procured through Intend, the Council's e-procurement portal. This will eliminate the manual entry of contract information on the Contracts Register and consequently prevent future errors of this kind arising.

Once again I thank Councillor Harper for his identification of this error.”

Councillor David Harper asked the following supplemental question:

“I have noted that the contract with Larkstoke properties is for £9,999, as are a number of other contracts listed on the Contracts Register. As contracts under £10,000 can be awarded through a less rigorous procurement process than contracts above this amount, could assurance be given that these contracts are being tendered for correctly?”

Councillor Metin Huseyin replied as follows:

“Yes, the process followed for procuring these contracts follows the procedures set out in the Council's Contract Standing Orders.”

2. The following question was submitted by Councillor David Harper:

“Regarding planning department, and the proposed £50K in next year’s budget to fund temporary workers in the form of contractors. Can it be confirmed that this year, the cost for contractors in Planning Department is nearer £200K, or at least a sum much larger than £50K and in this context, what significant or strategic changes are planned to address the lack of available candidates who are prepared to work for MVDC Planning Department on the available pay scales. How will this answer give confidence that £50K is realistic and in addition, deliver the improvement to services that residents are experiencing in terms of time to scrutinise plans including visiting sites and reading carefully the application and in terms of enforcement?”

Councillor Duncan Irvine responded as follows:

“The 2017/18 budget provision for Temporary Staff is £90k. The forecast outturn is currently estimated to be £300k. It is proposed to increase the budget by £50k to £140k for 2018/19. This proposed increase is to ensure there is sufficient budget to cover the costs of contract staff for the first quarter of 2018/19 by which time it is planned to have the Development Management Service resourced by permanent staff.

It is proposed to achieve this by ensuring the vacant posts are attractive, provide interesting challenges and flexible working arrangements and reflect salaries of neighbouring authorities. Two of the current vacant posts are for planners starting out on their career and who would be given support and a breadth of hands on experience and an opportunity to progress through a broad salary range as they gain experience and qualification. We are also taking advantage of the new apprenticeship scheme to upskill an existing member of staff.

Notwithstanding current vacancies and the use of contract staff, the Development Management Team is performing very well and exceeding the national and local key performance indicators which measure the time it takes to determine planning applications; 94% of major planning applications are determined within the thirteen week period; 90% of minor applications and 97% of other applications are determined in the eight week period.

It is recognised that the Enforcement Team requires support to address the significant volume of alleged breaches of planning control. This is currently being addressed in the short term by the appointment of an experienced Planning Enforcement Manager and through an internal review of the Development Management Team to ensure that its resources are deployed to those areas of work where there are they are most needed”

Councillor David Harper asked the following supplemental question:

“I calculate that the temporary staff budget for 2017/18 had been set at £90,000 but it looks that the actual spend will be closer to £300,000. The budget for 2018/19 has an additional £50,000 allocated for temporary staff, so will this be a saving of £160,000 from the current budget? Has there been a strategic change that will make a difference and reduce the continued spend on temporary staff? I note that provision has been made for an additional Planning Enforcement Officer, has this role now been filled?”

Councillor Duncan Irvine replied as follows:

“We are not cutting £160,000 from the existing budget, but are undertaking a thorough review to address long standing issues within the team and are looking to reduce the reliance on temporary staff within the team, through the measures mentioned in the original answer. It likely to be the case that temporary staff will still need to be employed in the early months of next year, but as the new measures are put in place this is likely to reduce during the year, resulting in reduced expenditure in this area. I can confirm that a new Planning Enforcement Officer has now been recruited and will be starting in the role in mid-February.”

3. The following question was submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy:

“What is the average council tax payable per household in Mole Valley in 2017-8 broken down by source (county, district, police, etc) and compared with the average council tax per household payable elsewhere in Surrey?”

Councillor Metin Huseyin responded as follows:

"I thank Councillor Kennedy for his question.

Like all local authorities, MVDC is required to set, and publish, its Council Tax on the basis of the amount paid by a resident living in a Council Tax Band D property. This is so that people living in essentially the same or similar properties can see how much they would be expected to pay in different authorities.

The resulting analysis, set out in Table A, clearly shows that Mole Valley has one of the lowest Council Tax levels of the 11 districts and boroughs in Surrey - £168.56 in 2017/18.

Table A: Band D Council Tax 2017/18				
	Borough/ District £.p	County £.p	Police £.p	Total £.p
Runnymede	154.59	1,331.55	224.57	1,710.71
Guildford	161.82	1,331.55	224.57	1,717.94
Mole Valley	168.56	1,331.55	224.57	1,724.68
Waverley	171.91	1,331.55	224.57	1,728.03
Epsom and Ewell	182.07	1,331.55	224.57	1,738.19
Spelthorne	192.44	1,331.55	224.57	1,748.56
Tandridge	203.62	1,331.55	224.57	1,759.74
Surrey Heath	206.30	1,331.55	224.57	1,762.42
Elmbridge	211.00	1,331.55	224.57	1,767.12
Reigate and Banstead	214.44	1,331.55	224.57	1,770.56
Woking	226.71	1,331.55	224.57	1,782.83

Of course, not everyone lives in a Band D property, and it is interesting to consider, as suggested by Councillor Kennedy, the Council Tax paid by the 'average' Mole Valley resident.

This is significantly influenced by the number of properties in each Council Tax Band. If a district or borough has a disproportionately high number of properties in the upper Council Tax Bands, (Bands E to H), they will tend to have an average Council Tax higher than the simple Band D figure.

Conversely, if a district or borough has a disproportionately high number of properties in the lower Council Tax Bands, (Bands A to C), they will tend to have an average Council Tax lower than the simple Band D figure.

Table B, also set out in the written answer to Councillor Kennedy's question, shows the resultant average Council Tax collected by each Surrey district and borough in 2017/18.

Table B: Average Household Council Tax 2017/18				
	Borough/ District £.p	County £.p	Police £.p	Total £.p
Runnymede	146.07	1,258.20	212.20	1,616.47
Guildford	159.47	1,312.23	221.31	1,693.01

Waverley	176.95	1,370.58	231.15	1,778.68
Spelthorne	178.62	1,235.91	208.44	1,622.97
Mole Valley	180.66	1,427.16	240.70	1,848.52
Epsom and Ewell	185.95	1,359.91	229.35	1,775.21
Reigate and Banstead	212.31	1,318.29	222.33	1,752.93
Tandridge	212.32	1,388.44	234.17	1,834.93
Surrey Heath	215.11	1,388.40	234.16	1,837.67
Woking	218.73	1,284.66	216.66	1,720.05
Elmbridge	235.57	1,486.62	250.72	1,972.91

This shows that the 'average' Council Tax charge in Mole Valley is some 7% higher than the Band D amount, due to the relatively high number of properties in Council Tax bands F, G, and H, while in some other authorities the average charge is up to 7% lower than the Band D amount.

However, despite having nearly 40% of properties in Council Tax Bands F and above, which is the second highest proportion of all Surrey authorities, Mole Valley has an 'average' Council Tax which is still at the lower end of Surrey authorities, and significantly below the 5 highest charging authorities."

Councillor Paul Kennedy asked the following supplemental question:

"Will the Executive Member be impressing upon his colleagues at Surrey County Council and with the Surrey Police that, as Mole Valley is one of the higher payers of Council Tax per household, we should be getting a full range of services?"

Councillor Metin Huseyin replied as follows:

"Yes."

4. The following question was submitted by Councillor Paul Kennedy:

"What was the total income received in 2017 by each Mole Valley car park and permit area as a proportion of available income, and can any comparator information be provided for any earlier year or years?"

Councillor David Mir responded as follows:

"The concept of available income per car park is difficult to quantify. For the basis of this question, we have looked at each car park, and assumed as the maximum possible income level being if every space was in use from 8.00am to 6.00pm, six days a week.

Table One, provided separately as Appendix 1, sets out the income by car park for 2017. We do not have fully comparable figures for previous years, although an analysis was undertaken in April – August 2015. These figures are provided in Table Two (Appendix 1). It should be noted that this period represents a less busy period for car parking, as it includes three school holiday periods.

Permits are sold at a town and village level, and are not car park specific. Therefore the income figures for some car parks, such as Randalls Road, appear low.

In budget terms, permits are monitored by type, not town. The figures provided in Table Three (Appendix 1) indicate the total income generated by the different permits in 2017. More work would be required to produce this information at a more detailed level."

51. Report of the Scrutiny Committee

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee advised that apart from Executive reports to be considered elsewhere on the agenda, the Committee received a report from the Asset Investment Panel. During the course of the meeting the Panel amended their final report to accommodate the views of all Panel Members. It was confirmed that the report of the Asset Investment Panel would form part of the consideration of the Asset Investment Strategy report at the Council meeting on 20th February 2018.

The Scrutiny agenda also included a number of updates from Members about the outside organisations they have been appointed to by the Council. There were updates given on Projx, the Clarion Regional Panel and the Redhill Aerodrome Consultative Forum.

52. Month 9 (December) – 2017/18 Business and Budget Monitoring

The Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Services, Councillor Metin Huseyin, introduced the latest Business and Budget Monitoring report, highlighting a number of areas to Members including the following:-

- The purchase of three properties in Dorking for use as emergency accommodation had recently been completed.
- The Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs) for Meadowbank Recreation Ground, Dorking Town and Leatherhead Town were now in place.
- Designs to improve the play facilities at Kingston Road Recreation Ground were being consulted upon. The engagement and build programme for the skate park improvement would also be run alongside the playground refurbishment to enable both to be open for the summer of 2018.

It was confirmed that there was a projected £341,000 overspend in the Revenue Budget, from increased expenditure in four areas, namely the Environmental, Planning, Property and Revenue services. The projected overspend had been reduced since the previous monitoring report in October, when it was projected to be £525,000. Reassurance was given that this overspend had been addressed in the budget for 2018/19.

It was also confirmed that there was a projected overspend of £2m in the Capital Budget which could mainly be attributed to the unforeseen costs relating to the clearance of contaminated soil at the Meadowbank development.

A question was raised about the Strategic Risk Register and in particular whether the impact from the Council's IT systems being hacked could be mitigated against, as any attack was likely to have a significant impact. It was agreed that the scoring for this risk would be reviewed.

It was confirmed that the Community Transport Review was being progressed with a report scheduled to be included on the next Executive/Scrutiny Committee cycle in March 2018. This report would include provision for replacing the East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership services that may be discontinued as a result of a loss of grant funding.

RESOLVED: That the Council's performance and financial position for the end of December (Month 9) 2017/18 be noted.

53. 2018/19 Budget and Council Tax Resolution (Key Decision)

The Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Services, Councillor Metin Huseyin, introduced the report, outlining the Administration's budget proposals for 2018/19. It was advised that the proposed budget for 2018/19 was balanced, protected service delivery and included some new spending proposals, despite the constraints created by reduced Government funding.

The following key proposals for the 2018/19 Budget were highlighted:-

- Additional spending of almost £400,000 had been allocated to priorities in the Planning, Parks & Open Spaces, Community Support and Economic Development services.
- An increase to car parking charges was being proposed.
- It was proposed to extend the scope of the Asset Investment Strategy to generate additional income for MVDC.
- Provision had been made for a £1.5m one-off expenditure on the "Transform Leatherhead" project, funded mainly from an expected increase in retained business rates income from the

Government “pilot” project on Business Rate Reform.

- Provision had also been made to restore an annual contribution from the Revenue Budget to the Capital Budget to fund the refurbishment and improvement of Council assets.

It was confirmed that spending in the Budget would be supported by an increase to Council Tax of 2.9%. This increase was within the Government’s cap on Council Tax increases of 3% and on a Band D property would equate to an increase of approximately 10p per week.

The Chairman of the Standing Budget Panel, Councillor Simon Ling, introduced the recommendations of the Panel, confirming that they had been generally impressed by the care with which the budget had been prepared and the detailed attention given to it by Executive Members. The Panel were pleased to note that the expected shortfall resulting from the reduction in central Government funding had largely been eliminated by the effects of three main policy developments, namely the savings from the Joint Waste Contract which will be effective from August 2018, the increased income from the proposed increase in car parking charges and the enhanced Asset Investment Strategy. The Panel agreed that the benefits from the first two were relatively risk-free, but there remains a significant risk that the required income from the Asset Investment Strategy may not be achieved, but were reassured that all possible efforts were being made to mitigate this risk.

The Panel recommended for future years that the Executive carry out a more fundamental periodic review of the Fees and Charges Principles prior to the beginning of the budget setting process so that the revised version was agreed prior to the fees and charges proposals being considered/created.

The Panel noted that additional funding of £150,000 had been included in the budget for the Planning Service. The Executive Member for Planning had explained to the Panel that a restructure was being prepared for the Development Management team to reduce the need for temporary contractual staff. As it would take time to implement the new structure, the additional funding would be used to cover agency fees in the interim to enable the service to continue to meet its performance targets. Based on recent experience of difficulties recruiting to roles within the Planning Service, the Panel highlighted this as a possible area of risk should the required permanent staff not be recruited within predicted timescales, and as such resulting in higher than budgeted costs for temporary staff.

The Panel had also considered the proposed increase to parking charges which had been frozen at the same rate for the past 9 years. It was agreed that the need to carry out maintenance and improve security in the Council’s car parks was a reasonable justification for the increase in these charges, but agreed that the proposal may attract negative attention given the rise from 60p an hour to £1 an hour equated to a 67% increase. At the time of their meetings, the Panel had noted that no decision had yet been made on whether to continue to allow the ability to pay for exact time periods after the first hour and had recommended that this feature continue. The Leader of the Council confirmed that flexibility on payment after the first hour would continue to be offered.

The Panel noted that financial aspects of the Asset Investment Strategy were split between the Assets & Investment Portfolio (which contained the revenues) and the Finance & Corporate Services Portfolio (which contained the expenditure). The Panel were concerned that this may create confusion as it meant that the figures for the Strategy were not clearly laid out in one place. The Panel also noted that the costs which went through MOVA were not represented at all within the budget, which made it difficult to judge how staff resource was split between work on MOVA and work on MVDC business. The Panel gave a strong recommendation that the reporting method be revised so that the overall net benefit to MVDC was clearly apparent.

The Panel agreed that there should be a clear financial plan for the next three years for the Transform Leatherhead project setting out what was to be done, the expected costs, income and sources of funding for each phase.. The Panel recommended that communications costs should be specified in the Transform Leatherhead budget to give an idea of how much staff time was being spent on communications.

Both the Leader of the Council and the Executive Member thanked the Standing Budget Panel and acknowledged their work in scrutinising the budget and providing a series of constructive recommendations for the Executive to consider. The full set of recommendations along with the response of the Executive are attached at Appendix 2.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor David Draper also reported back on their discussion of the budget report, highlighting that concern had been raised over the proposed increase to car parking charges and the effect that this would have on footfall in the towns of the district.

Echoing the Standing Budget Panel, the Committee also expressed concern that £50,000 allocated in the budget to the Planning Service would not be sufficient to cover contractor salaries while the structure of the service was reviewed. The Committee also commented on the proposed recruitment of a Tree Inspector with a suggestion that the Council could advertise for an Ecologist as they may be more readily available for recruitment than a tree inspector.

The Scrutiny Committee Chairman also indicated that he would be happy to extend the remit of the Parking Panel to investigate proposals put forward in a motion to the Council relating to the cost for Residents Parking Permits.

RESOLVED: The Executive recommends to Council:-

1. That the proposed budget for 2018/19 be set at £9,068,000
2. That the Band D Council Tax for 2018/19 be set at £173.45, representing a 2.9% increase on 2017/18, in line with the Government announcement that Council Tax can be increased, without triggering a referendum, by up to 3.0%.
3. That the Capital Programme for 2018/19 be approved
4. That as request is made to Scrutiny Committee to extend the remit of the Parking Panel
5. That the Section 151 Officer's statement concerning the 2018/19 budget and the medium term financial outlook for the Council be noted
6. That the level of Members' Allowances be considered in the light of the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel to be presented to the Council on 20 February 2018.

54. Mole Valley District Council Grant Applications (Key Decision)

The Executive Member for Wellbeing, Councillor Lucy Botting, introduced the report advising that it detailed the proposals relating to applications made this year by local organisations for grant funding in 2018/19. The report also provided information on the organisations that will be in receipt of a grant for 2018/19 awarded as part of multi-year agreements.

It was highlighted that MVDC's Grants Policy had been reviewed in the past year to take account of the creation of a Small Community Grants fund. Also arising from the review, it was proposed to align the timeframe for larger community grants to establish a common 3 year cycle. The rationale for this was to provide greater certainty to those organisations in receipt of grant funding and to streamline the administration for larger grants.

It was confirmed that Officers had provided advice to organisations enquiring about the application process, in line with the Grants Policy. Additionally, all interested organisations who met the basic criteria had been given the opportunity to submit a grant application and all applications made to the Large Community Grants fund were set out in the report. Although details of unsuccessful applications to the Small Community Grants fund were not included in the report, it was advised that these would be circulated to Members and included in future reports. It was highlighted that in total the recommended revenue grant allocation for 2018/19 was over £236,000 and for capital £40,000 which overall equated to an increase in grant funding of approximately £3,000 from 2017/18.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee reported that although the report was positive in many ways, particularly the Small Community Grants fund, concerns were voiced by some members of the Committee about the level of grant allocation to the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). The Executive Member confirmed that funding for the CAB, had been agreed last year and covered a three year period with planned reductions. It was recognised that MVDC did a lot of work with CAB providing support for local residents and Officers and Members worked closely with the CAB to help them

resolve any funding issues. It was highlighted that representatives from the CAB would be attending the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 13th February.

The Scrutiny Committee had also raised concern about East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership (ESRTP) no longer being awarded a grant and in particular how this would affect those residents who used existing ESRTP services. The Executive Member confirmed that a report on the Community Transport review would be brought forward for the next Scrutiny Committee/Executive cycle in March. This report would set out the future vision for MVDC's own Community Transport provision and assurance was given that services would continue to be provided for residents that currently used ESRTP services.

It was suggested that as there were no new applications made to the Large Community Grants fund it may be beneficial to review how the fund was advertised to raise awareness. In response it was confirmed that although there were no new applications to the Large Community Grant funds, there were a lot of Small Community Grants fund applications being submitted. These comments regarding awareness of the fund would be taken on board for next year.

RESOLVED:

1. That the capital and revenue grants for 2018/19 be approved, subject to the necessary budget being committed.
2. That the budget allocation to the Small Grants Community Fund be approved.
3. That the proposed changes to the grants reporting process be approved.
4. That the revised Grants Policy be approved.

55. Thomas Flack Trust Fund Applications (Key Decision)

The report was introduced by the Chairman of the Thomas Flack Working Group, Councillor Lynne Brooks, who informed Members that the Thomas Flack Trust Fund was an independent fund of which Mole Valley District Council were the sole trustee and as such responsible for administering grants on behalf of the Fund. It was noted that there had only been three applications to the Fund this year, two of which had been recommended for approval by the Working Group.

The Working Group were also recommending the allocation of funds for an independent development appraisal on one of the Trusts' properties (255 Guildford Road, Effingham), as there was development potential for the site that could deliver a significant amount of capital that would be reinvested within the Fund.

RESOLVED:

1. That the views of the Thomas Flack Working Group are taken into account and the grants for the financial year 2018/19 be approved.
2. That the views of the Thomas Flack Working Group are taken into account and that authorisation be given for the appointment of Bruton Knowles to undertake an independent development appraisal on 255 Guildford Road, Effingham in accordance with trust law. A fee quote of £3,050 plus reasonable disbursements and VAT has been obtained and it is recommended these fees, should be paid from Trust funds.

56. Future Mole Valley – Member Engagement Programme

The Executive Member for Planning, Councillor Duncan Irvine, reminded Members that at the Executive meeting on 28th November an undertaking was given that a Member Engagement Programme would be developed to harness the imagination of Members and allow scrutiny from across Council, in order to produce the best Local Plan for Mole Valley.

The programme included a greater frequency of meetings for the Planning Policy Working Group in the lead up to the production of the Local Plan, to take account of the significantly increased

workload. Although the membership of the Working Group would remain the same, there would be an open invitation to other Members of the Council to attend and participate in these meetings. A number of Member Seminars were also due to be scheduled to ensure that Members had a full understanding of the process for setting the Local Plan.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Member Engagement Programme be endorsed, to enable additional Member input into the principal policy areas of the emerging Local Plan.
2. That the terms of reference for the Planning Policy Working Group be amended.

57. Potential Expansion of the Joint Waste Contract (Key Decision)

The Executive Member for Environment and Parking, Councillor David Mir, introduced the report explaining that Tandridge District Council had registered an interested in joining the Joint Waste Contract of which Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) were an existing member along with Elmbridge, Surrey Heath and Woking Borough Councils. To allow another local authority to join the Partnership required the agreement of the existing partners and would be on the basis that there was no financial disadvantage to MVDC.

RESOLVED:

1. That Tandridge District Council be admitted to the Joint Waste Collection Contract on the basis that no existing partner is financially disadvantaged.
2. That the final decision be delegated to the relevant Corporate Head of Service to agree, once the financial mechanisms under the Inter Authority Agreement have been finalised, in Consultation with the Executive Member and S151 Officer.

Executive 6th February 2018 – Councillor Question Time: Additional Information

Table One – Income by Car Park - 2017

Car Park	Capacity	Maximum Income	Cash Income	RingGo Income	Percentage Utilisation
Ashtead					
Ashtead Peace Memorial Hall	150	£270,000	£39,859.00	£9,312.72	18.21%
Grove Road	45	£81,000	£24,435.95	£3,828.05	34.89%
Permits	80				41.03%
Excluding Permits*		£207,000			
Overall Utilisation					37.41%
Bookham					
Lower Road	50	£90,000	£48,159.15	£2,550.27	56.34%
Lower Shott	42	£75,600	£5,701.25	£807.39	8.61%
Permits	11				11.96%
Excluding Permits		£145,800			
Overall Utilisation					39.24%
Dorking					
Dene Street	25	£45,000	£22,069.00	£12,848.75	77.60%
Wathen Road	101	£181,800	£93,145.70	£26,667.35	65.90%
Southside	178	£320,400	£141,689.00	£24,515.51	51.87%
South Street	30	£54,000	£17,999.60	£9,563.76	51.04%
West Street	34	£61,200	£32,644.55	£11,744.34	72.53%
North Street	16	£28,800	£9,252	£2,938.38	42.33%
Church Street	31	£55,800	£5,981.65	£8,472	25.90%
Junction Road	31	£55,800	£11,153.55	£12,989.51	43.27%
Pippbrook (Saturday only)	140	£42,000	£3,233.30	£717.06	9.41%
Reigate Road	244	£439,200	£170,709.40	£43,608.98	48.80%
St Martins Walk	361	£649,800	£211,226.15	£39,603.54	38.60%
Permits	472				39.63%
Excluding Permits		£1,084,200			
Overall Utilisation					84.19%
Leatherhead					
Bridge Street	24	£43,200	£33,952.45	£3,864.67	87.54%
Church Road	47	£84,600	£18,251.50	£15,425.68	39.81%
Church Street	51	£91,800	£65,333.47	£9,314.48	81.32%
Randalls Road	226	£406,800	£78,362.00	£115,928.66	47.76%
Station Road	96	£172,800	£41,229.85	£28,468.07	40.33%
Swan Centre	330	£594,000	£303,576.35	£25,312.51	55.37%
Upper Fairfield Road	32	£57,600	£28,240.25	£2,662.33	53.65%
Permits	367				45.53%
Excluding Permits		£790,200			
Overall Utilisation					97.43%

Table 2 – Income by Car Park – April to August 2015

Car Park (and capacity)	Maximum Income	Cash Income	RingGo Income	Percentage Utilisation
Ashtead				
Ashtead Peace Memorial Hall (157)	£141,300	£28,132.10	£847.02	21.2%
Grove Road (45)	£40,500	£10,207.25	£598.90	26.7%
Permits (62)				30.7%
Excluding Permits	£126,000			
Overall Utilisation				31.6%
Bookham				
Lower Road (50)	£45,000	£20,597.35	£588.99	47%
Lower Shott (42)	£37,800	£2,788.60	£203.45	7.9%
Permits (5)				5.4%
Excluding Permits	£78,300			
Overall Utilisation				30.1%
Dorking				
Dene Street (25)	£22,500	£1,788.45	£2,017.35	16.9%
Wathen Road (101)	£90,900	£42,821.70	£4,327.40	51.1%
Southside (178)	£160,200	£67,042.20	£3,523.29	44%
South Street (30)	£27,000	£11,107.95	£1,413.63	46.4%
West Street (34)	£30,600	£18,476.30	£1,370.79	64.9%
North Street (16)	£14,400	£4,098	£1,087.29	36%
Church Street (31)	£27,900	£1,788.45	£696	8.9%
Junction Road (31)	£27,900	£4,935.90	£2,491.92	26.6%
Pippbrook (Saturday only) (140)	£18,480	£836.40	£67.93	4.9%
Reigate Road (244)	£219,600	£83,234.35	£8,259.06	41.7%
St Martins Walk (361)	£324,900	£107,469.80	£8,259.06	35.6%
Permits (234)				22.1%
Excluding Permits	£735,300			
Overall Utilisation				51.3%
Leatherhead				
Bridge Street (24)	£21,600	£12,535.55	£617.74	61%
Church Road (47)	£42,300	£9,086.75	£2,923.76	28.4%
Church Street (51)	£45,900	£35,644.45	£1,704.06	81.4%
Randalls Road (226)	£203,400	£45,464.95	£28,250.88	36.2%
Station Road (96)	£86,400	£14,268.05	£1,202.87	17.9%
Upper Fairfield Road (32)	£28,800	£11,677.90	£267	41.5%
Permits (161)				33.8%
Excluding Permits	£283,500			
Overall Utilisation				57.7%

Table 3 – Income by Permit Type – 2017

Permits	2017 Income
Annual	£ 501,120.00
Resident	£ 36,750.00
Off peak	£ 2,640.00
Bookham Traders	£ 1,650.00
Dorking Business	£ 20,700.00
Dorking Low Paid Worker	£ 7,800.00
Temporary Disability	£ 380.00
	£ 571,040.00

Executive 6th February 2018 – Agenda Item 7**BUDGET 2018/19****RESPONSE OF THE EXECUTIVE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDING BUDGET PANEL**

The recommendations of the Standing Budget Panel (SBP) are set out in their report on the 2018/19 Budget. They are summarised below (R1 – 14) together with the Executive's answer (A1 – 14) in each case.

R1.	The Standing Budget Panel recommends that the next, periodic review of the Fees & Charges Principles should be undertaken <u>before</u> the budget setting process rather than during it. Alongside the review, information should be provided to demonstrate compliance with the Principles in the charges set.
-----	--

A1. The Executive agrees. For the next review, in 3 years, we shall structure the budget timetable to include an early, fundamental review of the Principles before the detailed proposals are formulated.

R2.	The SBP recommends that, in future years, the Executive Member template be amended to include a short explanation of the reasoning behind significant increases.
-----	--

A2. The Executive agrees and will complete the proposed, additional section on the template.

R3.	The SBP recommends that, in future years, the Executive Member template be amended to include a statement of changes in headcount for the budget year in each portfolio.
-----	--

A3. The Executive agrees and will complete the proposed, additional section on the template.

R4.	The Panel recommends that a more substantive section on risks be included in the budget report. This should include the key risks identified by Executive Members in formulating their budget proposals.
-----	--

A4. The Executive confirms that this will be done next year and the budget report extended accordingly.

R5.	The Panel recommends that the Grants report should include reference to the number, value and some explanation of the rationale behind grant applications not recommended for approval.
-----	---

A5. The situation for 2018/19 is that no further applications for major grants were received beyond those listed in the report. The small grant position is different and the planned quarterly monitoring reports on allocations of small grants will include reference to the applications turned down.

R6.	The Panel recommend that the Executive consider charging for new street signs where they are provided for developers.
-----	---

A6. The Executive agrees. This will be explored during the preparation of next year's fee and charge schedule by the Executive Member for Environment & Parking.

R7.	The Panel recommends that the car park charging mechanism that enables drivers to pay for precise periods after the first hour be retained
-----	--

A7. The proposed changes to car parking charges have always included the retention of the ability for drivers to pay for precise periods after the first hour. This is clarified in the revised version of the budget report for Executive on 6 February 2018. Each additional 5p, after the first hour, will buy 3 minutes.

R8.	The Panel recommends that a sensitivity analysis be prepared to illustrate the impact of car parking volumes reducing by 5%, 10% and 20%.
-----	---

A8. The Executive agrees. This has been done and is explained in the revised version of the budget report for Executive on 6 February 2018. The financial impact of each reduction is £155k, £310k and £620k respectively.

R9.	The Panel requested that communication costs relating to Transform Leatherhead be provided.
-----	---

A9. The Executive is happy to provide the information requested. Communications involves input from a number of staff mainly from the Communications Team and from the Transform Team, at different times and in different

combinations. MVDC does not operate a detailed time recording system so an estimate of time and therefore cost will need to be completed, and will be shared with Members.

R10	The Panel recommends that the budget and potential borrowing for Transform Leatherhead should be made available to Members
-----	--

A10. The Executive agrees and had already initiated work in anticipation of the recommendation. A Funds Flow Forecast and accompanying notes will be provided together with a high level Programme Gantt Chart showing the estimated timing of individual projects within the programme and their governance arrangements; together with a project dependencies paper. These papers will also be made available to the public on the Transform Leatherhead website.

R11.	The Panel recommends that steps should be taken to recruit a Tree Inspector sooner rather than later.
------	---

A11. A Tree Inspector has been recruited by appointing an interim, agency employee to a permanent role.

R12.	The Panel recommends that particular attention be given to the allocation of additional resources for enforcement (for 2017/18 onwards) in view of the high level of public expectation.
------	--

A12. An experienced enforcement contractor has recently been appointed to the vacant post for 6 months to manage the team.

R13.	The Panel recommends continual assessment of the budget position in Development Management and remedial action taken as and when necessary.
------	---

A13. The position will be highlighted in the regular business and budget monitoring reports during the year so that Executive can take the action required.

R14.	The Panel was pleased to receive additional, detailed budget analysis from the Executive Member for Planning at their meeting. It recommends that the other Executive Members adopt this approach.
------	--

A14. This is accepted by the Executive. The Executive Member for Planning's analysis will be shared with the other members so that they can review the detail provided on their own portfolio for next year.