

Work undertaken by the Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2009/10

**Overview Items**

Item	Date of Meeting	Information	Observations
1 Annual Report of Progress of Travel Action Plan, Energy Use Plan and Carbon Reduction Management Action Plan	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2009	A report updating Members with actions taken over the past year by officers that would help Waverley reduce energy, mileage and money.	<p>The following recommendations in the report were supported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The energy use plan to continue being in use and eventually be incorporated into the LACM action plan by March 2010.</li> <li>2. The transport plan to continue being used until majority of actions are investigated or completed. It will continue to be reviewed annually.</li> <li>3. The final progress report on the CRMAP to be communicated in January 2010 with a view to discontinue the use of this action plan, once the majority of actions are completed or underway.</li> </ol> <p><i>(The Chairman, Cllr Mrs James voted against Recommendation 2).</i></p> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b> Recommendations endorsed by the Executive on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2009..</p>
2 Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, Enforcement of Powers	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2009	A report setting out the powers now available to the Council, under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 to address a wide range of activity and behaviour that was detrimental to the Environment and/or was anti-social and the implications for	<p>The following recommendations in the report were supported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Council's Scheme of Delegation be amended so that the relevant Heads of Service be delegated to authorise their nominated officers to enforce the relevant provisions of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 in accordance with the schedule at Annex 2;</li> <li>2. The option to employ a dedicated enforcement team be kept under review and reconsidered should the incidence of environmental crime and/or anti-social behaviour escalate to a level that might justify that investment;</li> <li>3. The Council adopts the default level of Fixed Penalty Charges set out in Annex 2 and the discounts for early payment as set out in Annex 3 to the report; and</li> <li>4. Officers investigate the opportunities for joint working, on the enforcement of the provisions of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, with neighbouring District Authorities.</li> </ol> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b> Recommendations endorsed by the Executive on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2009.</p>

3	Review of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2009	Waverley of exercising those powers.	<p>The following were majority observations raised by the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee is concerned whether the policies being implemented, and whether improvements being made, were achieving the objective of protecting the SPA.</li> <li>• The Committee notes that there is additional capacity in Farnham Park and staff working on site have indicated that greater capacity could be achieved in Central areas.</li> <li>• There is concern that the population of Dartford Warblers and other ground nesting birds maybe decreasing and could be the result of climate change not the effect of development.</li> </ul> <p>The following were minority observations raised by the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was some concern that the consultation document did not attach any plans outlining potential sites.</li> <li>• Members felt that the attraction of Farnham Park was its sense of remoteness and there was a concern that this would be lost if developers made too many improvements or new development on site.</li> <li>• There was some concern over the measurement of usage of the park; and</li> <li>• There was also some concern over the cost of funding the consultation associated with this work and measuring the usage of the park.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action taken by the Planning Policy SIG:</b> Comments noted by the Planning Policy SIG on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2009.</p>
4	Draft Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy	10 <sup>th</sup> November 2009	Update on the current position with the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	<p>The following observations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee concurred with the views of Farnham residents and wanted to ensure that the character of Farnham was preserved and although rapid further development was not favoured, Members acknowledged that some smaller development was necessary in the town.</li> <li>• Members agreed that the Council needed an Avoidance Strategy and although</li> </ul>

<p>Avoidance Strategy (SPA) and discussion on the way forward.</p>	<p>doubling the SANG at Farnham. Park could be a solution possibly the better way forward for the Council, in the short term, would be to allow a small and slow release of some further SANG on Farnham Park (possibly 4hectares) and immediately pursue evaluation of the three other preferred sites which could be used in the medium to long term future once they became available. In particular, it was felt that the land at the East of Farnham Park and Alice Holt Park should be investigated further as soon as possible but in the long term also Farnham Quarry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was some concern regarding the statistics Members had been given in reports concerning planning permissions/developments already agreed and Members requested reassurance that they were provided with real and reliable information. Although, Members noted that it was difficult to know what would have happened if they had not taken the steps that had already been taken.</li> <li>• The Committee felt that this Issue had been held back by the Core Strategy and the LDF not yet being completed and Members agreed that Officers move ahead as quickly as possible with this work.</li> <li>• The Committee was concerned about uncontrollable, inappropriate development if doubling the SANG at Farnham Park was allowed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b></p>	<p>The Executive on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009 resolved that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Officers continue to assist Farnham Town Council with a view to the early conclusion of the Farnham Design Statement, recognising always that this is a Farnham Town Council project; and</li> <li>2. Officers continue their investigations of alternatives to Farnham Park as previously agreed with the Executive with the objective of enabling appropriate medium term options to be considered at a later date.</li> </ol>
<p>And, recommended that</p>	<p>40. the SPA Avoidance Strategy be adopted;</p> <p>41. a further 3.45 hectares of Farnham Park be designated as SANG (equivalent to 179 further homes);</p> <p>42. a revised tariff taking into account inflation, changes in medium term interest rates and the proposed contribution towards the SPA Access Management and Monitoring project of Natural England be agreed as set out in the Avoidance</p>

5	Proposed Investment Programme for Playgrounds and Recreational facilities for Young People 2009-11	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2009	A report outlining the proposed methodology for allocating capital funding to playgrounds and youth facilities in parks and open spaces over the coming two years and it	<p>Strategy (Appendix 4: page xix);</p> <p>43. no further designations of Farnham Park as SANG be considered until either the Core Strategy is adopted or July 2012 whichever is the earlier; and</p> <p>44. this Council's assurance be given that no further significant capital works will be undertaken in Farnham Park other than those proposed in the Historic Landscape Survey and Restoration Management Plan, and that maintenance and minor improvement works will be in accordance with this already agreed plan, modified only with the approval of stakeholders, in particular Farnham Town Council.</p> <p>Council, on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2009 made the following decision:</p> <p>(a) Councillors Reed, Duckett and Mrs James asked that their votes against the adoption of recommendation 40. be recorded, but the recommendation was carried.</p> <p>(b) It was moved and seconded that recommendation 41. be amended as identified in italics:</p> <p>41. a further 3.45 hectares of Farnham Park be designated as SANG (equivalent to 179 further homes) <i>and to be made available as such on adoption of the Farnham Design Statement as local supplementary planning guidance or on 31st July, whichever is the sooner,</i></p> <p>A recorded vote was taken but this was carried.</p> <p>The following recommendations in the report were supported subject to the addition of the sentence highlighted in bold:</p> <p>1. Endorses the proposed approach for prioritisation of capital spend on playgrounds and recreational facilities for young people over the next two years <b>in consultation with Town and Parish Councils to identify needs and sources of funding;</b></p> <p>2. Approves the proposed list of projects for the next two years; and</p> <p>3. Agrees to the amendment of the 2009/10 Capital Programme to include the additional S106 funding of £4,400 for Beacon Hill Recreation Ground. <i>(Cllr Jane Thomson abstained from voting on recommendation 1).</i></p> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b></p>
---	--	----------------------------	--	---

6	New powers for Overview and Scrutiny Committees – Introduction dealing with a Councillor Call for Action and other Developments	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2009	sought approval of the resultant provisional priority list.	<p>Recommendations endorsed by the Executive on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2009.</p> <p>The following Observations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee feel that "single wards" is an unfortunate restriction to CCfA and should be amended to "local issues".</li> <li>• A number of issues still needed clarification, such as if there were any proposals to work with County Overview and Scrutiny processes, and all Overview and Scrutiny Committees should have the opportunity to look at this again when more information and guidance was provided.</li> <li>• The Committee supports the proposals for the introduction of a protocol for CCfA and note the information provided on other developments in respect of the introduction of new powers for overview and scrutiny committees</li> <li>• The Committee would like the opportunity to consider arrangements further, when guidance was received, for access to information and district powers for scrutiny of LAA</li> <li>• In considering Step 3 of the proposed protocol, the Committee agreed to propose that both the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the relevant committee should undertake the consideration of the Call for Action form.</li> </ul> <p>(Cllr Mrs James abstained from voting on recommendations 3 and 4 and was against recommendation 5).</p> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b> The Executive endorsed the comments of the O&amp;S Committees and recommended that the Procedure Rules in the Constitution be amended, as set out in Annexes 1 and 2 of the agenda report.</p>
	Proposals for the implementation of one of the new powers as known 'Councillor Call For Action' arising from new legislation. The proposed protocol was based largely on a protocol developed by officers in another Surrey Authority who had agreed to share their proposals with others in order to reduce duplication of effort and to encourage a coordinated approach to the implementation of the new			

7	Implementation of new powers for Overview and Scrutiny Committees	10 <sup>th</sup> November 2009	Further Information on the new powers, both in relation to the scrutiny of the Surrey Local Area Agreement and the scrutiny of the work of Waverley's Crime and Reduction Partnership.	<p>The following Observations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers would feed back to Members concerns about what could happen if the findings of the Joint Task and Finish Groups were not accepted by the relevant County Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee.</li> <li>• There was concern that the Surrey Police Authority were not coming across as particularly happy about meeting with each of the Borough and District Councils to discuss issues.</li> <li>• It was felt that there was a need to emphasis arrangements and clarify that ELOS could reserve the right to call in any issue for review if and when it felt appropriate.</li> <li>• There was concern that this was a tentative arrangement which required input from all Councils and this may not be forthcoming. It was felt that these proposals should be reviewed after a relatively short period of two years.</li> <li>• Arrangements could be made for borough and districts with similar interests and difficulties to consult together as a Joint Overview and Scrutiny exercise.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b>  At its meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> December the Executive resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees be endorsed; and</li> <li>2. officers draft appropriate changes to the Overview and Scrutiny Article and Procedure Rules in the Constitution and submit these to the next cycle of meetings.</li> </ol>
8	Proposed Household Food Waste Collection Service	23 <sup>rd</sup> November 2009	A report on the proposal for a phased introduction of a segregated household food-waste collection and the future plans for the waste	<p>The following observations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee agreed that Food waste collection was a priority, and highly desirable for the Council, but, how high a priority depended on the budget implications and what would have to be given up to proceed with this trial.</li> <li>• The Committee wanted assurance that the Council would make savings if it began collecting food waste rather than continue taking it to land fill. Members noted the aspect of the pressure of increases in landfill tax in future years.</li> <li>• The Committee would like to see a cost breakdown per household and comparison with Surrey Heath and Guildford although noted that a direct comparison would not be possible since in the short term Waverley would be</li> </ul>

and recycling service.

- introducing a phased rather than an integrated approach. Members noted a more comparable service would be possible in around two years time.
- The Committee was concerned about the costs of ongoing publicity and questioned whether £20,000 was actually needed for this process.
  - The Committee noted that the £30000 Staff item (Food Waste Adviser) was no longer deemed necessary.
  - There were social concerns about how the waste would be separated when it was taken to the MRF.
  - The Committee questioned whether the Council should consider charging the full cost for green waste collection.
  - The Committee noted that the Local Public Service Grant Funding was a one off payment and the implications this had for supporting the trial's introduction.
  - The Committee agreed that the trial should start with urban areas first prior to any consideration of extending it to rural areas.
  - The Committee supported the proposal for a bolt on service during the duration of the trial. The Committee supports, via the imminent renegotiations with the existing Contractor contract, for the Council to go for an integrated service.
  - The Committee noted that officers were in negotiations with the Contractors about establishing a trial area of 40,000 homes. The Committee preferred an approach, if financially possible, would be for the Council to adopt a trial in each of the four urban areas, covering all 40,000 homes, to maximise participation and yield rather than just piloting in one area.
  - Members supported the 6 'Next Steps' noted in the agenda report and given that the Committee's deliberations on this subject had focused on the financial and logistical aspects of introducing kerbside food waste collection requested that priority be allocated to:
    - c) Working up a detailed financial strategy to fund the initiative;
    - d) Establishing the best location for the initial round(s) to optimise participation and collection rates.

**Action taken by the Executive:**

On 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009, the Executive resolved that:

1. In considering service initiatives for 2010/11 the introduction of a food-waste collection service be a priority for the Council;
2. Subject to approval as part of the budget-setting process in February 2010, the

9	Youth Strategy	12 <sup>th</sup> January 2010	A report on the Youth Strategy and draft Action plan for comment.	<p>Council should embark on a bolt-on service during 2010/11, and the service should focus initially on urban areas;</p> <p>3. Officers be requested to bring forward proposals for further encouraging home composting in the rural and semi-rural areas of the Borough; and</p> <p>4. Officers be instructed to proceed with the 'Next Steps' as outlined in Paragraph 25 of the report, to report back to Members in February 2010 with the outcome of this work and to seek a final decision on whether to proceed with this initiative.</p> <p>5. Officers be requested to bring to a future meeting proposals for longer-term strategy options relating to the overall objectives of waste minimisation.</p> <p>The following observations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee fully supported the Youth Strategy and Action Plan and recommended to the Executive that it be endorsed.</li> <li>• The Committee praised the Community Development Officer (for youth) and Portfolio Holder for being able to do so much for young people with a limited budget.</li> <li>• The Committee questioned the costs of the proposals detailed in the Action Plan. Members were assured that the costs were met through partnership and those actions were deliverable from the limited budget that was available.</li> <li>• The Committee agreed that the strategy gave the Council a clear direction for delivering services to young people in the Borough.</li> <li>• There was a concern about the service provided to young people in rural areas. If it was not possible to take activities to them, the Council should look at how to improve transport options to enable these young people to come to the main four centers in the Borough. Members suggested that the availability of grant funding should be investigated.</li> <li>• The Committee asked for regular updates on the action plan at future meetings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b> Youth Strategy and Action Plan endorsed by the Executive on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2010.</p>
10	Review of Provision and Maintenance of Public Conveniences	15 <sup>th</sup> March 2010	A report seeking views on the future provision	<p>The following observations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the closure of the three sites identified in the report with effect from 1 April 2010 was not supported without further information being provided;</li> </ul>



11	Initial Draft of the 2010 Air Quality Progress report	15 <sup>th</sup> March 2010	A report on current progress with improving air and tackling air quality in the Borough.	<p>of public conveniences in the Borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Farncombe Public Conveniences should be maintained for use by commuters and users of local shops;</li> <li>alternative sources of funding, to include charging and sponsorship, should be investigated further before any closures were pursued;</li> <li>further transfer arrangements with Town and Parish Councils be evaluated and a phased approach be considered if appropriate;</li> <li>appropriate measures for obtaining accurate usage information should be undertaken; and</li> <li>consideration be given to re-tendering the current cleaning contract and looking at options for renegotiating or working with neighbouring authorities, and the outcome of any current discussions with Guildford Borough Council be made available before any decisions are made.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b>  On 16<sup>th</sup> April 2009, the Executive noted the concerns of the Committee and resolved to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Put in place seasonal opening (April - September) at Tilford Public Conveniences; and</li> <li>Carry out further research into the condition and usage of all three public conveniences in the Farncombe area and Windrush House public conveniences in Bramley, and ask officers to return with further recommendations including what alternative facilities might be made available on a formal basis.</li> </ol>
12	Draft Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document -	15 <sup>th</sup> March 2010	Consultation on the draft Residential Extensions	<p>The following comments were submitted as part of the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was suggested that the document could contain more detail about what could be done without the need for planning permission and point towards national guidance clarifying this.</li> </ul>

Consultation		Supplementary Planning Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was also questioned how the document fitted in with the Certificate of Lawfulness process which was becoming more widely used. Officers confirmed that developers and agents would be encouraged to be mindful of the document even for those developments which would not require planning permission.</li> <li>The Committee supported Village Design Statements and wanted to encourage all villages to produce one.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b> Comments submitted as part of the consultation process on the Draft Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
--------------	--	---------------------------------	---

In-depth Reviews	Item	Date of Meeting	Information	Observations
1	Flooding	<p>Commenced on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008</p> <p>Select Committee on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2008</p> <p>Concluded on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2009</p>	<p>The initial scoping report for the review into Waverley's preparedness to respond to major emergencies, including the emerging national developments in flood risk management, in particular the Pitt Review, the Government's new strategy document entitled 'Future Water' and the Draft Flood and Water Management Bill published in April 2009 was agreed on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008.</p> <p>The final recommendations on this review were agreed on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2009 and forwarded to the Executive</p>	<p>The following recommendations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completion of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in consultation with the Environment Agency. The cost of the SFRA would be covered by the existing planning service budget.</li> <li>2. Town and parish councils be encouraged to take more of an interest in managing flood risk, using Bramley Parish Council as an example of good practice. This could be achieved using existing staff resources.</li> <li>3. Supporting and co-operating with the Environment Agency and the new 'lead local flood authority' (i.e. Surrey County Council). These were new relationships and the cost to Waverley of 'supporting and co-operating' is unknown.</li> <li>4. There needed to be further Mapping, surveying and maintaining, WBC owned, watercourses and assets. Much of this can be done using existing staff resources.</li> <li>5. The Council should look into promoting existing arrangements for advising residents by all available means in times of flooding.</li> </ol> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b> The Executive endorsed the recommendations from the review on 7<sup>th</sup></p>

	for consideration on 7 <sup>th</sup> July 2009.	July 2009.
<p>2</p> <p>Waverley's Role with Local Businesses</p>	<p>The initial scoping report on waverleys role with local businesses was considered on 8<sup>th</sup> September. A meeting with partner business organisations, neighbouring local authorities and local businesses about their thoughts on the Council's input to economic development and business support in the Borough.</p>	<p>Commenced on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009</p> <p>Select Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2010</p>
<p>3</p> <p>Transport Issues – Guildford-Cranleigh Rail Link</p>	<p>The Committee considered a scoping report on the review of the Guildford – Cranleigh Rail Link reopening on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009. The Committee agreed that it had a responsibility to look at this proposal seriously to reassure residents; and, although the deadline had been missed for comments to the consultation process, it was still important that the Councils views on these submitted proposals.</p>	<p>The committee recommended that at this stage, and based on the information provided, the Council did not pursue further investigation into the re-opening of the rail-link and forwarded the following observations to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee agreed that there was little possibility of being able to finance the next step, the completion of a feasibility study, unless substantial funding from external partners was provided.</li> <li>• There was concern about being to provide adequate car parking around the stations for this proposal to go ahead.</li> <li>• The Committee questioned the financial viability of the scheme.</li> <li>• Some Members also questioned whether the new line would help local businesses in Cranleigh and Bramley as residents might be more likely to travel to Guildford and London to shop if accessibility to Guildford was improved.</li> <li>• There was concern that the new rail link might not provide adequate links with other local transport providers, specifically the buses.</li> <li>• Members also questioned if the views of residents had been taken account, since there seemed to have been undue focus on the financial aspects of the scheme.</li> </ul>
		B51

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to these proposals, some Members raised the importance of the LDF and achieving sustainability within the Towns and Villages and felt that this re-opening proposal, if it were possible, should be considered as part of this process.</li> <li>• The Committee did not feel that the proposal should be dismissed in its entirety because of the positive opportunities it could bring to this area of the Borough. Furthermore, it was noted from the report, that, if funding was available, obstacles in building the line could be overcome. It was also recognised, however, that any further consideration would have to look at not just the financial aspect but also the potential impact on local communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action taken by the Executive:</b> The Executive on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2009 resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Waverley was not in any position to fund the capital costs of the reopening and therefore accepted the ELOS recommendation that the Council does not pursue further investigation into the reopening of the rail link;</li> <li>2. the Council would give whatever encouragement and assistance it could to any party who wished to take forward such work; and</li> <li>3. the Council would continue to work with Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council to protect and develop the Downs Link as a sustainable transport corridor.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--

**Performance**

Item	Date of Meeting	Observations
Performance Management Reports	16 <sup>th</sup> June 2009, 8 <sup>th</sup> September 10 <sup>th</sup>	A number of observations have been made and forwarded to the Executive on the performance reports which are available to view from previous minutes.

	November 2009 and 15 <sup>th</sup> March		The Following observation was noted prior to the report being received by the Executive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To add to the report the inputs made through other grant awarding schemes such as the Voluntary Grants Partnership to give Members a more complete picture within the Annual Report.</li> </ul>
Community Partnership Performance Monitoring	10 <sup>th</sup> November 2009		

**Call in meetings**

None

Financial Item	Date of Meeting	Information	Observations
General Fund Revenue estimates 2010/11	12 <sup>th</sup> January 2010	A report on the General Fund Revenue Estimates 2010/11 detailing, in particular, the proposals from the Star Chamber for reducing the budget shortfall.	<p>The following observations were forwarded to the Executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee thanked the Performance Sub-Committee, and non-Members of the Sub-Committee, for attending the meeting and having detailed discussions on the budget papers prior to ELOS. Members agreed that this arrangement should take place again next year as it was very helpful to go through the budget in detail prior to the main Committee.</li> <li>There was concern expressed by Members about the layout of the budget papers. Officers advised Members that they would be working on a more detailed and clear presentation on the budget in future.</li> <li>Members were advised that the vacancy factor was included within the calculations for the budget and that some element would be achieved through natural turnover. Where there was a need to achieve this target to balance the budget, the Corporate Management Team would try and keep some non-key posts open to achieve these savings.</li> <li>The Committee found the budget misleading where one-off costs were listed as a saving although they were being met from revenue reserve fund. Members questioned whether this was actually still a saving.</li> <li>There was concern that making so many efficiencies would begin to affect the Councils overall performance specifically staff response times to queries from both Councillors but also members of the public.</li> <li>Members were concerned about the restriction on the budget for use of consultants as part of the LDF process and whether this would impact the timetable. Members requested that the latest process and activity timetable be circulated following the meeting.</li> <li>There was concern expressed by Members about the cooperation from Surrey County</li> </ul>

Council (hereafter referred to as SCC) and their involvement in providing specialist advice for the LDF in light of SCC's indicated £190 million budget savings. Members were assured that there was £6,000 left in this year's budget for transport advice from SCC and officers would be meeting with them w/c 18 January 2010 to confirm their ability to deliver this work.

- The Committee was assured that the savings proposed, specifically from the loss of two monitoring positions, would not affect performance.
- Members were concerned that there should be no cut-backs imposed on the Planning Enforcement department which would otherwise adversely affect their performance to date.
- There was concern from some Members regarding the amount of funding going to Farnham Museum compared to other Museums as well as the continual on-going costs of running the museum. Members were advised that the Museum was looking at its staffing arrangements and performance would be looked at carefully by the Performance Sub-Committee.
- There was concern about the transfer of public conveniences from Waverley to Cranleigh Parish Council and considering Cranleigh did not have the budget to fund this, whether the Council would achieve the proposed saving. Members were also concerned about this saving being proposed without Cranleigh Parish Council being first consulted and transfer agreement elicited.
- The Committee noted that the Council was purchasing an additional low emissions pool car. Although some Members supported the Councils efforts, Members were concerned that the Council may not be doing enough to encourage the ownership and usage of low carbon cars by its residents. For example, the Council could give incentives for those who used such vehicles with an extra hours free parking. Members felt that the Council should be identifying and evaluating mechanisms to assist uptake and usage of such cars.
- The Committee noted a question from Councillor Lovell about his concern that the income from car parking across the Borough had reduced. Officers advised Members that income had fallen for a number of reasons, specifically because of the recession and, most recently, the adverse weather. Consequently, the ambitious target this year had not been met and the target next year had also been reduced and was now more realistic. Enforcement of car parking had improved since a new contractor was in place.
- The Committee raised the need to protect income streams across all relevant Council services.
- Members were concerned by the new Food Waste service being a significant growth item and needed reassurance that going ahead with this new service was the right decision for the Council. The Head of Environmental Services advised Members that SCC had been flexible with the capital costs, which they funded, and the Council would be allowed to use some of

is funding to support the revenue costs the scheme. Members agreed that this should go forward until further information had been sought on delivering this new service, noting that there were concerns about the overall costs.

- The Committee noted that the Council would only be carrying out one round as a pilot next year and noted that they were over 2 years away from delivering an integrated service. Members were positive about providing the service and long term, felt that the Council should investigate funding to cover further rounds although, noting, to cover all urban areas would have significant costs.
- There was disappointment from Members that Haslemere and Cranleigh Initiatives had not received matched funding compared to the previous year for continued support from the Council and as expected by the Parish Councils. There was also concern over the lack of communication between the Council and the proposals for supporting these town and parish Initiatives. The Committee felt that these initiatives should be receiving £7,500 and not just £5,000 as proposed and that this funding should be sought if possible.
- The Committee was concerned that rural areas were not being treated on an equal basis and would like to see a more equal allocation and distribution of monies to such rural areas.
- A Member sought clarification on the calculation of the Depreciation charges and was reassurance was given from officers.
- There was concern from Members about the revised arrangements for dealing with the out of hours' Noise standby arrangements and whether this service, in light of the proposed saving, would continue to be effective. Officers assured Members that the service would still be delivered but would be a 'Targeted' rather than a responsive service. Members were also assured that there would not be a reduction in service but was just a different way of delivering it.
- Members asked for more information about the reduction in the advertising budget within planning and what specific impact would result. Members were advised that this was for public notices in the paper and reflected the reduction in planning applications. It was now also being coordinated by Communications who could negotiate reduced costs on its behalf.
- Members noted the BVPI sub committee concerns regarding the proposed reduction in the Statutory Dog service provision.

**Action Taken by the Executive:**

The Observations were noted at the meeting of the Executive on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2010.

Draft Capital	12 <sup>th</sup>	A report on the	To observations from the Performance Sub-Committee were forwarded to the Executive as well
---------------	------------------	-----------------	--

Programme	January 2010	Draft Programme and the capital schemes relevant to the Committee.	<p>as questioning why no justification statement had been completed in the papers for the second low carbon emissions pool car and, although noting that this had already been purchased with a deal when buying the first, Members felt that this should still have been completed.</p> <p><b>Action Taken by the Executive:</b> The Observations were noted at the meeting of the Executive on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2010.</p>
Waverley Community Partnership – Funding Round 2010/11	12 <sup>th</sup> January 2010	The Committee considered the applications to the Waverley Community Partnership (for Community Partnership funding) within its remit and noted that the recommendations for grant, as set out in Annexe 1, were only recommendations at this stage and would be finally determined by the Executive in February. The Chief Accountant outlined the new arrangement that had been followed this year in determining the grants	<p>The following observations were forwarded to the Executive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee expressed disappointment that there was not a Member Group set up to consider the officer recommendations prior to them being brought to Committee. Members felt that a new arrangement should be put in place for next year to ensure substantial and decisive Member input in order to question the continuity of the proposals and to provide local expert knowledge. Officers responded to Members concerns that these were recommendations only and Members comments would be taken into account before the actual proposal was taken forward to the Executive.</li> <li>• Despite their concern and disappointment in terms of the process, Members noted that only minor changes in grant levels were proposed and the proposals were accepted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action Taken by the Executive:</b> The Observations were noted at the meeting of the Executive on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2010.</p>