

**WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**16<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2013**  
**REPORT TO THE COUNCIL MEETING**  
**15<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2013**

---

**Title:**

**COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13**

---

This report details the work undertaken by the Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee over the municipal year 2012/13.

The Committee met on seven occasions in 2012/13. Scheduled meetings took place on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2012, 17<sup>th</sup> September 2012, 19<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and 28<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The meeting scheduled to take place in March was postponed because there was no matters to discuss. There was a Call-in meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> August 2012 to discuss the Weyhill Car Park consultation and a special meeting of the Committee took place on 3<sup>rd</sup> December to discuss the core strategy.

The membership was as follows: -

Cllr Maurice Byham	Cllr Denis Leigh
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Roger Steel
Cllr Jim Edwards (Chairman)	Cllr Jane Thomson
Cllr Patricia Ellis	Cllr Brett Vorley
Cllr Jenny Else	Cllr Ross Welland
Cllr Mary Forszewski	Cllr Nick Williams
Cllr Diane James	Cllr Andrew Wilson
Cllr Nick Holder (Vice-Chairman)	

Substitute members:

Cllr Ian Sampson	Cllr Stephen Hill
Cllr Tony Gordon-Smith	Cllr Christiaan Hesse
Cllr Pat Frost	Cllr Lynn Graffham
Cllr Stella Andersen-Payne	Cllr Stewart Stennett
Cllr Richard Gates	Cllr Liz Wheatley
Cllr Peter Isherwood	

There were two members of the Tenants' Panel co-opted to this Committee:  
Mrs Ann Powis and Mrs Christine North.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for performing the overview and scrutiny role in relation to the following main functions:-

- Community welfare
- Older people in the community
- Day centres

- Community safety
- Town and village liaison
- Rural issues and the voluntary sector
- Environment
- Planning and major developments
- Economic development
- Land drainage
- Business liaison
- Cultural and leisure provision and youth

## 2. **IN-DEPTH REVIEWS**

- 2.1 The Committee did not undertake any in-depth reviews in 2012/13. Members had considered undertaking a review on Infrastructure at its meeting in June 2012 but at a following meeting in November 2012, The Committee received a scoping report and noted that Council had adopted a Planning Infrastructure Contributions (PIC) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in 2008 and, more recently, the Council had published a comprehensive Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the development ambitions of the Core Strategy. Consequently, it would not be appropriate for Members to undertake a review of this Plan as it was now in its final form in preparation for the Core Strategy Examination.
- 2.2 Consequently, an alternative proposal was agreed for the Committees involvement in work being undertaken on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

## 3. **REVIEW OF ITEMS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMUNITY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 2010/11**

Items considered by the Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee during the course of the municipal year 2012/13 are set out below and the observations made at those meetings.

### 3.1 *Air Quality Update (17<sup>th</sup> June 2012)*

The Committee received the initial draft of the Air Quality Progress Report for comment. The completion and submission of the Air Quality progress report to DEFRA would help deliver Waverley's statutory duties as defined under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995. It was also an opportunity for Waverley Borough Council to tackle local air pollution and help improve the health of the local community.

The Committee endorsed the Action Plan and agreed that the following observations be forwarded to the Executive for consideration:

- The Committee receive an executive summary setting out the main points of the air quality action plan at future meetings; and
- Members welcomed the efforts taken so far with air quality improvements and ask that the Executive encourage Surrey County Council and other bodies to continue to try and make changes to improve air quality in the Borough and across Surrey.

**At its meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2012 the Executive resolved that the observations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees were noted and the report was endorsed.**

3.2 Service Plan Outturn Report 2012/13 (17<sup>th</sup> June 2012)

The Committee received a report presenting the outturn on the Service Plans for 2011-12 and highlighted the achievements during the year. The report gave Members the opportunity to assess the large amount of activity that had taken place during the year and to reflect on a number of significant project and service actions that were completed or progressed.

The Committee RESOLVED to note the Service Plan outturn report for 2011/12.

3.3 Street Cleaning Review 2012 (17<sup>th</sup> September 2012)

The Committee received a report on a review of the Council's street cleaning service which also set out a number of proposals as to how the service would be improved going forward.

The Committee considered the report and raised a number of observations on the recommendations proposed to take the service forward. Accordingly, the Committee RESOLVED to endorse the recommendations subject to the following observations to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> October:

1. There was concern about the cleaning of footpaths in particular rural areas of the Borough and the equipment used to clean them. It was noted that the addition of a second crew of targeted street cleaners, and a review of equipment used by Veolia, could go some way to address these issues.
2. There was some concern about the enforcement aspect of dealing with fly-tipping swiftly if Surrey police resources were reduced further.
3. There was concern about the cleaning of drains, in particular around Cranleigh, Beacon Hill and Woolmer Hill. It was noted that this was the responsibility of Surrey County Council but Waverley would be working closely with the County to address this issue.
4. There was concern about parts of the borough where there was joint responsibility for cleaning such as footpaths around business premises. Members wanted to see more action to take forward cleaning of these areas.
5. The Committee very much supported recommendation 12 in relation to exploring technologies and developing a broad range of methods for encouraging more informal feedback on the street cleaning service.
6. There was concern about the timely cutting of verges on main roads coming into the Borough.
7. It was noted that there were particular issues with fly posting in Farnham.
8. There was some concern about the roll out of the new public recycling litter bin scheme in the rural areas and Members would like to see a report reviewing this service. It was noted that this service would be in place from mid-October and success would be measured by the quality of the recycling collected. Officers would report back to the Committee

in due course and, if proved successful, would be rolled out to the more rural areas.

9. An update report on progress with the recommendations would be brought to the next meeting on street cleaning.

**At its meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 the Executive resolved that the observations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees were noted and the recommendations contained within the Street Cleaning review endorsed.**

3.3 *The Farnham Maltings SLA – A six month performance review of the outreach programme and museum service for Farnham Museum (19<sup>th</sup> November 2012)*

Members received a report which clarified the new funding and monitoring arrangements that were now in place between Waverley and Farnham Maltings and to review the progress they had made in delivering the outreach service and the museum service at Farnham Museum in the first six months of the new arrangements. Gavin Stride, the Director of the Maltings and Liz May, the new Curator of the Museum were present at the meeting to speak about the changes since the transfer and future aspirations for the museum.

The Committee noted the report and raised the following observations for the Portfolio Holder and officers to note:

1. The Committee was pleased to note that the Museum was starting to perform better since the transfer and had confidence in growth of the Museum over the next six months.
2. The Committee was pleased to see the involvement with the community and encouraging their participation in new activities, such as storytelling.
3. The Committee was pleased to hear about the outreach work with young people but would like to see progress made over the coming months for outreach work with families, older and vulnerable people in the community.
4. The Committee would like more work done to promote reminiscent loan boxes in the community.
5. The Committee noted the Museums commitment to work with schools around the Borough through reviewing and remodelling the education provision and school involvement would only increase once the arrangements were more established.
6. The Committee noted the Museum would be looking to work in partnership with the Cranleigh Arts Centre to ensure both attractions were successful with their outreach work.
7. The Committee was pleased to note that the Museum was working hard to update its exhibitions on a regular basis which would encourage members of the public to re-visit.

3.4 *Leisure Development Plan 2012-15 (19<sup>th</sup> November 2012)*

The Committee received a report outlining information about the Leisure Development Plan which the Leisure Services Team proposed to work towards over the next four years.

The Committee considered the Leisure Development Plan and RESOLVED that the following comments be forwarded to the Executive:

1. The Committee would like to see more support with marketing for local sports clubs on the Council's website.
2. The Committee suggested the Leisure Service looking at work being carried out by the Surrey Sports Board and that Cllr Munro and a representative from County come along to a future meeting to present to the Committee what is being done by the County Council in developing leisure across the County. There were also a number of questions Members would like to ask about the bigger picture of leisure with young people through school provision.
3. The Committee was surprised that there was not more being done under the section on Health Promotion around "falls prevention" and this was not noted in the plan.

**At its meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2013 the Executive resolved that the observations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees were noted and Leisure Development Plan endorsed.**

3.5 Update on Government Changes for the Planning System(19<sup>th</sup> November 2012)

The Committee received a report updating Members on changes to the planning system and highlighting some of the issues key for service delivery. Members were advised that the Government had put in place very significant changes to the planning system over the last two years and it was now embarking on another raft of further legislative and procedural changes with the intention of freeing up constraints on development in order to help stimulate growth.

The Committee considered the report and RESOLVED that the following comments be forwarded to the Executive:

1. The Committee endorsed the officers comments contained in the report about changes to the planning system and felt that all the issues raised should be noted in a strongly worded letter to Government. There was particular concern about the proposals in relation to further permitted development rights. There was also some concern about pressure on the high street because of the proposals allowing change of use of the first floors of shops to two flats which could add to parking pressures in town centres.
2. The Committee noted that planning fees continued to fall significantly below full cost of recovery. It was noted that a benchmarking exercise had recently taken place but the Government would still not allow fees to be set locally. The Committee supported officers in highlighting this issue to Government as, although the proposal to allow fees to be increased by 15% was welcomed, this still would not recover the full costs involved.

**At its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2012 the Executive resolved that the observations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees were endorsed and a response was sent to the Government expressing Waverley's concerns about the proposed changes to the planning system.**

3.6 Proposals for new Garden Waste Service (19<sup>th</sup> November 2012)

The Committee received a presentation from the Head of Environment on the proposals for a new Garden Waste Service. The presentation outlined proposals for delivering the service in a different way with a preference for introducing wheely bins to replace the green sacks that were currently used. The costs of delivering a new service and compared to other similar authorities were also outlined to Members.

The Committee considered the options and RESOLVED that the following comments be forwarded to the Portfolio Holder on the proposals for a new Garden Waste Service in Waverley:

1. The Committee agreed that the cost for customers was putting residents off using the garden waste service and reducing the cost of sacks was a more attractive option than introducing wheelie bins to increase participation. The service was far more expensive than other neighbouring authorities and this was the issue that needed addressing noting that the demographics of Waverley was far different to others and so comparison could not be completely accurate.
2. The Committee did not support the option to introduce a wheelie bin service in the Borough for garden waste.
3. The Committee noted the free bring service provided for the collection of garden waste on Saturdays in Godalming and Haslemere was hugely popular and felt strongly that this should be retained. The Committee suggested introducing this service to all town centres to see whether it was equally effective but noting that there would be an additional cost for this.
4. The Committee were concerned about the under utilized space for recycling facilities in town centre car parks and requested that this be looked into further.

3.7 Proposed refurbishment of Weyhill (Fairground) Car Park Haslemere – Results of informal Consultation (28<sup>th</sup> January 2013)

The Committee received a report setting out the findings of the recent informal consultation exercise which was carried out to help inform the proposed application to the Secretary of State for common land consent to refurbish Wey Hill (fairground) Car Park, Haslemere.

The Committee noted the report and the proposed timetable for taking these proposals forward and RESOLVED that the following comments be considered by the Executive:

1. There was some concern from the Committee that views of residents might be dismissed because they were purely about charging but car parking was a major issue for Haslemere and all objections should be given due and careful consideration throughout the process.
2. The Committee did not feel that the statistics given for the level of response were not a true reflection of the real interest in this proposal and should be disregarded.
3. The Committee was supportive of improving the car park but agreed that taking these proposals forward there needed to be very

comprehensive and sensitive consultation with residents and local business about charges.

4. There was a request that a proper landscaping scheme for the car park was considered when taking proposals forward for refurbishing the site.
5. There was also a recommendation to the Executive that consideration was given to implementing minor/temporary repairs to the surface as a duty of care to its users.

**At its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013 the Executive resolved that the outcome of the informal consultation exercise and the observations made by the Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted.**

3.8 *Avoidance strategy for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area – Release of additional suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANG) at Farnham Park (28<sup>th</sup> January 2013)*

The Committee received a report seeking the release of the remaining SANG capacity in Farnham Park to ensure the continued delivery of much needed housing, including affordable housing, in Farnham.

The Committee considered the report and the proposals for the release of the remaining SANG and RESOLVED that the recommendations be endorsed subject to the following comments being considered by the Executive:

1. There was concern about whether or not SANGs actually worked as an effective avoidance measure. Natural England had advised that it could take 5 years to prove whether SANGs did work and a survey had been undertaken last year but the results had not yet been published. It was felt that all the evidence about the effectiveness of SANG should be reviewed before the Council made a decision on releasing the remaining SANG capacity in Farnham Park. Both the surveys carried out by Natural England and Waverley BC should be made available to Members for consideration, and written assurance from Natural England that the Eastern Car Park would be acceptable and meet the standards laid down by them and the European Directive.
2. The Committee noted that money was collected from Developers via section 106 agreements for infrastructure, but even if continued to take this in perpetuity there would still not be enough money for future maintenance. Therefore, the Council should consider reviewing charges to developers.
3. There was concern about the urbanisation of Farnham Park and Members did not want to see too many urban features so that it could keep its semi-natural feel and beauty. Any future improvements should be discussed with the Town Council and other interested parties fully before they were taken forward.
4. The Committee questioned the figures for the usage of the Car park as a number of places were used by Commuters as it was free and there was no time limit.

**At its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2013 the Executive resolved that the observations made by the Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee were noted and a further 6.9 ha of land was released at Farnham Park for SANG; and the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder, was authorised to**

**make minor editorial changes to the Avoidance Strategy in the light of this.**

3.9 Service Level Agreements – Nominated Pilot Project review (28<sup>th</sup> January 2013)

The Committee considered a report summarising the progress in the first six months of the three nominated organisations that were funded through a Service Level Agreement for 2012-2014 as pilot for this new way of working. Members were asked to note the outcome of the SLA pilot process to date.

The Committee RESOLVED to note the report with the following comments being considered by the Portfolio Holder:

1. The Committee was concerned to see that there were more enquiries from people with long term mental health issues and to ensure that CAB had appropriate information and expertise to help these people.
2. It was noted that Farnham CAB had reduced its opening hours and were only covering 4 days a week compared to 5 days for other Bureaus. They are reviewing this and looking into their telephone service and how this service could be improved.
3. The Committee was concerned about the complexity of the application forms and the difficulty for smaller organisations in completing these. Officers were asked to review the forms for following years and, where possible, simplify them.
4. The Committee wanted to support the CAB as much as possible as issues such as helping people deal with debt, were only going to increase over the coming years.
5. The Committee was concerned about the continuation of the Hospital Hoppa service since funding had been reduced especially as the demand for this service continued to increase.

3.10 Waverley Core Strategy – Submission (3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012)

The Committee received a presentation from the Head of Planning, Matthew Evans, and the Planning Policy Manager, Graham Parrott on the key issues arising from the consultation on the pre-submission Core Strategy, time frame and examination process.

The Committee considered the report and AGREED that the following substantive point be made to the Executive at its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> December, that it felt strongly that the decision on the future policy for Dunsfold Park should be reviewed as a matter of urgency, to include consideration of housing.

Further observations on the Core Strategy Submission were made as follows:

1. There was concern about there being no detailed reference to address concerns about aviation at Dunsfold Park. It was felt that there was not a clear understanding of the affects of increased aviation in the area, particularly around Cranleigh and rural villages, and this should be addressed in more detail in the Strategy. The Committee asked that officers looked at his issue in more detail particularly about the environmental issues and affects of increased aviation use on the area.



2. There was significant concern about the content of CS10 and what this would mean for the future of Dunsfold Park. It was noted though that the Core Strategy had come to a clear view for Dunsfold Park and the decision taken by Council some time ago that it wanted to see a future for the site which was business lead. Members also noted that the Core Strategy was a strategic document which would not go into the detailed specifics on aviation use. This was something, however, that would be considered as part of the future Master Plan and other working documents.
3. The Committee further discussed the future of Dunsfold Park and the proposed policy CS10 in more detail, specifically, using the site for housing as it was a brownfield site, more favourable than other greenfield releases proposed particularly around Cranleigh and Farnham.
4. The Committee felt that even at this late stage, the concerns about CS10 should be raised with the Executive as Dunsfold Park was a key site with the potential for addressing housing numbers in the Borough.
5. The Committee felt concern about the release of greenfield sites and that brownfield land, such as Dunsfold Park, should be looked into more favourably. It was felt that the proposed policy CS10 should be reappraised before it was submitted.
6. During discussion about the future of Dunsfold Park, if housing was allowed, as part of a mixed development, it was felt that the numbers should be far less than those proposed in the last planning application and the site should not be considered as the sole site for addressing housing numbers.
7. There was a question raised about where people were moving from or to in the Borough. It was noted that a lot of people moved out of the Borough because of the cost of housing or had to share or move back in with family. Providing affordable housing in the Borough was essential and it was felt that the location of these should be placed, ideally, first in brownfield sites. It was noted that 230 houses was agreed by Council and this would be put forward to the Inspector. If this was not agreed then this, and a decision on the way forward, would come back to the Council to review. Furthermore, Members were advised that Dunsfold Park was also not the only option for housing and meeting future housing needs in the Borough.
8. The Committee proposed a further two points be added to the policy CS10 as follows:
  - to completing a detailed masterplan to investigate a development of mixed use on this site and
  - to complete a detailed aviation assessment.
9. There was concern about the increase in traffic on the roads because of the number of houses being built, not only in the Borough but large developments by neighbouring authorities close to the boundaries. Members hoped that there was cross border discussion taking place about making sure the roads could cope with extra demand and access to services was maintained.
10. Further concern was expressed about the traffic on local roads, such as the A31 and A3 since the building of the Hindhead Tunnel. It was proposed that officers discussed this concern further with Surrey County Council, the Highways Authority and Guildford Borough Council.

11. The Committee was concerned about current infrastructure meeting the needs of the community with such an increase in housing, particularly services such as water supply and drainage. Members asked that Officers continued to work closely with service providers.

**At its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2012 the Executive agreed to defer consideration of this report in the light of the observations raised by the Special meeting of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

#### **4. FINANCIAL ISSUES**

##### **4.1 Financial Strategy 2013/14 – 2016/17 and General Fund Budget 2013/14 (28<sup>th</sup> January 2013)**

Member's attention was drawn to the annexes to this report and attention was drawn to the main issues of budget assumptions, inflation and government grants relating to Council Tax Freeze. The Committee also noted the Star Chamber reduction proposals and the overall budget picture from the time of the Finance Seminar to date which, assuming the Star Chamber reductions being approved, resulted in a balanced budget for 2013/14 and allow for a council tax freeze.

Following questions on specific issues contained within the annexes, the Committee endorsed the recommendations for the budget in the service areas within its remit subject to the following observations being considered by the Executive:

1. The Committee congratulated officers in managing to balance budgets whilst still providing an excellent service to its customers.
2. The Committee questioned why the new HMO license fee remained below average for Surrey authorities and if this was something that could be reviewed with the possibility of being increased in line with others.
3. It was noted that the Farnham Museum was still receiving a substantial grant from the Council despite its transfer last year to the Farnham Maltings. The Committee wanted performance monitored and to see more improvement over the coming years.
4. The Committee raised concerned about any proposals relating to staff vacancies and the affect this could have on staff moral and service delivery. Members felt that this issue should be monitored carefully through the O&S Performance Sub-Committee.
5. It was noted that charges had decreased for computer charges and the Committee questioned why this was the case. Further information would be provided to Members following the meeting.

##### **4.2 General Fund Budget Issues 2013/14 (19<sup>th</sup> November 2012)**

The Committee received an outline of the Executive's proposed approach to be taken to the 2013/14 budget and was reminded of the extent of the likely budget shortfall and the need to achieve savings as indicated within the financial strategy

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** that the following observations be forwarded to the Executive:

1. Two high priority service areas where the Committee would not want to see a reduction in expenditure were day centres and homelessness.
2. The Committee would like to receive an update on Dunsfold Park, the expenditure proposed for this area and report on the work carried out by the Dunsfold Park SIG.
3. The Committee note that officers were currently going through the star chamber process and were identifying savings and efficiencies across the Council. Consequently, it was more about what would happen if money was not put in certain areas rather than where money should be spent. Therefore, now was not the right time for comment on this area until their was more information available.

#### 4.3 General Fund capital Programme 2013/14 (28<sup>th</sup> January 2013)

This report put forward proposals for the draft 2013/14 Capital Programme in respect of the General Fund services. The Committee noted that the proposed Capital Programme amounted to £4,369,200 and included an indicative figure for the works to improve the Herons Leisure Centre at Haslemere. For 2013/14, total external funding was estimated to be £2,433,867 with £1,935,333 to be met from Waverley's own resources. Members noted that the budget proposals included increasing the Contribution to Capital from the Revenue Budget from £2m as planned at the Finance Seminar to £2.6m. This was lower than the current level of £2.87m in 2012/13.

The Committee RESOLVED to endorse the recommendations contained in the report and had no observations for the Executive to consider.

#### 4.4 Waverley Community Partnership – Applications for revenue funding 2013/14 (28<sup>th</sup> January 2013)

The Committee received a report that asked Members to consider the applications to the Waverley Community Partnership for revenue funding in 2013/14, taking into account the observations made by the Community O&S Grants Sub-Committee.

The Committee endorsed the recommendations for Grant funding with the following comments, and those from the Sub Committee, being considered by the Executive:

1. The Committee thanked officers for their work in this process and their early and ongoing consultation with local organisations.
2. It was noted that not all organisations received a 10% reduction in their grants but Age UK Waverley had received a 11.8% cut. Members questioned why this organisation, which provided an excellent service for elderly in the Borough and might be taking on additional service provision, had been singled out and questioned the level of its reduction compared to others. Officers would feedback to Members following the meeting with the reasons behind this recommendation.

**At its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013 the Executive had regard to the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and resolved that the grand levels for each organisation as noted in the annexe to the report were approved.**

## **5. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

### **5.1 Performance Management Report, Quarter 1 (April-June) 2012/13 (27 September 2011)**

The Committee received the Performance Management Report for Quarter 1 and review of performance indicators and targets. The Committee was pleased to see a number of improvements since the last meeting in performance, particularly Godalming and Farnham Museums which was significantly above target for the number of visits it received. Members raised their concerns about the performance of planning enforcement which remained below target. They were aware that officers were working hard to clear a backlog of cases which is why it was difficult to deal with new cases within eight weeks and noted that an action plan was in place to deal with performance. However, members were concerned about staff turnover and continuation of service in this area. The Committee noted the performance report and RESOLVED that the comments from the Performance Sub-Committee and those raised at the meeting noted above be forwarded for consideration by the Executive.

**At its meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 the Executive thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for its comments and recommendations in the report.**

### **5.2 Performance Management Report, Quarter 2 (July-September) 2012/13 (19<sup>th</sup> November 2012)**

The Committee considered the performance figures for Q.2. The Committee noted the performance report and RESOLVED that the comments from the Performance Sub-Committee and those raised at the meeting noted below be forwarded for consideration by the Executive:

1. The Committee was pleased to see a number of improvements since the last meeting in performance, The Committee noted the quarter 2 performance statistics and endorsed the comments of the Community Sub-Committee to be put forward to the Executive at its next meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2012.
2. There was some concern from Members about the management of the Edge and its current performance and requested that this be looked into and an update be brought back to the next meeting on this issue.
3. The Committee asked for more details surrounding information contained in the Planning Enforcement Action Plan about Dunsfold Park.

## **6. APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES**

Appointment of a Performance Management Sub-Committee (17<sup>th</sup> June 2012)  
Councillors Jim Edwards, Jenny Else, Denis Leigh, Diane James, Nick Williams and Andrew Wilson

Tenant Panel Representatives:  
Mrs Samantha Johnson and Mrs Jane Rawlings

Appointment of Community O&S Grants Sub-Committee (19<sup>th</sup> November 2012)

Councillors Andrew Wilson, Jenny Else, Nicholas Holder and Jim Edwards.

## 7. **CALL-IN**

### 7.1 Weyhill Car Park, Haslemere (7<sup>th</sup> August 2012)

At its meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2012 the Executive considered a report on an approach for the future refurbishment of Weyhill Car Park in Haslemere. The Executive agreed that:

“to authorise the preparation and submission of a fresh application for common land consent for the refurbishment of Weyhill Car Park under Section 38 of the Commons Act 2006”.

Following the Executive meeting, four members of the Community Overview & Scrutiny Committee – Councillors Jim Edwards, Denis Leigh, Nicholas Holder and Andrew Wilson – had asked that the Committee scrutinise the decision.

The Committee agreed to recommend to the Executive that it should carry out a full and in-depth consultation with local traders, residents and the Town Council. The Committee asked the Executive to reconsider the length of time allocated for consultation, proposing that the initial consultation be set at a reasonable amount of time of 6 weeks, before moving onto the second stage.

Furthermore, the Committee made the following observations to the Executive for consideration:

1. The Committee was concerned about the implications of the proposals on the traders in Weyhill.
2. The Committee asked that it be kept informed about progress with this issue and be consulted before future reports are received by the Executive.
3. There was concern about the future management and design of the site when it was refurbished and the allocation of short and long stay spaces.
4. The Committee would like to have sight of the business case for the proposals, which were approved by Council in December 2011, to gain a greater understanding of its future benefits to the local area.
5. The Committee noted that charges were not yet settled but would be inline with other car parks in the local area. Members requested that they be kept informed of future proposals for charging on this site.
6. The Committee would like the Executive to consider a comprehensive solution to parking for the whole of Haslemere, not just on this site.
7. The Committee would like the Executive to look again at a solution for the barrier at entrance to the car park and, noting the potential costs, look, as soon as possible, if there is any other way to control this temporarily.

**At its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> September 2012 the Executive resolved that the Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee was thanked for its comments on the report; and the recommendation from the Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee that a six week pre-application consultation with local traders, residents and the**

**Town Council should be carried before moving on to the second stage was agreed.**

**8. OFFICER PRESENTATIONS**

8.1 *Presentation from the Surrey Fire Service (17<sup>th</sup> June 2012)*

The Committee received a presentation from Surrey Fire Service. The presentation outlined changes to the internal management structure following a review in 2011 which also reduced area command units from three to two, East and West covering different areas in the County but positioned where they were most needed.

8.2 *Olympic Torch Relay (17<sup>th</sup> June 2012)*

The Committee received a presentation from the Head of Leisure, Kelvin Mills and the Safety & Emergency Planning Adviser, Aaron Carter, about the Olympic Torch Relay, which would be coming through Godalming Town Centre on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2012. The Council was working with Sport Godalming and Godalming Town Council to celebrate the event and there would be an afternoon of sport and fun on The Burys Field starting from 1pm and the Rock Choir in the evening. Over 150 volunteers had been recruited to steward the route and officers had circulated leaflets to local residents and businesses who would be affected by the relay about the arrangements on the day.