## Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee 2021/22 - work programme

Part 1 of 4: Recommendations made

#	Agenda Item	Recommendation	Made to	Agreed?	Details
21.12.13	LPP2	Consider developing an	Executive, at the time	Noted	Noted by Executive
- 5.1		equestrian policy to protect the	of the review of the		14/12/21
		unique quality of Waverley's	Local Plan		
		rural settlements.			
21.12.13	LPP2	Have due regard to the	Executive and Full	Noted	Please note the
- 5.2		questions a-k when debating	Council, December 14 <sup>th</sup>		attached document
		the recommendations in	2021		setting out in greater
		section 2 of the report:			detail the Executive
		a) Whether an appropriate			responses to
		assessment is required in order			questions a-k
		to comply with habitats			
		regulations?			
		b) Whether the likelihood that			
		future development at Royal			
		School will exceed the footprint			
		of existing buildings and hard			
		surfaces at the site would			
		threaten the setting of the			
		neighbouring countryside?			
		c) Whether the Red Court site			
		being nearer the settlement			
		boundary and being more			
		walkable from Haslemere			
		makes it a more appropriate			
		site than the Royal School? Do			

these factors impinge on Waverley's commitment to sustainability? d) Whether the Executive and the Full Council can have confidence that the Royal School (including its playing fields) will be able to relocate to the Farnham Road and make the site available within the plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitgate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	
sustainability? d) Whether the Executive and the Full Council can have confidence that the Royal School (including its playing fields) will be able to relocate to the Farnham Road and make the site available within the plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether et requirement identified by Acon Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	
d) Whether the Executive and the Full Council can have confidence that the Royal School (including its playing fields) will be able to relocate to the Farnham Road and make the site available within the plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	
the Full Council can have confidence that the Royal School (including its playing fields) will be able to relocate to the Farnham Road and make the site available within the plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	
confidence that the RoyalSchool (including its playing fields) will be able to relocate to the Farnham Road and make the site available within the plan period?e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might limpact on its deliverability?f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact on identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact on development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	d) Whether the Executive and
School (including its playing         fields) will be able to relocate         to the Farnham Road and make         the site available within the         plan period?         e) Whether the cost of         providing sewage infrastructure         at the Royal School raises         viability concerns which might         impact on its deliverability?         f) Whether the Council has a         duty to co-operate with East         Hampshire District and         Grayshott Parish Councils         regarding the Royal School and         Red Court sites should be         treated as brownfield and/or         previously developed sites?         h) Whether the requirement         identified by Acorn Consultants         to provide a SANG to mitigate         the impact of development at         the Royal School adversely	the Full Council can have
fields) will be able to relocate to the Farnham Road and make the site available within the plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adueseloped impacts the deliverability of	confidence that the Royal
to the Farnham Road and make the site available within the plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	School (including its playing
the site available within the plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	fields) will be able to relocate
plan period? e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	to the Farnham Road and make
e) Whether the cost of providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	the site available within the
providing sewage infrastructure at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	plan period?
at the Royal School raises viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	e) Whether the cost of
viability concerns which might impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	providing sewage infrastructure
impact on its deliverability? f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	at the Royal School raises
f) Whether the Council has a duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	viability concerns which might
duty to co-operate with East Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	impact on its deliverability?
Hampshire District and Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	f) Whether the Council has a
Grayshott Parish Councils regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	duty to co-operate with East
regarding the Royal School site? g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	Hampshire District and
g) Whether either, both or neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	Grayshott Parish Councils
neither the Royal School and Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	regarding the Royal School site?
Red Court sites should be treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	g) Whether either, both or
treated as brownfield and/or previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	neither the Royal School and
previously developed sites? h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	Red Court sites should be
h) Whether the requirement identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	treated as brownfield and/or
identified by Acorn Consultants to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	previously developed sites?
to provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	h) Whether the requirement
the impact of development at the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	identified by Acorn Consultants
the Royal School adversely impacts the deliverability of	to provide a SANG to mitigate
impacts the deliverability of	the impact of development at
	the Royal School adversely
	impacts the deliverability of
that site?	that site?

		<ul> <li>i) Whether screening is an adequate response to the potential loss of green space on the Royal School site?</li> <li>j) Whether allocating the Royal School sets an unwelcome precedent about building in AONB?</li> <li>k) Whether a given course of action will delay adoption of LPP2 as a whole and, therefore, reduce the Council's control over development within the Borough?</li> </ul>			
21.11.24 - 9.1	Cranleigh Leisure Centre New Build	The Committee supports the four recommendations outlined in para 2.1 – 2.4 of the covering report	Executive, 30 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	Agreed	On 30/11/21, the Executive endorsed these recommendations going forward to Full Council
21.11.24 - 9.2	Cranleigh Leisure Centre New Build	The portfolio holder and officers arrange one or more informal briefings for all councillors ahead of the Council meeting on 14 December, to allow time for the proposals to be considered in detail, and clarification provided where required, before councillors make a decision at Council.	Executive, 30 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	Agreed	Briefing held on 3 <sup>rd</sup> December
21.11.24 - 10	Tree and Woodland Policy	The Executive consider the following comments from individual committee members:	Executive	Pending	Decision due February 2022

		<ul> <li>a. would like to see the chapter on Biodiversity strengthened considerably from an ecological perspective,</li> <li>b. more emphasis on natural regeneration,</li> <li>and more consideration as to how this policy can support and work alongside Waverley's planning policies on trees,</li> <li>woodland and biodiversity.</li> </ul>			
21.11.24	First Homes Approach Policy	The Committee endorses the Policy but understands that it is	Executive, 30 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	Agreed	Executive meeting on 30/11/21 agreed the
**	1 oney	likely to have limited impact on			recommendations
		the supply of affordable homes			endorsed by this
		in Waverley.			Committee
21.11.03	Dunsfold Park SPD	That the Executive proceed to	Executive, 9 <sup>th</sup>	Agreed	Resolution passed.
- 6.1	(03/11/2021)	consultation, subject to the	November 2021		Response to
		giving consideration to			individual comments
		observations and suggestions			circulated on the 19 <sup>th</sup>
		from individual committee			November 2021.
		members.			

#	Agenda Item	Resolution	Status	Actioned to	Timescale	Details of current status
21.12.13 - 5.1	LPP2	Provide an estimate of what proportion of the Royal School site is currently covered by buildings and hard standing.	Completed	The Head of Planning and Economic Development	14 <sup>th</sup> December 2021	As per the Head of Planning and Economic Development at the 14 <sup>th</sup> December, <i>16%</i> of this site is currently buildings or hard standing.
21.12.13 – 5.2	LPP2	Confirm whether, in light of Mr Baudry's question, Haslemere Town Council are content with the characterisation of their views in the report.	Superseded	The Head of Planning and Economic Development	14 <sup>th</sup> December 2021	The Planning Team contacted Haslemere Town Council but did not receive a response in time for Executive and Full Council on 14 <sup>th</sup> December 2021.
21.11.24 - 1.1	Minutes	Follow-up to be provided Continentals activities during No Mow May	Pending	Kelvin Mills	January 2022	Response appended to the minutes
21.11.24 – 1.2	Minutes	Follow-up to be provided on rural crime	Pending	Katie Webb	January 2022	

21.11.24 – 6	Committee	A briefing on	Pending	Zac Elwood	January 2022	
	Forward Work	planning				
	Programme	enforcement to				
		be provided to				
		the Committee				
		ahead of this item				
		being brought to				
		the main				
		committee				

## Part 3 of 4: Upcoming items

#	Title	Purpose for scrutiny	Leader Member/Officer	Date for O&S consideration	Date for Executive decision (if applicable)
R1	Asset Management	Receive a verbal update on the progress of implementing this strategy.	Peter David	Standing	N/A
R2	Housing Development Update	To receive an update on the current council housing developments.	Louisa Blundell	Standing	N/A
1	Asset Management strategy	Review the new strategy	Peter David	March 2022	TBD
2	Climate Change and Sustainability SPD	Review the Supplementary Planning Document	Zac Elwood	March 2022	TBD
3	Corporate Performance Report Q.3 2021/22	To scrutinise the performance of the areas and KPIs within the Committee's remit	Heads of Service / Nora Copping	March 2022	N/A
4	Farnham Museum - service	Receive the results of the consultation	Kelvin Mills / Charlotte Hall	March 2022	ТВС
5	Housing Allocations Task and Finish Group – Final Report	Review the final report of the Task and Finish Group and decide which recommendations to adopt	Cllr George Wilson / Michael Rivers / Mark Mills	March 2022	June 2022
6	Housing Associations (HAs)	To follow the September 2019 information session, the Committee may wish to invite a representative from a major housing association within the borough to present to the Committee.	Andrew Smith	March 2022	N/A
7	Implications of the Environment Bill	Assess how this legislation might impact Waverley	Richard Homewood	March 2022	N/A
8	Leisure Services Contract	Review an assessment of management options for the Leisure Service	Kelvin Mills / Tamsin McLeod	March 2022	ТВС
9	Local Planning Enforcement Plan update	Review proposed updates to the plan	Zac Elwood	March 2022	TBD

10	Maintenance contract procurement	Review the results of a procurement exercise	Hugh Wagstaff	March 2022	ТВС
11	Project Closure Report on Housing Responsive Repairs and Voids contract procurement.	To review report following former committee's task and finish group on procurement project to ensure all recommendations completed.	Hugh Wagstaff	March 2022	December 2022
12	Safer Waverley Partnership 2022-23	Review and scrutinise the activities of crime and disorder partnerships and the activities of its partners. This fulfils the requirements of s.19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006.	Andrew Smith / Katie Webb	March 2022	N/A
13	Suicide Prevention Action Plan update	Update on the implementation of the plan	Louise Norie	March 2022	N/A
14	ASB PSPO update	To receive an update on the impact of the PSPO in Godalming.	Richard Homewood	June 2022	N/A
15	Cranleigh Leisure Centre new build update	Update on the progress of this project	Kelvin Mills / Tamsin McLeod	June 2022	ТВС
16	Planning Improvement Plan	To review the plan	Zac Elwood	TBD	TBD

Subject	Objective	Key issues	Chair	Lead officer	Status	Progress	Target Completion Date
Housing allocations policy	The objective of the review is to confirm that the allocation scheme: • is fit for purpose and delivering fair, transparent and efficient access to social housing • reflects current statutory and regulatory requirements, and • reflects local housing need and affordability, and • is managed by team with sufficient resources to administer it effectively	<ul> <li>Does the scheme meet statutory and regulatory requirements?</li> <li>Who has been successful in accessing social housing?</li> <li>Do stakeholders understand the scheme?</li> <li>Does the scheme reflect local housing need?</li> </ul>	Cllr George Wilson, Cllr Michaela Wicks (vice- chair)	Michael Rivers / Mark Mills	In progress	First meeting took place November 4 <sup>th</sup>	March 2022

Part 4 of 4: Task and Finish groups