

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 21st July 2022 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Wren (Chair), Botten (Vice-Chair), Allen, Bilton, B.Black, G.Black, Blackwell, Bloore, Booth, Caulcott, Chotai, Crane, C.Farr, S.Farr, Flower, Gaffney, Gillman, Gray, Groves, Hammond, Jones, Langton, Lee, Lockwood, Mansfield, Montgomery, Moore, North, O'Driscoll, Prew, Pursehouse, Robinson, Sayer, Shiner, Stamp, Steeds, Swann, C.White and N.White

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Cooper, Evans and Pinard

84. MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING ON THE 26TH MAY 2022

These minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

85. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) Ex-Councillor Richard Allen

The Chair was sorry to announce that Richard Allen, a former well-known Warlingham Councillor, had passed away recently. He served from 1998 to 2008, representing the Warlingham West Ward and was Deputy Leader from 2004. Members stood in silence as a mark of respect.

(ii) Karen Hughes (Surrey Police / Borough Commander for Tandridge)

The Chair confirmed that Karen Hughes would be leaving her current post to take up a new position within the police service. On behalf of the Council, the Chair thanked Karen for her dedicated service to Tandridge and wished her well in her future role. The Chair also looked forward to working with Inspector Lyndsey Whatley who would be succeeding Karen as the Borough Commander for Tandridge.

(iii) Fundraising

The Chair appealed to Councillors to support her 'family fun sports day' at Holland Sports Club on Sunday, 11th September from 12.30pm. She also referred to other fundraising events being planned for later in the year, further details of which would be advised in due course:

- open mic night on 9th October 2022
- murder mystery evening in November 2022
- quiz night in February 2023
- charity ball in March 2023
- sponsored walk
- 'pay to watch' on-line fitness workouts

(iv) Variation to the order of business and proposal to exclude the press and public for additional items

The Chair advised that the Standing Order 30 questions submitted by Councillor Cooper (Minute 89 refers) would be dealt with immediately after the reception of the 26th May Standards Committee minutes. This would be followed by the consideration of the minutes of the 7th June Standards Committee.

The Chair also advised that the Council would be asked to vote on a proposal to exclude the press and public from consideration of the following items:

- Councillor Cooper's Standing Order 30 questions; and
- the 7th June Standards Committee minutes.

86. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jones declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in connection with Minute 18 of the Planning Committee minutes of the 9th June 2022 (2021/1800 – New Aldi Supermarket, 381 Croydon Road, Caterham).

87. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 30 BY COUNCILLOR O'DRISCOLL

Two questions had been submitted by Councillor O'Driscoll, the details of which are attached at Appendix A, together with the responses from Councillor Sayer and the Chair respectively.

88. MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PRESS AND PUBLIC FOR MINUTES 89 AND 90

The Chair, seconded by Councillor Botten, proposed a motion to exclude the press and public for both the Standing Order 30 questions submitted by Councillor Cooper (Minute 89 refers) and consideration of the 7th June Standards Committee minutes (Minute 90 refers).

In accordance with Standing Order 13(4), Councillor Groves requested a recorded vote on this matter. This was supported by the requisite number of Councillors. The result of the recorded vote was:

For:

Councillors Bilton, B.Black, Blackwell, Booth, Botten, Caulcott, Chotai, Crane, C.Farr, S.Farr, Gaffney, Gillman, Gray, Jones, Langton, Lockwood, Mansfield, Montgomery, Moore, Pursehouse, Robinson, Sayer, Shiner, Stamp, Swann, C.White, N.White and Wren (28)

Against:

Councillors Allen, G.Black, Bloore, Flower, Groves, Hammond, North, Prew and Steeds (9)

Abstain:

Councillors Lee and O'Driscoll (2)

RESOLVED – that, in addition to agenda item 9, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of:

- (a) the Standing Order 30 questions submitted by Councillor Cooper under agenda item 4(ii); and
 - (b) the minutes of the 7th June Standards Committee meeting under agenda item 5.1
- ... in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that:
- (i) the items involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 (information relating to an individual) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act; and
 - (ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

89. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 30 BY COUNCILLOR COOPER

Three questions had been submitted by Councillor Cooper. These were dealt with following the exclusion of the press and public arising from the resolution in Minute 88.

The questions were read out by the Committee Clerk in Councillor Cooper's absence. Councillor N.White responded to each question.

90. REPORT OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE - 7TH JUNE 2022

This item was dealt with following the exclusion of the press and public arising from the resolution in Minute 88.

RESOLVED – that the report of the Standards Committee meeting held on the 7th June 2022 be received.

91. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES

RESOLVED – that the reports of the following meetings be received, and the recommendations therein, be adopted:

Standards Committee – 26th May 2022

Planning Committee - 26th May and 9th June 2022

Community Services Committee - 26th May and 16th June 2022

Housing Committee – 26th May and 21st June 2022

Planning Policy Committee - 26th May and 23rd June 2022

Strategy & Resources Committee – 26th May and 30th June 2022

Councillor Allen, seconded by Councillor Moore, proposed the following amendment to the recommendation in Minute 66 (30th June meeting) regarding the Council's election cycle:

“ that the current scheme of elections by thirds be retained the alternative option of changing the election cycle to ‘whole Council elections every four years from 2024’ be supported and an extraordinary meeting of the Council be arranged to provide an opportunity for such a change to be ratified in accordance with the requirements of the relevant legislation.

Upon being put to the vote, this amendment was lost.

Audit & Scrutiny Committee - 26th May and 5th July 2022

Planning Committee - 7th July 2022

92. TRANSPORT FOR LONDON'S CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS TO EXPAND THE ULTRA LOW EMISSION ZONE (ULEZ)

This item had been added to the Council summons in accordance with Standing Order 6(1)(m) following a request from the Chair. Transport for London (TfL) was seeking views on the merits of expanding the ULEZ from 29th August 2023. The key aspects of TfL's proposals were:

- the expanded zone would cover the same area as the Low Emission Zone
- drivers of vehicles that don't meet the ULEZ standards would need to pay a £12.50 daily ULEZ charge to drive within the expanded zone (ULEZ is enforced based on declared emissions from a vehicle rather than age – however, for example, cars that meet the ULEZ standards are, generally speaking:
 - petrol cars first registered with the DVLA after 2005 (although cars that meet the standards have been available since 2001)
 - diesel cars first registered with the DVLA after September 2015

This would, for example, affect Tandridge residents when driving vehicles which don't meet the ULEZ standards into the Croydon or Bromley Council areas.

TfL's website stated, *“these proposals are part of the commitment by the Mayor of London and TfL to help improve air quality and public health, tackle the climate emergency and reduce traffic congestion across Greater London”*.

The objective of the agenda item was for a response to be agreed and sent to TfL before the 29th July deadline.

A proposed consultation response was moved by Councillor Sayer and seconded by Councillor Farr. During the debate, Members expressed support for the proposed response, although some minor amendments were suggested.

Councillor Prew, seconded by Councillor Bloore, proposed an amendment to:

- delete the following sentence:

“Failing that, we request that consideration is given to making an exemption for vehicles that are registered in adjoining authorities.”; and

- replace it with the following sentence:

“Any other decision transgresses and runs counter to the will and interests of Tandridge residents”.

Upon being put to the vote, this amendment was lost.

RESOLVED – that, subject to:

- (i) the essence of the following sentence being inserted elsewhere so as not to appear as the final text before the ‘Example given by another Councillor’:

“Failing that, we request that consideration is given to making an exemption for vehicles that are registered in adjoining authorities.”; and

- (ii) the addition of a sentence requesting a meeting with TfL (to discuss the proposals before any decision is made)

the proposed response, as tabled at the meeting, be agreed. (The actual response, incorporating the edits referred to at (i) and (ii) above, is attached at Appendix B).

93. CONFIDENTIAL STAFFING MATTER

The Council resolved to consider this matter following the exclusion of the press and public in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that:

- (i) the item involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 (information relating to an individual) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act; and
- (ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

RESOLVED – that the matter be referred to the Strategy & Resources Committee in light of additional information, to be provided by officers, to assist with its deliberations.

Rising 10.31 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL – 21ST JULY 2022 – SO 30 QUESTIONS

Questions from Councillor O’Driscoll

Question 1 – to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Sayer)

As other Councillors may be aware, this week is anti-social behaviour awareness week. Westway residents have been affected by anti-social behaviour from youths in recent months with this behaviour primarily taking place in The Village and in Hambledon Linear Park. While the introduction of the Dispersal Order in Westway has had positive effects, will the Leader of the Council work with me and Westway residents to tackle anti-social behaviour?

Response from Cllr Sayer

Yes, I would be more than happy to try to tackle anti-social behaviour wherever it occurs in our District. As you probably know, we had Dispersal Orders issued last year for my own area of Oxted and anti-social behaviour is a widespread problem.

It is a good idea, I’ve found, for District Councillors to liaise closely with the local beat officers for their Wards so that prompt action can be taken when a problem flares up - and also to liaise with their Parish Councils, perhaps with a view to funding the installation of CCTV, which is something I am aiming to have brought in soon in Oxted and Hurst Green.

I would strongly urge councillors to encourage residents to report incidents so that the police have the information about where anti-social behaviour is occurring and can direct officers to where their presence is needed most. The police rely heavily on intelligence gathered through our communities and this enables them to react accordingly.

The issues with youths visiting and congregating in the area tends to be seasonal. School holidays, weekends and, of course, the weather can play a part.

Partnership work is continuing between the Council’s Community Safety Specialist and Surrey Police to address the problem.

Surrey Police have been working with local schools to investigate which schools the youths attend and where they live. This has prompted home visits and discussion with the schools.

I also understand that the Design Out Crime Officer has been conducting what’s called an Environmental Visual Assessment. The purpose of this is to review the area and make recommendations to reduce the impact or eliminate the issues arising from youths gathering there.

You’ll know that this is anti-social behaviour awareness week and, on Monday, Surrey Police were at Tesco in Caterham, with the aim of increasing awareness and engaging with residents to discuss anti-social behaviour locally.

One of the priorities for the Council’s Health & Wellbeing Board is to look at youth activities and the benefits of being active, which could help with reducing anti-social behaviour. The Board is meeting next week to discuss youth provision.

Question 2 – to the Chair of the Community Services Committee (Councillor Wren)

Residents have been in touch about a lack of recreation facilities in Tandridge, with no running tracks, few purpose-built football pitches and not many swimming pools and leisure facilities across the District. As we should be aiming to get our residents healthier or keeping fit, I feel we should be investing in these facilities. What steps are this Council taking to invest in leisure facilities such as those I have outlined for our residents?

Response from Cllr Wren

“Tandridge District Council has a variety of recreational facilities. The Holland Sports & Social Association running track is well used and, of course, is a great community developed asset. Also, we do have public swimming facilities at de Stafford School and the Tandridge Leisure Centre as well as the Village Health Club. We have free outdoor gym equipment at Queen’s Park, Whyteleafe Rec and at Holland Sports. I’ve been speaking to groups of trainers in the area who now give their time up to provide free fitness / health & wellbeing classes using Council-owned sites and facilities. I’m happy to work with you to encourage trainers to do this in your Ward.

We always seek to improve and add to our facilities and, through the planning application process, the Council currently seeks provision of on-site or off-site contributions for improvements to informal open spaces, land, play facilities, and recreational equipment on housing sites through the CIL process and planning obligations. For example, Councillor Sayer and I have been working with a local school regarding a planning application to improve its swimming pool. As part of the emerging Local Plan process, the Tandridge Open Space, Sports & Recreational Facilities Assessment was commissioned in 2017 to understand the needs and opportunities for indoor sports and leisure facilities in the District. Page 45 of that document includes strategic recommendations for existing venues in the District which could be protected and enhanced. Further detailed work is needed to progress this in line with the financial implications for the Council. The Council also adopted an Open Space Strategy in 2021 which sets out how we will manage and improve open spaces across the District until 2025. The strategy includes an action plan by parish, with a list of potential funding sources (both internally and externally) which are being explored.

The Council has quarterly meetings with Freedom Leisure who operate the District’s leisure centres. The pandemic was challenging for Freedom and we are working with them, including helping with communications and marketing and with referrals from the Wellbeing Prescription Service. That service is an extremely important part of what we do, covering everything from weight management and increasing physical activities, to ways to combat loneliness and offering financial advice. This is a free service which people can self-refer to.

We also have a local Health & Wellbeing Board, chaired by Councillor Swann. The Board is co-ordinating some excellent initiatives which I’ve been reading about. Councillor Swann provides regular updates on the things we’re doing across the District to help improve residents’ health & wellbeing. I couldn’t attend the recent Surrey Youth Games, but we always have a lot of youngsters from Tandridge competing and we were extremely successful this year.

We will carry on supporting leisure and wellbeing initiatives and there maybe things you’re not aware of that I’d be happy to talk to you about.”

APPENDIX B**APPENDIX B**

Agreed response from the Leader of the Council to TfL's consultation regarding the expansion of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ)

Tandridge District Council strongly objects to the proposal to expand the ULEZ zone to the Greater London boundary because of the intolerable financial burden it will place on Tandridge families and on Tandridge businesses, particularly at a time when they are struggling to cope with large cost of living increases and to recover from COVID. Please see example from one of our other Councillors below.

Many residents of Tandridge District, and especially those in the northern areas, access jobs, schools, health services, shops and leisure facilities in the Croydon and Bromley Borough Council areas and/or have family, friends and businesses just across the border. All these people face punitive charges to carry out essential tasks of their everyday lives.

Residents of Tandridge depend on cars and vans for their livelihoods. The District is poorly provided with both public transport and employment opportunities with many residents travelling out of the area to London Boroughs to work. Census data shows that 65% of those travelling out of the District to work, travel by car. They have no option and we believe it is unfair to penalise them for that.

For those on minimum wage, such as carers working across the border, these charges are unsupportable, and it is unrealistic and unreasonable to expect them to be able to spend thousands of pounds upgrading their car.

This Council notes that the London Mayor's request to central government to help to fund scrappage schemes for old cars owned by Londoners means that Tandridge District taxpayers would subsidise new cars for Londoners whilst getting no support themselves. That is clearly unfair and, if there is to be any such scrappage scheme, it should include bordering Councils. We ask that consideration is given to making an exemption for vehicles that are registered in adjoining authorities.

It is stated that the reason for the expansion of the ULEZ is to clean up London's air but we fear that high emission vehicles will make detours into Tandridge District to avoid the charges, leading to more air pollution within our District.

If this proposal is accepted, it will have major detrimental effects for neighbouring authorities such as ours and so we respectfully call on TfL and the Mayor of London to think again and to scrap the idea.

We would like to request a meeting with TfL to discuss the proposals before any decision is made.

Continued

Example given by another Tandridge Councillor:

“My son-in-law lives in Hurst Green, Oxted and is a firefighter and works at the Croydon Fire Station. He works 4-day shifts, 2 days and 2 nights. In addition, he does window cleaning in Sutton approximately 2 days a month. As we all know, firefighters aren’t paid a lot, hence many have second jobs. Here’s how it would be with the proposed ULEZ charge:

<i>8 day shifts a month</i>	<i>£100</i>
<i>8 night shifts a month</i>	<i>£200</i>
<i>2 window cleaning days</i>	<i>£25</i>

Total £325 a month, £3,900 a year. To pay for this, his salary would need to increase by at least £5,000 a year.

While I appreciate the need to reduce emissions, how is a normal family expected to survive with 10% plus inflation, massive increases in utility bills and a punitive tax for going to work?”