



Surrey Heath Borough Council
Surrey Heath House
Knoll Road
Camberley
Surrey GU15 3HD
Telephone: (01276) 707100
Facsimile: (01276) 707177
DX: 32722 Camberley
Web Site: www.surreyheath.gov.uk

Division: Transformation
Please ask for: Rachel Whillis
Direct Tel: 01276 707319
E-Mail: democratic.services@surreyheath.gov.uk

Friday, 26 June 2015

To: The Members of the **EXECUTIVE**
(Councillors: Moira Gibson (Chairman), Richard Brooks, Mrs Vivienne Chapman,
Colin Dougan, Craig Fennell, Josephine Hawkins and Charlotte Morley)

Dear Councillor,

A meeting of the **EXECUTIVE** will be held at Surrey Heath House on Tuesday, 7 July 2015
at 6.00 pm. The agenda will be set out as below.

Please note that this meeting will be recorded.

Yours sincerely

Karen Whelan

Chief Executive

AGENDA

Pages

Part 1 (Public)

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Minutes

3 - 10

To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2015 (copy attached).

3. Declarations of Interest

Members are invited to declare any interests they may have with respect to matters which are to be considered at this meeting. Members who consider they may have an interest are invited to consult the Monitoring Officer or the Democratic Services Officer prior to the meeting.

4. Questions by Members

The Leader and Portfolio Holders to receive and respond to questions from Members on any matter which relates to an Executive function in accordance with Part 4 of the Constitution, Section B Executive

Procedure Rules, Paragraph 16.

- | | | |
|-----------|---|----------------|
| 5. | Requests for Carry Forward of Unspent Budget from 2014/15 to 2015/16 | 11 - 18 |
| 6. | Response to the Issues and Options Stage Consultation of the Rushmoor Local Plan | 19 - 32 |

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 16 June
2015**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

+ Cllr Richard Brooks	Cllr Craig Fennell
- Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr David Allen, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Paul Innicki, Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Chris Pitt and Cllr Valerie White

6/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

7/E Appointment of Executive Working Groups

RESOLVED

- (i) **to establish the following Executive Working Groups for the Municipal Year 2015/16 as indicated below;**

<u>Group</u>	<u>No of Seats and Allocation to Political Group</u>	<u>Members</u>
Camberley Theatre and the Arena Leisure Centre Working Group	7 6 – Conservative Group 1 – Others Group	Cllr Ian Cullen Cllr Craig Fennell Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans Cllr Edward Hawkins Cllr Ian Sams Cllr Pat Tedder Cllr Valerie White <u>Substitutes</u> Cllr Victoria Wheeler
Camberley Town Centre Future Management Working Group	7 6 – Conservative Group 1 – Others Group	Cllr Rodney Bates Cllr Richard Brooks Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman Cllr Colin Dougan Cllr Edward Hawkins Cllr Jonathan Lytle Cllr Max Nelson <u>Substitutes</u> Cllr Ruth Hutchinson
Digital Services Working Group	7 6 – Conservative Group 1 – Others Group	Cllr Dan Adams Cllr David Allen Cllr Paul Deach Cllr Colin Dougan Cllr Jonathan Lytle Cllr Victoria Wheeler Cllr Valerie White <u>Substitutes</u> Cllr Rodney Bates
Equality Working Group	7 6 – Conservative Group 1 – Others Group	Cllr Bill Chapman Cllr Josephine Hawkins Cllr Ruth Hutchinson Cllr Paul Ilnicki Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper Cllr Ian Sams Cllr Valerie White <u>Substitutes</u> Cllr Pat Tedder

(ii) that the Conservative Group substitutes be reported to a future meeting; and

- (iii) to endorse the Terms of Reference of the Working Groups, as set out at Annex A to the Agenda Report.

8/E Appointment of Members to Outside Bodies 2015/16

The Executive considered a list of outside bodies in respect of which the Council had been invited to appoint representatives for the 2015/16 municipal year, together with the Group Leaders' nominations to these positions.

In addition to the Outside Bodies the Council had appointed representatives to in 2014/15, it was agreed to appoint Members to Collectively Camberley Ltd, the Community Noise Forum, and Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

RESOLVED that the representatives shown be appointed for the 2015/16 municipal year to serve on the bodies as set out below:

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>2015/16 appointments</u>
Accent Group - Local Customer Services Committee	Cllr Colin Dougan
Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee	Cllr David Lewis Cllr Nick Chambers (sub)
Blackwater Valley Advisory Committee for Public Transport	Cllr Paul Ilnicki Cllr Valerie White Cllr Chris Pitt (sub)
Blackwater Valley Joint Local Authorities Group	Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman (sub)
Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership	Cllr David Lewis Cllr Wynne Price
Briars Centre Management Committee	Cllr John Winterton
Camberley Town Football Club – Observer	Cllr Valerie White
Chobham Common Liaison Group	Cllr Pat Tedder Cllr Victoria Wheeler
Citizens Advice Bureau Management Committee	Cllr Robin Perry
Collectively Camberley Ltd	Cllr Richard Brooks
Community Noise Forum	Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans Cllr Conrad Sturt
Deepcut Village Association	Cllr Paul Deach
Fairoaks Airport Consultative Committee	Cllr Pat Tedder

Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee	Cllr Josephine Hawkins Cllr Robin Perry (sub)
Frimley Community Centre Management Committee	Cllr Bruce Mansell
Frimley Fuel Allotments Charity(4 year appointments)	Cllr Paul Deach Cllr Edward Hawkins Cllr Paul Ilnicki Cllr Bruce Mansell
Heatherside Community Centre Council	Cllr Paul Ilnicki Cllr Jonathan Lytle (sub)
Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee	Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Charlotte Morley (sub)
Henry Smith Charity (4 year appointments)	Cllr Chris Pitt
Joint Waste Collection Services Committee	Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman Cllr Valerie White (sub)
Local Government Association - General Assembly	Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Richard Brooks (sub)
Miss Gomms Trust (4 year appointments)	Cllr Nick Chambers
Mytchett Community Association General Committee	Cllr Craig Fennell
Parking and Traffic Regulation outside London Adjudication Joint Committee (4 year appointments)	Cllr Craig Fennell Cllr Paul Deach (sub)
RELATE North East Hants and Borders	Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper
South East Employers	Cllr Josephine Hawkins Cllr Chris Pitt (sub)
South East England Councils	Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Richard Brooks (sub)
Surrey Climate Change Partnership Member Group	Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman
Surrey County Playing Fields Association	Cllr Pat Tedder/ Cllr Victoria Wheeler

Surrey Heath Age Concern	Cllr Ruth Hutchinson
Surrey Heath Arts Council	Cllr Ian Cullen Cllr Edward Hawkins Cllr Ian Sams
Surrey Heath Duke of Edinburgh Award Committee	Cllr Jonathan Lytle
Surrey Heath Local Area Committee	Cllr Rodney Bates Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman Cllr Josephine Hawkins Cllr Paul Ilnicki Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans Cllr Valerie White Cllr Alan McClafferty (sub) Cllr Robin Perry (sub)
Surrey Heath Partnership	Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman
Surrey Heath Sports Council	Cllr Craig Fennell Cllr Charlotte Morley Cllr Max Nelson Cllr Victoria Wheeler
Surrey Heath Youth Focus	Cllr Paul Deach Cllr Ruth Hutchinson
Surrey Leaders Group	Cllr Moira Gibson
Surrey Waste Partnership	Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman
Voluntary Support North Surrey	Cllr Darryl Ratiram Cllr Paul Deach

9/E Highways Bids to the Local Enterprise Partnership

In March 2014 the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) had submitted a series of bids for infrastructure improvements which had been prepared by the counties and districts across the area. The schemes for improvements to the A331/A30 (Meadows Gyratory) and London Road (A30) at Camberley Town Centre had been approved and were now moving forward to design and implementation stage.

Members were reminded that the Department of Communities and Local Government Funding required a proportion of funding to be provided by local partners. The Executive, at its meeting on 2 December 2014, had agreed in principle local contributions funding for the 2 highway bid schemes. Contributions were now being sought for a total contribution from this Council of £1,625,000 toward these schemes.

Developer contributions would be sought to fund those schemes but to enable the works to proceed quickly, initially all of the funding would have to come from the Council. There was a risk that future developer contributions would not meet the whole cost of these works.

Members were advised that borrowing was not permitted to fund this expenditure and the funding would therefore need to come from the Council's reserves.

It was noted that, in respect of the London Road (A30) scheme, Members had previously been asked to agree the funding in principle on the basis that the local contribution would be sought, in its entirety, through developer funding associated with the redevelopment scheme for the London Road block; in the event of funding being insufficient, the Council would be asked to consider whether to fund a local contribution. However, the LEP funding for this scheme had come forward earlier than expected and as a result there was no scheme within the town centre from which developer contributions could be sought at that time.

RECOMMENDED that

- (i) local contributions funding of up to £1,625,000 be agreed for the following highway bid schemes:**
 - A30/A331 (Meadows Gyratory) in 2015/16 – 2016/17**
 - London Road (A30) Camberley Town Centre Highway Improvements in 2016/17 – 2017/18**
- (ii) contributions be phased over 2015/16 and 2016/17, with payment to be made upon commencement of the works; and**
- (iii) any cost overruns on these two schemes would not be funded by the Council.**

10/E Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule - Prioritising Infrastructure Projects, Governance Arrangements and Neighbourhood Engagement

The Executive was reminded that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL) was a mechanism to secure financial contributions from development towards infrastructure in and around the Borough. The Council's Community Infrastructure Charging Schedule had been adopted by the Council in July 2014 and was implemented from 1 December 2014.

The CiL Charging Schedule was accompanied by the Council's Regulation 123 list, which set out the list of infrastructure projects and/or types to be funded through CiL. The Regulation 123 List had been agreed by the Executive on 1 July 2014.

The Executive was informed that the Council would need to set up a governance system for the distribution and prioritisation of CiL receipts. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations set out a duty on the Council as the Charging Authority to pass a proportion of CiL receipts to Parish Councils. This proportion

only related to development which had taken place within the parished area. The proportion of CiL receipts was 15% capped at £100 per existing council tax property per year or 25% uncapped where there was a Neighbourhood Plan in place.

For un-parished areas the Council would need to consider how it engaged with local communities to spend the 15% or 25% element of CiL and agreed that consultation would be carried out with the local Ward Councillors. Members noted that developments might on occasion affect other Wards and agreed that in such cases the appropriate Ward Councillors would also be consulted.

It was reported that the Council would need to set up a governance system for the distribution and prioritisation of CiL receipts. It was therefore proposed that a Panel comprising the Leader, the Finance Portfolio Holder, the Chief Executive and the Section 151 Officer be established to recommend prioritisation of projects and CiL receipts to the Executive for determination.

RESOLVED that

- (i) a governance system, as set out in the above, be established to prioritise those infrastructure projects set out in the Council's Regulation 123 List; and**
- (ii) the Executive consult with the appropriate Ward Members in unparished areas regarding the neighbourhood funding element of CiL.**

11/E Mobile Home Park Fees

The Executive was informed that new legislation had been introduced to enable local authorities to set fee levels for the licensing, renewal of licences and inspection of mobile home parks. The new licensing arrangements were designed to enable local authorities to monitor site licence compliance more effectively thereby ensuring residents' health and safety was better protected.

Adopting a Licence Fee Policy would allow the Council to recoup its costs in managing the application, amendment and transfer of caravan licences, and allow it to charge an annual fee for the inspection of sites.

Guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government had been taken into account in the development of the Council's Fee Policy. Three neighbouring authority's fee levels had also been reviewed in order to ensure consistent local practice.

There were currently only two relevant mobile home sites in the Borough, both of which were located in Mytchett.

RESOLVED to adopt the Mobile Home Park Fees Policy, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, to be introduced from the 2015/16 Financial Year.

12/E End of Year Performance Report 2014/15

The Leader presented a report on the end of Year Performance data for 2014/15. The detailed performance report, attached at Annex A to the agenda report, illustrated the achievements of the Council against performance indicators, corporate key priorities and annual milestones.

It was reported that 83% of corporate key priorities had been met, 91% of all service milestones had been met and 85% of performance indicators had met or exceeded their targets.

Whilst there had been notable successes, a number of challenges had been experienced that had slowed or delayed delivery. In relation to the Council's number one corporate key priority, Camberley Town Centre, it was reported that, where the Council had total control of the area of work it had delivered its target; however, where it had been reliant on third parties it had taken longer than planned.

It was suggested that it would be useful for Members to receive a briefing on the projects associated with Camberley Town Centre.

RESOLVED to note the Council's Performance for 2014/15.

13/E Consultation on Business Improvement Districts

The Executive considered a proposed response to the Department of Communities and Local Government's consultation on changes to Business Improvement Districts (BID). The consultation was based upon a review which had been carried out in 2014.

Members were reminded that Camberley's BID, Collectively Camberley, had been established in 2012 and was due for renewal in 2016.

The response to the question concerning whether BIDs should be required to provide individual notification of the outcome of the ballot to all affected business was discussed. It was agreed that the response to this question should state that the BID ballot notification should provide an opportunity for businesses to supply an email address at which they can receive a link to the ballot results, and state that the results would otherwise be published on the BID and the Council's websites.

RESOLVED to approve the response to the consultation on changes to Business Improvement Districts, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.

Chairman

Requests for Carry Forward of Unspent Budget from 2014/15 to 2015/16

Summary

To seek authority to carry forward unspent budget from 2014/15 to 2015/16 in line with financial regulations.

Portfolio - Finance

Date Portfolio Holder signed off report: 1 June 2015

Wards Affected - All

Recommendation

The Executive is advised to APPROVE the budget carry forwards for 2015/16 totalling £220,502 as set out at Annexes A and B.

1. Resource Implications

- 1.1 Any amount carried forward is effectively a charge to the General Fund for the year in which it is spent. Therefore if all of the carry forwards were approved this would result in £220,502 being charged against general fund reserves in 2015/16.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 Financial Regulations state that where the total budget carry forward requests exceed £25,000 they must be approved by Executive.
- 2.2 Carry forwards fall in two categories as follows:
 - 1) Those which arise from budget underspends in the previous year, which are as a result of works being deferred into the current year. These are shown in Annex A and total £139,469.
 - 2) Those that arise from the receipt of Government Grants which due to accounting rules have been recognised as income when received provided all the conditions for its original grant have been met. However some grants are received too late in the year to be spent and therefore requests are made to carry these forward so they can be spent in the following year. These are shown in Annex B and total £81,033.

3. Options

- 3.1 The Executive can:
 - 3.1.1 Accept any or all of the budget carry forwards as listed; or
 - 3.1.2 Reject any or all of the budget carry forwards as listed; or
 - 3.1.3 Amend any or all of the budget carry forwards as listed

4. Proposals

4.1 The Executive is asked to APPROVE the budget carry forwards for 2015/16 as listed in Annexes A and B.

5. Supporting Information

5.1 Budget holders were asked to complete a form for each carry forward request in which they had to demonstrate that:

- 1) Capacity – They had adequate capacity in the service to use this budget without affecting in year service delivery and objectives
- 2) Capability – They were able to do the work actually in the year.
- 3) Committed – The Council was committed to do this work and also explain why it had not been done in the prior year.

6. Corporate Objectives And Key Priorities

6.1 Budgetary control supports the Objective of providing services better faster and cheaper

Annexes	Annex A and B – List of carry forwards and supporting information.
Background Papers	Carry Forward Requests
Author/Contact Details	Sarah Parmenter – Senior Accountant Sarah.Parmenter@surreyheath.gov.uk
Exec Head of Service	Kelvin Menon – Executive Head of Finance

Consultations, Implications and Issues Addressed

Resources	Required	Consulted
Revenue	✓	27 May 2015 (CEO)
Capital	N/A	
Human Resources	N/A	
Asset Management	N/A	
IT	N/A	
Other Issues	Required	Consulted
Corporate Objectives & Key Priorities	✓	27 May 2015 (CEO)
Policy Framework	N/A	
Legal	N/A	
Governance	N/A	
Sustainability	✓	27 May 2015 (CEO)
Risk Management	N/A	
Equalities Impact Assessment	N/A	
Community Safety	N/A	
Human Rights	N/A	

Resources	Required	Consulted
Consultation	N/A	
P R & Marketing	N/A	

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex A – Carry Forward Requests for Budget Under Spends

Budget Under Spends			
Service	Officer	Value Requested	Reason Requested
Waste and Recycling	Tim Pashen	£11,843	To supply 559 recycling bins and 187 refuse bins for residents within the borough during 2015/16. The bins were ordered in March 2015, but delivery was taken during 2015/16
Waste and Recycling	Tim Pashen	£83,266	Income received for a recycling performance award from the Surrey Waste Partnership. All authorities in the partnership are required to produce an action plan to increase recycling and reduce waste collection costs. This carry forward will allow SHBC to fund the action plan and save year on year collection costs. The income is expected to be spent on waste initiatives and the Waste Action Plan will be submitted to the Executive for approval at a later date.
Elections	Richard Payne	£7,860	Pre-prepared work for the May combined elections was carried out during 2014/15 but the expenditure will occur in 2015/16 so the unspent budget is needed to pay for these costs
Finance	Kelvin Menon	£13,500	Required for additional staff to assist with the financial year end and statutory accounts for 2014/15
Employee Expenses	Louise Livingston	£15,000	For the continuation of the Leadership Training implemented during 2014/15
Communications and Marketing	Daniel Harrison	£8,000	To enter into a 12 trial month period with Eagle Radio to create a “Community Hub” for effective communication/consultation with residents
TOTAL		£139,469	

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex B – Carry Forward Requests for Unspent Grant Carry Forwards

			Unspent Grant Carry Forwards
Service	Officer	Value Requested	Reason Requested
Housing Services	Clive Jinman	£11,167	DCLG Prevention of Homelessness Grants. Used for project based work and to help individual residents at the risk of homelessness.
Housing Services	Clive Jinman	£21,144	DCLG Grant funding to secure private tenancies for singles and couples without children. This grant is ring fenced and if it is not utilised is to be returned to the DCLG
Elections	Richard Payne	£40,607	Grant income to support the transition to IER and the work will continue throughout 2015/16. The grant is ring fenced for this work.
ICT	Janet Jones	£8,115	For the continuation of the ICT projects for the publication of data sets to support the Government Transparency Agenda and the EU Directive for the joining up of and access to spatial data. The grant income is ring fenced and if it is not utilised is to be returned to the DCLG
TOTAL		£81,033	
GRAND TOTAL		£220,502	

This page is intentionally left blank

Response to the Issues and Options stage Consultation of the Rushmoor Local Plan

Summary

Rushmoor Borough Council is consulting on the Issues and Options Stage of the Rushmoor Borough Local Plan 2011 -2032. The consultation runs from 8th June - 20th July 2015.

Rushmoor forms part of the same identified Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Area as Surrey Heath and Hart. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) a Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and a Joint Employment Land Review have been undertaken by the three authorities. Of particular relevance to Surrey Heath are the proposed options regarding housing numbers, employment , retail , infrastructure and Farnborough Airport

Housing

The SHMA sets out an objectively assessed housing need and each authority should seek to meet this unless there are specific policies in the NPPF which indicate otherwise. These include sites protected under the Habitats Regulations (Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) (SPA) and Green Belt. Rushmoor are indicating that they will not be able to deliver approximately 1,600 dwellings of their objectively assessed housing need and therefore seek to see these dwellings delivered by Surrey Heath and Hart.

Employment

The Employment Land Review indicated that to maintain economic growth there is a need to retain strategic and locally important employment sites within the Functional Economic Area. The Issues and Options consultation seeks to take forward this approach.

Retail

The Issues and Options consultation sets out the approach to the regeneration of Farnborough and Aldershot. This regeneration will need to ensure that it does not have a detrimental impact on surrounding town centres, including Camberley.

Farnborough Airport

The Issues and Options consultations seeks to ensure the amenity of residents by proposing a number of policies to restrict noise and flying at weekends and Bank Holidays and to limit hours of operation

A hard copy of the Rushmoor Local Plan Issues and Options Paper will be made available in the Member's room and it can be viewed on

<http://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/newlocalplan>.

Portfolio: Regulatory
Date Portfolio Holder signed off report 10th June 2015

Wards Affected

All

Recommendation

The Executive is advised to:

- (i) NOTE the publication of the Issues and Options Stage Consultation on the Rushmoor Local Plan 2011-2032; and**
- (ii) AGREE the response set out at Annex A as the Council's formal response to the consultation.**

1. Resource Implications

- 1.1 There are no resource implications beyond that provided for within the agreed budget for 2015/16.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 Rushmoor Borough Council is consulting on the Issues and Options for the Rushmoor Borough Plan from the 8th June to the 20th July 2015. This is the first stage in the Local Plan preparation and the preferred option alongside other options on a number of topics; including housing, employment, retail, infrastructure and Farnborough Airport. The Rushmoor Local Plan will set out where development will take place within the borough of Rushmoor. It will also set a housing target and set out policies for employment and retail/leisure uses. The Council's draft response to the consultation is appended as Annex A of this report.

Housing

- 2.2 National Planning Policy in the NPPF sets out that in producing local plans authorities should identify their housing market area and undertake a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to establish the level of objectively assessed housing need in the Housing Market Area. Local plans should set out how they will meet this need and if they cannot meet their full need set out how it could be met within the Housing Market Area.
- 2.3 Rushmoor, Surrey Heath and Hart form a joint Housing Market Area and have undertaken a joint SHMA (2014) which identifies the overall level of objectively assessed housing need and a level for each authority. Rushmoor's objectively assessed housing need for the period 2011-2032 is 9,822 dwellings over the plan period. Rushmoor are indicating in the Issues and Options consultation that they will only be able to provide circa 8,200 dwellings over the plan period, which is some 1,600 dwellings below their objectively assessed need.
- 2.4 Rushmoor will be looking to Hart and Surrey Heath to take some of these dwellings. The NPPF recognises that there may be specific policy constraints such as the Habitats Regulations and land designated as Green Belt which indicate that development should be restricted. Whilst Surrey Heath will seek to meet its objectively assessed need, the borough

is impacted by both these constraints and will not be in a position to meet unmet need in another authority within the Housing Market Area. The Council's draft response to the consultations sets out that Surrey Heath will not be in a position to take any unmet need from Rushmoor.

- 2.5 The Issues and Options consultation sets out the sources of Rushmoor's land supply for housing. These are completions, allocated site at Wellesley and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) sites including sites in Aldershot and Farnborough town centres. It is considered that these are reasonable sources. However there may be an opportunity for further residential development to come forward through the regeneration of Aldershot Town Centre and Farnborough Town Centre and this option should be considered in more detail by Rushmoor.

Employment

- 2.6 Surrey Heath, Rushmoor and Hart form a joint Functional Economic Area and in line with national policy have undertaken a Joint Employment Land Review (ELR). The ELR indicates that other than those sites identified in the review there is limited scope to re-designate sites from employment use to other uses, such as residential. The ELR also recommends identifying, through the local plan process, strategic and locally important employment areas. Rushmoor's preferred option is to follow the advice in the ELR and identify strategic and locally important employment areas. Surrey Heath's draft response to the consultation supports the approach of identifying strategic and locally important employment areas. This will help ensure that there is opportunity for economic growth and the retention of business in the Blackwater Valley area.

Retail, Leisure and Town Centre

- 2.7 Rushmoor's Retail, Leisure and Town Centre Study (2015) indicates that the Aldershot catchment has long term capacity to support up to 11,700 sqm of A1-A5 uses (shops, financial and professional services, restaurants/cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaways). The consultation recognises that this could be met through existing vacant floorspace in Aldershot. Similarly, for Farnborough the Study indicates that the catchment has long term capacity for up to 21,600sqm of A1- A5 uses which can be met through outstanding retail commitments.
- 2.8 Whilst there is support for the approach of maintaining the vitality and viability of town centres within the Blackwater Valley this approach needs to ensure that the retail hierarchy in the Blackwater Valley is retained. In the Rushmoor Retail Study the Venuescore Retail Shopping Index (2013) indicates that Camberley is a regional location grade with Farnborough a sub-regional location grade and Aldershot a major district grade. Any redevelopment of Farnborough and Aldershot Town Centres should not have a detrimental impact on Camberley Town Centre which is recognised as a Step-up town by the EM3 LEP.
- 2.9 Infrastructure delivery is not covered in detail in the Issues and Options consultation. There will be the need for more detailed work to be undertaken as the Plan progresses both in terms of viability and deliverability.

Farnborough Airport

- 2.10 To ensure the amenity of local residents Surrey Heath Borough Council supports the approach set out in the Preferred Options at
- Option SP4 Which seeks to retain the current permission for annual traffic movements including those at weekends and Bank Holidays
 - Option SP4(1) Which limits the types of flying acceptable at Farnborough Airport
 - Option SP4(2) Which seeks to limit noise and flying at weekends and Bank Holidays
 - Option SP4(3) which limits the hours of operation
 - Option SP4(4) which limits the weight of aircraft
 - Option SP4 (5) Which deals with safety issues

3. Options

3.1 Options are to

- (i) Agree the response set out in the response form appended to this report and to submit them as the Council's formal response to the Rushmoor Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.
- (ii) To agree the response set out in the response form appended to this report with any additional comments from Executive and to submit them as the Council's formal response to the Rushmoor Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.
- (iii) To not agree the response.

4. Proposals

- 4.1 That Members support option (i) to agree the response set out in the response form appended to this report as the Council's formal response to the Rushmoor Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.

5. Supporting Information

- 5.1 None

6. Corporate Objectives And Key Priorities

- 6.1 Underpins Objective 1 of the Corporate Plan – 'Making Surrey Heath an even better place where people are happy to live' by monitoring the vision and spatial planning objectives of surrounding authorities and ensuring that Surrey Heath's interests are fully considered.

7. Policy Framework

- 7.1 The consultation process Surrey Heath is responding to is part of the process of preparing the Rushmoor Local Plan. The Rushmoor Local Plan will set out the spatial policies to guide the future direction of development of Rushmoor

8. Other matters

8.1 In relation to governance, sustainability, risk management, equalities impact, human rights, community safety, consultation, PR and Marketing there are no matters arising from this consultation by a neighbouring authority.

9. Officer Comments

9.1 None.

Annexes	Annex A: Surrey Heath Borough Council's response to the Rushmoor Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.
Background Papers	None
Author/Contact Details	Jane Ireland – Planning Policy and Support Manager Jane.ireland@surreyheath.gov.uk
Head of Service	Jenny Rickard- Executive Head of Regulatory

Consultations, Implications and Issues Addressed

Resources	Required	Consulted
Revenue	✓	<u>09/06/2015</u>
Capital		
Human Resources	✓	<u>09/06/2015</u>
Asset Management		
IT		
Other Issues	Required	Consulted
Corporate Objectives & Key Priorities	✓	<u>09/06/2015</u>
Policy Framework	✓	<u>09/06/2015</u>
Legal	✓	<u>09/06/2015</u>
Governance		
Sustainability		
Risk Management		
Equalities Impact Assessment		
Community Safety		
Human Rights		
Consultation	✓	<u>09/06/2015</u>
P R & Marketing	✓	<u>09/06/2015</u>

This page is intentionally left blank

For office use only:

Respondent ID:

Comment ID:

Draft Rushmoor Local Plan: Preferred Approach June 2015

Consultation Comment Form

We are inviting you to take part in the consultation on the draft Rushmoor Local Plan Preferred Approach. This document sets out the vision for the borough and approach to development up until 2032.

The six week consultation period will run from Monday 8^h June to Monday **20th July 2015**. Comments should be received by 5pm on the closing date.

When adopted, the Local Plan will play an important role in shaping Rushmoor's future – how our towns will develop, protecting and enhancing our natural environment, developing our local economy, improving leisure and visitor facilities and supporting more sustainable forms of travel.

The draft Local Plan Preferred Approach contains a vision and objectives for the Borough up until 2032 and includes a series of policies under category heading. For most policies, the Council has identified its preferred approach and discounted options.

We would encourage you to comment online at www.rushmoor.gov.uk/newlocalplan

Before completing this comment form please note that:

- All valid comments (electronic or written) and the name(s) of the respondent will be made publically available. Personal contact details will remain confidential.
- *Comments should only relate to the document titled above.*
- *Please complete all sections of this form fully and clearly. However, you do not need to respond to every question in the consultation paper.*
- *Please use a separate "Section 2" box for each comment that you intend to make.*
- The Council can only consider comments made on the forms provided. Electronic copies can be downloaded www.rushmoor.gov.uk/newlocalplan

The completed comments forms must be received by Rushmoor Borough Council no later than 5pm on 20 July 2015.

Please note that late representations may not be taken into consideration.

Please return this form to the Council via one of the following methods:

Post: Local Plan Preferred Approach Consultation
Planning Services
Rushmoor Borough Council
Council Offices
Farnborough Road
Farnborough
Hampshire
GU14 7JU

Or

Email: plan@rushmoor.gov.uk

Section One: Respondent's Details

All respondents should complete Part A. If you are an Agent, please complete Parts A & B

Part A: Respondent	
Title / Name:	Jane Ireland
Job Title (if applicable):	Planning Policy Manager
Organisation / Company (if applicable):	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Address:	Surrey Heath House Knoll Road Camberley
Postcode:	GU15 3ED
Tel No:	01276707213
E-mail:	Jane.ireland@surreyheath.gov.uk

Part B: Agents – Please complete details of the client / company you represent	
Client / Company Name:	
Job Title (if applicable):	
Address:	
Postcode:	
Tel No:	
E-mail:	

I understand that my response(s) will be considered by the Council in preparing the Rushmoor Local Plan, and that my comments will be made publicly available and identifiable to my name and/or organisation. The information in this form is, to the best of my knowledge, correct.

Signed: Jane Ireland	Dated:
-----------------------------	---------------

Section Two: Your Representation

Question 1: The vision and objectives

The draft Local Plan Preferred Approach vision should be both aspirational and achievable and set out the kind of Borough we will strive to become by 2032. To deliver the vision, eleven objectives are set out in the document. The vision and objectives for the Local Plan Preferred Approach have been developed from a range of strategies and through engagement with stakeholders.

- a) Do you think that the vision of the draft Local Plan Preferred Approach depicts / sets out the Borough that communities would want to be living and working in by 2032?

YES

NO

Comments Box

There is a need to consider how Rushmoor's objectively assessed housing need could be better met within the borough. Regard will need to be given to the constraints within Surrey Heath when considering how any remaining objectively assessed housing need can be met within the Housing Market Area.

There is a need to ensure that any retail regeneration of Aldershot and Farnborough does not have a detrimental impact on Camberley Town Centre.

- b) Do you think that the strategic objectives of the draft Local Plan Preferred Approach identify the things that the borough needs to meet the vision for 2032?

YES

NO

Comments Box

There will be the need to undertake more detailed infrastructure delivery and viability work as the plan progresses

Question 2: The Local Plan Policies

Please state using the comments boxes below which paragraph or policy of the draft Local Plan Preferred Approach you are commenting upon.

Please indicate which part of the document on which you are commenting, and use one box per comment (issue): *(please create more comment boxes if you need to)*

COMMENT BOX 1 Please identify the specific policy number or paragraph that your comment below relates to	Policy No:SS2 (Spatial Strategy) and Vision Paragraph No: Paras 6.11-6.24
Please indicate the nature of your comment: <i>(mark 'x')</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Support the Preferred Approach <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Seek changes to the Preferred Approach X <input type="checkbox"/> Support a Discounted Option <input type="checkbox"/> Suggest an alternative approach <input type="checkbox"/> General Comment	
Please enter your comment below: <i>(Please be as concise as possible and include any changes that you would wish to see) (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>	
<p>1.1 It is noted that the Issues and Options consultation indicates that Rushmoor will only be able to deliver circa 8,200 dwellings over the plan period, which is some 1,600 dwellings below their objectively assessed need.</p> <p>1.2 The NPPF recognises that there may be specific policy constraints such as The Habitats Directive and land designated as Green Belt which indicate that development should be restricted. Whilst Surrey Heath will seek to meet its objectively assessed need, the borough is impacted by both these constraints and will not be in a position to meet unmet need in another authority within the Housing Market Area, including Rushmoor's unmet need.</p> <p>1.3 In taking forward any regeneration of Farnborough and Aldershot there may be an opportunity for further residential development to come forward through regeneration and this option should be considered in more detail by Rushmoor.</p>	

COMMENT BOX 2

Please identify the specific policy number or paragraph that your comment below relates to

Policy No: SS2 (Spatial Strategy) and PC1(Economic Growth and Investment)

Paragraph No:Paras 6.25-6.28 and 11.1-11.19

Please indicate the nature of your comment: *(mark 'x')*

- Support the Preferred Approach **X**
- Seek changes to the Preferred Approach
- Support a Discounted Option
- Suggest an alternative approach
- General Comment

Please enter your comment below:

(Please be as concise as possible and include any changes that you would wish to see) (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Surrey Heath Borough Council supports the approach of identifying strategic and locally important employment areas. This reflects the Joint Employment Land Review (2015) undertaken by Surrey Heath, Rushmoor and Hart. This approach will help ensure the opportunities for economic growth and retention of business in the Blackwater Valley area.

COMMENT BOX 3

Please identify the specific policy number or paragraph that your comment below relates to

Policy No:SS2 (Spatial Strategy), SP1(Aldershot Town Centre), SP2 Farnborough Town Centre)

Paragraph No:6.29-6.34

Please indicate the nature of your comment: *(mark 'x')*

- Support the Preferred Approach
- Seek changes to the Preferred Approach **X**
- Support a Discounted Option
- Suggest an alternative approach
- General Comment

Please enter your comment below:

(Please be as concise as possible and include any changes that you would wish to see) (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Whilst there is support for the approach of maintaining the vitality and viability of town centres within the Blackwater Valley this approach needs to ensure that the retail hierarchy in the Blackwater Valley is retained. In the Rushmoor Retail Study the Venuescore Retail Shopping Index (2013) indicates

that Camberley is a regional location grade with Farnborough a sub-regional location grade and Aldershot a major district grade. Any redevelopment of Farnborough and Aldershot Town Centres should not have a detrimental impact on Camberley Town Centre which is recognised as a Step-up town by the EM3 LEP.

COMMENT BOX 4

Please identify the specific policy number or paragraph that your comment below relates to

Policy No: SS2(Spatial Strategy), SP4 (Farnborough Airport), SP4.1(Type of Flying), SP4.2 (Noise, and Flying at Weekends and Bank Holidays), SP4.3 (Hours of Operation), SP.4.4 (Aircraft Weight), SP4.5 (Safety)

Paragraph No:7.70-7.128

Please indicate the nature of your comment: *(mark 'x')*

- Support the Preferred Approach **X**
- Seek changes to the Preferred Approach
- Support a Discounted Option
- Suggest an alternative approach
- General Comment

Please enter your comment below:

(Please be as concise as possible and include any changes that you would wish to see) (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

To ensure the amenity of local residents Surrey Heath Borough Council supports the approach set out in the Preferred Options at:

- Option SP4 Which seeks to retain the current permission for annual traffic movements including those at weekends and Bank Holidays
- Option SP4(1) Which limits the types of flying acceptable at Farnborough Airport
- Option SP4(2) Which seeks to limit noise and flying at weekends and Bank Holidays
- Option SP4(3) which limits the hours of operation
- Option SP4(4) which limits the weight of aircraft
- Option SP4 (5) Which deals with safety issues

This page is intentionally left blank