

COUNCIL MEETING

22 February 2017

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 14 December 2016** (Pages 3 - 8)
2. **Executive - 10 January 2017** (Pages 9 - 14)
3. **Executive - 7 February 2017** (Pages 15 - 22)
4. **Planning Applications Committee - 15 December 2016** (Pages 23 - 34)
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 12 January 2017** (Pages 35 - 42)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 9 February 2017** (Pages 43 - 62)
7. **Joint Staff Consultative Group - 19 January 2017** (Pages 63 - 66)

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on
14 December 2016**

+ Cllr John Winterton (Mayor)
+ Cllr Valerie White (Deputy Mayor)

- Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr Oliver Lewis
+ Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle
+ Cllr Rodney Bates	- Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Bruce Mansell
+ Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr David Mansfield
+ Cllr Bill Chapman	+ Cllr Alan McClafferty
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Ian Cullen	+ Cllr Max Nelson
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Robin Perry
Cllr Craig Fennell	+ Cllr Chris Pitt
Cllr Surinder Gandhum	- Cllr Joanne Potter
+ Cllr Moira Gibson	+ Cllr Nic Price
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Wynne Price
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	+ Cllr Ian Sams
- Cllr Paul Ilnicki	Cllr Conrad Sturt
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

45/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Dan Adams, Paul Ilnicki, Katia Malcaus Cooper and Joanne Potter.

46/C Minutes

It was moved by the Mayor, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, and

Resolved that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 9 November 2016 be approved as a correct record.

47/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor updated Members in relation to a number of events he had attended since the last meeting. These include events at Guildford Judiciary and Surrey University, the opening of the refurbished gym at the Arena Leisure Centre, the

Surrey Heath and Surrey Sports Awards, a visit to the Thameside Brewery in Staines and a number of special celebrations, including 100th and 107th birthdays.

The Mayor had also attended parades with the Royal British Legion and made visits to the Camberley Ice Rink, the Camberley Theatre Pantomime and the opening of a new funeral directors in Lightwater.

The Mayor also welcomed to the meeting Lt Col Tim Cave-Gibbs from the Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst and Libby Butler and Daniel Farrow from Gordon's School. In recognition of the strong historic ties with the armed services within the Borough it had been decided to introduce a new role of Mayor's Cadets. It would give the young people concerned personal insight into and experience of local government and community. It was hoped that this initiative would continue with successive Mayors and that the existing links with the armed services would be maintained and enhanced in the coming years.

The Mayor invested Libby and Daniel as his Cadets and presented Mayor's Cadets sashes. As Mayor's Cadets, Libby and Daniel would accompany him to a variety of relevant civic events, such as the Remembrance Day Parades and Fly the Flag for Armed Forces Day.

48/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader reported that the Surrey Leaders had recently discussed the changes introduced by Surrey County Council to recycling payments, with food waste payments in future being calculated by the tonne instead of per household. As a result, Surrey district councils would receive reductions in payments, some of which were likely to be considerable.

In relation to the Three Southern Counties Bid, the Leader reported that there remained uncertainty around what would be required in terms of accountability, but that it was likely that a directly elected Mayor would be required.

49/C Questions from Councillors

The Leader responded to a question submitted by Councillor Ruth Hutchinson under Procedure Rule 11 relating to the noise impact of the 3rd runway at Heathrow on local residents especially within the villages.

50/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 4 October 2016, 9 November 2016 and 6 December 2016

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson, seconded by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, and

Resolved that the minutes of the open meetings of the Executive held on 4 October 2016, 9 November 2016 and 6

December 2016 be received and the recommendations therein be adopted as set out below:

The Council Tax Base and the Local Council Tax Support Scheme

Resolved that

- (i) the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for Surrey Heath, approved by Council on 22 January 2013, remain unchanged for 2017/18;**
- (ii) bullet point 7 of the background at Section 1 of the Council Tax Exceptional Hardship Policy be amended to state that Council Tax Support must be in payment, or have been in payment, in the financial year which an award is sought, to ensure the Exceptional Hardship awards can be made to those meeting the set criteria;**
- (iii) the Executive Head of Finance be authorised to make minor changes to the Local Council Tax Support scheme so as to ensure that where applicable to income calculation it remains in line with Housing Benefit changes introduced by legislation; and**
- (iv) incomes and applicable amounts and non-dependant deductions are uprated in line with the percentages and amounts supplied by DWP and DCLG, and applied to Housing Benefit claims.**

Appointment of External Auditor

Resolved that the Council opts into the appointing person arrangements made by Public Sector Audit Appointments for the appointment of external auditors.

(Note: The recommendations made by the Executive at its meeting on 9 November 2016 had been considered by the Council at its meeting on the same evening.)

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 20 October 2016 and 17 November 2016**

It was moved by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor David Mansfield, and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 20 October 2016 and 17 November 2016 be received.

- (c) External Partnerships Select Committee – 22 November 2016

It was moved by Councillor Paul Deach, seconded by Councillor Robin Perry and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 22 November 2016 be received.

- (d) Licensing Committee – 23 November 2016

It was moved by Councillor Bill Chapman, seconded by Councillor Ian Sams and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 23 November 2016 be received.

- (e) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 7 December 2016

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Jonathon Lytle, and

Resolved that the open minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 7 December 2016 be received.

51/C Portfolio Holder's Question Time

No questions were asked of Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, the Community Portfolio Holder.

52/C Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the ground that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
53/C	3
54/C	3

53/C Council, Executive and Committees - Exempt

- (a) Executive – 9 November 2016 and 6 December 2016

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson, seconded by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, and

Resolved that the exempt minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 9 November 2016 and 6 December 2016 be received.

- (b) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 7 December 2016

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Jonathon Lytle, and

Resolved that the exempt minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 7 December 2016 be received.

54/C Review of Exempt Items

The Council reviewed the minutes which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved that

- (i) Minute 46/E and the Agenda Report to remain exempt pending review;**
- (ii) Minute 47/E, the Agenda Report and any associated paperwork remain exempt for the present time;**
- (iii) Minute 48/E, the Agenda Report and any associated paperwork remain exempt for the present time; and**
- (iv) Minute 27/PF, the Agenda Report and any associated paperwork remain exempt for the present time**

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 10
January 2017**

+ 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 Alan McClafferty, Cllr David Allen, Cllr Chris Pitt and Cllr Victoria Wheeler, plus Simon Hope of Montagu Evans.

64/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

65/E Revenue Grants 2017/18

The Council funded a number of voluntary organisations which either worked in partnership with the Council or performed functions on the Council's behalf. The allocation of these grants in 2016/17 had been £140,000 for community organisations and £24,900 for leisure organisations, totalling £162,900.

The Executive considered a table providing a breakdown of these organisations' funding requests, together with supporting information. The table compared the funding requested against the grant awarded for 2016/17, the percentage of requested funding against annual running costs and, where appropriate, the in-kind financial support given to the organisations.

Members were also provided with information relating to the achievement of targets contained in each of the Service Level Agreements (SLA).

It was reported that, during the course of the previous year, the External Partnerships Select Committee had invited a number of the revenue grant funded organisations to its meetings to explore their fundraising strategies and future financial sustainability.

Whilst most organisations were working hard to safeguard their future financial sustainability, a number of positive recommendations had been made and had been implemented, including Tringhams Lunch Club teaming up with Surrey Heath Age Concern to cross reference clients and enhance transport opportunities.

With regard to Tringhams Lunch Club, the organisation had already been consulted on the proposed grant reduction.

It was noted that, within the Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership annual report for 2016, there had been few references to core works undertaken in Surrey Heath for public benefit, which the grant awarded by SHBC was meant to support. The Partnership would also now benefit from SANGS (Suitable Alternative Green Space) funding. It had been proposed that its grant be reduced from £10,000 to £5,000.

Resolved that, subject to the delivery of the service level agreements, revenue grants be allocated for the period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018 as follows:

Organisation	Grant for 2017/18
Surrey Heath Citizens Advice	£80,000
Voluntary Support North Surrey	£30,000
Surrey Heath Age Concern	£10,000
Tringhams, West End	£13,000
Camberley Central Job Club	£7,000
Basingstoke Canal Authority	£10,000
Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership	£5,000
Surrey Heath Sports Council	£3,500
Surrey Heath Arts Council	£1,400

(Note: In accordance with the Council's Members Code of Conduct, Councillor Charlotte Morley declared a non-pecuniary interest as the Secretary and the Council's representative on the Surrey Heath Sports Council.)

66/E Camberley Crown Post Office Consultation

The Executive considered a draft response to the Post Office's consultation on proposals to relocate Camberley Post Office to within the curtilage of WH Smith, High Street, Camberley.

Members expressed concern at the proposal to vacate the Crown Post Office, particularly given the Council's aspirations for and investment in the Town Centre. It was noted that residents very much valued the existing outlet and concerns were expressed on accessibility in WH Smith, as well as the suitability of the building for an external ATM (automated teller machine).

The Executive agreed to amend the response at Annex A to the Officer report to emphasise the disappointment and concerns expressed at the meeting and the Chief Executive was asked to consider an appropriate revised response in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

RESOLVED, that

- (i) the response attached as Annex A to the Executive report be amended to reflect the Council's concerns at the loss of the Crown Post Office and potential access issues in WH Smith; and**

- (ii) **The wording of the letter to be submitted to the Post Office be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Council Leader.**

67/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

Minute	Paragraph(s)
68/E	3
69/E	3

Note: Minutes 69/E and 70/E are summaries of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

68/E Procurement of Developer for Ashwood House and Pembroke House

The Executive considered a report seeking approval to the award of the contract to redevelop Ashwood House and Pembroke House and authorised the actions proposed.

69/E Reference from the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - Member Call-in

The Executive considered a reference from the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee following its consideration of a Member Call-in on procurement.

The Executive considered the recommendations of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee and

Resolved, that

- (i) **Wherever possible or practicable, for future purchases, the due diligence and red book data/reports considered by the Executive, be made available to the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee under exempt arrangements; and**
- (ii) **An annual report be made to the Committee providing a review of purchase and yields achieved across all the Council's properties.**

70/E Review of Exempt Items

The Executive reviewed the reports which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

RESOLVED that

- (i) Minutes 68/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt during the 'Stand Still Period', but that the decision be made public when the preferred bidder is announced; and**
- (ii) Minute 69/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt, but that the decision be made public.**

Chairman

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 7
February 2017**

+ 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 Chris Pitt and Cllr Victoria Wheeler

71/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

72/E General Fund Revenue Estimates 2017/18

The Executive noted that, whilst it was for the Council to decide upon the level of Council Tax set, the Executive could make a recommendation. Members were advised that the budget had been prepared on the assumption that Council Tax would be increased by £5 per band D property, being the maximum permitted without requiring a referendum.

It was reported that, from 2017/18 the Council would receive no Revenue Support Grant from Central Government to pay for its services. This included funding for services transferred by Central Government to the Council, such as the Local Council Tax Support Scheme which had replaced Council Tax benefit.

The net cost of Services for 2017/18 was £736k lower than last year. This was due to the significant investments which the Council had made in property during the year. As a result of this investment, there was no longer a need for a general savings target, nor did the Council have to use any of its New Homes Bonus this year to support the revenue budget.

Wages and salaries budgets had increased this year following many years of real term reductions. This reflected the creation of new posts to manage the new investment property function of the Council, but also took account of pressures the Council was facing in respect of pensions and competitive wage costs. The budget had therefore risen to cover these associated costs.

In line with the Council's strategy to increase income, a number of fees and charges had been increased and had been approved in accordance with financial regulations. These changes were reflected within the budget.

The previous Chancellor George Osborne had announced a four year local Government settlement in his 2015 Autumn Statement. Authorities could agree to the settlement if they submitted an efficiency plan. Over 97% of Councils across the country had agreed to the settlement. Although this Council had reluctantly agreed to the settlement, it had objected in the strongest terms to the “negative Tariff” in 2019/20, which was effectively a “tax” on the residents of the borough by Government. It was likely that this would be reviewed as part of the work in connection with the 100% localisation of business rates due to come in in the same year, but no change to this position had been assumed in the financial forecast.

The figures announced last year for 2017/18 had been confirmed in the provisional settlement announced on 15 December 2016 and had been used in calculation of this budget.

The Government had consulted during the year on the future of the New Homes Bonus (NHB). Although it had been confirmed that the scheme would continue, the Government had wanted to “sharpen” the incentive. The provisional settlement indicated that this Council would receive £1.226m in 2017/18, compared to £1.421m in the previous year.

Expenses totalling £645k were being charged directly to reserves set aside for this purpose. The General Fund was estimated to be at least £2m at the end of 2017/18, if the savings and budget were delivered as predicted.

The outcome of the forecast was that savings of about £186k would be required by 2021/22 on the assumption that the reduced New Homes Bonus was used to support the budget. This would need to be covered by a combination of increases in the Council tax base and Business rates, through new construction, as well as income generation from commercial activities and savings in the delivery of services. If the Council was unable to bridge the gap, then services might have to be reduced or stopped to ensure that the budget remained in balance.

The investment in property had transformed the Council’s finances for 2017/18 and more of this would be required if future financial challenges were to be met. Despite the risks attached, this was the only credible way that services could be maintained in the face of reductions in government funding.

Members were reminded that the Council paid a special grant to parishes to compensate them for the change to the tax base due to the introduction of the Local Council Tax support scheme. It was proposed that this grant would remain unchanged from that paid in 2016/17, despite the fact that it was no longer funded by central government.

Recommended to Council that

- (i) the 2017/18 General Fund Revenue Budget of £10,507,079, as set out in Annex A to the agenda report be approved;**

- (ii) **the support grant for parishes to compensate them for the effects of the local council tax support scheme be unchanged for 2017/18 compared to 2016/17;**

The Executive noted

- (i) **that the budget contained £645,000 as per paragraph 11 of the agenda report, chargeable to reserves set aside for this purpose;**
- (ii) **that a minimum revenue payment of £1.389m had been allowed to repay debt;**
- (iii) **that the Council no longer received Revenue Support grant which had reduced Government funding by £357,000;**
- (iv) **that the provisional NNDR baseline of £1,464,663 and the final settlement would be reported to Council at its meeting on 22 February 2017;**
- (v) **that a full report, setting out Council Tax proposals for 2017/18 would be presented to Council on 22nd February 2017;**
- (vi) **that, although investments had been made, further savings and income generation through investment would be required as a result of anticipated reductions in Government funding in the future; and**
- (vii) **the increase in the Council tax base generated from the development of new housing which delivered an extra £85,000 a year in Council Tax.**

73/E Treasury Strategy 2017/18

The Executive was reminded that the Council's investment portfolio comprised of funds available for longer-term investment, and short term investments sufficient to meet cash flow requirements. Investment income was a significant source of income which was used to maintain services.

The Executive received a report which fulfilled the Council's legal obligation, under the Local Government Act 2003, to have regard to both the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice and the Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance on Local Authority Investments.

The Council had invested substantial sums of money and was therefore exposed to financial risks including the loss of invested funds and the revenue effect of changing interest rates. The successful identification, monitoring and control of risk were, therefore, central to the Council's Treasury Management Strategy.

In accordance with the CLG Guidance, any changes to levels of investments and borrowing, or to the interest rates forecasted which resulted in changes to the approved treasury management indicators, would be reflected in relevant future reports for the Executive and the Council to consider.

The budget for investment income in 2017/18 was £300,000, based on an average investment portfolio of £25 million, at an interest rate of 1.2%. The budget for external debt interest paid in 2017/18 is £2.8m, based on an average debt portfolio of £124 million, at an average interest rate of 2%. It was noted that if actual levels of investments, borrowing and interest rates differed from those forecast, this would affect actual performance against budget.

Funding for the proposed corporate capital programme for 2017/18 – 2019/20 would need to be funded by borrowing or out of revenue due, as the Council did not hold any capital receipts.

Recommended to Council the adoption of the following:

- (i) the Treasury Management Strategy for 2017/18 as set out in the report;**
- (ii) the Treasury Management Indicators for 2017/18 at Annex A to the agenda report; and**
- (iii) the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement and Estimated Minimum Revenue Provision Payment Table at Annex F to the agenda report.**

74/E Corporate Capital Programme 2017/18 - 2019/20

The Executive received details of the proposed 2017/18 Capital Programme, as shown in Annex A to the agenda report. The Council no longer held a Capital Receipts Reserve. As a result, only in-year receipts could be offset against the proposed spend. Annex C to the agenda report showed that it would not be possible to fund the current Capital Programme from capital receipts and that existing revenue and/or borrowing would have to be used. Additional capital receipts could be realised from the sale of Council assets although there was a risk, in the current climate, that prices would be depressed or that such disposals would not be realised.

The Revenue Capital Fund was estimated to be about £9.0m at 31 March 2017 and would be used to support the Capital Programme if required. However this would reduced the amount of reserve available to support revenue expenditure and hence the General Fund in the future. The Council had undertaken borrowing during 2016/17 to fund significant property acquisitions and should be prepared to do this again should the need arise.

The Executive noted the estimated loss of investment income as a result of the proposed Capital Programme, based on the estimated average rate of poorest performing investments of 0.6% for 2016/17.

Additional capital schemes might be brought during the year for the Executive and Council to consider. These might result in a change to the Prudential Indicators, the Capital Financing Requirement and the Minimum Revenue Payment. If this was the case, those changes would be reflected in the relevant reports for the Executive and the Council to consider.

Recommended to the Council that

- (i) the new capital bids for £3,871k, in Annex A to the agenda report, for 2017/18 be approved, and be incorporated into the Capital Programme;
- (ii) the Prudential Indicators summarised below and explained in Annex D to the agenda report, including the MRP statement, for 2017/18 to 2019/20, in accordance with the requirements of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2011, be approved:

Prudential Indicator	2017/18 Estimated £000	2018/19 Estimated £000	2019/20 Estimated £000
Capital Expenditure	3,871	600	600
Capital Financing Requirement	140,653	138,901	137,112
Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream	35.17%	38.52%	41.36%
Incremental impact of investment decisions on Band D council Tax	-£15.29	£8.27	£0.97
Operational Boundary	157,000	157,000	157,000
Authorised Limit	167,000	167,000	167,000

Resolved to note

- (i) that the Capital Financing Requirement for this Council as at 31 March 2018 was estimated to be £140.653m and as such a Minimum Revenue Payment of £1,392k was required;
- (ii) the provisional Capital Programme for 2018/19 and 2019/20; and
- (iii) the available capital receipts forecast shown in Annex C to the agenda report.

75/E Surrey Pension Fund

The Executive received a report detailing the performance of the Surrey Pension Fund. The Surrey Pension Fund was managed and administered by Surrey County Council on behalf of all Districts, the County and a number of other organisations.

Due to growth in investments and additional payments the fund was now managing to keep pace with liabilities. This had resulted in the deficit falling and the funding level increasing. At the current time, the scheme was over 90% funded.

As a result of legislation, Local Government Pension Schemes had been required to pool their assets. Consequently, the Surrey Pension Fund had joined the "Borders to Coast Fund" which had a total value of £35.9bn.

The Fund was required to have an actuarial review every 3 years and this had last been carried out as at 31 March 2016. The review had indicated that the Fund would 82.6% funded compared with 72.3% in March 2013. As a result, the actuaries were recommending, for this Council, no increase in current contributions or deficit recovery payments for the next 3 years.

Resolved to note the contents of the report.

76/E Drone and Model Aircraft Policy

The Executive was informed that neighbouring authorities had recently adopted a zero-tolerance approach to the operating of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UVA) within their parks and open spaces. Consequentially, this was pushing more operators to move across boundaries, increasing the use of the Council's parks and open spaces.

A review of the Borough's Open Space Byelaws was in its early stages and was due to be completed before the end of 2017.

Members noted that a number of UAVs could be flown to capture or observe the images beneath, which had privacy implications of the subsequent use of the material captured. It was also noted that one of the Council's parks, in particular, was on the flight path into Farnborough Airport, which had further implications and restrictions imposed from the Civil Aviation Authority.

Learning to use this type of equipment was usually done through trial and error and so, naturally, results in a number of collisions and accidents, all of which have the potential to be a health and safety risk within Parks and Open Spaces. As these devices had become more affordable, the number of in-experienced operators was also increasing. The Council had seen a significant increase in the number of complaints from not only residents neighbouring its facilities but also from other users of the Parks and Open Spaces.

It was therefore proposed to introduce a Policy stating that permission would not be granted by the Council to any request to use Unmanned Aerial Vehicles on land owned by Surrey Heath Borough Council, whether for recreational or commercial purposes. Exemptions to this Policy would only be considered where users were part of a formalised model aircraft flying club that could demonstrate all health and safety and insurance measures were in place. A licence agreement must be made between the Council and the formalised club before site usage would be established.

It was proposed, for clarity, that the title of the Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Policy should be amended to include reference to Drones and Model Aircraft.

Resolved to adopt the Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Policy, attached as Annex 1 to the agenda report, as amended, prior to a review and amendment of the current Byelaws.

77/E Response to Woking Borough Council's Consultation on land east of Martyrs Lane

The Executive considered a draft response to a consultation by Woking Borough Council.

In 2015, Woking Borough Council had produced a draft Site Allocations Development Planning Document (DPD) which proposed to accommodate future urban growth post 2027 through a series of Green Belt releases to the south of the Woking urban area. This safeguarding strategy was proposed and supported by the evidence base of that time.

Woking Council was now consulting on a proposal to substitute the proposed safeguarded sites to the south of Woking with a single Green Belt site to the north: Martyrs Lane, Horsell, Woking. This 112ha site was proposed to accommodate at least 1200 new homes from 2027.

This Council had not raised any concerns in relation to the proposed safeguarded sites in 2015 when Woking consulted on its draft Site Allocations DPD as they had been located to the south of Woking and some distance from Surrey Heath and its cross boundary interests. However, the Martyrs Lane site represented an entirely different strategy, with the Council looking to accommodate urban growth to the north of Woking, and close to Surrey Heath.

Given the proximity of the site to Surrey Heath, and an apparent lack of supporting evidence base to justify it, there was concern that this change of policy direction could have an adverse impact on residents and business' in Surrey Heath. In addition, Martyrs Lane lay adjacent to the A320, a strategic cross boundary road corridor that served Woking, Runnymede and Surrey Heath at that point. The road was an important route providing access to key service centres such as Woking and Staines, and to the M25. Congestion on the A320 had already been previously identified as an issue for the wider area.

Resolved that the response set out in the letter at Annex 1 to the agenda report be submitted as Surrey Heath Borough Council's formal representations to the Woking Borough Council consultation on land east of Martyr's Lane.

78/E Pay Policy Statement 2017/18

The Executive was advised that, in accordance with Section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011, the Council was required to update the Pay Policy Statement on an annual basis.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the Surrey Heath Borough Council Pay Policy Statement 2017/18, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be approved.

79/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

Minute	Paragraph(s)
80/E	3
81/E	3

80/E Executive Working Group notes

The Executive received the notes of the Camberley Theatre and Arena Working Group meeting held on 24 November 2016 and the Local Plan Working Group held on 19 January 2017.

Resolved that the notes of the Camberley Theatre and Arena Working Group meeting held on 24 November 2016 and the Local Plan Working Group held on 19 January 2017, be noted.

81/E Review of Exempt Items

The Executive reviewed the report which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

RESOLVED that, in relation to minute 80/E above, the notes of the Camberley Theatre and Arena Working Group meeting held on 24 November 2016 and the Local Plan Working Group held on 19 January 2017 be made public.

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 15 December 2016

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr David Mansfield (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Adrian Page
- Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
- Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Richard Brooks)

In Attendance: Duncan Carty, Jonathan Partington, Gareth John, Lee Brewin and Jenny Rickard

28/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

29/P Application Number: 16/0916 - 30 Chertsey Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8PQ

The application was for the Advertisement Consent to display advertisement surround to ATM proposed by planning application SU/2016/0915. (Additional info recv'd 26/10/16)

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Tedder.

Some Members felt that the site was not appropriate for an external ATM as there would be issues with safety and parking. There was also no proposal to install bollards at the site to help prevent ram raiding the ATM. It was also felt that the shop would be open enough hours during the day to use the post office money withdrawal facility inside.

Members were advised that the post office opening hours would be 6am – 9pm on Monday to Saturday and 7am to 5pm on Sundays.

Resolved that application 16/0916 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Adrian Page and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Mansfield, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

30/P Application Number: 16/0915 - 30 Chertsey Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8PQ

The application was for the installation of ATM to right hand side of the shop front. (Additional info recv'd 26/10/16).

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Tedder.

Resolved that application 16/0915 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Adrian Page and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Mansfield, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

31/P Application Number: 16/0681 - Pinewood, 93 College Ride, Bagshot, GU19 5EP

The application was for the erection of a part three storey, part four storey 69 bedroom (Class C2) Care Home with link to and conversion of existing locally listed building from offices (Class B1a) to provide ancillary facilities to Care Home with associated landscaping, formation of access road and parking and associated works.

Members received the following updates:

'Paragraph 6.1, page 39 - Correction: There has been one representation in support and 4 representations raising an objection.

A legal agreement has been provided to provide mitigation against impact on the SPA and Travel Plan monitoring, in a similar manner to SU/10/0606. However, this has not been checked (because the legal fee not paid).

Paragraph 7.10, page 44 -The LLFA has raised an objection on lack of drainage information. However, the Council's Drainage Engineer considers that the LLFA concerns could be considered by condition(s). A reason for refusal on drainage has, therefore, not been added.'

Members were concerned about the lack of parking spaces at the site and safety issues regarding no pavements on College Ride.

Resolved that application 16/0681 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Elsemore, representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

32/P Application Number: 16/0631 - Land rear of The Parade, Frimley, Camberley

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 7 No. residential dwellings, with vehicular access, car parking with alterations/reduction to existing public car park/servicing areas (all matters reserved). (Additional information rec'd 23/11/2016).

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Sams.

Members received the following updates:

'Economic Development Officer – No comments.

The agent has responded to the proposed reasons 1, 2 and 3 of the officer report by providing:

- An affordable housing statement was received on 14/12 which concludes that the Written Ministerial Statement, the associated Court judgement and updates to National Planning Practice Guidance which indicate that affordable housing should not be sought for schemes of 10 dwellings or less, with less weight given to local policies which would require an on-site provision; and*
- An addendum report has been received today to indicate improvements to the approach could be provided including a revised surface treatment (e.g. cobble edge and block paving access road), use of different colour hard surface treatments, variations in texture and levels, use of bollards to define spaces, traffic calming measures (e.g. raised tables), kerbing to define different surfaces, and the introduction of soft landscaping; with a plan has been provided which indicates that on-site ecological mitigation can be provided on this site. This includes the provision of trees, tree mounted bat boxes, bat boxes integral to the buildings and landscaping.*

Officer response

- The addendum report indicates possible enhancements to the approach but it is not considered that this would overcome reason 1 and the objections on character grounds.*
- The addendum report indicates possible ecological enhancements including further tree provision, and the provision of bat boxes (in the trees and within the fabric of the dwellings). The Tree Officer has indicated that there are too many trees, too close together with some under the tree canopies of existing retained trees, which may prove difficult to establish on the long-term. However, broad leaf hedging, along with some tree planting may be possible instead. It is too late, however, for SWT comments to be provided. At this late stage it is therefore recommended that reason 2 remains.*
- The agent has not demonstrated why local policies for affordable housing provision should be set aside in favour of the national position; has not provided any viability information; information about whether the developer can be defined as a small developer; and whether the Borough has*

conditions where housing needs are not so extreme, and the house prices so high, that a different approach to the national position is not required. As such, it is recommended that reason 3 remains.

One additional letter of comment has been received from an objector not raising any additional issues.'

Clarification was sought on the allocation of parking spaces on the site. Members were advised there would be 10 residential and 76 for the car park.

Resolved that application 16/0631 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Kitcherside spoke in support of the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Ian Sams and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

33/P Application Number: 16/0691 - 33 Upper Park Road, Camberley, GU15 2EG

The application was for the part demolition and erection of a part two storey, part three storey front, side and rear extension and front/rear dormers to provide extended accommodation in the third floor/roof space and conversion of the building to provide 8 no. one bedroom and 2 no two bedroom flats for use by the learning disabled with associated accommodation. (Amended plans rec'd 17/11/2016).

Members received the following updates:

*'Natural England raises no objection.
The Council's Tree Officer raises no objections.*

Representations (page 56)

One further objection has been received raising no new issues.

Four objections received to the amended scheme, from those who had objected to the original proposal, indicating that their objections remain in place and that although there may be a reduction in windows facing their properties (29/31 Upper Park Road) over the existing arrangement, but there is an increase in habitable room windows (4 to 6) in this elevation.'

Some Members were concerned as to how the flats would be kept for the use of the learning disabled. Officers advised that if the flats were sold on the open market it would be an enforcement issue.

Resolved that application 16/0691 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

34/P Application Number: 16/0962 - Plot A, Trade City, Former BAe Systems, Lyon Way, Frimley, Camberley

The application was for the erection of 1 no. research and development/light industrial/general industry/warehouse building (Class B1b/B1c/B2/B8) with ancillary offices, car parking and landscaping and associated development.

Members received the following updates:

Consultations

The Council's Environmental Health Officer and the Environment Agency raise no objections.

The Local Lead Flood Authority (SCC) also raises no objections subject to conditions (see conditions 12 and 13, already proposed within the officer report, and amended condition 14 below).

The County Highway Authority raises no objections subject to conditions (see conditions 5 and 7, already proposed within the officer report, and additional condition below).

Recommendation

Amend Condition 9 to state:

Any tree or plants, which within a period of five years of commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the Local Planning Authority, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Amend Condition 10 to state:

No development shall take place until a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants and/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include nomination of a competent person to oversee the implementation of the works. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied/brought into use until there has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority verification by the competent person (indicated above) that any remediation work required and approved under the provisions above has been implemented fully in accordance with the approved details. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such verification shall comprise: (a) as built drawings of the implemented scheme; (b) photographs of the remediation works in progress; and(c) Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free of contamination. Thereafter the scheme shall be monitored and maintained in accordance with the approved remediation scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the risk from contamination can be managed and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Delete Condition 11

Amend Condition 14 to state:

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the sustainable drainage system has been construction in accordance with the approved details pursuant to Conditions 13 and 14 above, and details of a management and maintenance plan, indicating who will on and maintain the surface water drainage elements and their associated inspection and maintenance regimes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure that the sustainable drainage system is designed to technical standards and to limit flood risk and to comply with Policies CP2 and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Additional condition:

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved on site details of secure cycle storage area(s) and access thereto are to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the details shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure visual amenities are not prejudiced and to promote the use of alternative transport methods to the private car and to accord with Policies DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.'

Some Members sought clarification regarding the change in footprint of the building and the car park. Officers advised that the site was the same size but there would be some loss of landscaping. The proposal for the building was now squarer in shape. There was also some concern about flooding issues. Members were also informed that there had been considerable work carried out installing balancing ponds and pumps. In addition conditions had been amended to take into account flooding concerns.

It was noted that the proposal would bring a different type of employment opportunities to the area in research and development.

Resolved that application 16/0962 be approved subject to the conditions as amended as set out in the report of the executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

35/P Exclusion of the Press and Public

The Committee resolved, that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for minute 36/P, on the ground that it would involve a likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 6 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

36/P Enforcement

The Committee noted a verbal update from the Executive Head – Regulatory in relation to enforcement action.

37/P Review of Exempt Item

It was resolved that item at minute 36/P remain exempt.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 6, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 12 January 2017

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr David Mansfield (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| - Cllr Richard Brooks | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| + Cllr Nick Chambers | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| - Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| Cllr Surinder Gandhum | - Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr Jonathan Lytle | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| - Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper | + Cllr Valerie White |
- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Cllr Ian Sams attended from min 40/P.

Substitutes: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Pat Tedder)

In Attendance: Emma Pearman, Neil Praine, Michelle Fielder, Jonathan Partington, Gareth John and Lee Brewin

38/P Minutes

The non-exempt minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

39/P PRB First Residential Phase Design Codes

The Committee received a report on the Design Codes for the first phase of residential development at the former PRB site, pursuant to planning conditions.

Members noted the two design codes relating to land in the northern and southern parcels.

Members were advised of the following update:

'Recommendation changed to APPROVE.

The change to the recommendation reflects the fact that revised Design Codes, in line with the advice of the Urban Design Officer, have been received. The revised codes are those provided in the agenda papers.'

The approach of the two design codes followed the principles of the approved Site Wide Code and Regulatory Plan, which was approved by the Planning Applications Committee in July 2016. The report added a further layer of detail to the Deepcut SPD. Members were advised that the Site Wide Design Code had been subject to review by Design SE and the two design codes for consideration

now built upon those principles. Reserved matters applications would also be subject to review by Design SE.

Resolved that the revised Design Codes pursuant to planning conditions be approved as amended.

40/P Application Number: 16/0920 - Lynwood, Heath Rise, Camberley, GU15 2ER

The application was for the variation of condition 4 of Appeal Decision APP/D3640/A/10/2133102 to planning permission SU/09/0814 so as to allow changes to windows, doors, basement layout and the erection of dormer windows on all 3 plots, and changes to roof for Plot 3 (retrospective for Plots 1 and 2).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory.

Members were informed that there was a condition attached to the application which removed permitted development rights should the Committee be minded to approve the application. The landscape plan had also been revised to mitigate the gaps in the existing vegetation. However, some Members still felt that the proposal would be overbearing. Some councillors requested that the word 'suitable species' in condition 7 be changed to 'native species'.

Resolved that application 16/0920 be approved, as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Cllrs Edward Hawkins and Colin Dougan declared that they knew the developer.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Robin Perry and Conrad Sturt.

41/P Application Number: 16/0925 - By Pass Nursery, Blackstroud Lane East, Lighthwater GU18 5XR

The application was for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling with further basement accommodation, following demolition of all existing buildings and caravan.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr White.

Members received the following updates:

'A member site visit was undertaken on the 5th January 2017. The following were in attendance, Cllr E Hawkins, Cllr S Gandhum, Cllr R Perry and the case officer Mr N Praine.'

ADDITIONAL INFORMATIVE

In respect of waste, the applicant is encouraged to break up any hardstanding and waste for removal in an efficient way to ensure minimal vehicular movements when removing waste from site. Additionally the applicant is encouraged to explore recycling and reclaim facilities when removing waste from site. Waste materials must not be burnt on site, the applicant is also reminded of Environmental Health legislation and could be fined up to £20,000 for on-site burning.'

Some Members had concerns that the proposal was situated in the Green Belt but officers advised that this issue was covered in the agenda report. Paragraph 7.4.3 of the report outlined the special circumstances for allowing development in the Green Belt.

Despite these circumstances some Members still felt that the proposal had a greater impact on the Green Belt.

Some Members suggested that the wording in the update, 'additionally the applicant is encouraged to explore recycling and reclaim facilities when removing waste from site', the word 'encouraged' should be changed to 'required'.

Resolved that application 16/0925 be approved, as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Cllrs Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ian Sams and Conrad Sturt declared that they knew the applicant as he had been a councillor at Surrey Heath.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams and Conrad Sturt

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

42/P Application Number: 16/0951 - 3 Blackthorn Drive, Lightwater, GU18 5YW

The application was for the erection of two storey rear/side extension, first floor rear/side extension above existing garage, single storey front/side extension and part conversion of garage and associated alterations (amendment to 16/0411). (Amended Plan - Rec'd 14/12/2016).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Valerie White.

Members received the following updates:

'Just to point out that paragraph 4.2 should have also drawn attention to the proposed flue on the rear elevation which is different to the previous application, however it is not considered that this would cause any harm to character or amenity and as such does not change any conclusions within the report.'

Cllr White advised that Windlesham Parish Council had asked her to call in the application to Committee. However, following subsequent amendments, the Parish Council concerns had been withdrawn.

Resolved that application 16/0951 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application :

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

43/P Application Number: 16/0935 - 181 Ambleside Road, Lightwater, GU18 5UW

The application was for the erection of two storey and single storey front rear and side extensions and raising of existing roof to provide two storey, 4 bed dwelling.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr White.

Members received the following updates:

An email with attachments has been received from the agent for the application. This email provides 3 plan attachments which seek to demonstrate that the current application is smaller than that which has already been approved.

'In this regard it is noted that the approved development has a larger floor area than that which is currently proposed. However officers do not object to the proposal on the basis of a floor space increase per se, rather it is the configuration of the development and the proposed two storey development in close proximity to the shared boundary with no.179 which is, specifically, of concern.'

Some Members asked whether the Lightwater design statement had been taken into account with regards to this application. Officers confirmed that the application had regard for this.

Resolved that application 16/0935 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

44/P Exclusion of Press and Public

The Committee resolved, that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for minute 45/P and 46/P, on the ground that it would involve a likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3, 6 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

45/P Exempt Minutes

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 15 December 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

46/P PRB Deepcut - Urgent Item

The Committee received an urgent update report on the PRB Deepcut.

47/P Review of Exempt Item

It was resolved that minute 46/P remain exempt.

Chairman

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 6, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 9 February 2017

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr David Mansfield (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Nick Chambers	- Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Ian Sams
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper	- Cllr Valerie White

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (In place of Cllr Colin Dougan) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Surinder Gandhum)

In Attendance: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Duncan Carty, Emma Pearman, Neil Praine, Michelle Fielder, Jonathan Partington, Gareth John, Lee Brewin, Ross Cahalane and Jenny Rickard

(Neil Praine attended from minute 53/P)

48/P Minutes

The open minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

49/P Application Number: 16/0554 - Land south of 24-46 (evens), Kings Road and 6 & 9 Rose Meadow, West End GU24 9LW

The application was the approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscape, scale and layout) pursuant to outline planning permission APP/D3640/W/15/3028247 [SU/14/0532] for the erection of 84 dwellings (including 8 one bedroom flats, 34 two bedroom houses, 28 three bedroom houses and 14 four bedroom houses) with access from Rose Meadow. (Amended Plans and Additional Plan/Info - rec'd 07/12/2016). (Amended Info and Plans recv'd 12/12/16). (Amended and Additional Plans recv'd 13/12/16). (Amended Information recv'd 14/12/16). (Additional & amended plans recv'd 15/12/16). (Additional plans recv'd 16/12/16). (Amended plans recv'd 5/1/17 & 6/1/17).

Members received the following updates:

'Correction:

The last sentence of Paragraph 7.11.3 (on Page 27) should read:

"This contribution has been secured through the legal agreement attached to the appeal decision and, as such, no objections are raised on these grounds."

Education Authority (SCC) has raised no objections subject to the provision of a contribution towards education [Officer comment: See paragraph 7.9.3 of the agenda report whereby this was discounted at outline stage and on appeal]

Six additional representations raising an objection have been received making the following additional comments:

- *Lack of one storey houses (bungalows) for an aging population*
- *Lack of provision for an aging population*
- *No evidence that the travel plan has been implemented which is required prior to permission being granted [Officer comment: These details are required by condition 13 of outline permission to be provided and approved prior to first occupation]*
- *VDS has been overlooked*
- *Council's approach is at odds with other Council's approach to SANG development (e.g. Ashdown Forest SPA)*
- *Lack of recreational facilities in West End – part of reserve site should be used for such purpose*
- *Concerns about the requirements to meet Condition 7 of the outline permission (method of construction)*

LLFA have confirmed no objections subject to the imposition of a condition and informative to explain requirements of Condition 10 of the outline permission.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objections, subject to conditions.

FURTHER CONDITIONS:

6. Prior to occupation, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as agreed.

7. Before any of the operations which involve the movement of materials in bulk to or from the site are commenced, facilities shall be provided as must be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in order that the operator can make all reasonable efforts to keep the public highway clean and prevent the creation of a dangerous surface on the public highway. The agreed measures shall thereafter be retained and used whenever the said operations are carried out.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to

accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

8. The approved development shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement by ACD Arboriculture Rev. B dated 07.12.16 unless the prior written approval has been obtained for the Local Planning Authority. In addition, the required pre-commencement meeting must include the Tree Officer and be agreed a minimum of 7 working days in advance of the start of any works on site to allow the all parties to attend. Tree works, tree and ground protection, site supervision of excavation works, and storage etc. will all need to be agreed at that stage.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS:

Amendment to second sentence of Part 1 of Condition 4 to read:

“The submitted details shall include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, speed restraint devices, street furniture, walls,....”

Amendment to Condition 1 to read:

“Except for the requirement to meet Condition 4 below, the proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans...”

PROPOSED INFORMATIVE:

The applicant is advised that to comply with Condition 10 of the appeal decision APP/D3640/W/15/3028247, the applicant will need to supply the following information, Environment Agency consent(s), exceedance flow routes and final construction details.’

Some Members were concerned that there had not been any community engagement between the developer and neighbouring residents. Members were advised that there had been a public exhibition but not on reserved matters. There were also concerns regarding traffic safety. It was noted that the road scheme had been amended to alleviate pinch points and to add in pavements.

Some concern was raised about the cumulative impact of the development, but this had been dealt with at the outline stage. In addition, some Members asked how long it would take to complete the development. This could not be included in a condition however, there was a standard condition which stated that the development should begin no later than two years from the date of approval. There was also a condition limiting the hours of construction.

Resolved that application 16/0554 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members declared that they had received letters from residents and the developer and had attended a design meeting.

Note 2

As this application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Beulah Kingston and Jason Ing spoke in objection to the application and Andy Stallan representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Nick Chambers and seconded by Councillor Max Nelson.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Innicki, Max Nelson, Jonathan Lytle, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page and Conrad Sturt.

50/P Application Number: 16/0679 - Land South East of 4-14 (evens) Kings Road, West End Woking

The application was for the Residential development of 35 dwellings comprising of 8 four bedroom, 10 three bedroom, 10 two bedroom houses and 3 two bedroom and 4 one bedroom flats with associated access, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage and landscaping. (Additional Plan & information recv'd 03/08/2016). (Additional info recv'd 4/8/16). (Additional Info Rec'd 05/08/2016). (Additional Info recv'd 20/10/16). (Additional/Amended Info - Rec'd 09/01/2017). (Additional Information - Rec'd 16/01/2017).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Corrections:

Paragraph 3.4 – A copy of the appeal decision at Annex 1 has been subsequently added.

The last sentence of Paragraph 7.10.4 (on Page 65) should read:

"It has been concluded that the proposal accords with the Development Plan and whilst the implementation and completion of the development will result in a financial benefit this is not a matter that needs to be given significant weight in the determination of this application."

The applicant has requested an extension to complete the required legal agreement for SANG delivery and retention to 28 February 2017, with any required further extensions agreed by the Head of Service.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objections, subject to conditions. Eleven additional representations raising an objection have been received making the following additional comments:

- *It is so rural that it is outside the scope of the VDS [Officer comment: There are parts of the VDS within the defined Countryside (including the Green Belt)]*
- *The requirements made by the Surrey Wildlife Trust should be met before development starts*
- *The requirements made by Environmental Health (assessment of ground gas) should be submitted to and approved prior to commencement of foundations [Officer comments – See proposed Condition 8]*
- *Visibility splays and high friction surfacing to highway, as required by County Highway Authority should be provided [Officer comments – See proposed Conditions 12 and 13]*
- *CIL contribution should be obtained for a contribution towards education [Officer comment: The type of contribution falls outside the CIL scheme]*
- *Infrastructure should be considered across all approved planning applications (300+ dwellings) in the area*
- *Residents have not been consulted on any road improvement to Kings Road [Officer comment: None are proposed]*
- *Lack of provision for an aging population*
- *Council's approach is at odds with other Council's approach to SANG development elsewhere (e.g. Ashdown Forest SPA)*
- *Lack of recreational facilities in West End – part of reserve site should be used for such purpose*

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

17. The approved development shall be implemented in accordance with the Tree Report (Tree Survey and Constraint Advice) and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement by ACD Arboriculture dated 23.03.16 and 01.07.16, respectively, unless the prior written approval has been obtained for the Local Planning Authority. In addition, the required pre-commencement meeting must include the Tree Officer and be agreed a minimum of 7 working days in advance of the start of any works on site to allow the all parties to attend. Tree works, tree and ground protection, site supervision of excavation works, and storage etc. will all need to be agreed at that stage.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

18. No development shall take place until an ecological strategy and management plan for the off-site woodland mitigation has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The offsite woodland should be delivered and managed in accordance with the approved details and commenced prior to occupation of the proposed development. The development shall also be implemented in accordance with the Ecological Impact Assessment dated 7 July 2016 and its Addendum dated 20 October 2016 both by EAD Ecology unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation and to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS:

Amendment to Condition 2 to read:

“Except for the requirement to meet Condition 4 below, the proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans...”

Also, the list of approved drawings in proposed Condition 2 should also include the following approved drawings:

“HT-28-S2F2 Rev. B, HT-29-S2FOG Rev. C, HT-30-S2H1 Rev. D, HT-31-S2H2 Rev. C, HT-32-S2H2 Rev. C, HT-33-S2H2 Rev. C, HT-34-SG Rev. B and HT-35-SGP Rev. B”

Amendment to second sentence of Part 1 of Condition 4 to read:

“The submitted details shall include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, speed restraint devices, street furniture, walls,”

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION:

To extend the time period to complete the legal agreement for SANG delivery and retention to 28 February 2017, with any required extensions to be agreed by the Head of Regulatory.’

There was some concern regarding the un-adopted road which led to the site, the design and density of the development. Members were advised that although the road was un-adopted it was still a right of way. In addition no condition could be added to improve the road as it was a private road.

Resolved that application 16/0679 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory, and to extend the time to complete the legal agreement for SANG delivery and retention to 28 February 2017, with any required extensions to be agreed by the Head of Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Committee Members declared that they had received information from the developer.

Note 2

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Dr Jeff Llewellyn representing the West End Action group spoke in objection to the application and Mr Greg Pitt representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Innicki, Max Nelson, Jonathan Lytle and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

51/P Application Number: 16/1048 - Land south of Beach House, Woodlands Lane, Windlesham GU20 6AP - WITHDRAWN

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 15 dwellings comprising houses for the over 55s (Class C3) and houses for the Windlesham Trust Community Home (Class C2) with access off Broadley Green. Access only with all other matters reserved.

Members were advised that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant and therefore was not considered by the Committee.

52/P Application Number: 16/0779 - Whitehill Farm, Kings Ride, Camberley GU15 4LZ

The application was for the erection of 4 no. blocks part two storey /part two storey with accommodation in the roof, with balconies and roof gardens, to provide 21 no. two/three bedroom units and 20 no. two storey units of extra care residential accommodation along with car, cycle and buggy parking, access and landscaping including footpaths links.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The applicant has provided further evidence concerning the future occupiers indicating that the average occupier of extra care accommodation is 77 years old and that people in their 70's are unlikely to be able to walk to the SPA due to the distance in-between.

The applicant has also considered that the landscape analysis has been provided for the applicant by a qualified landscape architect and that the scheme has not been assessed by a qualified landscape officer and the development can be provided within the site and is unlikely to give rise to unacceptable landscape or visual effects which cannot be mitigated.

The applicant has provided a sequential assessment to indicate that there are no other available sites for this development.

The applicant has also referred to an RTPI report on dementia care which identifies that good quality housing and well-planned, enabling local environments can have a substantial impact on the quality of life of someone living with dementia, and that town planning has a role to play if health and social policies are to succeed.

The applicant has requested a deferral for this application to allow more time to consider the impact of the proposal on the SPA. However, Natural England considers that there is no need to extend the timeframe to determine this application because they do not consider that an agreement on this issue is possible.

The Surrey Wildlife Trust has raised concerns about the proposal on SPA grounds and that there is insufficient information to be able to confirm the ecological impact of the development.

Four further objections have been received raising the following additional concerns:

- Behaviour of builders on site [Officer comment: This is not a material planning consideration for the current proposal]*
- Noise from generator on site [Officer comment: This relates to the approved development]*
- Security threat for military families [Officer comment: This would not be a reason to refuse the current proposal]*

ADDITIONAL REASON FOR REFUSAL

3. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species likely to be present on the site failing to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.'

There was some concern regarding the visibility of the development from the road, development in SPA and the felling of many trees.
It was noted that the borough was required to have 255 private extra care units by 2018. Members were advised that the units were designed to give 'extra care' residents independent living and the choice to live in larger homes so family members could stay. In addition residents would not be permitted to have any pets.

Resolved that applications 16/0779 be refused as amended for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that had been contacted by residents and the developer.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Richard Brooks declared that he had attended an exhibition by the developer and left the room during the consideration of the application.

Note 3

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Jenny Garner spoke in objection to the application and Guy Wakefield, the agent and Rob Andrews (the applicant) spoke in support.

Note 4

The recommendation to refuse the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Conrad Sturt and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 5

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Max Nelson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

53/P Application Number: 16/0947 - Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windlesham GU20 6HL

The application was for the erection of an 88 bedroom care home with associated landscaping and planning, following demolition of existing dwelling and builders yard. Access from Chertsey Road. (Additional information recv'd 1/11/16). (Additional information rec'd 09/12/2016). (Additional Information - Rec'd 10/01/2017). (Amended Plan - Rec'd 16/01/2017).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The applicant has circulated an 11 page information document to some Members in support of the scheme. The applicant explains that this information can be found within the submitted planning documents.

Officer comment: This summary document does not contain new information, although some elements are only mentioned briefly in the draft S106 rather than the submitted planning documents. This summary states that the openness of the Green Belt will be maintained with screening from the road and landscaping, and views through the buildings and heights; and, that the scheme will have a reduced impact on openness than the previous scheme. As explained at paragraph 7.10 of the agenda report the applicant has assessed openness against visual impact rather than the quantum of built form, which is significantly greater than the extant scheme. The applicant also references the lack of alternative sites, however, the applicant did not carry out an alternative site assessment with this or the previous application so this is an unknown factor.

Two additional letters of representation (one with no name/address) in support of the application have been received. The issues raised are that it is an intelligent and thoughtful care home, will enhance the attractive residential community, allow individual needs to be addressed in a sensitive way, will provide a higher level of care than other homes.'

It was noted that some Members felt that the proposal was harmful to the Green Belt, was a large increase in scale, would have potential traffic and parking issues and was an isolating location for the residents of the care home.

Members were advised that the proposal was designed to move away from the institutional look and provision for care homes. More car parking spaces were being offered contrary to the standard requirement. This was as a result of the developer listening to neighbouring residents' concerns about parking.

Some Members felt that there was a serious need for dementia care in the borough and this need outweighed the Green Belt issues.

Members were reminded that should they vote against the officers' recommendation, the very special circumstances to support this decision would have to be robust and clear.

Resolved that application 16/0947 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had been contacted by residents and the developer.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillors Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler declared that the applicant had met with them and handed them a document. There was no discussion;

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had attended an exhibition and was contacted by several parties in support and in objection to the application;
- Councillor Jonathan Lytle declared that he had also attended an exhibition.

Note 3

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Victoria Muir spoke in objection to the application and David Driscoll, representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 4

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Note 5

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Max Nelson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman Jonathan Lytle, Ian Sams Conrad Sturt.

54/P Application Number: 16/1041 - Unit 2, adjacent to Waitrose, 150-152 London Road, Bagshot

The application was for the subdivision of existing retail unit to provide 3 No. retail units to be used for the following: one unit for the sale of bulky goods and goods relating to outdoor pursuits with ancillary travel clinic (Class A1); one unit for the sale of bulky goods with ancillary pet care, treatment and grooming facilities and installation of mezzanine floor (Class A1); and one used as a cafe/restaurant (Class A3).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The applicant has provided further evidence of the impact of the proposal on local/town centres, particularly in relation to the proposed Cotswold Outdoor (Unit 2A) outlet. The unit would be seen as a flagship store which, whilst providing a similar range of products to other Cotswold Outdoor stores, would extend the range to include a library and travel clinic. The clinic would provide travel advice together with associated products including travel guides, maps, dietary

suggestions, insect guards, creams, etc. Cotswold Outdoor has specialist brands (Runnersneed, CycleSurgery and Snow + Rock) which would be provided under one roof. All of this differentiates the proposed Cotswold Outdoor outlet from its rivals.

A schematic layout has been provided which indicates that clothing and footwear would be provided on 56% of the floorspace provided for retail sales but it is noted that product ranges will change, influencing changes to the retail floor layout, because of the seasonality of the product demands. As such, it is recommended to adjust the maximum floorspace for the sale of clothing and footwear, as outlined in Condition 1, to 70%, and this has been agreed as the maximum that should be provided by the Council's Retail Adviser.

The applicant has confirmed that they do not want any restriction and formally requests that the application is deferred to allow further negotiations.

Three further objections have been received raising the following additional concerns:

- John Lewis should extend their Waitrose development into this store*
- Café will not be productive (profitable) with other nearby cafes*
- Highway safety impact, with other developments in the area*
- Impact from air quality (dust and fumes) - a new report is required*
- Impact on Bagshot centre*
- Impact on infrastructure, community and other services*
- Provision of vet facilities*
- Development is marketed as the "Bagshot Retail Park" and suggests that the developer's vision is complete*
- Lack of parking provision*

CHANGE TO CONDITION 1:

Unit 2a, as defined on the approved plan 13001/96, with a total net sales area of 1,201 square metres shall only be used under Class A1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order) for the sale of goods, as listed below:

- (a) outdoor and leisure clothing, accessories, equipment, footwear and services for walking running, camping, trekking, climbing, canoeing, water sports, cycling and winter sports with ancillary travel clinic;*
- (b) home improvement products and materials including hardware and DIY;*
- (c) garden centre goods including garden furniture, plants, BBQ and associated equipment;*
- (d) furniture, lighting, carpets and floor coverings;*

- (e) household textiles, housewares and haberdashery including furnishing, fabrics, cushions and curtains; bedding and linen; blinds and poles; clocks, pictures and mirrors and related accessories;*
- (f) pets, pet foods and related products and services, including ancillary pet care, treatment and grooming facilities;*
- (g) bulky electrical and gas kitchen items;*
- (h) motor goods, cycles, cycle products and accessories; and*
- (i) bulky leisure goods e.g. kayaks, tents, boats.*

Under part 'a' of this condition no more than 70% of the net retail sales floorspace within the unit shall be used for the sale of outdoor clothing and footwear and should not include any fashion clothing or footwear. The goods listed under part 'a' of this condition shall only enure for the benefit of the first occupier.

Reason: In the interest of the vitality and viability of Bagshot centre and Camberley Town Centre and to comply with Policies CP1, CP10 and DM12 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'

Members were advised of a further update stating that the applicant had agreed the 70% limitation on outdoor clothing and footwear and would not be seeking a deferral.

Some Members were concerned that the extra retail units on this site would detract from Camberley Town Centre and Bagshot Village Town Centre. Other Members felt that the proposal would provide what Notcutts had previously supplied.

There was concern regarding staff parking in the residential areas around the site but Members were informed that the County Highways Agency had raised no objections.

Resolved that application 16/1041 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Committee Members declared that they had been contacted by residents, the applicant and the developer.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Jonathan Lytle and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillor Paul Ilnicki.

55/P Application Number: 16/1087 - Land between 4 and 5 School Lane, Windlesham GU20 6EY

The application was for the erection of a detached three bedroom, two storey dwelling and detached garage. (Amended Plan - Rec'd 10/01/2017).

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr. White.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Since writing the committee report a further 9 letters of objection have been received (taking the total number of objections to 17). These letters of objection primarily raise concern about the vehicle access / highway safety and this matter is covered at paragraph 7.2 of the committee report. The 9 representations of objection also raise the following concerns:

- *Size of the proposed dwelling out of character with the surrounding area [This matter is covered at paragraph 7.4 of the committee report]*
- *The proposed dwelling will negatively impact upon the amenity of surrounding residential properties [This matter is covered at paragraph 7.5 of the committee report]*
- *The proposed dwelling will negatively impact upon biodiversity [This matter is covered at paragraph 7.7 of the committee report]*

A number of concerned parties have also queried why the planning report does not go into significant discussion regarding the proposed highway works. The reasons for this are covered at paragraphs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.4, 3.5, 7.2 and 7.3 of the committee report. To summarise, the highway works are identical to the previous scheme SU/15/0166 which were found to be acceptable by the Surrey County Council Road Safety Team, the Surrey County Council Highway Authority and at the previous planning appeal [Appendix 3 of your committee papers] by the

Planning Inspectorate. The highway works are identical to the previous proposal and given the findings of Surrey County Council Road Safety Team, the Surrey County Council Highway Authority and the Planning Inspector, it is not considered an objection on highways grounds can be sustained.'

Members were advised that officers had been contacted by residents with concerns that the report had not covered highways issues. This was because the previous application had been considered by the SCC Road Safety Team, the County Highways Agency and the Planning Inspectorate. There had been no objections to the highways scheme.

Some Members had concerns about the loss of parking spaces in the vicinity and the highways issues due to the narrow line of sight out of School Lane. Officers advised that the Planning Inspector had been satisfied that the proposal would not cause highways issues. Some Members were still concerned about public safety particularly regarding the lack of a footpath. A deferral was requested in order for the highways study to be completed. However, officers advised that the County Highways Agency had taken the forthcoming review into account when making the decision about the application.

Resolved that application 16/1087 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she lived close to the site and left the Chamber during the consideration of the application;
- Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that he had been in contact with some of the neighbours.

Note 2

As this application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Nick Griffin, the agent spoke in support of the application.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt and Victoria Wheeler.

Councillor Jonathan Lytle did not vote as he left the room during the consideration of the application.

56/P Application Number: 16/1063 - 1, 1A & 3 Guildford Road, Frimley Green, Camberley GU16 6NL

The application was for the change of use of first floor from C3 (residential) to B1 (offices) and use of land to rear for parking in connection with the first floor offices and ground floor estate agency.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Paul Deach.

Members received the following update:

'Kevin Cantlon, the Economic Development Officer, has written the following in support of the application:

Luff and Wilkin is a local company owned and run by local people who have made a commitment to the borough over a number of years. They provide employment to local people and will add additional staff numbers should their application prove successful. Each local job filled in the borough contributes in excess of £51,000 to the UK economy.

It is likely that any future employees of Luff & Wilkin will use the amenities in Frimley Green for things such as shopping and lunchtime activities, thereby helping to support the village economy.

Over the course of the next few years significant housing expansion of Deepcut, one mile away, is planned. As a property and estate agent Luff and Wilkin would be well placed to handle some of the new residential sales and lettings business for the new development, which could potentially bring about expansion of the company thus creating more jobs.'

The Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and praised the work of the planning officers. However, it was noted that with regard to this application, the applicant had contributed to the business in the area and this proposal would provide much needed part time positions. This was particularly relevant to the large military community nearby. There was some concern about parking but it was felt that the benefit to the economy outweighed the loss of the residential unit.

Resolved that application 16/1063 be approved subject to conditions, the final wording to be finalised after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Vivienne Chapman declared that the applicant was a close friend and left the Chamber during the consideration of the application;
- Councillor Paul Ilnicki declared that he knew the applicant.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Paul Ilnicki, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Conrad Sturt.

The motion was lost.

Note 4

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 5

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Conrad Sturt.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Paul Ilnicki, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

The motion was carried.

57/P Exclusion of Press and Public

The Committee resolved, that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for minute 59/P and

60/P, on the ground that it would involve a likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

58/P Exempt Minutes

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

59/P PRB Deepcut

The Committee received an update report in relation to the PRB site at Deepcut.

60/P Review of Exempt Items

The Committee resolved that the information at minute 59/P remain exempt.

Chairman

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff
Consultative Group held at Surrey
Heath House on 19 January 2017**

+ Geraldine Sharman (Chairman)
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Moira Gibson	- Andrew Edmeads
- Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	+ David McDermott
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Lynn Smith
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	+ Anthony Sparks
+ Cllr Robin Perry	- Karen Wetherell
+ Cllr Ian Sams	
Cllr Conrad Sturt	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Lee Brewin and Louise Livingston

1/J Notes

The notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 14 July 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

2/J Information and Security Policy

The Head of ICT and the Information Governance Manager had revised the Information Governance Strategy and Information Security Policy to produce a revised Information Security Policy. It was noted that this policy applied to staff only. A separate guidance to managing emails would be produced at a later date.

The following amendments were agreed:

- On page 27, paragraph two under the heading 'Remote Access', add after '*Surrey Heath email, Live Ops.....*'
- On page 37, under the paragraph entitled 'Speed of Response', add final sentence, '*Except for complaints which must comply with the Complaints procedure.*'
- The recommendation was amended in line with the delegated powers of the Head of Paid Service in relation to adoption of Policies and Procedures and their amendments.

**Resolved that the Head of Paid Service be asked to approve the
Information Security Policy as amended.**

3/J Pay Policy Statement

The Group received a report on the Pay Policy Statement 2017/18. This was an annual statement as required by the Localism Act. The Group was advised that the Statement would be considered at the Executive and Council for agreement.

The following amendments were advised:

- On page 45, first sentence under Chief Officers' Remuneration, should read '*three*' and not two statutory roles.
- On page 45, the last post in the table should read, '*Head of Investment and Development*'.

Resolved that the Pay Policy Statement be noted.

4/J Voluntary Duties Leave Policy and Procedure

The Group was advised that the Voluntary Duties Leave Policy and Procedure was a new policy to develop the Council's Corporate Social Responsibility. It detailed leave allowed to staff for voluntary duties, which would be one day paid leave for this purpose.

The following amendments were advised:

- The recommendation was revised in line with the delegated powers of the Head of Paid Service.
- On page 56, final sentence under examples, the word 'sort' should read '*sought*'.
- On page 57, the title of the first table should read, '*Examples of approved organisations for Voluntary Duties Leave*'.
- In table 2, the two organisations 'non-profit affiliates' and 'non-profit religious organisations' under the approved heading should be deleted and one example called 'non-profit organisations' should be added.

It was noted that as far as possible voluntary work should take place in the borough.

It was also agreed that a report be submitted to this group in a years' time to provide an overview of voluntary duties carried out under this scheme.

Resolved that the Head of paid Service be asked to amend the terms and conditions of employment, to include the adoption of the Voluntary Duties Leave Policy and Procedure as amended.

5/J Work Programme

The Group reviewed the work programme for the remainder of the 2016/17 municipal year, and was advised that the title of the item 'Data Protection Policy' may change in line with new legislation, the General Data Protection Regulation.

Members commented that there were still only six staff representatives as part of the Group. Officers advised that they were actively seeking volunteers to become staff representatives on the Joint Staff Consultative Group.

Resolved that the work programme for the remainder of the 2016/17 year as set out in Annex be approved and amended as appropriate.

Annex A

**Joint Staff Consultative Group
Work Programme
2016/17**

Consultative Group meetings for 2016/17 municipal year are scheduled to be held on the following dates:

16 Mar 2017

The following work for the 2016/17 municipal year has been identified for consideration by the Consultative Group:

Meeting	Topic	Source
16th March 2017	Data Protection Policy	ICT/HR
	Information Governance Strategy	ICT/HR
	Pay Settlement	HR

Annex A

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank