

# **COUNCIL MEETING**

## **23 February 2022**

# **ADDENDUM TO THE COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK**

- |     |   |                        |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 3.  | <b>Executive - 15 February 2022</b>                                       | <b>(Pages 3 - 10)</b>  |
| 6.  | <b>Planning Applications Committee - 10 February 2022</b>                 | <b>(Pages 11 - 18)</b> |
| 8.  | <b>Licensing Committee - 16 February 2022</b>                             | <b>(Pages 19 - 26)</b> |
| 9.  | <b>Performance &amp; Finance Scrutiny Committee - 19<br/>January 2022</b> | <b>(Pages 27 - 34)</b> |
| 10. | <b>Employment Committee - 8 February 2022</b>                             | <b>(Pages 35 - 38)</b> |



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 15  
February 2022**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

- |                               |                        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| + Cllr Colin Dougan           | + Cllr David Mansfield |
| + Cllr Shaun Garrett          | + Cllr Adrian Page     |
| + Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Robin Perry     |

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath, Cllr Charlotte Morley, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Helen Whitcroft and Cllr Valerie White

**90/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2022 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

It was noted that minute 88/E - Surrey Heath Physical Activity Strategy had omitted reference to concerns raised by Councillor Graham Alleway that resolving issues of blocked footpaths was essential to increasing fitness and, furthermore, to aligning with the national Active England campaign to make pedestrians and cyclists the dominant interested parties for the highways network.

**91/E Questions by Members**

The Planning & People Portfolio Holder, Councillor Adrian Page, undertook to respond to a query from Councillor Graham Alleway about the pre-application planning application enquiry process.

**92/E Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/23 - 2025/26**

The Executive considered a report setting out the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), the revenue budgets estimates for the 2022/23 financial year, and the indicative estimates for the period 2023/24 to 2025/26. The MTFS also incorporated a 4-year capital strategy and programme, plus a Treasury Management Strategy, both of which would be considered separately at that meeting.

Members received a presentation from the Chief Finance Officer detailing the key principles and assumptions underpinning the MTFS. A summary of the budget was presented, identifying items of budgetary growth amounting to nearly £4.8m, as well as service efficiencies totalling approximately £2.4m. The sources of finance to support the budget were noted, the primary source of which was Council Tax. The budget included an increase to Council Tax of £5 per Band D property.

Members were advised that the budget gap in 2022/23 was £2.55m. The proposals for reducing the overall budget from approximately £15m in 2022/23 to £13m in 2025/26, thereby reducing the reliance on reserves from £2.5m to £300k in the period of the MTFs, were noted. Further information was requested from Members prior to the Council meeting in relation to the makeup of the efficiencies that were expected to be achieved from the Zero Based Budget process.

The Leader and Finance Portfolio Holder undertook to ascertain further information in respect of apparent discrepancies between information included in the Draft Financial Statements 2019/20 published on the Council's website and the levels of reserves included in the budget report.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council the approval of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and associated Revenue Budget Estimates covering the period 2022/23 to 2025/26, including that**

- (i) the 2022/23 budget estimates giving a net cost of services revenue budget for the Council of £14.788 million as shown in Appendix 1 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy be approved;**
- (ii) the unavoidable and service pressures of £4.791 million shown in Appendix 1 and in more detail in Appendix 1-1 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy be approved;**
- (iii) the revenue efficiencies of £2.413 million shown in Appendix 1 and in more detail in Appendix 1-2 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy be approved;**
- (iv) the recommendation by the Strategic Director Finance and Customer Services (the Council's Section 151 Officer) that a sum of up to £7.500 million of earmarked reserves at this stage be repurposed to the general revenue fund balance to support the revenue budget over the period of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and provide a sustainable budget for the Council be approved;**
- (v) authority be delegated to the Strategic Director in consultation with the Chief Executive and the Portfolio Holder for Finance to identify which reserve(s) the sum at (iv) be drawn from and the eventual amount to be re-purposed;**
- (vi) the increase in the Surrey Heath Borough Council element of the annual precept be increased by £5.00 per Band D property and in the appropriate statutory proportions for other properties; and**
- (i) a total of £0.270 million of earmarked reserves are allocated to support budgets in the services these earmarked reserves were set aside for.**

**RESOLVED to note**

- (i) that the Capital Strategy, Capital programme and Treasury Management Strategy, as elsewhere at that meeting, form part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy;**
- (ii) the forecast level of reserve balances, as shown at Appendix 4 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy;**
- (iii) the forecast level of reserve balances will be subject to confirmation once the outturn position for the 2021/22 financial year, to be reported in the revenue outturn report early in the new financial year;**
- (iv) the Council Tax base for Surrey Heath Borough Council is 38,976.2, as agreed in December 2021;**
- (v) the Medium Term Financial Strategy contains a savings target of £1.350 million over the period of the strategy, which will be achieved through a combination of further services efficiencies, increases in income and potentially service reductions to be identified through a output-based budget review for all services of the Council and subject to a Star Chamber challenge review that will commence in March 2022; and**
- (vi) the statement of the Chief Financial Officer (Strategic Director Finance and Customer Services) on the robustness of estimates and sustainability of balances.**

**93/E Treasury Management Strategy Report 2022/23**

The Executive was informed that the Council's Treasury management was conducted within the framework of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice 2017 Edition, the 'CIPFA Code', which required the Council to approve a Treasury Management Strategy before the start of each financial year.

Members considered a report detailing the proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2022/23, Treasury Management Indicators, Minimum Revenue Provision policy statement, and Treasury Management Policy Statement. The report fulfilled the Council's legal obligation under the Local Government Act 2003 to have regard to the 'CIPFA Code'.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that**

- (i) the Treasury Management Strategy for 2022/23, as shown at Annexes A and B to the agenda report;**
- (ii) the Treasury Management Indicators for 2022/23, as set out at Annex C to the agenda report;**

**(iii) the Minimum Revenue Provision policy statement and estimated minimum revenue provision payment table, as set out at Annex F to the agenda report; and**

**(iv) the Treasury Management Policy Statement at Annex G to this report**

**be adopted.**

**RESOLVED to note**

**(i) the investments as at 30th November 2021, as set out at Annex D to the agenda report; and**

**(ii) the existing Investment and Debt Portfolio, as set out at Annex E to the agenda report.**

#### **94/E Capital Strategy 2022/23 - 2025/26**

The Executive considered a Capital Strategy report, which provided a high-level overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contributed to the provision of local public services, along with an overview of how any associated risk is managed and the implications for future financial sustainability.

The report summarised the capital programme, treasury strategy and investment strategy. These documents set out how the Council intended to manage its £13.0m of investments, £146m of borrowing and £108m of investment property together with approval for the 2022/23 capital programme of £1.101m.

It was reported that the Capital Programme was much reduced in 2022/23 to 2025/26 and would be funded from receipts reserves, with no borrowing for new schemes. Members considered the Capital Programme and referred to the Local Plan provision for gypsy, traveller and travelling show people sites in the 3 year capital programme. Assurances were provided that, although funding had been scheduled in years 2023/24 and 2024/25 of the programme, if opportunities for acquisitions of sites arose in 2022/23, this funding would be brought forward.

It was advised that a review of projects included in this year's Capital Programme would be considered as part of the Quarter 3 monitoring of the 2021/22 budget.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the Capital Strategy and associated Capital Programme covering the period 2022/23 to 2025/26 be approved, including**

**(i) the new capital bids for £1.139 million, as set out in Appendix 1 to Annex A to the agenda report, for 2022/23 be approved, and that they be incorporated into the Capital Programme; and**

- (ii) **The Prudential Indicators summarised below and explained in Annex A to the agenda report for 2022/23 to 2025/26 in accordance with the requirements of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2011 be approved; and**

Prudential Indicator	2022/23 Proposed £m	2023/24 Estimated £m	2024/25 Estimated £m	2025/26 Estimated £m
Capital Expenditure	1.139	1.428	1.428	0.928
Capital Financing Requirement	174	171	167	164
Ratio of net financing costs to net revenue stream	28.22%	27.54%	26.89%	26.30%
Financing Costs	3	3	3	3
Operational Boundary	230	230	230	230
Authorised Limit	235	235	235	235

**RESOLVED to note that**

- (i) **the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) for this Council as at 31 March 2023 be estimated to be £174 million and as such a Minimum Revenue Provision of £2.32m is required;**
- (ii) **the provisional financing for Capital Programme for 2022/23 to 2025/26 (Table 2 in Appendix 1 to Annex A of the agenda report);**
- (iii) **Potential reprofiling from 2021/22 of £8.499 million (Table 3 in Appendix 1 to Annex A of the agenda report); and**
- (iv) **the available capital receipts forecast shown in Appendix 2 to Annex A to the agenda report.**

**95/E Review of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 16 November 2021, it had reviewed a revised Local Council Tax Support Scheme which had been recommended by the Community Support Working Group. At this meeting, the Executive had agreed to conduct a consultation on the proposed new scheme.

The consultation had been undertaken between 1 December and 31 December 2021, which had received 14 public responses. A summary of the responses and comments made were noted.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that**

- (i) **the revised Local Council Tax Support Scheme, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, replace the existing Local Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2022;**
- (ii) **Transitional protection for those impacted by more than a £5 per week reduction in support in payments of council tax due to the introduction of the revised scheme from 1 April 2022; and**
- (iii) **Transitional protection from the new capital limit for those current vulnerable group claimants with over £6000 but less than £16,001 capital for the period 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022.**

#### **96/E Building Control Proposed Shared Working Arrangement**

The Executive was informed that the Council had been in discussion with Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) to establish a shared working arrangement for the Building Control functions. The Building Control manager role in RBC was due to become vacant; the first stage of the process would involve creating an overall Building Control Manager who would manage the proposed shared service across the two councils. It was proposed that this Council's Building Control manager would take up this role on a full-time basis. RBC would contribute 50% of the costs of the Building Control Manager.

The intended start date for this arrangement was 1 April 2022. The arrangement would be reviewed over the next 12 months, which would establish the shared service between Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils. A further update would be reported to the Executive in due course regarding the long-term operations of the joint service.

Members noted the changes to the team's structure that would be undertaken to support the shared working arrangements. The anticipated benefits of the partnership were also recognised.

**RESOLVED that the shared Building Control management service with Runnymede Borough Council be implemented and the new structure for Surrey Heath Borough Council be agreed.**

#### **97/E Council Response to Surrey Minerals & Waste Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation**

The Executive considered a draft response to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) for Surrey, which had been prepared by Surrey County Council as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. Once adopted, the MWLP would replace the existing Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 and the associated development plan documents and guidance, and the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019. The plan would also be a material consideration for this Council in the preparation of the local development plan and making planning decisions.

**RESOLVED that the response set out in Annex 1 to the agenda report be agreed as the Council's formal response to the**

**Regulation 18 'Issues and Options' consultation on the Surrey Minerals & Waste Local Plan.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 10 February 2022**

---

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	- Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	- Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Mansfield	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath and Cllr Morgan Rise

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop, Gavin Chinniah  
William Hinde, Jonathan Partington, Emma Pearman  
and Eddie Scott

**52/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on 20 January 2022 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**53/P Application Number: 21/1302 - 39 Commonfields West End Woking Surrey GU24 9JA**

The application was for the erection of a single storey side extension following the demolition of the garage.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the applicant was Councillor Graham Alleway.

Members received the following updates on the application:

"No representations have been received in respect of this proposal."

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 21/1302 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report.**

**Note 1**

Councillor Graham Alleway declared that he was said applicant in respect of the application and in line with Part 5, Section D, paragraph 14 of the Constitution left the room accordingly.

**Note 2**

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all Committee members knew the applicant as he was a serving Councillor; and
- ii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that Councillor Alleway was part of the Community Group and thereby she was his Political Group Leader.

**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 grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft, Valerie White and Victoria Wheeler.

**54/P Application Number: 20/0777 - Burnside Nursery, Philpot Lane, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8HE**

The application was for the erection of a replacement dwelling and ancillary buildings comprising a stable and barn and manege area for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the associated dwelling house following the demolition of existing agricultural workers' dwelling and nursery buildings.

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee by Councillor Pat Tedder because of concerns about water displacement and because the proposal was considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, with the site tied to an agriculture tenancy.

Members were advised that Councillor Pat Tedder had subsequently withdrawn her objections prior to the meeting.

Members were advised of the following updates:

**“UPDATE**

**For clarification**

Paragraph 1.2 of the report compares the size of the built form between the existing glasshouses and the proposed stables and storage building. This comparison is also set out elsewhere in the report, to illustrate Officers would like to make it clear that glasshouses are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and nor are the proposed stables and storage building considered inappropriate, given that paragraph 149 of the NPPF allows the provision of

appropriate facilities for outdoor recreation, and these buildings are considered to be appropriate in size to facilitate the equestrian use of the adjoining fields. As such no very special circumstances are required to justify the equestrian buildings and in this way it is different to applications where residential houses are proposed to replace glasshouses, which generally rely on very special circumstances.

### Conditions

Condition 3 - An amendment to the wording is proposed as follows (additional wording in bold):

*3. The stables and storage building hereby permitted shall be used for equestrian purposes only as set out in the application, and the equestrian use shall be incidental to the use of the residential property only and shall not involve any commercial use. The buildings shall not be used for any other purpose **including residential accommodation**, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.*

Condition 6 - An additional clause is proposed as below:

*6d) Details of landscaping along the front boundary of the site.*

An additional condition is proposed as follows:

*There shall be no alteration of site levels within any part of the application site and following the proposed demolition, all materials shall be moved off site to an appropriate facility for disposal as soon as practicable and prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby proposed. Prior to commencement of development, photos of the entire site which clearly show the external ground shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To ensure that demolition materials are properly disposed of and not used to raise the levels of the land which may result in flooding or drainage issues, in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”*

Some Members were concerned as to the effect of the proposal on flooding and drainage issues in the local area and wished to strengthen the proposed condition 6 of the officer recommendation accordingly. It was agreed to amend the proposed condition to emphasise and specify that all the demolition materials including that derived from the previous hardstanding should be moved-off site and disposed of properly.

Furthermore, with consideration to the stable rooms, which included a kitchen/rest room and WC and shower and made up part of the proposal, Members wished to strengthen condition 3. It was agreed to add the words, ‘or residential occupancy’, in order to reinforce that the buildings should not be used for any other purpose, including to provide any overnight accommodation, without prior approval by the local Planning Authority.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Cliff Betton, seconded by Councillor David Mansfield and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 20/0777 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and updates, and the additional amendments to the conditions**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had participated in conversations with neighbours to the site, but it did not have any influence on the decisions which she would make in respect of the application.

**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 grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft, Valerie White and Victoria Wheeler.

**55/P Application Number: 20/0318 - Heathpark Wood, East Of Heathpark Drive, Windlesham, Surrey**

The application was a reserved matters application for 116 dwellings and community facilities with associated landscaping, open space, car parking and access from Woodlands Lane and the provision of SANG with associated works (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale being considered) and submission of details to comply with conditions 5 (drainage strategy), 7 (greenfield runoff rates), 9 (programme of archaeological work), 15 (surface materials), 16 (visibility zones), 18 (travel plan), 19 (finished floor levels), 20 (tree reports), 21 (external lighting), 22 (badger method statement), 23 (landscape and ecological management), 25 (SANG management plan), 26 (bat survey), 27 (dormice survey), 28 (cycle and refuse storage areas), 29 (vehicle and cycle parking provisions) and 32 (sound attenuation) all pursuant to outline planning permission 15/0590 allowed on appeal dated 26 July 2017.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“The applicant has agreed to update the surveys for the LEMP submitted pursuant to condition 23 and have withdrawn the consideration of this condition from the application. As a consequence informative 19 is withdrawn. A further condition submission will be made pursuant to condition 23 once the survey work has been completed. For information this is a pre-commencement condition.

The applicant has agreed to all the requested changes by the Council's Arboricultural Officer.

In the appeal decision the Inspector made the following comments on the loss of the woodland and biodiversity:

*“96. Section 40(1) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 imposes a duty on any English public authority to have regard, in the exercise of its functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The proposed development would lead to the loss of about 5ha of the existing woodland north of Woodlands Lane. That area consists principally of mature plantation conifers, although some younger, native deciduous trees, including birch, sweet chestnut, oak and beech, have established themselves, particularly in gaps where conifers have fallen. The understorey here is dominated by tall bracken with clumps of holly and of invasive non-native species such as rhododendron and laurel. Ground flora is very limited in its diversity.*

*97. This is an environment of low biodiversity value, not a site of having the potential to contain a unique and rare insect, fern, moss and fungal species assemblage, as Dr Berardi described it, albeit without the benefit of a prior site visit. Any loss of biodiversity resulting from the loss of this woodland would be more than compensated for by the proposed enhancements to the retained woodland areas surrounding the proposed development area, and by the new planting and landscaping that is proposed for the SANG and the development area itself.”*

In the context of these comments and as this application is for reserved matters, Surrey Wildlife Trust acknowledge the approved position on biodiversity. With regard to the issue of lighting in relation to bats, Surrey Wildlife Trust advise that they have no further comment on the lighting plan and note that the woodlands and SANG should be kept dark [*Officer comment: no lighting is proposed within the woodlands or SANG*]

A further letter of representation has been received which raises objection to the proposal on grounds of loss of woodland, impact on wildlife, air pollution associated with additional cars, traffic problems and impact on local infrastructure.

#### Correction to condition 1

Drawings PERTV1975 12 rev D Sheets 1-8  
PERTV1975aia-amsC

#### Amended recommendation

GRANT subject to a legal agreement to secure the maintenance and management of the public open space, the ecological mitigation and retained woodland areas in perpetuity and the following conditions as amended by this update sheet”.

The Committee were also verbally advised that the proposed condition 4 of the Officer’s recommendation had been amended to state that the LAP, LEAP and Open Space should be available for use by occupation of the 60<sup>th</sup> dwelling.

As the application triggered the Council’s public speaking scheme, Mr Chris McDonald, on behalf of Windlesham Heathpark Wood Group, and Mrs Sophie Holt spoke in objection to the application. Ms Laura Jackson spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

Members raised concerns as to the effect of the noise disturbance, from the construction works associated with the proposal, on the identified local badger population. As a result, the Committee agreed to amend condition 17 of the officer recommendation to remove the words, 'to create the bunds', in order to stipulate that the advanced warning signage to advise of the presence of badgers should be displayed within a month of the commencement of the works within the proposed SANG.

The Committee also agreed to further amend the revised condition 4 in order for it to require that the LAP, LEAP and Open Space should be available for use by occupation of the 60<sup>th</sup> dwelling or within 12 months of the first occupancy whichever is the sooner.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 20/0318 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and update sheet, as amended; and a legal agreement to secure the maintenance and management of the public open space, the ecological mitigation and retained woodland areas in perpetuity.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all members of the Committee had received correspondence from a number of interested parties;
- ii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had engaged in conversations with local residents, the Windlesham Society and the applicant in respect of the application; and
- iii. Councillor David Mansfield declared that he had received a large amount of emails in respect of the application, but had not returned correspondence, responded or engaged in conversations on the application.

**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 officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Edward Hawkins, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Robin Perry and Graham Tapper.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Helen Whitcroft

Voting in abstention in respect of the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**56/P Application Number: 20/1070 - St Margarets Cottage And The Ferns,  
Woodlands Lane, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6AS**

The application was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the Committee Meeting.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing  
Committee held at Council Chamber,  
Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road,  
Camberley, GU15 3HD on 16 February  
2022**

---

+ Cllr Rodney Bates (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Dan Adams (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr David Mansfield *
+ Cllr Richard Brooks *	+ Cllr John Skipper
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Tim FitzGerald *	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft *
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Lewis	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

\* Committee Member in attendance virtually.

Officers Present: Paula Barnshaw, Rebecca Batten, Helen Lolley,  
Frances Soper and Nick Steevens

**19/L Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2022 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**20/L Gambling Act 2005- Draft revised Statement of Principles 2022-2025**

The Committee was reminded that the Council, as a licensing authority, had a duty to undertake various regulatory functions imposed by the provisions of the Gambling Act 2005 and before exercising these functions it must first adopt a Statement of Policy indicating how the functions would be exercised. This Statement required review every 3 years from date of adoption.

At its meeting on 20 October 2021 the Committee had considered a draft revised statement. The draft Statement had subsequently been subject to a public consultation, which had taken place between 8 November and 19 December.

The Committee was informed that the draft statement of principles incorporated amendments which were included as a result of the Gambling Commission's Guidance to licensing authorities, which was last published in April 2021.

It was noted that once approved the Council was required to publish a notice of its intention to publish a new Statement of Policy. The policy would then come into effect four weeks later.

The Committee raised grievances that the Council, as the Licensing Authority, did not have powers to enforce the barring of local individuals from gambling premises, where it had ascertained that they were struggling with a gambling problem. Whilst it was acknowledged that in such a scenario the Council could redirect the individual to services such as the National Gambling Helpline, the Committee agreed that the Council should lobby the borough's Member of Parliament to devolve greater powers to local authorities to deal with such cases. Whilst the Committee noted that it was not within the Committee's terms of reference to enter into the Council's policy on such national issues, it resolved to note its desire for a letter to be written, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Licensing Committee, to the local Member of Parliament detailing the raised concerns.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. full Council be recommended that the revised Statement of Principles 2022-2025 (SoP) in relation to exercising functions under the Gambling Act 2005 be adopted; and;**
- II. support for the writing of a letter to the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, to lobby for greater devolved powers to combat problem-gambling, be noted.**

**21/L Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire (PH) Licensing fees and charges**

As the relevant licensing authority, Surrey Heath Borough Council was responsible for the licensing of taxis and private hire drivers, vehicles and operators. The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 included provisions that allowed district and borough councils to recover such fees as they consider reasonable with a view to recovering the costs of the issuing and administration of drivers' licences for both taxis and private hire vehicles (Section 53(2)). Furthermore, Section 70 of the Act allowed the same for vehicle and operators' licences.

'A district [or borough] council may charge such fees for the grant of vehicle and operator licences sufficient in the aggregate to cover in whole or in part –

- The reasonable cost of carrying out by or on behalf of the district council of inspections of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles for the purpose of determining whether any such licence should be granted or renewed
- The reasonable cost of providing hackney carriage stands, and
- Any reasonable administrative or other costs in connection with the foregoing and with the control and supervision of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles.'

The proposed updated fees were considered by the Licensing Committee at its meeting on 15th December 2021, and it was recommended that the proposed fees be approved by the Strategic Director-Environment and Community in consultation with the Strategic Director-Finance and the Finance Portfolio Holder. Subsequently as required by the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, the Council had placed a notice in the local press. Following the statutory 'notice

period', the Council had received two further representations from Members of the Taxi and Private Hire trade.

The Committee noted that whilst the additional representations requested the reconsideration of the increased fee for the permanent transfer of a vehicle licence, it was noted that the current £50 fee did not currently cover the cost of the administration of the transfer. Furthermore, it could in fact be perceived that the Council was currently de facto subsidising permanent licence transfers.

**RESOLVED that the proposed revised Taxi and PH fees and charges as per Annex A of the agenda reports pack, be recommended for approval by the Strategic Director - Environment and Community in consultation with the Strategic Director-Finance and the Finance Portfolio Holder.**

## **22/L Hackney Carriage (Taxi) Fares**

The Committee considered a report setting out proposals to update the Taxi Fare Chart for the hire of Hackney Carriages in Surrey Heath.

Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (the Act) provided that a district or borough council may set local taxi fares for journeys within its area by means of a table or scheme of fares.

The current fares were set in 2012 and a revised fare chart had been proposed following review of the proposed fares at its meeting in October 2021. Following the meeting the proposed fares had been subject to public consultation by way of an advert in the local media and through the Council's social media channels. On 30 December 2021 the Council received a representation from a member of the trade, which resulted in some additional information in respect of the price per mile being added to the Fare Chart and a decision to restart the consultation process. A further representation from the same member of the trade was received on 4 January 2022, which was appended to the agenda report, but had not resulted in any proposed changes to the fare chart.

Members were reassured that the Council conducted a measured mile meter check in order to ensure accurate fares were paid by customers. Moreover, in acknowledgement of rising fuel prices, it was noted that the existing fare chart was last adopted in 2012 and lasted 10 years; increases in fuel prices and other charges would be monitored and further reviews of the fares would take place if required.

The proposed fare chart was the maximum fare which could be charged by the trade.

**RESOLVED that the revised Fare Chart, as per Annex A of the agenda reports pack, be approved for introduction from 1st April 2022.**

## **23/L Verbal Update – Tax Conditionality Checks from 4th April 2022**

Members received a verbal update in respect of the new taxi and private Hire tax conditionality checks, which had resulted from the recent Finance Act 2021 (Schedule 33).

The act introduced additional checks, which would form a part of applications to renew licences for taxi and private hire drivers, private hire vehicle (PHV) operators and scrap metal dealers in England and Wales.

The new measures aimed to uncover and discourage the hidden economy, which consisted of individuals and businesses with sources of taxable income that were entirely hidden from Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC).

From 4 April 2022, licence applicants would have to complete a 'tax check' and licensing bodies would need to confirm that the applicant has completed the check.

A tax check would be conducted for renewed applications in England and Wales for licences to:

- drive taxis and Private Hire Vehicles
- operate a Private Hire business
- carry on the business of a scrap metal dealer on a site
- carry on business as a mobile collector of scrap metal

On application for the renewal of a licence, the local authority would have to obtain confirmation from HMRC that the applicant had completed the check before being able to consider their renewed licence application.

Once the 9 digit number had been provided a simple check on the HMRC website would give the Council confirmation that the applicant has registered for tax or not. If the applicant did not register for tax, the licence would not be renewed.

In preparation for the new requirements, the Council had notified all drivers and operators by means of a newsletter in October and January that they should register for tax before renewal of their licence after 4<sup>th</sup> April 2022. First-time applicants would not have to complete the check.

**RESOLVED that the update be noted.**

## **24/L Environmental Health and Licensing Teams Update**

The Committee received an update on the work undertaken by the Environmental Health and Licensing team during the 21/22 municipal year.

The work of the Environmental Health and Licensing team continued to provide services relating to the Council's statutory responsibilities which were primarily aimed at protecting public health & safety, environmental control, prevention of crime and disorder and protecting the vulnerable. Across the service officers were responsible for the licensing of a range of activities with approximately 900 active licences, registrations and consents currently active within Surrey Heath.

### Animal activity premises licensing

There were currently 40 animal activity premises licences within the borough including riding establishments, animal boarders/day care, dog breeders, pet sales and the performance and exhibition of animals. Depending on the risk rating of the premises a licence would run for 1 to 3 years in accordance with Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) statutory guidance. A vet was also required to accompany the officer on visits to riding establishments and dog breeders. Enquiries and complaints relating to these licensed activities were responded to by officers and premises visits were carried out as required including out of hours visits.

### Covid-19

Covid-19 continued to be a significant area of additional work across Environmental Health (EH) & Licensing providing support and guidance to businesses and event organisers on compliance with Covid risk assessments and controls, including the introduction of covid passes.

In conjunction with Economic Development a survey asked businesses what help they required with Covid risk assessments and as a result the offer of one to one coaching had been made to businesses on carrying out effective risk assessments for their workplaces.

Furthermore, in 21/22 officers had been carrying out face-to-face Covid contact tracing visits to residents who had failed to engage with the Contact Tracing Service. In total 120 visits had been carried out by officers to date including at weekends.

### Food Safety and Health and Safety

The food safety and health and safety work of the team was reported to this Committee in the annual service plans in October.

Following the approval of the Food Safety and the Health and Safety Service Plans, the identified priorities for 21/22 had been followed with a focus on activities which were of a greater risk. Following the easing of Covid-related restrictions, investigations had now been undertaken in response to complaints and food poisoning & workplace accident notifications. Food hygiene standards in food businesses remained high with 97.4% of food businesses rated satisfactory, good or very good and customer satisfaction levels with those who received food and safety visits was high. 95% of businesses had reported that they had been treated fairly and 98%: that the officer was polite, helpful and knowledgeable. Where contraventions were identified there was a graduated approach to enforcement with formal action as a last resort.

### Pollution Control

Complaints about noise, light, smoke, rubbish & pest infestations continued to be a large area of work with approximately 400 complaints per year investigated by officers.

Work continued to be undertaken to assess contaminated land sites and responded to land search enquiries and planning and licensing consultations on likely polluting impacts. Officers also carried out routine air quality monitoring and

carried out the environmental permitting of 24 prescribed polluting processes including: Dry Cleaners ; Petrol stations ; Pet Food Manufacturer ; Mobile Crusher ; Vehicle refinishers.

Following questions and comments by Members, it was reaffirmed that following an inspection, poor food hygiene provision or found infestations would be reflected in a premise's food hygiene rating. If a prosecution was pursued, the process would take place in the public domain and publicity would be sought in order to deter poor compliance by other premises. It was noted that in future Ward Members would be notified of formal action against food premises, in their wards, following food safety inspections.

The Committee were advised that face to face contact tracing took place when positive Covid-19 cases couldn't be contacted electronically or via the telephone by the national track and trace service or by Surrey County Council by electronic means.

Members also acknowledged that the Council licensed 2 dog breeders within the borough under the animal activity licensing regulations. During the pandemic it had become harder to identify commercial breeders amongst the backdrop of large volumes of puppy sales. However, Members were advised that dog-walking was not a licensable activity.

Members thanked the Licensing and Environmental Health teams for their continued valuable work; especially under the difficult circumstances of the pandemic.

### **RESOLVED that the update be noted**

#### **25/L Licensing Act 2003 - Summary of Decisions**

The Committee received details of the decisions taken under delegated powers in respect of licence applications where no representations had been received from the responsible authorities or any other persons.

Members were also advised of a proposal to relax licensing hours in England and Wales as part of the celebration of her majesty's platinum jubilee. On the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> of June licensing hours would be extended to include the hours of 11pm to 1am for the sale of alcohol for consumption on the premises and for the provision of regulated entertainment in licensed premises. Existing conditions to licences would continue to apply for the additional hours.

Furthermore, the Committee were advised that the Council had included additional information on its website in respect of how to hold a street party to mark the weekend; including how to apply for a temporary road closure. It was noted that any event which would include the sale of alcohol would require a temporary event notice.

#### **26/L 2022-23 Licensing Committee Work Programme**

The Committee noted its proposed Work Programme for the forthcoming municipal year.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 19 January 2022**

---

+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Valerie White (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Edward Hawkins
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+* Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke	- Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

\* In attendance virtually

Members in Attendance: Cllr David Mansfield, Portfolio Holder: Environment & Health  
Cllr Adrian Page, Portfolio Holder: Planning & People

Officers Present: Keiran Bartlett, Senior Planning Officer  
Sarah Beck, Operations Manager (West), Joint Waste Solutions  
Jo Chauhan, Head of Operations, Joint Waste Solutions  
Gavin Chinniah, Head of Planning  
Anna Godleman, Climate Change Officer  
Kelly Goldsmith, Partnership Director, Joint Waste Solutions  
Louise Livingston, Head of HR, Performance & Communications  
Damian Roberts, Chief Executive  
James Robinson, Senior Environmental Health Officer  
Nick Steevens, Strategic Director: Environment & Community:  
Ben Sword, Engagement, Wellbeing & Events Manager  
Bob Watson, Strategic Director: Section 151 Officer  
Darren Williams, Corporate Head of Community Services

## **27/PF Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2021 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## **28/PF Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **29/PF Environment and Health Executive Portfolio Update**

The Committee received and noted a report summarising the Council's work over the past twelve months which were encompassed by the Environment and Health Executive Portfolio; a portfolio which included community services, waste and recycling, emergency planning and business continuity, air quality and health and wellbeing.

### **30/PF Joint Waste Solutions Update**

Kelly Goldsmith, Partnership Director and Jo Chauhan, Operations Director, gave a presentation in respect of Joint Waste Solutions' (JWS) work to manage the Borough's waste collection services which were provided through a partnership agreement with Elmbridge, Mole Valley and Woking Councils with a single operational team managing the contract with Amey.

It was reported that the Covid-19 pandemic had continued to impact on waste collections in the Borough over the past year with increasing levels of household waste being collected at the kerbside. A national shortage of HGV drivers, during the second half of 2021, had heavily impacted the joint contract area and whilst it had been possible to maintain collections of residual, dry mixed recycling (DMR) and food waste by redeploying managers and other depot staff with HGV licences and loaning drivers across the joint contract area, there had been insufficient drivers available to maintain a full garden waste collection service. Consequently, in line with DEFRA guidance, the garden waste service had been suspended in August 2021. Garden waste collections had since been reinstated on a reduced cyclical basis and Amey and JWS were working hard to reinstate a full service as soon as possible. Whilst it was hoped that a regular garden waste collection service would be resumed in February 2022 this would not be confirmed until JWS and Amey were certain that it would be sustainable. All subscribers to the Garden Waste Service had been offered the option to extend their subscription on a pro-rata basis for the length of time that collections had not taken place.

The Committee was informed that there were currently 17 driver vacancies across the contract area and Amey had managed to secure the services of eight agency drivers, reducing the overall number of vacancies across the joint contract area to nine. In an effort to ameliorate the shortage of HGV drivers a package of initiatives including intensive HGV driver training courses, a new recruitment and retention scheme and the payment of a market supplement to HGV drivers had been put in place. Amey was also working closely with recruitment agencies to identify drivers. It was agreed that a breakdown of driver vacancies in Surrey Heath each quarter for the past four years would be circulated.

It was noted that the contract's performance was measured against a number of performance indicators which were reported on a quarterly basis to the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee, with more generalised trend data being presented to the Surrey Environment Partnership on a quarterly basis. It was reported that the service was currently performing well against its agreed target of 80 missed bins per 100,000 with 38.7 bins missed in the third quarter of 2021 (October to December 2021). With regards to street cleansing, during the third quarter of 2021 only 0.5% of the 300 street transects surveyed were rated as falling below the agreed Grade B standards (under the NI195 Methodology) against a target of 4%.

Analysis of waste collections in the Borough showed that whilst total volumes of waste were higher than in previous years there had been a significant reduction in the volume of recyclates collected in the Borough during the latter part of 2021 a reduction which was primarily attributed to the suspension of garden waste collections. Notwithstanding this decrease, Surrey Heath was currently ranked fifth nationally for its recycling rates.

Contamination of DMR, particularly in flatted developments, had an impact on the Council's recycling rates and JWS's Low Performing Areas Team was working to address this both directly residents and households where multiple incidents of contamination had been identified, through the use of targeted communications and new style bins, and with collection crews to improve their understanding of the importance of preventing

contamination entering the waste stream with the introduction of Recycling Champions and crew education videos. Moves which had resulted in a significant reduction in the number of loads being rejected by Materials Recycling Facilities (MRF).

The Committee expressed their frustration with the quality of the communications with residents over the suspension of the garden waste service. Members drew officers' attention to particular concerns over the delays in informing residents that services were being suspended and the wording of the letter sent to residents telling them that if they asked for a refund of their subscription then they would be unable to rejoin the scheme at a later date.

The Committee's criticism was accepted and it was clarified that the future shape of the garden waste collection service at the time of the service suspension was not yet clear and JWS and Amey had been reluctant to promise a service that it may not be possible to provide in the future. Notwithstanding this it was acknowledged that the wording of the letters sent to residents could have been improved. It was agreed that information regarding the number of refunds provided to residents would be circulated.

In response to a query about what arrangements were in place to ensure that waste collection requirements of new developments were considered at the planning stage, it was confirmed that ensuring waste collections were taken into account by developers was an ongoing issue. It was agreed that clarification would be provided on what dialogue had taken place with the Council's planning section in an effort to improve the provision for waste receptacles.

The Committee noted the proposed targets for recycling rates in 2022/23 was lower than it had been in 2019/20 and 2020/21 and it was requested that these be reviewed to ensure that they were sufficiently challenging.

The Committee thanked officers for the update.

### **31/PF Community Services Update**

The Committee received a presentation from Darren Williams, Corporate Head of Community Services, on the work of the Community Services Partnership across Surrey Heath.

In November 2020, the Executive had agreed to enter into a partnership arrangement with Runnymede Borough Council to provide community services to residents across Surrey Heath and Runnymede. The Partnership, overseen by a joint partnership board with representatives from both local authorities, shared all financial risks and rewards and the service was accountable to both Runnymede and Surrey Heath. Over the past twelve months a significant amount of work had taken place to TUPE staff into the new arrangements, develop new team dynamics and implement a new governance framework and develop new ways of working. The Council's Internal Audit function had conducted an audit of the implementation of the partnership and whilst the final report was still awaited, it was reported that interim feedback had highlighted that there was evidence of a strong partnership arrangement and good governance frameworks in place.

The Community Services Partnership provided a range of services including: community alarms and telecare, community transport, a handy man services, a hospital discharge service, meals at home, social prescribing and day care centres. Whilst the Partnership was administered through a central service based in Runnymede the services themselves were delivered from local bases. The Partnership also worked closely with other council

services to assist residents in accessing related services for example Personal Independence Grants and recreational activities.

The Community Services Team's relationship with health and social care partners enabled it to play a key role in the development of preventative services for residents and over the past year there had been improved engagement with partners both locally and across the wider Frimley Integrated Care System

As part of work to ensure the most efficient and effective use of services on offer the partnership was exploring different ways of delivering services to residents, for example currently both Surrey Heath and Runnymede leased vans to deliver meals to residents with hot meals being delivered at lunch time and a sandwich supper. Moving to a system where some residents are provided with a hot supper and a sandwich lunch whilst others were provided with a hot lunch and a sandwich supper meant that vans were not being left unused for large parts of the day and fewer vans were needed across the partnership area.

Although the Government's restrictions during the pandemic had impacted heavily on community services with the closure of day centres and a reduced number of community transport journeys booked there had also been an increase in the number of residents utilising the Meals at Home Service. As restrictions had been eased the number of journey provided by the Community Transport had increased from 926 in quarter 1 of 2021/22 to 2,007 in quarter 3 of 2021/22, Windle Valley Day Centre had reopened and a new Homesafe Plus service for Surrey Heath residents leaving hospital and a handyman referral service had been launched.

During 2022/23 the Community Services Team's priorities would focus on continuing to rebuild services following the pandemic, identifying and developing new service opportunities both internally and with partner organisations as well as continuing to grow and develop new team structures and operational processes.

The Committee thanked Darren Williams for his update.

### **32/PF Air Quality Annual Report 2021**

The Committee received a report detailing a review of air quality across the Borough during 2020/21.

The annual Air Quality Review formed part of the Council's statutory requirements in relation to Local Air Quality Management under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995. The report set out the results of air quality monitoring work, detailed the activities and strategies employed by the Council to improve air quality and reviewed the progress made in this area.

The Council monitored air quality at 51 locations across the Borough with the majority of monitoring stations being located in built up areas near busy roads. The World Health Organisation had defined a limit of 40micrograms per cubic metre limit for NO<sub>2</sub> particulate as being the optimum level for protecting the health of asthmatic children in urban areas and it was reported that mean NO<sub>2</sub> particulate levels had in 2020 fallen below this limit at all the diffusion tube monitoring locations in the Borough and there had been no exceedance of the hourly mean NO<sub>2</sub> objective of 200microgrammes per cubic metre. Analysis of the air quality in the vicinity of the M3 had found that NO<sub>2</sub> particulate levels had fallen at all monitoring locations when compared against the levels measured before the M3 was converted to a smart motorway. Whilst these changes were considered to be positive it was stressed that pandemic restrictions had significantly impacted on traffic

levels for significant periods of time in 2020 and they should be treated with caution until more data became available in the coming years.

It was queried where the monitoring stations in the south of the Borough and in the vicinity of the A331 were located and it was agreed that this would be clarified.

It was agreed that the possibility of publishing a whole borough map showing the locations of monitoring stations on the Council's website would be explored.

The Committee noted the report.

### **33/PF Climate Change Working Group Update**

The Committee received a report providing an update on the work that had taken place to deliver the actions and priorities contained within the Council's Climate Change Action Plan.

The Action Plan included 65 actions that if implemented in their entirety would contribute to delivering the Council's ambition to achieve a net zero carbon emission target by 2030. It was recognised that whilst the agreed actions had been categorised as being either high, medium or low priority the addition of deadlines would be useful.

It was recognised that the Council had a key role to play in helping residents to take steps to reduce their own carbon emissions and consideration needed to be given to incorporating this into Council decisions for example improving the provision of secure bike parks.

It was noted it would be necessary for the Council to supplement the £45,000 budget allocated to climate change initiatives to be supplemented by grants and many of the agreed actions would require the Council to work in partnership with other organisations in order for them to be achieved. It was agreed that the funding of climate change initiatives would be followed up outside the meeting.

The Committee thanked officers for their work.

### **34/PF Local Plan Local Authority Monitoring Report**

The Committee received a report containing the Local Plan Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) for 2020/21.

The AMR had been produced in line with the requirements set out in the Localism Act 2011 and set out the actions that had been taken to implement the Local Development Plan and the Local Development Scheme, the extent to which policies in the Surrey Heath Local Plan have been achieved and identified any solutions and changes where targets were not being met.

It was acknowledged that the lack of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) capacity was one of the main barriers to development, particularly in the west of the Borough. It was clarified that where SANG capacity was provided outside the Borough, for example in Hawley Meadows in Hart and Shephards Meadow in Bracknell Forest, the Council was responsible for collecting developer contributions for SANG funding on a quarterly basis and passing this on to the appropriate planning authority, an arrangement that was cost neutral to the Council.

It was agreed that information pertaining to the proportion of SANG funding used to provide car parking would be circulated.

The Committee was informed that a new Town Centre Strategy was being developed and this would supersede the Town Centre Area Action Plan.

The Committee noted the report and thanked officers for the work that had been done to develop the new draft Local Plan.

### **35/PF Draft Annual Plan 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report setting out the Council's draft Annual Plan for 2022/23. The draft Annual Plan set out the key goals, projects and performance targets for the Council during the 2022/23 financial year to deliver the goals and ambitions set out in the Council's new Five Year Strategy. A final draft would be presented to the Executive for approval in March 2022. Arising from the Committee's questions and comments the following points were noted:

- It was confirmed that the draft Annual Plan had been developed with input from the Council's finance team and Corporate Management team to ensure that all projects were fully budgeted for.
- Clarification would be sought on the progress of the ESO fuel pipeline and the potential implications for Turf Hill car park improvement works.
- The target for the collection of dry mixed recycling would be reviewed and adjusted to ensure that it was sufficiently ambitious.
- It was agreed that current performance levels would be added to enable performance improvements to be monitored.

It was stated that more context needed to be provided about previous performance and targets to enable consideration of the proposed targets for performance indicators for 2022/23. It was requested that Chobham be added to the areas supported by the Community Support Working Group to address Poverty, and also that references be included to Surrey Heartlands health partners where appropriate

The Committee noted the report.

### **36/PF Corporate Risk Register**

The Committee received a report setting out the Council's key corporate risks and the actions being taken to mitigate their potential impact.

It was confirmed that the Council's Property Management Strategy had been implemented three or four years ago.

The Committee noted the report.

### **37/PF Public Realm Task and Finish Group**

It was noted that consideration of this item would be deferred to the next meeting due to the late availability of the report.

The Committee considered a report exploring the potential application of ISO9001 standards and principles to services being delivered by the Council.

Following the Grenfell Tower fire a national initiative had been launched for all Building Control functions to acquire ISO9001 accreditation and whilst a number of local authorities, in particular large scale county or unitary authorities, held ISO certification for services which traded commercially alongside private sector organisations none held ISO accreditation for their services in their entirety. Furthermore, there was no widespread use of the standards found in central government.

The Committee was informed that no evidence had been found to support a link between ISO accreditation and local government performance and it was stressed that given the time, staffing and financial resources that would be required to acquire and maintain ISO9001 accreditation a clear business case would be required before any decisions to pursue accreditation were taken. Notwithstanding this, it was acknowledged that a number of the key principles underpinning the ISO9001 standard could have some applicability to local government and could be applied without having to pursue official accreditation.

However, it was stressed that a significant number of the Borough Council's services and functions were already overseen by external bodies who applied their own quality management standards and reporting frameworks to the Council's work. Consequently, the Committee sought assurances that if the principles of ISO9001 were adopted then the Council would need to ensure that care would be needed to ensure that unnecessary additional administrative and monitoring burdens were not placed on services, that assessing and measuring a service's conformance to ISO9001 principles did not come at the expense of either doing valuable work or measuring and understanding process performance and that services here demand was variable were not forced into incurring additional costs in trying to meet standardised processes.

The Committee stressed that the cost of any work to embed ISO9001 principles into Council practice had to be balanced against any improvements that achieving the standards would bring to the services in question and that care had to be taken to ensure that applying the principles of ISO9001 to council services tangibly improved processes and did not simply become an audit of the service.

It was noted the pursuing ISO9001 accreditation was estimated to cost between £225,000 and £265,000 with money needing to be spent on additional staffing costs, consultants, documentation and external accreditation costs. The Committee stressed that in the current financial climate this level of expenditure could not be justified.

The Committee acknowledged that the Council's new senior management team had only become fully staffed at the start of January and it was considered that they should be given time to become fully embedded and develop their understanding of the Council's services before any new initiatives were implemented. The Committee agreed that Option 2 (That all functions work towards accreditation of ISO9001) be removed from the list of options proposed to Full Council for consideration.

It was suggested that a hybrid option that combined Option 3 (Focus on delivering service improvements through existing mechanisms including the Council's new management structure) and Option 1 (Adopting the key principles that underpin ISO9001 and related quality frameworks to help improve performance and customer focus) could provide a suitable way forward.

The Committee agreed that a report setting out the preferred options would be presented to Full Council for consideration.

**39/PF Work Programme**

The Committee received and noted its work programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

It was requested that additional meetings of the Committee were scheduled to enable full and proper consideration to be given to matters being scrutinised. It was noted that the Committee's terms of reference currently only allowed for a maximum of six meetings a year and it was agreed that the matter would be raised with the Governance Working Group.

**40/PF Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee would take place on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2022 at 7pm.

**Chairman**

**Minutes of a Meeting of the  
Employment Committee held at Surrey  
Heath House on 8 February 2022**

---

+ Cllr Colin Dougan (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Cliff Betton (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Cllr Alan McClafferty
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
* Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	

+ Present

\* In attendance virtually but did not vote

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates

Officers Present: Louise Livingston, Julie Simmonds, Rachel Whillis.

**22/EC Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 October 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

**23/EC Pay Settlement 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report setting out the current position on negotiations for the 2022/23 Pay Award. It was reported that negotiations had taken place at a Joint Staff Consultative Group meeting, but the Group had not reached an agreement on a proposed pay award. Staff Representatives had requested a consolidated payment of £650 on all pay scale points, whilst Member representatives had offered a consolidated payment of £500 on all pay scale points. Consequently, in accordance with the Annual Pay Settlement Procedure, both options were presented to the Committee for consideration.

Members considered the factors that had been presented as the basis for the Staff Representatives' request. Having taken into account these representations, whilst also recognising the Council's financial position, the Committee agreed to recommend to Full Council that a £500 increase on a pay scale points be agreed as the Pay Award for 2022/23.

It was advised that during the negotiations Staff Representatives had requested clarity on Christmas closure, specifically asking for the continuation of the arrangements in recent years whereby the Council had closed between Christmas and New Year. This had been facilitated by a combination of a contractual day's leave and the awarding of a further additional day's leave, which had been matched by staff taking a day's leave from their annual leave entitlement. Having indicated a desire to enhance the offer being made to staff, plus also recognising a need for further clarification on the status of the additional day's leave, Members agreed to grant an additional day's leave over the Christmas period in 2022/23. Arrangements for beyond 2022/23 would be further discussed at a future meeting.

The Committee echoed comments made at the Joint Staff Consultative Group meeting about improving the procedure for negotiations and agreed to add an item to its next meeting's agenda. It was also agreed to add an item to the future work programme on assessing whether to link future pay awards to the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that a consolidated increase of £500 on all pay scale points be agreed as the Pay Award for 2022/23.**

**RESOLVED that an additional day's leave be granted for the Christmas period 2022/23.**

#### **24/EC Safeguarding Policy and Procedure**

The Committee considered a revised Safeguarding Policy and Procedure, which had been updated in line with changes in processes and guidance. Where possible, it had been amended to simplify and ensure clearer guidance when used as a reference document.

**RESOLVED to adopt the revised Safeguarding Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report.**

#### **25/EC Casual, Fixed Term and Temporary Workers Policy and Procedure**

The Committee was informed that the Casual, Fixed Term and Agency Workers Policy and Procedure had been reviewed to take into account the new Senior Management Structure and associated titles.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the revised Casual, Fixed Term and Agency Workers Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.**

#### **26/EC Pension Discretions Policy**

The Committee was informed that each pension fund was required to have a discretionary policy, which needed to be kept under review. Surrey County Council had not issued an updated Pensions Discretions Policy. Although there was no legal requirement that it be reviewed annually, it was this Council's practice to review it annually.

The Joint Staff Consultative Group had considered the Policy at its meeting on 13 January 2022 and had recommended updating paragraph 5.2 of the Policy to state that the table in the appendix referred to for the relevant decision maker. It had also agreed that references to job titles would be updated to reflect the revised senior management structure.

**RESOLVED that the Pensions Discretions Policy be updated, as set out Annex A to the agenda report.**

## **27/EC Review of Recruitment Policy and Procedure**

The Committee considered proposed changes to the Recruitment Policy and Procedure, which aimed to reflect operational changes within the recruitment process. These changes included a new job profile template, a new timescale for making job adverts live, a new online staffing resources form, ongoing temporary changes to right to work checks due to COVID-19, and the new Disclosure Barring Service umbrella body company.

**RESOLVED that the revised Recruitment Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.**

## **28/EC Review of Health and Safety Policy - Statement of Intent**

The Committee considered a review of the Health and Safety Policy- Statement of Intent, which had been updated to reflect the change in the Council's Chief Executive.

**RESOLVED that the revised Statement of Intent, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.**

## **29/EC Review of Health and Safety Policy - Organisation**

The Committee considered proposed changes to the Health and Safety Policy – Organisation. Subject to further minor grammatical changes, it was agreed that the revised Policy be adopted.

**RESOLVED that the revised Health and Safety Policy – Organisation, as set out at Annex A, as amended, be adopted.**

## **30/EC Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution**

The Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution had been reviewed and updated to reflect the establishment of the Employment Committee and its role in relation to the agreement of Staff Terms & Conditions. Amendments to the Constitution had also been made to reflect the revised senior management structure and the HR Manager's job title.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the revised Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution, as attached at Annex A to this report, as amended, be adopted.**

## **31/EC Work Programme**

The Committee discussed its work programme for rest of the municipal year and agreed to add a review of the Annual Pay Settlement Procedure to the agenda for the next meeting.

It was also agreed to add an item on Christmas leave from 2023 onwards to the work programme, with a projected date for consideration in June 2022. An item

assessing whether to align future pay awards to the Medium Term Financial Strategy would also be added to the forward programme.

**RESOLVED that the work programme for the remainder of the 2021/22 municipal year, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be agreed.**

Chairman