

# **COUNCIL MEETING**

## **14 October 2015**

# **COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK**

1. **Council - 23 July 2015** (Pages 3 - 6)
2. **Extraordinary Council - 23 July 2015** (Pages 7 - 10)
3. **Executive - 28 July 2015** (Pages 11 - 18)
4. **Executive - 8 September 2015** (Pages 19 - 26)
5. **Executive - 29 September 2015** (Pages 27 - 32)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 20 July 2015** (Pages 33 - 44)
7. **Planning Applications Committee - 19 August 2015** (Pages 45 - 50)
8. **Planning Applications Committee - 14 September 2015** (Pages 51 - 66)
9. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 29 July 2015** (Pages 67 - 72)
10. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 30 September 2015 (to be laid on the table)**
11. **Licensing Committee - 9 September 2015** (Pages 73 - 74)
12. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 15 September 2015** (Pages 75 - 80)
13. **Joint Staff Consultative Group Notes - 22 September 2015** (Pages 81 - 82)



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY  
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at  
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on  
23 July 2015**

---

+ Cllr Joanne Potter (Mayor)  
+ Cllr John Winterton (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 Nic Price
+ Cllr Moira Gibson	- Cllr Wynne Price
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	- Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
- Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

**14/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Wynne Price and Ian Sams.

**15/C Minutes**

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

**Resolved that the minutes of the Annual meeting of the Council held on 20 May 2015 be approved as a correct record.**

**16/C Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed Members that her Mayoral Year, so far, had been very busy and enjoyable. She had attended events at nursing homes, schools, public houses and many more. She had also attended 3 royal events.

## **17/C Leader's Announcements**

The Leader reported that she had recently attended the Local Government Association Annual Conference. Government speakers had emphasised devolution as a new theme for local government. However it was clear that, in order to be given devolved powers, local authorities would be expected to combine and to have a directly elected Mayor. Combined authorities were likely to be based on county authorities.

## **18/C Questions from Councillors**

Councillor Rodney Bates asked a question of the Leader relating to Individual Electoral Registration (IER) and received a written reply. It was noted that John Penrose MP, Minister for Constitutional Reform at the Cabinet Office, had announced in Parliament, on 16 July 2015, that he would be bringing forward the end date for the transition to Individual Electoral Registration from December 2016 to December 2015.

In response to a supplementary question from Councillor Bates the Leader agreed to ask Michael Gove MP, and the Local Government Association, to urge the government to change its recent decision so that the transition to IER would end in December 2016.

## **19/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies**

(a) Executive – 26 May 2015, 16 June 2015 and 7 July 2015

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson, seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks, and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 26 May 2015, 16 June 2015 and 7 July 2015 be received and the recommendation therein be adopted as set out below:**

### **9/E Highways Bids to the Local Enterprise Partnership**

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

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 30 April 2015, 27 May 2015 and 22 June 2015

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 30 April 2015, 27 May 2015 and 22 June 2015 be received.**

- (c) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 4 June 2015

It was moved by Councillor Josephine Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Charlotte Morley and

**Resolved that the notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 4 June 2015 be received.**

- (d) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 17 June 2015

It was moved by Councillor David Allen, seconded by Councillor Dan Adams, and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 17 June 2015 be received.**

- (e) Licensing Committee – 24 June 2015

It was moved by Councillor Bill Chapman, seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 24 June 2015 be received.**

- (f) External Partnerships Select Committee – 14 July 2015

It was moved by Councillor Paul Deach, seconded by Councillor Dan Adams and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 14 July 2015 be received.**

- (g) Audit and Standards Committee – 15 July 2015

It was moved by Councillor Valerie White, seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 15 July 2015 be received.**

## **20/C Officer Employment Rules**

It was reported that the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 had come into force on 11 May 2015. The Regulations required local authorities to incorporate certain provisions in respect of disciplinary action relating to statutory officers into the Council's Standing Orders at the first ordinary meeting falling after 11 May 2015.

The Regulations set out changes to the statutory disciplinary and dismissal procedures applying to the Head of Paid Service, the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer. Under the new process, the dismissal of a statutory officer must be approved by way of a vote at a meeting of the authority who would be able to dismiss, provided they had taken into account the advice, views or recommendations of a Panel which must include at least two independent persons as defined under Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011. The Panel must also take into account the conclusions of any investigation and representations from the officer concerned.

**Resolved that the Officer Employment Rules at Part 4 Section J paragraph 7 of the Constitution be amended in accordance with the Schedule to the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 as set out at Annex A to these minutes.**

## **21/C Presentation to Brigadier Allan McLeod**

The Mayor, on behalf of the Council, presented Brigadier Allan McLeod, Commandant of the Defence College of Logistics, Policing and Administration in Deepcut, with a gift in recognition of his close relationship with the Council since 2012 and all his help and assistance in allowing use of the prestigious Officers' Mess as a venue for the annual civic dinner. The Mayor wished him every success for the future.

Mayor

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY  
MEETING OF SURREY HEATH  
BOROUGH COUNCIL held at Surrey  
Heath House, Camberley on  
23 July 2015**

---

+ Cllr Joanne Potter (Mayor)  
+ Cllr John Winterton (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 Nic Price
+ Cllr Moira Gibson	- Cllr Wynne Price
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	- Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
- Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

**22/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Wynne Price and Ian Sams.

**23/C Civic Honours**

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks and unanimously

**Resolved that Keith John Bush, a past Member of the Council of the Borough of Surrey Heath from 1999 to 2015, representing West End Ward, having rendered eminent service to the Council, particularly as Mayor of the Borough for the Municipal Year 2006 to 2007, Deputy Mayor in 2005 to 2006, Chairman of the Leisure Committee from 2001 to 2002, a Member of the Executive holding the Leisure Portfolio from 2002 to 2003, the Corporate Portfolio from 2003 to 2004, the Regulatory and Special Projects Portfolio from 2007 to 2008, the Planning, Development and Homes Portfolio from 2008 to 2009, the**

**Organisational Development Portfolio from 2009 to 2012 and the Regulatory Portfolio from 2012 to 2015 and the Chairman of the Local Development Framework Working Group, the Council's representative on South East Employers Organisation from 2010 to 2012 and recalling his sedulous devotion as a Trustee of Chobham Poor Allotment Charity, as a Parish Councillor for the West End Parish Council particularly as Vice Chairman and Chairman of that Parish Council; and as a member of the church choir of Holy Trinity, West End and St Johns, Bisley, the Council of the Borough of Surrey Heath in grateful recognition of these services ably and honourably performed does hereby confer upon the said Keith John Bush the title of HONORARY ALDERMAN of the Borough in accordance with the provisions of Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972.**

**And that such conferment be signified by the presentation to him of a copy of this Resolution authenticated by the Common Seal of the Council.**

The Mayor congratulated Mr Bush upon the conferment of his title as an Honorary Alderman of the Borough of Surrey Heath and presented to him a sealed copy of the above resolution and a badge of office.

#### **24/C Civic Honours**

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson, seconded by Councillor Rodney Bates and unanimously

**Resolved that Alan Douglas Whittart, a past Member of the Council of the Borough of Surrey Heath from 1993 to 2015, representing the Frimley Green Ward, having rendered eminent service to the Council, particularly as Mayor of the Borough for the Municipal Year 2008 to 2009, Deputy Mayor in 2007 to 2008, and the Council's representative on the Surrey Heath Sports Council from 1998 to 2015; Relate from 1998 to 2011; the Surrey Heath Arts Council 2010 to 2011; the Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership between 2005 and 2015; the Surrey Heath Youth Focus from 2010 to 2015; the Blackwater Valley Recreation and Countryside Management Committee 2000 to 2001, the Police Community Partnership Group between 2000 and 2006; the Social Services Community Partnership Group 2000 to 2001 and as an Observer to the Camberley Football Club from 2010 to 2011; and recalling his sedulous devotion as the President of the 1st Frimley Green and Mytchett Scout Group, the Council of the Borough of Surrey Heath in grateful recognition of these services ably and honourably performed does hereby confer upon the said Alan Douglas Whittart the title of HONORARY ALDERMAN of the Borough in accordance with the provisions of Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972.**

**And that such conferment be signified by the presentation to him of a copy of this Resolution authenticated by the Common Seal of the Council.**



The Mayor congratulated Mr Whittart upon the conferment of his title as an Honorary Alderman of the Borough of Surrey Heath and presented to him a sealed copy of the above resolution and a badge of office.

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 28 July  
2015**

---

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

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

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Edward Hawkins and Cllr Alan McClafferty

**17/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**18/E Additional footnote to the Council's adopted Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 123 List**

The Executive was reminded that the Council had adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL) in July 2014 and the Regulation 123 list, which set out the type of infrastructure which would be funded or part funded through CiL. The regulations allowed a charging authority to levy a charge on the owners or developers of land where development took place so that they contribute to the costs of providing infrastructure needed to support the development.

In order to ensure that the Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) could be met, all development which provided additional residential units was required to provide or contribute to avoidance measures to mitigate the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The avoidance measure was through the provision or contribution to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) including the management and maintenance of SANG in perpetuity. Shared SANG was included in the Regulation 123 list.

Changes to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 had allowed for the conversion of empty B1 Office use to residential under Permitted Development. If there was no increase in overall floor area then the development was not CiL liable. It was also noted that further legislative changes could lead to other exemptions from CiL.

The Executive was informed that, whilst the provision of SANG was infrastructure, the management and maintenance of the SANG was not and therefore this element could be collected outside of CiL by use of a Unilateral Undertaking.

It was therefore recommended that the Council should review the CiL charging schedule in respect of SANG. In the interim, it was recommended that an additional footnote be added to the Council's Regulation 123 list to reflect that

funding for SANG management and maintenance would be sought from these permitted development schemes.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) a review of the CiL charging schedule be undertaken to address the impact of recent and forthcoming legislative changes upon the Council's ability to collect funding for SANGs and thus ensure delivery of an adequate supply of housing for the Borough;**
- (ii) an interim SANGs charge of £112.50 (Gross Internal Area per square metre) be levied to cover maintenance and management of SANGs for residential development from which CiL cannot be levied; and**
- (iii) an additional footnote be added to the Regulation 123 List, as set out in Paragraph 4.2 of the agenda report, to explain the interim charge and ensure that residential development provided can meet the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 by contributing to the management and maintenance of SANGs.**

**19/E Food Safety Service Plan 2015/16**

The Executive was informed that the Food Standards agency required all food authorities to have a Food Safety Service Plan to ensure that national priorities and standards were addressed and delivered locally.

The draft Food Safety Service Plan for 2015/16, which followed the Food Standards Agency's set format, was considered. Members were advised that, at its meeting on 24 June 2015, the draft Plan had been reviewed by the Licensing Committee, which had recommended its adoption.

It was noted that the number of food businesses which were 'broadly compliant' with food hygiene law remained high at 95%. Officers continued to work with the 5% of businesses which were not broadly compliant, in order to ensure that they improved their standards.

The Executive was advised that there would be more focus on conducting the first inspection at premises within 28 days of registering and conducting programmed interventions within 14 days before or after the due date target.

**RESOLVED that the Food Safety Service Plan 2015/16, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be approved.**

**20/E Review of the Corporate Capital Programme 2014/15 and Report Capital Prudential Indicators for 2014/15**

The Executive considered a report on the capital outturn for 2014/15 and the approval of any carry forward of budgets into the 2015/16 capital programme. The

report also detailed the actual performance against the 2014/15 prudential indicators.

**RECOMMENDED that**

- (i) **the carry forward budget provision of £11.147 million from 2014/15 into 2015/16 be approved;**
- (ii) **the revised 2015/16 Capital Programme of £21.272 million be noted; and**
- (iii) **the final capital prudential indicators for 2014/15 be noted.**

**21/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)
22/E	3
23/E	3
24/E	3

Note: Minutes 22/E and 23/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.

**22/E Development of Property**

The Executive made decisions in relation to the development of property owned by the Council.

**23/E Camberley Bowling Club**

The Executive made decisions in relation to the renewal of a lease for Camberley Bowling Club.

**24/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) **minute 22/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time; and**

- (ii) minute 23/E remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations.**

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 8  
September 2015**

---

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

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

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates and Cllr Chris Pitt

**25/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman, subject to the addition of “per square metre” to (ii) of the resolution of minute 18/E, for the purpose of clarification.

**26/E Questions by Members**

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Rodney Bates concerning the housing of Syrian refugees in the borough.

**27/E Bagshot Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals**

Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 required local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas. In response to this statutory requirement, a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals document for the Bagshot Village Conservation Area had been prepared.

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 6 January 2015, it had agreed to the undertaking of a targeted, six-week consultation on the draft version of this document and a proposed alteration to the Bagshot Village Conservation Area boundary. A final version of the document had now been prepared, taking into account comments received during the consultation as appropriate. It was intended that this document would replace the Bagshot Village Conservation Area Statement (1997), which was now considered to be out of date in form and content.

**RESOLVED to adopt the Bagshot Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals document and the proposed alteration to the Bagshot Village Conservation Area boundary.**

**28/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)
29/E	3
30/E	3
31/E	3
32/E	3

Note: Minutes 29/E, 30/E and 31/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.

**29/E Acquisition of Property**

The Executive made decisions in relation to the acquisition of property.

**30/E Parking Service Improvement**

The Executive made decisions in relation to the replacement of the structural expansion joints on the top floor of Main Square Car Park and the resurfacing of the surface and the access ramp.

**31/E Lease of the Camberley Rugby Club, Watchetts Recreation Ground, Camberley**

The Executive made decisions in relation to the renewal of a lease for Camberley Rugby Club.

**32/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) minute 29/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time;**
- (ii) the financial details relating to minute 30/E and associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time but the decision be made public; and**
- (iii) minute 31/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

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 29  
September 2015**

---

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

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

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates and Cllr John Winterton

**33/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**34/E Community Fund Grant Applications**

The Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme provided grants of up to £25,000 to assist local 'not for profit organisations' with the delivery of community projects. The Executive considered applications for grants which had been submitted by 30 June 2015.

The Executive considered the applications and agreed to approve applications from Camberley Job Club and Camberley Judo Club.

The application from Turners Boxing Academy to refurbish the boxing bag room, gym and changing rooms was discussed. The Boxing Academy was based at Collingwood College. Hire arrangements were managed by a Service Level Agreement which stipulated that the College was responsible for the maintenance of the building and the statutory health and safety requirements of the building.

Members agreed to refuse the bid as it was recognised that the grant would go towards the refurbishment of the College, for which the Boxing Academy was paying rent. However, it was further agreed that the Council supported the good work being delivered by the Boxing Academy and therefore wanted to explore alternative ways in which to assist the Boxing Academy.

The Executive considered applications from Sebastian's Action Trust to develop its present office space into a family mini-hub and from Step by Step for the purchase of 2 i-pad Air and 4 i-pad Air minis. It was agreed to reject the application from Sebastian's Action Trust as the works had already commenced and no verification of project costs had been received. It was also agreed to reject the application from Step by Step as the organisation had £858,000 in unrestricted reserves.

It was also noted that an application from Surrey Heath Veterans and Families Project had subsequently been withdrawn by the applicant as funding had been found elsewhere.

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) that the following grants be awarded from the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme:**
  - a. £1,500 be awarded to Camberley Job Club towards the purchase of 4 new laptops, plus printing and material costs, subject to verification of all costs;**
  - b. £17,500 be awarded to Camberley Judo Club to add a new strength and conditioning gym to its existing facilities, subject to planning permission and landlord consent being granted;**
- (ii) that the application by Turners Boxing Academy be refused but that the Council works with the Boxing Academy to explore alternative ways to assist the organisation;**
- (iii) that the following applications be refused**
  - a. Sebastian Action Trust's application for £9,500 towards the development of present office space into a mini family hub;**
  - b. Step by Step's application for £1,600 towards the purchase of 2 x i-pad Air and 4 x i-pad Air minis;****for the reasons set out at Annex C to the agenda report; and**
- (iv) to note the withdrawal of the Surrey Heath Veterans and Families Project's application.**

Note: It was noted for the record that Councillor Rodney Bates declared that he was friends with people involved in running Camberley Job Club.

### **35/E Quarterly Financial Report**

The Executive considered the Council's finances as at 30 June 2015.

Overall, services expected to be £240,000 under budget at the end of the year. This included £140,000 of savings on waste and recycling which had resulted from the renegotiation of the contract, which had not been agreed in time for the budget, and £100,000 of income relating to investment property acquisitions which had been made in the New Year.

The Executive noted the position of a number of financial areas at the end of the first quarter:

- In relation to interest received, despite the budget having been increased by £100,000 in 2015/16, the Council was on track to achieve this due to the new investment policy,



- It was estimated that, based on expenditure to date, there would be an underspend of £21,000 on wages and salaries at the end of the year
- In relation to sundry debts, invoices totalling £627,000 remained unpaid. However, £200,000 of this related to community alarms and parking season tickets which were invoiced at the start of the year, but paid by instalments throughout the year.
- Housing Benefit Debts stood at £610,000, of which 50% were on an agreed repayment plan, 14% were being pursued, 7% were with the DWP, and 24% were being considered for legal or other action.

It was reported that, using the new financial system, a new approach had been adopted where actual expenditure for the period under review would be compared to the budget to date. Using this approach, services would spread, or 'profile', their budget over the year depending upon when they anticipated income and expenditure to occur.

Services had reviewed and compared their actual income and expenditure to the profiled budget for the first quarter and, where there had been a variance over £25,000, had advised whether this was due to a timing issue for which the budget would need re-adjusting, or whether it indicated a potential risk of a year-end variance.

Members reviewed the areas where there had been variances over £25,000 and noted the reasons why these had occurred.

**RESOLVED to note the Revenue, Treasury and Capital Position for the first quarter of 2015/16.**

**36/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)
37/E	3
38/E	3
39/E	3

Note: Minutes 37/E and 38/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.

**37/E Frimley Cricket Club**

The Executive made decisions in relation to the granting of a lease for Frimley Cricket Club.

**38/E Lease of the West End Bowls Club, Rosewood Way, West End, Woking.**

The Executive made decisions in relation to the surrender of an existing lease and the granting of a new lease for West End Bowls Club, West End.

**39/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 minutes 37/E and 38/E and the associated agenda reports remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations.**

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 Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 20 July 2015**

---

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

+ Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Nick Chambers	- Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	- Cllr Victoria Wheeler
- Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Rebecca Jennings-Evans)

In Attendance: Cllr Adrian Page, Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Cllr Paul Deach, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington, Neil Praine, Cllr Nic Price and Jenny Rickard.

Cllr Paul Deach from min 9/P – 13/P  
Cllrs Nic Price and Adrian Page from min 9/P – 14/P

**9/P Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**10/P Application Number: 14/0532 - Land South of 24 - 46 (evens) Kings Road, and 6 and 9 Rose Meadow, West End GU24 9LW**

The application was for the outline application for 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. Access only to be considered. (Additional info rec'd 11/09/2014). (Additional info rec'd 09/10/2014), (Additional info rec'd 22/10/14), (Additional in rec'd 06/11/14).

The Committee was reminded that the application was the subject of a valid non-determination appeal that has been received by the Planning Inspectorate. The applicant had the right to make a non-determination appeal after the expiry of the statutory time limit or expiry of an extension of time agreement. The Planning Inspectorate became the determining authority. However, it was still necessary for the Council to confirm what it would have determined if it had been the determining authority.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'SCC (Education) has provided further comment suggesting a contribution of £508,877 towards secondary and primary education is required. However, they confirm that there are currently no projects to fund.*

*As such, the contribution would not comply with the tests set out in Paragraph 204 of the NPPF.*

*Correction: SU/06/0879 relates to 40-46 Kings Road and therefore relates to an adjoining site.'*

It was noted that the speakers agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application but they felt that other reasons for refusal should be included, including harm to the rural area, lack of infrastructure, highways issues, harm to the wildlife habitat and inappropriate access route.

Some Members felt that an additional reason for refusal that the development would be harmful to the rural character of the village should be included. Members were reminded that the site fell within the defined countryside (beyond the Green Belt) but also formed a part of a housing reserve site as previously defined in Policy H8 of the Surrey Heath Local Plan.

**Resolved that application 14/0532, had the Council been the determining authority, 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 Members had received correspondence regarding this application.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Mr Consterdine, Ms Doney and Ms Walters spoke in objection to the reasons for refusal.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application, had the Council been the determining authority, was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application, had the Council been the determining authority:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

11/P

**Application Number: 14/0594 - land north of Beldam Bridge Road, West End GU24 9LP**

The application was for the outline application for the erection of up to 85 dwellings with new access and change of use of land to provide publicly accessible recreation space (SANG), car parking, landscaping and open space (details of access only to be agreed). (Additional info rec'd 15/09/14), (Additional info rec'd 23/09/14).

Some Members felt that the application had been premature as the borough had met the housing requirement.

**Resolved that application 14/0593 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 Members had received correspondence regarding this application.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Ms Kingston, Ms Doney and Mr Bain spoke in objection to the application. Mr Woolf the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman 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 this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillor Max Nelson.

**Democratic Services Officer's Note:**

A day after the meeting the appellant lodged an appeal on the grounds of non-determination and before the decision had been formally issued. The planning decision cannot therefore be issued by the Authority and the application will now be decided by the Planning Inspectorate.

**12/P Application Number: 14/0869 - 12 Streets Heath, West End, GU24 9QY**

This application was for the erection of a two storey detached building to comprise of a 60 bedroom nursing home (Use Class C2) following demolition of existing dwelling. (Additional info rec'd 29/09/2014) (Amended & additional plans/info rec'd 16/12/14), (Amended info rec'd 19/02/15), (Amended info rec'd 26/02/15), (Amended info/plans rec'd 02/04/15). (Amended and Additional plans & documents rec'd 24/06/2015).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'Following the submission of an amended drainage strategy and illustrative landscaping masterplan a revised public consultation has been undertaken. This has resulted in 8 letters of objection (confirming the original objections remain) being received. A letter of support has also been received.'*

*Comments have been received from the Drainage Officer and no objection is raised, subject to the condition below **(additional condition)**:*

*Prior to the commencement of any development associated with the permission hereby granted a revised drainage strategy expanding upon the outline drainage submitted 24 June 2015 shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The details to be submitted shall make provision for:*

- Surface water drainage connections to the front of building (around car park) to be completed. Layout details to show connection of all downpipes into perforated carrier pipe, not directly into cellular attenuation.*
- Pipe detail around south west corner patio areas corrected (the use of a shallow slot drain is inappropriate in light of the landscaping details provided). The plan(s) must be revised to move the drain away from the landscaping or detailed to accommodate the larger slot drain (Aco Qmax 550) for conveying flows around the building.*
- The overflow channel (under the decking) to be a minimum section of 150x600mm, and discharging through a slot orifice within the retaining wall structure.*
- Level detail to be added to 'Outlet Flow Control' to clarify discharge and sump level details at the attenuation outfall.*
- All surface water and attenuation systems to be maintained to their full design capacity in perpetuity.*

*Reason: to ensure a satisfactory surface water drainage strategy and to comply with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policy DM10 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.*

**Amendments**

*The **reason** for imposing **condition 2** to be amended to:*



*To ensure that sufficient foul drainage capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community and to accord with the NPPF and Policies DM10 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.*

**The wording of condition 12 amended:**

*The development hereby approved shall only be used as a Class C2 care home and be occupied solely by persons who are mentally and/or physically frail; have mobility problems; suffer from paralysis or partial paralysis; or are in the need for assistance with the normal activities of life. The building shall not be used for any other purpose within Class C2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or any other statutory instrument and notwithstanding any provisions either in force or enacted at a later date there shall be no permitted change of use.*

*In addition:*

- there shall be no self-contained or staff accommodation within the approved development;*
- there shall be no dogs or cats at the premises at any time (other than assisted living dogs);*

*Reason: To ensure the integrity of the SPA is not harmed by the proposal in accordance with Policy CP14B of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.*

*Correction to the second sentence of para 7.3.4 to read:*

*However, in itself this does not mean that the proposal will be harmful to the character of the area. Indeed in plan form it can be seen that the residential development flanking three sides of the site has tighter urban grain than the application site.'*

The speakers in objection felt that there was not enough parking and there were highways issues. In addition the development would be a strain on the infrastructure, particularly schools, doctors, sewage system and increase the risk of flooding.

The speakers in support commented that the County Highways Agency had raised no objection to the parking allocation and that due to staff shift patterns the amount of parking would be sufficient. A footpath had been considered by the applicant but residents felt that it would urbanise Meadow Way.

Some Members felt that there were not enough parking spaces and this would cause more congestion on the roads. In addition it was felt that the scale of the development was too large.

Officers advised that the applicant was asked to submit more detail about the drainage. There had been several meetings with the Council's Drainage Engineer to ensure that drainage conditions could be finalised.

Members were also reminded that if the application was refused on highways grounds and as the County Highways Agency had raised no objections, there could be cost implications for the Council.

**Resolved that application 14/0869 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 had received correspondence from the applicant.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Mr Phillips and Mr Allard spoke in objection and Mr Johnson and Mr Street spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks 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 this application was as follows:

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

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application as amended:

Councillors Colin Dougan, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**13/P Application Number: 15/0141 - Weston Paddocks, (land adjacent to 1) Whitmoor Road, Bagshot GU19 5QE**

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 10 dwelling houses following the demolition of existing dwelling house and outbuildings (access and layout to be considered). (Amended plan recv'd 22/6/15).

A site visit had taken place at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'SAMM payment has now been received, therefore the recommendation is changed to approve'*

Some Members felt that the application was acceptable, in principle, but the access on to Whitmoor Road caused concerns. There had been a number of accidents, many unrecorded, on the road near the proposed access point onto the site and it was felt that this would be made worse and a traffic calming scheme would ease these issues.

Officers advised that a speed management scheme could be required by condition, which would need to be in place before any development. There would be a consultation on the scheme and Surrey County Council would need to agree as previously they had raised no objections to the application. Ward councillors would be kept informed of any progress with the management scheme.

**Resolved that application 15/0141 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

**Note 2**

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

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

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**14/P Application Number: 15/0216 - Unigate Dairies Ltd., 7-11 Updown Hill and 2 Wentworth Cottages, Windlesham GU20 6AF**

The application was for the erection of 2 commercial (retail/office) units, 2 two bedroom houses, 4 three bedroom houses, 4 one bedroom flats and two storey side extension (to 2 Wentworth Cottages) following the demolition of existing buildings with access and parking/garaging. (Amended & additional plans rec'd 04/06/15).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'The Environment Agency has revised their comments, raising no objections subject to a proposed condition to protect the Windlesham Ditch and its 5 metre wide buffer.*

*The applicant has confirmed that this area of land (at the south boundary of the site) is to be retained as a parking area, and that the existing tarmac surfacing is to remain (and is not to be replaced). Landscaping details are proposed to be*

*agreed under Condition 4. Also, details of protection of the Ditch and its buffer, during the demolition, site clearance and construction phases, are proposed under part of proposed Condition 9(i), as set on Page 92 of the officer report.*

*However, an amendment to Condition 9 is suggested as below:  
Replace “No development shall take place...” with “No demolition, site clearance or construction...”*

*Further details for sustainable drainage have been received and the comments of the Drainage Engineer are awaited.*

***CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION: for the Executive Head of Regulatory Services to GRANT following the consultation period with the Drainage Engineer subject to the following conditions [including the amendments above] and any other condition requirements of the Drainage Engineer’.***

Some Members had concerns about traffic issues due to overdevelopment on the site. It was also confirmed that condition 11 ensured that the retail unit could only be used for retail. However, officers would add ‘retail class A1’ to the condition to be clear.

**Resolved that application 15/0216 be approved as amended following the consultation period with the Drainage Engineer subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and any other condition requirements of the Drainage Engineer.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Nick Chambers declared that he owned a property in Chertsey Road but it was not close to the development site.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan 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 this application was as follows:

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

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

15/P

**Application Number: 15/0427 - Chobham Meadows Land between Station Road and Chertsey Road, Chobham GU24 8AN**

The application was for the change of use of land from Agriculture to Site of Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and associated works.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'One further letter of support and one raising an objection have been received, neither making any specific comments.'*

**Natural England** raises no objections subject to the undertaking of ecological surveys, visitor surveys, (to assist with calculating SANG capacity), and circular walk proposals and areas to remain for grazing (which need to be discounted from SANG capacity).

**Surrey Wildlife Trust** raises no objections subject to the provision of an appropriate suite of ecological surveys and current visitor level surveys (to assist with calculating SANG capacity). Although not formally requested, the advice would appear to suggest that these are provided prior to determination.

The **Environment Agency** raises no objections subject to the provision of an ecological survey (particularly for water voles), with any required mitigation measures, and a landscape management plan. The EA have also noted the flood alleviation scheme separately proposed for the site.

The **County Highway Authority** have commented that they "have undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The County Highway Authority therefore has no highway requirements."

*It is considered that in relation to the SWT comments, with the Council as landowner and local planning authority there is sufficient control over the land to not require surveys at this stage but require them at condition stage. In this respect the following condition is proposed:*

*3. No development shall take place until on-site ecological surveys, along with a strategy to consider any required mitigation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposal shall be implemented in accordance with the mitigation strategy.*

*Reason: To ensure that the proposal does not have an adverse effect on on-site ecology and to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

*Further neighbour notifications have been sent with an expiry date for comments on 4 August 2015.*

***CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION: for the Executive Head of Regulatory Services to GRANT following the expiry of the neighbour notification period, subject to no substantive new objections being raised.'***

Some Members requested a car park survey and officers advised this could be added to condition 2.

**Resolved that application 15/0427 be approved as amended subject to:**

- i) conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) the expiry of the neighbour notification period, subject to no substantive new objections being raised; and**
- iii) the amending of Condition 2 to include car park surveys (as a part of the management plan) at the request of Members.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that the applicant to this application was Surrey Heath Borough Council.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor David Allen 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 this application was as follows:

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

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White

**16/P Application Number: 15/0033 - Unit 2, Trafalgar Way, Camberley GU15 3BN**

The application was for the erection of a trade warehouse with ancillary offices (Class B8) and associated service yard, loading bay and parking following demolition of existing storage warehouse (Class B8).

Some Members felt that the site would benefit from landscaping along the boundary. Officers advised that paragraphs 7.4.8 and 7.4.9 and condition 3 covered this issue.

**Resolved that application 15/0427 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks 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 this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**17/P Application Number:15/0504 - 87 Park Road, Camberley GU15 2SW**

The application was for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers but it was reported to this Committee as the applicant was an employee of the Council.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'It has been noted that the Recommendation is missing from the report and should read Grant.'*

**Resolved that application 15/0504 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Conrad Sturt.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Chairman





**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 19 August 2015**

---

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

+ Cllr David Allen	- Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Robin Perry
- Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Colin Dougan	- Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Pat Tedder) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Colin Dougan)

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Charlotte Morley, Michelle Fielder, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Noreen Mian, Jonathan Partington and Lee Brewin

**18/P Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**19/P Application Number: 15/0385 - Sparks Garage, 2 London Road, Camberley GU15 3UZ**

The application was for an outline application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 10 residential apartments, access, parking provision and associated landscaping with access to be considered only. (Additional information received 10/07/2015).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*Following the completion of the Committee report, comments have been received from the Drainage Officer and an additional condition is proposed as follows:*

Condition 18

*The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Those details shall include:*

- a) *Information about the design storm period and intensity (1 in 30 and 1 in 100 (+30% allowance for climate change), discharge rates and volumes (both pre and post development), temporary storage facilities, means of*

- access for maintenance, the methods employed to delay and control surface water discharged from the site, and the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;*
- b) Any works required off-site to ensure adequate discharge of surface water without causing flooding or pollution (which should include refurbishment of existing culverts and headwalls or removal of unused culverts where relevant);*
  - c) Flood water exceedance routes, both on and off site;*
  - d) A timetable for implementation;*
  - e) Site investigation and test results to confirm infiltration rates;*

*Reason: to ensure that the proposed development can be adequately drained and to ensure that there is no flood risk on or off the site resulting from the proposed development, in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Proposals Document 2012.*

*An additional informative as detailed below is also required:*

*The drainage details required by condition 18 above should include full details of all foul water systems, to include cover levels, invert levels, pipe and chamber sizes, to be annotated upon a drainage layout plan. Details to indicate all connection points to buildings and to provide levels of any rodding eye or inspection point.*

#### *Affordable Housing*

*Government guidance that schemes for less than 10 units should not be subject to contributions towards or the provision of affordable housing was quashed by a High Court decision in early August. As such, the LPA is now reverting back to its Policy CP5 in respect of affordable housing, which means that this development would be liable for on-site affordable housing provision of 30% if 10 units are provided or 20% if 5-9 units are provided.*

*It is therefore considered necessary to add the following condition to ensure that provision is made for affordable housing is at the reserved matters stage:*

#### *Condition 19*

*Prior to the approval of any reserved matters application, an affordable housing scheme compliant with the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 Policy CP5 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: to ensure affordable housing is provided in accordance with Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.'*

Some Members had concerns about the impact of the proposal on the pedestrian access and parking. In addition the addition of yellow lines near the access was also raised. It was noted that there had been no objections raised by the County Highways Authority.

The Chairman asked for it to be a matter of record that the reserved matters applications should come to the Planning Applications Committee for determination. In addition it was requested that informative 4 be amended to make reference to parking standards.

**Resolved that application 15/0385 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 Councillor Sturt declared that he knew the applicant.

**Note 2**

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

**Note 3**

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

**Note 4**

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

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

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**20/P Application Number: 15/0455 - 80 Verran Road, Camberley GU15 2LJ**

The application was for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension and single storey front extension including integral garage following demolition of existing garage.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'Paragraph 6.1*

*The main reasons in support of the application are summarised below:*

- *The proposal is in keeping with the street scene and character of the area*
- *The proposal would add more variety to the street and improve the area*

- *Other houses have extended in a similar way which do not look out of place*
- *An extension sitting flush with the front elevation is preferred as it would look more natural*

*A neighbour has also queried who would be responsible if subsidence was caused*

*Officer's comment: In relation to other properties extending in the street each and every proposal has to be assessed on its own merits. Issues concerning the correct foundations and avoiding subsidence would be considered under the Building Control process.'*

Some Members sought confirmation that there had been no objections from neighbouring properties. Officers confirmed this.

The measurement between the proposed development and the neighbouring property 82 Verran Road was confirmed as 0.75m. Some Members felt that a site visit would be beneficial to assess the impact of the proposal on number 82.

The Chairman reminded Members of the Site Visit protocol that stated that:

*'where the Planning Applications Committee has commenced the consideration of an item but decides to defer an application because it considers that a site visit is necessary in order for it to determine the application, only those members who have attended that site visit will be able to vote in relation to that application at the next meeting'.*

**Resolved that application 15/0455 be deferred to allow for a site visit to take place.**

**Note 1**

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

**Note 2**

The recommendation to defer the application to allow for a site visit was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor David Allen

**Note 3**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to defer the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to defer the application:

Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

**21/P Application Number: 15/0479 - 69-73 James Road, Camberley GU15 2RH**

The application was for the erection of 10 three bedroom dwellings and associated ancillary works following demolition of existing commercial buildings. (Additional information received 22/6/15), (Additional info received 24/06/15).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'By email on 12 August the agent submitted details of vacant commercial units at Trade City. However this is not considered to go to the heart of the objection raised in terms of the loss of employment which would arise. This is because this information alone does not demonstrate that there is no need for this sized unit offering this range of employment opportunities, and that in the event the current occupiers vacate, the premises' could not be re let.*

*In addition the Environment Agency has confirmed its objection to the proposal is maintained.*

*Affordable Housing*

*Government Guidance that schemes for less than 10 units should not be subject to contributions towards or the provision of affordable housing, was quashed by a High Court decision in early August. As such, the LPA is now reverting back to its Policy CP5 in respect of affordable housing, which means that this development would be liable for on-site affordable housing provision of 30% if 10 units are provided or 20% if 5-9 units are provided. The applicant is to be advised of this by the addition of the informative below.*

*Additional Informative*

*The applicant is advised that following the change in government guidance pertaining to the threshold for the provision of affordable housing the Council will apply Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 to redevelopment proposal's giving rise to a net increase in residential units.'*

**Resolved that application 15/0479 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 David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt , Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 14 September 2015**

---

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

+ Cllr David Allen	- Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	- Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (In place of Robin Perry) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Colin Dougan)

In Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Charlotte Morley, Lee Brewin, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Karen Limmer, Jonathan Partington, Emma Pearman and Jenny Rickard

Cllr Paul Deach from min 22/P – 25/P  
Cllr Charlotte Morley from min 22/P – 27/P  
Karen Limmer from min 22/P – 23/P

**22/P Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 19 August 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**23/P Application Number: 14/0925 - Little Heath Nursery, Little Heath Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8RJ - Chobham Ward**

The application was for the redevelopment of a commercial nursery for residential use - 35 affordable dwellings with associated works with access from Burr Hill Lane; and provision of suitable alternative natural green space (SANGS) with associated works. (Amended plans & info rec'd 23/03/15), (Additional info rec'd 27/05/15), (Amended/additional info rec'd 28/07/15), (Amended plan rec'd 20/08/15).

A site visit took place at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'A response to the submitted Flood Risk Assessment has been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority who concludes that surface water drainage can be provided. However the Council's Drainage Officer has objected to the proposal.*

*The basis of this objection is that the information submitted does not adequately demonstrate that the surface water run-off can be accommodated without conflict arising between this and ground water. It is therefore considered that the **Recommendation should be changed** and the application should be **REFUSED** for the following reason:*

*In the absence of accurate and robust Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development would not result in an increased risk of either ground or surface water flooding; or that a conflict will not arise between these two water sources. The local planning authority cannot therefore reasonably conclude that the proposal would not result in harm or injury to either future (occupiers of the proposed development), or neighbouring occupiers or their property. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.*

#### *Suggested informative*

- 1. The applicant is advised that the raising of site levels is not considered to be an appropriate means of addressing the high groundwater table and on-site surface water ponding. This is because the build-up of ground levels will displace standing surface water and is likely to compromise the ability for neighbouring properties to drain effectively. One way this could be addressed (it is accepted there may be others) is by lowering level increases across the site and considering off-set ponding and additional land drainage systems (to the rear of properties (these would need to be shallow and independent from any other drainage system and discharge to the open watercourse at the lowest corner of the site))*
- 2. The applicant is also advised to address the inconsistencies between the FRA and submitted plans (with specific reference to the discrepancies between finished floor level details / attenuation / landscaping / tree retention).*
- 3. The applicant is also advised to ensure the following matters are addressed in any future application submission:*
  - Attenuation systems to cater for a 1:100 year event, +30% climate change, taken for worst case duration scenario and allowing for all impervious hard surface areas*
  - No buildings, fences or other obstructions to be constructed above existing ground levels within 5.0m of any watercourse (top of embankment)*
  - Full details of any offset of surface water ponding areas must be provided*
  - All drainage and attenuation systems to be fully annotated within the proposals. Details to include all pipe sizes and gradients, chamber sizes*



*including cover, sump and invert levels where applicable. All connections to properties to be shown.*

- *All attenuation systems to be fully detailed with plan sizes, levels and volumes. Details of attenuation tanking and venting systems to be provided.*
- *New access road to be drained independently from any attenuation system serving properties. Plans to detail a separate attenuation system provision to accommodate highway drainage with all gully connections to be shown. All road levels, kerb levels and drainage attributes to be fully annotated.*
- *Details must be provided for the surface water system (highway drainage) present at the site access. Full details of any surface water system likely to drain into or through the development must be provided.*
- *Total flows from the development to be restricted to a maximum of 5.0 litres/second/hectare.*
- *FFL of all proposed buildings to be provided.*
- *Levels for all impermeable hard surface areas to be provided must be provided (to include level information around the curtilage boundary and for any paved or parking areas). All elements of the drainage systems to be indicated upon the drainage layout plan*

*A request for the applications deferral from tonight's Agenda has been received from the Applicant via their Planning Agent. This is made on the basis that the applicant considers that the surface and ground water related objection could be resolved in a timely manner. Officers do not share this view.*

*Since writing the committee report a further objection has been received from Chobham Parish Council. This reiterates the previous concerns raised and adds that the revised drainage strategy does not address the development's impact off site.*

*5 further objections have also been received. These reiterate previous comments / objections; in addition specific reference is made to the Windsor Court Development and the contribution this will make to the Affordable Housing provision within Cobham. [Officer note: this development comprises 8x3 bedroom dwelling houses: it is not a rural exception site and because of this there is no requirement for these units to solely accommodate a local need; notwithstanding this, 4 of the units are to be rented to persons with a local connection to Chobham. It is not however considered that these four units will address the local need identified by the Housing Manager and as reported as part of the main Committee Paper's].*

*Comments have also been received from County Cllr Mike Goodman. ‘*

*A note was also circulated to Members from County Councillor Mike Goodman with regard to the application.*

Some Members questioned whether the application could be deferred for a month as requested by the applicant. It was advised that the drainage issues could not be resolved in that time period. Some Members were concerned that responses from required authorities had been delayed which had resulted in the recommendation being changed so close to the meeting date.

Some Members also felt that the need for shared ownership units had not been proven.

It was noted by the Committee that the Environment Agency had raised no objection to the application but the agency had provided strategic flood risk advice.

In addition, Members sought clarification on what would be considered on any future applications should this one be refused. It was advised that whatever issues the application was refused on would be a consideration should a further application be brought back to Committee. It was noted that given the County Highways Authority had not objected to the scheme, any reason for refusal on highways grounds would need to have robust evidence to support this.

**Resolved that application 14/0925 be refused for the reasons set out in the update report of the Executive Head Regulatory and that sufficient evidence had not been provided to support the need for affordable housing on the site.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he and Committee Members had received communication regarding this application.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the public speaking scheme, Mr Dymott and Mr Rees spoke in objection to the application. Mr Sheppard, the applicant spoke in support.

**Note 3**

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

**Note 4**

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

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

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt , Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**24/P**

**Application Number: 15/0175 - Camberley Police Station, Portesbury Road, Camberley GU15 3SZ - Town Ward**

The application was for the erection of 35 residential units (comprising 9 apartments in a 3 storey block and a mix of two storey dwelling houses (with rooms in the roof and 3 storey town houses). (Amended plans rec'd 13/07/2015 & 5/8/15).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'Housing Mix and Viability (Paragraphs 5.6, 5.7 and 7.7)*

*To confirm, the overall development would provide the following housing mix: 3 no. 1 bed (9%); 6 no. 2 bed (17%); 9 no. 3 bed (26%); 5 no. 4 bed (14%); and, 12 no. 5 bed (34%)*

*The applicant provided additional viability information. The Council's Viability Consultant assessed this and on the basis of revised calculations recommended that 8 affordable units (or 22.8%) ought to be provided. However, following further negotiation the provision from 4 to 6 units (or from 11.4% to 17.1%, respectively) was agreed with the following breakdown proposed:*

- *Plot 2 Ground Floor 1 Bed Flat (Shared Ownership)*
- *Plot 3 Ground Floor 2 Bed Flat (Shared Ownership)*
- *Plot 24 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*
- *Plot 25 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*
- *Plot 26 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*
- *Plot 27 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*

*The Council's Viability Consultant and Council's Housing Manager are supportive of this approach.*

*Consequently, this development would now deliver a total of 29 market housing of which 2 no. would be 1 bed (7%); 5 no. 2 bed (17.3%); 5 no. 3 bed (17.3%); 5 no. 4 bed (17.3%); and, 12 no. 5 bed (41%).*

*To reiterate paragraph 7.7.2 of the agenda report, whilst this market housing split is not aligned with Policy CP6 which requires a total of 50% of the market housing to be 3 bed or above, Policy TC18 of the AAP supports family housing at this location. Thus, the higher uplift of family housing, equating to approximately 76% of the total market housing, is not unreasonable.*

*This viability resolution took longer than anticipated and so there is concern that the legal process to draft and sign the legal agreement will not be completed by the 30 September 2015. Hence, the applicant is agreeable to an extension of time until Friday 30 October 2015.*

*Drainage (Paragraph 7.10)*

*Following comments received from the Council's Drainage Engineer further work is required on the drainage strategy before the application can be approved and any necessary drainage conditions imposed. It is therefore recommended that the*

*outstanding drainage issues be agreed under delegated powers and the extension of time until 30 October 2015 will also enable this to happen.*

### **Amended RECOMMENDATION**

*The Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to a receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure affordable housing provision and SAMM (£22,742); subject to receipt of an agreed drainage strategy; and, subject to conditions (as detailed on pages 53-56 of the agenda, and any additional conditions required in connection with the drainage strategy).*

***In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement and drainage strategy has not been agreed by the 30 October 2015 (with the drainage strategy received for consideration no later than 30 September 2015), the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE the application for the reasons set out on page 57 of the agenda; and, for the following reason:***

3. *In the absence of a workable drainage strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant and provides an appropriate sustainable drainage system for the management of run-off. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.'*

**Resolved that application 15/0175 be approved subject to:**

- i) the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head Regulatory;**
- ii) receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure affordable housing provision and SAMM (£22,742);**
- iii) an agreed drainage strategy by 30 October 2015; and**
- iv) any additional conditions required in connection with the drainage strategy.**

#### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he and Committee Members had been contacted by the developer and he and Cllr Richard Brooks had attended an exhibition in relation to the application.

#### **Note 2**

As this application triggered the public speaking scheme, Ms Green, the applicant spoke in support.

#### **Note 3**

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

#### **Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt , Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**25/P Application Number: 15/0272 - Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windlesham GU20 6HL - Windlesham Ward**

The application was for the outline application for the erection of a 65 bedroom care home, a doctors surgery and a detached bungalow with landscaping and access following demolition of existing buildings (access to be considered), (Additional info rec'd 24/06/15 & 15/7/15).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*‘Consultee comments*

*We have had comments from the following:*

- *Local Lead Flood Authority – Further information provided is not sufficient to meet requirements; there are discrepancies in the information which need to be checked. Therefore a fourth refusal reason is proposed as follows:*
  
- 3. *In the absence of a workable drainage strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant and provides an appropriate sustainable drainage system for the management of run-off. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.*
  
- *Environment Agency – No comments – low environmental risk*
  
- *Fisher German Pipelines – Further clarification that they are satisfied that the works will not affect the pipeline. [Officer comment: the pipeline is not considered to be a reason for refusal in any case]*
  
- *Windlesham Parish Council – This should have read ‘Comment’ as opposed to ‘Objection’ - Their response read as follows: Concern expressed by the access from Chertsey Road and highway safety issues, as the local school is only 500 metres away. Council asked if there are any very special circumstances in this case that would allow the Green Belt to be built on*

***Very Special Circumstances Statement – received 28<sup>th</sup> August***

The applicant provided an additional statement covering the factors they believe amount to very special circumstances. In the summary they make the following points:

- **Case Law and Planning Policy relating to very special circumstances state that they can be several factors taken together and none of these factors need to be exceptional individually** – Officers do not dispute this. Very special circumstances, however, must outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm. Either alone, or in combination opinion the very special circumstances do not amount to outweigh the significant harm to the Green Belt, and other identified harm to the character of the area and the unsustainability of the location.

Summary of factors put forward by the applicant that they considered amount to very special circumstances:

1. **A pressing need for specialist residential accommodation in SHBC for older persons** - Officer comment: This is not disputed in the report, however there is no information to suggest that at the present time there is a critical shortage of places in the borough, and the issue remains as to whether this is the appropriate location. Surrey Heath is meeting its housing targets and in any case paragraph 034 of the Housing and Economic Land Availability within the Planning Practice Guidance it makes clear that in decision making, unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
2. **No objections from either Parish Council and 210 letters of support** – Officer comment: While neither Parish Council has objected, Windlesham PC has raised concern over some issues as stated above.
3. **Priority rights to the care home proposed for Windlesham and Chobham residents** – Officer comment: the applicant has explained further in this document that this could be done by moving residents of Chobham or Windlesham to the top of any waiting list.
4. **By providing alternate accommodation, the proposed care home will release residential dwellings onto the wider housing market, reducing pressure on other greenfield sites in the Borough** – Officer comment: this may be the case, however this site causes harm to a greenfield site itself
5. **Local demand for a doctors surgery in Windlesham parish** – Officer comment: no further evidence of need has been provided to support this within the statement and additionally the County Highway Authority have objected due to the unsustainable location for such a facility
6. **No alternative non-Green Belt sites are available or suitable in Windlesham or Chobham parishes so if a scheme is to come forward it would have to be in a Green Belt location** – Officer comment: the

*applicant did not provide an Alternative Site Assessment with this application which would be expected to justify a development on this Green Belt site. Further information has been provided at a late stage within this statement which is taken from the Surrey Heath Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the applicant shows the sites identified within the SHLAA as potentially suitable for development within Chobham and Windlesham and states that there are none outside the Green Belt. However, the important difference between these sites and the application site is that they are likely to be previously developed land; as in paragraph 3.9 of the SHLAA it states that in choosing the sites to include, undeveloped sites within the Green Belt were excluded at the first stage, unless they were capable of being treated as a rural exception site for 100% affordable housing. None of these sites the applicant has shown therefore would be undeveloped sites in the Green Belt, as the majority of this site is. In order to discount these other sites the applicant should have provided information as to why none of these other sites would be more suitable. Therefore the fact remains that it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that there are no suitable alternative sites – and there may well be other sites which would be preferable to this one in terms of sustainability of location and a larger amount of previously developed land.*

- 7. Site lies adjacent to former BOC complex which was approved on the grounds of very special circumstances earlier this year. This scheme was objected to by the community and Parish Councils and represents far greater levels of built development in the Green Belt.**  
**Officer comment -** *The BOC development is significantly harmful to the Green Belt but was only allowed due to the very special circumstances pertaining to the merits of that specific proposal. Hence, the quantum of development allowed under BOC permission does not provide a greenlight for other neighbouring sites. The case officer in summing up the acceptability of BOC stated the following:*

*'...in the officer's opinion the combined weight of these very special circumstances marginally outweigh the significant harm to the Green Belt and other harm. It is considered that the applicant's contribution to the local, regional and national economy, particularly in a growth worldwide industry that will become increasingly important in the future, tips the balance in favour of support. In coming to this difficult conclusion regard has been had to whether permitting this development would set a precedent in the Green Belt, or in the event that the applicant vacated the site result in future development that would be even more harmful.*

*However, it is considered that the proposal is genuinely unique and so other developments elsewhere in the Green Belt would still have to be considered on their own merits being subject to the same stringent Green Belt control.'*

- 8. The site is located in an existing developed setting. Further it is well related to the strategic road network and will be supported by a sustainable Travel Plan including a minibus for staff and visitors.**  
**Officer comment –** *in this document the applicant has suggested a Travel Plan including the provision of a minibus amongst other factors. This has*

*been put to the County Highway Authority who has confirmed that it does not overcome their previous objection, and they are still concerned about the unsustainable location of the development, particularly the doctor's surgery. The surrounding development has been discussed in the report under section 7.3. However, this is a semi-rural area where built development is interspersed with rural open land, and this application would result in a band of continuous development which is not currently seen anywhere else along this part of the road outside the settlement area.*

**9. The proposal offers a large site whereby a high quality landscaped environment can be created for residents of the care home and plentiful car parking can be provided.** *Officer comment – do not dispute this, however car parking would have to be controlled by intercom because of the site's proximity to the SPA as discussed in paragraphs 7.4.3 and 7.8.1 of the Officer's Report, and the County Highway Authority have raised concern that such an intercom would cause queuing on the Chertsey Road.*

**10. The scheme would provide approximately 70 full time equivalent employment opportunities in a variety of low skilled and high skilled professions. On SHBC's own figures, this could generate £3,570,000 towards the local economy.** *Officer comment: this is discussed in paragraph 7.10.6 of the report.*

**11. A high quality design can be achieved and existing utilitarian buildings removed, such that the standard of design generally in the area can be raised.** *Officer comment: this is discussed in paragraph 7.10.8 of the report.*

*Officers do not consider therefore that this further information has overcome any of the previous reasons for refusal.'*

It was noted that just before the Committee meeting officer's received notification from the Local Flood Authority that the proposed fourth reason for refusal detailed in the update, should be withdrawn.

Some Members supported the views of the speakers in objection with regard to the Green Belt harm, the lack of public transport in the village, and a charitable or community trust would be preferable to a commercial concern. In addition they supported the County Highways Authority's comments that the location was unsustainable.

Some Members commented that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that there were very special circumstances.

Other Members felt that the scheme addressed the need for a care home in the village and there had been no objection to the application from neighbouring properties.

Members discussed the adjoining site at BOC and why given this development, the proposed scheme should also be supported. Members were reminded of the officer comment at point 7 above.



The officer's recommendation was to refuse the application because of the remote location of the site and lack of public transport, inappropriate and harmful development in the Green Belt and associated harm to the countryside; and because the very special circumstances provided by the applicant did not outweigh the harm.

In the event that the Members did not agree with the officer's recommendations, they were advised that they would need to consider whether there were any very special circumstances which outweighed the identified harm.

Some Members stated that they supported the very special circumstances given by the applicant. Members were then pressed by officers to state what specific very special circumstances they considered outweighed the harm. To guide, Members in being specific, they were directed to paragraph 7.10.2 of the agenda report and the update which lists the applicant's very special circumstances.

It was mentioned that this type of proposal was part of the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan but it was advised by officers that there was no such plan in existence.

Some Members stated that from the update (listed above) it was points 1 (a pressing need for the community); 6 (No alternative site); and, 10 (provision of employment) which were relevant very special circumstances.

It was also reiterated that the scheme was a provision of employment and there was a shortage of provision in the local area for a care home and doctor's surgery.

The exploration of an in and out access was suggested to help in addressing County Highways Authority's concerns, however, the objection was in regard of the inaccessibility of the access and any change to the access would not alleviate this.

**Resolved that application 15/0272 be approved for the very special circumstances pertaining to need, lack of alternatives and provision of employment and subject to, conditions, the wording to be finalised in consultation with Chairman and Vice Chairman and referral to the Secretary of State for consideration.**

#### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- i) Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he knew the applicant but had not met him regarding this application. He had also received documents from the applicant and correspondence from the Chobham Society;
- ii) Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that he knew the applicant and had also received the correspondence mentioned above;
- iii) Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she had been sent presentations and the applicant had attended an independent surgery;

- iv) Councillor Paul Innicki declared that he had been acquainted with the applicant; and
- v) Councillor Valerie White declared that she had also been acquainted with the applicant.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the public speaking scheme, Mr Rees and Ms Muir spoke in objection and Miss Jackson spoke in support. Mr Rumble, the agent and Mr Gunby, the applicant also spoke in support.

**Note 3**

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

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Innicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Councillor Richard Brooks abstained.

The motion was lost.

**Note 5**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor David Allen and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

**Note 6**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Innicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield and Victoria Wheeler.

Councillor Richard Brooks abstained.

The motion was carried.

**26/P Application Number: 15/0433 - 4 Frimley Road, Camberley GU15 3BA - St Michaels Ward**

This application was for the erection of 1 residential building to provide 16 two bedroom apartments with associated parking following the demolition of the existing two houses and flats. (Amended plans recv'd 14/8/15)

Members were advised of the following update:

*'Further consultation responses have been received as follows:*

- *Head of Environmental Services – No objection*
- *SCC Lead Local Flood Authority – Have objected, because of the lack of information on which to assess surface water drainage. Further works are necessary before the application can be approved and any drainage conditions imposed. It is therefore considered that the outstanding drainage issues be agreed under delegated powers and an extension of time has been agreed with the applicant until 30<sup>th</sup> October 2015 to allow this to happen.*

*In addition, a signed Unilateral Undertaking has now been received in respect of the SAMM payment, therefore the requirement to provide this is no longer necessary.*

*Because of these two issues the recommendation is proposed to be changed as follows:*

**Amended RECOMMENDATION**

*The Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to receipt of a revised drainage strategy; and, subject to conditions (as detailed on pages 92-94 of the agenda, and any additional conditions required in connection with the drainage strategy).*

***In the event that a drainage strategy has not been agreed by the 30 October 2015 (with the revised drainage strategy received for consideration no later than 30 September 2015), the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE the application for the following reason:***

1. *In the absence of a workable drainage strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant and provides an appropriate sustainable drainage system for the management of run-off. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood*

*and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.'*

In addition it was noted that the local flood authority had withdrawn their objection and therefore the recommendation had been amended to approve subject to conditions.

It was noted by some members that there was a lack of affordable housing within the scheme.

**Resolved that application 15/0433 be approved subject to conditions as sset out in the report of the Executive Head -Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

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

**Note 2**

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

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

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**27/P Application Number: 15/0455 - 80 Verran Road, Camberley GU15 2LJ - Watchetts Ward**

This application was for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension and single storey front extension including integral garage following demolition of existing garage.

This application was deferred from the 10 August 2015 Committee to enable Members to undertake a site visit. In accordance with Part 5, Section D, Appendix B, paragraph 10, only those Members who attended the site visit would be able to vote on this application.

Following the Committee, officers invited the applicant to amend the plans in order to reduce the depth of the two storey rear extension and the impact upon the neighbour. However, the applicant had decided not to amend the plans.

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of a local ward councillor it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'A site visit was held at 5pm on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2015. The following councillors attended and can therefore vote on the application:*

- *Cllr Hawkins; Cllr Mansfield; Cllr Allen; Cllr Brooks; Cllr Gandhum; Cllr Perry; Cllr Sams; Cllr Wheeler; Cllr White.'*

Clarification was sought regarding the measurement between the application site and the neighbouring house. It was noted as being 0.75m.

**Resolved that application 15/0455 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 had been contacted by the applicant and revised plans were circulated to Committee Members.

**Note 2**

As the application triggered the public speaking scheme, Mr Keenan the applicant spoke in support of the application.

**Note 3**

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

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Edward Hawkins David Mansfield, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Ian Sams and Surinder Gandhum

**28/P Application Number: 15/0532 - 34 Curley Hill Road, Lightwater GU18 5YH - Lightwater Ward**

This application was for the conversion of garage to habitable space, the erection of a two storey rear extension following demolition of existing extension and conversion of roof space to provide habitable space. (Amended & additional plans rec'd 12/08/15), (Additional plans rec'd 13/08/15), (Additional info rec'd 17/08/15).

Members were advised that the applicant had withdrawn the application.

**29/P Application Number: 15/0568 - Former Cheswycks School, Guildford Road, Frimley Green, Camberlery GU16 6PB - Frimley Green Ward**

This application was for the outline application for the erection of a two storey building with accommodation in the roof to provide a 62 bedroom care home including car parking, landscaping, access and associated works. (Access, layout, appearance and scale to be determined). (Amended info recv'd 7/9/15 and 9/7/15). (Amended plan rec'd 17/08/2015).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'The appeal decision referenced in the Committee Report has been dismissed. In dismissing the appeal the Inspector raised no objection to the principle of the development and like the Council was simply concerned about the lack of a legal agreement and ecological survey's. As detailed in the Committee Report these concerns have been overcome in the revised application and the recommendation remains to approve.'*

**Resolved that application 15/0568 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the  
Performance and Finance Scrutiny  
Committee held at Surrey Heath House  
on 29 July 2015**

---

+ Cllr David Allen (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Wynne Price (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr Max Nelson
+ Cllr Bill Chapman	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	- Cllr Chris Pitt
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Oliver Lewis	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle	+ Cllr John Winterton
+ Cllr Alan McClafferty	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Andrew Crawford, Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Sarah Parmenter, Julia Hutley-Savage, Jenny Rickard and Cllr Charlotte Morley

**8/PF Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed Members and Officers to the meeting and in particular, welcomed Councillor Charlotte Morley, the Regulatory Portfolio Holder, who would brief Members and answer questions on her Portfolio.

**9/PF Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 17 June 2015, were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

**10/PF Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders**

Councillor Charlotte Morley outlined the areas covered by her portfolio, focussing in particular on development control, drainage, land charges/technical support, planning & conservation, housing, private sector housing enforcement and Family Support.

Planning - Members welcomed the push within the Department to go paperless. It was noted that, in the future, it was intended that the majority of planning applications would be submitted electronically and speedily available on the Council's web site.

In 2014/15, 115 planning applications had been refused. Of those, 23 had been appealed. The Council had been successful on 12 appeals, 6 were still to be determined and 5 appeals had been upheld, 3 of which had resulted from Member overturns of officer recommendations.

Planning Policy, the Arboricultural Officer and the Drainage Engineer had contributed to significant improvements/developments over the previous year. The

drainage Engineer had been particularly successful in finding external grants to fund major and minor drainage projects across the Borough, as well as working with partner organisations to achieve notable reductions in incidences of flooding in the Borough.

In response to a Member's concerns on block tree preservation orders over large geographical areas, dating from the time of the Urban District of Frimley and Camberley, Councillor Morley confirmed that there would be a focus on tree issues over the forthcoming municipal year

Housing – Councillor Morley reminded Members that the Council no longer held housing stock, this having been handed to the Accent Housing Group. There were also other housing associations operating within the Borough. However, the Council maintained the Housing Register and applied the criteria by which social housing would be offered/allocated.

Housing Officers had focussed heavily on working with people to prevent homelessness and encourage downsizing. This had resulted in significant savings to the Council. The need for bed and breakfast accommodation had also been severely curtailed. There was limited bed and breakfast stock available in the Borough and accommodation was typically sourced in Aldershot, Ash Vale and Slough. However, only 2 individuals were currently so housed and both had made themselves intentionally homeless.

The Council's Housing Enforcement Officer worked to ensure safety and standards in rental accommodation and in particular in houses in multiple occupation.

The Committee noted, in response to a Member's question, that a television report in respect of a homeless family in the Borough was inaccurate, but that it had not been possible for the Council to discuss some of the very complex difficulties faced by both the Council and the family in question. The family had been offered accommodation, despite not meeting certain key criteria, but had refused the offer.

Family Support – As part of the Government's Troubled Families Scheme, Surrey County Council had sought District/Borough support to operate family support services, to make the service closer to, quicker and more responsive to the community. Surrey Heath and Runnymede Councils had jointly established a Family Support Team which dealt with families experiencing multiple problems/issues which involved multiple agency work.

A team is formed around the family where all relevant agencies will work together as one team to work with the whole family. Intensive support is offered with a family coordinator allocated to a family, working with each member of that family, to better understand the family dynamics and the hopes, aspirations and needs of each.

A key project aim was to reduce anti-social and criminal behaviour which, it was expected, would deliver indirect savings to other public bodies as a result. Knowledge gained so far suggested that young people and adults engaged in anti-social behaviour and criminal activity typically had issues around self-esteem,



anger and authority, but often did not meet the thresholds for either adult mental health or children's mental health services.

Members welcomed the improvements and new developments in services, highlighting in particular the much reduced use of bed and breakfast for homeless individuals/families, improvements in drainage/flooding incidences and the ground breaking work of the Family Support Team. In consideration of housing enforcement, the Committee noted that, whilst there was only one enforcement officer, significant increases in cases would be required to justify further resources.

**Resolved, that the report be noted.**

## **11/PF Review of Reserves and Provisions**

The Senior Accountant presented a report explaining the criteria for maintaining individual Reserves and Provisions, following the closure of the 2014/15 accounts and therefore as at 31 March 2015. She explained that Provisions were required for any liability of uncertain timing or amount that had been incurred. They were recognised when:

- The local authority has a present obligation (legal or constructive) as a result of a past event;
- It is probable that a transfer of economic benefit will be required to settle the obligation; and
- A reliable estimate can be made of the amount of the obligation

Reserves were amounts set aside for specific policy purposes and balances which represented resources set aside for purposes such as general contingencies and cash flow management. Generally they were:

- A working balance to help cushion the impact of uneven cash flows and avoid unnecessary temporary borrowing - this forms part of general reserves
- A contingency to cushion the impact of unexpected events or emergencies - this also forms part of general reserves
- A means of building up funds, often referred to as earmarked reserves, to meet known or predicted requirements.

The report included an estimate for each reserve/provision for 2016. A drop in reserves was shown in the region of £2 million. However, whilst this position could improve, the Committee would be updated after the issue of the External Auditor's annual report. It was noted that reserves were not used to meet any revenue shortfalls.

In the course of discussion, the following was highlighted in relation to individual reserves and provisions:

- (i) Atrium S106/Atrium Art – The Atrium S106 reserve was generated when the Atrium was built and had been used, mainly, for CCTV. The Atrium Reserve would be used to maintain the artwork in place.
- (ii) Blackwater Valley & Developer Contributions – Members requested details of specific expenditures going forward.
- (iii) Chobham and Town Team Partnership – Members noted that whilst some reserves attracted interest, other did not. The Senior Accountant indicated that funds generated by community groups tended to have interest added, whilst reserves generated by Government or Council funds did not, with interest going to the General Fund Working Balance.
- (iv) Community Fund – Although £75,000 was budgeted for, expenditure was rarely above £30,000 and this was reflected in the reserve. Councillor Josephine Hawkins reported that Community Fund Grants came within her Portfolio and that the deadlines for applications were the end of June and end of September each year. No monies were paid until works were completed.
- (v) Commuted Sums – These sums were allocated for maintenance on specific projects and could not be used for other purposes.
- (vi) Insurance Reserve – Members queried the level of this reserve. It was confirmed that the funds were being held against potential costs in connection with the rundown of Municipal Mutual Insurance. It was expected that the actual costs would become clearer shortly, with a supreme court judgement expected in the near future.
- (vii) Land Drainage – In response to a Member query on funding for the Frimley Fuel Allotments land, the Executive Head of Regulatory noted that the Council could only expend drainage funds on Council owned land.
- (viii) Remediation Fund – Although it had not been used since 2002, this fund had been established to cover the remediation costs of land damaged by traveller incursions. Members recommended that the purpose be changed to include preventative work. Clarification was also sought on the cost of incursions in Heatherside and how the remediation thereof would be funded.
- (ix) Repairs and Maintenance – The level of this reserve was based on the value of all the Council's assets and the likely cost if all repairs/maintenance had to be done in this financial year. This gave an anticipated annualised cost of work. Members requested a breakdown of expected costs in 2015/16.
- (x) Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) – An Interest free loan had been secured from the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership to purchase SANGs. This would be recouped by a charge against developers offsetting new developments. The SANGs had to be maintained in perpetuity. Councillor McClafferty agreed to review projected SANGS maintenance costs with the Executive Head of Regulatory.
- (xi) Bagshot Library – Members sought details on what works were planned for this Council owned building.
- (xii) General Fund Working Balance – Members sought clarification on the significant reduction in this fund projected from 2015 to 2016.

**Resolved, that**

- (i) the report be noted; and
- (ii) the Executive be advised to consider changing the purpose of the Remediation Fund, to include preventative work.

**12/PF Work Programme**

The Democratic Services Officer updated Members on the proposed work programme for the remainder of the municipal year. He noted in particular that meetings were planned for:

30 September 2015;  
2 December 2015;  
27 January 2016; and  
23 March 2016.

The Committee agreed to the work programme attached at Annex A.

**Resolved, that the Work Programme, as attached at Annex A, be agreed.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing  
Committee held at Council Chamber,  
Surrey Heath House on 9 September  
2015**

---

+ Cllr Bill Chapman (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Ian Sams (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Bruce Mansell
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Nic Price
+ Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	- Cllr Conrad Sturt
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Oliver Lewis	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

**5/L Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**6/L Taxi Licensing - Deregulation Act 2015**

The Chairman proposed that the item be deferred in order for further information to be obtained before the item was considered.

**RESOLVED to defer the item to the next meeting.**

**7/L Taxi Licensing - Engine Capacity Requirements**

The Committee was informed that councils which had adopted the provisions of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 had the right to set conditions and regulations relating to Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles on the grounds of public safety. One of the conditions which had been set by this Council related to a minimum engine capacity of 1600cc being required for all licensed vehicles.

It was recognised that, since the adoption of the Act in the mid-1970s, the automobile industry had greatly improved safety standards and the efficiency of power units. Most diesel powered cars were now turbocharged, whilst others now benefited from electrically assisted hybrid engines.

The current engine capacity limit of 1600cc was considered to be an unnecessary burden on the taxi trade and to inhibit the trade from using less polluting and more efficient smaller engine or hybrid electric cars. Members noted the minimum engine capacity limits in place at neighbouring local authorities, a number of whom required a minimum capacity of 1300cc.

It was reported that there were no particular restrictions for taxi drivers on the make and model of their vehicles, but they must have 4 or more doors.

**RESOLVED that the current minimum engine capacity limit for Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles be reduced from 1600cc to 1300cc and that any engine capacity requirement for vehicles powered by an electric hybrid system be removed.**

**8/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.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Surrey Heath House on 15 September 2015**

---

- + Cllr Paul Deach (Chairman)
- Cllr Dan Adams (Vice Chairman)

- |                               |                       |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| + Cllr Ian Cullen             | + Cllr Adrian Page    |
| Cllr Ruth Hutchinson          | - Cllr Robin Perry    |
| - Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Chris Pitt     |
| + Cllr David Lewis            | + Cllr Nic Price      |
| - Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper   | + Cllr Darryl Ratiram |
| + Cllr Alan McClafferty       | + Cllr John Winterton |
| + Cllr Max Nelson             |                       |

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Jonathan Lytle (In place of Rebecca Jennings-Evans) and Cllr Ian Sams (In place of Dan Adams)

**7/EP Chairman's Announcements and Welcome to Guests**

The Chairman welcomed Mary Tomlinson and Elise Batelaan from Natural England, and James Adler and Ben Habgood from Surrey Wildlife Trust to the meeting.

**8/EP Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**9/EP Natural England**

The Committee received a presentation from Mary Tomlinson and Elise Batelaan from Natural England on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area.

The Special Protection Area (SPA) had been designated in March 2005 under the European Habitats Regulations. In 2005 the Thames Basin Heath SPA met the qualification as an SPA, namely having 1% of each of the special interest features population within its area, with 30% of the country's Dartford Warbler, 8% of the Nightjar, and 10% of the Woodlark populations. As ground nesting birds, they were susceptible to disturbance from people and dogs.

The SPA covered over 8200 hectares across 3 counties. 11 Local Planning Authorities were directly affected by the SPA and a further 4 had to consider it due to their close proximity. It was noted that the SPA was highly fragmented.

The Committee was informed that, when the area was designated, there were approximately 290,000 properties within 5km of the SPA. In 2006 a visitor survey

on the Thames Basin Heath had estimated that there were 5 million visits per year; the majority of people visiting the SPA were dog walkers, whilst the second most important type of visitor was those walking alone. The survey had also ascertained that most visitors drove to the site and 75% of visitors came from within 5km.

The impact the designation of the SPA had created on the planning system was noted, in particular as the Habitats Regulations required that any plan or project would need to demonstrate that there was no likely significant effect on the European Habitat. As a result, at the time of the SPA's introduction Natural England had objected to every net increase in housing within 5km of the site.

In response to this challenge, Natural England had developed a strategic way to assist with delivering housing development in the zones affected by the SPA. A three-part approach had been developed:

- **Offsite mitigation** – the provision of new or upgraded alternative greenspace for recreation. This was commonly known as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace.
- **Onsite access management** – to mitigate for current and future use. This involved wardens working on site, education for people around the SPA, and responsible dog walking.
- **Onsite habitat management** – bringing the SPA into favourable condition.

It was reported that, in 2011 the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) project had commenced. The aim of the project had been to ensure there was no net increase of recreational disturbance on the SPA. As of March 2015 there were 4 full time SAMM wardens and 1 full time education officer, plus 10 seasonal wardens. Work was underway on creating a website and there had been activity on social media to promote public awareness. Other work included attending events and awareness sessions, a project to promote responsible dog walking and the importance of the SPA. Feedback on the project to date had been positive.

The Committee was informed that currently all 11 Local Planning Authorities affected by the SPA had a strategic approach in place, as outlined in Policy NRM6. This included providing for no new increase in dwellings within the 400m zone of influence of the SPA; a financial contribution to a strategic or bespoke SANG and a contribution towards SAMM for development within 5km of a SANG; and within 7km, larger developments would be required to consider providing mitigation. There were currently 41 SANGs, covering nearly 1000 hectares. £630 per dwelling was provided towards the SAMM project.

In 2012/13 an updated SPA visitor survey had been conducted, which had shown similar trends to the 2006 survey, although a higher percentage of visitors had dogs. There had been a 10% rise in visits, although the survey had shown this was not a statistically significant rise.

In June 2015 a SANG survey had been undertaken to determine how effective the alternative greenspace had been at mitigating recreational impacts upon the SPA. Initial findings indicated that the SANGs were providing effective mitigation: the larger SANGs were working very well in providing destination locations and the



smaller SANGs were working well at a local level. The survey had also provided a number of recommendations and would be agreed by the Joint Strategic Partnership Board.

Members were advised that data from 2003 onwards demonstrated that, although there were variations year on year, the bird populations had been successful in breeding.

Members recognised the need to increase education and awareness about the organisation's work and its objectives. It was agreed to further consider ways the Council could assist with promoting the organisation and its aims.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the presentation be noted; and**
- (ii) officers be asked to further investigate ways in which the Council could assist with promoting Natural England's work and objectives.**

**10/EP Surrey Wildlife Trust**

The Committee was informed that Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) had been founded in 1959. SWT was the only organisation concerned solely with the conservation of all forms of wildlife in Surrey. It focused on 3 main areas: land management, research and education. SWT was part of a network of 47 wildlife trusts across the UK.

SWT had acquired its first land in 1965. It had been working with the Council since 1988 in managing Brentmoor Heath, which the Council had purchased from the MoD the previous year. In 2002 SWT had taken on management of Surrey County Council's 3500 hectares countryside estate. In 2006 it had further expanded the land it managed when it signed an agreement with the MoD to manage its land for conservation within the county. It had also started a farming operation to sustainably manage the areas in 2007.

Members were advised that SWT was the largest land manager in the county, managing 8000 hectares of land, approximately 5% of the whole land area of Surrey. The land managed by SWT received millions of public visits per year, with 1000 volunteers providing 10,000 days' work per year. It was noted that SWT's work did extend slightly outside the Surrey boundary. It was also reported that the organisation was one of the major deliverers of conservation management on the Special Protection Area.

Members were informed about the organisation's work within the borough, which included

- Management of Brentmoor Heath reserve. Areas of work included tree removal to open up the areas of heath and work with volunteers to undertake scrub control across the area.

- The introduction of grazing on a range of sites in the borough, including Barossa Common.
- There was a high level stewardship scheme in place at Lightwater Country Park. Work included addressing an area of encroaching scrub and gorse; SWT had provided cattle and more recently introduced goats to address this problem.
- Making hay on Council land in Chobham
- The operation of some of its largest nature reserves were within the Surrey Heath area

The Committee was advised that SWT had carried out educational work for over 40 years. It had 2 education centres which were attended by over 15,000 children each year and was increasingly carrying out educational outreach work in schools and other areas beyond its 2 centres.

It was reported that SWT's research work was developing. It had recently published a paper in a journal on the effects of grazing on heathland. The organisation was also in the process of forming a partnership with the University of Surrey's Veterinary School.

The Committee was advised that SWT's future goals were to make the quality of its existing nature reserves as high as possible and maximise the bio diversity of these reserves. Members were further advised that SWT was always interested in discussing the possibilities of either physically managing more land or being involved in advice on how to manage areas. It also had a long term desire to stay involved in the management of Brentmoor Heath and would welcome opportunities to work with the Council further.

Members recognised the need to increase education and awareness about the organisation's work and objectives. It was agreed to further consider ways the Council could assist with promoting the organisation and its aims.

#### **RESOLVED that**

- (i) the presentation be noted; and**
- (ii) officers be asked to further investigate ways in which the Council could assist with promoting Surrey Wildlife Trust's work and objectives.**

Note 1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Cllr Chris Pitt declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a life member of Surrey Wildlife Trust.

Note 2: It was noted for the record that

- (i) Cllr Paul Deach declared that he carried out media work on behalf of Surrey Wildlife Trust, although and he had not received any payment from the Trust for his work; and
- (ii) Cllr John Winterton declared that Surrey Wildlife Trust managed a piece of land for which he was a Trustee.

**11/EP Committee Work Programme**

The Committee considered a proposed work programme for the remainder of the 2015/16 municipal year.

**RESOLVED, that the Work Programme for 2015/16, as attached at Annex A to these minutes, be agreed.**

Chairman

**External Partnerships Select Committee  
Work Programme 2015/16**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Partners</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>24 November 2015</b>	Enterprise M3 – The Local Enterprise Partnership	Geoff French ( <i>agreed to attend</i> )
	Surrey Chambers Of Commerce	Louise Punter ( <i>agreed to attend</i> )
	Collectively Camberley	Lucy Boazman ( <i>confirmation awaited</i> )
<b>19 January 2016</b>	Camberley Care	TBC
	LIVE	TBC
	Dementia Friendly Surrey	TBC
<b>29 March 2016</b>	Surrey Heath Health and Wellbeing Board	Tim Pashen
	Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group	Dr Andy Brooks
	Frimley Park Hospital	Andrew Morris

Potential First Item for 2016/17

- University of Surrey

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held at Surrey  
Heath House on 22 September 2015**

---

- + Cllr Josephine Hawkins (Chairman)
- + Geraldine Sharman (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         | + Rachel Whillis  |
| - Cllr Conrad Sturt     |                   |

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Belinda Tam and Lee Brewin

**8/J Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 4 June 2015 were received and confirmed.

**9/J Exceptional Payments Policy**

The Group received a report on the Exceptional Payments Policy.

It was noted that the Additional Duties and Honoraria policies had been merged to create the revised Exceptional Payments Policy. The policy also included the request form which when completed would need to be approved by Finance and Human Resources.

**Resolved that in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation, the amendments made to the Exceptional Payments Policy be adopted.**

**10/J Work Programme**

The Group received a report on the work programme for the municipal year 2015/16.

**Resolved that the work programme for the 2015/16 municipal year as set out below be approved and amended as appropriate.**

Meeting	Topic	Source
21 January 2016	IIP	HR
	Pay Settlement	HR
	Pay Policy Statement	HR

17 March 2016	IIP	HR
	Reservists Policy	HR

Chairman