

# **COUNCIL MEETING**

## **16 December 2015**

# **COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK**

- |     |  |                        |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 1.  | <b>Council - 14 October 2015</b>                                 | <b>(Pages 3 - 10)</b>  |
| 2.  | <b>Executive - 10 November 2015</b>                              | <b>(Pages 11 - 14)</b> |
| 3.  | <b>Executive - 1 December 2015</b>                               | <b>(Pages 15 - 18)</b> |
| 4.  | <b>Planning Applications Committee - 13 October 2015</b>         | <b>(Pages 19 - 24)</b> |
| 5.  | <b>Planning Applications Committee - 11 November 2015</b>        | <b>(Pages 25 - 32)</b> |
| 6.  | <b>Licensing Committee - 4 November 2015</b>                     | <b>(Pages 33 - 36)</b> |
| 7.  | <b>Appointments Committee - 18 November 2015</b>                 | <b>(Pages 37 - 40)</b> |
| 8.  | <b>Appointments Committee - 20 November 2015</b>                 | <b>(Pages 41 - 44)</b> |
| 9.  | <b>External Partnerships Select Committee - 24 November 2015</b> | <b>(Pages 45 - 50)</b> |
| 10. | <b>Performance and Finance Committee - 2 December 2015</b>       | <b>To follow</b>       |

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY  
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at  
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on  
14 October 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 Richard Brooks, Bill Chapman, Craig Fennell, and Conrad Sturt.

**23/C Minutes**

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

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Council, and the Extraordinary meeting of the Council, held on 23 July 2015 be approved as a correct record.**

**24/C Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor reported that she had had a very busy few weeks. A highlight had been a visit to the Chelsea Football Ground.

The Mayor thanked Councillor Dan Adams and his brother Steve for the charity bike ride they had just completed in support of the Mayor's charities. So far they had raised £700 and money was still coming in. The Mayor also thanked Councillor Paul Deach for covering the event.

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

The Leader reported that the proposals submitted by East Sussex, West Sussex and Surrey County Councils to the Government outlining a case for devolution of specific functions and budgets to the three counties had not been accepted. Further work would be required to move the proposals forward. The Government would be looking for accelerated housing levels in excess of those already committed. The Government would also need to convince local authorities that they would deliver on their promises.

The Leader updated the Council in relation to the EM3 Joint Leaders Board and indicated that there would shortly be new round of bids. Kate Dean, a property consultant, and a former member of EM3, had highlighted issues about planning for town centres for the next 10 years to accommodate the requirements of new types of customers. There was a need to apply this work to the Camberley Town Centre.

The Leader also referred to the recent sad death of Councillor Robert Watts, the Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council.

## **26/C      Questions from Councillors**

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Rodney Bates relating to the help the Council would give to address the plight of Syrian refugees.

In response to a supplementary question, the Leader indicated that, whilst the Council would do what it could to help, clear guidelines from the Government were needed together with adequate resources.

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

- (a)      Executive – 28 July, 8 September and 29 September 2015

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

### **Resolved that**

- (i)      **the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 28 July, 8 September and 29 September 2015 be received;**
- (ii)     **the carry forward budget provision of £11.147 million from 2014/15 into 2015/16 be approved;**
- (iii)    **the revised 2015/16 Capital Programme of £21.272 million be noted; and**

**(iv) the final capital prudential indicators for 2014/15 be noted.**

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 20 July, 19 August and 14 September 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 20 July, 19 August and 14 September 2015 be received.**

- (c) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 29 July and 30 September 2015

It was moved by Councillor David Mansfield, seconded by Councillor Wynne Price, and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 29 July 2015 and 30 September 2015 be received.**

- (d) Licensing Committee – 9 September 2015

It was moved by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, seconded by Councillor Ian Sams and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 9 September 2015 be received.**

- (e) External Partnerships Select Committee – 15 September 2015

It was moved by Councillor Paul Deach, seconded by Councillor David Lewis and

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 15 September be received.**

- (f) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 22 September 2015

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

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 22 September 2015 be received.**

## **28/C Portfolio Holder's Question Time**

Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman answered questions in respect of her Portfolio relating to flying tipping, progress on the joint waste contract, recycling, dementia services, lower life expectancy and mental health issues in areas of deprivation and health and safety responsibilities.

## **29/C Presentation by the Police and Crime Commissioner**

The Council received a presentation from Mr Kevin Hurley, the Police and Crime Commissioner. He referred to current initiatives, which included joint enforcement teams with local authorities, the trends in crime statistics for the county, emerging types of crime such as cyber-crime, the funding challenges facing police forces and the effect on police officers resulting from the reductions in the civilian work force.

Members asked Mr Hurley a number of questions relating to the frequency of the use of Tasers, road deaths and the application of his policy on zero tolerance. The Mayor, on behalf of the Council thanked Mr Hurley for his informative presentation.

## **30/C Exclusion of Press and Public**

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

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
31/C	3
32/C	3

## **31/C Council, Executive and Committees - Exempt**

The Council received the exempt minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 8 September and 29 September 2015 and made decisions relating to the exempt recommendations made by the Executive.

## **32/C Review of Exempt Items**

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

### **Resolved that**

- (i) Minute 22/E remain exempt for the present time;**

- (ii) Minute 23/E remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations;**
- (iii) Minute 29/E exempt for the present time;**
- (iv) the financial details relating to Minute 30/E remain exempt for the present time but the decision be made public;**
- (v) Minute 31/E remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations;**
- (vi) Minute 37/E remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations; and**
- (vii) Minute 38/E remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiation.**

Mayor

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 10  
November 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 Chris Pitt

**40/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**41/E Surrey Local Strategic Statement**

The Executive was informed that the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required public bodies to undertake Duty to Co-operate on planning issues which crossed administrative boundaries.

On 16 July 2014 Surrey Leaders had agreed to meet as the Surrey Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Board to provide a vehicle for co-operation and joint working between local authorities in Surrey on strategic planning issues. The Terms of Reference of the Board and the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on how local authorities would work together to prepare a Local Strategic Statement, which had been considered by Surrey Leaders and Surrey Chief Executives, were noted.

The MoU detailed the type of evidence gathering and technical work that would require joint working and set out an agreed methodology. This included undertaking a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and consideration of constraints such as the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and flooding. It also set out the need for an up to date picture of the Green Belt, which could include future reviews of the Green Belt.

The Executive noted that the advice set out in the NPPF stated that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. This should be through the preparation or review of a Local Plan and not as a matter arising from a requirement of a Local Strategic Statement. It was therefore considered that, in signing up to the Local Strategic Statement, it should be made clear that any such review in Surrey Heath would be undertaken in line with this advice. An accompanying letter would be sent setting out the Borough's position on this matter.

The preparation of a Local Strategic Statement would be undertaken by the Surrey Planning Officers Association and would set out common priorities on strategic matters that can be used to demonstrate Duty to Co-operate.

**RESOLVED**

- (i) to agree the Terms of Reference of the Surrey Strategic Planning Infrastructure Board;**
- (ii) that the Leader be authorised to sign the Memorandum of Understanding which sets out how the Surrey Local Authorities will work together towards preparing a Local Strategic Statement for Surrey;**
- (iii) to agree to the preparation of a Surrey Local Strategic Statement subject to the proviso that within Surrey Heath a review of the Green Belt would only be undertaken through a Local Plan review where the need for such a review of Green Belt had been demonstrated; and**
- (iv) that the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to work with the Surrey Planning Officers Association on the preparation of a Local Strategic Statement.**

**42/E Waste Regulations 2011**

The Executive was reminded that the Waste Regulations 2011 required any organisation which collected waste to comply with the waste hierarchy and collect paper, metal, plastic and glass by separate collection, by January 2015, unless it was not necessary to 'facilitate or improve recovery' and it was not technically, environmentally and economically practicable to do so.

It was reported that, as the Waste Regulations were complicated and there was much uncertainty around how to comply with them, a 'Route Map' had been developed to help local authorities assess their compliance; this had been used by the Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) as a basis for assessing the compliance of each Waste Collection Authority (WCA). The compliance modelling had been carried out by Surrey County Council using data supplied by participating WCAs.

The results of the assessment had indicated that separate collections were not necessary to facilitate high quality recycling of the four key materials. Although they were technically practicable, they were neither economically nor environmentally practicable. The current system delivered by the Council appeared to be operating in accordance with the waste hierarchy. The report did not recommend any changes to the format of the current collection system to ensure compliance with the Waste Regulations.

The assessment had also identified areas where the Council could influence changes in order to reduce the environmental impact of its current system; these would be explored by Surrey County Council, as the Waste Disposal Authority, when a new contract was let in 2018.

**RESOLVED to**

**(i) note that**

- a. the results of an assessment of the Council's waste collection service indicate that separate collections are not necessary to facilitate high quality recycling of the four key materials;**
- b. whilst separate collections were technically practicable, they were neither economically nor environmentally practicable; and**

**(ii) retain the current comingled recycling service.**

**43/E Surrey Heath Waste Action Plan**

At its meeting on 7 April 2015 the Executive had adopted the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Revision 2 (2015) which had been produced by the Surrey Waste Partnership.

The Executive noted the targets which had been selected to measure success of the Strategy. In order to meet these ambitious targets each authority had been asked to produce a Waste Action Plan, which would be regularly monitored by the Surrey Waste Partnership.

It was reported that, at 58%, Surrey Heath remained the best performing authority in Surrey for the proportion of waste recovered, recycled and composted. However, as with most authorities, the recycling rate had started to fall and major interventions would be needed in order to raise recycling rates. A number of factors were considered to have contributed to a fall in rates, including the Environment Agency's ban on the composting of Highway Leaves, a lack of knowledge of what could be recycled, a fall in recycling values, and an increase in bin contamination.

The Executive was advised that the Surrey Heath Waste Action Plan 2015/16 would largely be funded from recycling performance awards the Council had received for 2012/13 and 2013/14 which had totalled £83,266. This sum formed part of a carry forward agreed in July 2015.

**RESOLVED that the Surrey Heath Waste Action Plan 2015 to 2020, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be approved.**

**44/E Revised Key Priorities**

The Executive was reminded that the 2020 Corporate Strategy was due to be reviewed by March 2016. In line with this, the first area to be revised was the Council's Key Priorities. The project plans which sat under each priority, which would demonstrate how each priority would be delivered, were being developed.

The updated Key Priorities were noted. It was felt that it was important to retain specific reference to improving train and bus services in the Key Priorities. The Executive therefore agreed to include the action point relating to working closely with train and bus providers, which was currently included in Key Priority 2, in the revised Key Priority 1.

**RESOLVED to adopt the Council's revised Key Priorities, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.**

**45/E Economic Development Strategy Update**

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 11 November 2014, it had agreed the Council's Economic Development Strategy and its actions plans.

Members noted the progress that had been made in the previous 12 months in relation to the action plans, in particular the work that had been carried out with local Business Associations, a Business Advice Clinic for start-up businesses, and the work with Camberley Central Job Club.

**RESOLVED to note the Economic Development Strategy update, and request a further update in 2016.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 1  
December 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 Chris Pitt

**46/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**47/E Community Infrastructure Levy**

The Executive was reminded that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was a new way in which local authorities could raise funds towards infrastructure from developments in their area. In the majority of cases this would replace the existing system of using planning obligations known as Section 106 agreements.

The Council was required to pass a proportion of CIL receipts to Parish Councils. The proportion of CIL receipts was 15%, capped at £100 per existing council tax property per year, or 25% uncapped where there was a Neighbourhood Plan in place. It was noted that at that time no Neighbourhood Plans had been adopted.

In June 2015 the Executive had agreed that, in line with the parished areas, 15% of CIL collected would be available to spend for non-parished areas; Ward Councillors for these areas would be asked to submit suggestions for projects in their area to be funded by CIL. A CIL Governance Panel comprising the Leader, Finance Portfolio Holder, Chief Executive and Executive Head of Finance would consider these suggestions and report back to the Executive.

As the Council had begun to receive these funds it was required to decide how to use them, pay the relevant allocations to Parish Councils, and publish its CIL income and expenditure.

The CIL income received between April and September 2015 was noted. In addition, £188,000 had been collected since October. Members were informed that 28 payments were outstanding in relation to developments in 12 wards.

**RESOLVED**

- (i) **to note the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies received;**

- (ii) to note that the 15% of CIL funds from parished areas received for the reporting period between 1 April and 30 September 2015 has been transferred to those Parish Councils where development has occurred, as required by the legislation;
- (iii) that Ward Councillors for the non-parished areas be asked to submit ideas for projects within their wards following discussion with their communities and that these be reported to the Executive in due course;
- (iv) that the remaining CIL contributions held by the Council be retained for spending to support the Council's Key Priorities; and
- (v) to note that the report of levy income and expenditure, as set out in Annex 1 to the agenda report, will be published on 31 December 2015.

#### **48/E Family Support Service Level Agreement**

The Executive was reminded that the Family Support Service was a nationwide service funded by the Department of Communities and Local Government in response to the Government's Troubled Families initiative. A joint Runnymede and Surrey Heath Team had been established for two years and, along with the rest of Surrey, had moved into delivering the second phase of the initiative.

Minor changes to the Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Runnymede BC were required as a result of moving to Phase 2 of the initiative. It was reported that the SLA was largely the same as the one in place between 2013 and 2015; the main revision to the SLA ensured that any redundancies would be divided equally across the two boroughs.

The Executive agreed that a further report would be brought a meeting in 2016 which provided information on the longer term performance and outcomes of the work undertaken by the team.

**RESOLVED that the Executive Head of Regulatory, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Regulatory, be authorised to enter into an amended Service Level Agreement with Runnymede Borough Council to take account of potential future liabilities and changes that may arise in the service.**

#### **49/E 2015/16 Mid-Year Performance Report**

The Executive considered a report on the Council's performance against its key priorities, service milestones and performance indicators between April and September 2015.

Members recognised that the number of milestones and performance indicators currently being reported was high and the information to be reported in the



2016/17 Annual Plan would be reviewed to ensure the milestones and performance indicators were appropriate.

**RESOLVED to note the 2015/16 Mid-Year Performance Report.**

**50/E      Function and Performance of the Development Management Team**

The Executive noted the report that had been presented to the Planning Applications Committee at its meeting on 13 October 2015 regarding the function and performance of the Development Management service for the period between April 2014 and September 2015.

**RESOLVED to note the report to the Planning Applications Committee on the Function and Performance of the Development Management Team.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House  
on 13 October 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), Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Conrad Sturt) and Cllr Adrian Page (In place of Richard Brooks)

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

**30/P Minutes**

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

**31/P Monitoring Report**

Members received a report on the function and performance of the Development Management Service from April 2014 to September 2015.

The Committee was also advised of the following update to the report:

***'2. Staff Turnover and Recruitment***

***Para 2.3***

*One of the trainee officers has handed in her notice as she has decided that a career in planning is not for her.*

***Para 2.5***

*A contract planner was due to start on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> October but pulled out on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> October due to finding an alternative contract closer to his home. We are actively seeking to find another contractor and interviewing this week.*

***4. Applications Performance***

***Para 4.3***

*The Q2 figures (July – September 2015) have now been received and so the table has been updated below:*

	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 14/15	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Average
Majors (Target 60%)	86%	100%	75%	100%	100%	91%	92%
Minors (Target 65%)	74%	61%	59%	70%	73%	83%	70%
Others (Target 80%)	86%	88%	78%	77%	78%	92%	83%

## **5. Appeal Performance**

*Corrections:*

*Corrected Para 5.2*

*There were 14 appeals (or 40%) allowed. The additional two appeals allowed were:*

- *12/0812\* - Change of use to retail (103 Mytchett Road, Mytchett, Surrey GU16 6ES)*
- *13/0771 - Advert appeal (Unit 12, Nelson Way, Camberley, GU15 3DH).*

*14/0067 should read 14/0667*

*Corrected Para 5.3*

*Of these 14 allowed appeals, 6 of these were reported to Planning Applications Committee. Of the 6 determined by Committee, 5 of them were Member overturns (denoted by \*).'*

Four key points were noted:

- i) The difficulty with staff retention was Surrey wide and not just an issue experienced by Surrey Heath;
- ii) The speed of decision making;
- iii) Service changes had improved despite recruitment issues;
- iv) There was a commitment to further service changes over the next three years.

**Resolved that the report be noted.**

**32/P**

**Application Number: 15/0445 - LAND NORTH EAST OF MALTHOUSE FARM 70, BENNER LANE, WEST END, WOKING, GU24 9JG**

The application was for the erection of residential development to provide 95 dwellings (including 5 one bed, 25 two bed, 32 three bed and 33 four bed units) with vehicular/pedestrian accesses, parking, landscaping and open space. (Addl information recv'd 24/8/15)

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'County Highways Authority raise no objections requesting conditions concerning the provision of vehicular access requirements and secure bicycle parking facilities, retention of parking, provision of a construction management plan and a travel plan*

*Lead Local Flood Authority (SCC) raises no objections.*

*A statement has been provided to address the impact on trees. The Arboricultural Officer has subsequently removed his objections.*

*It is proposed to **remove refusal Reason 4.***

*Correction:*

*The Reason 3 wrongly includes reference to SANG (which can be dealt with by condition instead) and Condition 3 is amended to indicate:*

*In the absence of a completed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and development Management Policies 2012 and Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) in relation to the provision of a contribution towards strategic access management and monitoring (SAMM) measures in accordance with the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document 2012.'*

Some Members had concerns regarding flooding, the density of the development, traffic congestion, parking and the lack of health and education provision in the scheme. Members also sought clarification on S106 and CIL payments. Officers also advised the Committee that they had requested specific information from Surrey County Council regarding how the education request directly related to the development, but no information had been provided, and therefore the planning obligations tests under the NPPF could not be met.

It was noted that any additional reasons for refusal would have to be defensible. It was proposed by the Committee that a further reason for refusal be added in relation to the density, layout and the relationship with immediate neighbours to the scheme.

**Resolved that application 15/0445 be refused as amended for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory including an additional reason in relation to density, layout and the relationship with immediate neighbours to the scheme.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Committee Members declared that they had received a letter from the West End Action Group and emails from several villagers.

**Note 2**

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Bain and Mr Llewellyn spoke in objection to the application and Mr Bond, the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application as amended 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 as amended:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting in against the recommendation to refuse the application as amended: Councillor Max Nelson.

**33/P**

**Application Number: 15/0332 - NOTCUTTS GARDEN CENTRE, 150-152 LONDON ROAD, BAGSHOT, GU19 5DG**

The application was for the Variation of Condition 3 and 10 of planning permission SU/13/0435 (relating to the erection of a part single storey, part two storey building to provide 2 retail units (Class A1) with ancillary cafe and storage facilities as well as parking, landscaping, and access following the demolition of existing garden centre) to allow the provision of 4 retail units (including cafe).

Members were advised of the following update:

*'Four further objections received with these new objections:*

- *Impact on a dog grooming business;*
- *Impact on businesses in Bagshot;*

*A new application SU/15/0859 has been received for this proposal, with the addition of the sale of pets.*

*A non-determination appeal has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate under the written representation procedure. The appeal is waiting to be made valid by the Inspectorate. As such, the Council is not in a position to determine this application.*

## ***Amended RECOMMENDATION***

***The Council WOULD HAVE REFUSED if it had been the determining authority.'***

Some Members had concerns about the development not complying with the original planning application and that resident and business views had not been considered. However officers advised that comments could be forwarded to the Planning Inspector with regard to the appeal.

**Resolved that application 15/0332, had the Council had been the determining authority, be refused for the reason as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor David Mansfield had received information from the agent and Councillor Nick Chambers lived 12 houses down from the site.

### **Note 2**

The recommendation to refuse the application had the Council been in a position to determine it was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

### **Note 3**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application had the Council been in a position to determine the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application had the Council been in a position to determine the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman and Ruth Hutchinson.

Chairman





**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 11 November 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 Adrian Page (In place of Colin Dougan)

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

**34/P Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**35/P Application Number: 12/0546/2 - Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, GU16 6RN**

The application was for a Non-Material Minor Amendment to vary conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission 12/0546.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'For information the text of condition 2 and 3 as originally imposed is:*

*2. Prior to the commencement of any development or the submission of any reserved matters application, a Phasing Scheme for the delivery of the entire development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Phasing Scheme shall include an Indicative Strategic Masterplan for the development of this site identifying the phases of development and shall include details of the land uses and quantum of development to be delivered by each phase. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.*

*3. Prior to the submission of any reserved matters applications, Design Codes which are in substantial compliance with the approved parameter plans and the*

*submitted Design and Access Statement shall be submitted for each of the Character Areas. The Design Code shall include the following:*

- a) built-form strategies to include density and massing, street grain and permeability, street enclosure and active frontages, type and form of buildings and landmarks and vistas*
- b) design strategies for principal buildings or land uses within the character area, including where appropriate the primary school, the sports hub sites*
- c) a strategy for a hierarchy of streets and spaces*
- d) principles for the alignment, width, lighting and surface materials proposed for all footways, cycleways, roads and vehicular accesses to and within the site*
- e) design of the public realm, including layout and design of squares, areas of public open space, areas for play, street furniture and sustainable urban drainage*
- f) principles for determining quality, colour and texture of external materials and facing materials for roofing and walls of buildings and structures including a consideration of opportunities for using locally sourced and/or recycled construction materials*
- g) principles for hard and soft landscaping including the inclusion of important trees and hedgerows*
- h) on-street and off-street residential and commercial vehicular parking, off-street turning (where required) and/or loading areas cycle parking and storage*

*The Reserved Matters applications shall thereafter accord with the approved Design Codes for the site.'*

It was noted that legal advice had been sought from external legal representatives.

Some Members felt that more information was required on various planning codes but Members were reminded that planning officers had the expert knowledge to advise Members accordingly.

**Resolved that application 12/0546/2 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield 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:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper arrived after the start of the consideration of applications 12/0546/2 and 15/0676 (these were considered together) and therefore was unable to vote.

**36/P      Application Number: 15/0676 - Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut GU16 6RN**

The application was for a variation of condition 35 pursuant to planning permission 12/0546 (Hybrid planning application for major residential-led development totalling 1,200 new dwellings) to permit the residential units to attain Code 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (or equivalent national standard) as opposed to attaining level 4 and level 5 for CO2 reduction and water efficiency measures.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'One further letter of objection has been received; however this raises concern over the principle of the site being developed and not the variation of the condition itself.'*

It was noted that legal advice had been sought from external legal representatives.

Some Members felt that more information was required on various planning codes but Members were reminded that planning officers had the expert knowledge to advise Members accordingly.

**Resolved that application 15/0676 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and the receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement/deed of variation by 1 December 2015.**

**In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement to link the planning obligations secured under the S106 Agreement dated 17 April 2014 to both planning permission 12/0546 and the new planning permission (as either permission could be implemented) is not completed by 1 December 2015 then the application shall be refused as it would fail to provide adequate infrastructure mitigation; SANGS and SPA provision and would not provide an inclusive and sustainable form of development (detailed reason for refusal to be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory Services).**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

## **Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper arrived after the start of the consideration of applications 12/0546/2 and 15/0676 (these were considered together) and therefore was unable to vote

### **37/P Application Number: 15/0166 - Land between 4 and 5 School Lane, Windlesham GU20 6EY**

The application was for the erection of a detached 4 bedroom, two storey dwelling (with accommodation in the roof space) and integral garage. (Additional plan recv'd 11/6/15), (Amended plan rec'd 23/07/15).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however at the request of a local Ward Councillor it had been called in to be determined at this Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'Since writing the report four further objections have been received a number of the objections raised are already considered in the report, however, the following issues as raised in the objection letters are considered below.*

- The development will lead to a loss of on street parking which will have a negative impact on the flow of traffic and highway safety,*
- There is limited visibility at the School Road / Chertsey Road junction for pedestrians,*
- There will be an increase in speed of vehicles using Chertsey Road as a result of this proposal,*
- If the pedestrian barrier outside Chertsey Road Hall is removed this will raise health and safety concerns,*
- School Lane is a single width track and vehicles meeting each other will have to reverse onto Chertsey Road causing a highway safety concern,*
- The loss of on street parking and associated traffic flow disruption will negatively impact on the use of the Chertsey Road Hall as a community asset,*

- *The proposal will prejudice planned future County Council public consultation regarding traffic flow improvement measures, and*
- *There has not been any consultation with Chertsey Road Hall.*

*The County Highway's Authority have considered the issues raised in these three objections and have provided the following response:*

***the existing on street parking pressures on Chertsey Road,***

*The proposed works will be amended to shorten the length of the road narrowing to be broadly consistent with the extent of the existing double yellow lines [See condition 8 on page 59 of the agenda]. On this side of the road [northern side], the scheme will have no impact upon existing on street parking levels. On the southern side, the presence of the existing vehicle driveways means that there is very little opportunity to park on street, with just one opportunity to park outside number 46. The general tendency along this part of Chertsey Road is for people to park on the northern side which can't legally take place along the frontage of the hall. When parking does occur on both sides it can cause an obstruction to passing traffic, to pedestrians or to the existing driveways, as evidenced by one of the objectors' photos. The proposed scheme will reduce the likelihood of that occurring in the future, due to less room for drivers to try and straddle the carriageway and footway. Where achievable (because of existing driveways), the position of posts on the footway, will further prevent vehicles mounting the footway throughout the extent of the works.*

***the existing usage of School Lane and lack of pedestrian visibility***

*This is an acknowledged issue, the widening footway outside the hall will mean that pedestrians do not have to walk immediately adjacent to the vehicle exit from School Lane. The works offer a small gain on the existing situation*

***the existing and likely increase in speeds of traffic using Chertsey road***

*The existing speeds on Chertsey Road is not something that we can expect the development to address. The introduction of the narrowing point is unlikely to lead to increased speeds, to the contrary a visible change in environment, could to a limited extent aid speed reduction.*

***the existing pedestrian barrier outside the Hall***

*The retention, deletion or replacement of the barrier is an issue than can be considered at the detailed design stage. Whilst a wider footway may in theory allow for it to be removed, the reason for it being there is obvious, so if the need remains, it may either be retained/relocated/replaced as part of the proposed works.*

***Vehicles reversing onto School Road***

*Typically a single dwelling would generate 4-6 vehicular movements per day. Taking a mid point of 5 trips per day, this might equate to 1 trip between the hours of 7-10am and 1 trip between 4-6pm. The remaining trips would fall outside of these hours. These are typical/average figures, so in reality the actual numbers may be higher or lower. Typically, the trips would also be in favour of outbound trips in the morning and inbound in the evening, mirroring existing patterns in the lane. Whilst the additional trips increase the likelihood of opposing vehicles meeting in the lane, it would be difficult to argue that the level of intensification would be severe, even if the trips were higher than the above 'average' figures. In combination with the improved visibility proposed as part of this scheme, it is not considered that a case exists to raise an objection on these grounds.*

*Turning to the objection from a Surrey County Councillor Cabinet Member, the County Councillor objects as there is a traffic calming consultation due at the end of November and the application before Borough Members tonight is not part of the wider County Council scheme. On this basis the County Council consultation could not be implemented due to this change. Again The County Highway Authority have considered the issues raised and consider that the size and position of the highway improvement works the subject of this application would not prejudice the County Council's future consultation process or layout / design and any final surface treatments and signage are to controlled under the s278 agreement.*

*Finally, it is noted that consultation letters were sent to the Chertsey Road Hall on the 18<sup>th</sup> September 2015.'*

Some Members were concerned about the changes proposed on the road and pavement at the location of the access to the site. It was noted that the County Highways Authority had raised no objections.

Clarification was sought with regard to the ridge height of the proposal and it was noted that the ridge height sat comfortably in the street scene taking into account the distance between the properties and the incline of School Lane.

Some Members noted that a barrier would be removed but requested assurances that it would be replaced or upgraded after the work was completed. It was advised that a clause and condition could be added to this effect.

Members felt that a site visit would be beneficial to view the road and access site. There was concern about the loss of parking spaces on the road and congestion along School Lane causing safety issues. It was also asked that the results of a County Highway Authority consultation on 25 November be taken into consideration with regard to this application.

The Chairman reminded Members that if they were minded to defer the application for a site visit, only those Members who attended the site visit would be able to vote at the meeting when the application was considered. Members were concerned about when the visit would take place, taking into account the time of year and Members who work.

**Resolved that application 15/0166 be deferred to allow a site visit to take place.**

**Note 1**

It was noted that Councillor Pat Tedder declared she had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as her property was sited opposite the development and she left the Chamber during the consideration of the application.

It was noted for the record that Councillors Hawkins, Sturt, Wheeler and White declared that they knew one of the speakers and were also contacted by various residents.

It was noted for the record that Councillor Chambers declared that he owned a property about 10 houses down from the development in Chertsey Road.

It was also noted that Committee Members had received documentation from residents.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr S Pilgrim and Mr Thody spoke in objection to the application and Mr Griffin, the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to defer the application:

Councillors David Allen, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to defer the application:

Councillor Nick Chambers

**38/P      Application Number: 15/0769 - 39 Hamesmoor Road, Mytchett, GU16 6JB**

The application was for the conversion of three bedroom dwelling into two one-bedroom flats (part retrospective).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however at the request of a local Ward Councillor it had been called in to be determined at this Committee.

A site visit took place at the site.

Some Members asked why the application was called in; it was believed due to resident's concerns.

**Resolved that application 15/0769 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 David Allen and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing  
Committee held at Council Chamber,  
Surrey Heath House on 4 November  
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

In Attendance: Cllr Alan McClafferty

**9/L Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

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

The Committee was informed that the Deregulation Act 2015 had been introduced to remove or reduce unnecessary burdens on businesses, individuals, public authorities and taxpayers.

Section 10 of the Act, which related to the duration of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire driving licences, as well as Private Hire operator's licenses, had confirmed the default duration of the driving licences as 3 years and the operator's licence as 5 years. As the Council currently granted licences for one year only, it was therefore proposed to increase the default licence to comply with the new law.

Members were advised that all licensed drivers were currently required to undergo triennial criminal record checks with the Disclosure and Barring Service. Licensed drivers were required to notify the Council of the details of any conviction imposed on them during the period of their licence. In addition, the Licensing Team received any relevant notifications from the Police which, if necessary, could lead to a licence being suspended or revoked.

Drivers were also required to undergo a medical examination every 3 years, although the checks were required on an annual basis upon reaching 60 years of age or at any age on the recommendation of a medical practitioner.

The Committee considered that, where there was less than 3 years remaining on a current check or an annual examination was required, a licence should only be granted for one year. It was also recognised that there may be some

circumstances where a driver would have reason to request a licence for only one year, for example where they were approaching retirement or looking for a change in career, and that request should usually be permitted. In all such cases a reason for this decision would be recorded.

It was proposed that, for the remainder of the financial year, where a licence was granted for a period longer than a year, the fee charged would be increased on a pro rata basis. The fees for the next financial year would be set at a future meeting.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) licensed hackney carriage and private hire drivers continue to be subject to a triennial criminal record check, driving licence check and medical examination in order to maintain the integrity of the 'fit and proper' standard and that in circumstances where there is less than three years left before further checks are required the duration of a hackney carriage or private hire drivers licence be reduced accordingly;**
- (ii) in circumstances where a private hire operator is not a licensed driver a criminal record check be required every 3 years;**
- (iii) subject to the statutory advertisement and consultation period, for the remainder of the current financial year, where a licence is granted for a period longer than one year the fee charged be also increased on a pro rata basis and that future fees be set at a future meeting; and**
- (iv) in circumstances where a licensed driver or private hire operator requests a licence for only one year rather than a longer period then that request be usually permitted in the exercise of discretion.**

**11/L Food Standards Agency Audit**

The Committee was informed that the Food Standards Agency (FSA) set minimum standards of performance which all local authorities responsible for food law enforcement were expected to meet. The Local Authority Audit Scheme was the process by which the FSA conducted a qualitative assessment of local authority performance.

A focussed audit of the controls the Council's food service had in place to deal with Incidents and Alerts had been carried out in July 2015. Members noted the FSA's audit report, which reflected the positive feedback which had been delivered by the auditors during their visit. The Executive Summary of the report stated that "the Authority was found to be delivering a range of food law enforcement activities in accordance with the statutory obligations placed on the Authority as a competent food authority. These were generally delivered according to prescribed timescales by experienced professional staff."

The FSA had made 4 recommendations which had been agreed with the Council. Two of these recommendations had already been completed and submitted to the FSA for approval. Of the 2 outstanding, the recommendation relating to the service plan containing clear information on resources would be addressed in the next Food Safety Service Plan and the recommendation concerning a review of the enforcement plan would be addressed shortly.

**RESOLVED to note the contents of the Food Standard Agency's Audit Report.**

**12/L Statement of Licensing Policy**

The Committee was reminded that, in accordance with the Licensing Act 2003, all licensing authorities were required to have a Statement of Licensing Policy. A Statement of Licensing Policy was in force for a 5 year period.

The Council was in the process of reviewing and updating the existing policy. A 6 week consultation would commence on 6 November 2015. Members were advised that a list of prescribed consultees was contained in statutory guidance.

It was noted that the Cumulative Impact Policy covering Camberley Town Centre would be reviewed as part of the consultation.

Following the consultation, an additional committee meeting would be held to consider any comments received and to review the draft Statement of Licensing Policy.

**RESOLVED to note the update.**

**13/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

This page is intentionally left blank

# Minutes of a Meeting of the Appointments Committee held at Committee Room 1, Surrey Heath House on 18 November 2015

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Richard Brooks (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins  
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley  
+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Victoria Wheeler (In place of Rodney Bates)

In Attendance: Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman

## 1/A Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2013 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

## 2/A Exclusion of Press and Public

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

Minute	Paragraph
3/A	
4/A	

### 3/A Appointment of Executive Head of Business

The Committee interviewed candidates for the post of Executive Head of Business.

#### 4/A Review of Exempt Items

The Committee reviewed the item 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 the decision be made public following

- i) confirmation that the requirements of Part 4 of the Constitution in respect to the offer of employment as a chief officer of the Council are satisfied; and**
- ii) the acceptance of the appointment.**

Chairman

**Appointments Committee  
18 November 2015**

**3/A Appointment of Executive Head of Business**

The Committee interviewed candidates for the post of Executive Head of Business.

**RESOLVED that the post of Executive Head of Business be offered to Daniel Harrison, subject to the requirements of Part 4 of the Constitution in respect to the offer of employment as a chief officer of the Council being satisfied.**

**(Note: Minute 3/A is no longer exempt as the requirements in Minute 4/A have been met.)**

This page is intentionally left blank



# Minutes of a Meeting of the Appointments Committee held at Committee Room 1, Surrey Heath House on 20 November 2015

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Richard Brooks (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins + Cllr Rodney Bates  
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley  
+ Present

**5/A Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

## 6/A Exclusion of Press and Public

The Committee is advised to RESOLVE that, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as set out below:

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>
7/A	1
8/A	1

## 7/A Appointment of Executive Head of Transformation

The Committee interviewed candidates for the post of Executive Head of Transformation.

## 8/A Review of Exempt Items

The Committee reviewed the item 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 the decision be made public following

- i) **confirmation that the requirements of Part 4 of the Constitution in respect to the offer of employment as a chief officer of the Council are satisfied; and**
- ii) **the acceptance of the appointment.**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appointments Committee  
20 November 2015**

**7/A      Appointment of Executive Head of Transformation**

The Committee interviewed candidates for the post of Executive Head of Transformation.

**RESOLVED** that the post of Executive Head of Transformation be offered to Mrs Louise Livingston, subject to the requirements of Part 4 of the Constitution in respect to the offer of employment as a chief officer of the Council being satisfied.

**(Note: Minute 7/A is no longer exempt as the requirement set out in Minute 8/A has been met.)**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Surrey Heath House on 24 November 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 John Winterton)

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

The Chairman welcomed Geoff French from Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership, Carol Squires from Surrey Chambers of Commerce, and Lucy Boazman and Lorna Dane from Collectively Camberley Business Improvement District.

**13/EP Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**14/EP Enterprise M3 LEP**

Geoff French, the Chairman of the LEP, reminded the Committee that Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) had been established in 2011. The LEP covered the area from the New Forest to the M25, incorporating a number of towns, 1 city and parts of 2 national parks.

The Committee was informed that the LEP area had one of the highest performing economies in the UK and had a highly educated workforce. The area had a concentration of growth sectors, especially science and technology, and there was some room for business to expand.

The budget for running the LEP was £800,000, of which £500,000 was received from the Government; the 14 district authorities in the LEP area contributed £10,000 each and the 2 County Councils provided £20,000 each. Further income was received from sponsorship. It was also recognised that lots of work was provided by the private sector for free.

Last year the LEP had secured £148m of local growth funds to be spent over the next 6 years. It had also secured £42m in project loans at a very low interest rate. Mr French reported that the £22m the LEP had available to loan out when it was first established had begun to be paid back, which in turn was being recycled in new loans. It was also advised that EU funds were about to be launched.

A number of projects that had been supported by the LEP across its area in the past year were noted. Included in this were road projects around the towns in the area and a number of sustainable transport packages, including a project for facilities from Blackwater Station along the Blackwater Valley.

Members were reminded that the Leader was an EM3 Board Member and the Chief Executive was a member of the EM3 European Management Group. In relation to Surrey Heath, the LEP had provided money to the Council to acquire a SANG site in order to facilitate development. It had also arranged a project loan at a very low interest rate for the Council for a project in Camberley.

The Committee was advised that the LEP was involved in plans to improve the A30/ A331 junction; the scheme for the junction was currently being revisited but remained in its programme. However, one part of the scheme relating to a cycle way from Blackwater Station to the business parks was ready to go ahead. There was also a scheme in the programme for future years for improvement along the A30 through Camberley. Members noted that Camberley had been identified as a “step up town” and recognised the importance of improving infrastructure around the Town.

It was reported that the criteria used by the government to assess the bids put forward by the LEP was the number of job opportunities and houses created by a project. It was advised that, in relation to developing the LEP’s programme, the organisation responded to the schemes primarily brought by the Highways authorities and had carried forward the Government’s methodology in ranking schemes for priority.

**RESOLVED to note the presentation.**

**15/EP Surrey Chambers of Commerce**

The Committee received a presentation from Carol Squires, who lead Business Development, International Trade and Policy for Surrey Chambers of Commerce. Surrey Chambers of Commerce was one of 53 accredited Chambers in the UK. She informed Members that she worked with a team of ten members to provide services to help ensure that businesses grew in the area.

The Chamber currently had 1,500 members and affiliate members in Surrey. It had an increasing membership and a growing suite of services. The organisation also placed a lot of importance on working in partnerships to help businesses become aware of what support was available. It also placed importance on helping businesses on their journey, from start-ups to the large international companies.

A quarterly economic survey was conducted nationally, with the results released in the quarterly economic report. The results could be drilled down to regional,

county and district results, which enabled the assessment of performance against competitors and provided a useful business development tool.

The Chamber's reputation for networking was recognised, with over 5,000 businesses having walked through its networking events in the last year.

It was reported that there were over 4,200 businesses in Surrey Heath and the Chamber worked closely with the Council's Economic Development team. Ms Squires noted the importance that was placed on commercial development of Camberley and the work carried out by Collectively Camberley Business Improvement District. The work undertaken by Siemens in local schools was also highlighted as a notable example of partnership work taking place in the borough.

The Committee was informed that in Surrey Heath there was a strong focus on international trade and it was reported that over the last 3 years there had been an increase in exporting activity.

The Committee was informed that 6 years ago the Chamber had worked with Tomlinscote School to launch the country's first Young Chamber. This had since been copied across the country. It continued to be carried out by Tomlinscote School.

It was reported that the programme for start-up businesses, which had been launched in June 2015 using investment from the Council, had been very successful. The Chamber had facilitated 30 fully booked start-up clinics where new businesses had received signposting information, assistance with business plans, and follow up support.

**RESOLVED to note the presentation.**

**16/EP Collectively Camberley Business Improvement District**

The Committee was informed that the Collectively Camberley Business Improvement District represented the business community in Camberley Town Centre. It had been established in October 2011 and had worked collectively to enhance Camberley Town Centre. Its aim was to make Camberley Town Centre the destination of choice for shoppers and visitors as well as a vibrant location for businesses and residents alike.

The BID's Chairman and Board of Directors were elected voluntary positions, with the 12 directors currently representing a range of sectors. Members were reminded that Cllr Richard Brooks, the Finance Portfolio Holder, was a member of the Board. The core team responsible for delivering the output of the BID included a Manager, an Operations Manager and a marketing intern.

The Committee was informed that Collectively Camberley worked with 386 businesses across all sectors who together contributed £263,000 in additional BID levy; the average BID levy was £561 p.a. In addition to the levy, the team sought additional income. There had been a 20% increase in additional income this year, meaning more money was available to be spent on enhancing the Town Centre.

Collectively Camberley was an elected body and therefore delivered a business plan agreed by its voters. A BID term lasted 5 years and consequently Collectively Camberley would be seeking renewal in 2016. The organisation would be consulting all businesses within the BID area on what they wanted Collectively Camberley to deliver going forward, which would be used for the business plan for the renewal period.

In 2011 the businesses of Camberley had voted on a business plan which had split the funds into the following 4 areas:

- **Marketing, Events and Promotions.** This was Collectively Camberley's primary focus
- **Access**
- **Attractiveness**
- **Business Support**

The BID had delivered 28 projects, promotions and events each year since its creation. It was noted that Camberley was becoming known for its events such as the Classic Car show. In addition it delivered workshops, promotional support, floral displays and the Town Centre website. A number of successes of the BID were highlighted, including

- the introduction of the Industry Insider card scheme
- the launch of the successful Collectively Camberley website in June 2011
- a huge increase in footfall on events days.
- the Camberley Together Against Crime radio scheme, which currently had 72 members
- the launch of the Love Camberley Facebook and Twitter brand, which had approximately 4,300 local followers
- 124 floral displays across the Town Centre which were provided in partnership with the Council

The Committee was informed that the previous Property Weekly Hot 100 Retail Locations Report had been released, which had showed Camberley as amongst the top 50 hot towns for potential retail opportunities. It was reported that Camberley was in the top 5 in the UK for a premium retail opportunity. Camberley also had consistently above average footfall when compared to national statistics.

**RESOLVED to note the presentation.**

Note: It was noted for the record that Cllr Paul Deach declared that he supplied social media support services to Collectively Camberley. After consultation with officers he considered that, as the Committee was not a decision making body, it would be acceptable for him to remain in the meeting.

**17/EP Committee Work Programme**

The Committee noted the work programme for the remainder of the 2015/16 municipal year.



Members suggested that a future meeting could focus upon youth issues, with a presentation on the Windle Valley Youth Project.

The Committee noted the economic development work that was ongoing and agreed to seek presentations from the Bagshot, Deepcut, Frimley and Yorktown & Watchmoor Business Associations. It was also suggested that at this meeting an item in relation to the Institute of Directors could be included.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Committee's Work Programme, as set out at Annex A to the agenda, be agreed; and**
- (ii) presentations from**
  - a. the Business Associations in the borough and the Institute of Directors; and**
  - b. the Windle Valley Youth Project**

**be added to the draft 2016/17 Work Programme**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank