

COUNCIL MEETING

13 April 2016

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 24 February 2016** (Pages 3 - 16)
2. **Executive - 1 March 2016** (Pages 17 - 20)
3. **Executive - 22 March 2016** (Pages 21 - 26)
4. **Planning Applications Committee - 7 March 2016** (Pages 27 - 36)
5. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 27 January 2016** (Pages 37 - 48)
6. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 23 March 2016 (to follow)**
7. **Licensing Committee - 16 March 2016** (Pages 49 - 50)
8. **Joint Staff Consultative Group - 17 March 2016** (Pages 51 - 54)
9. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 29 March 2016** (Pages 55 - 60)
10. **Audit and Standards Committee - 31 March 2016 (to follow)**

This page is intentionally left blank

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

+ 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

41/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Bruce Mansell and Conrad Sturt and Honorary Alderman Alan Whittart.

42/C Minutes

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held
on 16 December 2015 be approved as a correct record.**

43/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor announced that she had had a very busy period over Christmas and the New Year attending events, including the Windlesham Pram Race which she had so enjoyed very much that she intended to attend next year. She also had participated in 3 Burns Night's suppers, attended a number of school award

evenings and an award ceremony at Limbicare. The Mayor reported that some of the most enjoyable aspects of her year so far had been meeting the volunteers in the community and going out on duty with the police and Street Angels.

The Mayor reminded Members of the visit by a delegation from Bietigheim-Bissingen on 10 March and of her Charity Ball on 14 May.

44/C Questions from Councillors

Under Council Procedure Rule 11, the Regulatory Portfolio Holder responded to a question from Councillor Rodney Bates, relating to the potential implications for the Council and residents of the Planning and Housing Bill that was currently being considered by Parliament.

In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Charlotte Morley confirmed that reports would be submitted to the Executive, in due course, on all aspects of this legislation.

45/C Council Tax and Budget 2016/17

The proposed budget for 2016/17 showed a decrease of just under £300k compared with the previous year. This was after taking into account a further £169k increase in deficit pension contributions and a £265k increase in payroll costs of which £153k had been due solely to a change in Government policy on National Insurance.

As a result of the choice for different levels of Council Tax increase, two budget options were presented based on a Council Tax increase of 1.94% and another of £5, although Members could decide to set Council Tax at any level.

The financial forecast indicated that there would be between a £1.4m and £1.6m budget gap by 2020. £1m of this would not arise until 2019/20 and might be impacted by the 100% Localisation of Business Rates which was due to start in the same year. However it was noted that if savings of this magnitude were needed and taking into account the savings already made, it would seriously call into question the future financial sustainability of the Council and its services.

The Executive had considered a proposed budget on 9th February 2016. However the proposals had not taken into account the changes in Government grant which had been announced the previous evening. Nevertheless the service budgets now presented were unchanged from the ones presented to the Executive. The only changes between the two budgets were due to the change in the settlement and had affected the savings required, use of new homes bonus, Government grants and the Council Tax requirement.

The net cost of services for 2016/17 at £11,523,632 represented a decrease of £295,918 on the previous year.

It was noted that not all of the net cost of services would be met by Council Tax and that the council tax requirement would be determined following deductions made to allow for sources of funding.

Members noted that there was no reduction in special grant to parishes to compensate them for the change to the tax base due to the introduction of the Local Council Tax support scheme.

It was reported that the Section 151 Officer had determined that a surplus of £600,000 could be declared on the Collection Fund for the year. Of this £448,460 would be paid to Surrey County Council, £79,370 to the police and the remaining £72,170 to this Council.

Whilst the level of Revenue Support Grant paid to local authorities had reduced, the amount paid out as New Homes Bonus had risen reflecting the Government's policy to reward those which delivered housing development. However due to constraints this Council had one of the lowest levels of new and affordable housing in Surrey. The Council was due to receive £1,418k in respect of new homes bonus of which £700k had been used to support the revenue budget. The remainder would be placed in the capital reserve.

It had been determined that expenditure of £746,900 should be funded from reserves relating to community grants, costs related to Transformation, community safety, property maintenance, Family Support and SANGS reserves.

It was noted that "Localisation of Business Rates" gave local authorities a direct financial incentive to increase economic growth activity, as measured by an increase in business rates driven by development, in their local area. It had been assumed that Business Rates would increase by 9% over the spending review period. In 2020 Councils would be allowed to retain 100% of business rates. However how this affected the Council would be dependent on the baseline and tariff set. The amount the Council received was very small compared to what it collected and amounted to only 4% of the total.

A national business rates revaluation was due to take place in 2017 and this would result in changes to individual authority's baselines and tariffs. In addition, a rebalancing of business rates between authorities was due to take place in 2020. The implication for this Council would become clear once the proposals for 100% rate retention had been revealed. The cost of any revaluations, irrespective of which year they related, fell on the Council together with any interest due. Given the continued uncertainty over the level of revaluations on appeal only the baseline level of £1.435m had been put in to the budget.

The Council had received notification of an indicative settlement for 2016/17 of its rate support grant of £357k on 17th December, representing a reduction of 67% in cash terms compared with 2015/16 followed by its total removal in 2017/18. This had been confirmed by Parliament in February 2016. However as a result of lobbying a transitional grant of £133k in 2016/17 and £85k in 2017/18 had been given to help manage the loss. It had been originally proposed by the Government that the grant would go negative in 2016/17, by applying a "tariff adjustment" to business rates. However this would now not come in to effect until 2019/20. The funding for the Local Council Tax support scheme was no longer shown separately and Councils were now expected to fund this themselves going forward. A number of other grants had also been removed.

The Minister had offered to guarantee the future settlement figures provided Councils submitted, by October 2016, an efficiency plan indicating how they would deal with the challenges they present. It was not known what was actually being guaranteed and the Government had already said that wider economic considerations might mean the guarantee had to be broken anyway. There were also no details as to what would be required for the efficiency statement or how it would be monitored. As a result the Council was asked to authorise the Executive Head of Finance, after consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, to decide whether the Council signed up for the guarantee or not.

Special Expenses reflected the cost of providing services to non-parished areas which in parished areas were funded by a parish precept. The charge was billed as a separate item to non parished areas in a similar way to a precept in parished areas.

The Government had announced that the trigger for a referendum for Council Tax would be set at 2% or £5 whichever was the higher and that there would be no offer of a grant if Council Tax was frozen. Given the new flexibility over Council Tax increase the budget had been prepared on two bases namely:

- An increase of 1.94% being under the 2% limit;
- An increase of £5.

Given the longer term financial implications the Section 151 Officer had advised that Council tax be increased this year to by the maximum permitted of £5. Only by doing this could income for services be protected for future years.

All reserves and provisions were considered appropriate and supportive of future expenditure requirements. Revenue Reserves (including earmarked reserves) were projected to be around £18m at 31st March 2016. However all capital reserves would have been exhausted.

In respect of the General Fund Working Balance, a risk calculation indicated that a minimum balance of £1m was needed to provide financial cover for day to day cash flow and any financial emergencies which might occur during the financial year. This would be satisfied by both options to increase the Council Tax provided all the savings were achieved.

A number of fees and charges had been increased and had been approved in accordance with Financial Regulations. These changes had been reflected within the budget. However a change in the VAT status for Local Land Charges Searches was currently awaiting HMRC confirmation. As a result it was proposed that the Executive Head of Finance be authorised, after consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to amend the affected fees and charges to reflect the VAT change once it was confirmed by HMRC.

Against an uncertain background, the Council was required to consider a financial forecast which predicted the Council's finances for the next 5 years. The Council noted the assumptions which had been made on the basis of what was known at the moment.

The financial forecast predicted that savings would be relatively modest until 2019/20 when they would rise to £1.6m due to the imposition of the negative tariff. Whether this would be offset in part by the 100% localisation of business rates was not known. Members noted the outcome of the financial forecast, the challenges it contained, the impact on the choice of Council tax increase and the effect this might have on the future financial sustainability of the Council. Members also noted that there were a number of financial risks contained within the budget.

In accordance with the Local Government Act, the Council's Chief Financial Officer confirmed he was satisfied that the preparation of the 2016/17 estimates had been undertaken with rigour and due diligence and provided the appropriate level of resources to meet forecast service requirements whichever budget option was adopted. He also reported that the Council's Reserves, Provisions and the General Fund Working Balance, supplemented by the Revenue Capital Reserves were at such levels to meet all known future expenditure requirements and fund any unforeseen or urgent spending which might arise. The Chief Financial Officer drew attention to the risks within the budget particularly around the Council's ability to continue to deliver savings in the future.

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

Resolved

- (i) to note that under delegated powers the Executive Head of Finance calculated the amount of the Council Tax Base as 36,890.20 (Band D Equivalent properties) for the year 2016/17 calculated in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended;**
- (ii) to note expenditure totalling £746,900 be charged directly to reserves;**
- (iii) to note that £700,000 of the new homes bonus is being used to support the 2016/17 budget;**
- (iv) to note the implications of an increase in Council Tax above 2% or £5 whichever is the larger is deemed to be "excessive" by Government;**
- (v) to note the level of savings and Minimum Payment Range required;**
- (vi) to note that the Revenue Support Grant has been reduced by 67% compared to the previous year, will disappear by 2017/18 and be negative after that;**
- (vii) to note the there is no reduction in the grant given to Parishes for the Local Council Tax Support Scheme;**

- (viii) to note that a council tax surplus of £600,000 is being declared;
- (ix) to note the comments in respect of the robustness of the 2016/17 budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves, provisions and the General Fund Working Balance;
- (x) to note the comments in respect of the financial forecast in respect of the budget gap and the potential impact on the future financial sustainability of the Council;
- (xi) to note that of the Council's Budget requirement, £176,000 be a special expense relating to the non-parished area of the Borough;
- (xii) that the Executive Head of Finance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder be authorised to amend the Local Land Charges fees and charges when the VAT change is confirmed by HMRC;
- (xiii) that the Budget Requirement for 2016/17 be £11,046,231 as set out in paragraph 76 of the Council agenda report;
- (xiv) that the Council Tax Requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2016/17 be £7,425,997 as set out in paragraph 76 of the Council agenda report;
- (xv) that the Council Tax for 2016/17 (excluding special expenses and parish precepts) be set at £201.30 for a Band D property being an increase of £5 compared to 2015/16; and
- (xvi) to authorise the Executive Head of Finance after consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance to decide whether the Council signs up to the Government's offer of a settlement guarantee.

Note: In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken. The following Members voted in favour of the decision: Councillor Dan Adams, David Allen, Richard Brooks, Bill Chapman, Vivienne Chapman, Ian Cullen, Paul Deach, Craig Fennell, Moira Gibson, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis, Oliver Lewis, Jonathon Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Charlotte Morley, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Chris Pitt, Joanne Potter, Nic Price, Wynne Price, Darryl Ratiram, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White, John Winterton. The following Members voted against the decision: Councillors Rodney Bates and Ruth Hutchinson. Councillor Victoria Wheeler abstained from voting.

46/C Setting of Council Tax 2016/17

Having determined its Council Tax Requirement for 2016/17, the Council was now required formally to approve the Council Tax for the area taking into account precepts received from Surrey County Council, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner and the Parishes.

In approving the Council Tax for 2016/17, the Council noted that the Executive, at its meeting on 12 January 2016, had approved the draft Council Tax base for 2016/17 but had delegated the final setting of the base to the Executive Head of Finance. The tax base had been set at 36,890.20 Band D equivalent properties.

Resolved

- 1. to note that the Council Tax Base for 2016/17 calculated in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:**

- a) for the whole Council area as 36,890.20 (Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")); and**

- b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in Table B below.**

Bisley	1,513.05
Chobham	1,928.94
Frimley and Camberley	23,382.72
West End	2,013.81
Windlesham	8,051.68

being the amounts calculated by the Council in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amount of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which special items relate.

- 2. that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2016/17 (excluding parish precepts and special expenses) is £7,425,997**
- 3. that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:**
 - a) 52,561,683 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31(A)2 of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.**
 - b) 44,422,249 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.**
 - c) 8,139,434 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above**

exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).

- d) **£220.64** being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), as divided by Item T (1(a) above) calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts)
- e) **713,437** being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per para 1 above)
- f) **£201.30** being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

- 4. to note that the County Council and the Police Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

Surrey County Council Basic Precept

Precept	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Basic	829.26	967.47	1,105.68	1,243.89	1,520.31	1,796.73	2,073.15	2,487.78
Adult Social Care	16.26	18.97	21.68	24.39	29.81	35.23	40.65	48.78
Total	845.52	986.44	1,127.36	1,268.28	1,550.12	1,831.96	2,113.80	2,536.56

Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
146.79	171.26	195.72	220.19	269.12	318.05	366.98	440.38

- 5. that the Council, in accordance with sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Parish precepts and special expenses

Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Part of Area	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bisley	36.14	42.16	48.18	54.20	66.25	78.29	90.34	108.41
Chobham	26.96	31.45	35.94	40.44	49.42	58.41	67.39	80.87
Frimley and Camberley	5.02	5.85	6.69	7.53	9.20	10.87	12.54	15.05
West End	27.72	32.34	36.97	41.59	50.83	60.07	69.31	83.17
Windlesham	24.32	28.37	32.42	36.47	44.58	52.68	60.79	72.95

Surrey Heath Borough Council

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
134.20	156.57	178.93	201.30	246.03	290.77	335.50	402.60

Aggregate of Parish and Surrey Heath Borough Council

Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Part of Area	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bisley	170.34	198.73	227.11	255.50	312.28	369.06	425.84	511.01
Chobham	161.16	188.02	214.87	241.74	295.45	349.18	402.89	483.47
Frimley and Camberley	139.22	162.42	185.62	208.83	255.23	301.64	348.04	417.65
West End	161.92	188.91	215.90	242.89	296.86	350.84	404.81	486.77
Windlesham	158.52	184.94	211.35	237.77	290.61	343.45	396.29	475.55

Total of all Precepts

Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Part of Area	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bisley	1,162.65	1,356.43	1,550.19	1,743.97	2,131.52	2,519.07	2,906.62	3,487.95
Chobham	1,153.47	1,345.72	1,537.95	1,730.21	2,114.69	2,499.19	2,883.67	3,460.41
Frimley & Camberley	1,131.53	1,320.12	1,508.70	1,697.30	2,074.47	2,451.65	2,828.82	3,394.59
West End	1,154.23	1,346.61	1,538.98	1,731.36	2,116.10	2,500.85	2,885.59	3,462.71
Windlesham	1,150.83	1,342.64	1,534.43	1,726.24	2,109.85	2,493.46	2,877.07	3,452.49

6. to note that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2016/17 is NOT excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.

47/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

(a) Executive – 12 January and 9 February 2016

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 12 January and 9 February 2016 be received and the recommendations at Minute 55/E, 60/E and 61/E be adopted as set out below:

55/E - The Council Tax Base and the Local Council Tax Support Scheme

Resolved that

- (i) the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for Surrey Heath, approved by Council on 22 January 2013, be amended to remove the award of a Family Premium for any new claims or new births after 31 March 2016;**
- (ii) the Executive Head of Finance make any further minor changes to the Local Council Tax Support scheme so as to ensure that where applicable to income and applicable amount calculation it remains in line with Housing Benefit changes introduced by legislation; and**
- (iii) incomes and applicable amounts and non-dependant deceptions be uprated, in line with the percentages and amounts supplied by the Department of Work and Pensions and the Department of Communities and Local Government, and applied to Housing Benefit claims.**

60/E - Corporate Capital Programme

Resolved that

- (i) the new capital bids for £670k for 2016/17 at Annex A to the Executive agenda report be approved, and be incorporated into the Capital Programme;**
- (ii) the Prudential Indicators summarised below and explained in Annex D of the Executive agenda report, including the MRP statement, for 2016/17 to 2018/19 in accordance with the requirements of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2011 be approved;**

Prudential Indicator	2016/17 Estimated £000	2017/18 Estimated £000	2018/19 Estimated £000
Capital Expenditure	1,045	525	525
Capital Financing Requirement	20,357	20,057	19,752
Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream	4.29%	7.20%	7.24%
Incremental impact of investment decisions on Band D council Tax	£11.46	£6.63	-£0.16
Operational Boundary	24,000	24,000	24,000
Authorised Limit	26,000	26,000	26,000

61/E - Treasury Management Strategy Report 2016/17

Resolved to adopt

- (i) the Treasury Management Strategy for 2016/17 as set out in the Executive agenda report;**
- (ii) the Treasury Management Indicators for 2016/17 at Annex C to the Executive agenda report; and**
- (iii) the Annual Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement at Annex D to the Executive agenda report.**

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 13 January and 10 February 2016**

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

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 13 January and 10 February 2016 be received.

- (c) Audit and Standards Committee – 17 December 2015**

It was moved by Councillor Valerie White, seconded by Councillor Paul Ilnicki and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 17 December 2015 be received.

- (d) Licensing Committee – 14 January and 8 February 2016**

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

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Licensing Committee held on 14 January and 8 February 2016 be received and the recommendation at Minute 17/L be adopted as set out below:

Resolved that the Statement of Licensing Policy 2016-2021, as attached at Annex A to the Licensing Committee minutes, be approved.

- (e) External Partnerships Select Committee – 19 January 2016

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 19 January 2016 be received.

- (f) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 21 January 2016

It was moved by Councillor Josephine Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Robin Perry and

Resolved that the notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 21 January 2016 be received.

48/C Leader's Question Time

The Leader responded to a question requesting information on the progress of discussions on the issue of poverty and deprivation in the Borough, which Councillor Richard Brooks, at the last meeting, had indicated he would address further outside the meeting. The Leader advised that Councillor Brooks had the issue under consideration.

49/C Motions

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12, it was proposed by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Ruth Hutchinson that

"This Council believes that it is in the best interests of our residents and businesses for the UK to remain a member of the European Union."

Following debate the motion was put to the meeting and was lost.

50/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 items of business on

the ground that they 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>
51/C	3
52/C	3

51/C Council, Executive and Committees - Exempt

The Council received the exempt minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 9 February 2016.

52/C Review of Exempt Items

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

Resolved that Minute 67/E remain exempt until completion of the lease negotiations.

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 1
March 2016**

+ 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, Cllr Alan McClafferty and Cllr Chris Pitt

69/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

70/E Update on the 3SC Devolution proposal to Government

The Leader of the Council provided an update on a meeting of all Leaders in the 3SC Devolution proposal, held on 8 April 2016. Concerns had been expressed as:

- (i) The Government proposals had yet to be published and the contribution of individual Councils was not known;
- (ii) The proposals tabled were Sussex centric, with most infrastructure proposals in Sussex, rather than in Surrey;
- (iii) The Government had been unable to indicate what infrastructure funding would be transferred to Shire Counties;

It had been made clear, at the 3SC meeting, that Councils would want infrastructure in place before delivering housing.

Members considered options around 'double devolution' and suggested that devolution round the EM3 LEP and a Northern/Southern configuration could prove more productive for this Borough.

Resolved, that

- (i) **The contents of the report be noted; and**
- (ii) **The Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to feed comments back to the 3SC devolution bid team.**

71/E Response to the Consultation on the New Homes Bonus

The Executive considered a report on the Government's consultation on the future of the New Homes Bonus and a draft response from the Council thereon.

Members noted that the New Homes Bonus had been funded by top slicing business rates and reducing grant. The new proposals focussed on making it more difficult to achieve the bonus, with a view to reducing the overall cost so that the funds saved could be transferred to the Better Care Fund, to assist with pressures in Adult Social Care.

The Executive noted that the proposed changes would adversely affect this Council and agreed to respond to the consultation, opposing the proposed reduction.

Resolved to authorise the Executive Head of Finance to draft the response to the Consultation on the New Homes Bonus at Annex A to the agenda report and make any changes required in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, for a letter to be sent under the Portfolio Holder's signature.

72/E St Georges Industrial Estate

The Executive considered a report on St Georges Industrial Estate, which had recently been purchased by Surrey Heath Borough Council. There were 23 Light Industrial Units let out to businesses on varying terms and the report highlighted the need to be able to make commercial decisions within commercial tenant timescales.

The Head of Legal Services already had delegated authority on a number of estate management matters and it was proposed that the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers be amended to authorise the Head of Legal Services to grant, in consultation with either the Council Leader or the Transformation Portfolio Holder, leases not subject to the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 and for a term of up to 25 years.

Resolved, that the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers be amended to authorise the Head of Legal Services, in addition to those delegations already in place in respect of estate management matters relating to St Georges Industrial Estate, to grant, in consultation with either the Council Leader or the Transformation Portfolio Holder, leases not subject to the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 and for a term of up to 25 years.

73/E Write-off of Irrecoverable Revenues Bad Debts

The Executive considered a report proposing the write off of irrecoverable revenue bad debts over £1,500.

Members noted a schedule of bad debts for both Council Tax and Business Rates and sought clarification on the following:

- (i) Debtors in Prison – For those debtors listed as being in prison, what basis was used for determining whether or not to write off the bad debt?
- (ii) Longer Term Debts – Referring to businesses which had been in debt for a number of years, had mechanisms been put in place to trigger earlier actions?

The Finance Portfolio Holder reported that, although bad debts were written off, the debtors would be pursued should that possibility arise in the future. Mechanisms had been introduced to trigger winding up actions in response to multiple rent arrears. In relation to debtors in prison, whilst it was likely that the write-off was proposed due to their lack of assets rather than incarceration, the Portfolio Holder would review both areas and provide Members with an update.

Resolved, that bad debts totalling £47,722.84 in respect of Council Tax and £156,215.47 in respect of Non-Domestic Rates to be written-off in 2015-16.

74/E Collectively Camberley Business Improvement District

The Executive considered an update on the progress made by the Camberley Town Centre Future Management Working Group, in particular, in respect of recommendations to the BID, in relation to matters which the Council considered should be included in the prospectus for the BID renewal.

Members were reminded that the Council would be required to make a decision later in 2016 as to whether it should vote for a renewed BID. It was also noted that following a soft market testing through surveys, Collectively Camberley had reported that 76% of respondents supported a renewed BID.

Resolved, that the progress made to date by the Camberley Town Centre Future Management Working Group be noted.

75/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 they involved the disclosure of exempt information.

RESOLVED, that

- (i) **Annex A, to Item 8 - Write off of Irrecoverable Revenues Bad Debt, remains exempt; and**
- (ii) **The Notes of the meeting of the Camberley Town Centre Future Management Working Group of 8 December 2015 and 12 January 2016 be made public.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 22
March 2016**

+ 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 Pat Tedder

76/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 1st March 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

77/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 31 December 2015.

Resolved that

(i) **the following grants be awarded from the Council's
Community Fund Grant Scheme:**

Applicant	Project	Grant Award
(a) Bisley Village Hall	To fit a new kitchen floor and kitchen.	£15,540
(b) Camberley Rugby Football Club	To extend the existing club house to add additional changing room facilities for ladies and girls teams.	£10,000
(c) Chobham Burymead Football Club	To replace the windows on the east side of the building adding anti vandal screens for security, plus the security doors with crash bars to comply with new fire regulations, to replace the existing moveable goals and the line marker.	£3,597.60
(d) Frimley	To replace the existing boiler that is	££6,201

	Cricket Club	almost 40 years old and to provide a new fence to deter vandalism on the pavilion roof.	
(e)	Surrey SATRO	To provide new tools for the mobile construction classroom.	£500
(f)	Woking Hospice	To provide the fixed equipment required for a new in-patient bedroom that will benefit the local community with a life limiting illness.	£10,000

(i) the following applications be refused:

	Applicant	Project	Reason
(a)	British Red Cross	To contribute towards the Camberley theatre costs associated with hosting the Red Cross 'Make your Move' event on the 25th June 2016.	Declined on the basis of the reserve levels.
(b)	Crossroads Care Surrey	To undertake bespoke dementia training of the 70 carer support staff that operate within Surrey Heath.	Declined on the basis of the reserve levels.
(c)	R-U-Able	To provide free, sports specific taster sessions in swimming, boccia and cycling and to develop the marketing and website.	Declined as the applicant had not supplied sufficient information to verify the project costs.

78/E Response to the Technical Consultation on the Implementation of Planning Changes

The Executive considered a response to the Government's consultation on the Technical consultation on the implementation of planning changes.

The consultation covers a number of aspects of the reforms contained in the Housing and Planning Bill which was currently progressing through the Parliamentary process. These changes are intended to support housing delivery. Those themes addressed within the consultation of particular significance were the introduction of Permission in Principle, introduction of Brownfield Registers, speeding up of neighbourhood planning, government intervention in Local Plans, introduction of Fast Track planning applications and testing competition in the processing of planning applications.

It was noted that the suggested changes would have implications for fee income for planning applications. It was not clear what proportion of fees the Council would receive for planning applications processed by the private sector. It was not evident that this would result in any reduction in costs or the current levels of staff required. Changes would result in increased costs and time required for the Local Plan process including examinations. The impact of these proposals would be felt within 2016/17 as the government was clear that it wished to progress these changes quickly.

Resolved to agree the response set out at Annex 1 of the agenda report as the Council's formal response to the DCLG consultation on the Technical consultation on the implementation of planning changes.

79/E Fixed Penalty Notice Policy

The Executive considered a revised and updated Fixed Penalty Notice Enforcement Policy which reflected changes in legislation and set out the Council's commitment to take enforcement action against environmental crime perpetrators.

Two significant changes to the current regime were proposed. The first related to the abolition of the early repayment option for the offences of Failing to Produce Waste Documents and Failure to Produce Waste Carriers Licence. Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for both these offences were £300, currently reduced to £180 if paid within 10 days. It was hoped that the withdrawal of an early payment discount would encourage businesses to be properly licensed and to dispose of their waste correctly, rather than risk a fine.

Currently, although the law allowed for FPNs to be issued to anyone over the age of 10, the Council did not issue FPNs to anyone under the age of 18. The second significant change related to the introduction of a flexible policy which allowed officers, at their discretion, to issue FPNs to juveniles between the ages of 10 and 17.

In this connection, Members asked for the details of the research which indicated that juveniles were responsible for increased littering during the schools holidays. The Portfolio Holder undertook to provide the evidence outside the meeting.

Resolved that the revised Fixed Penalty Notice Policy, as set out at Annex A of the agenda report, be approved.

80/E Corporate Peer Challenge Review

In December 2015 the Council had undergone a review of the Corporate Peer Challenge that had taken place in October 2014. There had been 15 recommendations in the report which had formed the focus of the review visit in December 2015. The outcome of the review had been very positive and demonstrated the progress the Peer Review Team felt the Council had made against their recommendations.

Resolved to note the report on the Corporate Peer Challenge Review and to agree its publication on the Council's website.

81/E Camberley International Festival

It was reported that it was proposed to deliver a ten day celebration of culture and the arts across Camberley Town Centre starting in June 2016, with a view to making it an annual event if successful.

The Camberley International Festival aimed to add to the arts, culture and events currently on offer in Camberley and to further enhance Camberley's image as a highly desirable place to live, work and visit. The festival would open with internationally renowned folk act Lau on 1st June and close with the Queen's 90th birthday picnic event on the London Road Recreation Ground on 11th June.

As 2016 was Camberley Theatre's 50th Anniversary year, this presented the perfect opportunity for launching the Festival, initially as part of the anniversary celebrations and then overseeing its continued growth and development as part of the anniversary celebration's legacy. BAFTA Award winning actor Juliet Aubrey had agreed to be a patron of the festival.

Resolved to note the proposals for the Camberley International Festival.

82/E Quarterly Financial Report

Members received the third quarter monitoring report against the 2015/16 approved budget, which provided an update on the Revenue, Treasury and Capital budget position as at 31st December 2015.

Overall despite a number of over and underspends the Council was predicted to be £14k under budget which was just over 0.1% of the overall net revenue budget. This was after meeting the annual savings target of £250k and represented a remarkable achievement in the current environment given the pressures local government was under.

Resolved to note the Revenue, Treasury and Capital position as at 31 December 2015.

83/E Pay Award 2016/17

The Executive was advised that it was proposed that a 1% cost of living rise for 2016/17 be awarded to staff and back dated to the 1st April 2016. The costs would be funded from existing budgets.

A number of points had been considered when deciding the level of this cost of living rise which included what other councils in the surrounding area were paying, the National award of 1%, and the objective of ensuring the Council remained an employer of choice and continued to provide excellent service to the community.

Recommended to Full Council a 1% pay award for 2016/17, to be met from the existing salaries budgets.

(Note: In relation to the above item, the following interests were declared and the Members were not present for its consideration:

- (a) Councillor Rodney Bates, for the record, as an employee of a neighbouring local authority; and
- (b) Councillor Richard Brooks, a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, as his wife was employed by the Council.

84/E Surrey County Council Verges, Roundabouts and Highway Weedspraying

The opportunity existed for Council to take on highways grass cutting and weed spraying in the Borough on behalf of Surrey County Council, effectively bringing the majority of grass cutting in the Borough under one contract. Highway weed spraying was currently carried out on behalf of the County Council by this Council under an existing arrangement, which would cease from 2016. A tendering process had been carried out by the County Council to include potential operators on a Framework Agreement.

The County Council had offered sufficient funding to engage a known operator, along with a percentage uplift (20%) for this Council's costs. The contract would be for 5 years, with a 12 month termination period for either party. A business case demonstrated that these contracts could be delivered at no financial cost to this Council with the opportunity to earn income through sponsorship of roundabouts. In addition the proposal could deliver a number of other non-financial benefits.

The situation would be reviewed after twelve months and then annually thereafter.

If the Council was to take on this contract, the Council would then be responsible for the vast majority of grass cutting in the Borough. It would allow for a truly joined up approach, provide for anomalies and inefficiencies to be ironed out and for a targeted approach to high profile or problem areas to be undertaken. Any surplus funding would be used to increase the cutting regime in certain areas, or to enhance areas through bedding schemes, hanging baskets or other soft management and landscaping methods.

Resolved

- (i) **to authorise the Executive Head of Business to enter into contractual arrangements with Surrey County Council for verge cutting and weed spraying;**
- (ii) **to agree that further work on roundabout sponsorship continues and that all net surplus be used to improve the cutting service provided and enhance the overall appearance of the Borough; and**
- (iii) **that these arrangements be monitored annually.**

85/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)
85/E	3

86/E Review of Exempt Items

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

RESOLVED that financial information in the report at agenda item 13 to remain exempt but the decision and Minute 84/E to be made public.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 7 March 2016**

+ 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 Cllr Colin Dougan)

In Attendance: Jane Ireland, Emma Pearman, Jonathan Partington, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Moira Gibson, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Lee Brewin, Gareth John, Jenny Rickard and James Robinson

Cllr Paul Deach – from min 48/P – min 49/P
Cllr Moira Gibson – from min 48/P – min 49/P
Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper – from min 48/P – min 49/P
Cllr Victoria Wheeler – from min 48/P – min 50/P

Jane Ireland – from min 48/P – min 49/P
James Robinson – from min 48/P – min 49/P

Mr Alan Cleverly OBE

The Chairman, with sadness, advised the Committee that Mr Cleverly, the agent for the Conservative Association Surrey Heath had passed away that morning. He would be sorely missed.

48/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

49/P Application Number: 15/0590 - HEATHPARK WOOD, HEATHPARK DRIVE, WINDLESHAM

The application was for the outline planning permission for the erection up to 140 dwellings and community facilities, with associated landscaping, open space, car parking and access from Woodlands Lane, and use of land to provide publicly accessible recreation space (SANG). (Details of access only to be agreed).

(Additional info received 10.08.2015). (Additional info & amended plan rec'd 02/10/2015). (Additional info recv'd 8.12.15).

Members were advised of the following update:

1. 'Amended RECOMMENDATION:

Subject to conditions (as detailed on pages 40-51 of the report and amendments in this update sheet), signing of the legal agreement to secure provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), affordable housing and SAMM, and reporting the application to the National Planning Casework Unit the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to GRANT planning permission, in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Applications Committee.

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been agreed by 31st March 2016, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE the application for the reasons set out on page 39 of the agenda.

Officer comment:

In respect of the above, a draft of the legal agreement has been received which is satisfactory in respect of SAMM and Affordable Housing.

With regard to the SANG, Natural England has today removed its objection and as such the Local Planning Authority are satisfied that it sufficiently addresses SANG management, subject to some minor amendments.

A copy of a letter was received from Windlesham Heathpark Wood Group which was addressed to the National Planning Casework Unit (NPCU), requesting that the application be called in by them for determination. The NPCU have therefore requested that the decision is not issued until we have notified them of what the decision is, at which point they will decide whether to take this request any further.

- 2. Air Quality – Further objections have been received. The Environmental Health Officer produced a 24-page document in response to these objections which has been circulated to the Committee and is on our website. The EHO concludes again that there is no reason to object to the development on the grounds of air quality.*
- 3. Flooding – a further objection has been received in respect of flooding, however, it is considered that the report adequately addresses this issue and conditions are proposed in this regard should permission be granted.*
- 4. The two SANG management plans have been amalgamated at the request of Natural England so amend condition 30 to read:*

Prior to commencement of development the submitted draft SANG Management Plan – Ecology Revision 2 Feb 2016 received 29.02.16 shall be updated and finalised, and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with Natural England.

5. *Correction – Annex C should read ‘Environmental Health Officer’s comments’*
6. *Amend Condition 2 to include reference to the SANG Proposal Plan. The applicant states this is complete but this outline application is considering details of access only with landscape details at reserved matters stage:*

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Site Location Plan SLP-01B received 25.06.15, and access to be provided in the location as shown on the Indicative Site Access point 30446-5501-SK04 Rev B. The SANG area shall be constructed broadly in line with the Amended SANG Proposal Plan Rev G received 02.10.15. The dwellings shall be built wholly within the area of the site identified as a Housing Reserve site under Policy H8 (saved) of the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000 as shown on the Proposals Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7. *Further information from Windlesham Heathpark Wood Group has been circulated to Members (This included photos, a list of policies that they consider are relevant, and some proposed reasons for refusal).*

Officer comment:

With regard to the list of policies, RE3 is not a current policy and the matters raised by the other policies including national and local housing policies, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is fully discussed in section 7.5 of the report. With regard to the photos submitted, please note that photos 1 & 6 do not appear to be of the site itself but an area to the east of St Margaret’s Cottage which is outside the application site and not affected by this application. With regard to photos 3 & 4 of the backdrop to Heathpark Drive, please note that there is a buffer of at least 10m proposed behind the houses where trees would be retained. With regard to the proposed reasons for refusal, it is not considered that these raise any new issues that have not been discussed in the report. The first one relates to the release of the housing as discussed in section 7.5, the second to ecology and ancient woodland as discussed in sections 7.7 and 7.10 and the third reason covers several matters which are discussed throughout the report.

8. *Ecology – Further objection was received on the presence of bats and an objection was received today from Surrey Bat Group (via Windlesham Heathpark Wood Group) which was sent to Members.*

Officer comment:

Surrey Wildlife Trust still raises no objection and Surrey Bat Group has since verbally confirmed that they would have no objection to a condition to require further surveys at reserved matters stage.

Additional condition:

Surveys to establish the presence or otherwise of bats shall be undertaken in line with the advice received from Surrey Bat Group dated 4th March 2016 and provision of appropriate compensation/mitigation suggested, and these shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority along with the details of reserved matters.

Reason: To ensure that there are no significant adverse effects upon biodiversity in accordance with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. *As SAMM is now covered in the legal agreement, Condition 31 would not be required.'*

A further comment had been received from the applicant just prior to the meeting which had not been in time for officers to read it and comment.

Members were concerned about the sustainability of the development and the ecological harm, in particular the harm to bats, badgers and various birds.

The Local Ward Councillor spoke against the proposal. It was emphasised that the proposal was on safeguarded land which amounted to long term protection of the Green Belt. There were concerns about the habitat of the wildlife on the site and that a robust condition would have to be included to protect the bats. In addition the ancient woodland would need to be protected from the drainage measures taken for the dwellings on site. Confirmation was required as to the presence of red kites and sparrow hawks on site.

Officers reminded Members that the most up to date policy contained within the NPPF needed to be considered with regard to this proposal. In respect of biodiversity surveys were agreed by Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England. Officers advised Members of the test under paragraph 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005 and that Officers were satisfied that further impact on protected species could be considered as part of the reserved matters submission. It was confirmed that any reserved matters submission would need to be considered by the Committee.

Members still had concerns regarding the ecological harm and the safeguarding of the Green Belt. Officers had, after the receipt of a legal agreement, recommended to approve the application subject to conditions. However, after consideration Members felt that the application should be refused as the Local Plan needed to be reviewed before the safeguarded land should be released for development and more robust surveys be carried out in respect of the bats, badgers and certain species of birds.

Resolved that application 15/0590 be refused for the following reasons:

- i) any development on safeguarded land be held in abeyance until a review of the Local Plan is carried out;**
- ii) a thorough bat survey had not been carried out;**
- iii) no mechanisms in place to safeguard the badgers on the site; and**
- iv) no thorough survey on protected birds nesting on the site.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Committee Members had been contacted by residents.

Note 2

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Chris McDonald, representing the Heathpark Wood Group, Mrs Ann Fenton and Tony Murphy, spoke against the application. Mr Geoff Armstrong, the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

There was no proposer and seconder with regard to the officers' recommendation to approve the application as amended.

Note 4

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Conrad Sturt.

Note 5

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, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Abstaining from the vote:

Councillors Ian Sams.

50/P Application Number: 15/1069 - CHOBHAM NURSERIES, BAGSHOT ROAD, CHOBHAM, WOKING, GU24 8DE

The application was for erection of five detached dwellings (2 x 3-bed, 2 x 5-bed, 1 x 6-bed) with detached garages, parking, access and landscaping, following demolition of existing horticultural buildings. (Additional and Amended Plans - Rec'd 02/02/2016.) (Amended Plan - Rec'd 19/02/2016.)

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of Cllr E Hawkins and Cllr Tedder it has been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following update:

1. *'A satisfactory legal agreement has been signed and received in respect of SAMM and Affordable Housing - **the Recommendation is therefore changed to GRANT.***
2. *An amended Site Plan has been received which now shows the correct visibility splays and has taken into account the requirements of the County Highway Authority and as such Condition 2 should be updated so that the second plan in the list reads: Site Layout Plan 13-P908-20B received 29.02.16*
3. *A response to the application has been received by the Local Lead Flood Authority, who have not objected subject to the following additional conditions:*
 19. *Prior to commencement of development, a Drainage Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Drainage Strategy shall:*
 - *Provide results from infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365. The Sustainable Drainage System shall then be designed in accordance with these results.*
 - *Provide evidence showing that the site is not discharging via infiltration into a Ground Water Source Protection or into contaminated lane.*
 - *Show evidence that there are no risks from contamination on or offsite and that the proposal shall not infiltrate into a source protection zone*
 - *Provide details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite*
 - *Provide details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development*
 - *Provide long and cross sections of each proposed SuD element and a finalised drainage layout plan*

The development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is appropriately designed, in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

20. Prior to construction of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the SuDS elements must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is maintained throughout its life time to an acceptable standard, in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is appropriately designed and implemented in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. A further objection has been received today from The Chobham Society which states that:
- *The development is inappropriate within the Green Belt with no very special circumstances [see section 7.3 of the report]*
 - *It will turn a peaceful rural lane into something like a housing estate road [see section 7.4 of the report]*
 - *It will represent further incursion into the diminishing green space that separates Chobham from West End [Officer comment: the site already is covered with glasshouses – see section 7.3 of the report]*
 - *If approved the houses should have a maximum of three bedrooms to replenish existing stock that is being lost by way of extensions [Officer comment: Housing mix has to be balanced with character concerns and the area is characterised by larger, detached dwellings. Two of the five houses proposed are 3-bed houses. See section 7.4 and 7.7 of the report].'*

There were concerns about the access and the size of the dwellings on the site. Members were reminded that County Highways Authority had raised no objection. Landscaping was also a concern but the Committee was advised that condition 5 covered that issue.

Resolved that application 15/1069 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mrs Gill Head spoke against the application. Mr Jim Bailey, the agent spoke in support.

Note 2

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

Councillors, David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:
Councillors Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

51/P Application Number: 15/1133 - CHOBHAM SERVICE STATION, STATION ROAD, CHOBHAM, WOKING, GU24 8AJ

This application was for the Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission SU/13/0367 so as to allow the petrol station to remain open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of Cllr Tedder it has been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following update:

1. *'Please note that the Location Plan on page 136 correctly shows the boundary between the site and 1 Rowell End Villas (the OS map on page 133 does not indicate this)*
2. *If permission is granted, a further condition should be added requiring details of the proposed lighting to be submitted before the extended hours commence (see paragraph 7.5.10), to read:*

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the proposed lighting to be used during midnight – 6am shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Ten further objection letters have been received which raise the following issues:

- Chobham is peaceful at night and we should not be encouraging people to drive here in the small hours to use the petrol station or shop [see section 7.5 of report]*
- Cannot see a benefit to the village but there will be an increase in noise, and potentially crime [see section 7.5]*
- A precedent will be set with other shops like Co-Op and Tesco potentially wanting to open 24 hours as well [Officer comment: each application would be judged on its own merits]*
- Questioning the 'early engagement' referenced by the developer in that this involved only letters sent to immediate neighbours [Officer comment: the effectiveness of the early engagement is not something that is taken into consideration of the planning application and not something that the applicant must do]*
- Early engagement showed that neighbours had complained to the station manager about the noise of the car wash, and that the manager did not want to switch off the faulty machine; manager does not act upon other noise complaints nor are complaints followed up [Officer comment: again this is part of the early engagement and appears to be a management issue rather than something that can be taken into account as part of the application]*
- Potential increase in traffic and HGVs [see section 7.6]*
- Already 24 hour petrol and diesel available nearby/no need for the facility/impact on amenity will outweigh need/inappropriate location [Officer comment: applicant does not have to demonstrate need in this location as there is no policy that would require this]*
- Impact on Conservation Area [see sections 5.3 and 7.4]*
- Those living next door deserve respite from it [see section 7.5]*
- Elected representatives must take a stand against it if Officers cannot [Officer comment: Officers must take into account specialist advice and in this case there have not been any objections from statutory consultees regarding noise, traffic or the conservation area]*

Photos by an objector showing tanker deliveries were circulated to the Committee.'

There was concern that the site was encircled by residential units and regarding the impact the service station already had on the surrounding housing.

The officers had recommended that the application be approved, however, after consideration the Members felt the application should be refused due to the harm the proposal would have on adjoining residential amenities. Following clarification by Officers, it was agreed that the harm was general disturbance rather than specific noise and light pollution.

Resolved that application 15/1133 be refused on the grounds of the harm to residential amenity.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members had received information from a resident.

Note 2

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had a disclosable pecuniary interest as she owned a property opposite the application site and she left the room during its consideration.

Note 3

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mrs Rachael Gillingham and Mr Darren Rees , representing the Chobham Society spoke against the application. Mr Rupert Ainsworth, the applicant spoke in support.

Note 4

There was no proposer or seconder with regard to the officers' recommendation to approve.

Note 5

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

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 refuse the application:

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

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Performance and Finance Scrutiny
Committee held at Surrey Heath House
on 27 January 2016**

+ 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

Substitutes: Cllr Ian Sams

In Attendance: Andrew Crawford, Sheena Adrian, Sarah Groom, Julia Hutley-Savage, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Cllr Craig Fennell and Daniel Harrison

26/PF Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Craig Fennell, the Business Portfolio Holder and reminded Members of the areas under the remit of his Portfolio. He also welcomed Councillor Ruth Hutchinson, Sarah Groom and Daniel Harrison, the newly appointed Executive Head of Business, congratulating him on his appointment.

27/PF Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 2 December 2015 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

28/PF Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders - Business

Councillor Craig Fennell referred Members to the elements of his brief as Business Portfolio Holder and highlighted the following:

- (i) The Camberley Theatre – There had been a change of management at the Camberley Theatre and a conceptual change on food and drink provision. The food service, including lunchtime provision, which had been opened 18 months previously, with an external food provider, had not proved a success and the food service had been scaled back.

Consideration had been given to seat replacement, with options including refurbishment or replacement. The cheapest option proved to be replacement at a cost of approximately £100,000.

The Pantomime had achieved a net profit of approximately £35,000. Efforts continued to reduce the subsidy needed for the Theatre and the venue would celebrate its 50th anniversary in 2016.

The Committee sought clarification on the following:

- Subsidy Reduction – Members requested a breakdown of Corporate Overheads, in terms of cost and allocation;
- On-line Booking – Following experience of difficulties in booking and seat selection/allocation, Members sought a breakdown of how this service operated and any plans for improvement;
- The Future – Members queried the requirement to have a Theatre and sought an indication of the Council's commitment to this venue, going forward.

- (ii) Green Space – The Green Space Team operated and maintained a number of parks in the Borough. Recent developments include the opening of 3G pitch facilities. The business plan had set an occupancy target of 60%. To date, £79,000 had been accrued, but expenditure had been reduced, giving a net profit of £44,000 against an expected return of £37,000.

Pistachio's Café – The contract for this venue, in Frimley Lodge Park, had been put out to tender and it was anticipated that a new partner would be opening the Café again within 6 weeks' time.

Lightwater Country Park – The Visitors Centre was currently the subject of a major revamp, including an extension and refurbishment of toilet and café facilities.

Events – It was planned to drive revenue gain through more events in the Council's parks.

Arena Leisure Centre – The Centre contract had been extended by 3 years, to allow time to consider future options.

Leisure Leases – The Green Space Team advised property officers on ability to pay when leisure leases were re-issued.

Sports Development – The Council's Sports Development Officer was heavily involved in pushing forward and developing sports in the Borough. Sports demand across the Borough was evolving, with some seeing participation in decline, such as football, but others growing, such as adult netball which had seen growth of 20%.

The Committee sought clarification on the following:

- Model Railway – Frimley Lodge Park – It was understood that the miniature railway had previously had operating difficulties, particularly in terms of opening times. Members requested an update on this facility;

- Walking Football – Given the growth of Walking Football for the over 50s, Members sought assurances that suitable venues would be considered in the Borough;
- Basketball – Given the growth of this sport, were there any plans to provide outdoor courts? Councillor Fennell confirmed that there were no plans currently.
- Athletics - The biggest growth area was in athletics. It was noted that there were no athletics facilities in the Borough and the introduction thereof would carry a significant cost.
- Netball – Given the significant growth in adult netball, Members highlighted the lack of suitable playing surfaces and asked that this be investigated and an update on progress be provided;
- Public Planting – Members raised the issue of the street scene and public planting, in which it was considered that the Borough trailed, in comparison to neighbouring boroughs;

Councillor Fennell noted that, previously, the Council had looked to have hanging baskets in shopping areas, but had been advised by Surrey County Council that the street lighting was not strong enough to take the weight of these. As the street lighting was upgraded with greater load bearing poles, this issue would be considered further. Members asked that this matter be addressed urgently as the new street lighting was put in place across the Borough.

- Growth and Decline of Sports Involvement in Surrey Heath – The Committee requested a breakdown of the sports in the Borough that were growing or declining.

- (iii) Surrey Heath Museum – The Museum was developing and expanding its outreach work with schools in the Borough.

The Committee asked for an update on visitor numbers to the Museum.

- (iv) Events in the Borough – Members sought an update on what events were planned for the celebration of Her Majesty the Queen's 90th birthday and National Picnic Week, which was understood to coincide with the birthday celebrations.

Councillor Fennell highlighted the 'Clean for the Queen' initiative, which the Council planned to participate in.

The Executive Head of Business was asked to provide an update on plans for picnic events and the celebration of the Queen's 90th Birthday.

- (v) Car Parking – The Council provided car park facilities for Camberley Town Centre, but also the rest of the Borough. It also provided on-street parking

enforcement at nil cost to the Borough. Unlike most surrounding Councils, which provided little or no free time on High Streets, Surrey Heath did not charge for the first 30 minutes.

Members noted that the Car Parking Strategy would be considered in the following agenda item, but sought clarification on the following:

- Revenue - How did parking revenue compare year on year and what had been achieved in terms of parking targets?

Councillor Fennell reported that parking revenue was slightly down on target by 2.4%. Earlier in the financial year, there was a major dip in usage for a weekend, following the suggestion on a television programme that Camberley could be a target which would interest terrorists. He agreed to circulate a comparison of revenue achieved over recent years.

- Feeder Road to Frimley from the Blackwater Valley Relief Road – Members were reminded that one of the feeder roads into Frimley had been closed (for some time) as it had been deemed to be dangerous. Members queried whether the use of this defunct road for parking had been considered and if this could be achieved safely.

Whilst there were differing views on whether or not the proposed parking could be achieved safely, Councillor Fennell agreed to raise the issue at a future parking meeting with Surrey County Council and to feed back the outcome to Members. The parking meeting was unlikely to be held before the next meeting of this Committee.

Councillor Fennell noted that whilst the first 2 hours in the Burrell Road car park were free of charge, a charge had been levied thereafter to deter commuters from parking there all day.

- Kings Ride/College Ride – Councillor Robin Perry reported that, as parking restrictions had been imposed in Camberley Town Centre, drivers had migrated to Kings Ride, College Ride and the surrounding roads.

Councillor Fennell acknowledged that when you introduce parking restrictions in one area, it caused a ripple effect in other areas. He offered to meet Ward Councillors on site to review the issue.

- Chobham – Councillor Victoria Wheeler highlighted residents' concerns on the lack of enforcement in Chobham, suggesting in particular that enforcing on current restrictions was preferable to introducing further double yellow lines. She also sought the Portfolio Holder's views on parking charges in the Chobham car park.

Councillor Fennell noted that there were only a limited number of enforcement officers to cover the whole Borough. Whilst he

acknowledged that income from parking in the Chobham car park was less than the costs involved, it had been implemented to assist local businesses by reducing commuter parking.

- Sponsorship of Roundabouts – Members noted that the Council had previously refused proposals for sponsoring roundabouts, but that, now, 5 roundabouts had been sponsored by businesses, bringing income to the Council.

Councillor Fennel reported that, previously, no income would have come to the Council, with all proceeds going to SCC. He agreed to provide the Committee with details of potential revenue streams from further roundabout sponsorship.

- Signage – Referring to other boroughs which used electronic signage, Members suggested the introduction of signage indicating which car parks were full or had spaces and the number thereof.

The Executive Head of Business reported that live feeds on parking were available on the Council's website.

Members asked for feedback on the possibility/practicality of signage outside car parks.

- Main Square Car Park – Members noted the need for more wide spaces in the car park and asked what consideration had been given to a proposal to reverse access and egress, using the current exit as the main entrance and vice versa.

Councillor Fennell reported that a significant number of parking bays had already been widened to accommodate larger vehicles. The Main Square Car Park was constructed in 1970. Mitigation measures have been built in to improve traffic flow, but the shape and structure did not easily accommodate a change in the entrance and exit.

The Chairman thanked the Business Portfolio Holder for his presentation and the Executive Head of Business for his support.

Resolved, that

- (i) **The report be noted; and**
- (ii) **With the exception of information on the feeder road, Frimley discussions with Surrey County Council, which would be circulated following the next meeting with SCC on that matter, the information requested by Members be circulated electronically prior to the next meeting.**

29/PF Update on Car Park Strategy

The Executive Head of Business noted that many areas of the Car Park Strategy had been considered during the previous item. He highlighted the following developments:

- (i) Ticketing – A new ticketing system had been introduced making a lot more data available on line;
- (ii) Payments by Phone – Payment for Camberley Town Centre parking by mobile phone was under development and it was hoped that this could be introduced in the future;
- (iii) Town Centre Car Parks – Town Centre car parks had been the subject of major refurbishment, including new lifts, improved lighting and floors, producing an improved environment for customers;
- (iv) Parking Enforcement – This had previously made a loss, but was now breaking even;

Members highlighted difficulties with enforcement, when, in some areas, parking on pavements caused considerable difficulties for pedestrians, whilst in others, drivers were required to do so.

The Committee requested further information on strategies for on street parking.

- (v) Out of Town Parking – Officers had been reviewing current arrangements on out of town parking, recognising the impact that parking changes imposed by the Council could have on local residents. A report on out of town parking arrangements would be considered at a future meeting of the Executive, when the costs and benefits of policies such as charging would be considered.

Members noted the practice in some Boroughs of charging for or preventing parking at lunchtime, to discourage commuter parking and the Portfolio Holder was asked to look at this as another option in out of town parking consideration.

- (vi) Marketing – The Council was working closely with partners to promote Camberley Town Centre and parking was key to their strategies, particularly in the run-up to Christmas.

Members noted that some residents did not have smart phones and could be penalised if all information in areas such as availability of parking places was provided on-line, without alternative methods. Details were requested on what other methods were being considered.

- (vii) Revenue Streams – Members noted that a parking Strategy Report had been considered in 2013. At previous meetings, the Committee had been informed that this Strategy would generate good revenue streams. This had not been covered in this report and the Committee asked for revenue data,

including a comparison to data dating from 2013 and comparator data for the Council's immediate closest neighbouring boroughs.

Resolved, that

- (i) The report be noted; and**
- (ii) The information requested by Members be circulated electronically prior to the next meeting.**

30/PF Mid Year Performance Report

The Transformation Team Manager presented a report on performance data for the period 1 April to 30 September 2015 and provided a verbal update on indicative outcomes for Quarter 3.

- (i) The Camberley Theatre – Additional income generation targets had been missed for 3 Quarters;
- (ii) Complaints – targets had been missed in terms of the percentage of stage 2 and 3 complaints responded to within 10 days. 80% had been achieved in Quarter 1, 50% in Quarter 2 and 60% in Quarter 3. This could, however, reflect the complexity of the cases involved.

Members queried whether complaints responded to meant that or resolved, whether the response sent would be computer generated and if there were delays, would the complainants get correspondence indicating progress?

The Transformation Team Manager confirmed that, at Stages 2 and 3, complainants would receive a letter from a Head of Service, responding to the specific complaint. Where there was a delay against the target resolution date, the complainants were appraised of the delay and reasoning. When the numbers of complaints were low, 3 to 4 complaints could significantly affect percentage outcomes.

Members requested further details, particularly in respect of what areas complaints were made against, what happens when complaints are escalated, what happens if complaints are found to be justified or not and what measures are in place to learn from complaints.

- (iii) Customer Contacts - the target increase of customer contact undertaken via a self-service channel had been missed;

Members challenged the 'Red/Amber/Green (RAG)' colour coding of indicators. Whilst 'Green' was supposed to indicate that the indicator was on target, with a tick if completed, in Key Priority 1 (Improved Camberley Town Centre) in which all 3 targets listed had end dates of March 2016 and were marked as green, none of these appeared to be on target and in the case of the Arena Leisure Centre, unlikely to be completed in the next 3 years.

The Committee asked for further information, prior to the next meeting including the requested update on complaints and a review of the RAG reporting against actual achievement.

Resolved, that

- (i) The Executive be advised of the Committee's concerns in relation to the RAG Report colour coding; and**
- (ii) The Transformation Team Manager be asked to arrange for further data to be circulated to the Committee, prior to its March 2016 meeting, on complaints, including what areas of Council work complaints were made on, what happened when complaints were escalated, what actions were taken if resolution was delayed and what measures were in place to learn from complaints.**

31/PF Mid-Year Finance Report

The Committee considered a report on the Revenue, Treasury and Capital position for the first half of 2015/16.

Revenue - In terms of the Revenue Budget, the Acting Senior Accountant reported that:

- (i) Services – Overall, services were expected to be £250,000 under budget at the end of the year, with the savings target of £250,000 and a small overspend in one area offset by savings and income elsewhere;
- (ii) Interest Received – Despite the turbulence faced in the financial year, it was likely that interest received would exceed targets;
- (iii) Wages and Salaries - An underspend of £77,000 was expected on wages and salaries by the year end; and
- (iv) Income – The Council had a strategy of generating additional income and had been particularly successful in its investments in property.

Capital Budget – Of the allocated £19.773 million allocated in 2015/16, £17.289 million had been spent to date, mainly on property acquisition. These had been funded through borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board and/or the Local Enterprise Partnership.

Sundry Debt – As at 30 September 2015, there were invoices unpaid totalling £606,000, of which £218,000 related to one invoice from Surrey County Council.

Housing Benefit Debt – As at 30 September 2015, this stood at £643,000.

In response to Members questions, the Acting Senior Accountant reported that:

Iceland - £676,000 remained in Icelandic Banks in local currency.

Reporting Processes – The report, when drafted, was reviewed by the Corporate Management Team and then considered by the Executive, before coming to this Committee.

Members expressed concerns about the delay in and therefore the value of the data being reported to the Committee and asked the Acting Senior Accountant to:

- (ii) Discuss with the Executive Head of Finance ways to get more up to date data to this Committee;
- (ii) Provide more financial detail in the annexes to the report;
- (iii) Provide an Executive Summary, with a headline figure and a feel for the overall expenditure and income; and
- (v) Circulate more detail on the Camberley Theatre Budget.

Resolved, that

- (i) **The report be noted; and**
- (ii) **The information requested by Members be circulated electronically prior to the next meeting.**

32/PF Work Programme

The work programme for the remainder of the municipal year 2015/16 was considered and agreed by the Committee.

It was noted that the Committee would be required, at its next meeting, to set a work programme for the 2016/17 municipal year. The proposed meeting dates for 2016/17 were noted.

Resolved, that the work programme, attached at Annex A to the Committee report, be agreed.

33/PF Exclusion of the 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)
34/PF (Part)	3
35/PF	3
36/PF	3

Councillor Wynne Price in the Chair.

34/PF Working Groups

The Committee considered the establishment of a Task and Finish Group to address Members' concerns over the future health of shopping streets in the Borough and agreed to the establishment of a Task and Finish Group.

Membership would be nominated by the Group Leaders, with Councillor Edward Hawkins asked to chair the Group. The Group would be asked to develop draft terms of reference for consideration at the Committee's meeting on 23 March 2016.

35/PF Review of Exempt Items

The Committee reviewed the report which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of the Press and Public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved, that Minute 34/PF and the associated Committee considerations remain exempt for the present time.

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 Licensing
Committee held at Council Chamber,
Surrey Heath House on 16 March 2016**

+ 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 Ian Cullen
- Cllr Oliver Lewis	+ Cllr David Lewis

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ian Cullen and Cllr David Lewis

19/L Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 8 February 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

20/L Gambling Act 2005 - Draft Statement of Principles

Councillor Sturt declared an interest for the record as he was a Personal Licence Holder and the Designated Premises Supervisor for the Half Moon Public House in Windlesham.

Under the Gambling Act 2005, the Council is required to prepare and publish a Statement of Gambling Policy, setting out the general approach of the licensing authority when making decisions in relation to gambling, every three years. Surrey Heath's Statement had to be reviewed and re-published by 5 October 2016.

The current Statement had been reviewed and updated to reflect the contents of the latest Gambling Commission guidance and would be subject to a statutory twelve week consultation period. Consultation would take place with a range of groups including: the local police force, licence holders, the business community and local residents. The draft Statement would then be taken to Full Council for approval.

The Committee was informed that currently there were 9 licenced betting shops operating in the Borough, 52 permits and notifications had been issued for gaming machines and licences had been issued for 60 lotteries. Responsibility for administering the regime was split between the Council, which held responsibility for authorising Premises licences, and the Gambling Commission, who had responsibility for issuing Operating and Personal Licences.

Arising from Members' questions and comments the following points were noted:

- Licensed premises automatically received a licence to have up to two gaming machines on the premises. A separate licence had to be applied for if additional gaming machines were wanted.
- A training session focused on the Gambling Act and the Council's responsibilities would be arranged for members of the Committee.
- A list of betting shops in the Borough would be circulated.
- Although raffles and tombolas were covered by the Gambling Act if they were incidental to an event then a licence was not required. Works raffles were exempt from the Act if the prize was below a certain limit.
- Betting shops were required to refuse entry to those less than 18 years of age.
- Private members clubs had to restrict the playing of gaming machines to those who were over 18 years old.
- It was questioned whether the Non Domestic Rates List could be used for other purposes and it was agreed that this would be clarified.
- The Citizens' Advice Bureau would be added to the list of consultees
- It was confirmed that Geraldine Sharman was the Council's Information Governance Manager.
- Details of the Hampton Principles governing enforcement principles would be circulated.

RESOLVED that the draft Statement of Gambling Principles 2016-2019, set out at Annex A of the report, be approved for public consultation.

21/L Licensing Act 2003 - Summary of Decisions

The Committee received a report setting out the 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.

The Committee noted the report.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff
Consultative Group held at Surrey
Heath House on 17 March 2016**

+ 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	
Cllr Conrad Sturt	

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Belinda Tam and Louise Livingston

17/J Notes

The notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 21 January 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

18/J Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

19/J Leave and Special Leave Amendments

The Group received a report setting out the proposed revised Leave and Special Leave Policy and Procedures.

It was reported that since the report's publication the following changes had been made to the policy:

- Paragraph 6.1 – The annual leave entitlement had been updated to reflect the current grade structure.
- Paragraph 6.1 – The word eScene would be replaced with Heathspace
- Paragraph 6.3 – In the third sentence exigencies would be replaced with requirements.
- Paragraph 7.3 – The table would be updated to reflect current hours.
- Paragraph 8.1 – The maximum entitlement for compassionate leave following the death of an immediate family member would be amended to read 5 days.
- A separate policy would be produced covering military service in non-regular forces.
- Paragraph 8.5.2 – The third paragraph would be amended to read 'If agreed by both the individual and the service, staff with sufficient annual

leave, may take annual leave as opposed to unpaid leave to care for a dependent.'

- Paragraph 8.5.2 – The final paragraph was a repetition and would be deleted.
- Paragraph 8.8 – Following the bullet pointed section the reference to Head of Service would be changed to reflect the titles already amended.

The Group noted the report.

20/J Reservists Policy

The Group received a report setting out a proposed Reservist Policy for Council staff serving the Armed Forces Reserves.

The Group was informed that since the report's publication the following amendments had been made:

- Paragraph 3 – Would be renumbered
- Paragraph 10.vi – Would be amended to read 'Managers must complete the consent form included...'
- Paragraph 11.2.v – Would be amended to read 'A Reservist can claim up to a total of £400 per day for all forms of payment from the MOD.'
- Paragraph 11.3.i and ii – These paragraphs would be amended as follows:
 - i If the employee is a member of the Local Government Pension Scheme, then Surrey Heath Borough Council will suspend its employer contributions during mobilisation.
 - ii If the employee continues to pay their contributions, then the Ministry of Defence will pay the employer contributions on the amount of Assumed Pensionable Pay.
- Paragraph 13.2.iv – Would be amended to read 'If a Reservist believes that their employer's response to their reinstatement denies their rights in any way, an application can be made to an Independent Reinstatement Committee for assessment'
- Appendix A – The Second box under the Return to Work flow chart would be amended to read 'If the employer's response seems unfair...'

The Group noted the report.

21/J Work Programme

The Group received a report setting out the work programme for the 2016/17 municipal year.

It was suggested that consideration be given to looking at the Parking Policies applying at Surrey Heath House.

The Group noted the report.

It was reported that Surrey Heath Borough Council had been awarded a Gold level IIP. The Council's submission had been particularly strong meeting 96% of the indicators and was one of only two councils in Surrey to have achieved the Gold level. An email would be sent to all staff informing them of this achievement and thanking them for their input.

The Group commended Council staff for this achievement.

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Surrey Heath House on 29 March 2016

+ 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 Ian Sams
+ Cllr Max Nelson	+ Cllr John Winterton

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ian Sams (for Councillor Chris Pitt)

In Attendance: Cllr Bill Chapman, Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman and Cllr Charlotte Morley

Guests: Dr Andy Brooks, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group
Inspector Bob Darkens, Surrey Police
Sean Rafferty, Surrey County Council

24/EP Chairman's Announcements and Welcome to Guests

The Chairman welcomed Sean Rafferty, Surrey County Council, Inspector Bob Darkens, Surrey Police, and Dr Andy Brooks, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group, to the meeting.

25/EP Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 19 January 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

26/EP Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

For reasons of transparency, Councillor Ruth Hutchinson informed the Committee that she was employed by Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust.

27/EP Presentation on the Family Support Programme

Sean Rafferty, Surrey County Council, gave a presentation in respect of the Surrey Family Support Programme which had been set up to support families

identified as having complex, multiple issues that required the input of significant resources from a number of different agencies.

The programme had been set up by Surrey County Council in 2011 as part of the Government's Troubled Families initiative. Families were identified for inclusion on the programme via a variety of routes including referrals made by single agencies including the Police, Health Services, Education and Children's Social Care and via the interrogation of County Council databases. The Family Support Programme then assessed and prioritised each potential family against a set of criteria developed by Central Government. Families selected for the programme underwent a single multi-agency assessment of their needs and a single multi-agency support plan for the family was developed.

Using the Team around the Family approach, the local Family Support Team then allocated each family a lead professional who would co-ordinate the support that would be given to the family and bring together the practitioners working with each family to develop a systematic approach to help and support the family in-line with the plans agreed with the families. Where it was identified that a family had additional needs then a locally based Family Co-ordinator provided additional intensive support to the family for a period of between twelve and eighteen weeks. The Programme had now been fully operational for two years and work was taking place to integrate the system and approach into practitioners' everyday work.

It has been estimated that there were in excess of 5,000 families with complex needs living in Surrey and the Government had set Surrey County Council the target of turning around the lives of 1,050 families by May 2015. This target had been met ahead of schedule in February 2015 and the programme subsequently expanded to include families who had initially been assessed as being a lower priority and less complex needs. Following agreement from Central Government, the Surrey Troubled Families Programme aims to turn around the lives of a further 3,660 families by April 2020.

Arising from Members' questions and comments the following points were noted:

- The participating families lived predominantly in urban areas and tended to fall into lower socio-economic categories.
- During 2015/16, the Programme had worked with 1,200 families and 600 of these had received additional intensive support.
- Although, data was collected on a range of indicators including the number of adults helped back into work and the number of school days missed practitioners also measured success in terms of the positive feedback received from families following intervention work.
- The local team based at Surrey Heath Council were considered to be exemplars of good practice and work was taking place to replicate the approach taken elsewhere in the County.
- The Family's key worker would work intensively with the family for the first six weeks of the programme. During this time priority issues and appropriate agency involvement would be identified.

It was acknowledged that more could be done to raise awareness of the Programme amongst Councillors. Councillor Morley, Regulatory Portfolio Holder, agreed to brief members about the Programme. It was agreed that the Committee would receive regular updates on the Family Support Programme.

The Chairman thanked Sean Rafferty for his presentation.

28/EP Presentation by Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group

Dr Andy Brooks, Chief Executive, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group, gave a presentation in respect of the work of the Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The presentation included an overview of the CCG's aims and objectives, a summary of the CCG's work to date and an overview of the CCG's future plans.

The Committee was informed that the CCG worked with a range of partners including 9 GP practices, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust, North Hampshire Urgent Care, North Surrey Voluntary Support and the Borough and County Councils, to provide approximately 90,000 people living across Camberley, Bagshot, Lightwater, Frimley and Ash Vale with a high quality health and social care provision.

The CCG performed well when measured against nationally prescribed performance indicators and was currently ranked 1st in the Country for residents' ability to access GP services out of hours and was ranked 3rd in the Country for the way that it dealt with long term conditions.

Key areas of recent work have included the introduction of the Walk and Live Confidently Programme, which aimed to keep residents mobile and living independently for longer, the commissioning of additional GP hours to improve out of hours access and extend surgery hours from 8am to 8pm, and the development of the Surrey Integrated Care Model.

The Surrey Integrated Care Model provided service users with an integrated one stop shop that provided residents with a single point of access for their health and social care needs and had been developed following input from both service users and service providers. Referrals to the service could be made by an individual agency or residents could self-refer. Referrals were then assessed by one of three local Integrated Care Teams based across the CCG area who would identify the best way to take the person's case forward and the agencies and organisations that would need to be involved and referrals made as necessary. The introduction of the Integrated Care Model meant that residents' needs were now being assessed holistically and referrals were being made according to a person's needs instead of according to what isolated service was thought to be appropriate. The Integrated Care Team also worked with cases where health links were not immediately apparent, for example a referral was received from an elderly lady who was experiencing loneliness and wanted help with her shopping and to get out more. The Service referred the lady to the local library where she was able to take computer classes which enabled to do her shopping online and a referral was made to Age Concern who provided ongoing social support. The

Service also works with hospitals to co-ordinate the services provided to patients when they were discharged.

The area's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) provided a profile of the area in terms of its current and future health and social care needs and this had been used by the CCG to help it develop its strategic direction and priorities for the coming years. The CCG had agreed the following six priorities which would shape its future work:

- Prevention and self-care
- Improving support in the community and promoting independence
- Improving children and young people's access to services and the quality of services provided to this group
- Integration of urgent and emergency care
- Improving the integration of the commissioning of health and social care
- Commissioning value for money

Arising from Members' questions and comments the following points were noted:

- The CCG was working with partners to ensure that hospital capacity in the area was appropriate and that residents were receiving care in the community rather than being admitted to hospital unnecessarily.
- Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust was in the process of developing plans for the redevelopment of the Heatherwood Hospital Site. It was envisaged that the majority of hospital appointments would take place locally with patients only travelling to Wexham Park Hospital for more specialised treatments.
- Although the CCG did not have responsibility for commissioning general Practice Services, the growing demand for GP services was a concern for the CCG who had invested additional money into the primary care service so that GP surgeries were able to extend their opening hours.
- It was confirmed that all the doctors employed by the Out of Hours GP service were NHS doctors and the majority were local to the Surrey Heath area. The service's performance in terms of quality of care compared favourably with national figures and the service was considered to be an efficient and effective one.

It was agreed that the presentation would be circulated to Members.

The Chairman thanked Dr Brooks for his informative update.

29/EP Crime and Disorder Presentation

Inspector Bob Darkens, Borough Commander for Surrey Heath, Surrey Police, gave a presentation in respect of the work of the Surrey Heath Safer Neighbourhood Team, local crime figures and the changes to service delivery that would be implemented from 4 April 2016.

The Committee was informed that the introduction of new Home Office regulations covering the reporting of crime meant that all police forces now had to record every incident reported to them as a crime before any investigation work could

take place. In addition, it was not possible to remove a crime from the recording system if subsequent investigations found that no crime had been committed. Consequently the number of recorded crimes being reported had risen across the Country and it was not currently possible to provide accurate year on year comparisons.

It was reported that although the number of violent crimes with injury reported in Surrey Heath had increased by 53% to 128 offences compared to the number recorded during 2014/15, the number of cases achieving positive outcomes had increased by 14.7% to 41.8%. It was stressed that the majority of these crimes related to incidents of domestic abuse. There had been 119 domestic burglaries recorded during 2015/16, compared to 171 in 2014/15, a decrease of 30.4%. There had been 26 serious sexual assaults recorded during 2015/16 an increase of 54% when compared to 2014/15; an increase that was attributed to reports of historic sexual offences being included in the recorded figures and people having greater confidence to report crimes of this nature.

The Surrey Heath Neighbourhood Team had conducted a number of operations during 2015/2016 including one that had resulted in the dismantling of a drug related organised crime group operating across west Surrey. The Police force had also worked with a range of partners including VOSA, environmental officers, taxi licensing and the Council's Safer Travel Team to promote and improve road safety in the area through a combination of sanctions and education. One criminal behaviour order had been issued to someone with a history of shoplifting and 'moving off without payment' offences and his ongoing offending in Surrey Heath had now ceased. Following the refusal of repeated offers of support, an Anti-social Behaviour Closure Order had been enacted against a resident in Old Dean.

The Committee was informed that in order to make best use of available resources and in recognition of the changing nature of the crimes being reported Surrey Police would be reorganising its approach to policing to focus on core policing work. The reorganisation would result in the reorganisation of neighbourhood policing, with the introduction of Area Policing Teams, the refocusing of Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the setting up of an enhanced Public Protection Team with responsibility for safeguarding the County's most vulnerable residents.

From 4 April 2016, Surrey Heath would be covered by an Area Policing Team based at Woking Police Station. These large teams would cover a wider area than current neighbourhood teams with officers being assigned to specific geographical areas. As a result of these changes Surrey Heath would from 4 April 2016 be covered by five rotas each made up of 10 police constables and one sergeant. These teams would deal with all volume crime and officers would maintain ownership of a crime from the time it was first reported through to the end of the investigation process. PCSOs would form part of the reconfigured Safer Neighbourhood Teams, of which there would be one team per Borough. The Safer Neighbourhood Teams would no longer undertake general community engagement or reassurance activities unless they relate to locally agreed chronic issues or repeat problems that cause disproportionate harm, threat or risk to the community.

Calls to the 999 emergency telephone number would in future be dealt with initially by the newly formed Demand Reduction Team who would triage all the Police's 999 calls and prioritise them. Callers making calls that were considered not to be a police matter would be signposted to alternative agencies.

It was agreed that a briefing note setting out these changes in more detail would be circulated to the Committee.

Councillor Morley briefed the Committee on the remit of the Surrey Police and Crime Panel which included: scrutiny of the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), reviewing the PCC's precept on Council Tax, scrutinising the Police and Crime Plan, removal of the PCC if an offence was committed and scrutinising appointments to the position of Chief Constable.

It was stressed that Police and Crime Panels were only able to veto the Council Tax precept proposed by the PCC twice and their actions were limited by Government statute.

The Chairman thanked Inspector Darkens for his update.

30/EP External Partnerships Select Committee Forward Plan

The Committee considered a report setting out the proposed work programme for the Committee for the new Municipal Year.

It was suggested that Windle Valley Dementia Club be added to the list of external partners to be invited to a future meeting.

RESOLVED that the proposed work programme for the 2016/17 Municipal Year be approved.

Chairman