

# **COUNCIL MEETING**

## **27 July 2016**

# **COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK**

1. **Council - 18 May 2016** (Pages 3 - 12)
2. **Executive - 19 April 2016** (Pages 13 - 18)
3. **Executive - 7 June 2016** (Pages 19 - 26)
4. **Executive - 12 July 2016** (Pages 27 - 36)
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 12 May 2016** (Pages 37 - 46)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 30 June 2016** (Pages 47 - 64)
7. **Planning Applications Committee - 21 July 2016 - to follow**
8. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 28 June 2016** (Pages 65 - 70)
9. **Licensing Committee - 29 June 2016** (Pages 71 - 72)
10. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 6 July 2016** (Pages 73 - 80)
11. **Joint Staff Consultative Group- 14 July 2016** (Pages 81 - 84)

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY  
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at  
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on  
18 May 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

**1/C Mayor**

It was moved by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman that Councillor John Winterton be elected Mayor for the ensuing year. The motion was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED, that Councillor John Winterton be elected Mayor of the Borough of Surrey Heath for the ensuing municipal year.**

Councillor John Winterton made and signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office of Mayor and was invested with the Mayoral Chain of Office.

The Mayor, Councillor John Winterton, in the Chair

Councillor Winterton thanked the Council for his election as the 44<sup>th</sup> Mayor of the Borough and the Council's ambassador. He congratulated Cllr Joanne Potter and her escort, Mrs Jackie Piper, for the way in which they had most ably carried out their duties as Mayor and Mayor's Escort during the past year and thanked Councillor Potter for all her help and guidance during his year as Deputy Mayor.

The Mayor paid tribute to the support he had received from his wife, Di Winterton during his year as Deputy Mayor. He also thanked Reverend Mark Wallace from All Saints, Lightwater for agreeing to be his Chaplain during his mayoral year.

Councillor Potter, in responding, thanked all the councillors and officers who had supported her in the past year, with particular thanks to Cllr John Winterton for his support as her deputy throughout the year, her Chaplain, Reverend Phil Parker, Members and supporters who had raised money for the Mayor's Charity during the year, and the Mayor's Secretary.

## **2/C Deputy Mayor**

It was moved by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans and seconded by Councillor Conrad Sturt that Councillor Valerie White be appointed Deputy Mayor for the ensuing year. The motion was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED, that Councillor Valerie White be elected Deputy Mayor of the Borough of Surrey Heath for the ensuing municipal year.**

Councillor White thanked Members for their affirmation and encouragement and promised that she would carry out her duties on behalf of Surrey Heath residents, to the best of her ability. Her husband, Mr David White, was invested as the Deputy Mayor's Consort.

## **3/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 13 April 2016 be approved as a correct record.**

## **4/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Pat Tedder.

## **5/C Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed the Council that the charities he would be supporting during his mayoral year were Connect Counselling Service and Disability Initiative.

## **6/C Executive Arrangements**

The Leader informed the Council that Councillor Richard Brooks would be the Deputy Leader and the following councillors would be Portfolio Holders with the areas of responsibility as set out below:

<u>Portfolio Area</u>	<u>Portfolio Holder</u>
Business	Cllr Craig Fennell
Community	Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman
Corporate	Cllr Josephine Hawkins
Finance	Cllr Richard Brooks
Regulatory	Cllr Charlotte Morley
Transformation	Cllr Colin Dougan

She reported that all decisions would be taken collectively by the Executive. She had not reserved any decisions to the office of the Council Leader and no individual decision making powers had been delegated to Portfolio Holders.

### **7/C Establishment of Committees and Review of Political Proportionality**

The Council was required by law to allocate seats in proportion to the political composition of the Council, with the aggregate membership of all the committees also being proportionate.

It was moved by the Mayor and seconded by the Deputy Mayor, that the scheme of proportionality set out in the agenda be adopted.

#### **RESOLVED, that**

- (i) the committees as set out at Annex A of the agenda report be appointed with the committee sizes shown; and**
- (ii) the scheme of proportionality as set out at Annex A of the agenda report be adopted for 2016/17.**

### **8/C Appointment of Members to Committees**

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

**RESOLVED, that the membership of the standing committees of the Council for 2016/17 be as follows:**

**Planning Applications Committee** (16 members and 6 substitute members)

Committee Members:

Cllr David Allen, Cllr Richard Brooks, Cllr Nick Chambers, Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Cllr Colin Dougan, Cllr Surinder Gandhum, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper, Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr

Adrian Page, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Ian Sams, Cllr Conrad Sturt, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Valerie White.

Substitutes:

Cllr Dan Adams, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr Max Nelson.

**Licensing Committee** (15 members)

Committee Members:

Cllr Nick Chambers, Cllr Bill Chapman, Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Cllr Surinder Gandhum, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Oliver Lewis, Cllr Jonathan Lytle, Cllr Bruce Mansell, Cllr Joanne Potter, Cllr Nic Price, Cllr Ian Sams, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Valerie White.

In accordance with Substitution Procedure Rules, no substitutes were appointed to the Licensing Committee.

**External Partnerships Select Committee** (15 members and 5 substitute members)

Cllr Dan Adams, Cllr Ian Cullen, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Cllr Max Nelson, Cllr Adrian Page, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Chris Pitt, Cllr Joanne Potter, Cllr Nic Price, Cllr Darryl Ratiram.

Substitutes:

Cllr Oliver Lewis, Cllr Jonathan Lytle, Cllr Wynne Price, Cllr Ian Sams, Cllr Pat Tedder.

**Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee** (15 members and 5 substitute members)

Committee Members:

Cllr Dan Adams, Cllr David Allen, Cllr Bill Chapman, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Oliver Lewis, Cllr Jonathan Lytle, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Cllr Max Nelson, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Chris Pitt, Cllr Wynne Price, Cllr Darryl Ratiram, Cllr Victoria Wheeler.

Substitutes:

Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper, Cllr Joanne Potter, Cllr Ian Sams, Cllr Valerie White.

**Audit and Standards Committee** (7 members and 4 substitute members)

Committee Members:

Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Cllr Jonathan Lytle, Cllr Bruce Mansell, Cllr Conrad Sturt.

Substitutes:

Cllr Dan Adams, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper.

**Appointments Committee** (5 members and 3 substitute members)

Committee Members:

Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Richard Brooks, Cllr Moira Gibson, Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Cllr Charlotte Morley.

Substitutes:

Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Valerie White.

**9/C Appointment of Chairmen and Vice Chairmen**

It was moved by the Mayor and seconded by the Deputy Mayor, that the chairmen and vice-chairmen of committees, as previously nominated and as set out below, be appointed for the ensuing year:

**RESOLVED, that the following appointments of chairmen and vice-chairmen of committees, as previously nominated and as set out below be made for the ensuing year:**

<b><u>Committee</u></b>	<b><u>Chairman</u></b>	<b><u>Vice Chairman</u></b>
Planning Applications	Cllr Edward Hawkins	Cllr David Mansfield
Licensing	Cllr Bill Chapman	Cllr Ian Sams
External Partnerships	Cllr Paul Deach	Cllr Dan Adams
Select		
Performance and Finance	Cllr Alan McClafferty	Cllr Jonathan Lytle
Scrutiny		
Audit and Standards	Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Cllr Conrad Sturt
Appointments	Cllr Moira Gibson	Cllr Richard Brooks

**10/C Joint Committee**

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

**RESOLVED that Councillor Charlotte Morley be appointed to the Surrey Police and Crime Panel for the 2016/17 municipal year.**

**11/C To Appoint Working Groups and Other Bodies of the Council and the Membership thereof**

It was moved by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Moira Gibson that the bodies set out below be established and that the size of these bodies, the allocations to the different party groups and the nominations thereto be as laid on the table.

**RESOLVED, that the following working groups or bodies of the Council be established, the allocation of seats be approved, and the membership of those bodies be as set out below:**

**Governance Working Group (5 members and 3 substitute members)**

Members:

Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Moira Gibson, Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Cllr Wynne Price.

Substitutes:

Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Cllr Ian Sams, Cllr Victoria Wheeler.

**Joint Staff Consultative Group (8 members)**

Cllr Moira Gibson, Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr Charlotte Morley, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Ian Sams, Cllr Conrad Sturt, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson.

**Waste Contract Consultative Group (5 members and 3 substitute members)**

Members:

Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Max Nelson, Cllr Ian Sams, Cllr Pat Tedder.

Substitutes:

Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr John Winterton, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson.

**12/C Responsibility for Functions**

The Constitution, at Part 4 Section A, required the Council at its Annual Meeting to agree the Scheme of Delegation of Functions.

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



**RESOLVED, that the Scheme of Delegation of Functions, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.**

**13/C Governance Working Group**

The Council received a report from the Governance Working Group in relation to

- (i) the Licensing Committee; and
- (ii) the Electoral Review of Council Size.

The Working Group had discussed ongoing concerns about the small number of members participating in Licensing Sub Committees and had considered options for widening the pool of members from which to select participants, including the use of the Licensing Committee's appointed substitutes.

It had, however, been reported that Section 6(1) of the Licensing Act 2003 restricted the size of the Licensing Committee to between 10 and 15 councillors and that the membership of any Sub-committees established by the Licensing Committee had to be drawn from the main Committee. A recent court case had clarified that

- (a) If licensing authorities were able to substitute non-members as and when they wished it would remove the requirement to establish a licensing committee of at least 10 but not more than 15 members of the authority;
- (b) The nature of the work required of licensing committee members meant that they must be trained for the role;
- (c) Section 6(1) of the Act stated that the licensing committee must have not more than 15 members and, if there are already 15 members, to add another would exceed the statutory maximum and could not be done; and
- (d) Standing orders could not override the legislative provisions.

Consequently it was clear that substitute members were not allowed. The Council's Procedure rules did provide that there should be no substitutions for licensing when dealing with Licensing Act 2003 matters and the licensing sub-committees of the Licensing Committee.

The Local Government Boundary Commission's review on the Council's size had been considered by the Working Group. The first stage of the review would be to decide the Council size. The Commission would determine the Council size taking into the decision of the Council and any other representations from political groups.

The Working Group had noted that both the Conservative Group and the Others Group had considered proposals for future council size: the Others Group had proposed a council size of 39 and the Conservative Group, a council size of 34.

It was reported that the Working Group had discussed the 2 proposals and had, by a majority, agreed to advise the Council to recommend a Council size of 34.

**RESOLVED that the Chief Executive, after consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to submit, to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, the Council's proposal on a reduction of council size from 40 members to 34 members, based on the following factors:**

- (i) the Strong Leader and Executive arrangements introduced since the last review;**
- (ii) the extensive Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers extended since the last review;**
- (iii) the technological advancements in communications and the changing way in which residents accessed information and services;**
- (iv) reduction in the committee structure and frequencies of meetings including the way in which the Council fulfils its scrutiny responsibilities; and**
- (v) the financial position of the Council, and the Country as a whole.**

Note: Councillor Rodney Bates, on behalf of the Others Group, asked that his Group's vote against the above decision be recorded.

#### **14/C Appointment of Pool of Independent Persons**

The Monitoring Officer reminded Members that previously the Council had appointed a single Independent Person in accordance with the Localism Act 2011. The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 provided for further arrangements relating to disciplinary processes requiring two Independent Persons.

The current appointment had expired and advertising for a replacement had not been successful. However, a pool of Independent Persons had been appointed by a consortium of councils, namely Mole Valley, Guildford, Waverley, Spelthorne and Reigate and Banstead. The consortium authorities had been operating a protocol to deal with the practical issues of dealing with complaints, including any conflicts of interest, common processes and arrangements for dealing with complaints.

There were currently five people who formed part of the pool across the authorities.

- Roger Pett
- Tony Allenby

- Vivienne Cameron
- Paul Sherar
- David Seymour
- Bernard Quoroll

The Council agreed to join the consortium and appoint the above persons in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.

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

**RESOLVED to appoint the following persons to be Independent Persons in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 until May 2019:**

- **Roger Pett**
- **Tony Allenby**
- **Vivienne Cameron**
- **Paul Sherar**
- **David Seymour**
- **Bernard Quoroll**

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 19 April  
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: Councillors Chris Pitt and Pat Tedder.

**87/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**88/E Proposed Refurbishment of the Mall, Camberley**

The Head of Legal Services reported that Capital & Regional (C&R) had developed a scheme for the refurbishment of the Mall, Camberley which, in accordance with the terms of its lease, would need consent from the Council.

Members noted that a briefing had been provided for the Executive by C&R and that a temporary shop front had been constructed on the Unit 02 in the Mall, giving examples of flooring, lighting and treatment of the roof. An application for planning permission had also been submitted and this would be considered by the Planning Applications Committee on 12 May 2016.

C&R planned to commence the refurbishment in June 2016, allocating approximately 10 months to the works, which would be carried out during the evenings, to avoid interfering with trading or impacting on customers.

Members agreed that the proposed works would be an important part of the regeneration of the Town Centre and would support Key Priority One as part of the delivery of the overall Town Centre Vision for Camberley

**Resolved, to grant Landlord's Consent for the refurbishment of the Mall.**

**89/E Appointments to Surrey Leaders' Group Outside Bodies**

The Executive received a report seeking a nomination to the Surrey Leaders' Group outside bodies and in particular, to a vacancy on the Surrey County Council Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board, formerly known as the Health Scrutiny Select Committee.

Members noted that there was one place available for nomination to and that nominations had been received for Councillor Darryl Ratiram and Councillor Ruth Hutchinson.

Nominated Members were encouraged to submit full and detailed explanations on their suitability for the vacant post.

**Resolved, that Councillors Ruth Hutchinson and Darryl Ratiram be nominated to the vacant position on the Surrey County Council Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board.**

**90/E Consultation on West End Village Design Statement Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

The Executive considered the proposed West End Village Design Statement Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and a report seeking authority for the Council to undertake a statutory consultation on the SPD.

The West End Village Design Statement (VDS) supported policies in the Council's Core Strategy, gave a description of the different character areas of West End and set out design guidelines for these areas.

Members' agreement was sought on a 6 week statutory consultation on the VDS in respect of it becoming an SPD. Following the completion of the consultation, a further report would be submitted to the Executive, to consider adoption of the VDS as an SPD.

It was noted that the role of the VDS was to support the Council's adopted Local Plan and in particular the Development Management Policies, by providing local guidance on design issues. However, the VDS could not be used to determine whether permission could be granted or not, as this was the role of the Local Plan.

**Resolved, to agree to the Council undertaking a statutory consultation on the draft West End Village Design Statement SPD.**

**91/E Surface Car Park Management Changes**

The report on possible changes surface car park management arrangements was deferred to a later meeting to allow further considerations to be incorporated.

**92/E Olympic and Paralympic Games**

The Executive received a report proposing a number of initiatives in Surrey Heath, to celebrate the Rio Olympic and Paralympic Games in the summer of 2016.

The proposed initiatives were designed to harness and build on the enthusiasm for sport which would be generated by these 2 international events, to improve health, encourage both residents and visitors to visit the Town Centre and to foster a sense of civic pride.

Members noted that the proposed events would include:

- A Sports and Physical Activity Market on Park Street – This would be similar to the concept of the Farmers’ Market, but with a number of sports and physical activity stalls and demonstrations from local experts;
- Press Event at the Judo Club – An event, to be confirmed, when those selected for the UK Team could be congratulated by local VIPs;
- ‘Our Sporting Heritage’ Exhibition – An exhibition in the Camberley Museum which would showcase historical sports photos or memorabilia from local athletes who had previously lived in Surrey Heath;
- Camberley Judo Club on the Big Screen – Showing Judo and/or other events live from the Camberley Theatre;
- Surrey Heath Summer of Sport Festival Week – focussing on the coordination of a number of sports clubs across the Borough, to offer a series of one-off taster sessions in a variety of Olympic sports; and
- Olympic Athletes visiting Surrey Youth Games sessions - Athletes from the Judo Club and other sports to make guest appearances, enhancing this already successful event.

Whilst it was proposed to allocate up to £500 on publicity measures, the Executive noted that this could be achieved from within existing resources.

**Resolved that**

- (i) **the proposed Surrey Heath initiatives to celebrate the Rio Olympic and Paralympic Games in the summer of 2016, be noted; and**
- (ii) **the expenditure of approximately £500 be agreed, from within existing resources, to allow for the rental of items for a Sports and Physical Activity Market on Park Street, Camberley, designed to engage the public.**

**93/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:

<b>Minute</b>	<b>Paragraph(s)</b>
<b>95/E</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>96/E</b>	<b>3</b>

Note: Minutes 95/E and 96/E are summaries of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

**95/E Review of Exempt Items**

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

**RESOLVED, that the information in the report at Agenda Item 11 and Minute 95/E remain exempt, but that authorisation be given to a press release at the appropriate 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 Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 7 June  
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 Chris Pitt

**96/E Minutes**

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 19 April 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**97/E Renewal of Camberley town centre Business Improvement District**

The Executive considered a report on the proposed renewal of the Camberley Town Centre Business Improvement District (BID) and a recommendation from the Camberley Town Centre Future Management Working Group that the Council votes 'Yes' for a further 5 years of the BID.

Members noted that the Council had a liability to the BID through a 1.5% levy on its property within the BID area. Whilst this would vary depending on the Council's property portfolio, the contribution in 2016 was £10,086.29.

The Council administered the billing and collection of BID levies, for which the Authority received £5,000 per annum, and provided further officer support through media and marketing, Greenspace and Economic Development teams.

Members supported the proposal to support a further 5 years of the BID and agreed that the Chief Executive be asked to vote on the Council's behalf in accordance with Executive's decision.

**Resolved, that**

- (i) The recommendations of the Camberley Town Centre Future Management Working Group be accepted;**
- (ii) The Council record a Yes vote in support of a further 5 years of the Camberley Business Improvement District; and**
- (iii) The Chief Executive be asked to cast the Council's vote in accordance with the Executive's decision.**

**98/E Expressions of Interest to the Local Enterprise Partnership**

The Executive considered a report detailing proposed expressions of interest for funding from the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for 2 projects in the Borough, including an addendum providing additional consideration of the risks involved.

Members noted that bids to the LEP required matched funding. For the Camberley Town Centre Public Realm and High Street improvements, 50% of the funding would come from the LEP, with this Council and Surrey County Council each contributing 25%. However, the Yorktown and Watchmoor public transport improvements proposals had been submitted by Surrey County Council in conjunction with the Yorktown and Watchmoor Business Association. They would each fund 25% if the bid was successful, with the LEP covering the remainder.

The LEP would levy a 1% administration fee on all grant projects taken forward to the business case stage. Given that there was no guarantee that the LEP would deliver on all projects where business cases were submitted, there would be a risk to the Council as the 1% share would need to be paid regardless of the success of the Town Centre bid.

Members noted that, on a notional bid of £6 million, the Council's match funding element would be £1.5 million, with the administration fee at £15,000, but the administration fee and match funding elements of the transport project would be met by Surrey County Council and Stagecoach.

**Resolved to**

- (i) note the bids being presented to the Local Enterprise Partnership; and**
- (ii) agree, in principle, to make a funding contribution to the Camberley Town Centre Public Realm and High Street improvements, if they are approved by the LEP.**

**99/E Design Review to Assist with Determination of Strategic Planning Applications**

The Executive considered a report proposing the use of a design review panel to consider housing schemes in excess of 50 dwellings (Gross) and those where the new floor area exceeded 10,000 square metres (Gross). The report proposed the use of Design – South East as the appointed body responsible for the reviews and to recover the costs of the design review panel from the applicants. It also proposed that the protocol on how this would operate in practice should be agreed at officer level.

Members noted the success of the piloted work on the Princess Royal Barracks, Deepcut, which had been well received by both developers and officers. The threshold for major projects had not been defined by the Government as each local authority was considered to have different local requirements and issues, but the proposal to include schemes in excess of 50 dwellings or 10,000 square metres, was considered appropriate for Surrey Heath.

**Resolved, to agree to**

- (i) the use of a design review panel with the indicative threshold set at housing schemes in excess of 50 dwellings (gross); and, any other developments where the new floor area exceeds 10,000 sq metres (gross);**
- (ii) appoint Design- South East (D-SE) as the appointed body responsible for review; and,**
- (iii) the applicant paying for the design review panel service and for a protocol as to how this will work in practice to be agreed at officer level.**

**100/E Allocation and Expenditure of Planning Infrastructure Contributions (PIC)**

The Executive received a report recommending the allocation and expenditure of specific funds, received via planning obligations as part of Section 106 Agreements and Unilateral Undertakings, collected from development schemes in the Borough for specific categories of work.

Whilst the report identified a number of projects and indicated how the funds required linked back to developments generating the income, Members agreed that this report and the proposal therein required further consideration.

**Resolved, that the report be deferred to a later meeting to allow further consideration.**

**101/E Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) Policy for Environmental Offences**

The Executive considered a report seeking authority to issue Fixed Penalty Notices for fly tipping. Members noted that, under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Councils could introduce fixed penalty notices for fly tipping, up to a maximum of £400 for each incident of fly tipping.

The Executive noted that the report had recommended a lower fee for early payment of the fine. However, given the severity of the impact of fly tipping on local communities, the Community Portfolio Holder proposed an amendment to the recommendation to remove this option.

Consideration was given to widening the scope for allocating funds collected through such fines, but it was noted that DEFRA guidance specified that this should be used for prevention, detection and investigation of future offences.

The Council had previously placed messages in Heathscene, highlighting issues around fly tipping, including responsibility for third party tipping. Members agreed that this message should be reinforced through Heathscene and web page messages.

**Resolved to**

- (i) **Set a fixed penalty of £400, with no reduction for early payment, in accordance with the Unauthorised Deposit of Waste (Fixed Penalties) Regulations 2016;**
- (ii) **Delegate to Executive Head of Community, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Community, the ability to vary all environmental Fixed Penalty Notice charges in accordance with legislation; and**
- (iii) **Agree that revenue raised from fixed penalty notices be used on prevention, detection and investigation of future offences.**

## **102/E Appointment of Members to Outside Bodies 2016/17**

The Executive considered a report seeking Member nominations to outside bodies where the activities of those bodies were seen as a priority for the Council.

Members noted an addendum providing proposed nominations. The list included a proposal that the Council should not nominate to:

- (i) The Accent Housing Group – it was noted that a number of housing associations were now operating in the borough and that the nomination was to the Local Customer Services Committee rather than the Board; and
- (ii) Blackwater Valley Joint Local Authorities Group – This group had not met for a number of years.

Members agreed that the decision not to nominate to the Accent group should be the subject of a review in 12 months, which would consider how the Council could best support housing association residents.

The Executive noted that Annex B, in the addendum, should be amended to reflect that there were no vacancies to consider in the Frimley Fuel Allotments Charity as 4 year appointments were made this charity and all representatives were current.

### **Resolved that**

- (i) **No appointments be made to Accent Group (subject to review in 12 months) or the Blackwater Valley Joint Local Authorities Group; and**
- (ii) **Appointments to outside bodies be agreed as indicated below:**

<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Representative 2016/17</u>
Accent - Local Customer Services Cttee	<i>No representative proposed</i>
Basingstoke Canal Joint Mgmt. Cttee	<i>Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Nick Chambers (sub)</i>
Blackwater Valley Advisory Committee for Public Transport	<i>Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr Valerie White, Cllr Chris Pitt (sub), Vacancy (sub)</i>

Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership	<i>Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Wynne Price</i>
Blackwater Valley Joint Local Authorities Group	<i>No representative proposed</i>
Briars Centre Management Committee	<i>Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans</i>
Camberley Town Football Club – Observer	<i>Cllr Valerie White</i>
Chobham Common Liaison Group	<i>Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler</i>
Citizens Advice Bureau Management Committee	<i>Cllr Robin Perry</i>
Collectively Camberley Ltd	<i>Cllr Richard Brooks</i>
Community Noise Forum	<i>Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Cllr Conrad Sturt</i>
Deepcut Village Assoc.	<i>Cllr Paul Deach</i>
Fairoaks Airport Consultative Cttee	<i>Cllr Pat Tedder</i>
Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee	<i>Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Cllr Robin Perry (sub)</i>
Frimley Community Centre Mgmt. Cttee	<i>Cllr Bruce Mansell</i>
Frimley Fuel Allotments Charity	<i>Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Paul Innicki, Cllr Bruce Mansell</i>
Heatherside Community Centre Council	<i>Cllr Paul Innicki, Cllr Jonathan Lytle (sub)</i>
Heathrow Airport Consultative Cttee	<i>Cllr Charlotte Morley, Cllr Robin Perry (sub)</i>
Henry Smith Charity (4 year appointments)	<i>Cllr Chris Pitt, Cllr Bruce Mansell, Cllr Ian Sams</i>
Joint Waste Collection Services Committee	<i>Ex-officio - Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman Cllr Valerie White (sub)</i>
Local Government Association - General Assembly	<i>Leader of the Council – Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Richard Brooks (sub)</i>
Miss Gomms Trust	<i>Martin Goodway, Cllr Chris Pitt, Cllr Joanne Potter, Rev Russell, Cllr Pat Tedder Cllr Nick Chambers</i>
Mytchett Community Association General Committee	<i>Cllr Craig Fennell, Vacancy (sub)</i>
<u>Organisation</u>	<u><i>Representative 2016/17</i></u>
Parking and Traffic Regulation outside London Adjudication Joint Committee	<i>Cllr Craig Fennell, Cllr Paul Deach (sub)</i>
RELATE North East Hants and Borders	<i>Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper</i>

South East Employers	<i>Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Cllr Chris Pitt (sub)</i>
South East England Councils	<i>Leader of the Council -Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Richard Brooks (sub)</i>
Surrey Climate Change Partnership Member Group	<i>Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman</i>
Surrey County Playing Fields Assoc.	<i>Cllr Victoria Wheeler</i>
Surrey Energy and Sustainability Partnership	<i>Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman</i>
Surrey Heath Age Concern	<i>Cllr Ruth Hutchinson</i>
Surrey Heath Arts Council	<i>Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Ian Cullen, Cllr Ian Sams</i>
Surrey Heath Duke of Edinburgh Award Forum	<i>Cllr Jonathan Lytle</i>
Surrey Heath Local Area Committee	<i>Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Vivienne Chapman, Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Cllr Paul Innicki, Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Cllr Valerie White, Cllr Alan McClafferty (sub), Cllr Robin Perry (sub)</i>
Surrey Heath Partnership	<i>Leader of the Council – Cllr Moira Gibson Cllr Vivienne Chapman (Portfolio Holder)</i>
Surrey Heath Sports Council	<i>Cllr Craig Fennell (Portfolio Holder), Cllr Charlotte Morley, Cllr Max Nelson, Cllr Victoria Wheeler</i>
Surrey Heath Youth Focus	<i>Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Ruth Hutchinson</i>
Surrey Leaders Group	<i>Cllr Moira Gibson</i>
Surrey Police and Crime Panel	<i>Cllr Charlotte Morley</i>
Surrey Waste Partnership	<i>Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman</i>
Voluntary Support North Surrey	<i>Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Darryl Ratiram (sub)</i>

(Note: In accordance with the Council's Members Code of Conduct, Councillor Rodney Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a Community Trustee of the Frimley Fuel Allotments Charity.)

### **103/E Appointment of Executive Working Groups**

The Executive considered a report proposing the appointment of 4 working groups, their terms of reference, the number and allocation of seats and the appointment of Members to those seats and as substitutes.

**Resolved to appoint the following Working Groups with terms of reference and numbers, as indicated in the Executive report and membership (including substitutes) as indicated below:**

- **The Camberley Theatre and the Arena Leisure Centre Working Group (7)**



**Members** – Councillors Ian Cullen, Craig Fennell, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Edward Hawkins, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**Substitutes** – Councillors Bruce Mansell, Jonathan Lytle and Victoria Wheeler.

- **The Camberley Town Centre Future Management Working Group (7);**

**Members** – Councillors Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle and Max Nelson.

**Substitutes** - Councillors Nic Chambers, Robin Perry and Ruth Hutchinson.

- **The Digital Services Working Group (7)**

**Members** – Councillors Dan Adams, David Allen, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Jonathan Lytle, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**Substitutes** – Councillors Rodney Bates, Wynne Price and Ian Sams.

- **The Equality Working Group (7).**

**Members** – Councillors Bill Chapman, Josephine Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Paul Ilnicki, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Ian Sams and Valerie White.

**Substitutes** – Councillors Nic Chambers (plus one Conservative vacancy) and Pat Tedder.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 12 July  
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 Chris Pitt and Cllr Pat Tedder

**1/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**2/E Council Finances as at the 31 March 2016**

The Finance Portfolio Holder presented a report on the position of the Council's finances as at 31 March 2016. He noted that the report provided the 'first view' as to the outturn and that figures could change as a result of the final accounts processes.

Members noted that the Council had come in under budget, due to a mix of investment in property, better pricing on contracts, reduced staffing costs, including shared work with other authorities, and continued improvement in waste collection and recycling.

**Resolved, that the Revenue, Treasury and Capital Position as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 be noted.**

**3/E Requests for Carry Forward of Unspent Budget from 2015/16 to 2016/17**

The Executive received a report seeking authority to carry forward unspent budget from 2015/16 to 2016/17, in line with financial regulations.

The carry forwards fell into 2 brackets:

- (i) Those arising from underspends; and
- (ii) Those arising government grants, where they have been received to late in the year to be spent.

The carry forwards would result in £303,658 being charged against the general fund reserves in 2016/17.

**Resolved, that the budget carry forwards for 2016/17, totalling £303,658, as set out at Annexes A and B to the Executive report, be approved.**

**4/E Review of the Corporate Capital Programme 2015/16 and Report on Capital Prudential Indicators for 2015/16**

The Finance Portfolio Holder reported on the capital outturn for 2015/16 and sought approval for any carry forward of budgets into the 2015/16 Capital Programme. He included a breakdown of the actual performance against the 2015/16 capital prudential indicators.

Members noted the intention to borrow to acquire assets to assist with economic development and regeneration, provided that the assets would generate a return adequate to service any required loans.

**Recommended to Council that**

- (i) the carry forward budget provision of £1.161 million from 2015/16 into 2016/17 be approved;**
- (ii) the revised 2016/17 Capital Programme of £2.706 million be noted; and**
- (iii) the final capital prudential indicators for 2016/17 be noted.**

**5/E Expenditure on Professional Advisors**

The Executive received a report detailing expenditure on professional advisors for the Year 2015/16. It was noted that, in common with other smaller Borough Councils, this Authority had to buy in expertise as needed, when the requisite skills were not retained in-house and it was uneconomic to have in-house resources.

**Resolved, that expenditure on professional advisors, for the year 2015/16, be noted.**

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

The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) came into effect in December 2014. The accompanying Regulation 123 list set out the types of Infrastructure which would be funded or part funded through CIL, including shared Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).

The Regulatory Portfolio Holder proposed an amendment to the footnote to the Regulation 123 List to clarify the approach to CIL exempt residential uses so that these types of developments could discharge their requirement under the Habitats Regulations.

Members noted that payment for management and maintenance of SANG could be collected outside of CIL by use of a Unilateral Undertaking, as it did not fall within the definition of infrastructure.

**Resolved, that an amendment be made to the Regulation 123 List footnote to ensure CIL exempt residential development can meet the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 by contributing to the management and maintenance of SANG.**

**7/E Council's Response to Guildford Borough Council's Proposed Submission on its Local Plan**

The Regulatory Portfolio Holder reminded Members that, following the Executive meeting in September 2014 a letter of objection had been sent on Guildford Borough Council's Draft Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites.

Guildford Borough Council had now begun consultation on the Proposed Submission Local Plan Strategy and Sites document. This document had addressed many of the concerns raised in the earlier consultation.

However there was a continuing concern regarding the removal of the Pirbright Barracks and Keogh Barracks from the Green Belt, particularly as there had been no Duty to Co-operate discussions on these sites.

The report appended a proposed consultation response, set out in a letter at Annex 2 to the officer's report, as the Borough's formal representations on the draft Guildford Local Plan.

Members were informed that the consultation on the document had commenced on 6 June and the closing date for comments would be 18 July 2016.

**Resolved, that the letter contained in Annex 2 to the Executive report be submitted as Surrey Heath Borough Council's formal representations to the Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites consultation.**

**8/E Review of the Housing Allocation Policy and Tenancy Strategy**

The Executive considered a report containing recommendations for changes to the Housing Allocation Policy and Tenancy Strategy to ensure that they were fit for purpose in meeting housing need in the Borough.

The Regulatory Portfolio Holder emphasised that minor amendments were being proposed to ensure that any points learned in the previous year were incorporated to improve operations. There was no change proposed to the Tenancy Strategy.

The Executive noted concerns that measures taken to target any abuse of processes did not have a knock-on effect on other tenants/residents. It was noted that there was an ability within the policy to exercise discretion and the impact of the changes would be kept constantly under review, with any issues being brought back to the Executive. It was also emphasised that the proposed changes would have no impact on the Council's commitments under the Community Covenant.

**Resolved, that**

- (i) the changes proposed to the Housing Allocation Policy be adopted with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2016; and**
- (ii) no changes be made to the Tenancy Strategy and it be subject to continued review on an annual basis in line with best practice.**

#### **9/E Review of progress on the Council's Homelessness Strategy**

The Executive considered a report outlining progress on the Council's Homelessness Strategy, the current position in relation to this area of work and seeking endorsement of the work programme proposed for the Housing Service over the next 12 months.

The Regulatory Portfolio Holder acknowledged the increase in rough sleeping in the Borough and noted that a real time survey had already commenced to develop an understanding of how the Council could address this. She also noted Members' concerns that any impacts of welfare reform be under constant review and the need for a policy on harassment and illegal eviction to be developed.

#### **Resolved, that**

- (i) progress on the Action Plan in the Homelessness Strategy be noted; and.**
- (ii) the Homelessness Strategy be updated to include the actions proposed in the officer's report.**

#### **10/E Camberley Town Centre Christmas Event**

The Business Portfolio Holder presented a report proposing that a Christmas event be held in the Camberley Town Centre, at the London Road Recreation Ground. This would consist of a "real ice" skating rink and associated seasonal market stalls along with signage to connect the event to the key Town Centre access points.

It was proposed that the event be delivered by an independent event company which had been selected following a tender process. They would carry the vast majority of the financial risk.

It was considered that the event would help promote Camberley as a destination of choice for seasonal eating, shopping and recreation, encouraging shoppers and other footfall to the Town Centre.

The proposal was subject to licensing and planning applications and it was noted that there might be a need to install a different power supply to the Pavilion in the Recreation Ground, though this would be cheaper and more environmentally friendly than the alternative of using generators.

Members welcomed the extensive consultation with affected residents and received assurances that discussions were being held with the Highways Authority to limit any negative traffic impacts on shopping.

The Executive noted concerns on the need to ensure that there was no negative impact on Town Centre businesses, particularly in the period of uncertainty following the European Union Referendum. It was emphasised that the Council would focus on providing a successful event, managing accessibility of Camberley Town Centre and ensuring community safety. Environmental Health Officers would monitor noise levels and impact on residents and Town Centre businesses had already expressed an interest in having stalls on the site.

### **Resolved**

- (i) to agree that, subject to successful applications for both Licensing and Planning permission, a winter ice rink and Christmas fair event be held on London Road Recreation Ground in December 2016 to promote the Town Centre, delivered by “Event By Event”;**
- (ii) that a budget of £10,000 be made available from the Town Centre fund to provide any additional Council related costs linked to the event;**
- (iii) that the project delivery be delegated to the Executive Head of Business, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and local Ward Members; and**
- (iv) that, after the event, a further report be brought back to the Executive recommending a way forward for future events, following review and consultation with residents and local members.**

### **11/E Wilton Road Car Park**

The Business Portfolio Holder reported that, as part of the Surrey Heath Parking Strategy, the management of all car parks was reviewed annually. Following a recent review and customer feedback, he proposed the reduction of the maximum stay on Wilton Road to 5 hours, except for permit holders, with no return for the remainder of the day, except for permit holders. This would provide customers with greater access to this car park and local facilities.

The car park had 80 spaces and 5 disabled bays, but was being used by several commercial businesses for all day parking to support their own business interests, rather than to support local trade or facilities. This often conflicted with short stay visitors who wished to use local facilities and impacted in particular on the Recycling Centre and the Indoor Bowls Club.

The Executive noted Members' concerns on the need to ensure that the proposed changes would have no impact on the St Georges Estate. Councillor Fennell gave assurances that any impacts would be kept under review. He also reminded

Members that the proposed changes would be the subject of a public consultation, which would include businesses on the Estate. Any concerns arising from the consultation would be reported back to the Executive.

**Resolved, that the maximum stay on Wilton Road car park be reduced to 5 hours, except for permit holder and no return, except for permit holders for all day.**

#### **12/E Frimley Lodge Park Car Park**

As indicated at Minute 11/E, the Council had recently completed the annual review of its car parks. The Business Portfolio Holder presented a report proposing that specified parking areas be introduced in Frimley Lodge Park. This would form part of the Council's Off Street Parking Order, with a view to increasing safety and ambulance access, reducing problems caused by congestion and reducing environmental damage caused by irresponsible parking.

Whilst the success of Frimley Lodge Park was welcomed, the Executive recognised that there was a need both to increase parking on site and improve parkers' habits. Traffic flow data was being collected and improvements were planned for the internal roads in the Park.

Noting Members' concerns on consultation, Councillor Fennell reported that the proposed changes would be the subject of consultation which would include Park users. Officers would ensure that the Frimley Green Scouts, Frimley and Mytchett Society and St Michael's Church would be included in that consultation.

**Resolved, that**

- (i) specified parking areas be introduced at Frimley Lodge Park by including Frimley Lodge Park in the Borough of Surrey Heath Off Street parking order; and**
- (ii) the authority to introduce these changes be delegated to the Executive Head of Business, in consultation with the Business Portfolio Holder.**

#### **13/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)
14/E	3
15/E	3



Note: Minutes 14/E and 15/E are summaries of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

**14/E Lease of Deepcut Village Hall**

The Executive considered a report regarding a proposed lease for the Deepcut Community Centre and agreed appropriate actions thereon.

**15/E Review of Exempt Items**

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

**Resolved, that the agenda report and minute remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 12 May 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 Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper)

In Attendance: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Cllr Paul Deach, Duncan Carty, Emma Pearman, Michelle Fielder, Jonathan Partington, Laura James and Andrew Crawford.

Cllr Rebecca Jennings–Evans arrived part way through the application detailed at minute 58/P.

Cllr Paul Deach was in attendance as a non-committee member. He left the Chamber during the applications considered at minute 60/P, 61/P and 62/P as he has worked on the Mall Corporation.

**57/P Minutes**

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

**58/P Application Number: 15/0720 - Brook Green and Tiny Brook Waverley Close, Camberley GU15 1JH**

The application was for the outline application for the erection of two blocks of flats each containing 8 residential flats following demolition of two existing dwellings. The appearance and landscaping were reserved.

**Resolved that application 15/0720 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report if the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr Edward Hawkins declared that he resided within the vicinity of the proposal but not close by.

**Note 2**

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

**Note 3**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Max Nelson, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**59/P Application Number: 16/0133 - Buckstone Farm, Windlesham Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8SW**

The application was for the retention of front boundary fence with a reduction in height. (Amended plan rec'd 10/03/16), (Additional plans rec'd 14/04/16).

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

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'One further letter of representation was received on 26<sup>th</sup> April from an objector who had already responded to the application. The issues raised are as follows:*

- New proposal will hardly make any difference and will only be approximately 9cms lower than present fence [Officer comment: This is incorrect, the fence is currently 2.1m in height and will be reduced to a maximum of 1.6m]*
- Laris Farm fence sits at the top of a grassy bank and is an entirely different situation [Officer comment: The fence is proposed to be the same height from the ground as Laris Farm's fence, see paragraph 7.4.3 of the Officer's Report for further information]*
- The Historic Buildings Officer suggests the fence should be between 1m and 1.2m high which would have general support [Officer comment: This is incorrect, The Historic Buildings Officer agreed that a fence the same height of the old fence would be acceptable upon visiting the site. In his response he said I think that is 1m-1.2m from memory. He did not say that it should be this height and has seen the old fence still in place]*
- Lower fence would have the result that this important listed building would no longer be obscured from the road [Officer comment: It is not considered that the reduction in height of the fence would obscure the building from the road, as the building can clearly be seen with the old fence in place, and in any case if this application is refused the old fence could be retained]'*

**Resolved that application 16/0133 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr E Bain spoke in objection and Mrs Woods, the applicant, spoke in support.

**Note 2**

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

**Note 3**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

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

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

**60/P Application Number: 16/0202 - The Mall, The Square, Camberley GU15 3SL**

The application was for the refurbishment of the interior of The Mall to include new elevational treatment surrounding existing shopfronts together with feature lighting, amendments to existing roof columns and decorative detailing to roof, and new flooring (excluding Bietigheim Way and tenant shopfronts).

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

It was noted that some bridges and columns would be removed and confirmed that the flooring would be less slippery.

**Resolved that application 16/0202 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that the Chairman declared that the Council held the freehold to the site.

**Note 2**

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

### **Note 3**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

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

### **61/P Application Number: 16/0156 - 12-16 Park Street, Camberley GU15 3PL and 191 London Road, Camberley, GU15 3EY**

The application was for the variation of condition 3 of planning permission SU/10/0537 (relating to the erection of a part four, part five storey building to comprise restaurants (Class A3), drinking establishment (Class A4) and a 95 bedroom hotel (Class C1) to allow the use of a ground floor unit (unit 1) for indoor leisure uses (Class D2).

This application would normally have been determined under delegated powers, however, it was being reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory.

Members were advised of the following update:

*'Additional/amended details have been received from the applicant including:*

- *Amended layout of the unit;*
- *Promotional information concerning the future occupying company, Fairweather Golf;*
- *Letter from the letting agency confirming the level of interest in this property since it has been marketed; and*
- *Marketing reports and brochures.*

*The applicant had requested this information (except the marketing reports and brochures) to be forwarded to members of the Planning Applications Committee which has been arranged separately through the Committee team.*

*The amended layout of the unit has been required to fit the use around the existing pillars within the ground floor unit. This has necessitated the moving of the booths closer towards the front of the unit and the siting of one of these booths would effectively block the transparent shop "window" fronting London Road, necessitating the proposed change to Condition 2 below. The change to the layout drawing necessitates the proposed change to Condition 3 below.*

*The information from Fairweather Golf provides an overview of the proposed use includes the technology which would be provided for coaching and golfing sessions.*



*The letter from Lambert Smith Hampton (the letting agents) confirms that letting for the site began in 2007 and has been difficult (for which there has been no success) for a number of reasons including the economic downturn (which delayed the construction of the development until 2011) and its peripheral location (with demand for restaurants taken first by more central sites such as the Atrium). The current proposal would lead to the filling of the unit (Unit 1) which could serve as a catalyst for the remaining empty units (Units 2-5) of this block.*

*The marketing reports (in the form of summary reports for 2011, 2012, 2014 and 2015) show the range of operators which were contacted (principally for uses within Classes A1, A2, A3 and A4) and the lack of progress with those negotiations. Four marketing brochures have been provided.*

*The applicant has also provided their previous objections to applications for changes of use from retail to restaurant uses for Atrium units (fronting Park Street), which have now been filled, because of the adverse effect on the letting of their units.*

*An application SU/16/0399 to allow a greater range of uses of “retail” (i.e. within Classes A1-A5) uses for Units 2-5 has been submitted.*

*As this application would provide a new (replacement) planning permission for the development approved under SU/10/0537 and now built, conditions to ensure that the details reserved by conditions under this permission that have been approved [Conditions 4, 8 & 11 of SU/10/0537] and need to be retained and conditions limiting the approved development (as a whole) [Conditions 7 and 12 of SU/10/0537] are proposed to be added.*

**CHANGE TO CONDITIONS:**

*2. The glazing at ground floor level for Unit 1 fronting Park Street shall be maintained as transparent glazing (without vinyls) and either provide views into the unit and/or maintain a window display area to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To retain an active frontage to the retail parade and to enhance the vitality and viability of Camberley Town Centre and comply with Policies CP10 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and Policies TC2, TC3 and TC5 of the Camberley Town Centre Action Area Plan 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

*3. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 148301 Rev. G received on 17 February 2016 and FW5905/01 received on 28 April 2016, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.*

**ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:**

*4. Details of drainage, refuse and cycle storage approved under Conditions 4, 8 and 11 of planning permission SU/10/0537 shall be retained unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To ensure that visual and residential amenities are not prejudiced and to ensure a satisfactory development is retained and to accord with Policies CP2, DM9 and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

*5. Before each subsequent occupation of the premises, the subject of the application, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be implemented in accordance with the details to be submitted and thereafter retained and/or developed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: The condition above is required in recognition of PPG 13 "Transport" and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.*

*6. No self-contained accommodation or ancillary accommodation in the form of a caretakers/managers/staff flat for the hotel shall be created within the development hereby permitted without prior planning permission being granted.*

*Reason: To ensure that the integrity of the Special Protection Area is not prejudiced as a result of the development and to accord with Policies CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

**Resolved that application 16/0156 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

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

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

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

Councillor Victoria Wheeler abstained.

**62/P Application Number: 16/0192 - Unit 1, 12-16 Park Street, Camberley GU15 3PL and 191 London Road, Camberley GU15 3EY**

The application was for the installation of shopfront.

This application would normally have been determined under delegated powers, however, it was being reported to the Planning Applications Committee because it was linked to application SU/15/0156 being reported elsewhere on this Agenda.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'As per the proposed change for Condition 2 of SU/16/0156, the proposed Condition 2 is proposed to be similarly changed.'*

**CHANGE TO CONDITION:**

*2. The glazing at ground floor level fronting Park Street shall be maintained as transparent glazing (without vinyls) and either provide views into the unit and/or maintain a window display area to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To retain an active frontage to the retail parade and to enhance the vitality and viability of Camberley Town Centre and comply with Policies CP10 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and Policies TC2, TC3 and TC5 of the Camberley Town Centre Action Area Plan 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

**Resolved that application 16/0192 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

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

**63/P Application Number: 16/0191 - Unit 1, 12-16 Park Street, Camberley GU15 3PL and 191 London Road, Camberley GU15 3EY**

The application was for the installation of 2 No. fascia signs and 1 No. projecting sign.

This application would normally have been determined under delegated powers, however, it was being reported to the Planning Applications Committee because it was linked to application SU/15/0156 being reported elsewhere in this Agenda.

**Resolved that application 16/0191 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

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

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

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

**64/P Application Number: 15/1123 - 9 Crofters Close, Deepcut, Camberley GU16 6GH**

The application was for the conversion of existing garage into a store/games room and the erection a single storey extension to this building to serve as a gym. (Amended plans rec'd 09/03/16).

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

Members were advised of the following update:

*'Amend informative 1 as follows:*

*In respect of condition 4 the applicant is advised that the development hereby approved shall only be used for private ancillary purposes for the personal enjoyment of the occupiers of the host dwelling house and its use is limited to those specified in the application, in addition to its use as a home office. There shall be no commercial use of the building and the building shall not be used to support any commercial activity. For the avoidance of doubt primary living accommodation comprising bedroom's, bed spaces, overnight accommodation, bathrooms, shower facilities, W.C's or kitchen facilities are not permitted within the development hereby approved.'*

Councillor Paul Deach addressed the Committee explaining that an attempt to mitigate the impact of the proposal on the neighbours would be desirable. He advised that close neighbours to the proposal had requested an extra condition to provide soundproofing in the garage. Officers advised that a condition could be added to address this and the wording would be finalised after consultation with Environmental Services, the Chairman and the Vice Chairman.

**Resolved that application 16/1123 be approved subject to a condition regarding sound proofing and conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

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

**65/P Application Number: 16/0274 - Heatherbank Cottage, 11 Church Hill, Camberley GU15 2HA**

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

This application was referred to the Planning Applications Committee in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation as the applicant was an elected Member and was related to a Council employee.

**Resolved that application 16/0274 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

Councillor Richard Brooks declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as the owner of the property and left the room during its consideration.

**Note 2**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that the applicant was a fellow councillor and was also a Conservative Party Member.

**Note 3**

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

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Max Nelson, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**66/P Tree Preservation Order: 04/15 - 12 Streets Heath, West End GU24 9QY - the formal objection to this Tree Preservation Order has been withdrawn; therefore this item has been removed from the agenda**

This Tree Preservation Order had been withdrawn from the agenda as the objection had been withdrawn. Consequently the Confirmation of the Order did not require Committee consideration.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 30 June 2016**

---

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

+ Cllr David Allen	- Cllr Adrian Page
- 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 Katia Malcaus Cooper	- Cllr Valerie White

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Pat Tedder) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Richard Brooks)

In Attendance: Duncan Carty, Sadaf Malik, Emma Pearman, Michelle Fielder, Jonathan Partington, Andrew Crawford, Gareth John, Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Cllr Charlotte Morley and Cllr Wynne Price

**67/P Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 May 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**68/P Application Number: 16/0095 - Plots B and C, Trade City, Former BAE Systems, Lyon Way Frimley**

The application was for the erection of 2 No. light industrial/ground industrial/warehouse buildings, (Class B1C/B2/B8) and ancillary office accommodation with parking and landscaping. (Additional Information Rec'd 15/03/2016), (Additional info rec'd 07/04/16), (Additional plans/info rec'd 26/05/16). (Amended plans & information rec'd 03/06/2016), (Amended plans rec'd 07/06/16).

Members were advised of the following updates:

One further objection raised on the following additional grounds:

- Impact of noise and vibration on residential amenity [*Officer comment: It is not considered that the impact of vibration would be so significant to warrant the refusal if this application. In relation to noise, see Paragraph 7.5 of the officer report*]
- Impact of vibration on structure of residential property [*Officer comment: This is a private matter*]

- Loss of privacy [*Officer comment: The level of separation and lack of windows in the rear elevation of the nearest building (Plot C) would limit any such impact. Also, see Paragraph 7.5 of the officer report*]
- Impact on wildlife and domestic pets (cats) [*Officer comment: It is not considered that the current proposal would have any significant impact on any protected species. The impact on cats which may stray into the site would not be a reason to refuse this application*]
- Impact on flood risk [*See Paragraph 7.7 of the officer report*]

**Resolved that application 16/0095 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

Councillor David Allen declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as the owner of a nearby property and having submitted an objection and left the room during consideration of the application.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman.

**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 Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, and Victoria Wheeler.

Councillor Ian Sams abstained and Councillor Colin Dougan refrained from voting having arrived part way through discussion thereon.

**69/P Application Number: 16/0199 - Plot A, Trade City, Former BAE Systems, Lyon Way, Frimley**

The application was for the erection of 1 No. light industrial/general industrial/warehouse buildings (Class B1c/B2/B8 and ancillary office accommodation with parking and landscaping. (Amended information recv'd 29/3/16), (Additional info rec'd 07/04/16), (Additional plans & info rec'd 26/05/16). Amended plans & information rec'd 03/06/2016).

**Resolved that application 16/0199 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

Councillor David Allen declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as the owner of a nearby property and left the room during consideration of the application.



**Note 2**

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

**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 Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillor Ian Sams.

**70/P Application Number: 16/0038 - 92 Park Road, Camberley GU15 2LN**

The application was for the formation of an access road to serve Kingsclear Care Home development (Class C2) following the demolition of existing dwelling (Class C3). (Amended plan rec'd 10/02/16). (Additional information recv'd 12/4/16).

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr David Lewis.

A site visit took place at this site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

An email response, with a revised drawing, has been received from the Agent. The amended drawing indicates details of soft landscaping to either side of the proposed access road and to either side of the new footpath link (where the existing access is to be removed).

In summary, the email indicates:

- The reference to "emergency" staff accommodation at Paragraph 7.2.3 of the officer report (relating to accommodation within the approved care home under construction (under permission SU/14/0562) at the adjoining site is misleading and this accommodation would be used as permanent accommodation for staff including 3 no. en-suite bedrooms and shared use of staff lounge and kitchen (negating the impact of the loss of the property at the application site). [*Officer comment: This would breach the legal agreement for the care home, restricting occupancy to residential care residents, and this accommodation is shown on the approved drawings as "overnight" staff accommodation. As such, this accommodation should be used as emergency or overnight accommodation only*].

- The landscaping can be provided to both sides of the proposed access road and reduced existing access (from vehicular to pedestrian), as shown on the amended.

The Committee received representations from Rebecca Mayne and Lisa Byrne (objecting) and Nicola Thornton (in support).

**Resolved that application 16/0038 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Colin Dougan and Councillor Victoria Wheeler knew one of the speakers.

**Note 2**

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Rebecca Mayne and Lisa Byrne spoke in objection and Nicola Thornton spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper.

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, and Victoria Wheeler.

**71/P Application Number: 16/0383 - Land adjacent to Lynwood, Heath Rise and between 9 and 18 Chaucer Grove, Camberley GU15 2ER**

The application was for the creation of alternative access to 5-bedroom dwellinghouse approved pursuant to application SU10/0717. Access to be created off Chaucer Grove as opposed to Heathcote Road as originally approved. (Amended plan rec'd 15/06/16). (Additional information recv'd 16/6/16).

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Richard Brooks.

Members were advised of the following updates

County Highway Authority response

The County Highway Authority has issued a revised response requiring a Construction Management Plan by condition. It is considered that this would help to ensure that any disruption during construction is minimised. They have also been advised of the home for adults on the corner of Park Road and have made the following additional comments:

- *The proposal is for one detached dwelling with vehicular access onto Chaucer Grove which is a cul-de-sac. The likely additional traffic movements generated by one dwelling is considered to be minimal with perhaps 1-2 movements in the am and pm peak hours.*
- *Concerns have been raised regarding the suitability of Chaucer Grove to accommodate the small number of additional traffic movements generated by the proposed development. The section of Chaucer Grove where the proposed dwelling is to be located has been designed as a shared surface, so cars and pedestrians/cyclists share the same space. The road has been designed to be narrow and winding in order to keep vehicle speeds low.*
- *I have looked at the accident records held by Surrey County Council and this shows that there are no recorded personal injury accidents within the last 5 year period either at the junction of Chaucer Grove and Park Road or along Chaucer Grove itself.*
- *To address concerns with regard to construction vehicles a Method of Construction statement will need to be submitted prior to any work starting on site.*
- *Chaucer Grove is an adopted highway and therefore would have been built to accommodate large vehicles, however Surrey County Council has powers under the Highways Act to recover any costs to repair damage that may have been caused to the road by construction or other types of vehicles. Following an assessment of the proposals, the Highway Authority do not consider that the proposed dwelling and vehicular access would cause a 'severe impact' on the public highway and therefore have no highway safety objections to the proposals subject to conditions being imposed.*
- *(Re: 116 Park Road – home for adults) I understand there are existing issues with vehicles who park on the pavement in the vicinity of this premises. The proposed dwelling at the end of Chaucer Grove will provide its own parking on site and I do not consider that it would contribute to a worsening of the existing situation. If vehicles are causing an obstruction then this is a matter for the police to deal with. I understand that there is also concern that residents from the development walk quite slowly when crossing the road. I have checked the personal injury accident records and there have been no accidents involving pedestrians in the vicinity of Chaucer Grove or it's junction with Park Road within the last 5 years.*

#### Surrey Wildlife Trust Response and change to recommendation

- A response has now been received from Surrey Wildlife Trust who has stated that the further bat survey undertaken in respect of the trees to be removed

has concluded that they do not currently support roosting bats and can be removed without adverse effect to bat species. SWT has advised that if they are not removed within a year they should be checked again, and also checked for the presence of active birds' nests prior to their removal.

As such the reason for refusal given in the report no longer applies, and the recommendation has changed to GRANT, subject to the following conditions and informatives:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission. Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. The proposed vehicular access shall be built and retained in accordance with the following approved plans Amended Location and Block Plans CDA-204-001 Rev J received 15.06.16 unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.
3. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:
  - a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
  - b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
  - c) storage of plant and materials
  - d) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
  - e) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway (photographic) and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused.

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: In order that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to highway users, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by ACD Environmental dated 12.04.16 and Tree Protection Plan BECK20203-03D both received 14.04.16. No development shall commence until photographs have been provided by the retained Consultant and forwarded to and approved by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. This should record all aspects of tree and ground protection measures having been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree

protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

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

5. If, within one year of the date of this decision, the trees shown to be removed on the Tree Protection Plan BECK20203-03D received 14.04.16 have not been removed then no trees shall be removed on the site until a Bat Survey to establish the presence or otherwise of bats within these trees has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to prevent harm to protected species in accordance with Policy CP14B of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, ODPM Circular 06/2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The access hereby approved shall not be implemented in addition to the access from Heathcote Road approved under planning permission SU10/0717.

Reason: In order to prevent further loss of trees and vegetation and associated harm to the wooded character of the locality in accordance with Guiding Principles WH1 and WH3 of the Western Urban Area Character SPD, Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Informatives:

1. Details of the highway requirements necessary for inclusion in any application seeking approval of reserved matters may be obtained from the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council.
2. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The application is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover to install dropped kerbs. [www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs).
3. The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition(s), the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

4. There is an existing lamp column in the area where the access is to be constructed and the applicant should be aware that this may need to be relocated.
5. The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours: 8am to 6 pm Monday to Friday; 8am to 1pm Saturday; and, not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays. For the avoidance of doubt 'Public Holidays' include New Year's Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, May Day, all Bank Holidays, Christmas Day and Boxing Day.
6. The applicant is reminded that all species of wild birds and their nests are protected under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and therefore in order to avoid contravention of current legislation, site clearance and demolition works should be timed to avoid the main bird nesting season, which in general runs from March to August. If this is not possible, a check should be carried out prior to works being commenced to ensure there are no active nests present.

## Objections

Two further letters of objection has been received which raise the following issues:

- Residential home for adults at 116 Park Road does not have planning permission yet has a significant number of traffic movements throughout the day, causes parking problems and pedestrians on foot [*Officer comment: The presence of the home had already been raised in other objection letters and as such these have been already taken into account by the County Highway Authority in their response*]
- Criteria of there not having been any personal injury accidents is not appropriate in a small residential cul-de-sac as data on near misses etc is not available [*Officer comment: the Planning Authority have to assume that the County Highway Authority have correctly assessed the application according to the relevant criteria*]
- The concept of looking at peak hours traffic is not particularly relevant to a residential cul-de-sac, average number of cars is 2/3 and these and associated deliveries generate multiple traffic movements throughout the day [*Officer comment: the Planning Authority have to assume that the County Highway Authority have correctly assessed the application according to the relevant criteria*]
- Concern over a letter having been received by residents from the applicant following objection letters which does not take fully into account or address the concerns raised [*Officer comment: All representation letters are fully taken into account by the Local Planning Authority in the determination of the application and the letter from the Applicant to residents is not relevant in the determination of the application*]

- A letter addressed to Legal Services was also received which stated that this application invalidates application 14/0120 for a Lawful Development Certificate for an existing use or operation comprising the implementation of planning permission 10/0717 for the erection of a detached dwelling house, agreed on 16/05/2014. It is not considered however that the change of access in any way invalidates a certificate which was to prove the implementation of a planning permission. A planning permission does not have to be implemented in full and as such a further application such as this to make changes is possible. As such Legal Services do not intend to revoke the above Certificate as requested.

#### Chaucer Grove Residents Association Document

A document has been circulated and emailed to Members today from Chaucer Grove Residents Association. It is considered most of the issues raised have already been addressed in the Officer's Report and this update sheet.

The quotes under 'Negative impact to the tree screen' are not from the Officer's report on the previous application. However, the Officer concluded that the verdant character would be preserved. In this case it is considered that the small number of trees being lost would not significantly impact the verdant character as most of the trees on this boundary would remain.

With regard to the number of trees being lost, trees are sometimes grouped in Arboricultural Reports and in paragraph 7.3.4 of the Officer's report it explains that one of these 5 is actually a group of 3 so the total number of trees lost is 7. The Officer's report explains in paragraph 7.3.4 that the previous access would also see a substantial loss of vegetation over a much longer distance that outweighs the slight variation in the number/quality of trees now proposed to be lost from that of the previously approved access.

The information provided in respect of application 09/0814 is not considered relevant to the consideration of this application. This application was for three dwellings which were allowed on appeal at a site adjacent to this one, after a refusal by Surrey Heath, but this is not the planning permission for the house to which this proposed access relates. The statements again appear to be from the applicant and not Officers.

Members noted that the recommendation had changed from refusal to approval following information provided in the Committee update and listed above.

**Resolved that application 16/0383 be approved for the reasons as set out in the update of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

#### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllrs Colin Dougan and Edward Hawkins knew Mr Macleod, who was speaking on behalf of the applicants.

#### **Note 2**

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr A Clarke spoke in objection and Mr Macleod spoke in support.

**Note 3**

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

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt and Victoria Wheeler.

**72/P Application Number: 16/0320 - 49 Bosman Drive, Windlesham GU20 6JN**

The application was for the division of existing four-bedroom dwelling to form two 2 bedroom dwellings with associated parking and garden space. (Part Retrospective).

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Conrad Sturt.

Members were advised of the following updates:

Following a site inspection visit, it was noticed that the plans submitted were not quite accurate in terms of the development on the ground, including the location of the door on the side elevation, the bay windows to the front, and position of parking spaces. As such the plans have been amended to reflect these minor changes and as such the following conditions have been updated to refer to the correct plans:

Conditions 2, 3 and 4 should now read as follows (there are no changes to conditions 1 & 5):

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Ground Floor Plan 1550 P104A, Proposed First Floor Plan 1550 P105A, Proposed Elevations 1550 P106A all received 22nd June 2016, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.



3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no gates, fences or walls shall be erected under Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of that Order other than along the existing boundaries defining the curtilage of 49 Bosman Drive as shown in red on the Location Plan 1550 P100A received 22nd June 2016 and along the boundary between the rear gardens of the two new dwellings as shown on the Block Plan 1550 P100A received 22nd June 2016; without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent any obvious sub-division of the driveway which may cause harm to character and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The parking area to the front of the properties as shown on Block Plan 1550 100A received 22nd June 2016 shall be retained as such at all times unless the prior approval has been obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient off-road parking remains for the two proposed dwellings so as not to cause a nuisance on the highway, in line with Policy DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Members expressed concerns in relation to the proposed development in that it was considered an inappropriate density and development and out of character for the area.

The officers had recommended that the application be approved. However, after consideration, the Members felt that the application should be refused due to the inappropriate development and density proposed and it being out of character with surrounding properties.

**Resolved that application 16/0320 be refused for the following reasons:**

- (i) **Inappropriate density;**
- (ii) **Inappropriate development; and**
- (iii) **Out of character with surrounding properties.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that one of the speakers was known to Cllr Conrad Sturt.

**Note 2**

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr R Chatfield and Mr P Williams spoke in objection.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Nic Chambers.

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Conrad Sturt and Victoria Wheeler.

**Note 5**

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

**Note 6**

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Conrad Sturt and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

**73/P Application Number: 16/0172 - The Manor, 30 Southwell Park Road, Camberley GU15 3QQ**

The application was for the variation of condition 1 of planning permission SU/15/0494 to allow an increase in the number of children in attendance at the nursery school from 12 to 15.

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Alan McClafferty.

Members were advised of the following updates:

An email response, with a revised drawing, has been received from the Agent. In summary, the email indicates:

- the negative nature of the pre-application advice which preceded the application [*Officer comment: The pre-app response indicated that the Council raised concerns about the proposal and any application would need to be supported by a noise report and traffic statement* ]
- the availability of the Environmental Health comments on the web-site [*Officer comment: A request was made to update the electronic file on the web-site*]
- the reasons why the application was called-in [*Officer comment: The reasons were provided to the agent*]
- the lack of a pro-active approach with officers [*Officer comment: As indicated above and in the officer report, the noise information was not satisfactory*]
- a request for a 12 month period permission so that the impact of the proposal can be monitored [*Officer comment: it is the officer's opinion that the application should have been supported by a noise report and the lack of such a report is fundamental in the assessment of the current application. Under such circumstances, officers do not agree with this request*]

**Resolved that application 16/0172 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

Councillor Colin Dougan declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as the owner of a nearby property and left the room during consideration of the application.

**Note 2**

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, the applicant, Mr Mike Sanderson spoke in support of the application. Mr R Grigson had been unable to attend to speak in objection , due to a family health issue. The Vice-Chairman, Councillor David Mansfield read a statement on Mr Grigson's behalf.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor David Allen and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry.

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, and Victoria Wheeler.

**74/P Application Number: 16/0162 - Highway Verge, West of the Cottage, Church Lane, Bisley, Woking**

The application was for the Advertisement Consent to display a notice board to display Parish and Borough Council Agenda's and Notices. (Non-illuminated).

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr David Mansfield.

Members were advised of the following updates:

The committee report refers to a neighbouring property as 'The Cottage' and this is correct. However, reference is also made to this property by its former name 'The Clock House' (paragraph 6.2, 7.4.2 and 7.5.2). This is incorrect and any reference to the Clock House should read The Cottage.

Paragraph 4.2 refers to the height from ground level as 0.6m, this is incorrect and the correct height from ground level is 1m.

Members expressed concerns in relation to the impact on the street scene and the character of the village, visual clutter and safety.

**Resolved that application 16/0162 be refused on the grounds of visual clutter, with the exact wording to be determined by the Officers in consultation with the Chairman.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr David Mansfield had been spoken to by a number of residents, but had not engaged in discussion or offered any views. It was also noted that the Chairman and Vice Chairman met on site.

**Note 2**

There was no proposer or seconder on the officer's recommendation to approve the application with conditions.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins.

**Note**

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, Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, and Victoria Wheeler.

**75/P Application Number: 16/0365 - 27 Diamond Ridge, Camberley GU15 4LB**

The application was for the variation of condition 3 of approval 15/0686 (two storey and single storey rear extensions) to enable minor material amendments including an increase in the size of the bedroom window on the northwest first floor side elevation and addition of obscure glazing film. (Amended plan recv'd 4/5/16). The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee for determination.

A site visit took place at this site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

A two page email, as an addition to the original objection has been received, plus a 9 page representation in response to the officer's report. On request of the objector, this representation has been circulated to Members. However, the key points made by the objector at no. 25 are summarised and commented on below:

- Summary of report does not reflect the objector's concerns.
- Para 1.2 of report - The objector considers there to be a significant difference to levels, not slight. No reference has been made to the fourth first floor window serving the half landing.
- Para 4.2 - Does not refer to the increased depth of the window.

*[Officer comment: For clarity the application form states that the height/depth would amend from 1.22 m to 1.25 m i.e. an increase by 0.03 m]*

- Page 105 - 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point - Officer's comments relating to design guidance is dismissive of the objector's concerns when the maintenance of a neighbour's privacy remains central to the decision making process.
- Page 105 - 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point - The drawing showing the ground floor window is misleading and inaccurate.

*[Officer comment: To regularise the situation a corrected drawing has been received].*

- Page 105 4th bullet point - Disagrees that there is no conflict with the Human Rights Act.
- 7.1.2 - Objector disagrees with the reasons as to why application 15/0686 was allowed.
- 7.1.3 - The applicant inserted a larger window than the approved plans with a more intrusive positioning and it is therefore misleading to say that they commenced the works in good faith.

- 7.2.2 - The case officer did not go into the rear garden and therefore can make no judgement about the level of intrusion here

*[Officer comment: A judgement could be made from standing and viewing from the applicant's bedroom. However, the officer did go into the rear garden during the Member site visit]*

- 7.2.3 - Explanation needed on how actual impact is judged and what is meant by perceived impact. Queries the difference latticing/leading makes and what is meant by the nature of these rooms. Objector disagrees with the statement relating to difficulty to gain full view of the window from the kitchen. There is actual impact on the enjoyment of the kitchen.

*[Officer comment: A judgement has to be made on the merits of the case based upon adopted policy and site specific circumstances. The objector perceives/interprets the harm as greater than the case officer's professional assessment of the seriousness of the impact. Latticing has the effect of interrupting views from a window, although this is a moot point. In respect of the nature of the rooms the overlooking effects are greater on primary/habitable spaces i.e. the kitchen/dining area, than the other secondary rooms affected (including the landing, utility room, bathroom and downstairs toilet) where normally usage is less; and, the bathroom/toilet windows also have obscure glazing]*

- 7.2.4 - Objector disagrees with statement that the patio cannot be seen.

*[Officer comment: The objector has not viewed from inside the applicant's window. The photographs on pages 110 and 111 of the agenda pack show the extent of visibility]*

- 7.2.5 - Queries the relevancy of making reference to permitted development rights in relation to the potential to insert a larger window.

*[Officer comment: The purpose of this statement is for information purposes to advise what control PD rights actually give]*

- 7.2.6 - Queries who decides when the film is degraded enough to need replacing, how this would be implemented and whether a planning officer would visit to make a judgement.

*[Officer comment: If a complaint was received in the future then this condition would provide the level of control for the Planning Authority to investigate and take any necessary action. The window would be inspected on site as part of this process]*

- 7.2.7 - Queries the relevancy of reference to permitted development rights in respect of the obscure glazing rating.

*[Officer comment: The purpose of this statement is to explain that the film inserted is effective as it meets the same standard otherwise required by PD]*

- 7.2.8 - The applicant resorting back to the original approval would be preferable.

*[Officer comment: If the applicant resorted back to the original approval then there would be no obligation for any obscure glazing given that permission was granted with no condition, see para. 7.1.3]*

- 7.2.9 - Request the window frame to be replaced. The objector does not consider switching a hinge without removing the casement to be an option. It is unreasonable to make a decision based on the applicant's current usage of the room and on the basis of promises.

*[Officer comment: The applicant has now sourced a local supplier who is able to reverse the direction of the window. See recommended condition below in the event that Members consider this to be necessary. It is accepted that this room could be used differently in the future, and the window could be opened more frequently. The objector has since advised that they would welcome this change]*

- 9.1 - The report is full of errors, omissions, misleading statements and untruths. It is biased.
- The two page email reiterates the concerns addressed above. In addition, this email consider the photographs used on the agenda not to be fully representative of the overall impact. On request of the objector further photographs have been circulated to Members.

### Additional Recommended Condition 3

3. Within 3 months of the date of this permission the casement window serving the bedroom in the first floor side elevation shall be hinged in the opposite direction so that it swings open to the rear of the property. Thereafter there shall be no changes to the openings of the window unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of good neighbourliness to prevent open views to the rear of the property to safeguard the privacy levels of no.25 Diamond Ridge and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.

**Resolved that application 16/0365 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory, and as amended.**

#### **Note 1**

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

#### **Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, and Victoria Wheeler.

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Surrey Heath House on 28 June 2016**

---

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

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

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Jonathan Lytle (for Cllr Dan Adams)  
Cllr Ian Sams (for Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper)

In Attendance: Cllr Colin Dougan

Guests: Arthur Birkby, Voluntary Support North Surrey  
Laurence Cottis, Tringhams  
Gill Gibson, Surrey Heath Age Concern  
Ian Graham, Surrey Heath Age Concern  
Libby Holcombe, Voluntary Support North Surrey  
Suzie Tobin, Voluntary Support North Surrey  
Solette Shepherdson, Voluntary Support North Surrey

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

The Chairman welcomed Laurence Cottis, Tringhams, Arthur Birkby, Suzie Tobin, Solette Shepherdson and Libby Holcombe, Voluntary Support North Surrey, and Gill Gibson and Ian Graham, Surrey Heath Age Concern, to the meeting.

**2/EP Minutes**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 29 March 2016 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**3/EP Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **4/EP Voluntary Support North Surrey**

Solette Shepherdson, Chief Executive Officer, and Arthur Birkby, Chairman, gave a presentation in respect of Voluntary Support North Surrey's work in the Surrey Heath area.

Voluntary Support North Surrey (VSNS), a registered charity limited by guarantee, provided a support service to third sector organisations across Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Council areas with the aim of building capacity and improving their resilience. Fifty percent of the organisation's work took place in the Surrey Heath area.

VSNS received funding from a range of sources including Surrey County Council, Surrey Heath Borough Council, Runnymede Borough Council and local Clinical Commissioning Groups. The £30,000 annual grant received by VSNS from Surrey Heath Borough Council represented approximately 8% of the organisation's budget.

A unique aspect of VSNS's relationship with Surrey Heath Borough Council was the presence of a Service Level Agreement that contained a set of objectives specific to the Surrey Heath area. Agreement of these objectives was an iterative process driven by Council officers and regular meetings took place to discuss and challenge the progress being made to achieve these objectives.

VSNS was working to reduce their deficit which currently stood at £18,000 and it was envisaged that the budget would be balanced by the end of the 2016/17 financial year. An increase in grant funding was acknowledged however it was stressed that this was negated by a reduction in the rent subsidy that the organisation received on its offices in the Ian Goodchild Centre.

Key areas of work for VSNS included developing and promoting volunteering, providing advice and guidance to the third sector on a range of subjects including governance matters and assisting with the identification of potential funding streams, provision of training opportunities and the administration of the vetting and barring service for local voluntary organisations.

82% of the groups and organisations supported by VSNS had made use of the funding advice and support services offered. These included access to the Grant Finder programme, weekly bulletins detailing any new funding streams identified, completing funding bids on behalf of organisations and proof reading funding bids before they were submitted. It was difficult to place a figure on the total amount of funding the VSNS had helped organisations raise however anecdotal evidence suggested that approaching smaller funds had a greater success rate than approaching larger national funding providers.

70% of the groups supported by VSNS have made use of the volunteer recruitment services on offer. Although the majority of people looking for voluntary work found placements without VSNS's assistance, the organisation had a good track record of success in finding voluntary placements for those with more

specific needs for example ex-offenders, job seekers and those with learning disabilities.

A Volunteer Plan had been produced to improve the recruitment and retention of volunteers by third sector groups. As part of the Plan, VSNS would work with third sector groups to improve their use of social media to raise awareness of their work and to recruit volunteers. The plan also set out VSNS's aim to help third sector groups invest more in their volunteers in order to improve volunteer retention rates.

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

- A requirement to produce quarterly reports for Surrey Heath Borough Council was felt to place an unnecessary constraint on resources.
- The two mobile home parks in the Mytchett area were classified as having high levels of deprivation compared to other parts of the Borough and would benefit from additional support.
- Although VSNS charged other voluntary groups rent to work from the Ian Goodchild Centre the income received did not cover the cost of the rent and service charge that VSNS had to pay to the Council.
- It was acknowledged that the organisation's lack of engagement with social media was an area that needed to be developed and work was now taking place to focus on this.
- It was suggested that Council media channels be used to help raise awareness of VSNS's work.

**RESOLVED** that:

- i. Consideration be given to reviewing the reporting requirements placed on Voluntary Support North Surrey to reduce pressure on resources
- ii. The use of Council communication channels to raise awareness of Voluntary Support North Surrey's work to be explored.

The Committee thanked Voluntary Support North Surrey for their update.

## **5/EP Tringham's Lunch Club**

Lawrence Cottis, Treasurer, gave a presentation in respect of Tringhams; a group set up in 2004 to promote the welfare of the elderly within the parishes of West End, Chobham, Bisley and Windlesham.

Tringhams collected elderly residents from across the area on two days a week and brought them to the Sports Pavilion in Benner Lane where they could enjoy a freshly prepared hot lunch and a range of social activities including exercise classes and day trips. The service was currently being provided to approximately 16 clients aged between 75 and 95 years old. It was hoped that these numbers would be increased to a regular client base of 20 however the demographic of the target client group meant that the client group was not static.

Exploration of alternative funding streams had resulted in Tringhams raising an additional £9,125 during the 2015/16 financial year from a variety of sources including: the Surrey Community Fund, Surrey County Council Fund, West End Parish Council, West End Village Society and donations and legacies from clients and their families.

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

- Costs were kept as low as possible however this needed to be balanced against ensuring that clients remained safe. For example, for a period a trial ran using only one mini-bus however it had proved impossible to safely transport all clients to and from the centre within the timescales required.
- Whilst reducing the number of minibuses owned by Tringhams to one would save Tringhams approximately £2,000 a year this saving would need to be offset against the costs incurred by the increase in Dial a Ride use that would be necessary.
- Eight volunteer drivers provided minibus transport for clients however more drivers were needed and Dial a Ride was being used to supplement provision.
- It was agreed that an approach for funding would be made to the West End Village Fete Committee.
- Mobility issues meant that a number of clients were unable to get in or out of cars easily and as a consequence minibuses were required in order to transport clients safely.
- Discussions had taken place with Surrey Heath Borough Council over the possibility of Tringhams buying a new minibus which would then be managed and maintained by the Council who would be able to use it on those days when Tringhams weren't. However these discussions had stalled and to date no decision had been reached on the matter.
- Tringhams had assumed responsibility for running the Bisley Butts Centre however this service had since closed.
- Tringhams was pro-active in their promotional activities and information about the services on offer had in the past been placed in village newsletters, church newsletters, parish magazines, GP surgeries in Chobham and West End and on Webcare.
- Work was underway to raise awareness of legacy giving amongst clients and their families.
- It was suggested that Council communication channels be used to encourage people to become volunteers.
- It was suggested that the Council could help facilitate discussions with Clinical Commissioning Groups to raise awareness of the organisation and the benefits that referrals to the service could have for patients.
- It was acknowledged that whilst Tringhams' constitution stated that the organisation had been set up to assist residents of a particular area this could be amended if it improved the long term viability of the organisation.
- Raising awareness of the service amongst younger people as an example of the services available for their parents could help to increase the size of Tringhams' client base.

The Committee expressed their support of Tringhams and commended them for the service that they provided.

**RESOLVED** that:

- i. Officers to support discussions with appropriate Clinical Commissioning Groups to raise referral rates from GP surgeries.
- ii. Work would take place to explore how awareness of Tringhams amongst the children of potential clients might be improved.
- iii. Council officers to take a proactive role in discussions on community transport options and the exploration of the wider co-ordination of transport for voluntary groups across the Borough.
- iv. The use of Council communication channels to raise awareness of Tringhams to be explored.

The Committee thanked Tringhams for their update and commended them for the work that they did.

**6/EP Surrey Heath Age Concern**

Gill Gibson, Charity Manager, and Ian Graham, Treasurer, gave a presentation in respect of the work of Surrey Heath Age Concern.

Surrey Heath Age Concern received a grant of £10,000 from Surrey Heath Borough Council; a figure that equated to approximately one third of the group's total budget. The charity employed three part-time members of staff working a total of 38 hours a week.

The Group's main objective was to enhance the lives of older people living in the Surrey Heath area. This was done through three main activities: a visiting and befriending service, the provision of the Rainbow Café in Camberley and Tea and Chatter sessions.

The Visiting and Befriending Service used a network of volunteers to provide companionship and reassurance to older people living in the Borough. Volunteer befrienders were carefully matched with their older person and received training before they started making visits. Volunteers were expected to make at least one one hour visit a week to the person they were matched with and visits could be made at any mutually agreed time including evenings and weekends. In addition to providing companionship, befrienders also fed any concerns that they might have back to Age Concern to ensure that problems were dealt with appropriately. The service was provided free of charge and was heavily oversubscribed.

The Rainbow Café in Camberley town centre was run by a part-time manager supported by 36 volunteers. In addition to offering snacks and drinks to the over fifties the café also provided free monthly 'Tea and Tech' sessions so that older residents could learn new computer skills. It was reported that the café currently managed to cover its costs and takings had doubled since the recent refurbishment.

In May 2015, monthly Tea and Chatter sessions were set up to enable older people to socialise on Sunday's and help counter-act loneliness. These sessions

attracted up to 45 people a month and Age Concern was working with the housing associations to make use of under-utilised communal areas in residential homes so that the scheme could be expanded.

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

- Managing the activities of the volunteers was particularly resource intensive and the waiting list for the volunteer befriending service had been temporarily closed to new applicants to ensure that the service was provided to an appropriate standard.
- The majority of those using the Rainbow Café were in their 80s and 90s.
- It was clarified that Surrey Heath Age Concern was independent of the national Age Concern organisation.
- It was suggested that experiential marketing would help raise awareness of the services offered.
- The possibility of Age Concern using Tringhams minibuses on Sundays to transport people to its tea and chatter groups would be explored outside the meeting.

The Committee thanked Surrey Heath Age Concern for their update and commended them for the work that they did.

## **7/EP Committee Work Programme**

The Committee received a report setting out the proposed work programme for the Committee for the coming year.

It was agreed that the accounts of those organisations supported by Surrey Heath Borough Council would be appended to reports when the organisations were invited to attend meetings.

The Committee noted the report.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing  
Committee held at Council Chamber,  
Surrey Heath House on 29 June 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 Joanne Potter
+ Cllr Paul Innicki	- Cllr Pat Tedder
- Cllr David Lewis	- Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Oliver Lewis	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

**1/L Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**2/L Statement of Gambling Policy**

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

At its meeting on 16 March 2016 the Committee had considered a draft revised Statement. The draft Statement had subsequently been subject to a 12 week public consultation, which had taken place between 18 March and 12 June 2016. One consultation response had been received.

The Committee was informed that a significant material change had been made to the draft Statement following the consultation by incorporating amendments brought about by the Gambling Commission's new Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice (LCCP), which had come into effect in April 2016. This insertion concerned the requirement for gambling premises to undertake a local risk assessment.

It was reported that the Council's legal officers had suggested a couple of minor typographical amendments, which the Committee agreed to incorporate in the final document.

**RECOMMENDED that the Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Policy – 5 October 2016 to 4 October 2019, as attached at Annex A to these minutes, be adopted.**

**3/L Food Safety Service Plan 2016/17**

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

Members considered the draft Food Safety Service Plan for 2016/17, which the Executive would be asked to approve at its meeting on 2 August 2016. The Plan followed the Food Standards Agency's set format.

In order to be considered 'broadly compliant' with food hygiene law, a business would be awarded a food hygiene score of 3 or above. It was noted that the number of food businesses which were 'broadly compliant' remained high at 97%. This figure had increased steadily in the previous few years from 83% in 2009/10. Officers continued to work with the businesses which were not broadly compliant in order to ensure that they improved their standards.

The Committee was advised that the Council continued to support its two Primary Authority Partnerships (PAPs) with Exclusive Hotels, the owner of Pennyhill Park, and Krispy Kreme Doughnuts.

**RESOLVED to advise the Executive to approve the Food Safety Service Plan 2016/17, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report.**

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

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

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the  
Performance and Finance Scrutiny  
Committee held at Surrey Heath House  
on 6 July 2016**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr Max Nelson
+ Cllr David Allen	- Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Bill Chapman	+ Cllr Chris Pitt
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	- Cllr Wynne Price
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Oliver Lewis	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ian Sams (Substituting for Cllr Wynne Price)

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Valerie White and Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman

### **1/PF Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed Members to the first meeting of the municipal year and in particular, welcomed Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, the Community Portfolio Holder, who had agreed to give a presentation and answer Members' questions on her portfolio.

### **2/PF Minutes**

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 23 March 2016 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

### **3/PF Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders - Community Portfolio Holder**

Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman referred Members to the elements of her brief as Community Portfolio Holder. She noted that the Council would continue to face a number of challenges in her areas of responsibility, notably around funding streams, the projected increase in the proportion of the community over 85 and most services being discretionary. She highlighted, in particular, the following:

Community Services – The Council was expanding a successful telecare package, including community alarms, pill dispensers, an extensive range of sensors and detectors including gas, CO2, fall and smoke alarms, plus GPS tracking and care calls for people with dementia. In addition, the Council ran a growing 'meals at home' service, 365 days a year and a well-used 'Dial a Ride' service, for which there were a number of plans for expansion.

The Windle Valley Day Centre was now providing day care, Monday to Friday, 8.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. with a combination of trained carers and volunteers, plus a hairdresser and foot health practitioner. A Saturday Club had now been opened for both people living with dementia and their carers.

Members were advised that, if they were aware of any residents who would benefit from a befriender service, they should contact the Operations Manager for Community Services.

Members highlighted concerns on the impact of future funding cuts. It was, however, noted that the Council was working with other councils and partner organisations to mitigate any impacts. The Executive Head of Community agreed to circulate details of funding streams for the period up to 2020.

Environmental Health – The Council had a team of 7 Environmental Officers covering a range of duties, including food safety, health and safety, air quality monitoring, statutory nuisance investigation and control, dog control and pest control, including an out of hours service. The Home Improvement Agency would be transferring to Regulatory Services, to have all functions under one service.

Recycling and Refuse – In 2014/15, the Council had recycled or composted 63% of municipal waste produced, making the Authority the top performing Council in Surrey and 4<sup>th</sup> in the UK. In dry recyclables, the Council was the top performing Council in the UK. This area would be the subject of a report later in the agenda.

The Council was participating in a Joint Waste Contract, with Woking, Mole Valley, Elmbridge Borough Councils and Surrey County Council and was in an advanced stage of negotiations with 3 tenderers.

Traveller Sites – The Council currently managed 2 sites on behalf of Surrey County Council (SCC), but SCC would be taking back management in September 2016.

Members queried what contingency plans were in place for illegal incursions. The Executive Head of Community referred Members to the close work in this area between Environmental Health Officers, the Council's Legal Services Team and Surrey Police. The Executive Head of Regulatory Services outlined the measures in place for incursions onto Council Land. She emphasised, however, that the Council had no powers over private land.

Councillor Chris Pitt reported on the numbers of travellers based in Surrey, the unauthorised encampments and the unauthorised developments. He suggested asking the External Partnerships Select Committee to invite John Hockley, an SCC officer with responsibilities in this area, to make a presentation to a later meeting of that Committee.

Health and Safety – The Council had an officer from another Surrey Authority, for one day a week, to provide advice on Health and Safety responsibilities.

Street Cleansing – The cleansing service covered a range of tasks including street sweeping, cleansing of car parks, public toilets and recycling sites, debris removal, fly tipping, fly posting and small scale graffiti.

Fly tipping continued to be an issue for the Borough and the Council recently took on powers allowing fines of up to £400 to be awarded to perpetrators of small tips.

Health and Wellbeing – The Council had established a multi-agency Health and Wellbeing Board, which had launched a Workplace Health and Wellbeing Charter and had promoted public health messages, sought to reduce excess winter deaths, established a dementia befriending pilot and managed an exercise referral programme.

A Surrey Heath Dementia Partnership had been established and Surrey Heath was working towards being declared a Dementia Friendly Borough.

Licensing – The Licensing Team dealt with premises, personal, taxi, hackney cab and gambling licences, whilst the Environmental Health team covered licensing of areas such as street trading, riding establishments, pet shops, dog breeding, dog boarding and catteries.

Emergency Planning and Business Continuity – The Council had a number of responsibilities as a Category 1 responder under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, including business continuity, updating and maintaining a flood plan and a Borough Emergency Planning package.

The Council had recently appointed a company called Applied Resilience to provide 25 hours per week emergency planning support.

Members noted a suggestion that there might be conflicting numbers on the Council's web pages for the out of hour's services. It was confirmed that the contact number was 01276 707100. The Council's web site would be checked to ensure that only this number was displayed.

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

#### **4/PF Housing Services Position Statement and Work Plan 2016/17**

The Committee received a report and presentation on the work and performance of the Housing Services team, including the Housing Services Position Statement and Work Plan for 2016/17.

The Team had sought to develop and deliver a range of housing and housing services that promoted the health and well-being of residents and the wider community through:

1. Providing effective, customer focused housing advice that offers a range of options and prevents homelessness;
2. Working with owners, landlords and tenants to maintain, adapt and improve their homes to meet current and future needs;

3. Joint working with statutory, voluntary and private sector partners to offer residents the right housing and support at the right time to meet their needs;
4. Developing joint strategies designed to promote independence and re-enablement, supporting effective service delivery across a range of partners and reducing pressure on health and social services; and,
5. Promoting and providing evidence to support the delivery of new homes and investment in the current housing stock to meet the Borough's current and future housing requirements.

The success or otherwise of the above would be reflected in a number of key indicators, namely:

- Increasing the number of households who have their homelessness prevented through advice and assistance year on year;
- Limiting the use of bed and breakfast by not placing households unless in an emergency and with no accepted household being placed in shared facility B&B for longer than 6 weeks;
- Delivering new affordable homes;
- Increasing the number of homes where category 1 and 2 hazards are eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level;
- Ensuring all Housing related complaints are investigated and resolved, using enforcement powers where necessary;
- Delivering a Home Improvement Agency that is responsive, cost effective and maximises the benefit of available grant;
- Increasing the number of households assisted into the private rented sector;
- Meeting the Silver Standard in the delivery of homelessness in 2017; and,
- Achieving 70% positive outcomes for Team Around the Person clients.

The Housing Services Manager highlighted a shortage in the Borough of suitable new rented accommodation, making it a challenge to meet some of the targets set for the Team. Members expressed concern at the low levels of affordable housing both built and planned.

There were currently only 2 households in bed and breakfast accommodation and one of these had alternative accommodation to move to.

As at November 2015, there were 18 rough sleepers in the Borough. Members noted that an all-night café had been opened in Camberley by a charitable organisation, which could be attracting homeless people from further afield. Given that people coming into Camberley from elsewhere would not be entitled to

assistance in this area, it would be important to ensure that they were reconnected to their real home areas.

Part of the work of the Housing Team was to mitigate the impact of welfare reforms, particularly for single homeless people. Members were informed that 3 out of every 4 people in social rented accommodation who had been moved to universal credit were already in arrears.

Within 5 ½ months, every form of benefit would be accessed by the internet only, yet many of those in receipt would be unable to access the internet or have the requisite skills. Members suggested that the Committee should highlight this development to the Executive and to ask what mitigating steps would be taken, particularly given the number of publically available PCs against the expected demand.

**Resolved, that**

- (i) the report be noted; and**
- (ii) The Executive be advised to consider ways to mitigate the impact of changes, due to be introduced in less than 6 months, to benefit arrangements, requiring all applications to be submitted on-line.**

**5/PF Surrey Heath Waste Strategy**

The Executive Head of Community presented an update on the Surrey Heath Waste Action Plan, which had been agreed by the Executive in November 2015. The report provided audited data for 2014/15 and compared to performance in 2013/14 and against the performance of the other collecting authorities in Surrey.

The Council was aiming to be the best performing authority in the UK and despite an increasing population, had reduced household waste levels. This had been reflected in the receipt of a Performance Incentive Award from the Surrey Waste Partnership, of £65,000, which was being invested back into recycling initiatives.

Surrey Heath was the top recycling authority in Surrey and was only surpassed nationally by authorities which recycled their garden waste. Whilst having a very successful garden waste club, this Council had been challenging the Environment Agency, through the Surrey Waste Partnership, on the composting of highway leaves, having established that any contamination was within acceptable levels.

The Executive Head of Community reported that the Joint Waste Management Contract processes had reached the stage where final tenders had been submitted by 3 shortlisted companies. These would be assessed on value for money and quality. Following this assessment, there would be meetings of the Executive and Council held on 8 November 2016, when authority would be sought for the inter-authority agreement and the purchase of vehicles.

In response to a Member query, the Executive Head confirmed that whilst fly tipping was lower than in neighbouring Boroughs, Environmental Health officers

were working closely with colleagues to both enforce and prosecute fly tippers. It was too early to assess any impact from Surrey County Council's decision to reduce the hours of the Wilton Road Recycling Centre and it was noted that the number of recycling options at Council 'Bring' sites had been reduced due to high levels of contamination. He agreed to circulate fly tipping data electronically.

**Resolved, that the Committee notes the performance achieved in meeting the targets and milestones set out in the Surrey Heath Waste Action plan 2016 – 2020.**

## **6/PF Independent Living**

The Committee had received a report in September 2015 on services provided by the Council to promote independent living. The Executive Head of Community presented an update, focussing on the range of services provided to older and vulnerable people living in the Borough with the aim of allowing those individuals to remain at home independently and safely for as long as possible.

Surrey Heath had an aging population, with people becoming increasingly frail. It was estimated that from 2012 to 2020 there would be an increase of 12% in those suffering from dementia in Surrey. In Surrey Heath, that percentage increase could be as high as 31%.

The vast majority of services in this area were discretionary, with the notable exception of disabled grants. The Council received grant funding from Surrey County Council of approximately £250,000, but Members noted concerns about funding cuts and how these could impact on services such as day care, community alarms, meals at home and community transport.

The Executive Head of Community reported that funding had been secured for this municipal year. The Council worked closely with partner organisations, including the Clinical Commissioning Group, Surrey County Council and voluntary sector organisations such as Age Concern, to meet the challenges of reducing funding and increasing demand. The Council was also working with Runnymede Council to better manage services and drive down costs.

Members were reminded that a befriending pilot had been set up in the Heatherside Ward. The Council was working with Age Concern to find befrienders for people living with dementia and other vulnerable residents. To date, up to 50 residents had benefitted.

There were already further befriender packages available in Surrey and a range of other services for older people, both within and outside the Borough. The Council had been running 'Making It Real' events twice a year, seeking to coordinate these disparate groups.

The Council's Community Actions Coordinator, Nigel Drury, currently issued updates to all networks on developments and he would be asked to include Members in the circulation of these updates.

Whilst the Council was not necessarily a commissioner for all community services needed in the Borough, the Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group was almost coterminous with the Borough boundaries and a joint commissioning group had been established, involving the CCG, Adult Social Services and this Council, with the Executive Head of Community as the Council representative.

**Resolved, that the performance and achievements for 2015/2016 and the proposed work plan for 2016/2017 be noted.**

## **7/PF Air Quality**

The Committee considered an update on air quality data produced in the Borough with comparisons to Government set targets and this Council's Air Quality Action Plan.

Members noted the current position and sought clarification on what impact the M3 had on the Air Quality Management Area and how this would be affected by changes in speed limit policies for that motorway.

The Executive Head of Community reported that it was planned that the Council would have real time measurements to compare the impact of changes to speed management on the M3.

**Resolved, that the Executive be advised that the current air monitoring programme should be maintained and reviewed following the conclusions of future Statutory Air Quality reports submitted to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.**

## **8/PF Working Groups**

The Committee considered a proposal from Councillor Victoria Wheeler to establish a Task and Finish Group to consider the impact on the Borough of the Government's welfare reform programme.

Councillor Bill Chapman reported that Surrey County Council had already established a Member group to consider impacts of welfare reform and that group had produced a report which could be used as a starting point for any Borough consideration.

The Chairman noted that, were Members inclined to establish such a Group, it would need to seek the Council Leader's authority, as the proposed work would be outside of the Committee's remit.

The proposal was put to a vote and lost

It was proposed that officers be asked to circulate a copy of the SCC report to Members prior to the next meeting, to permit informed consideration. In the meantime, the Chairman would discuss the proposal with the Council Leader.

**Resolved, that a copy of the report of the Surrey County Council Member Group on the issue of the impacts of welfare reform be circulated to all Members prior to the next meeting.**

**9/PF Work Programme**

The Chairman proposed that each meeting should be geared around one portfolio and that the reports going to the meeting should, where possible, be linked to that portfolio holder's areas of responsibility.

The agenda for the next meeting would include the report on Performance in 2015/16 and the Annual Plan for 2016/17. It was anticipated that the Council Leader and Chief Executive would attend that meeting for consideration of these reports.

It was hoped that, for future meetings, Portfolio Holders would submit a report prior to the meeting on their 4 key priorities. Members would be asked to submit questions in advance where possible, so that more issues could be addressed at the meeting rather than requiring written responses.

A draft Work Programme would be submitted for Members' consideration at the September 2016 meeting.

**Resolved, that the report be noted and that the changes outlined above be agreed.**

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held at Surrey  
Heath House on 14 July 2016**

---

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

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

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

**1/J Election of Chairman**

Under the Constitution of the Consultative Group, the positions of Chairman and Vice Chairman alternate between a Member representative and a Staff Representative. For 2016/17 the position of Chairman would be held by a Staff Representative and the position of Vice Chairman by a Member Representative.

**Resolved, that Geraldine Sharman be elected Chairman and Councillor Josephine Hawkins be elected Vice Chairman of the Consultative Group for the ensuing year.**

**2/J Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3/J Notes**

The notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 17 March 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

**4/J Social Networking Policy Review**

The Group received a report proposing amendments to the Council's Social Media Policy. In particular, it was proposed to rename the policy to Social Networking Policy.

Changes had been proposed to the policy, to encompass social networking at work, advice for staff using social networking privately and an additional clause on compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

The Group agreed to following additional amendments:

- (i) Paragraph 4 – Policy Statement – 5<sup>th</sup> Bullet Point – Delete “Slack and other collaborative tools” and insert “All forms of collaborative tools including Slack and Trello.
- (ii) Paragraph 7 – Policy and Procedure – Sub-Paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 – In both sub-paragraphs (personal internet site and social networking site from Surrey Heath Borough Council), insert an additional bullet point:
  - Do not discuss existing or proposed policies on social networking websites.

**Resolved, that the Head of Paid Service be asked to rename the Social Media Policy to Social Networking Policy, as attached in Annex A to the Officer’s report incorporating the above amendments.**

## **5/J Staff Benefits**

The Group received a report on a proposed new staff benefits programme. The changes involved joining the P&MM employee benefits package under the SE7 Framework, negotiated by Surrey County Council in partnership with 7 south-east councils and including 2 streams, those being:

- (i) Lifestylehub – High street, cinema, leisure and travel discounts; and
- (ii) Salaryplus – cycle and cycle to work savings.

The cost implications for the Council were £2 per employee for 245 employees, giving a per annum cost of £490. The contract term for both Lifestylehub and Salaryplus would be 2 years with an option for a 3<sup>rd</sup> year.

Members supported the adoption of the new staff benefits programme, subject to funding approval and agreed to advise the Executive to agree the £490 per annum for the 2 years with the option of a 3<sup>rd</sup> year.

**Resolved, that**

- (i) **subject to funding approval, the introduction of the new staff benefits programme, as detailed in the officers’ report, be supported; and**
- (ii) **the Executive be advised to agree funding at £490 per annum for 2 years, with an option of a 3<sup>rd</sup> year.**

## **6/J Work Programme**

The Group considered a proposed work programme, covering meetings scheduled for 6 October 2016, 19 January and 16 March 2017.

The Group agreed to the following item being added to the work programme for 6 October 2016:

- Review of the Officers' Code of Conduct.

**Resolved, that the Work Programme for 2016/17 set out at Annex A to the Officer's report, as amended, be approved.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank