

COUNCIL MEETING

5 October 2016

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 24 August 2016** (Pages 3 - 10)
2. **Executive- 2 August 2016** (Pages 11 - 16)
3. **Executive - 6 September 2016** (Pages 17 - 20)
4. **Planning Applications Committee - 25 August 2016** (Pages 21 - 26)
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 22 September 2016** (Pages 27 - 30)
6. **Audit and Standards Committee - 25 July 2016** (Pages 31 - 34)
7. **Audit and Standards Committee - 19 September 2016** (Pages 35 - 36)
8. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 20 September 2016 (to follow)**
9. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 28 September 2016 (to follow)**

This page is intentionally left blank

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

+ Cllr John Winterton (Mayor)
+ Cllr Valerie White (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 Joanne Potter

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In attendance: Alan Harris of Montagu Evans and Andrew Martin, James Barnett and Stewart Womersley of Addleshaw Goddard.

25/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Alan McClafferty, Katia Malcus Cooper and Conrad Sturt.

26/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
27 July be approved as a correct record.**

27/C Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on

the ground that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
28/C	3
29/C	3
30/C	3

28/C Property Acquisitions

The Council made decisions relating to the acquisition of property.

29/C Urgent Action

Members noted that the Urgent Action had been dealt with as part of the report at Minute 28/C.

30/C Review of Exempt Items

The Chief Executive advised Members that the matters dealt with at Minute 28/C above were the subject of a Non-Disclosure Agreement. Members were reminded of their duties to ensure that this highly confidential and commercially sensitive information remained confidential to the organisation at this time until a formal decision was made, to ensure that the Council's position was not compromised in the current financial markets, whilst the negotiations for this acquisition were finalised.

Resolved the Agenda Report, related information and Minute 28/C remain exempt.

Mayor

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 2
August 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

Councillor Richard Brooks (Deputy Leader) in the Chair.

In Attendance: Councillors Rodney Bates, Alan McClafferty and Robin Perry.

16/E Minutes

The open minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman, after an amendment to Minute 7/E to indicate that Councillor Rodney Bates declared an interest and left the Chamber for the Executive's deliberations thereon.

17/E Five Year Strategy 2016-2021

The Executive considered a report proposing the adoption of an updated Five Year Strategy, introducing an updated Corporate Strategy and putting forward a proposal that it become a five year rolling strategy. The Strategy would replace the previous 10 year strategy, but would continue with the direction of travel.

The Strategy had been refreshed, including four groups of Key Priorities, those being Place, Prosperity, Performance and People. It had been redesigned to be more helpful, succinct and readable.

Members noted a concern that, on Page 4 of the Strategy, under 'People', the 4th bullet point could be misinterpreted in respect of younger people.

The Transformation Portfolio Holder noted that the Strategy already allowed for minor adjustments and agreed that the bullet point should be amended.

Resolved, that the Five Year Strategy 2016 – 2021 as set out in Annex A to the Officer report, with a minor amendment to the People Column, Bullet Point 4, be approved.

18/E Annual Plan 2016/17

The Executive received a report proposing the adoption of an updated Annual Plan for 2016/17, including an overview of the vision and objectives from the Five Year Strategy and indicating the outputs and success measures that would be delivered in 2016/17 for each of the new priorities.

Members noted that the Annual Plan demonstrated how it would link into and work towards achieving the aims of the new Five Year Strategy. It had been simplified and was more succinct, with a more definitive breakdown of what should be achieved and measured. Outcomes would be reviewed against success measures at the 6 month point and at the end of the year.

Resolved, that the Annual Plan for 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017, as set out in Annex A to the Officer report, be approved.

19/E End of Year Performance Report 2015/16

The Transformation Portfolio Holder presented a report on the Council's performance for 2015/16. This would be the final report in the current format, with the new report reflecting changes agreed to the Annual Plan.

Members welcomed the proposed changes, referring to inconsistencies in interpretation and confusing messages from the Red – Amber – Green report. It was suggested that greater and earlier involvement in the vision and processes would assist Members and it was proposed that, where an issue or target was beyond the Council's control, such as when the action required sat with another Authority, this should be clearly indicated.

In respect of the delay in the report being considered, Members noted that this had partly driven the changes to the format proposed in this and the 5 year/annual plan proposals.

Successes included moves to regenerate Camberley Town Centre, Investment in properties, achieving the 'Gold' level in Investors in People plus the 'Commitment' level of the Workplace Wellbeing Charter and achieving income returns at 20% above the Local Authorities average.

Members queried the current status of the Land East of Knoll Road report, but noted that the target dates had been missed whilst a decision was awaited from Surrey County Council.

Resolved, that the Council's Performance for 2015/16 be noted.

20/E Medium Term Financial Strategy

The Finance Portfolio Holder presented a report setting out the implications and challenges of the Financial Strategy and forecast for the period from 2017/18 to 2020/21.

The financial forecast illustrated the need to make continued savings and increase income if the Council was to achieve financial sustainability going forward. Whilst the Government, in December 2015, had released a 4 year settlement to Councils to enable financial planning, uncertainty around the changes to business rates in 2019/20 and concerns about the percentage that the Council would get in the proposed 100% localisation of business rates created difficulties for financial projections/planning.

The Strategy proposed a number of measures aimed at addressing potential financial challenges and setting the direction of travel rather than authorising specific actions.

The Executive noted Member concerns on possible impacts from leaving the European Union, market fluctuations and the appointment of a new Government. The £100,000 projected saving from the proposed reduction in the number of Members was also queried.

Whilst agreeing on the need to re-assess the projected £100,000 saving, Members noted that the Medium Term Financial Strategy would be monitored, with the impact of the potential uncertainties kept under constant review.

Resolved, that

- (i) the Financial Strategy be noted; and**
- (ii) the adoption of the Medium Term Financial Strategy be recommended to the Council.**

21/E West End Village Design Statement

The Regulatory Portfolio Holder reminded Members that the Executive, in April 2016, had agreed that the Draft West End Village Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document (VDS) be subject to a statutory 6 weeks consultation. Following the completion of the consultation process and some minor adjustments, the report sought the adoption of the West End VDS as a Supplementary Planning Document.

The Executive noted that the VDS was guidance rather than policy. It could not stop development happening, but could provide additional information in respect of design and character and would support policies in the Council's Core Strategy.

Resolved, that the West End Village Design Statement be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

22/E Response to Runnymede Borough's Issues and Options and Preferred Option Local Plan consultation

The Executive considered a report on the publication by Runnymede Borough Council of its Local Plan Issues and Options and Preferred Approaches Document and the consultation thereon which would run until 17 August 2016.

The document was the first stage of the production of the Runnymede Local Plan and set out the approach to allocating sites for housing in Runnymede borough to 2035. This includes the DERA north and south sites in Longcross and proposals for their removal from the Green Belt.

Although not objecting in principle to the proposed development of the DERA sites, this Council had previously submitted an objection to the proposed

development due to concerns over the need to address both local and strategic transport implications.

Members noted a proposed response to the consultation document, including a requirement to address transport issues, improvements to the A320 and discussions with Highways England regarding the possible provision of a restricted access Junction (2a) from the M3 motorway, to allow separate entry and exit to local traffic to and from the West at the B386 Longcross Road over bridge. The response also referred to the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate.

Resolved, that the response set out in the letter at Annex 1 to the Officer report be submitted as Surrey Heath Borough Council's formal representations to the Runnymede Borough Council's Local Plan Issues and Options and Preferred Approaches document.

23/E Family Support Team Progress in 2015/16

The Regulatory Portfolio Holder presented a report setting out the tracked progress of families worked with in the previous year under the Troubled Families Initiative, to ascertain whether or not improvements achieved had been sustained in the 9 months following intensive support work with the Family Support Team.

The purpose of the troubled families' initiative was to change the repeating generational patterns of poor parenting, abuse, violence, drug use, anti-social behaviour and crime in the most troubled families in the UK.

Since its inception in 2013, the joint Runnymede/Surrey Heath project had worked with 230 families, providing intensive support and been awarded £654,815, in total funding for set up and payment by results. This represented an average cost of £2,847 per family worked with.

The scheme worked in two parts with families receiving intensive support for a period of around 12 weeks through the Team around the Family (TAF) and then support through a lead organisation for the following 9 months (post TAF).

27 Surrey Heath families had been assisted in 2015/16, out of 54 families supported by the Team. 8 of the 54 families had been found to have circumstances that warranted more serious interventions. Of the remaining 46, all had shown improvement in at least one of the criteria covered by the initiative.

One criterion, Domestic Violence/Abuse had proved more difficult to address, with 8 out of 11 families showing no improvement after intensive support. However, Members noted that, in this most challenging measure, an improvement with 3 out of 11 families was actually, in itself, a considerable achievement.

The report highlighted one weakness of the scheme, that being the lack of an agreed approach to monitoring progress of families in the post TAF period or resourcing for this. Partly in response to this concern, a restructuring of the Family Support team within Runnymede/Surrey Heath had introduced 2 senior posts with responsibility for post TAF tracking.

Surrey County Council was now introducing a 2nd phase of the initiative, in which a more refined approach would be adopted to assessing and tracking of families across the 12 months, to make claiming of Payment by Results easier, as well as monitoring of the improvements achieved to see whether these have been sustained.

Whilst the Team had sought to assess outcomes for the 54 families worked with over 2015/16, it had proved difficult to track families once they had left intensive support and to monitor progress against DCLG criteria. This would be the subject of further work with partners.

Resolved, that the report be noted

24/E Food Safety Service Plan 2016/17

The Community Portfolio Holder presented a report seeking approval of a Food Safety Service Plan for the period 2016 to 2017, which would ensure that the Council was compliant with the requirements of the Food Standards Agency and the Framework Agreement on Local Authority Food Law Enforcement.

Council Officers had carried out 380 food safety inspections in 2015/16, with 50 new businesses included in the inspections, and had established that 97% of food businesses in the Borough were 'Broadly Compliant' with food hygiene law.

In 2016/17, officers intended to build on the success of the Food Hygiene Rating System and to maintain the proportion of food businesses which were "Broadly Compliant" with food hygiene laws to at or above 95%.

Officers had done a significant amount of work with the non-broadly compliant businesses to achieve the necessary improvements. Over the next year, the focus would be on sustaining the improvements in the businesses and continuing to take action in noncompliant businesses.

Resolved, that the Food Safety Service Plan 2016/17 attached at Annex A to the Officer report, be approved.

25/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)
26/E	3
27/E	3

Note: Minutes 26/E and 27/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.

26/E Exempt Minutes

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

27/E Review of Exempt Items

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

Resolved, that the minutes remain exempt until the completion of the lease negotiations.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 6
September 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 David Mansfield and Cllr Chris Pitt

27/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 August 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

28/E Community Fund Grants

The Executive considered a report detailing grant applications to the Community Fund Grants Scheme from organisations within the Borough and recommendations on what could be an appropriate award in respect of each application.

Applications had been received from the following organisations:

- (i) All Saints Church, Lightwater - The grant application was for £24,690 towards a project to improve the kitchen and toilet areas, costing £74,071. It was proposed that a grant be made in the sum of £15,000, but that this should be subject to matched funding being provided respectively by Surrey County Council and the applicants;
- (ii) Camberley Cricket Club – The Club had applied for a grant of £12,750 against an overall project cost of £25,550 to supply and fit a replacement disabled lift. It was considered that the Club had sufficient reserves to meet a greater element of the costs involved and it was recommended that a grant be made in the sum of £5,000.
- (iii) Windlesham Bowls Club – The grant application was for £25,000 against an overall cost of £61,903, to extend the club house facilities by 4 metres. Members noted that applications had also been made to other granting bodies and it was recommended that a grant of £5,000 be made, subject to the applicants being able to raise the remaining funds required to complete the project.
- (iv) Deepcut Village Centre – The Deepcut Village Association had submitted a grant application for £20,000 to part pay the conversion of the changing rooms and shower facilities into a small hall at a cost of £110,880.

The Executive was reminded that the Council currently held S106 Planning monies collected for the Alma Dettingen development and noted that legal advice had indicated that the project met the criteria for use of this funding. Members agreed that, whilst they were supportive of the project, any decision of awarding a grant should be deferred until after the consideration of allocation of S106 funding later in the year.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the following grants be awarded from the Community Fund Grant Scheme:**
 - a. £15,000 be awarded to All Saints Church Hall to replace the kitchen and toilet facilities, subject to the match funding by Surrey County Council and the applicant under the Surrey Community Buildings Grant Scheme;**
 - b. £5,000 be awarded to Camberley Cricket Club to supply and fit a replacement disabled lift within the clubhouse;**
 - c. £5,000 be awarded to Windlesham Bowls Club to extend the club house facilities by 4 metres; and**
- (ii) the decision on the application from Deepcut Village Association for £20,000 towards the conversion of the existing changing rooms and showers into a small hall be deferred until after the consideration of the expenditure of S106 monies by the Executive.**

29/E Council Finances as at 30 June 2016

The Executive received a report on the position of the Council's finances as at 30 June 2016, representing the first quarter of 2016/17.

Members were advised that, at the end of the first quarter, expenditure on wages was under budget but was underachieving against the vacancy margin, which was being monitored.

It was reported that £264,000 had been spent on capital projects that quarter, with notable spending of £162,000 on disabled facilities grants, £34,000 on computer software and £50,000 on property development. All expenditure was within budget.

Members noted that, due to low interest rates, it continued to be difficult to increase returns on the Council's treasury investments. The Council was, however, on track to achieve its budgeted investment income for the year.

Sundry debts at 30 June 2016 amounted to £664,000, which compared with £622,000 for the same period the previous year. However, £224,000 of these debts related to community alarms and parking season tickets, which were

invoiced at the start of the year and consequently appeared as debts but were paid by instalments throughout the year. The balance of Housing Benefit Debts was £636,000 at 30 June 2016.

RESOLVED to note the Revenue, Treasury and Capital Position as at 30th June 2016.

30/E Annual Report on the Treasury Management Service and Actual Prudential Indicators for 2015/16

The Executive received a report which provided a summary of the Council's treasury management performance in 2015/16 and demonstrated compliance with the 2015/16 Prudential Indicators.

It was reported that the Council's Treasury Advisors, Arlingclose, had recommended that the Council make a change to its Treasury Strategy to enable it to place more of its funds with a single fund manager. It was recommended to increase the limit of £3m per manager in "any group of pooled funds under the same manager" to £5m; this would enable the Council to take advantage of funds which performed well.

RESOLVED to note the report on Treasury Management including compliance with the 2015/16 Prudential Indicators

RECOMMENDED that

- (a) compliance with the Prudential Indicators for 2015/16 be noted; and**
- (b) the Investment Limits for "Any Group of Pooled Funds under the same Management" in the 2016/17 Treasury Strategy be changed from £3m to £5m.**

31/E Business Rates Reform - Fair Funding Review

The Executive considered a draft response to the Government's consultation on Fair Funding review in respect of Business Rates.

RESOLVED to

- (i) endorse the draft consultation response, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report; and**
- (ii) delegate authority to the Portfolio Holder for Finance the completion and submission of the final response to the Government.**

32/E Self-Sufficient Local Government: 100% Business Rates Retention

The Executive considered a draft response to the Government's consultation on 100% Business Rates Retention.

Members noted the proposed response and agreed that the response to Question 18 should be strengthened.

RESOLVED to

- (i) endorse the draft consultation response as attached at Annex A to the agenda report; and**
- (ii) delegate authority to the Portfolio Holder for Finance for the completion and submission of the final response to the Government.**

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 25 August 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(arrived part way through min 10/P)	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (In place of Cllr Colin Dougan) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr David Allen)

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington and Cllr Jonathan Lytle

8/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

9/P Hook Meadow Appeal Decision

The Committee was advised that this item was for information only and was not for discussion at the meeting.

10/P Application Number: 16/0353 - Land to the Rear of 31 Windsor Road, Chobham, Woking, GU24 8LA

The application was for the provision of gated access to field and gravel apron. (Amended & additional plans rec'd 06/07/16). (Additional Information rec'd 19/07/2016).

The application would normally be determined under the Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, it was reported to Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllrs Tedder and Wheeler.

A Member site visit took place on the site.

The Committee was advised that the application was classed as a major application as the site area exceeded one hectare.

Members received the following updates:

'Reference to Cllr Wheeler having called the application in to Committee is incorrect.

Evidence concerning the maintenance equipment used (tractor) at the site has been received indicating the cutting blades pulled up as the tractor passes through the gate access.

The applicant has responded by letter to indicate that this manoeuvre is not best practice and the wider access point proposed under this application will improve access and allow other maintenance vehicles to access the site.

A response to this letter has been provided by an objector (Chobham Poor Allotments Charity who own the shared access) which confirms that the existing access has not impeded any access by a contractor in the last 30 years, the maintenance/upkeep of the watercourse is undertaken by the Environment Agency who would still be able to use this access and that whilst an independent access is required under this application, this cannot be obtained because the access crosses third party land (i.e. owned by Persimmon Homes).

The objection includes other comments/objections previously indicated in the officer report.

Correspondence has been received from Surrey County Council who has fielded concerns from a local resident about access to The Grange being restricted by cars parked on this highway (i.e. in the vicinity of the proposed access point).

A previous objector, Persimmon Homes, confirms that the formal notice has now been correctly served (as part owner of the site with the new access proposed across their verge) and confirms that there has been no prior agreement to this proposal.

Correspondence has been received from Surrey County Council who has been (email) copied an email to Persimmon Homes from a local objector to resist this proposal (as part landowner).'

Some councillors felt that the development was unneighbourly, too big and there would be a loss in residential amenity. Further views included that the development would cause visual harm, there would be a loss of boundary and landscaping and there would be safety issues for pedestrians. The width of the new access had not been demonstrated.

Officers had recommended approval of the application but some Members felt that the development would be harmful to the area and to residents.

Resolved that application 16/0353 be refused for the reasons set out below:

- **Impact on residential amenity;**
- **Visual harm;**
- **Loss of boundary and landscaping;**

- **Pedestrian safety**
- **No demonstration of the width of new access.**

The wording would be finalised after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman and Ward Members.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Cllr Tedder was a Trustee on the Chobham Poor Allotments charity.

Note 2

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Ms Pauline Isle spoke in objection.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Max Nelson.

Note 4

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

The recommendation was lost.

Note 5

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 6

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

11/P Application Number: 16/0575 - 8 Turpins Rise, Windleham, GU20 6NG

The application was for a single storey front extension.

This application would normally be determined under the Scheme of Delegation for officers; however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Sturt.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A further letter of objection on behalf of the objector at No.10 has been received from a firm of solicitors. This 4 page A4 document contains 18 bullet points and raises a number of concerns regarding perceived inaccuracies or omissions within the committee report.

The points raised, fall into 3 areas, namely: character, amenity and parking.

In respect of character, the further letter of objection notes an area of lawn between the border referenced at para 2.2 of the report and the hardstanding has not been referenced; submits there is an established building line in the spur, but then also submits that the dwellings are staggered to one another and further adds that the report overly relies on the presence of vegetative features as visual mitigation to the proposal, a further area of concern raised is that the case officer has not understood the nature of previous works undertaken at the application property. Substantive detail is provided on each of the points raised; however officers note that the consideration of the proposal's impact on character is largely subjective and it is not considered the matters raised in this letter of objection materially alter the assessment undertaken in the committee report.

In terms of amenity, the objection cites a failure to have regard to the cumulative impact of the proposed works and those previously undertaken on the objector's amenity, claims the case officer assessment in terms of loss of privacy is flawed and cites, by reference to a photograph that direct views into the front facing windows already exists. In respect of this latter point, if this is accepted by the Committee it becomes a question of whether the proposal could be said to significantly and detrimentally alter the existing relationship.

The final concern is the loss of available parking spaces to serve the property. In this regard there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would impede the applications property ability to provide 2 on-site parking spaces. It is also noted that there is no County Highways objection to the application.

In summary while the content of this letter of objection is noted this does not materially alter the assessment undertaken on the merits of the application and it remains that officers recommend that the application be approved.'

The Ward Member advised Members that there were strict deeds related to the property therefore the development would be out of character and there would be a parking and amenity issue.

Other Members felt the proposal would constitute overdevelopment, when all the houses were meant to be set back. There would also be a loss of a parking space and trees and shrubs.

Resolved that application 16/0575 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 Committee Members had received a letter from the applicant.

Councillor Conrad Sturt also declared that he had been contacted by the resident at number 10 in relation to the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

Note 3

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 22 September 2016

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

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

 - + Present
 - Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes:

In Attendance: Duncan Carty, Andrew Crawford, Gareth John and Jonathan Partington.

12/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 25 August 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

13/P Application Number: 15/0934 - Woodhall, Woodhall Lane, Sunningdale, SL5 9QW

The application was for the erection of part two storey, part single storey 6 bedroom dwelling house with basement with associated walled courtyard to include 2 part single, part two storey buildings to provide ramped basement access and 4 self-contained apartments following the demolition of existing building. (Amended plan rec'd 11/04/2016), (Additional info received 18/07/16).

This application has been referred to the Committee because it followed an earlier approval SU/12/0161 for the same development by the Committee (against the officer recommendation).

There were no updates in respect of this application.

Members noted this application had been approved in 2012 with special circumstances, but work had not commenced and the permission had now lapsed. The Committee was advised that, as there was no extant permission, the application had to be considered afresh and that the previous Committee decision carried limited weight.

Resolved that application 15/0934 be refused for the reasons set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that all Committee Members had been sent a statement by the applicant's agent.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Note 3

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and, Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Adrian Page, Robin Perry and Conrad Sturt.

14/P Application Number: 16/0537 - Old Dean Recreation Ground, Wimbledon Road, Camberley

The application was for the consent to display a non-illuminated freestanding community notice board, measuring 1m x 1.06m, and displayed at a height of 1m above ground level.

The application has been reported to Committee because the applicant was Surrey Heath Borough Council.

There were no updates submitted for this application:

Resolved, that application 16/0537 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 Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry.

Note 2

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

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

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 25 July 2016

- Rebecca Jennings-Evans (Chairman)
+ Cllr Conrad Sturt (Vice Chairman in the Chair)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr David Lewis
+ Cllr Rodney Bates	- Cllr Jonathan Lytle
- Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Bruce Mansell
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Dan Adams for Cllr Edward Hawkins
Cllr David Lewis for Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans

In Attendance: Sheena Adrian, Service Accountant (Capital & Assets & Treasury)
Karen Limmer, Head of Legal
Alex Middleton, Senior Auditor

1AS Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Audit and Standards Committee meeting held on 31 March 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2AS Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3AS External Audit- Financial Statements Audit Plan 2015/16

The Committee received a report setting out how the Council's External Auditor's, KPMG, planned to discharge its duties in relation to their audit of Surrey Heath Borough Council's financial statements for 2015/16.

The two key objectives of the audit were to:

- i. Provide an opinion on the Council's financial statements
- ii. Draw conclusions about the arrangements the Council had in place for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in their use of resources.

The audit had been completed and a satisfactory verdict had been returned. A full update would be given to the Audit and Standards Committee at their meeting on 19 September 2016. The audit had identified two key risks, the first related to the valuation of land and buildings and the second related to new borrowing which occurred during the 2015/16 financial year.

It was clarified that the valuation of council owned land and buildings was carried out by external surveyors and valuations were developed using CIPFA guidelines and industry standard formulae.

It was acknowledged that the requirement to report any uncorrected omissions or misstatements that were above £45,000 did appear to be punitively low however this level had been set following the difficulties that the Council had experienced with the implementation of the new financial management system during the previous financial year.

The Committee noted the report.

4AS Annual Governance Statement

The Committee considered a report setting out the draft Annual Corporate Governance Statement 2015/16.

There was a statutory requirement for the Council to produce an Annual Corporate Governance statement which reviewed the effectiveness of the Council's control systems and formed part of the final accounts for each financial year. The Statement set out the governance arrangements in place at the Council, addressed any key issues identified during the year and summarised progress made towards addressing any previously identified issues.

It was reported that the Council's Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer considered the Council's governance arrangements to be adequate and effective. Whilst no significant governance issues had been identified in 2015/16 a number of minor issues had been identified including the number of complex projects that the Council was involved with that were dependent on partnership working and these were being monitored through the planned work of the Council.

It was noted that the number of members on the Audit and Standards Committee was seven and not the fifteen stated in the Statement and this would be amended.

It was acknowledged that although there was a high level of awareness about data protection the implementation of an online training package had not gone as smoothly as had been anticipated and a number of Council staff still needed to complete mandatory data protection training. It was agreed that a detailed report on data protection training would be brought to the Committee's next meeting.

RESOLVED that subject to the amendments noted the draft Annual Governance Statement be approved for sign off by the Council's Leader and Chief Executive.

5AS Internal Audit Annual Report 2015-16

The Committee received a report summarising the work carried out by the Council's Internal Audit function during the 2015/16 financial year.

It was reported that during the 2015/16 financial year, the internal audit function carried out 20 audits; eighteen of which were completed in line with requirements set out in the Annual Plan and two which were unscheduled audits. The audits covered a wide range of services including ICT security arrangements, the Council's Recruitment and selection processes, information governance, grounds maintenance, the financial controls in place at the Windle Valley Day Centre and the Council's use of consultants and professional advisors. The audit work had found that although the Council's control systems were generally sound however areas of weakness that needed to be addressed had been identified and a total of 51 recommendations were made as a result. 15 of these recommendations were classified as being essential (or high) and required immediate attention to address perceived substantial weaknesses.

The Committee noted the ad-hoc work done by the Council's Internal Audit Function for external organisations. The Committee stressed that it was imperative that any further requests for help with audits from external organisations were carefully considered in order to ensure that the Council's limited resources were not spread too thinly and the Council was not put at risk.

The Committee noted the report.

6AS Annual Review of the Effectiveness of the System of Internal Audit

The Committee received a report setting out the outcomes of the Council's statutory annual review of the effectiveness of its system of internal audit for 2015/16.

The review had been based on:

- The work programme of the Audit and Standards Committee and any decisions made by the Committee
- Compliance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards
- An external audit of the work carried out by Internal Audit
- Performance against agreed work plans

It was reported that the review had found that the Council's internal audit systems were sound and internal control systems were working effectively and that recommendations identified in the 2014/15 review had been implemented. The review had recognised that the continued pressure on resources across the Council could impact on the Council's ability to deliver services and this was something that the Internal Audit function would need to be aware of and adapt to in the coming year.

The Committee noted the report.

7AS Annual Standards Report 2016

The Committee received the Monitoring Officer's Annual Report. The report included a summary of any key issues arising in relation to the Members' Code of

Conduct, an update on the appointment of Independent Persons to the Standards Committee and a forward look.

It was noted that the majority of issues raised with the Monitoring Officer during 2015/16 related to planning matters and in particular when interests need to be declared. Training sessions focused on decision making and standards issues have been held for all Borough council members. Training sessions on a range of subjects including planning matters have also been held for Parish Councillors.

The Council has entered into a partnership arrangement with other Surrey Councils to appoint a pool of Independent Persons who can be called on in the event of a Standards Inquiry becoming necessary. A meeting would take place in September to develop detailed plans for how the scheme would work.

Following their review of the Council's Scheme of Delegation, the Governance Working Group would continue its review of the Council's Constitution and a new Civic and Ceremonial Protocol was under development.

The Committee noted the report.

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held at on 19 September 2016

+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans (Chairman)
- Cllr Conrad Sturt (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	- Cllr Paul Ilnicki
+ Cllr Rodney Bates	+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Bruce Mansell

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Dan Adams for Cllr Paul Ilnicki

In Attendance: Sheena Adrian, Service Accountant
Neil Hewitson, Director, KPMG
Satinder Jas, Manager, KPMG
Kelvin Menon, Executive Head of Finance

8AS Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Audit and Standards Committee meeting held on 25 July be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9AS Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

10AS 2015/16 Financial Statements

The Committee received a report setting out the Council's audited Financial Statements for 2015/16 and the External Auditor's ISA260 Report for 2015/16.

ISA260 Audit Report 2015/16

Neil Hewitson, KPMG, presented the ISA260 External Audit Report 2015/16. The report set out any key issues identified as a result of KPMG's audit of the Council's financial statements for the year ending 31 March 2016 and provided an assessment of the Authority's arrangements to secure value for money.

The Auditors were pleased to report that unqualified opinions had been issued in respect of both the financial statements and value for money arrangements. It had been concluded that the Authority had made proper arrangements in place to ensure that it took properly informed decisions and effectively deployed resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for local residents. The work that had taken place over the last year to embed the new financial systems was noted and officers were congratulated on their work to implement eight of the ten recommendations made as a result of the 2014/15 audit.

The report acknowledged two significant risks to the Council: the valuation placed on land and buildings and borrowing of £17.9million. The Committee was informed that the Council's commercial property portfolio was considered to be a long term investment which was valued according to guidelines set out by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors. Any financial gains would only be realised when the property was sold and as such any short term falls in the commercial property market were not considered to be relevant at the current time. It was agreed that a list of properties within the Council's commercial property portfolio would be circulated to the Committee.

Two recommendations from the 2014/15 audit were not yet complete. The Committee was informed that workshops had been held with staff to analyse the Civica implementation and a formal report on the outcomes of these would be available by the end of the year. Work to formally document all budget monitoring discussions was ongoing and it was expected that standardised recording templates would be finalised by the end of September 2016.

In addition to completing the two outstanding 2014/15 recommendations, the audit report made one further recommendation to ensure that the work to restructure the finance systems continued to be embedded and strengthened.

Statement of Accounts 2015/16

The Committee received the audited Statement of Accounts for the 2015/16 financial year in line with statutory requirements the unaudited Statement had been published on the Council's website at the end of June 2016.

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

- It was agreed that an error in the narrative statement relating to the Borough's most deprived wards would be corrected to read St Michaels instead of St Pauls.
- The Council had only used half of the £1.2million received through the New Homes Bonus. The remaining funds had been placed in the Council's reserves and a decision on their use would be taken once the outcome of the Government consultation on reforming the New Homes Bonus was known.
- The Pension Fund had been reviewed at the end of March and the outcomes would be discussed in details with the actuaries in October. The fall in the value of gilt rates had impacted on the Fund's value however it was stressed that this was a situation that was not unique to Surrey Heath Borough Council.

RESOLVED that:

- i. The Chairman of the Committee approves the Financial Statements on behalf of the Council.
- ii. The Executive Head of Finance's letter of representation to the Auditors be approved.

CHAIRMAN