

# **COUNCIL MEETING**

## **14 December 2016**

# **COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK**

1. **Council - 9 November 2016** (Pages 3 - 6)
2. **Executive - 4 October 2016** (Pages 7 - 10)
3. **Executive - 9 November 2016** (Pages 11 - 22)
4. **Executive - 6 December 2016 (to follow)**
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 20 October 2016** (Pages 23 - 32)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 17 November 2016** (Pages 33 - 46)
7. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 22 November 2016** (Pages 47 - 52)
8. **Licensing Committee - 23 November 2016** (Pages 53 - 56)
9. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 7 December 2016 (to follow)**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY  
MEETING OF SURREY HEATH  
BOROUGH COUNCIL held at Surrey  
Heath House, Camberley on  
9 November 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 Joanne Potter
+ Cllr Moira Gibson	+ Cllr Nic Price
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Wynne Price
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	+ Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Paul Innicki	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	- Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

**41/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Richard Brooks, Colin Dougan, Oliver Lewis and Pat Tedder.

**42/C Minutes**

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held  
on 5 October 2016 be approved as a correct record.**

**43/C Joint Waste Contract**

The Council was informed that the Executive, at its meeting on 9 November 2016, had made decisions as outlined below:

- (i) that Bidder A be awarded the Joint Waste Collection and Street Cleansing Contract commencing on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2018 up to and including 5 June 2027, with the option to extend by one or more successive consecutive periods until 2 June 2041;
- (ii) that Council enters into the Joint Contract with each of the partner authorities and Bidder A;
- (iii) that the Council enters into the successor Inter Authority Agreement (Second IAA) with the other partner authorities, Elmbridge Borough Council, Mole Valley Borough Council and Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council (in its capacity as the waste disposal authority);
- (iv) that a lease of part of Doman Road Depot be granted, at a peppercorn rent, to Bidder A commencing on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2018 and co-terminus with Surrey Heath's participation in the Joint Contract and the Second IAA;

In addition the Executive had recommended as follows:

- (i) funding of £3.2m be included in the capital programme for 2017/18 and 2018/19 to provide capital funding for vehicle purchase funded by borrowing;
- (ii) the Executive Head of Corporate be authorised to update the Constitution with any required changes in light of agreeing the Second IAA; and
- (iii) the Community Portfolio Holder (and an appropriate named deputy) be appointed as the Council's representative on the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee.

Members were advised that in the process of developing the contract, it became clear that, if the Joint Waste Authority was to purchase the vehicles required to deliver the services, this would enable a further saving on the contract costs charged by the Contractor.

Accordingly, the participating authorities had agreed that the Contractor would procure and buy the vehicles, taking full responsibility for their specification and fitness for purpose, and then the Authority would buy the vehicles from the Contractor, funding the capital expenditure either from reserves or from Prudential Borrowing.

Vehicles would be owned by individual authorities but leased back to the contractor. The contractor had guaranteed the life of each vehicle and would be required to cover the remaining term of the lease should a vehicle require replacement before its book life was complete. Should the contract be terminated, any residual value would pass back to the individual authority together with any unamortised debt.

The Second Inter Authority Agreement, which the Executive had adopted at its meeting on 9 November 2016, set out how liabilities, rights, duties, undertakings and responsibilities arising from or out of the Joint Contract would be shared and managed between the authorities and also provided the terms governing the Partner Authorities' joint working arrangements throughout the term (including any extension) of the Joint Contract.

The Second IAA outlined the governance arrangements to oversee the Joint Contract and how decisions in relation to the Joint Contract and the services delivered by the contractor would be made by elected Members and officers. It also established new Terms of Reference for the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee (JWCSC) to oversee the implementation and evolution of the contract over its lifetime.

The revised governance arrangements included retaining some decisions for Executive or Council, as well as delegating some decisions formerly exercised by the Executive to the JWCSC. Any consequential amendments to the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers would also need to be considered.

It was proposed that £3.2m be included in the capital programme in 2017/18 and 2018/19 in order to provide capital funding for the vehicle purchase, to be funded by borrowing. It was also proposed that the Executive Head of Corporate be authorised to make any required changes to the Constitution arising from the Executive's decision to agree a Joint Waste Contract and a second Inter Authority Agreement.

It was proposed by Councillor Moira Gibson and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and

#### **Resolved**

- (i) to note the decisions of the Executive made on 9 November 2016 relating to the award of the Joint Waste Collection and Street Cleansing Contract, the entering into of the Inter Authority Agreement and the lease of part of Doman Road;**
- (ii) that funding of £3.2m to be included in the capital programme for 2017/18 and 2018/19 to provide capital funding for vehicle purchase funded by borrowing;**
- (iii) that the Executive Head of Corporate be authorised to update the Constitution with any required changes in light of agreeing the Second Inter Authority Agreement; and**
- (iv) that the Community Portfolio Holder be appointed as the Council's representative on the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee and the Regulatory Portfolio Holder be appointed as the deputy representative.**

#### **44/C Revision to Prudential Indicators**

The Council considered a report proposing a change to the Council's Prudential Indicators to permit further borrowing to allow investment in property in furtherance of the Council's Key Priority 2. The increase in Prudential Indicators did not commit the Council to borrow as this would be a decision based on a business case showing the financial return. It would also be necessary to increase the Capital Programme for 2016/17.

Members were advised that when entering into borrowing the Council must be confident not only that the interest could be serviced but also that the debt could be repaid through the mechanism of a Minimum Revenue Payment. This risk was minimised by only investing in assets which complied with the Property Acquisition Strategy and by borrowing on a fixed basis for the longest possible period. The Council was working with its financial advisors on its borrowing strategy in order to increase returns whilst reducing risk.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the setting of the level of External Debts and the Prudential Indicators be approved as set out in Annex A; and**
- (ii) the Capital Programme for 2016/17 be increased by £36 million for property investment in accordance with the Property Acquisition Strategy.**

Mayor

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 4  
October 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 David Mansfield

**33/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**34/E Public Space Protection Orders**

The Executive considered a consultation plan for the introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO), which was designed to tackle low level anti-social behaviour within the borough.

In 2004 the Council had implemented the current Designated Public Protection Orders (DPPOs) areas in Camberley Town Centre, Old Dean, St Michaels, Heatherside and Frimley Green Recreation Ground, which provided Surrey Police with the powers to seize alcohol or issue fines when necessary.

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 had replaced Designated Public Place Orders with PSPOs. The existing DPPO areas would be enforceable until 14 October 2017. PSPOs would need to be implemented in order for these powers to be enforced after this date.

A single PSPO could include a multiple number of restrictions and requirements within one order. The Executive considered suggestions in relation to expanding the existing area around controlled alcohol zones and utilising the wider powers to enforce emerging problems such as intoxicating substances, to deter begging in Camberley Town Centre only, and enhance the dog control powers within the 35 designated park and green spaces areas within the borough.

It was emphasised that at this stage the Executive was only being asked to approve the proposals for consultation.

Members discussed the consultation plan and agreed to clarify references to begging and homelessness in order to ensure that they were referred to as distinct and separate matters.

**RESOLVED to approve the Public Spaces Protection Order consultation plan, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.**

**35/E Local Development Scheme Update**

The Executive was reminded that local authorities were required to produce a Local Development Scheme (LDS) which set out the planning documents the Council expected to produce within the next 3 years. The Council's last LDS had been produced in 2012.

Members noted a new LDS which set out the Local Plan documents the Council intended to review over the next 3 years.

The Executive agreed to establish a Local Plan Working Group to oversee the progress of work on the Local Plan review. Proposed Terms of Reference for the Working Group were considered and it was agreed to amend the membership to 10 Members, to be comprised of 8 Conservative Group and 2 non- Conservative Group Members, with nominations for membership to be confirmed in due course.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Local Development Scheme covering the period 2016-2019, as attached at Annex 2 to the agenda report, be agreed;**
- (ii) a Local Plan Working Group be set up to oversee the work on the Local Plan Review; and**
- (iii) the Working Group's Terms of Reference be as set out at Annex 1 to the agenda report, as amended, with Group Leaders' nominations for membership to be advised prior to the first meeting.**

**36/E Home Improvement Agency and Disabled Facility Grants**

The Executive was informed that the Council had received an increased capital allocation from the Department of Communities and Local Government to deliver Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) in 2016/17.

The Council had received a 50% cut in revenue funding in 2016/17 from Surrey County Council. This funding had been used to fund a Case Officer within the Council's internal Home Improvement Agency. Members were advised that the Case Officer role was considered to be essential to support older and disabled people in a holistic way to maintain their independence in the home and help them through the application process for a DFG.

It was noted that, as the capital spend on DFGs would increase with the additional funding, there would be a corresponding increase in fee income. It was therefore proposed that this additional income be used to fund the Case Officer for the second half of 2016/17, in place of the reduced funding from Surrey County Council.



**RESOLVED that**

- (i) authority be given to spend the additional Disabled Facility Grant (DFG) allocation received from the Department of Communities and Local Government; and**
- (ii) a Case Officer within the Home Improvement Agency (HIA) be funded from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 from additional fees generated from the increased DFG spend.**

**37/E Economic Strategy Update**

The Executive noted an update on progress against the Economic Development Strategy and its action plan which had been adopted in 2014.

**RESOLVED to note the update on the progress of the Economic Development Strategy and request a further update in 12 months.**

**38/E The 2018 Parliamentary Boundary Review**

On 13 September 2016 the Boundary Commission for England (BCE) had published its initial proposals for new parliamentary constituency boundaries, the first of three rounds of consultation which would be undertaken before the BCE made its recommendations for new parliamentary boundaries to Parliament in September 2018.

The Executive was advised that, in conducting its review, the BCE must adhere to rules set by Parliament in 2011 which result in a reduction of the number of constituencies in England from 533 to 501. The rules also stated that every constituency, with the exception of the 2 constituencies in the Isle of Wight, must have an electorate that was no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

It was reported that the BCE was proposing to transfer the Bisley ward, which currently had 2,610 electors, from the Surrey Heath Constituency to the Woking constituency. The proposals also retained the current arrangements for the Surrey Heath Constituency to comprise the Guildford Borough wards of Ash Vale, Ash Wharf and Ash South and Tongham.

Members discussed the proposals and agreed to submit a response stating that the Council considered that Bisley should not be moved to Woking Constituency, for the following reasons:

1. The BCE's proposal reflected the current ward boundaries for Bisley, which could be affected by the separate ongoing review of the Council's ward boundaries. Although the revised local government boundaries had not yet been decided, the Council was minded to recommend that, from 2019, Bisley be combined with West End to form a single ward. If, as was understood, the BCE only moved areas on a ward basis, the changes could also result in West End also transferring to Woking Constituency, which would disrupt its numbers.

2. The electorate for Surrey Heath Constituency as proposed by the Boundary Commission, which included the three Ash wards but excluded Bisley, was 74,975. Retaining Bisley within the Constituency would not exceed the maximum electorate for a constituency and, although it would impact upon the electorate totals for Woking Constituency, given the low numbers involved, this could be resolved elsewhere.
3. Moving Bisley to the Woking Constituency would add unnecessary complexity. The proposed changes would exacerbate issues around coterminosity, which could impact heavily on the complexity of running combined elections in the future, thereby adding further risks to the election process.
4. The complexity of the boundaries would create confusion for residents.

**RESOLVED to authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader and the Bisley ward councillors, to finalise and submit the Council's response to the 2018 Parliamentary Boundary Review to the Boundary Commission for England.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 9  
November 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 Dan Adams, Cllr David Allen, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Bill Chapman, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Cllr Jonathan Lytle, Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper, Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Cllr Max Nelson, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Chris Pitt, Cllr Darryl Ratiram, Cllr Ian Sams and Cllr Valerie White

**39/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 October 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**40/E Questions from Members**

No questions were received from Members.

**41/E 2016/17 Mid-Year Review Report**

The Executive considered a report summarising the performance of the Council against its corporate objectives, priorities and success measures for the period between 1 April and 30 September 2016.

**RESOLVED to note the 2016/17 Mid-Year Review Report**

**42/E Deepcut Village Centre Commuted Sums**

The Executive was reminded that the Deepcut Village Centre had been built as part of the Alma Dettingen development at Deepcut. A commuted sum of £382,000 for maintenance of the venue over the life-time of the building had been included in the Section 106 Planning Agreement.

It was reported that the changing rooms in the Centre had been intended to provide facilities for outdoor pitches. However, as the playing fields were not to a standard to play competitive football and local residents had not originally supported the development of football pitches on the site, the development company had left this area of land as green space and the changing rooms had remained un-used.

The Deepcut Village Association, which managed the venue, was proposing that the under-utilised changing rooms be redeveloped into a small hall in order to offer an improved and expanded facility for the local community and to help increase revenue. The centre was used by 700-800 people per week and was expected to increase to over 1000 people per week after the works were completed.

Members were reminded that the Association had applied to the Council for a Community Fund Grant, which the Executive considered on 6 September 2016; whilst the Executive had supported the proposal, it had agreed to defer the award of any Community Fund grant money until it had considered whether the Deepcut Village Centre Commuted Sum funds could be used instead.

Approval was therefore sought for the use of S106 funds of up to £92,400 for internal redevelopment of the changing rooms. Members were advised that, if this funding was agreed it would negate the need for the Community Fund Grant.

### **RESOLVED**

- (i) a maximum of £92,400 be allocated to the Deepcut Village Association from the Deepcut Village Centre Commuted Sum Reserve, towards the Deepcut Village Centre redevelopment proposal; and**
- (ii) the decision on the final figure allocated be delegated to the Executive Head of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Regulatory and Portfolio Holder for Business.**

#### **43/E Joint Waste Contract - Award of Contract and second Inter Authority Agreement**

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 3rd December 2013, it had resolved to jointly procure a new waste collection and street cleansing contract with a number of other local authorities. The Joint Waste Collection Contract (JWCC) has now been procured to provide a range of waste collection, recycling, street cleaning and associated services for the four partner authorities: Elmbridge Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council, Surrey Heath Borough Council and Woking Borough Council.

Whilst the Partner Authorities currently operated successful and cost-effective recycling services, all of which are operated under individual contracts, the aim of the Joint Contract was to put a contract in place which would build on existing success by encouraging further innovation and yield significant savings and service benefits for local tax payers.

Members were reminded that the Partner Authorities and Surrey County Council, as the Waste Disposal Authority, had signed an Inter-Authority Agreement (First IAA) during 2013/14 to regulate the terms and nature of the procurement. The Partner Authorities had been working together to procure the joint contract supported by a Project Manager and specialist technical and legal advisers.

Whilst the Joint Contract has been designed to provide each of the Partner Authorities with the same specification, the specification made some allowance for local choice and flexibility. Through the Joint Contract, Surrey Heath would be procuring the following services:

- Municipal waste and recycling collection service, including mixed dry recycling, food waste, garden waste, electrical items, textiles and commercial waste;
- Bulky waste collection service;
- Clinical waste collection service;
- Street-cleaning service;
- Service Users' Contact Management, including the administration of the garden waste service.

The initial term of the Joint Contract was 10 years, expiring on 3 June 2027, but after the initial term it could be extended with flexible extensions of up to a further 14 years, giving a total maximum 24 year term.

The Joint Contract had been procured so as to enable all other Surrey waste collection authorities to have the opportunity to join during the life of the contract, should they so wish; however, the arrangement ensured that the four Partner Authorities as the first cohort of authorities joining the JWCC would not be adversely affected by those joining at a later stage.

The Executive noted the main stages of the procurement process along with the key contract features. The outcome of the tender evaluation process was a recommendation to award the contract to Bidder 'A'.

In order to ensure the contract was administered appropriately, a revised IAA (Second IAA) was required, which would set out how liabilities, rights, duties, undertakings and responsibilities arising from or out of the Joint Contract would be shared and managed between the authorities. It would provide the terms governing the Partner Authorities' joint working arrangements throughout the term, including any extension, of the Joint Contract.

The Second IAA outlined how decisions in relation to the Joint Contract and the services delivered by the contractor would be made by elected Members and officers, and established new Terms of Reference for the JWCSC to oversee the implementation and evolution of the contract over its lifetime. The IAA also established a Contract Partnering Board and outlined the role of the Authorising Officer and the Contract Management Office.

Members recognised that the outcome of the process was the result of a considerable amount of work and extended their thanks to all who had been involved in the project.

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) that Bidder A be awarded the Joint Waste Collection and Street Cleansing Contract (Joint Contract) with service delivery in Surrey Heath commencing on 5th February 2018**

up to and including 5 June 2027, with the option for the participating authorities and the contractor to agree to extend the Joint Contract by one or more successive consecutive periods until 2 June 2041;

- (ii) to enter into the Joint Contract with each of the partner authorities and Bidder A;
- (iii) to enter into the successor Inter Authority Agreement (Second IAA) with each of the other partner authorities, Elmbridge Borough Council, Mole Valley Borough Council and Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council (in its capacity as the waste disposal authority (WDA)), which will regulate the relationship between the participating authorities (as necessitated by entry into the Joint Contract), establishes the shared contract management office (CMO) and the required governance arrangements, including the revised terms of reference for the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee (JWCSC Committee);
- (iv) to grant a lease of part of Doman Road Depot to Bidder A commencing on 5th February 2018 and co-terminus with Surrey Heath's participation in the Joint Contract and the Second IAA at a peppercorn rent;
- (v) that responsibility for finalising the detail of the Second IAA and other related issues be delegated to the Executive Head for Community in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Community; and
- (vi) that responsibility to implement any actions necessary to implement the recommendations of this report, including any changes to the Council's constitution, be delegated to the Executive Head of Community; and
- (vii) that the Council be the administering authority for the Joint Contract.

**RECOMMENDED to Council that**

- (i) funding of £3.2m be included in the capital programme for 2017/18 and 2018/19 to provide capital funding for vehicle purchase funded by borrowing;
- (ii) the Executive Head of Corporate be authorised to update the Constitution with any required changes in light of agreeing the Second IAA;
- (iii) the Community Portfolio Holder (and an appropriate named deputy) be appointed as the Council's representative on the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee;

#### **44/E Future Surrey Waste Partnership**

The Executive was informed that the Surrey Waste Partnership, which comprised the waste collection authorities (WCA) and Surrey County Council as the waste disposal authority (WDA), had enabled Surrey authorities to perform increasingly well by working together. This partnership working had contained the costs of waste management in the county as well as enabled improved recycling rates and service improvements for residents.

Members were advised that analysis had indicated that, whilst the current level of co-operation had been beneficial, greater collaboration and co-ownership of the entire waste service would result in significant financial savings and further improvements to the services offered to residents. The analysis had suggested that that up to £12.4m per year could be saved from the collective budgets of WCAs and the WDA through operational efficiencies, increasing recycling, gaining greater value from materials, increasing commercial waste collections, and back office efficiencies.

In addition, the creation of a single entity for waste services in Surrey could further reduce the overall costs of waste management by aligning the operational and management functions of all the authorities within a co-ownership model and ensure that waste management in Surrey was designed as one complete system.

It was reported that neither the Joint Waste Collection Contract (JWCC), nor the Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) that would govern the future working arrangements of the JWCC Authorities currently included any of the waste disposal arrangements currently managed by Surrey County Council. This arrangement resulted in continued duplication of some waste functions, as well as the continued risk that policies and services designed by the disposal authority were not in line with those designed by the collection authorities, and vice versa.

It was therefore proposed to support the further development of the co-owned single tier entity, immediately expand the scope and function of the current IAA between the JWCC Authorities to include some of the waste functions from the county council, and amend the IAA to reflect these changes.

#### **RESOLVED to**

- (i) extend the Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) relating to the Joint Waste Collection Contract (JWCC) and the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee to include the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) functions (as follows) that currently reside with the county council, on the basis that this will not affect how decisions related to the JWCC are made nor have any negative financial implications for Surrey Heath Borough Council**

#### **WDA Partnership functions to be included in the IAA:**

- Kerbside improvement initiatives to increase recycling and reduce waste arisings;**
- Payments to waste collection authorities;**

- Data management and monitoring;
  - Policy development and alignment;
  - Performance management;
  - Engagement with government, the waste sector, industry and others on the waste agenda;
- (ii) delegate responsibility to the Executive Head Community in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Community Services and other members of the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee to amend the Inter Authority Agreement to enable this expansion; and
- (iii) support further development of the co-owned single tier entity model for waste services and asks the Executive Head Community , in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Community to work with partner authorities within the joint collection contract and Surrey Waste Partnership to develop the model with the aim of presenting a business plan to the Executive in 2017.

#### **45/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)
46/E	3
47/E	3
48/E	3
49/E	3

Note: Minutes 46/E and 48/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.

#### **46/E One Public Estate and Garden Village Bids**

The Executive made decisions in relation to a One Public Estate Bid and a Garden Village Bid.

#### **47/E Urgent Action**

The Executive noted Urgent Action taken in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers.

#### **48/E Acquisition of Property**

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



## **49/E      Review of Exempt Items**

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

### **RESOLVED that**

- (i)    the confidential annex relating to the agenda report for minute 43/E remains exempt for the present time;**
- (ii)   information at minute 46/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time pending review about whether the decision and associated information can be made public;**
- (iii)   information at minute 46/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt until the developer makes any decision public; and**
- (iv)   minutes 47/E and 48/E, the decisions therein, and any associated paperwork remain exempt for the present time.**

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 20 October 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 Jonathan Lytle             | - Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper       | + Cllr Valerie White    |
| + Present                         |                         |
| - Apologies for absence presented |                         |

Substitutes: Cllr Dan Adams (In place of Cllr Richard Brooks) and Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Victoria Wheeler)

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Joe Fullbrook, Daniel Harrison, Laura James, Jonathan Partington, Emma Pearman and Jenny Rickard

**15/P Minutes**

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

**16/P Application Number: 14/0451 - Land South of Beldam Bridge Road, West End, Woking**

The application was for the erection of 2 no. five bedroom and 1no. four bedroom two storey detached dwellings with detached double garages and accommodation in the roof with landscaping and access. (Amended and additional plans/information recv'd 26/5/16)

This application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory Services because of its strategic significance.

Members received the following updates:

*Update – At Paragraph 3.7, the hearing for appeal for SU/15/0455 was held in September 2016.*

*An upfront SAMM payment of £2,696 has been received.*

**CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION:**

***TO GRANT, subject to conditions***

Add additional condition:

*The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Those details shall include:*

- a) A design that satisfies the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Hierarchy and is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS;*
- b) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+30% Climate Change allowance for climate change storm events), during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storages volumes shall be provided. This shall include evidence if applicable showing that no further storage is viable for this site to provide for restriction to closer to Greenfield runoff rates;*
- c) A finalised drainage layout plan that details impervious areas and the location of each SuDS element, pipe diameters and their respective levels;*
- d) Long and cross sections of each SuDS element;*
- e) Details of how the site drainage will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development; and*
- f) Details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the SuDS elements and details of who is responsible for their maintenance.*

*Reason: To ensure the design meets the technical stands for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and to comply with Policies CP2 and Dm10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

Some Members were concerned about any further development around the site. Officers advised that the land south and east of the site was Green Belt land.

**Resolved that application 14/0451 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr Mansfield, in his capacity as Chairman of Bisley Scouts, declared that he had received a donation from the developer.

**Note 2**

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mrs Diane Doney spoke in objection and Mr Edmund Bain and Mr Hutchinson, the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

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

**Note 4**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

**17/P Application Number:16/0526 - Frimhurst Farm, Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut, Camberley GU16 6RF**

The application was for the continued use of the existing industrial centre (use classes B1, B2 and B8) and movement between these uses. (Retrospective). (Additional Plan Rec'd 21/09/2016).

Members received the following updates:

'Paragraph 3.8

*A split decision was issued for application 16/0528 for a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use. This allowed most of the E areas applied for (E2, E3, E4A and E4B) but refused the certificate in respect of E1B as it was not considered that it had been in continuous use for at least 10 years prior to the first Enforcement Notice being served on this area.*

*These areas lie outside the application site of this application and are subject to an Inquiry on 8<sup>th</sup> November.*

Location Plan

*This has been updated because it was incorrect on the western boundary. The correct plan will be shown on the presentation.'*

Some Members felt that as the applicant had carried out the changes required that the proposal was acceptable.

It was suggested that should the Committee approve the application, an informative be added to the decision notice stating that the approval represented

the limit of acceptable development on this site and no further applications would be considered favourably.

**Resolved that application 16/0526 be approved subject to conditions, and an informative, stating that the approval represented the limit of acceptable development on this site, the wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr Colin Dougan declared that he had visited the applicant and the site in his role as Economic Development Officer; and Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper declared that she worked with the applicant's husband on a different site.

**Note 2**

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Stephen Andrews, the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins.

**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 refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Dan Adams, Colin Dougan, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White

The recommendation was lost.

**Note 5**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan 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 approve the application:



Councillors Dan Adams, Colin Dougan, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Ian Sams, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson and David Mansfield.

The recommendation was carried.

**18/P Application Number: 16/0814 - London Road Recreation Ground, (Camberley on Ice), Grand Avenue, Camberley**

The application was for the Installation and operation of a temporary ice rink and associated structures for a Christmas Market on the tennis court and old putting green areas to be held annually for a 5 year period (2016 to January 2021) between November to January (including construction and dismantling periods) and open daily to the public until 9pm, excluding Christmas Day. To include a skate lodge/café/bar marquee, chalets/trader huts, children funfair rides, a bandstand, toilet trailers and ancillary floodlighting and festoon lighting, and perimeter fencing with pedestrian access off Grand Avenue and event traffic management measures. (Amended Plan - Rec'd 28/09/2016). (Additional information rec'd 06/10/2016).

This application had been reported to Committee because it is a Council sponsored event and it has also been called in by Cllr E Hawkins and Cllr Dougan.

A site visit took place at the site.

Members received the following updates:

Paragraph 6.1

*A total of 15 objections (i.e. from different households) have now been received. One objector comments the number of weeks the event is on is too long, otherwise these letters reiterate the concerns reported on pages 60 and 61 of the agenda.*

Paragraph 7.7.2 (see also paragraphs 5.2 and 5.8)

*The applicant has now provided a Waste Management Plan. The Environment Health Officer (EHO) supports this plan provided that the bins adhere to the Council colour scheme for collections, the skip for general waste are covered and location of the waste to be taken is provided. The EHO has agreed that this can be secured by informative.*

*Further details have also been provided on the freezing process and ice disposal, summarised below:*

- The antifreeze (glycol) is contained entirely within the pump system. At least 5 days before the rink is ready to open the system would be filled and the process to create ice would happen
- The glycol is watered down and not a neat chemical. With the rink being bunded the likelihood of large quantities pouring away are next to nil.
- During use of the rink the ice dump volumes would not be more than 1,000L per day in snow scraped off the ice. The dump is located on the east side of the rink and water run off can be to this point.
- The only water would be from an on-site hosepipe and as none of the water/ice would be contaminated no containment is required for the small quantities of run-off and there would be no requirement to discharge into the foul system
- When the rink is de-rigged the ice can be melted quickly within 24 hours by heating the glycol or melted slowly by just turning the system off and allowing melting over several days.

*The EHO and Council's Drainage Engineer support these details. The Drainage Engineer advises that in the event that the melting process is unmanned then the longer melt process ought to be employed to minimise risk. The applicant has confirmed that the melting process would be manned.*

#### Amended conditions

*10. The footprint produced by artificial lighting of the application site shall not extend into the curtilage of any adjacent residential property; and, no lighting associated with the development, other than security lighting (the specifics of which shall be agreed with the Council's Environmental Health Department at least 14 days prior to the setting up of each annual event), shall operate outside the hours of 09:00 and 21:30, unless required for emergency purposes.*

*Reason: as per agenda*

*11. Delete the word 'broadly'*

*13. The applicant shall arrange a site meeting with the Council's Tree Officer at least 7 days prior to the setting up of each annual event for the Officer to confirm and agree the correct positioning of tree protection fencing which shall be chestnut pale fencing supported by tree stakes. Thereafter the protection shall be retained throughout the period of operation.*

*Reason: as per agenda.*

#### Amended informatives

1. Insert additional final sentence to state, '...The applicant will need to provide details to [angela.goddard@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:angela.goddard@surreycc.gov.uk) at least 21 days prior to implementation.'
2. Amend last sentence to state '...The local background levels will need to be agreed with the Council's Environment Health Department at least 28 days prior to the premises being opened to the public.'

#### Additional informative

3. *The applicant is advised that the bins ought to adhere to the Council's colour scheme for collections and that the skip for general waste be covered. The applicant is requested to advise the Council's Environmental Health Department of the destination as to where the waste will be transported to, at least 28 days prior to the premises being opened to the public.'*

There was some concern regarding the noise that would be generated by live music, fairground rides and plant equipment and the responsibility for monitoring this. There were also concerns regarding whether the traffic management plan would be ready in time for the opening of the event, particularly with the proposed changes in traffic movement on Southwell Park Road.

Members were advised that an independent company would be used to monitor noise and the County Highways Authority had raised no objection to the changes to the traffic movement. The traffic management plan had already been submitted in draft form and there were minor changes to be made.

Some Members felt that the retail units at the site would take custom from the High Street whereas others felt the event would attract more customers into Camberley.

Some Members were concerned that the application was for a five year period and should the event cause problems for residents, it may be difficult to address this. Officers advised that the premises licence could be reviewed to address any concerns.

Condition 9 of the report stated that there would be no delivery and service vehicles in operation between 23.00 hours and 7.30 hours on any day. Members felt that the times in this condition should be amended to 21.00 hours to 7.30 hours.

**Resolved that application 16/0814 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and the amendment condition 9 to 'there would be no delivery and service vehicles in operation between 21.00 hours and 7.30 hours on any day.'**

**Note 1**

Councillor Colin Dougan declared an interest as he lived close to the site and he left the Chamber during the consideration of the application.

It was noted for the record that Cllrs Valerie White and Ruth Hutchinson declared that they had been members of the Licensing Sub Committee which had considered the premises licence application for this site.

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had been present at part of the Licensing Sub Committee meeting where the applicant's premises licence had been considered.

**Note 2**

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Alan Kirkland and Mr Chris MacDonald, representing the Southwell

Park Residents' Association, spoke in objection. Mr James Hitchens, the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

**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 Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams. Conrad Sturt, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:  
Councillor Pat Tedder

**19/P Application Number: 16/0759 - 49 Bosman Drive, Windlesham GU20 6JN**

The application was for the division of existing 6 bedroom dwelling to form 2 two bedroom dwellings with associated parking and garden space.

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

Officers had recommended that the proposal be approved as they felt that the development would be acceptable in terms of the principle of development, in character terms and impact on residential amenity, highways and impact on infrastructure.

However, some Members felt that the proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood and there would be a large increase in the density of the dwelling. Parking was also a concern. It was suggested that the reason for refusal given at a previous Planning Applications Committee meeting for the same proposal should be considered:

*'The sub-division of the site to create a separate additional dwelling would result in a density of use that would be inappropriate development, not in keeping with the established neighbourhood and harmful to the character of the area, contrary to Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

Some Members felt that as the dwelling would not change externally, the proposal was reasonable and there would be enough parking for two properties on the

existing site. The proposal would provide extra housing which was needed in accordance with the need in the five year housing supply.

**Resolved that application 16/0759 be refused due to the inappropriate density in the area and being out of character with the established neighbourhood, the wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that all Members had received documentation from the applicant, and Councillor Sturt had been contacted by residents in his ward.

**Note 2**

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Roger Chatfield and Mr Andrew Barette spoke in objection and Mr Gareth Bertram, the applicant spoke in support.

**Note 3**

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

**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 Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

The recommendation was lost.

**Note 5**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Conrad Sturt 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 Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan and Ian Sams.

The recommendation was carried.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 17 November 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 Jonathan Lytle  | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper (from part-way through min 21/P) | + Cllr Valerie White    |
- + Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Nick Chambers)

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Abinel Gurung, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington, Emma Pearman, Neil Praise and Cllr Wynne Price (left Chamber after min 21/P)

**20/P Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**21/P Application Number: 14/1000 - Hawk Farm, Church Lane, Bisley GU24 9EA**

The application was to remove Condition 3 under Section 73 of application ref. BGR/8745 (Outline application to erect nursery managers dwelling and garages) to allow non-agricultural occupancy of dwelling. (Amended plans recv'd 26/10/16)

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

There was a site visit at the site.

Members received the following updates:

*'Paragraph 6.1*

*Following consultation on the latest marketing undertaken a further 4 letters of objection have been received. The main points raised are summarised below:*

- *Insufficient period for marketing with it only being marketed for 3 months at its lowered price. Hamptons assertion that 6-12 months is a long time is*

*incorrect as the size, price or unusual nature of the property may mean it takes longer.*

- *Other factors apart from this restriction also affect its saleability, for example Brexit.*
- *Marketing is not extensive enough. Should have relied on one than more estate agent to market the property. No estate agent board outside the site and property currently not on UK Land & Farms website.*
- *The property seems overpriced in relation to other dwellings in the vicinity, particularly when it was first marketed in 2014 (other examples in the area have been provided – 4 bed houses sell for £700 -800k)*
- *The pricing reduction is insufficient as the industry norm for reduction in pricing on houses with agricultural restrictions with less than 20-30 acres is 35%*
- *No mention of NHBC guarantee on house being sold which is unusual and thus reduces its saleability*
- *Other independent valuations ought to have been carried out by the Council and its Agricultural Advisor*
- *An inability to sell because the applicant built and further extended the property over and above the size and price that an agricultural worker could reasonably afford should not be a reason to remove the condition*

*[Officer comment: Even if the dwelling had been completed in the 1970s it may have been subsequently extended by the occupier (s) and so the same scenario may still exist i.e. seeking to sell a larger property than originally approved]*

- *Downgrading the restriction to equestrian or somewhat similar may be a workable compromise*

*[Officer comment: The applicant has not sought to amend the condition but to remove it. Equestrian use for the grazing of horses, working horses on the land or horses for slaughter is agriculture. A downgraded condition would not be justifiable unless an exceptional need could be proven, see paragraph 7.3.1. This is unlikely to be the case]*

- *Uncertainty over the applicant's land parcels and whether the applicant is also seeking the removal of the agricultural classification for the adjoining land. If the condition is removed then the adjoining land could be sold off separately leaving it for further future development and harming wildlife.*

*[Officer comment: The original parcel of land that this restriction related to covered a significant larger area of land, see paragraph 2.1 of report. However, this restriction also applies to, for example, retired farmers Nb.*



*the condition refers to people employed in agriculture in the vicinity. The applicant has also now marketed the adjoining land with the dwelling, see second bullet point paragraph 7.3.6 on page 113. Any future use of the adjoining land would require planning permission and inappropriate development would be resisted given its Green Belt location]*

*Further comments from the applicant/Hamptons (paragraph 7.3.6)*

*In response to the concerns raised the applicant explains the following:*

- The property has now been marketed for over 7 months*
- It is unsaleable primarily because the location of the property is not known for agricultural properties and therefore the number of buyers looking in this area who can meet the tie is limited*
- It is the restriction and not the cost that is making the property unsaleable*
- Most of the dwellings sold by Hamptons offers are received within the first 2 months of marketing*
- A 'for sale sign' is not a pre-requisite of selling a property. The majority of dwellings sold do not have one. 90% of prospective purchasers search on-line*
- Fails to accept that 59 potential purchasers is not extensive marketing*
- The property is receiving 14 viewings per day on Right-move and a further 22 on Zoopla.*
- Our marketing is extensive proven by in the area Hamptons Sunningdale covers between £1 - £5m we have sold the most houses in 2016 (source Rightmove).*
- The reference made to the property being worth less than £1m does not take into account that this is a new build and such properties are receiving between 5-10% over second hand properties. This combined with its specification, generous proportions and its locational advantages i.e. being close to the village yet benefiting from an attractive rural location with its garden backing onto fields*

*Paragraph 7.6.1*

*The applicant has now reinstated the historical curtilage by erection of a low picket fence.*

*Recommendation*

*Amended condition 1:*

*The residential curtilage is as shown outlined in red on drawing no. 574-P-16-4B and there shall be no enlargement to this curtilage. The existing picket fence, or an equivalent replacement, delineating the northern rear boundary of this residential curtilage shall be retained in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To retain control in the interests of the Green Belt and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

Officers had recommended approval of the application but some Members were of the opinion that the marketing exercise for the sale of the site had not been adequate. It was also felt that the proposal was overdevelopment in the Green Belt, was out of character and the applicant had been fully aware of the agricultural condition. It was also noted that a precedent should not be set. The unlawful siting of a mobile home on the site was also a concern.

Officers advised that the dwelling was lawful in the Green Belt and that an informative would be imposed for the removal of the mobile home following permission being granted for this application.

There was no proposer or seconder for the recommendation to approve the application.

Members considered the reasons for refusal and felt that the marketing strategy had been inadequate and a properly targeted marketing scheme should be carried out for at least 12 months and a realistic price be agreed for the sale. The informative would still be included regarding the removal of the mobile home.

**Resolved that application 14/1000 be refused for the reasons set out above, wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr Mansfield attended a Parish Council meeting where this application was considered. He did not take part in any debate and did not vote. The applicant also approached Cllr Mansfield but he did not engage in any discussion about the application.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

**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 Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**22/P      Application Number: 16/0447 - 15-17 Obelisk Way, Camberley GU15 3SD**

The application was for the outline application for planning permission for the erection of a four storey building comprising use Class A1-A5 on the ground floor and 16 residential units (Use Class C) on the three upper floors (with access, layout and scale to be considered and appearance and landscaping being reserved matters) following the demolition of existing buildings. (Amended plans & Additional Information rec'd 14/07/2016). (Additional information rec'd 23/09/2016).

Members received the following updates:

*'The legal agreement to secure SAMM has been completed.*

*The agent wishes to draw the Committee's attention to the fact the original building was rebuilt following a fire in the 1950's. Officers note this submission; however it is not clear the extent of the damage or the rebuild works. It is however clear from photographs of the existing building that other than the interest and quality of the façade of the building, the existing building has little architectural merit. There is also no objection being raised to the demolition of the existing building.*

*Deletion of the following text from the final sentence of paragraph 7.8.1*

*As detailed above this contribution includes the SANG payment but is in addition to the SAMM payment.'*

Some Members felt that the proposal would be an excellent opportunity for the Town Centre but some questioned the lack of affordable housing. Officers explained that the policy allowed for negotiation regarding viability of the provision of affordable housing. The consultant's findings were that it would not be viable to provide this.

Although no amenity space had been adopted for the site, Members were advised that each residential unit would have a terrace or balcony. There would also be allocated space for bins and cycles.

Some Members felt that the façade of the existing building should remain as it was an example of attractive architecture from the turn of the last century and that the building should be locally listed. Officers advised that the conservation officer had raised no objection to the building being demolished particularly when the sides and back of the building were purely functional and had no ascetic merit.

Members were reminded that the design and materials of the building was a reserved matter and would therefore return to the Planning Applications Committee for consideration. It was also noted that the proposal considered previously the retention of the front of the building but it had not lent itself to development for retail and residential.

**Resolved that application 16/0447 be approved as amended 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 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 Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillor Victoria Wheeler

**23/P Application Number: 16/0669 - Longacres Nursery, London Road, Bagshot GU19 5JB**

The application was for the erection of an attached glass house following part demolition of existing glass house for garden centre.

Members received the following updates:

*'Correction to report – At Paragraph 9.7.1, it is confirmed that the proposal would not increase internal retail accommodation.'*

*With further advice from the Council's Drainage Engineer, Condition 4 is to be replaced to be more proscriptive and more certainty of the requirements prior to implementation.*

**REPLACEMENT CONDITION 4:**

*The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Those details shall include:*

- a) A design that satisfies the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Hierarchy and is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS;*
- b) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+30% Climate Change allowance for climate change storm events), during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storages volumes shall be provided. This shall include*

- evidence if applicable showing that no further storage is viable for this site to provide for restriction to closer to Greenfield runoff rates;*
- c) A finalised drainage layout plan that details impervious areas and the location of each SuDS element, pipe diameters and their respective levels;*
  - d) Long and cross sections of each SuDS element; and*
  - e) Details of how the site drainage will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development.*

*Reason: To ensure the design meets the technical standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and to comply with Policies CP2 and Dm10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

The Chairman advised the Committee that the application was in accordance with the approved plans and it would not constitute an increase in retail provision.

Some Members were concerned that the succession of applications on this site would set precedence and that the site was becoming more than just a garden centre. Officers advised that conditions had been applied to limit sales. In addition other Members felt that the site was an asset to the borough.

**Resolved that application 16/0669 be approved as amended 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 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 Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, Pat Tedder and Valerie White

**24/P Application Number: 16/0678 - Bovingdon Cottage, and Cattery, Bracknell Road, Bagshot GU19 5HX**

The application was for the erection of 2 x 3 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom dwellings with attached garages, following demolition of existing bungalow and cattery/kennel buildings. (Amended Plan - Rec'd 20/10/2016 & 21/10/16). (Amended Plans + Additional Plan - Rec'd 24/10/2016.) (Amended & additional plans rec'd 25/10/16).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr White.

Members received the following updates:

***'Change to recommendation – it is now REFUSE for the following reason:***

*The applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority the presence or otherwise of protected species (in particular bats and reptiles), and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, contrary to paragraph 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005, Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

*Paragraphs 7.10.3 and 7.11.4*

*The SAMM payment has been received. The applicant has confirmed that the development will be CIL liable as the cattery part of the site has not been in use for the required amount of time for it to be exempt from CIL. As such no SANG contribution is payable at this stage and CIL would be payable on commencement if the application is granted.*

*Paragraph 7.12.1*

*Further to paragraph 7.12.1 of the report, the applicant submitted an ecology survey which was considered by Surrey Wildlife Trust. The ecology survey identified that the site was suitable habitat for bats and reptiles. The Wildlife Trust have advised that further surveys to establish the presence or otherwise of bats and reptiles will be required before the application is determined, as the planning authority has insufficient information at this stage to be able to fully assess the impact on protected species. These surveys are not likely to be able to be carried out until spring when the animals are more active. As such the application is recommended for refusal for the above reason.*

*Paragraph 7.12.2 & paragraph 5.3*

*The Environmental Health Officer has responded in respect of the potentially contaminated land, with no objection to the proposal subject to a number of conditions requiring further ground work to assess if there is any contamination present and remediation schemes if necessary. If the application is granted then it is recommended that these conditions are included.*

*There has been no response from the Environment Agency on this, however it is noted in this regard that given the size of the site they are unlikely to comment as have not done so on similar, larger applications where there is potential contaminated land, and other applications have been approved with conditions to address this from the Environmental Health Officer.*

*Plans – Condition 2*

*If the Committee resolves to grant permission, three of the plans in the list under Condition 2 should be amended as further plans were needed to resolve very minor corrections to the size of the garage of plot 1 as it was shown incorrectly. The size of the garage in the*

*Officer's report is correct. The plans to be changed are as follows:*

- *Amended Ground Floor Plan Type 1 Proposed BC-03-020 P5 received 27.10.16*
- *Amended Proposed Elevations Type 1 BC-05-010 P5 received 27.10.16*
- *Amended Ground Floor Site Plan BC-030-010 P5 received 27.10.16'*

Some Members had concerns about highways issues and that the proposal would be overdevelopment on the site. The County Highways Agency had raised no objection.

Some Members felt that overdevelopment and the harmful impact on the Green Belt should be included as reasons for refusal.

**Resolved that application 16/0678 be refused as amended:**

- i. **for the reason as set out in the update to the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii. **as the proposal would have harmful impact on the Green Belt, and**
- iii. **the proposal would be overdevelopment on the site.**

**The wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.**

**Note 1**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Jonathan Lytle and Max Nelson.

**25/P      Application Number: 16/0836 - Cadet Training Centre, Frimley Park, Frimley Road, Frimley GU16 7HD**

The application was for the demolition of the Quartermaster's (QM) block and adjacent outbuildings. Conversion of part of the Admin block to re-house the QM department. New build block to provide kitchen/dining hall, multifunctional space and 6No bedrooms. Remedial work to the external facade of the Grade II listed mansion and conversion of redundant kitchen area to other uses.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor E Hawkins.

Members received the following updates:

*'The Garden History Society has now considered the proposal and in their consultation response, raise no objection'*

Members felt that the proposal was a good design and they welcomed the change.

Some Members were concerned about the flooding issues in Frimley and asked whether this could be looked at as part of the application, as the balancing pond was on the site.

Officers advised that the drainage officer had not raised any issues and there had been a flood risk assessment issued.

**Resolved that application 16/0836 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:

- Councillor Colin Dougan, in his capacity as Military Champion, was acquainted with the Commanding Officer at the Cadet Training Centre;
- Councillor Valerie White, in her capacity as Deputy Mayor, had attended lunch with the Commanding Officer at the Cadet Training Centre;
- Councillor Edward Hawkins had visited the Cadet Training Centre.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins.

**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 Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**26/P Application Number: 16/0837 - Cadet Training Centre, Frimley Park, Frimley Road, Frimley GU16 7HD**

This application was for the Listed Building Consent for the demolition of the Quartermaster's (QM) block and adjacent outbuildings. Conversion of part of the Admin block to re-house the QM department. New build block to provide kitchen/dining hall, multifunctional space and 6No bedrooms. Remedial work to the external facade of the Grade II listed mansion and conversion of redundant kitchen area to other uses.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor E Hawkins.

Members received the following updates:

*'The Garden History Society has now considered the proposal and in their consultation response, raise no objection'*

**Resolved that application 16/087 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:

- Councillor Colin Dougan, in his capacity as Military Champion, was acquainted with the Commanding Officer at the Cadet Training Centre;
- Councillor Valerie White, in her capacity as Deputy Mayor, had attended lunch with the Commanding Officer at the Cadet Training Centre;
- Councillor Edward Hawkins had visited the Cadet Training Centre.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan 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 approve the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**27/P      Application Number: 16/0693 - Cadet Training Centre, Frimley Park, Frimley GU16 7HD**

The application was for the erection of a 3.4 metre security perimeter fence, single storey security building with associated parking.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor E Hawkins.

Members received the following updates:

*'The Garden History Society has now considered the proposal and in their consultation response, raise no objection'*

Members felt that the proposal was a good design and welcomed the change.

Some Members were concerned about the flooding issues in Frimley and asked whether this could be looked at as part of the application as the balancing pond was on the site.

Officers advised that the drainage officer had not raised any issues and there had been a flood risk assessment issued.

**Resolved that application 16/0693 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Colin Dougan, in his capacity as Military Champion, was acquainted with the Commanding Officer at the Cadet Training Centre;
- Councillor Valerie White, in her capacity as Deputy Mayor, had attended lunch with the Commanding Officer at the Cadet Training Centre;
- Councillor Edward Hawkins had visited the Cadet Training Centre.

**Note 2**

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

**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 Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

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

---

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

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

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ian Sams for Cllr Chris Pitt

In Attendance: Cllr David Allen  
Cllr Colin Dougan  
Nigel Downey, Citizens Advice Surrey Heath  
Sarah Groom, Transformation Team Manager  
Tara Hastings, Citizen's Advice Surrey Heath  
Cllr Charlotte Morley  
Peter Nyman, Camberley Central Job Club  
James Stewart, Yorktown and Watchmoor Business Association  
Michael Usher, Frimley Business Association

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

The Chairman welcomed James Stewart, Yorktown and Watchmoor Business Association, Michael Usher, Frimley Business Association, Peter Nyman, Camberley Central Job Club and Nigel Downey and Tara Hastings, Citizen's Advice Surrey Heath, to the meeting.

**16/EP Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 20 September 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**17/EP Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Perry declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 7 Citizens' Advice Surrey Heath as he was the Council's representative on Citizens' Advice Surrey Heath's Board of Trustees.

## **18/EP Yorktown Watchmoor Business Association**

James Stewart, Chairman, gave an update in respect of the work of the Yorktown and Watchmoor Business Association.

The Organisation's main aim was to tackle barriers to business growth in and around Camberley with a particular focus on public transport provision, traffic congestion and local infrastructure. This was achieved through a combination of providing local businesses with a single body that could represent their views in a wider arena and working to promote specific projects that would improve business prosperity in the area.

A recent revamp of the organisation had helped improve its interface with local businesses and this had in turn helped progress a number of key projects for the area including the development of the Blackwater Valley Cycle Route, improvements to the Meadows Gyratory to address capacity issues, improving bus connectivity between railway stations and business areas and working to identify parking solutions in key business areas.

It was acknowledged that many small businesses lacked the resources to get fully involved with the Organisation however they were encouraged to be involved with the organisation's work through a series of standalone events including business breakfasts.

A decision by Surrey Heath Bough Council to part fund a post with Surrey County Council has resulted in a Highways Officer being based in Surrey Heath for one day a week. This has resulted in the priorities and problems in the area having a much greater profile than previously and meant that progress to improve traffic congestion was now being made in a number of areas.

It was stressed that businesses in Watchmoor Park and Watchmoor Point business areas were keen to promote alternative ways of travelling to work to their employees and were supportive of the cycleway that was currently under construction. However it was acknowledged that more needed to be done to counter the negative messages about the scheme currently on social media.

The Committee thanked James Stewart for his update.

## **19/EP Frimley Business Association**

Michael Usher gave a presentation in respect of the Frimley Business Association which had been set up two years ago with the key aim of improving the environment in and around Frimley High Street.

Funding had been secured from the Community Improvement Fund and this would be used to tidy up Frimley High Street and buy plants for the large planters down the middle of the road.

A Christmas Tree Light Switch On in 2015 had proved particularly successful. This event would be repeated on Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> December when it was hoped that it would help raise awareness of the businesses operating in Frimley High Street and encourage more people to visit and use them. It was suggested that the Project 5 event being run in partnership with the Surrey Wildlife trust might be an ideal way to source Christmas Trees for the high street and it was agreed that the details would be forwarded to the Association.

It was acknowledged that the large white building on the High Street was in need of some cosmetic work to improve its appearance however it was a privately owned building and there was little that could be done to impel the owners to address the situation.

The Committee thanked Michael Usher for his presentation.

## **20/EP Citizens Advice Surrey Heath**

Tara Hastings, Chief Executive, and Nigel Downey, Chairman, gave a presentation in respect of the work of Citizens Advice Surrey Heath. The presentation included an overview of the organisation, a summary of the services provided and areas for development.

The Organisation provided a free, independent and confidential advice service on a wide range of issues to local residents whilst at the same time working to improve policies and practices that affected people's lives directly. The organisation employed eight part time paid members of staff who were in turn supported by 40 volunteers and monitored by a ten member trustee board who had been selected on the basis of the skills they could offer the organisation.

To ensure that resources were deployed appropriately, and people approaching the service received an appropriate level of support, a triage system was used to assess the nature and complexity of a person's problems before an appropriate course of action was developed. Those seeking advice were increasingly presenting with multiple problems and in 2015/16, Citizens Advice Surrey Heath dealt with 4993 unique clients who presented with 15,110 problems.

The four most common reasons for approaching the organisation were to seek advice on benefits, debt, housing and employment. Data showed that, with the exception of one subject area, the number of people seeking advice had increased across all advice areas when compared to 2014/15 data. The exception to this was the number of people seeking advice for Council Tax arrears which had fallen by 19% to 196 people. This fall was attributed to the Borough Council becoming more proactive about tackling Council Tax arrears at an early stage and not waiting until the situation became critical; a move that was welcomed by the organisation.

As part of work to improve the accessibility of the service, an agreement had been entered into with Citizens Advice Woking and the organisation had joined Adviceline. This meant that Surrey Heath residents could now talk to advisors on a Friday when Surrey Heath's office was closed, weekly outreach services were being delivered in Chobham and Bagshot and home visits were offered to those who were unable to travel. The possibility of operating an outreach service at Frimley Park Hospital had been explored however to date this project had not got beyond initial discussions.

Analysis of the weekly outreach services had found that the Bagshot service was not as well used as it might and more needed to be done to widen awareness of the service before a decision was taken on whether the resources might be better used elsewhere in the Borough. Councillor Hutchinson agreed to help with this task in her capacity as ward councillor for Bagshot.

Initial approaches to the Clinical Commissioning Group for funding had been unsuccessful and it was agreed that Councillor Dougan would work with the CAB to try and unlock this potential funding stream.

Some success had been had with fundraising activities and over the past four years approximately £50,000 had been raised however it was acknowledged that this was an area that could be developed further.

Whilst the organisation had a Twitter account this was currently linked to the national Citizen's Advice Bureau website and work was taking place to link this to the local website so that more could be done to raise awareness of the services offered locally.

The Committee thanked Tara Hastings and Nigel Downey for their update.

## **21/EP Camberley Central Job Club**

Peter Nyman, Treasurer, gave a presentation in respect of the work of the Camberley Job Club. The presentation included an overview of the organisation, a summary of the services it provided and potential areas for development.

The Job Club, originally set up in 2012, had predominantly been funded by the Frimley Fuel Allotment Society. In April 2016, a grant of £5,000 had been received from Surrey Heath Borough Council which had been used to employ a part time administrator to strengthen and support the work of the small voluntary committee who ran the Job Club.

The Job Club met for two hours twice a week when a team of 12 volunteers, many volunteering for the first time, provided service users with support to help them find employment. In addition to providing advice and guidance on CVs and interview preparation volunteers also helped people to access training, become smarter with their job searches and could if necessary refer people to other more specialised services for example debt advice services and the Citizen's Advice Bureau. The Job Club encouraged its service users to undertake voluntary work and helped them to understand that the transferable skills acquired through voluntary work were positive attributes that should be included on CVs. External speakers were invited to attend sessions to talk on a range of subjects and the Committee was looking to expand this aspect of the service. In May 2016, the Job Club had hosted a successful employment conference and work had started on a similar event for May 2017. Employers were encouraged to attend sessions to talk to service users about the opportunities available and the Job Club were working with Council officers to expand this offer further.

Although Surrey Heath had low unemployment levels it was recognised that the labour market was volatile and the services offered by the Job Club provided supplemental support to service users in addition to the help that was available from Job Centre Plus. In addition to assisting those people looking for work the Job Club worked with the long term unemployed, those wanting to return to work after a significant break and people who found themselves out of work after a significant period of time in one role by helping them to build up their resilience, self-respect and self-confidence.

The Job Club was looking to expand its offer and had identified social care as a growth area in the region. Following work with Age UK and the Alzheimer's Society, a funding bid had been submitted to enable the development of an Introduction to Social Care Course. The possibility of spending time operating from the Sure Start Centre and possibly occupying a vacant space in the Mall on one day were also being explored.

The Job Club had a Twitter account and a Facebook page and it was hoped that with the new Administrator in post these would be more fully exploited.

The Job Club did not currently provide training on using Linked In as a job seeking tool and Councillor Adams offered to help the Job Club with setting this up.



The possibility of acquiring charitable status had been explored however it was felt that the organisation was too small to benefit from this at the current time and the matter would be revisited at a later date.

It was agreed that a suggestion to put an article in Heathscene about the Job Club would be followed up.

The Committee thanked Peter Nyman for his informative update.

## **22/EP Committee Work Programme**

The Committee considered a report setting out a proposed work programme for the Committee for the rest of the 2016/17 Municipal Year.

The following agenda items were suggested for consideration:

- Heathrow Airport and the actions planned to mitigate the effects of the building of a third runway

It was agreed that the next meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee would be rescheduled to Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> February 2017 at 7pm.

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing  
Committee held at Council Chamber,  
Surrey Heath House on 23 November  
2016**

---

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

+ Cllr Nick Chambers	- Cllr Oliver Lewis
+ Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Bruce Mansell
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	- Cllr Nic Price
- Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	+ Cllr Joanne Potter
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Lewis	

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

**5/L Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 29 June 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**6/L Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**7/L Licensed Driver Assessment Requirements**

The Committee considered a report detailing proposed changes to the assessment process used when determining whether Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver Licences should be issued or renewed.

The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 set out the regulations surrounding the issuing of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver Licences including making provision for licensing authorities to set additional local requirements on the grounds of public safety. In line with many other local authorities, Surrey Heath Borough Council implemented additional local conditions requiring drivers to undergo, and satisfactorily pass, both a medical assessment and a driving assessment before a licence was granted. For many years, these tests have been conducted by external bodies however the current providers of both the driver assessments and the medical assessments have written to the Council informing them that they will cease providing the services in the coming months.

The Committee was informed that it was felt that driver assessments were an important part of the licensing process and officers have, since the publication of a

national statement by the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA) informing organisations nationwide that it would be withdrawing its Driver Assessment Service with effect from 31 December 2016, identified a number of potential alternative providers including the AA and the Blue Lamp Trust. It was felt that offering drivers a choice of assessment providers would not only help maintain a high and consistent standard of driving assessments but also ensure that waiting times were kept at realistic levels and fees were competitive and continuing to tie drivers to one specified provider was unrealistic. It was therefore proposed that the application process be updated to reflect this.

As part of its responsibility to ensure that drivers granted a private hire or hackney carriage driver licence were 'fit and proper' persons and continued to remain so for the duration of the time they held a licence, the Council required all applicants and licence holders to undergo medical assessments. The Council's current provider of health assessments has written to the Council expressing the view that collating medical information relating to someone who was not registered at their surgery was not appropriate as they did not have all the necessary facts to hand in order to make a fully informed decision. Consequently they felt unable to continue providing this service.

As a result of this decision, it has been proposed that a new system for driver medical assessments be introduced. If agreed, the first step in the new process would be for drivers to undergo a medical examination with their own GP based on the DVSA Group 2 standard; a wide ranging in depth assessment that was required for drivers who hold a lorry or bus licence. The subsequent report would then be submitted to the Council as part of the licence application. If any concerns were raised at this stage, the report would be passed to a designated Medical Advisor for review and if necessary a further medical with the designated Medical Advisor would be carried out before a decision on whether or not a licence should be granted. Any costs incurred as part of the assessment process would be paid by the applicant and licences would not be granted until payment had been made. It was agreed that the medical assessment proforma would be circulated to the Committee for information.

It was proposed that an arrangement be entered into with Dr Fraser, Upper Gordon Road Surgery in Camberley to act as the Council's designated Medical Advisor. Dr Fraser was currently provided a similar service to a neighbouring licensing authority and provided medical advisor services to the Council's Housing Team and the Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group.

The Committee was informed that licenced drivers are required to undergo a medical assessment every three years, a frequency that was adopted by the Council to ensure that the medical examinations dovetailed with requirements that drivers underwent a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check every three years. There are a number of licence holders for whom these two checks do not match and it was proposed that flexibility be introduced to the frequency of medical assessments on one occasion only to enable the two assessments to synchronise providing that the driver in question did not have a medical issue that required an annual assessment.

**RESOLVED** that:

- i. The requirement for all applicants for a licence to drive a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Vehicle are dependent upon passing a driving assessment specific for taxi drivers and that the requirement for this to be solely obtained from the Driving Standards Agency be removed.
- ii. The proposed revisions to the Driver Medical Procedures, set out in paragraph 14, above be approved
- iii. The Council's Licensing Team enter into an arrangement for the provision of a medical advisory service with Dr Fraser, Upper Gordon Road Surgery, Upper Gordon Road, Camberley.
- iv. The age at which licensed drivers are required to undergo annual medicals be changed from 60 years of age to 65 years of age.
- v. The application process for licensed drivers be amended to allow a period of up to 5 years between medicals on one occasion only, providing a medical reason requiring an annual check does not exist in order to bring the requirements for the frequency of medical examinations in line with requirements for regular Disclosure and Barring Service checks.

**8/L Street Collections Policy**

The Committee considered a report setting out a proposed amendment to the Council's Street Collections Policy.

The Committee was informed that at the time that the policy had been adopted in 2012, it had been agreed that any one organisation should be granted a maximum of four collection licences per year and that the Rotary Club of Camberley and the Camberley and Frimley Lions would each be granted up to three collection licences for the month of December.

However, since the adoption of the Street Collections Policy the Council has received notice that the Camberley and Frimley Lions had been disbanded. The Surrey Border Lions has taken over their commitments in the area and had written to the Council requesting that they be allocated the three collection days in December that had been previously allocated to the Camberley and Frimley Lions.

**RESOLVED** that the number of collection days currently allocated at paragraph 7b of the Street Collections Policy to Camberley and Frimley Lions be reallocated to the Surrey Border Lions and that the Street Collections Policy be amended accordingly.

**9/L Licensing Act 2003 - Summary of Decisions**

The Committee received a report setting out a summary 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 and the minutes of a Licensing Sub Committee held on 19 August 2016.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Licensing Sub Committee held on 19 August 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Sub-Committee Chairman.

**Chairman**