

COUNCIL MEETING

12 April 2017

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 22 February 2017** (Pages 3 - 18)
2. **Executive - 7 March 2017** (Pages 19 - 26)
3. **Executive - 4 April 2017** (Pages 27 - 28)
4. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 16 February 2017** (Pages 29 - 34)
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 9 March 2017** (Pages 35 - 44)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 5 April 2017** (Pages 45 - 52)
7. **Licensing Committee - 15 March 2017** (Pages 53 - 56)
8. **Joint Staff Consultative Group - 16 March 2017** (Pages 57 - 58)
9. **Appointments Committee - 21 March 2017** (Pages 59 - 62)
10. **Performance and Finance Committee - 22 March 2017** (Pages 63 - 72)
11. **Audit and Standards Committee - 30 March 2017** (Pages 73 - 76)

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on
22 February 2017**

+ 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 Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Alan McClafferty
+ 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 Ilnicki	Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

55/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Colin Dougan, Ruth Hutchinson, Rebecca Jennings Evans and Bruce Mansell.

56/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 14 December 2016 be approved as a correct record.

57/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor told the Council of the sad deaths of Molly Chipperfield, a past Mayoress; John Emuss, a past councillor for the Mytchett and Deepcut Ward; David Ross, the husband of the former Mayor's Secretary, Pat Ross; Mrs Daphne Potter, Councillor Joanne Potter's mother; and Phyllis Chaplin, the oldest resident of the Borough at 108 years of age.

Over the Christmas and New Year period, the Mayor had visited Frimley Park Hospital for Christmas Carols and the Boxing Day Windlesham Pram Race.

He had attended the Holocaust Memorial Day at Surrey University, the Sea Cadets awards, Windlesham Parish Community Tea Party and the presentation of awards to local volunteers, and 'topped-out' a new Care Home in Camberley.

58/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader reported that she had attended a number of outside meetings.

The Surrey Leaders Group had agreed to write to the Chancellor, Phillip Hammond and Sajid Javid, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government requesting that the government help Surrey County Council to deal with its financial difficulties.

The Leader informed Members that most of the other Surrey Authorities were pursuing similar property acquisitions strategies and some had taken on much larger borrowing requirements.

In relation to the Three Southern Counties devolution bid, the Leader reported that there remained considerable uncertainty around its future.

South East England Council had discussed a number of planning concerns likely to face local authorities in the future, which included the 5 year land supply, the Green Belt and a potential sub national view of planning to direct strategic issues. In addition a sub national Transport Board would be established in the near future.

59/C Questions from Councillors

The Leader provided a written response to a question submitted by Councillor David Allen under Procedure Rule 11 in relation to the top 5 priorities to refurbish and overhaul Camberley Town Centre.

Councillor Allen asked a supplementary question relating to the approximate budget allocated to deliver the 5 priorities. The Leader agreed to provide an answer in writing.

The Transformation Portfolio Holder provided a written response to a question submitted by Councillor David Allen under Procedure Rule 11 pertaining to the "Internet of Things" and "Big Data".

Councillor Allen asked a supplementary question seeking further information in relation to the integration and implementation of the 2 technologies. The Leader undertook to ask the Transformation Portfolio Holder to provide a written response.

60/C Council Tax and Budget 2017/18

The net cost of services for 2017/18 at £10,787,136 represented a decrease of £736,496. This was mainly as a result of £1.5m of additional income from investment property purchased in 2016/17. Despite some related additional staffing and pension costs, the Council, for the first time for a number of years, had managed to set a balanced budget without any general savings target or the use of the New Homes Bonus to support the revenue spending. It was noted that not all of the net cost of services would be met by Council Tax and that the council tax requirement would be determined following deductions made to allow for sources of funding.

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

It was reported that the Section 151 Officer had determined that a surplus of £2,000,000 could be declared on the Collection Fund for the year. Of this £1,501,127 would be paid to Surrey County Council, £260,615 to the police and the remaining £238,258 to this Council.

The Council would receive a New Homes Bonus (NHB) of £1.226m in 2017/18 which would be placed into reserves. The Government had announced that NHB would be continued indefinitely but that there would be a number of changes going forward with a view to saving £250m from NHB. The changes were likely to cost the Council over £4m in lost NHB up to 2021 if houses continued to be built at the current rates.

It had been determined that the items totalling £645,000 should be funded from reserves relating to community grants, transformation costs, community safety, property maintenance, survey work in the Town Centre and Family Support.

The cost of any revaluations fell on the Council together with any interest due. The 2017 revaluation was likely to lead to a significant number of appeals thus making income levels difficult to predict.

The Council had worked hard to increase economic growth in the borough and it was likely that this year there would be a surplus on business rates. To reflect this, an additional £200k had been included in the budget in addition to the base line set by Government.

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

In December 2016 the Government had announced that the referendum trigger for 2017/18 for Council Tax for District Councils would be set at 2% or £5 whichever was the higher. The Section 151 Officer had strongly recommended that Council Tax be increased by the maximum permitted in order to meet the financial challenges the Council faced in 2019/20 and beyond.

It was noted that Surrey County Council, would again be permitted to increase its Council Tax by 1.992% for services plus an additional 3% to meet the costs of Adult Social Care.

All reserves and provisions were considered appropriate and supportive of future expenditure requirements. Revenue Reserves (including earmarked reserves) were projected to be around £19m at 31 March 2018. However all capital reserves would have been exhausted.

In respect of the General Fund Working Balance, a risk calculation indicated that a minimum balance of £1.4m was needed to provide financial cover for day to day cash flow and any financial emergencies which might occur during the financial year. This would be satisfied by both the Council Tax options presented.

A number of fees and charges had been increased and have been approved in accordance with the Financial Regulations.

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

The financial forecast had changed completely when compared to the same time last year. There was now a gap of £184k in 2020/21 compared to £1.7m in the forecast last year. The investment in property driven by Key Priority 2 had contributed significantly to closing this financial gap. This means that despite the forecast assuming that the whole of the New Homes Bonus would be used to support the budget in later years the whole scale of the funding challenge had reduced significantly.

As part of the 3 year settlement for local authorities, the Council's grant funding would reduce to zero in 2017/18 and would become £1m negative in 2019/20. As a result, the delivery of a balanced budget would become more difficult. To meet this challenge the Council had recognised that it was vital to take control of its own financial destiny. Reducing expenditure through efficiencies and joint working had made an important contribution but would not be enough by itself. As a result, in line with Key Priority 2, the Council had worked to increase income. This had been done not only by investing money in property but also by supporting economic growth and in particular the delivery of housing. In so doing the Council had been able to continue to provide the broad range of services and balance the budget. This strategy would need to continue if the Council was to meet the challenges it faced in 2019/20 and beyond.

The Council's Chief Financial Officer had confirmed he was satisfied that the preparation of the 2017/18 estimates had been undertaken with rigour and due diligence and provided the appropriate level of resources to meet forecast service requirements whichever budget option was adopted. He also reported that the Council's Reserves, Provisions and the General Fund Working Balance, supplemented by the Revenue Capital Reserves were at such levels to meet all known future expenditure requirements and fund any unforeseen or urgent spending which may arise. The Chief Financial Officer drew attention to the risks

within the budget particularly around the Council's ability to continue to deliver savings in the future.

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

Resolved

- (i) to note that under delegated powers the Executive Head of Finance calculated the amount of the Council Tax Base as 37,318.03 (Band D Equivalent properties) for the year 2017/18 calculated in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended;**
- (ii) to note expenditure totalling £645,000 be charged directly to reserves;**
- (iii) to note that an increase in Council Tax above £5 was deemed to be "excessive" by Government;**
- (iv) to note the level of Minimum Payment Range required;**
- (v) to note that the Revenue Support Grant had been reduced to zero in 2017/18;**
- (vi) to note the there was no reduction in the grant given to Parishes for the Local Council Tax Support Scheme;**
- (vii) to note that a council tax surplus of £2,000,000 was being declared;**
- (viii) to note the comments in respect of the robustness of the 2017/18 budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves, provisions and the General Fund Working Balance;**
- (ix) to note the comments in respect of the financial forecast in respect of the budget gap and the potential impact on the future financial sustainability of the Council;**
- (x) to note that of the Council's Budget requirement, £176,000 be a special expense relating to the non-parished area of the Borough.**
- (xi) that the Budget Requirement for 2017/18 be £10,507,079 as set out in Annex A of the agenda report;**
- (xii) that the Council Tax Requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2017/18 be £7,698,710 as set out in Annex A to the agenda report and;**

- (xiii) **that the Council Tax for 2017/18 (excluding special expenses and Parish precepts) be set at £206.30 for a Band D property being an increase of £5 compared to 2016/17.**

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

61/C Setting of Council Tax 2017/18

Having determined its Council Tax Requirement for 2017/18, the Council was now required formally to approve the Council Tax for the area taking into account precepts received from Surrey County Council, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner and the Parishes.

In approving the Council Tax for 2017/18, the Council noted that the Executive, on 6 December 2016, had approved the draft Council Tax base for 2017/18 but delegated the final setting of the base to the Executive Head of Finance. The tax base had been set at 37,318.04 Band D equivalent properties.

Resolved

1. **To note that the Council Tax Base for 2017/18 calculated in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:**
 - a) **for the whole Council area as 37,318.04 (Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government finance Act 1992, as amended (the “Act”)); and**
 - b) **for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in Table B below.**

Bisley	1,566.16
Chobham	1,960.49
Frimley and Camberley	23,664.75
West End	2,027.92
Windlesham	8,098.72

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

2. that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2017/18 (excluding parish precepts and special expenses) is £7,698,710;
3. that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - a) **£56,778,601** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31(A)2 of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - b) **£48,346,356** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - c) **£8,432,245** being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
 - d) **£225.96** being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), as divided by Item T (1(a) above) calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts)
 - e) **£733,575** being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per para 1 above)
 - f) **£206.30** being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
4. to note that the County Council and the Police Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

Surrey County Council Basic Precept

Precept	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Basic	846.07	987.08	1,128.10	1,269.11	1,551.14	1,833.16	2,115.19	2,538.22
Adult Social Care	41.63	48.57	55.50	62.44	76.31	90.19	104.06	124.88
Total	887.70	1,035.65	1,183.60	1,331.55	1,627.45	1,923.35	2,219.25	2,663.10

Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
149.71	174.67	199.62	224.57	274.47	324.38	374.28	449.14

5. that the Council, in accordance with sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Parish precepts and special expenses

Part of Area	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bisley	39.33	45.89	52.45	59.00	72.11	85.22	98.34	118.00
Chobham	26.20	30.56	34.93	39.29	48.03	56.76	65.49	78.58
Frimley and Camberley	4.96	5.78	6.61	7.44	9.09	10.74	12.40	14.88
West End	28.56	33.32	38.07	42.83	52.35	61.87	71.39	85.66
Windlesham	24.80	28.93	33.07	37.20	45.47	53.73	62.00	74.40

Surrey Heath Borough Council

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
137.53	160.46	183.38	206.30	252.14	297.99	343.83	412.60

Aggregate of Parish and Surrey Heath Borough Council

Part of Area	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bisley	176.86	206.35	235.83	265.30	324.25	383.21	442.17	530.60
Chobham	163.73	191.02	218.31	245.59	300.17	354.75	409.32	491.18
Frimley and Camberley	142.49	166.24	189.99	213.74	261.23	308.73	356.23	427.48
West End	166.09	193.78	221.45	249.13	304.49	359.86	415.22	498.26
Windlesham	162.33	189.39	216.45	243.50	297.61	351.72	405.83	487.00

Total of all Precepts

Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Part of Area	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bisley	1,214.27	1,416.67	1,619.05	1,821.42	2,226.17	2,630.94	3,035.70	3,642.84
Chobham	1,201.14	1,401.34	1,601.53	1,801.71	2,202.09	2,602.48	3,002.85	3,603.42
Frimley & Camberley	1,179.90	1,376.56	1,573.21	1,769.86	2,163.15	2,556.46	2,949.76	3,539.72
West End	1,203.50	1,404.10	1,604.67	1,805.25	2,206.41	2,607.59	3,008.75	3,610.50
Windlesham	1,199.74	1,399.71	1,599.67	1,799.62	2,199.53	2,599.45	2,999.36	3,599.24

6. to note that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2017/18 is NOT excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.

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

The following Members voted against the decision: Councillor David Allen.
Councillor Joanne Potter abstained from voting.

62/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 10 January & 7 February 2017

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

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 10 January 2017 and 7 February 2017 be received and the recommendations therein be adopted as set out below:

- (i) **the adoption of the Treasury Management Strategy for 2017/18 as set out in the Executive agenda report of 7 February 2017;**

- (ii) the adoption of the Treasury Management Indicators for 2017/18 at Annex A to the Executive agenda report of 7 February 2017; and
- (iii) the adoption of the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement and Estimated Minimum Revenue Provision Payment Table at Annex F of the Executive agenda report of 7 February 2017;
- (iv) the new capital bids of £3,871k for 2017/18, in Annex A to the Executive agenda report of 7 February 2017, be approved, and be incorporated into the Capital Programme;
- (v) the Prudential Indicators summarised below and explained in Annex D to the Executive agenda report of 7 February 2017, including the MRP statement, for 2017/18 to 2019/20, in accordance with the requirements of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2011, be approved:

Prudential Indicator	2017/18 Estimated £000	2018/19 Estimated £000	2019/20 Estimated £000
Capital Expenditure	3,871	600	600
Capital Financing Requirement	140,653	138,901	137,112
Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream	35.17%	38.52%	41.36%
Incremental impact of investment decisions on Band D council Tax	-£15.29	£8.27	£0.97
Operational Boundary	157,000	157,000	157,000
Authorised Limit	167,000	167,000	167,000

- (vi) the Surrey Heath Borough Council Pay Policy Statement 2017/18, as attached at Annex A of the Executive agenda report of 7 February 2017, be approved.
- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 15 December 2016, 12 January 2017 and 9 February 2017

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

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 15 December 2016, 12 January 2017 and 9 February 2017 be received.

(c) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 19 January 2017

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

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 19 January 2017 be received.

63/C Response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's Draft Recommendations

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England had published, for consultation, its draft recommendations on new electoral arrangements for Surrey Heath on 24 January 2017. The consultation ended on 20 March 2017, after which the Commission would review its draft recommendations and then publish its final recommendations. The changes proposed would be approved by Parliament and would provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the all-out elections for the Council in 2019.

Members noted that it would be necessary to conduct a Polling District Review prior to the 2019 Borough and Parish elections, when the revised arrangements came into effect.

The Governance Working Group on 3 February had considered the Commission's draft recommendations and had made a number of recommendations.

Officers had also considered the draft proposals and any practical consequences arising from the Commission's recommendations and Karen Whelan, as Electoral Registration Officer, had formulated her own response to the draft recommendations.

In relation to the wards of Bagshot, Lightwater, Windlesham, Chobham, West End and Bisley, one of the principal recommendations of the Boundary Commission resulted in the joining of Chobham and Windlesham wards into one ward with 3 councillors.

The Governance Working Group had been of the opinion that Chobham and Windlesham were 2 distinctly different communities and that a different solution should be proposed. The Governance Working Group had felt that a better solution could be formulated for the Windlesham, Lightwater, Bagshot, Bisley, West End and Chobham Wards which would better reflect the community identities, whilst achieving electoral equality and effective local government. It had therefore agreed that the ward councillors for these wards be asked to formulate an alternative proposal.

The Council noted that the Commission had not provided any detailed explanation as to why the Council's proposals Old Dean, Town, St Michaels, St Paul's and Watchetts Wards had not been included in its draft recommendations.

The Commission's draft proposals included the moving of 529 electors and 235 properties from St Paul's Ward to Old Dean Ward. The Commission had used the

railway line as the boundary instead of the A30. The Council considered that the A30 was a more recognisable boundary between the Old Dean and St Paul's Wards. In addition, it was felt considered that the electors identified to move from St Paul's Ward did not share any community identity with the electors in the Old Dean ward.

The Commission's draft proposals in relation to St Michaels Ward recommended the movement of 13 properties north of the A30 to the Town Ward. This would mean that electors within this area would move to the Town Ward whilst remaining in a different county division from the rest of Town ward, therefore requiring the creation of a new Polling District, which would comprise approximately 21 electors.

The Commission's proposals in relation to Town and Watchetts Wards had recommended that the roads between Brackendale Road and Tekels Park move from the Town Ward to Watchetts Ward.

The Governance Working Group had been of the opinion that the proposals for the Old Dean, St Pauls and Town wards should be re-examined and a better solution sought to reflect the community identities whilst achieving electoral equality and effective local government. Following the Governance Working Group meeting, the Ward Councillors for these areas had discussed options for the wards and had agreed to ask the Commission to reconsider the original submission from the Council in relation to Old Dean, Town, St Michaels, St Paul's and Watchetts Wards which provided electoral equality and better reflected community identity.

The Council noted that the Commission's draft recommendations included the proposal to move the boundary between Parkside and Heatherside by transferring an area which currently falls within Parkside to Heatherside Ward. This proposal had reflected one of the options put forward by the Council in relation to these 2 wards. In relation to these wards, subsequent to the meeting of the Governance Working Group, it was proposed that the Commission be requested to retain Youlden Close and Youlden Drive in Parkside Ward as these properties had no vehicular link to the roads in Heatherside Ward. The number of electors involved would not affect the electoral equality in these 2 wards.

The Commission's draft recommendations involved moving a significant proportion of the settlement of Frimley, including its identifiable centre which incorporated Frimley High Street, Frimley Railway Station and a number of community buildings, to Frimley Green ward. Changes to the County Council Divisions prior to the 2013 County Council elections had required the creation of the Frimley South (FC) Polling District, mostly comprising the Ansell Estate, as, due to the changes introduced, the electors in this area would be voting in the Frimley Borough Ward, whilst voting in the Frimley Green and Mytchett County Division; the remainder of Frimley Borough Ward continued to vote in the Camberley West County Division. The arrangements for Frimley South would remain the same under the Commission's draft proposals.

However, the Commission's draft proposals would introduce the need to create a further Polling District: the proposed re-drawing of the Frimley Green boundary with the northern boundary at the A325 would mean the electors affected would

thereafter vote in the Frimley Green Borough Ward, whilst continuing to vote in the Camberley West County Division.

The Council considered that the proposal to move a significant proportion of the settlement of Frimley, to Frimley Green Ward, was in conflict with the Commission's stated aim of recognising and reflecting community identity and resulted in further complication for voters as it introduced additional non-co-terminous boundaries within the area. The Council therefore proposed that the current boundary between Frimley and Frimley Green be retained and the approximately 1000 electors remain in Frimley. However in order to achieve electoral equality it was proposed that the Frimley South (FC) Polling District, comprising 860 electors, be transferred to the Frimley Green ward. Frimley would elect 2 councillors and Frimley Green, 3 councillors. This proposal would improve co-terminosity with the County Division and thereby reduce elector confusion, keep recognised communities together and provide for effective and convenient local government whilst achieving electoral equality.

It was noted that the Commission's proposals for Mytchett and Deepcut Ward had been to retain current boundaries and for 3 councillors to represent the ward.

In order to allow time for the respective ward members to formulate alternative proposals for the current wards of Bagshot, Lightwater, Windlesham, Chobham, West End, and Bisley it was proposed that the Chief Executive, after consultation with the Members of the Governance Working Group, be authorised to formulate the Council's representations to the Commission in respect of these wards.

Resolved to

- (i) note the Electoral Registration Officer's submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report;**
- (ii) note that a Polling District Review will be conducted prior to the 2019 Borough and Parish elections, when the revised arrangements come into effect;**
- (iii) make the following representations to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:**
 - (a) for the reasons set out at paragraph 5.4 of the agenda report, to object to the proposal to move a significant proportion of the settlement of Frimley, to Frimley Green ward and to propose that the current boundary between Frimley and Frimley Green be retained but that the Frimley South (FC) Polling District, comprising 860 electors, be transferred to the Frimley Green ward with Frimley electing 2 councillors and Frimley Green, 3 councillors;**
 - (b) to object to the proposals for Old Dean, Town, St Michaels, St Paul's and Watchetts Wards and to**

request the Commission to reconsider the original submission from the Council in particularly in relation to

- (i) the proposal to use the railway line as the boundary between St Pauls and Old Dean Wards as the Council considers that the A30 is a more obvious boundary between which better reflects community identity and provides electoral equality: and**
- (ii) the proposal to move of the small area north of the A30 from St Michaels Ward to the Town Ward as it would, because of the county divisional boundary, required the creation of a new Polling District comprising approximately 21 electors and 13 households;**
- (c) to request the Commission to revise its proposals for Heatherside and Parkside so Youlden Close and Youlden Drive remain within Parkside Ward;**
- (iv) make no comments in relation to the Commission's draft recommendations for Mytchett and Deepcut Ward; and**
- (v) authorise the Chief Executive, after consultation with the Members of the Governance Working Group, to submit representations to the Commission in respect of the current wards of Bagshot, Lightwater, Windlesham, Chobham, West End and Bisley.**

64/C Portfolio Holder's Question Time

The Leader responded to questions in relation to consultation for pilots for business rates, the prospects for a Blackwater Valley devolution bid, improvements to the public realm and the future of Local Enterprise Partnerships.

65/C Exclusion of Press and Public

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

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
66/C	3,6 and 7
67/C	3,6 and 7

66/C Council, Executive and Committees - Exempt

- (a) Executive – 9 November 2016 and 6 December 2016**

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

Resolved that the exempt minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 9 November 2016 and 6 December 2016 be received.

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 15 December 2016, 12 January 2017 and 9 February 2017

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

Resolved that the exempt minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 15 December 2016, 12 January 2017 and 9 February 2017 be received.

67/C Review of Exempt Items

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

Resolved that

- (i) Minute 68/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt during the 'Stand Still Period', but that the decision be made public when the preferred bidder is announced;**
- (ii) Minute 69/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt, but the decision be made public.**
- (iii) Minute 36/P and the associated agenda report remain exempt.**
- (iv) Minute 46/P and the associated agenda report remain exempt.**
- (v) Minute 59/P and the associated agenda report remain exempt.**

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 7
March 2017**

- Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Craig Fennell
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr David Allen, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr David Lewis and Cllr Chris Pitt

82/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

83/E Questions by Members

Councillor David Allen requested further information in relation to a question he had asked at the Council meeting on 22 February 2017, concerning Big Data and The Internet of Things.

Councillor Rodney Bates received a response to a question about a press release concerning the future of Heritage Services and the Surrey Heath Museum.

84/E Five Year Strategy and Annual Plan 2017/18

The Executive considered the Annual Plan for 2017/18 and reviewed the updated Five Year Strategy.

Some Members raised concerns that aspects of the Annual Plan were too vague and were consequently difficult to measure. It was noted that the documents would be reviewed at the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee meeting on 22 March 2017. Members were also reminded that the Executive would receive a separate report on the end of year performance in due course.

RESOLVED to agree the updated Five Year Strategy and the Annual Plan for 2017/18.

85/E Allocation and Expenditure of Planning Infrastructure Contributions

The Executive considered a report requesting the allocation and expenditure of specific funds received via planning obligations as part of Section 106 Agreements and Unilateral Undertakings collected from development schemes in Surrey Heath for specific categories of works.

Members were reminded that Planning Infrastructure Contributions (PIC) must be spent in accordance with the Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2011, which had been adopted by the Executive in October 2011. The categories under which the collection of infrastructure contributions could be made were noted.

Contributions collected for libraries and transport were allocated and spent by Surrey County Council on identified new transport infrastructure and library facilities. The contributions made on the remainder of the PIC categories were held and overseen by this Council; the agreed tariff scheme for these categories required that the majority of the sums raised were spent on equipped play space, with reduced proportions spent on the other identified category areas. The monies collected under PIC could not be used for the general maintenance of existing play space sites.

The Executive was advised that inspections of all parks had been undertaken, with Health and Safety inspections conducted and usage patterns taken into account. From this work, 11 projects had been identified for progression and would be funded by contributions already collected. It was reported that the equipment would be guaranteed for 10 years.

RESOLVED that

(i) the following projects be carried out and funded by funds collected through Planning Infrastructure Contributions:

- Briar Avenue, Lightwater – Equipped Play space
- Cheylesmore Drive, Heatherside – Equipped Play Space
- Chobham Road Recreation Ground, Frimley – Equipped Play Space
- Evergreen Road, Parkside – Equipped Play space
- Frimley Lodge Park, Frimley Green – Equipped Play space
- Lightwater Country Park, Lightwater – Equipped Play space
- Loman Road, Mytchett & Deepcut – Equipped Play space
- London Road Recreation Ground, St Michael's – Equipped Play space
- Old Dean Recreation Ground, Old Dean – Equipped Play space
- Borough Wide – Replacement Notice Boards
- Watchmoor Reserve, Watchetts – Environmental Improvements; and

(ii) the implementation of the individual schemes be delegated to the Executive Head of Business after consultation with the Business and Finance Portfolio Holders.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the Capital Programme for 2017/18 be increased by £613,000.

86/E Draft Residential Design SPD Consultation

The Executive considered a document entitled Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Regulation 13 Consultation Draft. The SPD set out principles to help ensure that the Borough received high quality new residential development to create attractive and well-functioning environments in which people were happy to live. The SPD covered the whole of the Borough including town centres, and rural and urban areas; it would be flexible enough to be applicable to the full range of residential scales, from small householder projects right up to the creation of large areas of new urban fabric.

The 2017 Design Guide would replace the Borough's following design guidance for residential development:

- Residential Development in Settlement Areas – Development Control Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance, 2002
- Design for House Extensions Leaflet; undated

Both of these documents were now dated as they had been prepared under an earlier legislative regime. In addition, these documents did not deal with the detail and scope of residential design covered by the proposed 2017 Residential Design Guide.

Members were reminded that, at present, the key Local Plan policies relating to residential design were DM9 of the CS&DMP DPD and TC11 of the Camberley Town Centre AAP. Both policies set out a series of high level non-specific design principles to guide all forms of development in the Borough. The SPD would provide detailed and specific guidance for residential development based on these more general principles.

The Executive was advised that the purpose of the SPD was to give guidance to the development industry, the Council, and the public on how to ensure that good design was achieved in new residential development in the borough. It was intended that the SPD would enable the Council to effectively defend its decisions at appeal on matters relating to the design of residential developments.

The Draft SPD would be released for public comment in March 2017 and subject to a five week consultation period.

RESOLVED that the Draft Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document – Regulation 13 Consultation, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be approved for public consultation.

87/E Draft Statement of Community Involvement Consultation

The Executive was reminded that, in October 2016, the Local Development Scheme for the production of a new Local Plan had been agreed. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which set out how the Council would involve the community in both the preparation of the Local Plans and associated Development Plan Documents, would form part of the Local Plan.

The previous SCI had been adopted in May 2012. This revised SCI had taken into account changes in legislation and guidance since this date, in particular in

relation to Duty to Co-operate requirements, changes around Neighbourhood Planning, and updated community contacts.

The updated SCI would be subject to a period of public consultation, following which the Executive would be asked to adopt a final version.

The Regulatory Portfolio Holder and officers undertook to consider alternative wording where the SCI referred to 'hard to reach groups'.

RESOLVED that the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be published for a six week consultation process.

88/E Council Finances as at 31st December 2016

The Executive noted the Council's financial position at 31 December 2016.

Members were advised that, in relation to the Revenue Budget, the Council was anticipated to come in approximately £100,000 under budget, excluding the £200,000 overall savings target. Once income from the Mall and associated properties, which had not been budgeted for, was taken into account there was likely to be a surplus.

At the end of the third quarter, nearly £123m had been spent or committed on capital projects, of which £122m had been spent on property acquisition, principally The Mall, 45-51 Park Street, Camberley, and Albany Park; these purchases supported the Council's Key Priorities 1 & 2.

Analysis carried out by the Council's advisors indicated that investment income was likely to be £100,000 higher than had been budgeted.

The Housing Benefits debt balance at 31 December 2016 was £649,000, compared with £669,000 at the end of the previous quarter.

At 31 December 2016, Sundry Debts amounted to £1.149m, compared with £1.002m for the same period the previous year. It was reported that debtors had risen due to property rents from recent acquisitions being invoiced in December but paid in January.

RESOLVED to note the Revenue, Treasury and Capital Position as at 31st December 2016.

89/E Camberley International Festival 2017

The Executive was reminded that the Camberley International Festival had been launched in 2016 as part of Camberley Theatre's 50th Anniversary celebrations, which had proved successful. Members noted plans for a second festival to take place in June 2017.

RESOLVED to note the proposal for the second Camberley International Festival in June 2017.

90/E Write Off of Irrecoverable Revenues Bad Debts

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

Members noted a schedule of bad debts for both Council Tax and Business Rates and were advised that, although bad debts were written off, the debtors would be pursued should that possibility arise in the future.

RESOLVED that bad debts totalling £32,111.48 in respect of Council Tax and £185,161.30 in respect of Non-Domestic Rates to be written-off in 2016-17.

91/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)
92/E	3
93/E	3

Note: Minute 92/E is a summary of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

92/E Lease of Car Park Space Adjacent to Citizens Advice Bureau and Office Space within the Ian Goodchild Centre

The Executive made decisions in relation to the lease of Car Park space adjacent to the Citizens Advice Bureau and office space within Ian Goodchild Centre.

93/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) Annex A, to Item 8 - Write off of Irrecoverable Revenues Bad Debt, remains exempt; and**
- (ii) Subject to any necessary consultation, minute 92/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt until the completion of lease negotiations.**

Chairman

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 4 April
2017**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Craig Fennell
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	- Cllr Charlotte Morley

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr David Allen and Cllr Chris Pitt.

94/E Mr Kevin Cantlon

The Executive was informed of the sad loss of Kevin Cantlon, the Council's Economic Development Officer, who had died unexpectedly on Monday 3 April 2017. The profound sadness of the Frimley Business Association to this news was reported and Members were advised of the Association's deep gratitude for the significant contribution he had made to its establishment and development.

Members were invited to participate in a moment of contemplation.

95/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

96/E Community Fund Grants

The Executive considered 3 grant applications to the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme. Members considered each application, noting the impact that each project would have and the reserves held by each organisation.

The Executive received a detailed breakdown of the remedial works planned at the Chobham Village Hall and noted that the application from the West Ends Bowls Club had not been fully completed and lacked the requisite 2 quotes for the work planned.

It was noted that the level of reserves held by applicants to the Community Grants Scheme were not factored in when considering awards from the scheme and it was suggested by some Members that this should be included in the criteria for assessing any future awards.

RESOLVED

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

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Grant Award</u>
Windlesham and Camberley Camera Club	To purchase a replacement digital projector	£1,484
Chobham Village Hall Charity	To rebuild and resurface the existing car park	£5,000

- (ii) to defer the application from West End Bowls Club for a contribution towards the extension the Clubhouse facilities, pending the submission of quotes.

97/E Pay Settlement 2017/18

The Executive considered a report on a proposed pay award to Council staff for 2017/18.

The proposed award, supported by the Joint Staff Consultative Group, was for a 2% cost of living increase across all grades, which would be met from within existing budgets.

RECOMMENDED a 2% pay award for 2017/18, to be funded from within the existing salaries budget.

Note: Councillor Richard Brooks declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, as his wife was employed by the Council and left the Council Chamber during consideration of the report.

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 16 February 2017

+ 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 Sams

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ian Sams for Cllr David Lewis

In Attendance: Nicola Airey, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group
Cllr Rodney Bates
Cllr Bill Chapman
Inspector Bob Darkens, Area Commander, Surrey Police
Jane Hogg, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust
Cllr Paul Ilnicki
Karen Limmer, Head of Legal Services & Monitoring Officer

23/EP Chairman's Announcements and Welcome to Guests

The Chairman welcomed Inspector Bob Darkens, Borough Commander, Surrey Police, Nicola Airey, Director of Planning and Delivery, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group and Jane Hogg, Integration and Transformation Director, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust to the meeting.

24/EP Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 22 November 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

25/EP Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

26/EP Crime and Disorder in Surrey Heath

Inspector Bob Darkens, Area Commander, Surrey Police, gave a briefing in respect of the work of the Surrey Police force to tackle crime and disorder in the Borough.

It was reported that the Surrey Heath area had the lowest recorded crime figures when compared to the other boroughs in Surrey Police's Western Surrey Division. There had been 18 fewer recorded incidents of criminal damage, 87 fewer recorded Drugs Offences, 48 fewer Non-dwelling Burglaries, 7 fewer Serious Sexual Offences, 35 fewer Simple Thefts and 16 fewer recorded incidents of Vehicle Crime than in the same period in the previous year. However there had been increases in the number of recorded incidents of Serious Acquisitive Crime (13 more), Domestic Burglary (20 more), Fraud and Forgery (6 more), Other Sexual Offences (7 More), Robberies (3 more) and Violence with Injury (4 more) than during the same period the previous year.

It was also reported that there had been 245 more recorded incidents of Violence without Injury than in the previous year. This sharp rise in numbers had resulted from a review of all cases reported to the Police Call Centre following criticism from the Police Inspectorate about the way that Surrey Police had been recording incidents reported to them. It was stressed that the category included a significant number of very low level incidents for example name calling and did not constitute a significant cause for concern.

The Surrey Heath Neighbourhood Team had conducted a number of operations during 2015/16 including case building work that had resulted in the eviction of a problem family from a property in Bisley following a significant number of incidents of anti-social behaviour. A Partial Closure Order had been served on a premise on the A30. The order meant that a drug dealer operating from the premises being banned from entering the property and a vulnerable adult living at the property had been safeguarded. Work was now underway to rehome the vulnerable adult to more suitable accommodation. A Partial Closure Order had been issued on a property in the High Street following incidents of drug use and anti-social behaviour. An application for a Full Closure Order would be heard by the Courts on 17 February. If granted this would prevent anyone but the landlord of the property from entering the premises.

Over the last fortnight, the Neighbourhood Team had made 11 arrests for Possession with Intent to supply. The offenders had been bailed whilst evidence was gathered to enable a decision to be taken on whether any charges should be brought against them. None of the people arrested were Surrey Heath residents and their bail conditions banned them from entering Surrey.

Following reports of the illegal sale of Nitrous Oxide cylinders, test purchases had been carried out and in excess of 3000 cylinders of the compound had been seized.

A prolific criminal, with a reputation for preying on vulnerable people in the Borough, had been sentenced to two years in prison.

The Neighbourhood Team was working with officers at Surrey Heath Borough Council to introduce Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs). These would be used to curb anti-social behaviour at specified locations and would focus on areas known to be susceptible to aggressive begging, dog fouling and the illegal use of psychoactive substances.

Notwithstanding these successes, Surrey Police faced a number of challenges in the Surrey Heath area including tackling public perceptions about Surrey Heath not being a safe place to live and work, the under-reporting of crime, ongoing issues relating to the supply of illegal drugs and resource constraints that meant that crimes against people would always take precedence over crimes against property.

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

- Concerns about the adequacy of safeguarding measures at the homeless shelter located in the Scout Hut on the A30 were being explored with the appropriate authorities.
- Incidents at Coldingley Prison in Bisley were included in the police crime statistics. Surrey Police was working with the Prison to address criminal activity within the prison.
- All reports of hate crimes were reviewed on a daily basis. To date, there had been no notable increase in the number of hate crimes reported following the referendum on 23 June 2016.
- There had been no noticeable increase in the number of burglaries taking place at night as a result of Surrey County Council's decision to turn off streetlights after midnight.
- The majority of reports of internet and cyber-crime were referred to the national Action Fraud Team. A significant proportion of the work around cyber-crime related to educating people about the dangers and actions that they could take to reduce their risks and joint work to raise awareness was taking place with Surrey Fire and Rescue Service as part of the Safe and Well Checks.

The Committee thanked Inspector Darkens for his update.

27/EP Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group

Nicola Airey, Director of Planning and Delivery, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), gave a presentation in respect of the work of the CCG across the Borough. The presentation included a summary of the CCG's priorities, an overview of key pieces of work over the past year and a summary of the challenges and opportunities faced by the CCG.

The CCG's current priorities focused on reducing reliance on medical interventions by helping residents manage long term conditions, putting programmes in place to help them live independently in their own homes for longer, improving the physical and mental wellbeing of children and young people in the Borough and improving the health of the local workforce.

Key pieces of work over the past year have included the commissioning of a new provider of smoking cessation services, working with the Public Health team to commission a new child weight management service, engaging with non-statutory bodies to promote mental resilience amongst children in schools, developing a falls prevention programme and continued work to embed and expand the scope of the Workforce Wellbeing Charter.

Funding and ensuring programmes were financially sustainable was a continuing challenge for the CCG; a situation that meant alternative funding streams were being explored for example funding was no longer available for adult weight management schemes and the CCG had been working with the Arena Leisure Centre to develop an alternative adult weight management offer.

It was acknowledged that communications was an area that needed to be improved. A new Communications Manager had been appointed and the CCG's website was being updated to improve the quality of its signposting.

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

- If CAMHS subcontracted a service then CAHMS themselves were responsible for the quality assurance of the sub-contracted service. Where the CCG was

involved in a service then the CCG had powers to quality assure the service through the contracting process.

- Teachers played a vital role in identifying issues at an early stage and they had requested help and training to identify the signs and triggers of impending problems amongst children and young people.
- It was acknowledged that the respite facilities at Pinehurst in Bagshot were an important part of the Borough's care offer and the CCG were pushing Surrey County Council to ensure that appropriate alternative accommodation was provided.
- It was acknowledged that mobile phone apps were useful tools however it was stressed that care would need to be taken to ensure that any app introduced to assist with accessing primary care and associated services was the right one for the job.

The Committee thanked Nicola Airey for her update.

28/EP Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust

Jane Hogg, Integration and Transformation Director, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust gave a presentation in respect of the Trust's work to develop and implement its Sustainability and Transformation Plan.

Made up of 30 statutory bodies including 5 CCGs, 1 acute care provider, 5 mental health and community providers, 5 GP federations, 2 county councils, 3 unitary authorities and 5 district and borough councils the Trust provided health and care services to 750,000 people across Surrey Heath, North East Hampshire and Berkshire.

The five year Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) had been introduced by the Government to encourage NHS organisations and local authorities to come together to develop 'place-based plans' for the future of health and care services in their area. STPs covered all aspects of NHS spending in England and were intended to cover three headline issues: improving quality and developing new models of care; improving health and wellbeing; and improving efficiency of services. Trusts had been tasked with identifying the key priorities needed for their local area to meet these challenges and deliver financial balance. In addition to having to cover all aspects of NHS spending, STPs also had to focus on improving integration with social care and other local authority services.

Following extensive work, the Trust had submitted its STP to NHS England on 21st October 2016 and funding applications had been submitted to the Sustainability and Transformation Fund.

The Frimley Health and Care STP recognised that although performance across the Trust's footprint was strong and that there were pockets of good practice more needed to be done to expand identified good practice, make best use of resources and reduce duplication and inefficiencies.

As part of this work the Trust had developed a number of initiatives that would be implemented over the next 18 months including:

- Ensuring people have the skills, confidence and support to take responsibility for their own health and wellbeing.
- Developing integrated decision making hubs to provide a single point of access to services.
- Laying the foundations for a new general practice model.

- Designing a support workforce that is fit for purpose across the whole trust
- Transforming the social care support market.
- Reducing clinical variation to improve outcomes and maximise value for all individuals accessing the Trust's services.
- Implementing a shared care record that is accessible to all professionals across the STP footprint.

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

- A planning application had been submitted for the redevelopment of Heatherwood Hospital and a decision was expected by the end of March.
- The redevelopment of Heatherwood Hospital would not provide additional acute services. Instead the re-provision of operating theatres, increase in bed capacity and better use of day case facilities would enable the Trust to improve its elective offer and reduce congestion at the acute sites.
- It was the Trust's ambition for 90% of patients to experience an 18 week referral to treatment time limit. However this was difficult to achieve when hospitals experienced a surge in acute cases which resulted in routine work being delayed.
- It was acknowledged that the current appointment booking system was old fashioned. Work was underway to make the booking system more flexible and user friendly.
- The preoperative smoking cessation programmes had been recognised as being an opportunity to help people give up smoking permanently and support services were available to help with this.
- The Trust was exploring ways to introduce video consultations, which had been used successfully elsewhere, for pre-operative and follow up consultations where the patient was considered to be healthy.
- It was acknowledged that councillors were in a unique position to work to influence national policy direction on health and social care.

The Committee thanked Jane Hogg for her informative update.

29/EP Monitoring Officer Report - Single Member Call-In

The Committee received a report providing an update on the outcome of a single member call-in relating to the revenue support grant given to the Citizens' Advice Bureau that had been received following a meeting of the Executive on 10 January 2017.

It was reported that the question had not met the call-in thresholds stated within the Council's Constitution and the matter was being followed up informally with the Member concerned.

The Committee noted the report.

30/EP Committee Work Programme

The Committee received and noted a report setting out their proposed work programme for the 2017/18 municipal year.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 9 March 2017

+ 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

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Ross Cahalane, Michelle Fielder, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Jonathan Partington and Emma Pearman

61/P Minutes

The open minutes were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

62/P Application Number: 16/1123 - Flexlands, Station Road, Chobham

The application was for the erection of 8 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed dwellings, communal pavilion, car parks, bin store, entrance gates and associated landscaping, following demolition of existing buildings. (Amended plan recv'd 6/1/17).

Members received the following updates:

'CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

Affordable housing – The Council's Viability Consultants have received further evidence from the applicant in this regard, regarding the site valuation and how the costs associated with the development were arrived at. They have, however, not changed their recommendation, and still conclude that the development is not able to make a contribution towards affordable housing, and as such none is sought on this basis.

Flooding - The Local Lead Flood Authority have removed their objection, and not objected subject to two conditions, which are already included within the report (Conditions 9 and 10). No comments were received from the Environment Agency.

CONDITIONS:

An additional condition is proposed as follows:

15. The pavilion hereby approved shall be used as an office and meeting/event room, ancillary to the development, and for no commercial or other purpose without the approval in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to retain control over the development and prevent any adverse impacts on amenity in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.'

Some Members felt that the development would improve the site but sought clarification that the gate to the site would remain the same. Officers advised that a condition would be added so any change in the type of gate would have to be considered at committee. Members were also reassured that the ancient woodland adjacent to the site would not be affected by the development.

With regards to additional condition 15 outlined in the update, some Members requested that the condition be strengthened to ensure that the pavilion would be used for events/meetings related only to the site and its residents.

There was some concern about the height of the car ports but Members were advised that the height was lower than the top of the rooves on the dwellings and there were no walls on the car port areas.

Some Members asked about any habitats of bats on the site which may become apparent once demolition began. Officers advised an informative could be added in relation to bats. In addition an informative could be added to advise that the weight restriction on the High Street in Chobham was 18 tons.

Resolved that application 16/1123 be approved as amended subject to:

- **the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- **an additional condition to ensure any change in the gate area would go to committee for consideration;**
- **condition 15 be strengthened to ensure the pavilion would be used for events/meetings related only to the site and its residents; and**
- **informatives added regarding bat habitats on the site and weight limits of vehicles along the High Street.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she lived in Station Road.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

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 as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

63/P Application Number: 16/1114 - The Cottage, Hatton Hill, Windlesham, GU20 6AB

The application was for the two detached two storey dwellings including new vehicular access following demolition of existing dwelling and garage.

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Conrad Sturt, as he felt the development constituted an organic growth to the village and the school would receive much needed funding from the applicant.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'An additional rebuttal letter has been received from the applicant in response to the officer's report, summarised below. This reiterates many matters already outlined in the applicant's submission but new points are commented on in turn:

- If Woodcote School is forced to close due to lack of funding, it would not only result in the loss of school places and loss of employment, but also loss of additional community services in which the school provides, such as local youth football club and bridge club, the use of fields for local Primary School Sports Days and support for the local Royal British Legion and local charities through collections in weekly chapel services.*
- The benefits arising from the enabling development will be long-term and not short-term, as the refurbishment and upgrading of existing facilities will provide longevity to the functionality of this accommodation. The future viability of the school will also be guaranteed.*
- As a boarding school, Woodcote is limited in the number of pupils it can take by the number of dormitories and beds. To increase numbers significantly the school would need to invest heavily in new accommodation,*

and the school's not for profit policy makes this impossible without the owning family disposing of assets.

Officer response:

The additional benefits outlined were not referred to in the original submission and may add further weight towards the Very Special Circumstances (VSC). There may also be a case for VSC based on an enabling case to allow the school to maintain and enhance existing facilities to allow it to continue to prosper. However, as the proposal amounts to a significant floorspace increase of over 300% and additional spread of development in the Green Belt, this case needs to be robust to outweigh this substantial harm to the Green Belt.

In this regard, further evidence would be required. For example, no indication has been given to the extent of the existing financial shortfall experienced by the school in its day-to-day running; how much revenue is expected from the enabling development; and, how much of a proportion of this will be allocated to plug this shortfall, or what specific school facilities need upgrade/expansion.

Additionally, the financial sustainability of the school's future expansion aspirations as outlined in the application has not been outlined. Permitting the current proposal as VSC may lead to future pressure to redevelop other Green Belt sites owned by the school nearby to enable such expansion and the associated capital and maintenance costs.

Overall, the VSC case outlined by the applicant is considered to be imprecise in terms of the amount of funding required; where the enabling funding will be allocated; and, how much of this would contribute to the existing school facilities and future expansion aspirations of the school. A 'masterplan' outlining the school's current needs, opportunities and future aspirations would assist.

- There is still an intention to carry out regular fundraising, but the benefits are limited.*
- The refurbishment of the existing house for rental would provide insufficient funding.*
- The school has been advised that any increase in existing fees would be counterproductive due to the competitive local school market.*

Officer response:

As already outlined at paragraph 7.11.3 on page 61 of the officer's report, it is still considered that insufficient detail has been given as to what fundraising activities have been undertaken/ explored and how this is insufficient to maintain the school. Similarly, no detail has been given in respect of the cost required to refurbish the existing house and the expected rental income. This is considered important as the house has been vacant for over one year. No appraisal of the existing fee structure vs those of competing schools has been provided to qualify that increasing school fees would be counter-productive.

- The new development will be contained to the roadside/frontage of the site, and although the residential floorspace will be increased from existing, there will be no spread of built form from the established linear form of development adjacent to Hatton Hill. Therefore there will be little impact on openness because the site is not currently open in its nature.*

Officer response:

Very limited weight is given to this argument. The significant expanse in footprint and spread of development across the site has already been outlined in the officer's report and the concentration of development towards the roadside does not diminish this harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The primary indicator of whether a development harms openness is the size of built form and not how open a site is or its relationship with neighbouring buildings.

- *Similar schemes have been granted within the Borough at Camberley Heath Golf Club (13/0100) and in the neighbouring Hart Borough.*

Officer response:

The above planning permission for four new dwellings at Camberley Heath Golf Club related to Designated Green Space within a defined Settlement Area, not Green Belt. Therefore, the material planning considerations are different and in any event, it involved a total encroachment of only 0.008% of the whole golf course site forming the Designated Green Space. Additionally, the proposal involved the loss of several existing warehouse-style buildings which appeared to add further weight in favour of the proposal. The case outlined in Hart Borough also granting permission for four dwellings was obviously subject to different local planning policies and it is therefore difficult to comment on how its merits relate to the current proposal. Notwithstanding this, each application must be considered on its own site-specific planning merits.

- *In the event that Councillors agree to the proposed development then they will enter into a S106 Agreement in order to secure financial contributions towards strategic access management and monitoring (SAMM) measures, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD.*

Officer response:

The payment of the £842 financial contribution required towards SAMM would overcome the second reason for refusal. In this instance, it is not considered necessary to secure this payment via legal agreement assuming that the applicant is willing to pay this amount up front. Should Members be minded to grant permission, the SAMM payment could be secured under delegated authority.'

Officers had recommended that the application be refused as they felt the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Some Members agreed with officers' recommendation as they felt that funding a school did not outweigh the harm in the Green Belt. The development constituted a 300% increase in size.

Some Members felt that the village benefitted from the school and the new development would not be seen from the road and would not cause harm in the Green Belt. Members felt that the very special circumstances outlined by the applicant in the agenda report and update did outweigh any harm in the Green Belt.

Resolved that application 16/1114 be approved due to the very special circumstances outlined by the applicant:

- **the ongoing support for education and the benefits to the community;**
- **The wording of conditions to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Ward Members.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members declared that they had received correspondence from the Planning Consultant.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

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 Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Surinder Gandhum, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder.

The vote was lost.

Note 4

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Conrad Sturt and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 5

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Surinder Gandhum, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

The vote was carried.

64/P Princess Royal Barracks

Members received a report on the proposed amendments to the existing Section 106 agreement pursuant to planning permission 12/0546 for the redevelopment of the PRB site in Deepcut.

The applicant team wished to revisit the S106 agreement particularly the triggers for delivery of elements on and off site infrastructure and mitigation and some definitions and terminology. A deed of variation would be needed to make these amendments which would usually be dealt with under delegated authority. However as the development was of strategic importance the agreement of Members was sought at Committee.

A further paper was received by the Committee which outlined that discussions had taken place and this resulted in the applicant team withdrawing their request to amend triggers in respect of the on and off site highway works. This was due to the potential impact on the wider mitigation package and possibly unacceptable impacts on the free flow of traffic or highway safety. Therefore the highway triggers outlined in item 6 on the agenda had been deleted.

It was noted that the draft deed of variation reflected the changes to various elements of the triggers and the rationale for these changes were noted.

Revised wording for the paragraph 2.2 was agreed.

Resolved that, subject to review by the Council’s legal advisers, the completion of the deed of variation be completed by the officers.

65/P Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED that, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the 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:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Paragraph(s)</u>
66/P	3
67/P	5

66/P Exempt Minute - PRB Deepcut

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

67/P Appeals Update

The Committee received a verbal update report in relation to the appeals process.

68/P Review of Exempt Item

The Committee resolved that the information at 67/P remain exempt.

Chairman

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 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 5 April 2017

- + 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 70/P) | + Cllr Valerie White |

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Pat Tedder) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Ian Sams)

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John and Jonathan Partington

Kevin Cantlon

The Chairman and on behalf of the Committee, wished to say that he was so saddened by the tragic loss of a much loved and valued colleague. He felt a great sadness for his widow Natalie and he added he would be sending a personal message to her.

69/P Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2017 were confirmed and signed, subject to the amendment of note 5 at minute 63/P, at the voting paragraph to approve the application, it should read 'voting against the recommendation to approve'. This typo was noted but the minutes for signature and the minutes on the Council's website had already been updated. A couple of minor typos in the printed hard copy agenda were also noted but they had already been amended in the minutes for signature and the Council's website.

70/P Application Number: 16/0652 - 24 and Greenaways 26 London Road, Bagshot, GU19 5HN

The application was for the erection of a three storey building to provide 15 x one bedroom and 10 x two bedroom retirement apartments with associated communal facilities, vehicular access, car parking and landscaping.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The Council's Viability Officer has confirmed a requirement for £226,000 towards affordable housing provision in lieu of on-site provision.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has raised no objections to the proposal.

Natural England has raised an objection to the proposal on the following basis:

"The application is not currently able to contribute towards an identified SANG and has not proposed an acceptable individual bespoke SANG to provide the avoidance and mitigation measures required. An identified SANG is required to enable certainty that there will not be a significant impact upon the SPA from development. SAMM contributions must also be secured. Natural England therefore objects to the proposed development and recommends that the application be refused planning permission."

A legal agreement is advanced for the provision of the affordable housing contribution and a SAMM contribution of £8,889.40 but has not been finalised.

Officers have carefully considered the objection from Natural England and, notwithstanding the Ash and Tongham decisions indicated in Paragraph 7.6.4, are concerned that there does not appear to be a SANG solution for this proposal.

In addition, the national Planning Practice Guidance at Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 21a-007-20140306, issued in March 2014, indicates:

"Care should be taken when considering using conditions that prevent any development authorised by the planning permission from beginning until the condition has been complied with. This includes conditions stating that 'no development shall take place until...' or 'prior to any works starting on site...'

Such conditions should only be used where the local planning authority is satisfied that the requirements of the condition (including the timing of compliance) are so fundamental to the development permitted that it would have been otherwise necessary to refuse the whole permission. A condition precedent that does not meet the legal and policy tests may be found to be unlawful by the courts and therefore cannot be enforced by the local planning authority if it is breached. Development carried out without having complied with a condition precedent would be unlawful and may be the subject of enforcement action."

One of the tests for imposing planning conditions is that they are "reasonable in all other respects". It is a concern that the imposition of Condition 3, which would prevent the commencement of the development until the SANG solution is provided would be unreasonable when there is significant uncertainty that this could be complied with during the lifetime of the permission.

As such, given the materiality of the Natural England objection and the Government guidance; and along with the precautionary approach which needs to be taken in relation to development which could have an adverse effect on the SPA, the recommendation is amended to recommend refusal on SPA grounds (both SANG and SAMM provision).

The lack of a mechanism to secure a contribution towards affordable housing provision elsewhere in the Borough is also added as a reason for refusal give that a legal agreement has not been secured.

The applicant has been informed about this proposed change to the recommendation. The applicant has responded strongly criticising the proposed late change in recommendation without the ability to respond. The applicant is of the opinion that Natural England has not added anything substantively more than its original advice (received 9 August 2016) and that the inspector's decisions remain material considerations. In the circumstances the applicant has requested three alternative options to refusal:

- *Defer the application from determination at this Committee meeting;*
- *Expand the required Section 106 legal agreement to include the required SANG mitigation and delay determining the application until completed; or*
- *Revert back to the original recommendation.*

However, it is considered that there has been a change in advice by Natural England with the latest advice received on the 22 March 2017 (after the report was finalised). There is no certainty that deferral of the application would resolve this matter in a timely manner and a S106 would still need details of an acceptable SANG site. The officer's recommendation to refuse therefore remains.

Change in recommendation:

REFUSE, for the following reasons:

1. *The Planning Authority is unable to satisfy itself that the proposal (in combination with other projects) would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the relevant Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSW). In this respect, significant concerns remain with regard to the adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use and damage to the habitat and the protected species within the protected areas. Accordingly, since the planning authority is not satisfied that Regulation 62 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010 (The Habitats Regulation) applies in this case, it must refuse permission in accordance with Regulation 61 (5) of the Habitats Regulations and Article 6 (3) of Directive 92/43/EE. For the same reasons the proposal conflicts with guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 and Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2012).*
2. *In the absence of a completed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to secure a contribution towards affordable housing provision elsewhere in the Borough, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

Some Members had concerns regarding the parking allocation for the number of flats proposed. It was felt that the proposal would lead to overspill parking on local roads.

Members were reminded that the County Highways Authority had raised no objection to the scheme. Some Members felt that it would be beneficial for a representative of the County Highways Authority to visit some proposed developments in order to experience local concerns.

The draft residential design guide was referenced by some Members and noted that the document stated that parking should be at the side or the rear of developments. This proposal had parking at the front.

Although a transport assessment had been submitted by the applicant, some Members felt that local concerns needed to be taken into account. In particular the level of parking and vehicular movements would be unacceptable in a village concept.

Clarification was sought regarding the description of the proposal as it stated in the report that it was for retirement apartments but the transport plan referred to it as sheltered housing. Officers confirmed to Members that the application referred to retirement/sheltered housing.

Members were minded to include a further reason for refusal as they felt the proposal would be overdevelopment of the site compared to the amount of parking and communal space provided. Officers reminded Members that the amount of communal space proposed was within the draft residential design guide.

Members agreed that there would be insufficient parking spaces to meet the local need of overall development and the frontage parking allocation would be contrary to the draft residential design guide.

Resolved that application 16/0652 be refused, as amended, for the reasons as set out in the update and a third reason for refusal be added to state that there would be insufficient parking spaces to meet the local need of overall development and the parking allocation would be contrary to the draft residential plan.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Valerie White 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 refuse the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

71/P Application Number: 16/0840 - Erlwood Manor, London Road,

Windlesham, GU20 6PG

The application was for the erection of single storey building to provide restaurant and support services for the existing business premises. (Amended & Amended Plans - Rec'd 07/12/2016). (Additional and Drainage Strategy Information - Rec'd 27/01/2017). (Additional Information rec'd 21/02/2017).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Comments have been received from the Arboricultural Officer. No objection is raised subject to condition (this will take the form of condition 11 as drafted in the committee report being amended (amendment underlined)), and an informative being added.

Amended condition 11

No development shall take place until full details of soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved, and implemented prior to first occupation.

The submitted details shall include details of new planting to be carried out and shall make provision for the planting of 5 new trees within the property boundaries of a minimum "heavy standard" size [12 - 14cm girth and a nominal diameter of 4.1cm].

All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All plant material shall conform to BS3936:1992 Parts 1 – 5: Specification for Nursery Stock. Handling, planting and establishment of trees shall be in accordance with BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape.

Any trees or planting that, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, dies, becomes damaged, diseased or is removed shall be replaced in kind.

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

Suggested informative

In relation to condition 11, the 5 trees to be planted as mitigation for the loss of the Oak and the Beech removed to facilitate the development should comprise a mix of any of the following: Quercus palustris "Green Pillar" / Quercus robur "Regal Prince", Quercus robur fastigiata "Koster" or Fagus sylvatica "Dawyck" [green cultivar not purple or gold variants].'

Members felt that the proposal would be beneficial to the local area as an enhanced catering option for staff at Eli Lilley could reduce the amount of vehicular movements in and out of the grounds at lunchtimes.

Resolved that application 16/0840 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 as amended was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 2

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

72/P Application Number: 16/0961 - 325 Guildford Road, Bisley, Woking GU24 9BD

The application was for the erection of 6 x three bedroom dwellings in the form of a pair of semi-detached houses and a terrace of two storey houses with accommodation in the roof and 6 x two bedroom and 3 studio flats in the form of a three storey block with parking, landscaping and access from Guildford Road following demolition of existing building. (Amended info and plan recv'd 2/11/16) (Additional Info - Rec'd 16/02/2017). (Amended Plans - Rec'd 09/03/2017). (Additional Information recv'd 10/3/17).

Members were advised of the following updates:

Correction

Paragraph 2.2 – The sentence should read:

"The application site includes an access direct from Guildford Road and no access is proposed through the adjoining Foxleigh Grange development."

Three representations in support have been received (none making any specific comments).

The LLFA had requested that further drainage details were provided which the applicant has more recently provided. On the basis that the LLFA will need a minimum 21 day period, an extension of time to determine the application is proposed.

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION:

To extend the time period to determine the application to allow full consideration of the further drainage details to 27 April 2017, and any required drainage conditions

added following the receipt of further LLFA comments, with any required time period extensions to be agreed by the Head of Regulatory.'

Members felt that the proposal would greatly improve the site.

Resolved that application 16/0961 be approved, as amended, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and to extend the time period to determine the application to allow full consideration of the further drainage details to 27 April 2017, and any required drainage conditions added following the receipt of further LLFA comments, with any required time period extensions to be agreed by the Executive Head - Regulatory.

Note 1

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

Note 2

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

73/P Application Number: 17/0081 - Shatin, Westwood Road, Windlesham, GU20 6LP

The application was for a detached two storey dwelling including parking area following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings. (Additional info rec'd 07/03/2017).

The application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation; however, it has been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Valerie White.

Members welcomed the removal of permitted development rights as outlined in condition 5.

Resolved that application 17/0081 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Max Nelson.

Note 2

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing
Committee held at Council Chamber,
Surrey Heath House on 15 March 2017**

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

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

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Chris Pitt

10/L Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 23 November 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

11/L Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

12/L Safeguarding Training and Convictions Policy for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Drivers and Private Hire Operators

The Committee received a report providing an update on work to introduce mandatory safeguarding training for hackney carriage and private hire licence holders and the work taking place to review the Convictions Policy for Licenced Drivers and Operators.

The 2014 Jay Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) in Rotherham and the subsequent Government Review of Rotherham Borough Council identified not only that taxi drivers had had a key role in facilitating and engaging in CSE but also that those involved in the licensing and enforcement of taxi and private hire regulations were often unable or unwilling to tackle the issue and were not using their regulatory powers effectively.

The government places a responsibility upon local authorities, private hire operators and individual drivers to ensure that licensed drivers are aware of warning signs that could indicate a passenger was at risk of CSE and that training

was available for hackney carriage and private hire vehicle drivers and operators to help them deal with potential CSE scenarios.

The Council played a pivotal role in ensuring that those wishing to hold a Hackney Carriage or Private Hire Driver or Operator's Licence are considered to be 'fit and proper' persons and that drivers and operators were aware of the signs that could indicate that a passenger was at risk from CSE. Surrey Heath Borough Council does not currently include CSE specific training in its requirements for those wishing to drive a licensed vehicle however drivers and operators were strongly advised to take up offers of safeguarding training that were made by the Council and other organisations. A standalone safeguarding training session run by the Council on 28 February 2017 had been attended by 103 drivers and operators and 60% of the drivers and operators holding licences issued by the Borough Council have now participated in safeguarding training.

The Committee was informed that, in an effort to further improve the calibre of the Borough's licensed trade, officers were exploring the possibility of introducing a requirement for drivers and operators to undergo mandatory safeguarding training as part of the licence requirements. Officers are working with Surrey County Council and the other Surrey District Councils to develop a consistent approach to CSE and to agree consistent procedures for the vetting and licensing of drivers and taxis and agree standards for revoking licences across Surrey and a further report on the matter would be brought to the Committee's next meeting.

The Committee was informed that as part of its ongoing review of policies, the Council's Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Convictions Policy had been reviewed to ensure that it took into account the latest legislation and was in line with recognised best practice.

The draft Policy had been developed using Local Government Association guidance. It was felt that the policy not only reflected the current social climate but also provided an appropriate balance between the need to safeguard the public and the rights of applicants.

It was clarified that currently all applicants had to apply for an enhanced Disclosure Barring Service (DBS) Check and submit this with their licence application. Drivers and operators were then required to complete a new DBS check every three years in order to continue working.

The Draft Policy would be subject to a six week public consultation period and a report on the outcomes would be brought back to the Committee's meeting on 23 June 2017 for consideration.

RESOLVED that:

- i. The work currently being undertaken by officers in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation be noted.
- ii. The draft Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Convictions Policy, attached as Annex A to the report, be approved for the purposes of consultation for a period of 6 weeks.

13/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.

The Committee noted the report.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff
Consultative Group held at Surrey
Heath House on 16 March 2017**

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

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

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Belinda Tam, Lee Brewin and Louise Livingston

6/J Notes

The notes of the meeting held on the 19 January 2017 were received.

7/J Declarations of Interest

It was noted for the record that the staff representatives declared that they were affected by the matters which would be discussed on item 5, the pay settlement.

8/J Data Protection Policy

The Group received a report on the update of the Data Protection Policy. It had been revised to come into line with new legislation in May 2018.

Resolved that the amendments to the Data Protection Policy as outlined in the report be agreed and the Head of Paid Service be asked to approve the Data Protection Policy as amended.

9/J Pay Settlement

The Group received a paper on the pay settlement. Apologies were given for the late submission; this was due to the process which needed to be followed.

The report outlined a proposal for a 2% pay increase for 2017/18. This figure was proposed in order to remain competitive with other Councils.

The recommendation was also updated.

Resolved that the Joint Staff Consultative Group be asked to advise the Executive to recommend that the 2% pay award for 2017/18 be agreed by Council and to be funded from the existing salaries budget.

10/J Work Programme

The Group received a report on the work programme for 2017/18. The following items were proposed.

Meeting	Topic	Source
6th July 2017	Safeguarding Policy	Louise Livingston
	Equalities Strategy	HR/EAG
	Code of Conduct (Review)	HR
28th September 2017	Social Media Policy (Review)	HR
	Off Site Working Policy (Review)	HR
18th January 2018	Pay Policy Statement	HR
	Dignity & Respect at Work Policy (Review)	HR
	Information Security Policy	ICT
15th March 2018	Whistle Blowing Policy (Review)	HR
	Pay settlement	HR

Resolved that the work programme for 2017/18 be approved and amended as appropriate.

Chairman

ii) the acceptance of the appointment.

Chairman

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 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
Performance and Finance Scrutiny
Committee held at Surrey Heath House
on 22 March 2017**

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

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

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Cllr Charlotte Morley and Cllr Conrad Sturt.

29/PF Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman welcomed Members and Officers to the meeting and in particular welcomed Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman and Charlotte Morley, the Community and Regulatory Portfolio Holders respectively, plus Louise Livingston, the Executive Head of Transformation and Jenny Rickard, the Executive Head of Regulatory Services who were attending to assist Members in their discussions.

The Chairman reminded Members that the Committee had requested written submissions from Portfolio Holders, to be circulated with agendas and that Members would be asked to submit as many questions as possible in advance of the meeting. A number of questions had been submitted and the Portfolio Holders would address these as part of their presentations.

Although the Purdah period for the Surrey County Council elections would not officially begin until the following day, the Chairman reminded Members of the need to avoid electioneering, going forward.

30/PF Minutes

The open minutes of the previous meeting, held on 7 December 2016, were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

31/PF Annual Plan 2017/18

The Committee considered a report on the Council's Five Year Strategy and the Annual Plan for the period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2018. The Strategy had been agreed by the Council in August 2016 and had subsequently been refreshed. Both the Strategy and Plan had previously been considered by the Executive on 7 March 2017.

In response to questions submitted prior to the meeting, the following information was reported to the Committee:

- (i) Consultants had already been engaged to work up proposals to take forward the refurbishment and rebranding of the Mall shopping centre in Camberley
- (ii) The previous planning application for Pembroke House, Frimley Road had been the subject of a large petition and had been refused. However, this had been in relation to a large supermarket occupying the ground floor and issues around a lack of amenity space. No complaints had been received in respect of the affordable housing. A new planning application would be submitted and considered in due course.
- (iii) Proposals to improve the public spaces across the town centre starting with Princess Way and the High Street were based on the Public Realm Strategy. The Council had recently submitted applications to the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership to improve the public realm for both areas, including measures to resurface the public footway and seating areas in Princess Way and resurfacing the High Street and pavement to make them more pedestrian friendly. The Camberley Town Centre Working Group was working with businesses to deliver projects to improve the High Street.
- (iv) The Borough formed part of a functional economic area with Rushmoor and Hart and, in developing the respective Local Plans, each Council would ensure that there was enough strategic employment sites and would have strategic policies in their Local Plans to allow Growth. These policies were monitored through annual Authorities Monitoring Reports, this Council's report being monitored by the Executive. The Council's Economic Development Strategy also sets out measures used by the Council to work with both public and private partners to promote and assist with the delivery of economic growth.
- (v) Measures to encourage inward investment were set out in the Economic Development Strategy, which was aligned with the growth strategies of both Surrey County Council and the EM3 LEP.

Inward investment was encouraged in a number of ways, including 'Open for Business', which included working with small companies, business associations and key account management for the larger employers in the Borough.

A report on economic activity was submitted to the Executive annually and the main measure of success would be an increase in the total business rates collected and the Council Tax Base.

- (vi) The Council was working with the Yorktown and Watchmoor Business Association and had submitted an application to the EM3 LEP to develop a new bus route to link trains and buses with the Business Parks, which were currently not served by public transport. This would include transport and

infrastructure improvements and was an example of a direct way in which the Council was working with businesses to deliver improvements. The Council was also working with SCC to achieve improvements to the A30 Meadows Gyratory.

- (vii) Encouraging new developments to strengthen the local economy would be achieved by allocating sites for development (residential, employment, retail) through the Local Plan, examples including potential developments such as Fair Oaks, Deepcut and One Public Estate initiatives.
- (viii) It was confirmed that 100% of the new housing in Pembroke House would be affordable. Subject to agreement with the Housing Association on the best mix, of the 25 Units proposed, 15 would be one-bedroom units.

The Executive Head of Transformation also undertook to provide, where possible, more specific detail on how each matter raised was being measured.

The Chairman noted that previous versions of the Annual Plan had carried significant detail and that this version was designed to be more user friendly for members of the public.

Resolved, that the report be noted.

32/PF Scrutiny of Portfolio Holder - Regulatory

Councillor Charlotte Morley, the Regulatory Portfolio Holder, reminded Members of the key functions covered by her Portfolio. She noted that, whilst she could address strategic issues, it would not be possible to discuss individual cases in the open part of the meeting.

In the course of discussion, the following issues were raised:

Enforcement - Members asked questions on enforcement arrangements and in particular in respect of:

- (i) The workload/extensive number of enforcements covered by one Enforcement Officer, including the number of enforcement issues which were outstanding;
- (ii) The workload of the Council's Arboricultural Officer;
- (iii) The way in which enforcement was prioritised for different types of enforcement;
- (iv) The training that officers received, particularly in respect of rural area issues;
- (v) The frequency with which the Enforcement Policy was reviewed and timescales for a review of the current policy; and
- (vi) Concerns that enforcement across the Borough was considered to be less than satisfactory.

Councillor Morley reminded Members that the Council had agreed a Local Enforcement Plan in September 2014, which reflected the resources agreed, as part of an earlier restructure. A further review was not proposed at this time.

The Local Enforcement Plan included a set of priorities for types of enforcement action, which reflected, at least in part, the resources available. As a result, the current approach sought to make best use of resources available, by seeking assistance from Corporate Enforcement Officers and the Contact Centre. Planning Officers were also key to enforcement processes. Councillor Morley agreed to explore the possibility of an increased role for the Contact Centre.

The Council recruited trained Planning Officers and gave them any necessary local familiarisation/training in both rural and urban areas, according to the needs of the individual officers. Planning Officers took professional qualifications and were mentored by senior officers. A newly introduced ICT package would enable access for planning/enforcement officers to Council systems whilst out on site.

The Council took enforcement action through the courts where appropriate and a number of current cases were in the judicial process already.

Councillor Morley noted that a number of the questions submitted in advance of the meeting had been specific and related to particular Council Wards. She reported that she would respond directly to these questions and urged Members to contact her on Ward specific issues.

Members expressed continued concerns over the performance of the enforcement function and it was proposed that the Executive be asked to review the resources for Planning enforcement, with a view to substantially improving this service.

Key Workers – A shortage of suitable key-worker housing had been identified in the Borough, with both Health and Social Care managers reporting severe difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff.

Councillor Morley reported that Key Worker accommodation was being considered as part of the work of the Local Plan Working Group. The Working Group would report its findings to the Executive in due course.

Homelessness Reduction Bill – Recognising the potential impact of this emerging legislation, Members queried what steps the Council was proposing for homeless people and the challenges facing the Council in this respect.

Councillor Morley explained that the “Team around the Person Team” was working with individuals who were homeless, providing one-to-one assistance to enable them to engage with agencies which could help. This had proved such a success that the Homelessness Grant for 2017/18 would be used to continue its funding.

The Council had, so far, this year, provided 26 nights of accommodation for rough sleepers, because weather conditions had been so poor. Further support was being considered for the range of homeless persons in the Borough, which included rough sleepers, vulnerable/at risk people and sofa-surfers. The Homelessness Reduction Bill would give Councils greater responsibilities to work with vulnerable people who were currently not within the organisation’s responsibility.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Charlotte Morley for her detailed answers to the wide ranging questions from Members in relation to her Portfolio.

Resolved, that the Committee expresses its concern about and advises the Executive to review the Planning Enforcement function, focussing in particular on resource and budgetary implications, with the objective of substantially improving this service.

33/PF Scrutiny of Portfolio Holder - Community

Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, the Community Portfolio Holder, had submitted a report highlighting key areas for her Portfolio and ongoing issues.

Green Waste Club - In response to a number of queries on the Green Waste Club, going forward, Councillor Mrs Chapman highlighted the following:

The Council's contract with Biffa would end in February 2018, when the new joint contact with Amey would commence.

Biffa currently ran the Green Waste Club and arrangements had been made for a seamless transfer so that participating households would not experience any change. However, Biffa had now written to all Green Waste Club members seeking to retain their custom and asking members to pay in advance, for a new contract with Biffa for 2018.

Agreement had already been reached between the Council and Amey for that company to take over green waste arrangements. In effect, Biffa would be using new contracts agreed with existing members to collect commercial waste which would not be processed by Surrey County Council or Surrey Heath facilities. Residents taking up the Biffa offer would be without Council or Amey support if anything went awry.

A clear message to this effect had been issued in the recent edition of Heathscene and this message would also be conveyed on the Council's web pages. Other steps to address this issue and the legal implications of Biffa's actions would also be considered.

Street Cleansing – Members queried the scope of the survey which indicated that 96% of streets had been graded A or B, expressing concerns about the status of some roads in the Borough, including the area around Frimley Park Hospital and Station Road under the A322 By-Pass. Councillor Mrs Chapman confirmed that the survey was Borough-wide, but that she would take on board the comments raised and discuss those with the Council's contractor. When residents called about a litter issue, the Council had a team which could react to one-off litter issues. However, neither the Council nor its contractor were authorised to enter private properties to remove litter.

Councillor Mrs Chapman reported that, when there was a requirement to clear highway land adjacent to dual carriageways, this Council had to liaise closely with both Surrey and Hampshire County Councils, as Highways Authorities, as, where possible, verge cleaning of dual carriageways was combined with sorting potholes and defective street lighting.

Community Services – Councillor Mrs Chapman briefed the Committee on developments in Community Services and in particular, partnership work with Runnymede Borough Council, including a shared manager and a range of far-reaching initiatives on dementia. In 2017/18, the Council would build on its partnership with Runnymede Borough Council, SCC Adult Social Care and the Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group, to strengthen and develop new services for the community.

One recent initiative included a pilot study introducing integrated health management through various forms of technology in the homes of people with moderate dementia and a carer on site. Half of the households in the pilot will have technological aids introduced and a comparison will be made between those with and without this assistance.

The Service would also introduce, in the summer of 2017, a respite service in the Windle Valley Centre for 8 clients, plus up to 2 emergency clients each day when required. This recognised that both cared for and carers need assistance.

The Council was working in partnership with Surrey County Council, the Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group and Frimley Park Hospital on a package for people returning home after being discharged from the hospital. These measures included providing an emergency telephone for a week, free food for 48 hours through Meals at Home and a code dial on the front door. Various follow-up services could also be provided at the clients' request.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman for her detailed answers to Members' questions and her briefing, particularly on innovative developments in Community Services.

Resolved, that the presentation be noted.

34/PF Task and Finish Groups

Councillor Robin Perry reported on a meeting of a Task and Finish Group, held on 14 March 2017, which had sought to review the impact of recent Government benefit reforms on Surrey Heath Borough Council and local residents, with a view to making recommendations on possible changes that could help minimise any negative repercussions.

The Group was assisted by Maria Zealey, from the Surrey Welfare Rights Group and the Revenues and Benefits Manager, Robert Fox.

The main welfare changes identified were:

- (i) Benefit Cap – down to £20k pa from 7 November
- (ii) Universal Credit - being introduced in phases,
- (iii) Housing Benefits - capped at Local Housing Allowance rates,
- (iv) Personal Independence Payment - replaces Disability Living Allowance,
- (v) Employment and Support Allowance being phased out from April 2017,
- (vi) Youth Obligation – from April 2017, 18-21 year olds to lose automatic entitlement to Housing Benefit, Child Tax Credit

- (vii) Child Tax Credit – from April 2017, entitlement to Child Tax Credit will be removed for third or subsequent children born after April 2017,
- (viii) Spare Room Subsidy (Bedroom Tax),
- (ix) social tenants with a household income of more than £31k will have to pay higher “market rate” rents.

Looking at the impact of benefit changes on Borough residents, the number impacted upon by the benefits cap and the introduction of Universal Credit was relatively small, but the impact on those individuals was likely to be high.

There had been an increase in homelessness and personal debt, exacerbated by the bureaucratic nature of the new schemes and, notably the need to have access to and basic skills in ICT.

Many debt management and Benefits Advice support services had been discontinued as part of general financial cutbacks.

The Task and Finish Group was planning to meet again before formulating recommendations to the Committee.

Resolved, that the update be noted.

35/PF Work Programme

The Committee considered a report enclosing a draft work programme for the municipal year 2017/18.

Members noted that the Council Leader and Chief Executive had been invited to the Committee’s July meeting to discuss the Performance report for 2016/17. Because the original meeting date, of 5 July 2017, clashed with the Local Government Association Conference, this meeting had been moved to 12 July 2017 to enable the guests to attend.

The Committee agreed the following Work Programme for Municipal Year 2017/18:

DATE	TOPIC	OFFICER
5 July 2017		
1	Performance 2016/17	Louise Livingston
2	Finance Report – End of Year 2016/17	Kelvin Menon
3	Presentation - Changes to Services for Older People in the Borough	Tim Pashen
4	Emergency Planning/Business Continuity	Tim Pashen
5	Waste Action Plan	Tim Pashen
6	Information Items report (Complaints/Ombudsman/Equalities/Air Quality Management/RIPA/Corporate Risk)	Andrew Crawford to collate
7	Task and Finish Groups	Andrew Crawford

8 Committee Work Programme Andrew Crawford

13 September 2017

1	Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders – Business/Corporate	Daniel Harrison/ Richard Payne
2	Review of Reserves and Provisions	Kelvin Menon
3	Annual Report on Treasury Management	Kelvin Menon
4	Green Space Update	Daniel Harrison
5	Task and Finish Groups	Andrew Crawford
6	Committee Work Programme	Andrew Crawford

6 December 2017

1	Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders – Finance/ Transformation	Kelvin Menon/Louise Livingston/ Karen Limmer
2	½ Year Treasury Management Report	Kelvin Menon
3	½ Year Finance Report	Kelvin Menon
4	Finance linked Reports	Kelvin Menon
5	Transformation linked Reports	Louise Livingston
6	Update on Investment Properties	Karen Limmer
7	Task and Finish Groups	Andrew Crawford
8	Committee Work Programme	Andrew Crawford

21 March 2018

1	Scrutiny of Portfolio Holders – Regulatory/Community	Jenny Rickard/ Tim Pashen
2	Corporate Risk	Kelvin Menon
3	Corporate linked reports	Richard Payne
4	Regulatory linked reports	Jenny Rickard
5	Task and Finish Groups	Andrew Crawford
6	Committee Work Programme	Andrew Crawford

36/PF 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)
37/P	3
38/P	3

Note: Minute 37/P is a summary of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minute of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

37/PF Minutes

The exempt minutes of the previous meeting, held on 7 December 2016, were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

38/PF Review of Exempt Items

The Committee reviewed the minutes 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 minute 37/PF and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

on to look after the Council's Property Interests and the Joint Waste Contract. The possibility of using interim staff to fill vacant posts until newly appointed permanent staff were ready to take up their posts was also being explored.

It was acknowledged that predicting the income generated by the theatre was a challenging task. The Committee was informed that actual income had been increasing year on year and the new theatre management team were working to develop the theatre's offer in order to generate higher levels of income.

The Committee noted the report and commended the approach being taken to develop and train young people within the Council.

14AS Certification of Benefits Claims

The Committee received a report setting out the findings of an audit of the Council's Housing Benefits Claims and Returns for 2015/16 completed by KPMG in November 2016.

In 2015/16, the Council had claimed a total of £16,281,299 in respect of Housing Benefits from the Government. The audit, which had been conducted in accordance with the requirements set out by the Government, had concluded that the claim and returns were fairly stated and in accordance with the relevant terms and conditions.

It was noted that during 2015/16 the Council had made overpayments of £27,681 as a result of local authority errors and administration delays.

The Committee noted the report.

15AS Independent Persons Protocol

The Committee received a report providing an update on the adoption of an Independent Persons Protocol.

The Committee was informed that the Localism Act 2011 required all local authorities to adopt a code of conduct for their elected members and to appoint at least one independent person to assist the council in dealing with complaints that the code of conduct may have been breached.

The Designated Independent Person had to fulfil three main purposes:

- to be consulted by the Authority before it made findings as to whether a Member had failed to comply with the Code of Conduct or decided on action to be taken in respect of that Member
- they could be consulted by the Authority in respect of a standards complaint at any other stage; and
- they could be consulted by a Member, or co-opted member of the Council, against whom a complaint has been made

To ensure that they had access to a pool of suitably trained and skilled independent persons the Council had entered into a consortium arrangement with six other local authorities. The Consortium had appointed six people to act as Independent Persons and the Protocol had been adopted to ensure that their use was well managed and that appropriate support and training was available to help them with any work they undertook as part of their role.

The Protocol was a working document and would be reviewed and updated as necessary.

The Committee noted the report.

16AS Internal Audit 3 Year Strategy 2017-2020

The Committee received a report setting out the proposed Internal Audit Three Year Strategic Plan 2017-20.

The Plan had been developed in line with the best practice principles set out by the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards. The areas to be audited had been identified through a combination of factors including the Council's Corporate Risk Register, projected levels of income and expenditure, the control environment, growth areas and identified public sector risks. The Plan would be used to form the basis of the Internal Audit function's work programme for the next three years.

In developing the plan, officers had tried to spread the work across a range of areas to ensure that audit work did not become overly burdensome to individual sections. Where a system was subject to annual audits then efforts were made to look at different parts of the system each year.

It was considered that the proposed five year gap between Development Control (Planning) audits was too large. It was suggested that the proposed 2018/19 audit be brought forward and the audit of another regulatory area planned for 2017/18 be put back to 2018/19. It was agreed that the audit timetable for Regulatory Services would be revisited.

RESOLVED that the Internal Audit Three Year Strategic Plan 2017-20, attached as Annex A of the report, be approved.

17AS Internal Audit Annual Plan 2017/18

The Committee received a report setting out the proposed work plan for the Council's Internal Audit Function for 2017/18.

The work plan had been based on the Internal Audit Three Year Strategic Plan and consisted of a combination of audit activities that were carried out on an annual basis, activities that were conducted on a triannual basis and one off audit projects.

It was expected that the activities proposed in the Annual Plan would require 430 working days to be delivered by the Council's two internal auditors. Additional resources would be brought in to supplement the internal Audit Team when required.

The Committee noted the proposed audit areas for 2017/18 and requested that consideration be given to auditing the Council's Investment Portfolio during the year.

RESOLVED that the Annual Audit Plan for 2017/18, as set out in Annex A of the report, be approved.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank