

COUNCIL MEETING

13 December 2017

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 4 October 2017** (Pages 3 - 8)
2. **Executive - 3 October 2017** (Pages 9 - 12)
3. **Executive - 7 November 2017** (Pages 13 - 18)
4. **Executive 5 December 2017 (to follow)**
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 19 October 2017** (Pages 19 - 26)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 16 November 2017** (Pages 27 - 48)
7. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 21 November 2017** (Pages 49 - 52)
8. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 18 October 2017** (Pages 53 - 58)
9. **Audit and Standards Committee - 8 November 2017** (Pages 59 - 62)

This page is intentionally left blank

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

+ Cllr Valerie White (Mayor)
+ Cllr Dan Adams (Deputy Mayor)

+ 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
+ Cllr Oliver Lewis	+ Cllr John Winterton

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

32/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Ian Cullen, David Lewis, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield and Robin Perry.

33/C Minutes

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

Resolved that the open minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 26 July 2017 be approved as a correct record.

34/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor told Members that she never ceased to be amazed by the work of the voluntary organisations in the Borough.

She had visited every care home in the Borough and attended a number of Macmillan Coffee morning events. She had very much enjoyed the Chobham Festival Jazz Evening and the Faith Forum Safari Supper.

The Mayor was pleased to inform the Council that the Frimley Business Association had won the Britain in Bloom Silver Award. Their competition entry had been made in memory of Kevin Cantlon, the Council's Economic Development Officer, who had died suddenly in April 2017. Kevin had always been very supportive of Frimley's local businesses.

35/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader reported that the Surrey Leaders had discussed the following topics at recent meetings:

- Business Rates Pilot – Surrey County Council together with the 11 district/borough councils had agreed to submit a bid to be a business rates pilot. The bid, which had to be submitted by the end of October, would be subject to sign off by the Section 151 Officers.
- Parking Enforcement Arrangements – Surrey County Council was changing the arrangements for parking enforcement. As a result in order to retain some control, it would be necessary to form a “cluster”, with Woking Borough Council. A report on the details of the arrangement would be submitted to the Executive.
- Waste Recycling – the County Council intended to reduce recycling payments to district/borough councils phased over 3 years. The Council currently received £383k a year. This would reduce to £234k in 2018/19, to £161k in 2019/20 and £88k in 2020/21 providing recycling rates did not reduce.
- Transport for the South East was currently being set up. This would be a partnership to improve the transport network for all and grow the economy of the whole South East area. It covered the area from the south coast to the borders of London and included, as well as Surrey, Medway, Kent, East and West Sussex, Berkshire, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.
- Flood and Drainage Works – The County Council was currently investigating the legality of imposing a flood levy as it had insufficient monies to carry out flood and drainage works throughout Surrey.
- Transit Camp for Gypsies and Travellers – The Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner was encouraging the establishment of a transit camp for gypsies and travellers in each borough/district. He considered that such camps would enable the police to deal with unauthorised encampments more effectively.
- New Housing Modelling – The Department for Communities and Local Government had introduced new modelling on the affordability of housing in each area. For the Borough this meant a minimal drop of 7% in the level of

housing required. Some councils in the south of Surrey had had a larger increase. Surrey Leaders had made representations to CLG relating to the basis of the modelling, the required reduction in house prices in order to achieve affordability and the continuing threat to the Green Belt.

36/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

(a) Executive – 1 August and 5 September 2017

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

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 1 August and 5 September 2017 be received and the recommendations therein be adopted as set out below:

- **Minute 31/E - Review of the Corporate Capital Programme and Capital Prudential Indicators for 2016/17**

Resolved

- (i) **the carry forward budget provision of £1.261 million from 2016/17 into 2017/18 be approved;**
- (ii) **the revised 2017/18 Capital Programme of £44.567 million be noted; and**
- (iii) **the final capital prudential indicators for 2016/17 be noted.**

- **Minute 40/E - Refurbishment of Windle Valley Centre**

Resolved that the Capital Programme be amended by the total sum of £35,000 based on the estimated costs for refurbishing the Windle Valley Day Centre, the costs to be funded from the Personalisation, Prevention and Partnership Fund.

- **42/E - Business Rates Relief Schemes**

Resolved that

- (i) **the Supporting Small Businesses Business Rates Relief Scheme, Local Discretionary Business Rates Relief scheme and the Pubs Business Rates Relief Scheme as set out in Annexes A to C of the agenda report be approved;**
- (ii) **the Executive Head of Finance in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance be authorised to**

make changes to the scheme arising out of the consultation with major preceptors; and

(iii) the Executive Head of Finance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, be authorised to make changes to the schemes to ensure that the costs remain fully funded by Government and do not fall on the Council.

- (a) Planning Applications Committee – 20 July 2017, 24 August 2017 and 21 September 2017

It was moved by Councillor Nick Chambers, seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan, and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 20 July 2017, 24 August 2017 and 21 September 2017 be received.

- (b) External Partnerships Select Committee – 19 September 2017

It was moved by Councillor Darryl Ratiram, seconded by Councillor Dan Adams and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 19 September 2017 be received.

- (c) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 28 September 2017

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson, seconded by Councillor Charlotte Morley and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 28 September 2017 be received.

37/C Motions

It was moved by Councillor David Allen and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder that

“Any and all governmental body consultations affecting any of the residents of the Borough of Surrey Heath be directly accessible and actionable with a front-page menu item that drops down to each current individual consultation on the front page of the Surrey Heath Borough Council website. This is for all consultations at either the Borough or County or National Level.”

Following debate, it was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler that the motion be amended as follows:

“Key consultations affecting residents of the Borough of Surrey Heath continue to be directly accessible via a front-page menu item on the Surrey Heath Borough Council website.”

Councillor David Allen as the mover of the motion indicated his agreement to the amendment as proposed.

The motion was put to the vote and carried.

Resolved that key consultations affecting any of the residents of the Borough of Surrey Heath continue to be directly accessible via a front-page menu item on the Surrey Heath Borough Council website.

38/C Leader's Question Time

The Leader responded to a question about the steps taken by the Council to address loneliness in the Borough.

39/C Exclusion of Press and Public

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

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
40/C	3
41/C	3
42/C	3

40/C Exempt Minutes

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

Resolved that the exempt minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 26 July 2017 be approved as a correct record.

41/C Executive and Committees - Exempt

The Council received the exempt minutes of the Executive of 1 August and 5 September 2017 and adopted the recommendation therein.

42/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 33/E remain exempt for the present time;**
- (ii) Minute No 45/E remain exempt until the completion of necessary legal procedures;**
- (iii) Minute No 46/E remain exempt until the completion of necessary legal procedures; and**
- (iv) Minute No 47/E be made public following a Press Release but any financial and contractual information to remain exempt for the present time.**

Mayor

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 3
October 2017**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

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

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Bill Chapman, Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Pat Tedder and Cllr Victoria Wheeler

49/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

50/E Community Fund Grant Applications

The Executive considered 6 grant applications to the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme.

Members considered each application, noting the impact that each project would have and, where relevant, comparable funding provided by other authorities.

It was noted that an application from Oakleaf Enterprise to introduce a service for vocational training for those experiencing mental ill health had been recommended for refusal as the scheme was fully funded until March 2018; it was, however, recognised that if necessary a new application could be considered in December 2017.

Members were advised that the application from Camberley Lawn Tennis Club to excavate and construct a crate-based attenuation soakaway system to mitigate the flooding of the tennis courts was recommended for deferral as, following advice from the Council's drainage engineer, it was felt that alternative options and solutions should be explored.

RESOLVED

- (i) **that the following grants be awarded from the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme, subject to any conditions set out in the agenda report:**

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Grant Award</u>
West End	To plant bulbs on the A322 grass	£300

Village Society	highway verges	
West End Bowls Club	To extend the existing clubhouse to meet increasing club membership numbers.	£5,000
Bagshot Playing Fields Association	To replace a dilapidated children's playground	£10,000
Old Dean Bowling Club	To install disabled toilet facilities and update the fire alarm system	£5,787

- (ii) **to refuse the application from Oakleaf Enterprise in Guildford to introduce a service for vocational training for those who are experiencing mental ill health, as the scheme is sufficiently funded until March 2018; and**
- (iii) **to defer the application from Camberley Lawn Tennis Court to install a new system to prevent flooding of the tennis courts in order to allow all options to be explored by the Council and the applicant.**

51/E Air Quality Feasibility Study

The Executive was informed that the National Air Quality Plan for Nitrogen Dioxide set out how the Government would ensure that compliance with air quality limits was achieved in the shortest time possible. A key part of the Plan was a requirement on some local authorities to undertake feasibility studies to explore a range of measures to improve air quality.

The Council had been named in the Plan as one of the authorities needing to undertake a feasibility study. Computer modelling had shown that along parts of the A331 concentrations of nitrogen dioxide were predicted to exceed the annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide. As a result, the Council had been directed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to produce a feasibility study by March 2018 on options for ensuring compliance with the air quality objectives on the A331 in the shortest period possible.

The Government had allocated the Council an initial grant of £50,000 for the feasibility study which would be carried out in partnership with Rushmoor and Guildford Borough Councils. The funding would enable the Council to develop its feasibility study proposal as well as conduct local assessments to support its evidence and local understanding which will form part of the proposal. This funding represented one tranche of the funding required for the feasibility study and did not prejudice further bids. Any further funds required would be subject to the approval and submitted by the Council for review by Defra's Assurance Panel.

RESOLVED to

- (i) **undertake a feasibility study to explore a range of measures to ensure compliance with the air quality objectives in the shortest time possible, to be funded from a grant of £50,000 allocated by the Government; and**
- (ii) **note the 2017 Annual Air Quality Status report for Surrey Heath.**

52/E Review of Reserves and Provisions

The Executive considered a report detailing the Council's Reserves and Provisions. At 31 March 2017 the Council had £21.35m in useable reserves which were backed by cash. The report also made an estimate as to the level of reserves as at 31 March 2018 based on current knowledge, together with schedules showing what each reserve was for and the rules regarding expenditure.

RESOLVED to note the report.

53/E Response to the Local Government Settlement Technical Consultation

The Executive considered a response to the Government's consultation on the 2018/19 Local Government Finance Settlement.

Members considered the proposed response and agreed that the response to Question 2 should be amended to state that, if the Government intended to pursue a policy for linking a reduction in New Homes Bonus payments to applications approved on appeal, the deduction should only be made for applications granted on appeal where costs were awarded against the local authority.

It was also agreed that the letter should be signed by the Leader and the Chief Executive.

RESOLVED to

- (i) **agree the proposed Consultation response, as amended; and**
- (ii) **delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, the completion and submission of the final consultation response.**

54/E Surrey Business Rates Pilots

The Executive was reminded that the Council collected £35m in Business Rates per year, of which only a small proportion was retained by the Council.

Members considered the opportunity to participate in a Business Rates Pilot with the other Surrey Authorities. The pilot would enable 100% of growth in business rates to be retained within Surrey. In exchange, the Government would effectively not give any Rate Support Grant or Rural Services Grants; these would have to come out of the business rates retained. Work undertaken had indicated that

Surrey as an area could benefit significantly by becoming a pilot. The group of authorities in the pilot would be required to propose arrangements for splitting the additional monies and it had been suggested that there should be a minimum gain of at least £500k for each authority.

The Leader reported that the pilot had been discussed at Surrey Leaders Group and that participating in the pilot was currently supported by a majority of authorities. It was, however, recognised that all authorities would need to agree to participate in the pilot for the submission to be made.

RESOLVED to

- (i) note the implications of joining a Surrey Business Rates Pilot for 2018/19; and**
- (ii) delegate to the Executive Head of Finance, in consultation with the Leader and Chief Executive, the final terms of the pilot and the submission of the application.**

Chairman

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

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

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

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Bill Chapman, Cllr Robin Perry and Cllr Chris Pitt

55/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

56/E Mid-Year Performance Report

The Executive reviewed a report which summarised the performance of the Council for the first 6 months of the year against the corporate objectives, priorities and success measures laid out in the Annual Plan for 2017/2018. The Executive commented favourably on the positive performance of the Council and on the excellence of the Annual Plan itself.

RESOLVED to note the 2017/2018 Mid-Year Report.

57/E Allotment Sand and Gravel Charity – Funding Request – Playground at Princess Royal Barracks, Alma Gardens, Deepcut

The Executive was informed that an application had been made to the Allotments Sand and Gravel Charity by Princess Royal Barracks, Deepcut for a grant of £30,051 towards the cost of a new community playground at Alma Gardens, Deepcut.

Members were reminded that the Allotment Sand and Gravel Charity had been established following the sale of a piece of land for £100,000 and was administered by the Council as the Trustee. The terms of the Charity Scheme required that the capital received from the sale of the land must be retained. However the Council had previously agreed that any interest received should be allocated.

The application met the terms of the Charity in that the site was within the previous Urban District of Frimley and Camberley and related to public open spaces and recreation grounds.

Whilst the application had been endorsed and supported by the Surrey Heath Military Covenant Group, it was noted that the facilities would be used by both civilian and military young people.

The total project cost was £84,000. To date £53,949 had been raised from the Military Covenant Grant Scheme and a Defence Infrastructure Organisation contribution. The new facilities were expected to last for 30 years and a commitment had been given by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation to provide the ongoing maintenance.

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that

- (i) a grant be made from the Allotment Sand and Gravel Charity (No 252731) in the sum of £30,051 to the Princess Royal Barracks to provide a new playground; and**
- (ii) the Chief Executive be authorised to allocate funding relating to this project.**

58/E Response to the DCLG consultation on Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places

The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) had issued for consultation a document 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'. This document included proposals which impacted on the Borough. These were:

- a standard method for calculating local authorities' housing need;
- a statement of common ground to improve how local authorities worked together to meet housing and other needs across boundaries;
- making the use of viability assessments simpler, quicker and more transparent; and
- increasing planning application fees in those areas where local planning authorities were delivering the homes their communities needed.

RESOLVED to agree the response to the DCLG consultation on Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places, as set out at Appendix 1 of the agenda report.

59/E Annual Report on the Treasury Management Service and Actual Prudential Indicators for 2016/17

The Executive received the annual report summarising treasury management performance during 2016/17 and demonstrating compliance with the Prudential Indicators.

Members were reminded that the Council was heavily dependent on investment income to support its current revenue expenditure. Although treasury income returns had decreased slightly in 2016/17, this had been against a backdrop of a continuing low interest rate environment nationally coupled with the redemption of investments to repay borrowing.

On the advice of the Council's Treasury advisors the Council, in order to take advantage of low interest rates, had continued to borrow short term from other public bodies rather than longer term from the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB). The Council's advisors had indicated that although interest rates were unlikely to increase significantly within the next 2 years, the Council should seek to fix for the longer term so to minimise interest rate risk.

Although the PWLB offered easy access to funds it did not necessarily offer the lowest rates for longer term borrowing and rates could only be fixed on the day they were borrowed. The Council had been advised that potentially the market was able to offer better rates as local authorities were viewed favourably and that they were in the market to offer a fixed rate borrowing option for a time in the future. This would mean that the Council would be able to continue to take advantage of low short term rates but be able to minimise the risk of rate rises in the future. Although going to market would have an initial cost this would be more than recovered in interest savings over the life of the loan. It was therefore proposed that treasury consultants be engaged to go to market and that the costs involved be met savings.

RESOLVED

- (i) to note the report on Treasury Management including compliance with the 2016/17 Prudential Indicators; and**
- (ii) that Treasury Consultants be appointed by the Executive Head of Finance in consultation with the Chief Executive to negotiate borrowing opportunities with other providers with the cost being funded from interest savings.**

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that compliance with the Prudential Indicators for 2016/17 be noted.

60/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)
61/E	3
62/E	3

61/E Performance of the Major Property Acquisitions

Members received a report on the performance of the Council's major property acquisitions.

In relation to The Square and associated town centre properties, the quarterly report received for the period from April to June 2017 had shown that gross rents were ahead of budget and that this was likely to continue for the remainder of the

year. The Centre had been rebranded in September and as at 30th June, the vacancy rate had been just under 5%, with almost 99% of rent due being collected.

The Council's Land and Property Board had reviewed the position for redevelopment of the London Road Block in current market conditions and a report with proposals for its redevelopment would be presented to a future meeting of the Executive.

The Development Agreement in relation to Ashwood House and Pembroke House had now been exchanged. By comparison with the agreed business case for this investment, the capital receipt received was more than the original estimate due to the fact that the final design now included additional flats. In addition to this capital receipt, the Council would also receive a contribution towards the planning costs and a projected CIL payment towards SANGS provision. Whilst there were further financial commitments for the Council in respect of Public Realm works and the removal of the ramp from the car park, these would be funded out of the proceeds of sale.

In the 6 months to 30th September, the rent income for St Georges Industrial Estate had exceeded the budget. As at the end of September, the estate had been 95% full and the Council's agents were working on letting the empty units. In the same period, the rent income for Albany Park had also exceeded the budget and the estate was now 100% occupied.

The Executive was advised that 2 other recent potential acquisitions had not proceeded. It was the nature of property investment that not every property investigated would be purchased as it was necessary to ensure that only those investments which represent good value and a low investment risk were eventually purchased.

The Council was working with agents to investigate other potential acquisitions within the Council's economic area to support regeneration and financial returns.

RESOLVED to note the performance of major property acquisitions.

62/E Review of Exempt Items

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

RESOLVED that the report at Agenda Item 10 – Performance of the Major Property Acquisitions remain exempt but that Minute 61/C be made public.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 19 October 2017

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Nick Chambers (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Adrian Page
- Cllr Colin Dougan	- Cllr Robin Perry
- Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
+ Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr David Mansfield	- Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Max Nelson	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Victoria Wheeler) and Cllr John Winterton (In place of Cllr Robin Perry)

In Attendance: Cllr Richard Brooks, Lee Brewin, Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington and Emma Pearman

25/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

Chairman's Note

The Chairman reminded Members that if an application was called in to Committee, clear reasons should be provided so that these can be published in the agenda report.

26/P Application Number: 17/0647 - Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windelsham GU20 6HL

The application was for the approval of the Reserved Matters (appearance, landscaping, layout, scale) pursuant to condition 1 of planning permission SU15/0272 for the erection of a 65 bed care home, doctors' surgery and detached bungalow following demolition of existing buildings.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'An amended landscaping plan has been provided which has taken into account the Council's Arboricultural Officer's suggestions in terms of species and is now considered to be acceptable, and the Arboricultural Officer has removed his objection.

Accordingly, the second plan listed in Condition 1 should be amended to read:

- *Hard and soft landscape GA Plan 17158 rev PL03 received 19.10.17'*

Resolved that application 17/0647 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Conrad Sturt had been contacted by the applicant.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Jonathan Lytle and seconded by Councillor Conrad Sturt.

Note 3

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

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

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

27/P Application Number: 17/0500 - St Georges Industrial Estate, Wilton Road, Camberley GU15 2QW

The application was for change of use of Industrial Estate to include Class B8 use (warehousing and distribution) whilst retaining the current Class B1(c) (Light Industrial) and B2 (General Industrial) approved uses. (Additional plan recv'd 15/8/17) (Amended Plan - Rec'd 15/08/2017.)

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, as the applicant was the Council it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee for determination.

Resolved that application 17/0500 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared, on behalf of the Committee, that the applicant was the Council.

Note 2

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

Note 3

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

28/P Application Number: 17/0484 - 26 Portsmouth Road, Camberley GU15 1JX

The application was for the outline application for the erection of a two storey building with accommodation in the roof to provide 8 No. two bedroom and 1 No. one bedroom flats with parking and associated development following the demolition of existing dwelling and surgery (siting, access, scale and appearance to be determined). (Amended information recv'd 27/9/17).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's scheme of Delegation for officers. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

There had been a site visit at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A further 8 representations raising an objection have been received raising the following additional issues:

- *The justification for the need for the surgery under SU/14/0036 was to improve these facilities for their patients and this need appears to have evaporated [See Paragraph 7.2 of the officer report]*
- *Proposal would put pressure on TPO'd trees which provide a substantial amount of privacy to local residential properties, which would be at risk [See Paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of the officer report]*

The County Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal indicating, in relation to the parking provision, that:

"The level of parking provision to be provided at the site complies with Surrey County Council's recommended guidance for residential parking of 1 car spacer per one and two bedroom flat. It is considered that if there is any occasional parking as a result of the development then this is more likely to occur in the less busy road of Highclere Drive. Highclere Drive has a 5.5 metre wide carriageway, sufficient to accommodate on-street parking on one side of the carriageway without unduly hindering traffic flow or causing a highway safety issue"

The Arboricultural Officer has made further comments confirming no objections to the proposal subject to the amended condition (as below).

An upfront payment of £3,514 has been received for the required SAMM contribution.

CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION:

To GRANT, subject to conditions

AMENDED CONDITIONS

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by Crown Consultants [Ivan Button] and dated 12 May 2017. No development shall commence until photographs have been provided by the retained Consultant and forwarded to and approved by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. This should record all aspects of tree and ground protection measures having been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

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

8. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved on site details of refuse and cycle storage area(s) and access thereto are to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the details shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure visual and residential amenities are not prejudiced and to promote the use of other modes of transport than the car and to accord with Policies CP11, DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

9. No development shall take place until a Method of Construction Statement, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors*
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials*
- (c) storage of plant and materials*
- (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)*
- (e) provision of boundary hoarding*
- (f) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway*
- (g) hours of construction*
- (h) confirmation of no on-site burning of material during site clearance, demolition or construction phases*

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

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the proposed modified access to Portsmouth Road has been constructed in accordance with the layout shown on approved drawing BX21-S3-101.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATIVES

5. In respect of landscaping, it will be expected as a minimum that the scheme required for the reserved matters application pursuant to this outline planning permission, should include tree replacement of semi-mature stock using a fastigate form of trees and hedge replacement using semi-mature hedging material, particularly at the flank boundary between 26 and 28 Portsmouth Road.

6. In respect of Condition 8 above, it would be expected that provision is made for secure and covered cycle parking facilities to accommodate a minimum of 18 bicycles.'

Some Members felt that 9 flats on the site would be overdevelopment and the mass would be overbearing and un-neighbourly, which was contrary to policy DM9. There was concern regarding the number of car parking spaces and the potential for parking overspill into Highclere and Portsmouth Road. It was noted that the car parking standards were for guidance.

The Chairman advised the Committee that he had requested a review of the car parking standards for Surrey Heath but until that had been carried out the application needed to be considered taking into account the standards set by the County Council.

Members were referred to the 2014 approved scheme, which was considered against policy DM9. There had been no change in policy. The officers also referred Members to p72 of the report paragraph 7, outlining the Planning Inspector's view on mass and bulk.

Officers had recommended that the application be approved; however, some Members felt that the proposal should be refused on the grounds that it would be an unduly intensive development in the area. It would constitute overdevelopment by size and design and would have an impact on neighbouring properties. There was concern regarding the parking and highway safety.

Resolved that application 17/0484 be refused subject to the reasons outlined above, the wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Dr Peter Broughton and Ms Annabele Scott spoke in objection and Mr Jeff Sadler, the agent spoke in support.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that Committee Members had received emails and pictures from residents.
- Councillor Nick Chambers declared that he knew one of the speakers

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

Note 4

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

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

Councillors Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Pat Tedder.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Valerie White and John Winterton

Councillor Surinder Gandhum abstained.

The recommendation was lost.

Note 5

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

Note 6

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Valerie White and John Winterton

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Pat Tedder.

Councillor Surinder Gandhum abstained.

The recommendation was won.

29/P Application Number: 17/0332 - Development Site at Home Farm, Church Road, Windlesham

The application was for the creation of a pond with associated landscape works. (Amended & Additional Plans - Rec'd 22/06/2017) (Amended plans recv'd 18/7/17) (Amended Plans - Rec'd 02/08/2017.) (Amended Plan - Rec'd 10/08/2017.) (Amended Plan - Rec'd 03/10/2017.)

The application would normally have been determined under the Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it was reported to Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Conrad Sturt.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Windlesham Parish Council has raised no objections.

One representation in support has been received indicating that proposed change would not have any impact on the Green Belt and should improve overall drainage of the area.

An amended landscape drawing has been received, deleting a reference to a bridge over the ditch.

AMENDED CONDITION:

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 16-P1389-102 Rev. B received on 18 July 2017 and 1332-L90-501 Rev. J received on 19 October 2017, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

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

The application had been called in because of concerns regarding flooding. Members were advised that the pond would 'hold up' water and would act as a balancing pond. It was also noted that the soil removed to make the pond would be disposed of off-site. The construction of the pond would be monitored by the Council's Drainage Engineer.

Resolved that application 17/0332 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared on behalf of the Conservative Group that the Conservative Constituency Office was detailed on the site map.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve application as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page.

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 Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 16 November 2017 and 22 November 2017

Attendance on 16 November 2017

- + Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
- Cllr Nick Chambers (Vice Chairman)

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

Cllr Max Nelson

 - + Present
 - Apologies for absence presented

Cllr Surinder Gandhum from min 30/P – 36/P

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

Attendance on 22 November 2017

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| + Cllr Nick Chambers | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Surinder Gandhum | + Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| + Cllr Jonathan Lytle | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| - Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr David Mansfield | + Cllr Valerie White |
- Cllr Max Nelson
- + Present
 - Apologies for absence presented

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

30/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 October were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

31/P Application Number: 17/0670 - Pembroke House, 148 Frimley Road,

Camberley GU15 2QN

The applications was for the demolition of existing building and erection of a four storey building to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class A1/A2/A3/B1/D1/D2) at ground floor level and 25 residential apartments (100% affordable housing comprising 12 no. 1 bed and 13 no. 2 bed) at part ground and upper levels, together with associated car parking (25 residential spaces and 11 commercial spaces), cycle provision, communal rear amenity space and private garden for flat 1, refuse storage, landscaping and other associated works. (Amended Information - Rec'd 07/09/2017.)

Application 17/0669, Ashwood House, 16-22 Pembroke Broadway, Camberley GU15 3XD, was considered in conjunction with this application.

Members received the following updates:

'Paragraph 6.0 (Final bullet point top of page 18) - This should read 'no.146 Frimley Road'

Paragraph 7.9.1 – Thames Water has confirmed that the attenuated flow rate of 2l/s can be accommodated in the sewer. The Lead Local Flood Authority supports the proposal, subject to conditions.

Condition 19 (page 34) – The applicant has requested that condition 19 be amended so that the commercial use shall not be subdivided into less than two units. This is to enable a degree of flexibility in order to respond to market demand.

[Officer comment: For the reasoning provided under paragraph 7.3.5 it is recommended that there is no change to this condition. It should be noted that the 2013 refusals also proposed two units]

Amended conditions

14. The design and installation of new items of fixed plant shall be such that when operating the cumulative noise level LAeq Tr arising from the proposed plant, measured or predicted at 1m from the facade of the nearest noise sensitive premises, shall be a rating level of at least 5dB(A) below the background noise level LAF90 Tbg. The measurement and/or prediction of the noise should be carried out in accordance with the methodology contained within BS 4142: 2014.

Reason: To limit noise and disturbance in the interests of the local neighbourhood's amenities and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.

Delete condition 20 (this is because the bench and phone box lie outside the redline plan)

Additional conditions

20. No works below ground shall commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Those details shall include:

- a) *A design that is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS.*
- b) *A construction phase plan showing how the drainage system will not be compromised during construction (to include details of how pollutants and sediments from construction will be managed to prevent being washed into the watercourse).*
- c) *Finalised drawings ready for construction to include: a drainage layout detailing the location of SuDs elements, pipe diameters and their respective levels and long and cross sections of each SuDS Element.*
- d) *An exceedance flow plan that shows where water will drain to during exceedance or system failure*
- e) *A maintenance plan showing the maintenance regimes for each SuDS element and who will be responsible for maintaining these.*

Reason: To ensure the design meets the technical standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site.

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

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is designed to the technical standards.

Amended informative

12. The applicant is advised to agree an alternative location for the public bench and the phone box, or confirmation that the bench and/or phone box is no longer required. Any necessary consent from British Telecom for the phone box's relocation or removal should be sought.'

Clarification was sought as to whether the commercial parking spaces would be made available to visitors of residents in the evening. Members were advised that the commercial bays were not restricted. They were also informed that for the residential parking at the rear of the site there would be restricted by rising bollards or equivalent to ensure that residential parking remained private.

There was some concern regarding the effect of the residential units being close to an industrial unit. Environmental Health had been consulted and there were conditions in the report to address this.

Resolved that application 17/0670 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head of Regulatory and subject to the receipt of a legal agreement to secure 100% affordable housing tied to Ashwood House (17/0669) and a SAMM payment of £10,747.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared on behalf of the Committee that the Council owned the freehold for the land on the site of the application.

Note 2

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

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 Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

32/P Application Number: 17/0669 - Ashwood House, 16-22 Pembroke Broadway, Camberley GU15 3XD

The application was for the conversion of the existing second and third floor levels and erection of a two storey roof extension to provide 116 residential apartments (comprising 12 no. studios, 48 no. 1 bed and 56 no. 2 bed) together with the retention of first floor car parking deck (100 spaces including 3 disabled bays), creation of communal amenity space (730 sq. m.) at first floor deck level, provision of associated cycle parking and refuse storage, landscaping, removal of redundant car park ramp and other associated works.(Additional Information - Rec'd 13/09/2017.)

Application 17/0670, Pembroke House, 148 Frimley Road, Camberley GU15 2QN, was considered in conjunction with this application.

Members received the following updates:

'Amended conditions

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans:

A-4161-00-005D, 020H, 021H, 022I, 023I, 024I, 025I, 026D; A-01-005D, 020G, 021G, 022E; A-02-020F, A-02-021 (all as listed on drawings schedule AH2 V2) unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

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

9. Within 6 months of first occupation of the development hereby permitted a scheme comprising the Public Realm Works shall be constructed along the site frontage to and including the amended service yard access and car park exit along

the entire forecourt and footway fronting Ashwood House and entire Princess Way passage between Pembroke Broadway and Princess Way. The Public Realm works shall include replacement bus shelters and associated infrastructure, including new or re-use of as maybe agreed with the Highway Authority, and real time passenger displays. Prior to first occupation full details of temporary arrangements, with details of implementation, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Add the following wording to the final sentence ‘...unless an alternative has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.’

12. The design and installation of new items of fixed plant shall be such that when operating the cumulative noise level LAeq Tr arising from the proposed plant, measured or predicted at 1m from the facade of the nearest noise sensitive premises, shall be a rating level of at least 5dB(A) below the background noise level LAF90 Tbg. The measurement and/or prediction of the noise should be carried out in accordance with the methodology contained within BS 4142: 2014.

Reason: To limit noise and disturbance in the interests of the local neighbourhood’s amenities and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.’

There was some concern that the application did not provide enough parking spaces for the site. Members were reminded that the site was a highly sustainable area being located in the town centre.

Some Members were concerned that the access and egress of the residential area could be hindered at busy times in the multi storey car park. Members were advised that the use of this parking area is no different than if it were to be used for the current office use and so there is no reason why access would be hindered. Members were informed that the parking spaces for residents would be permit parking only with access controlled by a fob system or similar.

Members asked about the indicative retail shop frontages proposed for Pembroke Broadway. It was requested that any proposal for shopfronts be reported back to committee for consideration. Officers confirmed that the shopfronts did not form part of the submission.

Some Members questioned the amount of affordable housing allocated on the site and why the proposal was policy compliant. It was explained that Policy CP5 first sought a 40% on site affordable housing provision for developments of 15 or more units. However, if this could not be met, then Policy CP5 requires viability evidence. This was provided. The alternative-site provision at Pembroke House was also consistent with Policy CP5.

Resolved that application 17/0669 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and

subject to receipt of a legal agreement to secure 25 no. affordable housing at Pembroke House and a SAMM payment of £49,352.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared on behalf of the Committee that the Council owned the freehold for the site..
- Councillor Edward Hawkins as Chairman of this Committee declared that he attended site review meetings in respect of this application.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

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 Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

33/P Application Number: 17/0526 - Land South of Beach House, Woodlands Lane, Windlesham GU20 6AP

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 15 affordable dwellings with access off Broadley Green. Access only with all other matters reserved. (Additional information recv'd 16/6/17). (Additional Information - Rec'd 27/09/2017.)

Members received the following updates:

'One additional objection has been received, which does not raise any additional issues than the previous objections.'

Members were advised that the accommodation would be made available to the residents on the housing register in the parish of Windlesham.

Some Members felt that there was not enough evidence to show that the benefit to the community would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Members were drawn to the Housing Register figures in the report that demonstrated a local need

for the proposal and officers clarified that permitted development rights would be withdrawn through a planning condition as recommended.

Resolved that application 17/0526 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and subject to the receipt of a legal agreement to secure the following:

- All units to be retained as social rented housing in perpetuity;
- All units to be occupied in accordance with a Local Lettings Policy to ensure the units are let to eligible persons with a local connection to Windlesham;
- Timescales for the construction, completion, sale and eventual occupation of the social rented housing units
- the financial contribution towards SAMM

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been completed by 30 November 2017, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to refuse for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal fails to provide a satisfactory legal agreement to secure the dwelling houses as affordable housing (social rented units). The proposal would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would undermine the purposes of including land in and would result in countryside encroachment, and would significantly harm its openness and otherwise undeveloped and rural character. The proposal does not satisfactorily address the requirements of Policy DM5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and cannot be considered to be a rural exception site or as an exception to para 89 of the NPPF.**
- 2. In the absence of a payment or a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14B (vi) (European Sites) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area) of the South East Plan in relation to the provision of contribution 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 Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2012).**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared on behalf of the Committee that the applicant had emailed correspondence to Members.
- Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that he had communicated with the applicant and residents.

Note 2

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Mike Goodman spoke in objection and Mr Douglas Bond, the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page.

Note 4

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

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

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

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillor Conrad Sturt

34/P Application Number: 17/0533 - Land South of Beach House, Woodlands Lane, Windlesham GU20 6AP

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 15 affordable dwellings (six managed by the Windlesham Community Homes Trust and nine intermediate affordable dwellings) with access off Broadley Green. Access only with all other matters reserved. (Additional information rec'd 16/6/17, 27/09/17 & 06/10/17).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'1) Report corrections

- I. *Owing to a formatting error, the second and third bullet points in Para 7.4.8 should read as follows:*
 - *Ensure that the provision of the affordable housing units is made in such a way that such housing shall be affordable for both initial and subsequent occupiers of the dwellings;*
 - *Timescales for the construction, completion, sale and eventual occupation of the affordable housing units*
- II. *Paragraph 7.11.2 in the 17/0526 report in respect of flood risk and drainage is also applicable to 17/0533*
- III. *The Policy DM5 criteria referenced in refusal reason 1 at the end of the report should also be amended as highlighted:*

The applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority that there is a proven local need within the Parish of Windlesham for the proposed intermediate housing, for sale below market levels but above social rent costs, to people with a local connection to the area. As such the proposal represents inappropriate and harmful development in the Green Belt. By association, the proposal would cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes for including land within it. There are no very special circumstances which either alone, or in combination, outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies CPA, CP2 and DM5 (i) and (iii) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2) Additional consultations

In response to the re-consultation following the change in the application description (as outlined in Paras 4.4 - 4.5 of the report), a total of 39 representations of support 25 additional objections have been received, which do not raise any additional issues than the previous objections.

3) Additional information

The applicant has provided a report undertaken by Wessex Economics Ltd (who was commissioned by the Council to undertake the joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment [SHMA] 2016) that seeks to demonstrate a need for Shared Ownership Housing within the Parish of Windlesham. The report refers to 2011 Census figures for the Parish and the Borough as a whole, along with the Subsidised Home Ownership need of 190 dwellings per annum for the Borough as a whole as identified in the SHMA. On this basis, the report concludes that there is a need for 35-37 shared ownership units per annum for the Parish. The report also refers to the fact that over the 5 year period 2011/12 to 2015/16 only 48 affordable intermediate homes have been delivered in Surrey Heath as a whole, whereas the SHMA target for Subsidised Home Ownership is for 190 dwellings per annum.

Whilst the report indicates a need across the Borough for Subsidised Home Ownership and Officers accept that there has been an under-provision of affordable intermediate homes in the Borough, the applicant has not demonstrated that there is a specific existing need in Windlesham Parish. Rather, a pro-rata approach has been taken based on Census and SHMA data. Irrespective of this and as outlined in Para 7.4.9 of the officer's report, no enabling argument has been put forward to justify the provision of intermediate homes for sale and there is doubt as to whether the proposed intermediate housing can be secured for local people in perpetuity as a Rural Exception Site, as required by Policy DM5 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

As such, the officer recommendation remains to REFUSE for reasons as already outlined in the report.'

Some Members asked whether the Trust could use the units approved in the application 17/0526 as part of the social housing provision for this application and officers advised that the applicant would be at liberty to consider this.

Some Members felt that the benefit to the community did not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Members were also concerned whether the need for over 55s accommodation would be taken up and how the units could be allocated.

Officers provided clarification between the two applications (17/526 and 17/0533). Members were advised that 17/0526 provided evidence of local need in accordance with policy DM5 and 17/0533 was recommended for refusal on Green Belt grounds as there was no identifiable need as outlined in the report.

Resolved that application 17/0533 be refused as amended for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared on behalf of the Committee that the applicant had emailed correspondence to Members.
- Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she had met with the representative of the Windlesham Community Home Trust on several occasions and left the Chamber during the consideration of the application..

Note 2

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Mike Goodman spoke in objection and Mr Douglas Bond, the agent and Ms Annie Wilson, Trustee of the Windlesham Community Homes Trust spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to refuse the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper.

Note 4

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

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

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to remove the application as amended:

Councillors Jonathan Lytle and Conrad Sturt

35/P Application Number: 17/0705 - 123 London Road, Bagshot GU19 5DH

The application was for the installation of external lighting. (Additional Plan - Rec'd 31/08/2017.)

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

A site visit took place at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer, following a visit to the site and surrounding properties when the lighting was switched on, has objected to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The lighting design specification indicates a 20 Lux level for the car park and 40 Lux in the drive thru area. This level of illumination appears to be the level required in high usage car parks/roads where other commercial or retail units share the space. Whilst there is no absolute standard, other guidance indicates design levels of between 5 and 10 Lux to be sufficient for shared outdoor car parks which would seem to be a more appropriate level bearing in mind that the proposal relates to a stand-alone unit.*
- The design achieves an average level of 23 lux in the car park and 46 Lux in the drive thru. As such, it over-achieves the standards, which may lead to unnecessary brightness. The scheme may be over designed and there is doubt that for the scale of the development, the correct design level has been selected.*
- Unlike 121 London Road, the obtrusive light spill onto 125 London Road has not been assessed. The average light level of the windows here is predicted to be 20 Lux against the stated design criteria of 10 Lux which is unacceptably high.*
- The lighting levels in the garden areas of 121 London Road are stated as between 0 to 1 Lux. There is serious doubt this is correct since this garden area is clearly lit by spill such that reported local practice by the outlet has been not to turn on lights in here in order to prevent disturbance.*
- The assessment makes reference to the use of back baffles in order to prevent light spillage. These have only recently been fitted and whilst the report indicated that baffles completely obscure light spill, it is clear that they do not work in preventing back spill.*
- If permission were to be granted, alternative fittings of lower power and/or design would be required and a compliance report could be requested. However, such compliance would not preclude the Council taking additional action to prevent artificial light nuisance under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.*

Following a site visit in the evening when the external lighting was switched on, it became apparent when viewed from surrounding residential properties that some of the nuisance came from lighting on the opposite side of the site shining across the site towards the respective residential properties. Such impact from the lighting, it would appear, cannot be baffled.

AMENDED REFUSAL REASON:

It has not been demonstrated that the external lighting provided under this application is genuinely needed to meet minimum requirements of health and safety legislation. The external lighting, by reason of the number of light columns, their predominant location

close to residential boundaries, the height and effect of illumination, is considered to be intrusive to and have an adverse visual impact on the conditions of occupiers of adjoining residential properties, resulting in an adverse impact on residential amenity and failing to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework and supporting Planning Practice Guidance.'

Members were concerned about the height and intensity of the lighting and the impact it had on neighbouring properties.

Resolved that application 17/0705 be refused for the reasons as amended and as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 2

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

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

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

36/P Application Number: 17/0653 - Michael Chell Menswear, 11-13 High Street, Camberley GU15 3RB

The application was for the erection of a part four storey, part three storey, part single storey rear extension and conversion of first floor accommodation to provide extended ground floor retail (Class A1) accommodation with residential accommodation over in the form of 6 No. one bedroom and 4 No. two bedroom flats with ground floor roof level amenity space parking, bin and cycle stores.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Amended drawings have been provided which retain the ground and first floor windows in the front elevation of the existing building. The Council's Conservation and Design Officer has confirmed that the amendments do not overcome his earlier objection to the proposal.

The Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer has indicated that the site benefits from a previous planning permission for residential development without conditions to limit noise disturbance to future occupiers and additional conditions may not be imposed. He indicates that in order to protect the amenity of future occupiers we should have required a noise impact assessment for that proposal

since that there is considerable noise here from night time entertainment with associated activities and general road traffic movements. The same requirements would apply for this application. [Officer comment: The requirement of the EHO could be considered by condition (if minded to approve)].

LLFA have requested further details.'

An email had been received by the applicant:

'Given the stated grounds for refusal the Officer's Report makes scant mention of the consequences of the Extant Consent, which allows for a complete demolition of all structures on the site. Had the Applicant acted on that Consent at the outset, which he is now likely to be compelled to continue with, and demolished the building on High Street then there would have been no original building against which much of the apparent criticism of the Application's new building along St Georges Road is based. Instead the Extant Consent allows the demolition of the building on the frontage that the report clearly states forms part of the High Street Character Area and seeks to protect. This will now be lost, and it was to avoid this unhappy situation that this scheme design and Application sought to avert.'

Members felt that the proposal impacted on the High Street character and they had concerns that it did not provide any parking for the units.

Resolved that application 17/0653 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

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

Note 2

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, PatTedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

37/P Application Number: 17/0702 - Kings Lodge Care Home, 122 Kings Ride, Camberley GU15 4LZ

The application was for the installation of dormers and roof lights, and conversion of roof space to provide 18 bedrooms/en suites with associated accommodation and car parking.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Natural England raises no objections subject to mitigation [Officer comments: This could be secured by condition(s), if minded to approve].'

Members were advised that 20 residents had already moved in to the accommodation in the last four months. Confirmation was also provided that the traffic calming measure agreed at the previous application for this site had now commenced.

Resolved that application 17/0702 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking Ms Jenny Garner spoke in objection and Mr Guy Wakefield, the agent spoke in support.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that Committee Members had received correspondence from the applicant and speakers.
- Councillor Valerie White, in her capacity as Mayor, officially opened the building this year.

Note 3

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Note 4

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Councillor Valerie White abstained.

38/P Application Number: 17/0719 - Garages at Windsor Court Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8LH

The application was for the erection of 2 No. semi-detached 2 storey, three bedroom houses, 2 No. semi-detached one bedroom bungalows, and single storey extension to provide 1 No. one bedroom ground floor flat with associated car parking and landscaping, following the demolition of existing garages.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Pat Tedder.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The Senior Environmental Health Officer raises no objections and recommends a condition (see below).

A set of photos have been provided taken within and around the application site showing the levels of on-street (and other) car parking in the area, as well as car parking on the application site. The parking shown within the application site is principally provided on an informal basis; and this parking (totalling seven spaces) would be displaced by the proposal. To gain access to garages, any parking to the front of the garages (amounting to five of these spaces) would need to be undertaken by those renting the respective garages and, as indicated in the officer report, the survey for the applicant indicates that only two of the garages on the site are rented by local residents.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION:

7. Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until parts 1 to 4 of this condition have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until part 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

1. Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

- (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;*
- (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:*
 - human health,*
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,*
 - adjoining land,*
 - groundwaters and surface waters,*
 - ecological systems,*
 - archeological sites and ancient monuments;*
- (iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).*

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

2. Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

3. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (referred to in PPS23 as a validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

4. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of part 1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of part 2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with part 3.

Reason: *To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework’.*

Some Members felt that the area needed more housing but there was a distinct lack of parking and the suggested parking would block access. There was also some concern regarding the potential loss of the footpaths but officers confirmed that they would remain and an informative was included to support this.

Resolved that application 17/0719 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and the subject to the securing of a contribution towards SAMP and delivery and retention of 100% affordable housing.

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been received by the 1 December 2017, or any longer period as agreed by the Executive Head of Regulatory, to secure a contribution towards SAMP and ensuring that the development is provided and retained as 100% affordable housing, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to refuse the application for the following reasons:-

- i) In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, or payment of the SAMP payment in advance of the determination of the application, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14B (vi) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012; and, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) in relation to the provision of contribution towards strategic access management and monitoring (SAMP) measures, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2012).**
- ii) In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, the applicant has failed to comply with Policies CP12 and CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Policies 2012 and Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) in relation to the provision of contributions towards local infrastructure including towards sites of accessible natural greenspace (SANG) measures, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2012) which would otherwise be exempted for affordable housing under the CIL regulations.**

Note 1

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

Note 2

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

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

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White

Applications considered on 22 November 2017

39/P Application Number: 17/0610 - 72 and 74 Guildford Road, Lightwater GU18 5SD

The application was for redevelopment of Club & Institute Union (CIU) site to erect part 2 storey/part 2.5 storey building(s) to accommodate new clubhouse facility (Use Class D2), retail floorspace (Use Class A1), residential use (Use Class C3 comprising 11no. flats & 3no. houses), together with 21 parking spaces, bicycle and refuse storage, following demolition of existing buildings. (Additional information and amended plans recv'd 28/9/17).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Final comments have been received from County Highways Authority (CHA) and an objection has been raised. The Highway's officer comments are below:

The County Highway Authority is not yet satisfied that the development would be compatible with the local highway infrastructure. Therefore, to enable the CHA to consider the proposals further, the applicant will need to address and provide further information on the following matters:

- 1. A new access onto a 30 mph road should be provided with visibility splays of 2.4m x 45m in both directions free of any obstruction above 1.05m in height and therefore the achievable splays should be shown on a drawing also showing the location of the arch over the access to demonstrate that this will not impede sight lines onto Guildford Road. The height of the arch should also be provided to ensure that it is sufficient to accommodate service/delivery vehicles.*
- 2. A pedestrian visibility splay of 2m x 2m should be provided on each side of the access and shown on the application drawings.*
- 3. It is proposed to provide 11 cycle parking spaces for the flats but no cycle parking provision is provided for either the retail unit or the users of the club. The applicant should investigate how additional cycle parking can be provided on site to address this. I would consider that at least one cycle space could be provided in front of the retail unit subject to there being sufficient space and at least two cycle spaces should be provided for the club.*

It is understood that the gardens for the dwellings may be too small to accommodate dedicated cycle parking. If this is the case and it is proposed to provide this within the dwellings themselves then the applicant should demonstrate how this will work. Any cycle storage provided within the dwellings should be for that specific use.

- 4. The applicant proposes to provide automatic gates at the access. The gates should be set back a minimum of 7 metres from the back of the footway to ensure vehicles do not obstruct the public highway whilst waiting for the gates to open particularly given that the site access is located adjacent to a zebra crossing and the high level of pedestrian activity in the vicinity and its proximity to a bus stop.*

Information should also be provided on how the key fob entry system will work particularly for unscheduled deliveries and how the refuse vehicle will access the site when the gates are likely to be closed. Details should also be provided explaining what system will be in place should the automatic gates fail to operate are not backing up on the highway causing an obstruction to other road users.

The Highway Authority would have no objection if gates were not provided at the access.

Additional reason for refusal

Based on the CHA comments above it is considered an additional reason for refusal should be taken forward as detailed below:

It has not been demonstrated to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the County Highways Authority, that the development would be provided with a safe means of access / egress and would not therefore lead to conditions prejudicial to highway safety. The development proposed is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF 2012, Policy DM11 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and objective 3 of the Surrey Transport Plan 2011-2026.

*It is also suggest that the applicant's attention be drawn to the CHA officer comments (which will need to be addressed in any resubmission) by way of **an additional informative** as detailed below:*

The applicant's is directed to the comments provided by the County Highway Authority in the consultation response dated 25 October 2017. Any resubmission for redevelopment of the site must address these comments / requirements.

Amended reason for refusal

- 1. The proposed development as a result of its height, massing, siting and site coverage would result in a form of development which would enclose and dominate Guildford Road to the detriment of the character of the commercial village centre. Moreover, the site coverage proposed fails to provide any meaningful opportunities for any landscaping or softening of what otherwise will be an unduly urban design response in the commercial village centre. In addition, the depth of the development into the site, coupled with the height and its proximity to, in particular the shared boundaries with No.70 Guildford Road and No.2 All Saints Road, would result in visually dominant and incongruous development forming poor relationships with neighbouring buildings, and, harmful to the spatial characteristics of the area. This harm would be compounded by the design response of Block A which would give rise to development out of keeping with it's setting. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy DM9 (ii) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, Design Principles B1, B2 and B5 (a) and B6 of the Lightwater Village Design Statement*

Members were advised that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

Application 17/0610 had been withdrawn by the applicant.

40/P Application Number: 17/0701 - Parkgate House, 185-187 London Road, Camberley GU15 3JS

The application was for the change of use of first and second floor of building from A2 office use to C3 residential use, and raising of roof to create additional floor to provide a total of 4 studio apartments, 8 one bed apartments and 2 two bed apartments with associated parking. (Additional Information rec'd 05/10/2017 & 23/10/2017). (Amended plans rec'd 23/10/2017). (Amended Plan - Rec'd 02/11/2017.)

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Affordable housing viability – The applicant submitted a Viability Report which concluded that providing affordable housing would make the development unviable. The external Viability Consultants have agreed that the scheme does not provide sufficient surplus to be able to fund a contribution in this regard, and as such none will be sought.'

Some Members were disappointed that there would be no contribution made by the applicant and there were a low number of parking spaces available. Officers advised that as the proposal was located in the town centre this would be sustainable. In addition the County Highways Agency had not raised any objections.

Some Members had concerns regarding the landscaping at the front of the site and officers advised that an informative would be added with regard to softening the exterior of the building with planting.

Resolved that application 17/0701 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 Robin Perry and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

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 Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max

Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

41/P Application Number: 17/0469 - Heathercot Yard, Evergreen Road, Frimley GU16 8PU

The application was for the erection of 4 x 2-bed terraced houses, 4 x 3- bed terraced houses, and 2 x four bed semi-detached houses with associated parking, landscaping and gardens, and creation of new access road onto Evergreen Road, on former builders yard following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings. (Additional information rec'd 03/10/2017) (Amended & Additional Plans - Rec'd 03/10/2017).

The Committee was asked to agree that this application be deferred until December Committee, to allow time for the ownership notices to be served another landowner.

Resolved that application 17/0469 be deferred until December Committee, to allow time for the ownership notices to be served another landowner.

42/P Application Number: 17/0763 - 13 Bramcote, Camberley GU15 1SJ

The application was for the erection of a single storey front extension, following the demolition of the existing single storey front porch. (Additional information rec'd 17/10/17).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, the applicant at No.13 was an employee of the Council. This application was considered in conjunction with application 17/0761 – 11 Bramcote, Camberley GU15 1SJ.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Paragraph 7.3.5 and 7.4.6 replace the RGD with the aforementioned policy documents'

Resolved that application 17/0763 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

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 Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

43/P Application Number: 17/0761 - 11 Bramcote, Camberley GU15 1SJ

The application was for the erection of a single storey front extension, following the demolition of the existing single storey front porch. (Additional information recvd 17/10/17)

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, as this proposal was physically linked to the proposal under 17/0763, 13 Bramcote, Camberley GU15 1SJ, it was reported to the Planning Applications' Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Paragraph 7.4.6 replace the RGD with the aforementioned policy documents'

Resolved that application 17/0761 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

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 Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Surrey Heath House on 21 November 2017

+ Cllr Robin Perry (Chairman)
+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle
- Cllr Ian Cullen	- Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Max Nelson
+ Cllr Ruth Hutchinson	- Cllr Chris Pitt
Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Joanne Potter
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Nic Price
+ Cllr Oliver Lewis	+ Cllr Ian Sams

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Lytle for Cllr Pitt

In Attendance: Jayne Boitout, Community Development Officer
Cllr Bill Chapman
Cllr Vivienne Chapman
Jane Hogg, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust,
Tom Lawlor, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group
Louise Livingston, Executive head: Transformation
Tim Pashen, Executive Head: Community

14/EP Chairman's Announcements and Welcome to Guests

The Chairman welcomed Jane Hogg, Integration and Transformation Director, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust, Tom Lawlor, Head of Improvement and Delivery, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group and Tim Pashen, Executive Head: Community, Surrey Heath Borough Council to the meeting.

15/EP Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnership Select Committee held on 19 September 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

16/EP Declarations of Interest

Councillor Deach declared an interest in respect of the fact that he was a Stakeholder Governor at Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust
Councillor Ratiram declared an interest in respect of the fact that he was employed by Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust.

17/EP Frimley Health and Care Sustainable Transformation Partnership

Jane Hogg, Integration and Transformation Director, Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust, and Tom Lawlor, Head of Improvement and Delivery, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), gave a presentation in respect of the work taking place to develop the Frimley Health and Care Sustainability and Transformation Partnership and

Accountable Care System and the work taking place at a local level to implement the priorities of the Sustainability and Transformation Partnership within Surrey Heath.

Historically health and social care organisations tended to operate in silos placing an emphasis on treating the patient in front of them and getting them out of the door as soon as possible; a situation that was not always the most effective way of utilising limited resources in the best interests of either patients or the public. Across the Country informal arrangements had been used to encourage collaborative working and it was hoped that the introduction of Sustainability and Transformation Partnerships would both systemise these arrangements and encourage further collaborative working.

The Frimley Health and Care Sustainability Partnership (STP) was co-terminus with Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead CCG, Bracknell and Ascot CCG, Surrey Heath CCG and North East Hampshire and Farnham CCG, covered a population of more than 800,000 people and involved over 30 statutory organisations. The priorities identified in the Frimley Health STP reflected NHS England's key five year priorities of improving urgent and emergency care, general practice, cancer and mental health and included the following priorities and initiatives:

STP Priorities

- Integrating wellbeing, prevention and self-care into all aspects of work
- Supporting long term conditions
- Proactively managing frailty
- Redesigning urgent and emergency care
- Reducing clinical variation and health inequalities between primary and secondary care settings

STP Initiatives

- Establishing better integration of decision making processes
- Transforming general practice to better meet local need
- Supporting and developing the domiciliary workforce to improve resilience
- Reducing clinical variation and health inequalities in respiratory and cardiology cases
- Integrating wellbeing, prevention and self-care into all aspects of the Trust's work
- Implementing a shared care record so that any health professional could access the core parts of a patient's health records and patients did not have to retell their medical histories multiple times

As the STP matured it was envisaged that it would develop into an Accountable Care System (ASC) which would see partners coming together to make a single consistent set of decisions about how to deploy health and social care resources providing more joined up and better co-ordinated care. The ASC would collectively manage the funding for their defined population and commit to a shared set of performance goals and financial system.

Arising from the subsequent discussion the following points were noted:

- Work was taking place to identify all the community assets in the Borough and how they might be utilised more effectively for social prescribing activities.
- The use of paramedic practitioners to provide first line responses was proving successful and built on work to encourage residents to access healthcare through alternative sources in the first instance instead of turning up at Accident and Emergency.

- Practitioners in the east Berkshire region had been part of a Shared Patient Record pilot and it was expected that this would be rolled out across Surrey Heath by the end of the 2017/18 financial year.
- Rising population numbers would require the trust to think differently about the way in which its resources were deployed and utilised most efficiently and effectively for example making use of video consultations and further integrating team working. Encouraging self-care and prevention amongst the local population was also seen as being key to reducing pressure on the health service. Strengthening out of hospital services would also be key to absorbing future pressures.
- It was expected that the Care Quality Commission would be inspecting the Trust imminently.
- A recent review of delayed care standards in Bracknell Forest which had encompassed the Trust's hospital provision had been positive.
- Bracknell Forest Borough Council had done a significant amount of work to develop social prescribing and the CCG learning from their experiences.
- The improvements made to cancer screening and care had resulted in the survival rates for cancer patients in Surrey Heath rising from 61.1% in 1999 to 73.8% in 2014. This increase had resulted in Surrey Heath's survival ranking going from 70th in the country to being amongst the top 5 best performing areas for cancer diagnosis and treatment.
- Work to develop an integrated community care approach had helped contribute to a 3% decrease in the number of emergency hospital admissions this year when compared against last year's figures.

The Committee thanked Jane Hogg and Tom Lawlor for their informative update.

18/EP Surrey Heath Health and Wellbeing Board Update

Tim Pashen, Executive Head: Community, gave a presentation on behalf of the Surrey Heath Health and Wellbeing Board. The presentation included an overview of the Health and Wellbeing Board's structure, function and priorities together with an introduction to the Surrey Heath Prevention Plan.

The Committee was informed that the introduction of the Social Care Act 2012 brought about the biggest changes in health and social care provision since 1948 with the creation of Clinical Commissioning Groups, responsibility for public health passing from the NHS to local authorities and the setting up of Health and Wellbeing Boards (HWBB) in order to bring together key stakeholders to work collaboratively to improve the health and wellbeing of residents.

The Surrey Heath HWBB was made up of partners from the Borough Council, Public Health and the Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group and had the following key priorities:

- To reduce the prevalence of long term conditions through action on their leading causes
- To improve the health and wellbeing of children and young people in Surrey Heath
- To improve the health of the Borough's workforce
- To help people live independently in their own homes.

The priorities had been selected according to an assessment of the health and wellbeing needs of the Borough's population and to help the Board achieve their goals a multi-agency Health and Wellbeing Prevention Plan which described the services, programmes

and activities that were either planned or already taking place in Surrey Heath that contributed towards the prevention of avoidable illness and death.

The HWBB was working to ensure that the programmes and initiatives in its Prevention Plan aligned with those of the Frimley Sustainability and Transformation Partnership's prevention and self-care work stream. In doing this not only would the HWBB be able to reduce duplication and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its work but the Board would also be able to implement its programmes on a larger scale.

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

- The Borough Council had air quality monitoring stations in place at key points across the Borough and live updates on the air quality were available through the Council's website. Consideration was being given to the possibility of making a service available where text messages could be sent to residents when pollution levels rose above a certain level.
- Work was taking place to develop an alternative way of delivering the Workplace Wellbeing Charter to local employers following a decision by the scheme provider to stop providing the scheme through external providers. This could impact on the work taking place in Surrey Heath and work was taking place with partners to identify ways that would enable continued access to the Charter.
- It was acknowledged that more needed to be done to raise awareness of the work that partners were doing through the Health and Wellbeing Board and it was agreed that the matter would be raised at the Board's next meeting.

The Committee thanked Tim Pashen for his update.

19/EP External Partnerships Select Committee Work Programme

The External Partnerships Select committee received and noted its work programme for the remainder of the 2017/18 Municipal Year.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Performance and Finance Scrutiny
Committee held at Council Chamber,
Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road,
Camberley, GU15 3HD on 18 October
2017**

+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle (Chairman)
+ Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Robin Perry
Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr Chris Pitt
+ Cllr Bill Chapman	- Cllr Joanne Potter
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Wynne Price
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr David Lewis	- Cllr Victoria Wheeler
- Cllr Oliver Lewis	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Victoria Wheeler) and Cllr Valerie White (In place of Cllr Oliver Lewis)

In Attendance: Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Craig Fennell and Cllr Josephine Hawkins

13/PF Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

14/PF Scrutiny of Portfolio Holder - Corporate

Councillor Josephine Hawkins, the Corporate Portfolio Holder reminded the Committee of the areas covered by her Portfolio and gave a brief description of each of the following services and functions:

Children's Champion
Communications and Marketing
Community and Revenue Grants
Contact Centre and Post Room services
Corporate complaints and Ombudsman matters
Equalities
Town Twinning

A large number of questions had been received from Members in advance. As a result, the Chairman had agreed that councillors would be restricted to no more than 3 questions each. Responses for any of the submitted questions which were not answered at the meeting would be dealt with at briefing meetings with officers or by written responses.

Councillor Josephine Hawkins responded to questions including:

1. Communications and Marketing
 - a) the number of social media posts made in support of consultations at the current URL of “consultations” and the list of these posts;
 - b) how brand and reputation was measured;
 - c) how the effectiveness of press releases was measured.
2. Child Protection, forced marriages and Female Genital Mutilation - the progress the Council was making to deal with these issues.
3. Contact Centre - recent customer service satisfaction levels.
4. Camberley International Festival and the Camberley Carnival.
 - a) numbers of footfall in the Camberley Town Centre both before and after the event;
 - b) the increase in revenue for the retailers because of this event;
 - c) the level of resident participation and how it was measured.
5. Surrey Heath Young Citizen Event – the extent of parental responsibility for their children’s safety.

15/PF Scrutiny of Portfolio Holder - Business

Councillor Craig Fennell, the Business Portfolio Holder reminded the Committee of the areas covered by his Portfolio. It was now divided into 4 main service areas delivering a wide range of functions as set out below:

Recreation & Business

- Green Space (parks and countryside)
- Play area maintenance and development
- Heritage Service
- Contract Management (Grounds Maintenance/Arena Leisure Centre)
- Pitch bookings

Parking Services

- Borough wide on street parking enforcement
- Multi-story and surface car park management/development

Commercial & Community Development

- Borough wide sports, leisure and community development
- Surrey Youth Games
- Special commercial events
- Volunteer development
- Leisure Lease management

Camberley Theatre

- Annual programme of theatre events
- Pantomime
- Youth Theatre
- Corporate and Community Events
- Frimley Lodge Live

As referred to in the previous minute, the Chairman had agreed that because of the large number of questions received, Councillors would be restricted to no more than 3 questions each. Responses for any of the submitted questions which were not answered at the meeting would be dealt with at briefing meetings with officers or by written responses.

Councillor Craig Fennell responded to questions including:

1. Camberley's Multi-Story Car Parks
 - (b)the Council's plans to increase occupancy rates to match neighbouring authorities;
 - (c)proposals to enable multiple apps to use the Go app;
 - (d)evidence of whether the Council's payment app Glide had increased or decreased the footfall in the Camberley town centre.
2. Surrey Youth Games – Team Surrey Heath's performance and the number of events entered.
3. Camberley Theatre
 - (a)the level of the Council's subsidy over the last 2 years;
 - (b)the measures to be taken to reduce the subsidy;
 - (c)when would the subsidy be eliminated.
4. Playground Renewals – the timing of the works for the playground at Watchetts Recreation Ground.

16/PF Green Space Update

Members received a detailed update report on the Council's Greenspace Service. The Service, split between directly employed staff and contracted out services, was responsible for a wide range of activities which maintained the Borough's green spaces.

The Service was responsible for the following operational areas:

Grass cutting
Hedge cutting & Vegetation maintenance
Sports pitches
Children's Play Areas
Dog Waste & Rubbish Collections
Municipal Planting
Park Pavilions & Public Toilet
Tree Inspections and resulting works
Weed Spraying

Members asked questions and received responses in connection with the following issues:

A cutting regime to encourage wild flowers on roundabouts
Responsibility for hedges which over hung footpaths
The Wild Surrey Heath Project

Conservation works for SANGS
Birch mulch in Lightwater Country Park
Bee keeping and the sale of honey

17/PF Air Quality Management Update

The Committee received a report on the latest air quality results for the Borough. It was noted that results showed that pollution from nitrogen dioxide, dust and other particulates showed levels within air quality objectives.

Members were informed that, in 2017 DEFRA, computer modelling had predicted that, until 2021, the A331 was likely to exceed legal limits for concentrations of nitrogen dioxide. As a result the Council had been directed by the Secretary of State to produce a feasibility study by March 2018 on options for ensuring compliance with the air quality objectives on the A331 in the shortest period possible. Work would continue to be carried out in conjunction with neighbouring local authorities, Highways England and the County Council.

The Committee discussed ways residents could help to reduce pollution levels in the Borough, particularly by avoiding short journeys in slow moving traffic and travelling at high speeds. In addition it was considered that it was important to convey a strong message to residents that air pollution in the Borough was reducing and to publish the air quality measures.

Furthermore, Officers agreed to look into whether it was possible to monitor air pollution levels in Frimley Green when the experimental traffic lights were installed.

The Committee was advised that pollution from aircraft was not currently a problem in the Borough as most of it dispersed in the atmosphere.

Resolved that Executive be advised to maintain the current air quality monitoring programme and to review it following the conclusions of future statutory Air Quality Status reports submitted annually to DEFRA.

18/PF Review of the Impact of Benefits Reforms on the Council and Borough Residents - Reference to the Executive

Members were reminded that the Committee, at its meeting on 12 July 2017, had considered a report from the Task and Finish Group which had looked at the impact of welfare/benefits reforms on the Council and Borough residents. The Committee had made a number of recommendations to the Executive.

A report had been prepared which provided further information and context on the original recommendations to enable Members to consider them further prior to submission to the Executive. However it was considered that the Task and Finish Group should be asked to review the recommendations in the light of the further information.

Resolved that consideration be deferred to enable the Task and Finish Group to review its recommendations in the light of the

further information and to report back to the Committee at a future meeting.

19/PF Committee Work Programme

The Committee considered the work programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

Members noted that further meetings were scheduled for:

6 December 2017

21 March 2018

Resolved that the Work Programme, attached as Annex A to the agenda report be agreed.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 8 November 2017

+ Cllr Paul Deach (Chairman)
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Rodney Bates
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins
+ Cllr Paul Ilnicki

+ Cllr Bruce Mansell
- Cllr Conrad Sturt

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Adrian Flynn, Chief Accountant
Neil Hewitson, KPMG
Karen Limmer, Head of Legal Services
Cllr Alan McClafferty
Kelvin Menon, Executive Head: Finance

8AS Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Audit and Standards Committee meeting held on 10 July 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9AS Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

10AS 2016/17 Financial Statements

The Committee received a report setting out the Council's audited Financial Statements for 2016/17 and the External Auditor's ISA260 Report for 2016/17.

Neil Hewitson, KPMG, presented the ISA260 External Audit Report 2016/17. The report set out any key issues identified as a result of KPMG's audit of the Council's financial statements for the year ending 31 March 2017 and provided an assessment of the Authority's arrangements to secure value for money. The Auditors were pleased to report that unqualified opinions had been issued in respect of both the financial statements and value for money arrangements. It had been concluded that the Authority had proper arrangements in place to ensure that it took properly informed decisions and effectively deployed resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for local residents.

The report included one recommendation arising from the audit. This concerned the risk around producing the accounts in accordance with the new timetable next year. This brings the unaudited accounts publication date to 31st May from 30th June and the audit completion date to 31st July from 30th September. The Council is seeking to address this through having an early closure in January to finalise the first 10 months and ensuring that the JPUT reports on time. All of the previous year's recommendations had been addressed and cleared.

It was reported that although the Council had produced its draft parent financial statements in line with statutory deadlines, however it was essential that the Council put plans in place to ensure that the required information was received from the subsidiary company in a timely fashion in future.

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

- In order to meet financial deadlines, the Council's assets were individually valued by a professional valuer as at the 31st December each year. An analysis by the auditors of the movement in property indices in the period from 1st January to the 31st March indicated that property values could have increased by potentially £471k. The Executive Head of Finance decided not to make this adjustment as the use of an index was only a representation of the movement in the property market as a whole and not based on a review of individual Council assets. As the adjustment was below the auditors £900,000 materiality threshold they were content for the adjustment not to be made.
- The Council's Information Governance Manager was running mandatory training for all Council staff on the Council's duty to comply with the General Data Protection Regulations and consideration was being given to the role of a Data Protection Officer.
- It was considered important that all members were familiar with the new data protection regulations and it was agreed that data protection training for members should be provided.

RESOLVED that:

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

11AS Disqualification Criteria for Local Authority Members

The Committee considered a report seeking feedback on Government proposals to update the criteria that barred individuals from becoming councillors.

The current criteria for disqualifying individuals from standing for election at a local level are set out in Section 80 of the Local Government Act 1972, paragraph 9 of Schedule 54B of the Local Democracy and Economic Development and Construction Act and Section 21 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999. Individuals can currently only be barred from standing for, or holding, office if they have within five years of the day of election, or since their election, been convicted in the UK, Channel Islands or Isle of Man of any offences and have received a sentence of imprisonment, suspended or not, for a period of not less than three months without the option of a fine.

The Government considers that these disqualification criteria no longer reflect the nature of sentencing options that can be conferred upon an individual to protect the public and address unlawful or unacceptable behaviour. The consultation proposes that, in addition to the original disqualification criteria, individuals who had been subject to the sex offender notification requirements or who were subject to certain anti-social behaviour sanctions should also be barred from standing for election or holding public office at a local level.

The Committee acknowledged that the proposals were well intentioned however concern was expressed that they could be construed as an infringement of people's privacy particularly in cases where convictions were considered to be spent and only needed to be

disclosed on a need to know basis. Furthermore a number of the penalties being used to tackle anti-social behaviour were based on new legislation and people would not be familiar with them so would not be aware of their potential impacts further down the line.

RESOLVED that:

- i. the Head of Legal Services meet with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to draft a response to the consultation.
- ii. the draft response be circulated to the Committee for comment before its submission.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank