

COUNCIL MEETING

12 December 2018

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 10 October 2018** (Pages 3 - 6)
2. **Executive - 16 October 2018** (Pages 7 - 10)
3. **Executive - 20 November 2018** (Pages 11 - 18)
4. **Planning Applications Committee - 18 October 2018** (Pages 19 - 26)
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 15 November 2018** (Pages 27 - 32)
6. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 13 November 2018** (Pages 33 - 40)
7. **Audit & Standards Committee - 26 November 2018** (Pages 41 - 44)

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on
10 October 2018**

- + Cllr Dan Adams (Mayor)
- Cllr Robin Perry (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 Chris Pitt |
| - Cllr Craig Fennell | + Cllr Joanne Potter |
| - Cllr Surinder Gandhum | + Cllr Nic Price |
| + Cllr Moira Gibson | Cllr Wynne Price |
| + Cllr Edward Hawkins | + Cllr Darryl Ratiram |
| + Cllr Josephine Hawkins | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Ruth Hutchinson | Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| + Cllr Paul Ilnicki | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr David Lewis | + Cllr Valerie White |
| - Cllr Oliver Lewis | + Cllr John Winterton |

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

25/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Robin Perry, and Councillors Craig Fennell, Surinder Gandhum, Oliver Lewis, David Mansfield and Wynne Price.

26/C Minutes

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

RESOLVED that the open and exempt minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 25 July 2018 be approved as a correct record.

27/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor reported that he had attended a wide variety of events since the last Council meeting, including a birthday party for the borough's oldest resident, Ethel, who was celebrating her 109th birthday. He also expressed his thanks to the

Council's Housing & Homelessness Manager for the support provided in a recent case concerning a young homeless man.

The Council was informed of the Mayor's plans to mark the centenary of the end of World War I by travelling to northern France to lay a wreath on the grave of a borough resident, chosen at random, who had lost their life in the War. The Mayors of the Borough's Twin Towns would be invited to join him for this occasion.

The Mayor thanked everyone who had sponsored the Mayoress for her recent skydive, which she had undertaken in aid of his charity.

28/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader informed the Council that Surrey Leaders had discussed the following matters at its recent meeting:

- Local Plans – a number of Surrey authorities' Plans had recently been under examination; common factors were emerging in relation to an increase to the number of houses per annum councils were expected to provide and the release Green Belt land. This Council would need to be aware of these factors throughout the progression of its own Local Plan.
- Surrey Homes and Property Enterprise (SHAPE) – a workshop had been held to evaluate the next steps of this initiative. Funding from One Public Estate had been received, some of which had been allocated to the Land East of Knoll Road project for a further viability study.
- Surrey County Council's budgetary position and the anticipated effect on the funding provided to the boroughs and districts for provision of services.

The Council was updated on the interim injunction obtained concerning the land at the junction of Woodhall Lane and the A30, Windlesham.

The Leader informed the Council of the events planned in Camberley Town Centre and the surrounding area for the run up to Christmas and encouraged Members to publicise and attend these events.

29/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 12 September 2018

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

RESOLVED that

- (i) **the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 12 September 2018 be received; and**
- (ii) **the 2018/19 capital programme be amended to include £10k for the playground refurbishment at Evergreen Road**

and £70k for Local Equipped area of play on land north of the Ridgewood Centre.

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 19 July, 23 August and 20 September 2018.

It was moved by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Valerie White, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 19 July, 23 August and 20 September 2018 be received.

- (c) Audit and Standards Committee – 23 July 2018

It was moved by Councillor, seconded by Councillor Paul Ilnicki, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 23 July 2018 be received.

- (d) Licensing Committee – 5 September 2018

It was moved by Councillor Adrian Page, seconded by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman, and

RESOLVED that, subject to the correction of the attendance record, the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 5 September 2018 be received.

- (e) External Partnerships Select Committee –

It was moved by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans, seconded by Councillor Bill Chapman, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 11 September 2018 be received.

- (f) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 27 September 2018

It was moved by Councillor Ian Sams, seconded by Councillor Moira Gibson, and

RESOLVED that the notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 27 September 2018 be received.

- (g) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 2 October 2018

It was moved by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper, seconded by Councillor Darryl Ratiram, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 2 October 2018 be received.

30/C Leader's Question Time

The Leader responded to a question on actions the Council could undertake to address issues of mental health in the borough and agreed that a report on this matter would be brought to a future Executive meeting, if appropriate.

In response to a question on any proposals for the provision of free parking in Camberley Town Centre in the run up to Christmas, the Leader advised that the usual arrangements for free parking on a Thursday evening would be in place.

31/C Exclusion of Press and Public

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

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
26/C (part)	3
32/C	3
33/C	3

32/C Executive and Committees - Exempt

The Council received the exempt minutes of the Executive meeting on 12 September 2018 and noted that the Urgent Action relating to the Council functions for the decision set out at Minute 29/E, had been undertaken.

33/C Review of Exempt Items

The Council reviewed the items 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 Urgent Action noted at Minute 32/C remain exempt for the present time.

Mayor

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15
3HD on 16 October 2018**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

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

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates and Cllr Chris Pitt

32/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2018 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

33/E Community Fund Grant Applications

The Executive considered 3 grant applications to the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme.

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

It was agreed to add a condition to all current and future grants requiring the organisation to visibly recognise the Council's contribution to the project.

RESOLVED that

- (i) **subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report the following grants be awarded from the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme:**
 - a. **£10,000 to the Windlesham Field of Remembrance to relocate War Memorial and landscape gardens;**
 - b. **£5,000 to Camberley Judo Club to purchase a pre-owned Mini-bus;**
 - c. **£1,380 to Beacon Front-Line Debt Service to purchase 6 laptops, and 4 mobile phones for volunteer and client use; and**

- (ii) **an additional condition be added to the grants to include a requirement for the organisation to provide a visible form of recognition of the Council's contribution to the project.**

34/E Surrey Heath Community Lottery

The Executive considered a report recommending the introduction of a new Surrey Heath Community Lottery.

The Lottery would generate funds to support good causes within the borough and enable voluntary not for profit organisations to access funds from this initiative; the community would have an opportunity to support their chosen charity at the same time as a chance of winning up to £25,000 per week.

Over 50 councils had established or were in the process of establishing a community lottery, most of which had engaged an External Lottery Manager (ELM) to manage the lottery on its behalf. It was advised that Gatherwell Ltd was the largest provider of council lotteries.

There would be weekly draw with tickets costing £1, with an option of 50% of proceeds from the sale contributing towards local good causes registered with the scheme.

Once launched and established, the Council's operational involvement in the lottery would be minimal. Members also noted that the Council would need to apply for a licence from the Gambling Commission and that the Executive Head of Transformation would oversee this process.

The funds would be accumulated over the year, with the first awards to be made in spring 2020 and applications invited to the new scheme nearer that time when the proceeds were known. The scheme would be named Surrey Heath Annual Community Lottery Award Scheme and operated alongside the Council's existing Revenue and Community Fund Grant schemes.

The set up and ongoing annual costs of running the lottery were noted. It was intended that the ongoing annual costs would be funded by the 3% VAT recovery cost that was levied for each lottery ticket sale; any excess proceeds would be added to the Surrey Heath Annual Lottery Award Scheme.

RESOLVED to introduce the Surrey Heath Community Lottery by April 2019 and a new Annual Community Lottery award scheme from April 2020, with the implementation of the lottery delegated to the Executive Head of Transformation in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Support & Safeguarding.

35/E The Community Matters Partnership Project

The Executive considered a report proposing the introduction of a Community Matters Partnership Project (CMP), a corporate responsibility programme which allowed businesses of all sizes to become involved with community projects within the borough.

The Project would enable employees from partner organisations to participate in volunteering, either through fundraising or Give and Get days, whereby partner organisations would undertake activities based upon community need.

The Executive noted the options for the operation of the Scheme, including the recommended option for it to be managed externally in partnership with Voluntary Support North Surrey.

Participating businesses would pay annual membership fees; the fees used by participating neighbouring authorities were noted, although work would be undertaken to ensure that the cost structure worked for Surrey Heath.

The set up and ongoing costs associated with the project were considered. Members sought reassurances about any future resource implications for the Council. It was clarified that any ongoing costs would be covered by a minimum number of organisations that were required to commit to becoming a member of the scheme prior to any launch.

It was agreed that a report would be brought to the Executive within 12 months of the launch of the project detailing progress made.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Community Matters Partnership for Surrey Heath Borough project be agreed;**
- (ii) the partnerships fundraising beneficiaries be decided once research has been concluded as to the needs of the community, as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the agenda report;**
- (iii) the Partnership be operated externally, as set out at paragraph 2.5 of the agenda report, with a Service Level Agreement in place setting out expectations;**
- (iv) the development of a full business plan which demonstrates that the necessary critical mass had been met and there would be no further costs to the Council, be delegated to the Executive Head of Transformation, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development;**
- (v) the implementation of the project be delegated to the Executive Head of Transformation, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development; and**
- (vi) a report be brought to the Executive within 12 months of the partnership launch detailing the progress made by the Community Matters Partnership Project.**

The Executive agreed to defer the report to its meeting.

RESOLVED to defer consideration of this item to its next meeting.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15
3HD on 20 November 2018**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

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

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Dan Adams, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Jonathan Lytle, Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper, Cllr Bruce Mansell, Cllr Chris Pitt, Cllr Joanne Potter and Cllr Valerie White

37/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2018 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

38/E Camberley Multi-story Car Parks Tariff Review

The Chairman of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee introduced a report on the Committee's recommendations from its review of the Executive's decision to increase tariffs in Camberley Town Centre Multi-Story car parks. This decision had been the subject of a Member call-in and had been considered at the Committee's meeting on 2 October 2018 (minute 10/PF refers). The Committee had agreed that:

- (i) The Called-In decision to implement changes to the parking tariffs in Camberley Town centre multi-storey car parks be referred back to the Executive for reconsideration because:
 - The decision taken had been based on a report that contained insufficient information to enable a fully informed decision to be made.
 - Increasing parking charges at a time when the town centre traders were facing already difficult trading conditions would further depress footfall through the town centre.
 - Considering Recommendations i and ii as a single indivisible recommendation had prevented adequate debate.
- (ii) The Executive be advised to:
 1. Make its decision only when more complete data relating to footfall and income and expenditure was made available; and that

2. The proposed increase in charges and the proposed introduction of subsidised permits for those earning below the living wage be considered as two distinct recommendations.

The Committee had also agreed to establish a Task & Finish Group to examine council provided parking in Camberley Town Centre.

The Executive reviewed the Committee's recommendations. Whilst some Members reiterated their view that car parking tariffs should be increased, there was general support for the Committee's proposal that the decision to increase the tariffs be deferred in order to undertake this review and create a holistic approach to parking in Camberley Town Centre. Members also expressed a wish for this review to include introducing a more strategic approach to increasing parking tariffs in future.

The Executive considered the Committee's view that subsidised permits for those earning the living wage and below should be introduced as soon as possible and reiterated its previous position that this would need to be introduced alongside a tariff increase.

The proposed remit of the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee's Task & Finish Group was noted and members of the Executive expressed a willingness to work with it to achieve these outcomes. It was, however, suggested that, as an established Town Centre-focused working group benefiting from officer support, the Camberley Town Centre Working Group would be better placed to undertake this work instead. The Chairman of the Committee indicated her support for this proposal and agreed to report this at its next meeting.

The Executive noted advice that the decision to delay an increase to the parking tariffs could impact on timings for the commencement of Phase 2 regeneration works in the Town Centre.

RESOLVED that

- (i) its decision to increase car parking tariffs in its Camberley Town Centre Multi-Storey Car Parks and introduce subsidised permits for those earning below the living wage be deferred pending the availability of more complete data relating to footfall and income and expenditure being made available in order to develop a holistic parking strategy for the Town Centre;**
- (ii) the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee be advised of the proposal for the above work to be carried out by the Camberley Town Centre Working Group in place of a Task & Finish Group; and**
- (iii) the Terms of Reference of the Camberley Town Centre Working Group be updated to include this area of work.**

Note: It was noted for the record that Councillor Valerie White declared that she was a user of Main Square Multi-Storey Car Park.

39/E Child Poverty in Surrey Heath

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 21 February 2018, the Council had received a motion from Councillor Rodney Bates requesting "*This Council notes with sadness that there are many children within the borough that are experiencing poverty including a third of all children within Old Dean. As a result, this Council requests officers bring forward a report to the Executive within the next 6 months outlining practical steps that the Council could consider in order to help address this issue in partnership with others*". The motion had been referred to the Executive for consideration (minute 58/C refers).

Members considered a report showing published data on the number of children living in poverty in the borough, broken down by ward.

The Executive discussed the Council's responsibilities under the Child Poverty Act 2010 and agreed to clarify what actions it was taking to support Surrey County Council in how it addressed its duties under the Act.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the report be noted; and**
- (ii) the Executive Head of Regulatory and Portfolio Holder for Support & Safeguarding be asked to clarify what actions this Council was taking to support Surrey County Council in how it addressed the Child Poverty Act 2010.**

40/E Mid Year Performance Report

The Executive considered a report detailing the Council's performance against its corporate objectives, priorities and success measures in the first 6 months of the year.

RESOLVED to note the 2018/2019 Mid-Year Report.

41/E Deanside Commuted Sums

The Executive was informed that Deanside had been built by Accent Housing Association in 2003. The maintenance of the park and woodland areas had been transferred to the Council in 2008.

Members were advised that the Council held £210,000 of Section 106 money from Accent Housing for the upkeep, maintenance and replacement of Deanside play area. Accent Housing had agreed to increase the scope of where these funds could be spent to include Old Dean Recreation Ground and Deanside.

An annual inspection by RoSPA had advised that the play area and BMX track at Old Dean Recreation Ground needed to be completely refurbished, which was expected to cost about £200,000.

It was proposed to use £100,000 from the Deanside Section 106 Agreement on the playground at Old Dean Recreation Ground; this would be in addition to the funding allocated by the Executive from Community Infrastructure Contributions in March 2017. Accent Housing was in agreement to support the refurbishment of this playground and a new deed of variation had been granted and agreed with all legal parties. Consultation had also been undertaken with local community groups.

Members noted that the proposed investment project would still ensure sufficient funds for on-going maintenance were retained for both Deanside and Old Dean Recreation Ground.

RECOMMENDED to Council that

- (i) £100,000 be made available to draw down from the Deanside Section 106 to refurbish the Old Dean playground; and**
- (ii) the implementation of the works be delegated to the Executive Head of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Places & Strategy.**

Note: Councillor Rodney Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was Chairman of the Old Dean Community Group, which had raised money for the playground.

42/E Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD

The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (Regulation 13 Consultation Draft) set out the approach that the Council would take to avoiding harm to the Special Protection Area as a result of new housing development.

The Executive was advised that the draft Supplementary Planning Document SPD updated the existing Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2012 and had taken into account guidance that had been issued since the 2012 SPD had been adopted. The notable changes included:

- The addition of the requirement for considering step-in rights where a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) was not owned by the Council
- The definition of ‘in perpetuity period’ had been updated in accordance with the Perpetuities and Accumulations Act 2009, which was considered to be at least 125 years, as SANGs were expected to be provided and funded in perpetuity
- Enabling the allocation of strategic or shared SANG (local authority owned) for development sites located in Camberley Town Centre, which were over the size threshold for triggering the requirement for bespoke SANGs, but unable to provide SANG land on-site
- A consolidation of how developer contributions were currently collected for SANG and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring payments

The revised SPD would be subject to a 6- week period of public consultation.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Draft Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2018) as set out in Annex 1 to the agenda report be approved for public consultation in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012;**
- (ii) the SANGs Levy footnote on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 123 List be updated to accord with the Developer Contributions section of the draft Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2018); and**
- (iii) if there are no significant changes arising from the consultation, authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning & People, to adopt the SPD.**

43/E Corporate Enforcement Policy

The Executive was reminded that the Council carried out a number of regulatory functions which could require enforcement action. A draft Corporate Enforcement Policy was considered, which outlined the Council's overall approach to enforcement. This overarching policy would be supplemented by service specific policies where appropriate.

The Policy had been produced in accordance with the Principles of Good Regulation, as set out in the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006 and had regard to the Regulators' Code introduced in April 2014.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the draft Surrey Heath Borough Council Corporate Enforcement Policy, as set out in Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed for consultation with stakeholders; and**
- (ii) the Executive Head of Transformation, in consultation with the Economic Development Portfolio Holder, be authorised to make any necessary amendments arising from the consultation and thereafter adopt the Policy.**

44/E Community Infrastructure Levy

The Council had been collecting Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding since the Charging Schedule came into effect on 1 December 2014. The CIL Regulations required the Council, as the collecting authority, to pay money over to

the parishes, decide how to use the Fund and to publish details of its CIL income and expenditure.

The Council had received a total of £1, 926,672.71 for the reporting period 1 April to 30 September 2018. The Executive was advised that monies due to parishes on 30 September 2018 had been as follows:

- Chobham - £18,467.28
- West End - £93,351.26
- Windlesham - £9,754.08

In March 2015, the Executive had agreed that a 15% proportion would also be made available to spend for non-parished areas according to local priorities. The amount collected within these areas had been as follows:

- Frimley - £17,990.96
- Town - £37,122.38
- Parkside - £7,587,00

It was proposed that Ward Councillors for the non-parished areas be asked to submit suggestions and bids for projects. Ward Councillors could also choose to save the money to roll forward to fund larger projects or combine across wards for jointly beneficial projects. Local projects would then be put forward to the Executive for funding in 2018/19 in combination with any project taken forward from any remaining Planning Infrastructure Contributions.

It was suggested by some Members that the procedure for submitting requests for CIL monies from non-parished areas should be reviewed to allow ward members within a specified distance from the development site to submit suggestions and bids for projects. It was agreed that clarification would be sought as to whether the current arrangements reflected legislative requirements.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the CIL monies received be noted;**
- (ii) Ward Councillors for the non-parished areas be asked to submit to the CIL Governance Panel ideas for spending CIL generated income within their wards; and**
- (iii) the remaining CIL contributions held by the Council be retained for spending to support key priorities.**

45/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and Regulation 5 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

Minute	Paragraph(s)
46/E	3
47/E	3

46/E Performance of the Major Property Acquisitions

The Executive received a report detailing the performance of the Council's major property acquisitions in the previous 6 months. Members were advised of the rental income against budget for Camberley Town Centre properties and noted the current position with House of Fraser. The success of the programme of events scheduled for the run up to Christmas to date was also noted.

The Executive was updated on the procurement process for the London Road Block development and the works underway at Ashwood House, both of which were on track.

It was noted that the 3 industrial estates, which had been purchased in order to safeguard local employment and support the delivery of Council services, were performing above budget. It was also reported that the acquisition of Vulcan Way, Sandhurst had recently been completed and that the performance of this acquisition would be included in future reports.

RESOLVED to note the contents of the report.

47/E Review of Exempt Items

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

RESOLVED that financial information included in the agenda report associated with minute 46/E remain exempt for the present time, but the acquisition of Vulcan Way Industrial Estate, Sandhurst be made public

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at the Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 18 October 2018

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Valerie White (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr Max Nelson
+ 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

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (in place of Cllr Robin Perry)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Wynne Price

Officers Present: Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington, Tim Pashen, Eddie Scott, Patricia Terceiro

25/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2018 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

26/P Application Number: 18/0557- St George's Court, St George's Road, Camberley. GU15 3QZ *

The application, made under Section 73A, was to vary conditions 10 and 11 of planning permission 2004/1050 (conversion of building to apartments) in order to revise the glazing specification required to 10:14:4 on St Georges Road and 10:12:6.4 on High Street elevations respectively. The application was to require individual glazing units to be corrected where incorrect glazing specification had been used; and condition 12 to ensure that whole building ventilation systems with acoustic trickle vents with a minimum attenuation of 40dB were installed to all windows within flats. (Amended and additional information recv'd 27/6/18), (Additional info rec'd 13/08/18).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Officers have had sight of email correspondence sent from 12th-18th October by residents to Planning Committee Members.”

As this application had triggered the Council’s Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Ian McLaughlin and Mr David Ross spoke in objection to the application. Mr Silvio Petrasso spoke in support of the application on behalf of the agent.

The officer recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Nick Chambers and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan, and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 18/0557 be granted subject to the conditions set out in the officer’s report.

Note 1

It was noted for the record all members of the Committee had received various pieces of correspondence in regard to the application.

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 grant the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

27/P Application Number: 17/0427- Chobham Adventure Farm, Bagshot Road, Chobham, Woking, GU24 8BY *

The application was for the provision of outdoor play equipment. (Additional Plans recv'd 31/08/2017.) (Additional Information - Rec'd 01/11/2017 & 02/11/2017.) (Additional plan recv'd 25/5/18), (Amended plans & additional info rec'd 14/08/18).

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Three further objections have been received, on the basis of amended details, raising these further issues:

- The slide has not been built, whilst the rest of the proposed equipment has been built and in operation for many months;
- The overall height will remain at 5 metres (on raised land);
- The adventure farm has been run successfully without the slide; and
- Lack of education and animal provision at the site since opening.

[Officer comment: The slide is proposed at a height of 3 metres above ground level. It is noted that the ground level varies in this part of the site and therefore a condition concerning the prior agreement of levels are proposed]

Two further responses from the Chobham Parish Council received raising further objections in relation to these further issues:

- The proposed (revised) slide would be unneighbourly;
- The history of significant non-compliance and unfulfilled conditions relating to the site which has created long standing enforcement issues; and
- The Parish Council should have been re-notified of amended plans.”

In addition as a result of historic planning issues on the site, the Committee added an informative advising the applicant that there was no additional permitted development rights for the farm park. The informative also instructed that any further development on the site would require planning permission.

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page. The recommendation was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 18/0427 be granted subject to the conditions set out in the officer report as amended.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins and other members of the Committee had attended various Member Site Visits on the site of the application.
- ii. All Members of the Committee had received various pieces of correspondence on the application.
- iii. Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she knew the Chobham Parish Council Clerk, who was a resident of the neighbouring property to the site.
- iv. Councillor Pat Tedder was a Member of the Chobham and West End Joint Burial Committee.
- v. Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper declared that her family visited the site for leisure and her friend was employed by the adventure park.
- vi. Councillor David Mansfield had attended the site for leisure and had received various pieces of correspondence on the Planning Application. However he did not pass comment on the application.
- vii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler and other Members of the Committee had received an email from Chobham Parish Council in relation to the Planning Application.

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 grant the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Adrian Page and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Paul Ilnicki, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

28/P Application Number: 17/0608- The Sports Ground, Church Lane, Bisley, Woking, GU24 9EA *

The application was formally withdrawn by the applicant prior to the Committee Meeting.

29/P Application Number: 17/1179- 317 Guildford Road, Bisley, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9BB *

The application was for the erection of a three storey building (containing six 3 bedroom terraced dwellings) and two 1 bedroom flats and 2 two storey buildings with front and rear dormers (containing 18 two bedroom flats and one 1 bedroom flat) with revised vehicular access off Guildford Road, bin and cycle storage and landscaping. (Amended plan rec'd 16/04/18) (Amended plans and information recv'd 20/7/18). (Additional information recv'd 7/9/18).

As this application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Michael Tiplady, on behalf of Ms Lori Heiss, and Ms Nelle Mecioniene spoke in objection to the application. Mr Ron Terry, on behalf of the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Members raised concerns in regard to the negative effect of parking provision in front of the proposed development on the street scene, and acknowledged it was in conflict with the Council's Local Plan. It was agreed that the dominance of parking provision at the front of the scheme and its negative effect on the street scene would be acknowledged and added to Reason 1 of the reasons to refuse in the Officer's report.

In addition Members wished to prescribe a higher number of parking spaces for if a future scheme were to be submitted. It was agreed an informative was to be added to the officer's recommendation to reflect this.

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Cllr David Mansfield and seconded by Cllr Victoria Wheeler. The recommendation was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 17/1179 be refused for the reasons as set out in the officer's report as amended, with the final wording for refusal reason 1 and the additional informative be finalised by the

Executive Head of Regulatory after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor David Mansfield had received various pieces of correspondence on the application but reiterated that he could not pass comment on the application before the Committee Meeting.

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 Nick Chambers, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

30/P Application Number: 18/0512- Land between Littlefield House and Southbrook, Shrubbs Hill, Chobham, Woking

The application was for the erection of a detached 6 bedroom dwelling with attached garage, with new access and associated landscaping and boundary treatments.

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Nick Chambers, on the grounds that was well-designed and would provide an extra dwelling.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

"A context comparison plan has been provided by the applicant which indicates that the proposal:

- would have no impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within the Green Belt when considering in the site's proper context (infill plot surrounded by similar detached dwellings in similar sized plots and does not extend beyond the existing residential enclave, being appropriate and acceptable in respect of the Green Belt and local character);
- officers raise no objection to the design and two storey scale residential amenity and impact on the highway with the detailed roof design can be addressed by condition; and
- SAMM and SANG payments can be made to avoid any impact on the SPA.

[Officer comment: The objections to the proposal regarding the impact on the Green Belt, as set out in the officer report, remain. An objection is raised on design grounds (see Reason 2) and the roof design of the proposal, currently with a large crown roof, cannot be amended by condition. SANG contributions would

be sought through the CIL regulations. However, the SAMM payment as not been secured (either by prior payment or completed legal agreement) and this objection remains].”

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

RESOLVED that application 18/0512 be refused for the reasons as set out in the Officer’s report.

Note 1

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

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

Voting in abstention:

Councillor Nick Chambers.

31/P Application Number: 18/0610- Land 80 Guildford Road, Bagshot, GU19 5NP

The application was an outline application for the erection of a detached 3 bedroom bungalow. Matters of access and layout to be considered.

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Valerie White, on the grounds that there could be very special circumstances to allow this application due to two recent approvals either side of the site.

Councillor Valerie White read out a letter on behalf of the applicant who was unable speak as the application had not qualified for the Council’s public speaking scheme.

The recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the officer’s report was proposed by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan and put to the vote and lost.

Members felt that as the proposed dwelling would be situated between the two proximate branches of the A322, the development would not harm the openness of the greenbelt.

There was a discussion about conditions to be imposed which included the removal of permitted development rights. It was agreed that the precise conditions, including for example standard time period, would be agreed with the chair and vice chair of the Committee.

An alternative motion to approve the application was under very special circumstances for the reasons set out below was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper. The recommendation was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that

- I. Application 18/0610 be approved for the following reason:
Even though it was recognised that the application site was in the Green Belt, the isolation of the site and the fact it was surrounded by roads on either side, meant the development would not be to the detriment to the openness of the Green Belt and the existing streetscene.**
- II. The reasons for approval and proposed conditions be finalised by the Executive Head of Regulatory after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee and the Planning Case Officer.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Valerie White had met the applicants prior to the applications determination at the Committee Meeting.

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 Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Abstaining from voting on the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Ian Sams and Victoria Wheeler.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 3, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application for the reason stated above:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Paul Ilnicki, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application for the reason stated above:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman and Colin Dougan.

Abstaining to vote on the recommendation to grant the application for the reasons stated above:

Councillors Ian Sams and Victoria Wheeler.

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at the Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 15 November 2018

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Valerie White (Vice Chairman)

- Cllr Nick Chambers	+ Cllr Max Nelson
+ 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

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

*Cllr Oliver Lewis was present from Minute from 35/P

Substitutes: Cllr Oliver Lewis (in place of Cllr Colin Dougan)

Officers Present: Ross Cahalane, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Neil Praine and Eddie Scott

32/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2018 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

33/P Application Number: 18/0605 - Land West of 94, Bagshot Green, Bagshot, GU19 5JT

The application was for the erection of 3 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom affordable Passivhaus dwellings, with associated parking, garden areas and landscaping, following demolition of existing garages. (Amended plans recv'd 1/8/2018, 03/10/2018 and 08.10.2018), (Amended plans rec'd 09.10.2018)

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Valerie White due to her concerns in respect of; the removal of existing parking, level of proposed parking and highway safety. Cllr White also raised concern in respect of over development of the site, loss of light/sunlight and loss of privacy.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Update to report - Paragraph 7.4.8 states that no trees are proposed to be removed or pruned on the site. The Monterey Cypress tree adjacent 94 Bagshot

Green is proposed for removal, the tree is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order and its location close to the adjacent dwelling is unsustainable in the long term. The Arboricultural Officer confirms that the tree is also coming to the end of its life and its removal is recommended in line with good arboricultural management across the site. On that basis no objections are raised.

During the member site visit, questions were asked about the Council's progress toward delivering its affordable housing targets. The following table illustrates the affordable housing completions for 2016/17 and 2017/18

	Net completions (no.)	Net completions (%)	Core Strategy Target (% of total completions)
All affordable housing 2017-2018	36	16%	35%
All affordable housing 2016-2017	30	13%	35%

It is important to note that a significant quantity of applications now come through as prior notifications for the conversion of offices, or in some cases light industrial or retail uses, to residential accommodation. Such applications cannot require developers to provide affordable housing.

The Government also issued a Written Ministerial Statement in November 2014 indicating that affordable housing should not be sought on sites of 10 units or less, which was subsequently included within the National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG). This has hindered delivery of affordable housing in the Borough. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated in July 2018 and now states,

“Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments...”

In respect of residential development, ‘major developments’ are sites of 10 or more new homes or sites over of 0.5 hectares or more. Therefore, this has reduced the number of applications where the Council can seek affordable housing.

Furthermore, developers can put forward viability cases as part of any planning application and this can have the effect of reducing the amount of affordable housing a site delivers. Accordingly, the Council has not met its policy target of 35% of total housing completions being affordable units. Increasing supply is therefore a weighty consideration.”

As this application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Mark Richards, on behalf of Mr D Appleton, spoke in objection to the application. Ms Emily Hadden, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The Committee was concerned as to the proposed dwellings' lack of amenity space and their overbearing effect. Furthermore the Committee felt the proposals were severe overdevelopment of the site which would result in cramped residential units. The bulk and height of the scheme were also causes for concern.

An alternative motion to refuse the application for the reasons set out below was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield. The recommendation was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that

- I. **Application 18/0605 be refused for the following reasons:**
 - **Overbearing effect**
 - **Concerns in regard to the quantum of amenity space**
 - **Overdevelopment of the site**
 - **Concerns as to the bulk of the proposal.**
- II. **The reasons for refusal be finalised by the Executive Head of Regulatory after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee and the Case Officer.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that a Member site visit had taken place on the application.

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 for the reasons stated above:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

34/P Application Number: 18/0033 - Kings Court & Land to front of Kings Court, 91-93 High Street, Camberley, GU15 3RN

The application was for the change of use of existing building to provide 23 x 1-bed and 7 x 2-bed apartments and extensions to existing building to provide a further 25 x 1-bed and 26 x 2-bed apartments and 2 retail units, with associated parking, access and layby, roof garden, bin and cycle storage, following part demolition of existing building. (Amended plan rec'd 04/07/2018.)

Members were notified of the following updates on the application:

"UPDATE

Application deferred”

The officer recommendation to defer the application to a later meeting was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Valerie White, and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 17/0427 be deferred to a later meeting.

35/P

Application Number: 18/0004: Cambridge Hotel, 121 London Road, Camberley, GU15 3LF

The application was for the erection of a part three storey part four storey building containing 21 flats (3 studios, 8 one beds and 10 two beds), including conversion of Cambridge Hotel building with its ground floor as a flexible Class A1 (Retail), A3 (Restaurant/Cafe) or Class A4 (Public House) Use and demolition of two storey/single storey part of hotel building and attached nightclub with parking, bin and cycle storage. (Amended Plans/Additional Information - Rec'd 19/04/2018.)

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Officers have had sight of the letter dated 14 November written on behalf of the applicant, emailed to the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee on the same date. This letter summarises the proposal and the officer’s report and introduces no new material considerations.”

Furthermore the Planning Case Officer verbally advised the Committee that an additional condition was added to the Officer’s recommendation. An additional pre-occupation condition would be agreed with the Chairman and Vice Chair of Planning Applications Committee in order to agree the precise location and size of the refuse store of the flexible commercial space. The location and size of the space would be dependent on the A1, A3 or A4 use and the requirements of the future tenant.

Some Members were concerned that the plans were of an inappropriate scale and the designs did not compliment the historic Cambridge Hotel frontage, which was a non-designated heritage asset. It was also stated that the lack of soft landscaping and the minimal distance between the proposed new building and the A30 was unsympathetic to the proposal’s prime position as the gateway to the Town Centre.

RESOLVED that application 18/0004 be granted subject to the conditions set out in the officer’s report as amended as per the Planning Officer’s Verbal Update.

Note 1

It was noted for the record all members of the Committee had received correspondence from the agent in regard to the application.

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 grant the application:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Oliver Lewis, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors David Mansfield, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 13 November 2018

- + Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans (Chairman)
- Max Nelson (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| - Cllr Bill Chapman | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| Cllr Ian Cullen | + Cllr Chris Pitt |
| - Cllr Ruth Hutchinson | + Cllr Nic Price |
| + Cllr David Lewis | Cllr Wynne Price |
| - Cllr Oliver Lewis | + Cllr Joanne Potter |
| + Cllr Jonathan Lytle | + Cllr Darryl Ratiram |
| | + Cllr Ian Sams |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Valerie White (in place of Cllr Bill Chapman)

In attendance: Jayne Boitout, Community Development Officer
Inspector Bob Darkens, Surrey Police
Louise Livingston, Executive Head: Transformation
Mr David Munro, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner

11/EP Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2018 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

12/EP Surrey Police

Inspector Bob Darkens, Surrey Heath Borough commander, gave a presentation in respect of Serious and Organised Crime (SOC) taking place in Surrey Heath.

Surrey Heath had been a target for SOC due to its high affluence and easy access to major cities such as Southampton, Reading and London via the motorway and railway network. Offenders of SOC often preyed on the most vulnerable in society such as drug and alcohol addicts, those with mental health problems and disabilities, the homeless, the elderly and vulnerable children.

Surrey Heath, like many areas across the country, had a known drug problem which was serviced by county line networks and had been a common thread in SOC cases. County line drug suppliers typically travelled from areas of high densities and often conducted exchange of illegal substances in the Borough for only a few hours at a time.

In addition to the trafficking and selling of illegal substances, Surrey Heath also experienced the following SOC:

- Typically, elderly Surrey Heath residents were most vulnerable to fraudulent activities.
- Fly tipping was often linked to other SOC's such as fraud. Surrey Police targeted and aimed to prosecute culprits via multiple convictions, as it was appreciated criminals, such as fraudulent tradesmen, were also likely to be those who dump waste materials.
- Child exploitation was often allied to county lines and children in care were more likely to be victims of child exploitation.
- The police had been challenged to find innovative ways to deal with cybercrime and had specialist units, such as the Surrey and Sussex Economic Crime Unit in order to tackle it.

There were several signs which indicated SOC maybe taking place.

- A dilapidated, dirty, badly kept home or business premises may indicate criminal behaviour. In contrast the arrival of expensive goods or products in a home, without a proportionate change in circumstances may also indicate SOC.
- People involved in SOC may have several mobile phones, known as "burner phones".
- The possession of fake or false documents may suggest involvement in larger criminal activity.
- Cash only businesses had often acted as a front for money laundering.
- Excessive amounts of beds and mattresses and poor appearance or health of residents had often been signs of human trafficking.

Whilst the police led processes to reduce and stop SOC, it could not be tackled by one agency alone.

In most cases, it was not police officers who found the crucial signals or links which indicated the occurrence of SOC, but often key members of the community and staff of key services, such as mental health practitioners, cleaners and meals at home or adult social care staff. Surrey Police aimed to encourage informants of SOC by the reassurance of the sanitisation of information. Information was treated at Surrey Police Guildford headquarters to ensure the given information remains anonymous and unattributable.

Partnership working also strived to shield vulnerable adults from SOC. In Surrey Heath the Community Harm and Risk Management Meeting Forum (CHARMM), made up of multi-agency professions, worked together to identify and protect those at particular risk. The forum included representatives from the Council, Police, NHS, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Alpha Extreme, Housing, and Mental Health support providers.

Successful direct action at SOC in 2017 included:

- The closure of 11 properties within Surrey Heath via the use of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Crime and Policing legislation. The properties had acted as bases for drug trafficking and hubs of anti-social behaviour. The effect of

such closures had been exemplified by a report which had recently asserted that Surrey Heath was a hostile place for drug dealers.

- The closure of a number of local brothels in 2017. Whilst it was underlined that prostitution was an illegal activity, there was acknowledgement that the police had limited resources and focussed on escort agencies, where human trafficking or other SOC might have also been taking place.
- The carrying out of Joint Enforcement Days in conjunction with the Surrey Heath enforcement team against scrap metal dealers. Whilst only 2-3 businesses in Surrey Heath had licenses for scrap metal dealing, a number of other traders had been illegally trading and collecting scrap metal.
- Working collaboratively with organisations such as Accent Housing and Adult Social Care had resulted in a number of Criminal Behaviour Orders being imposed.
- Whilst Surrey Police had tended not to exact significant numbers of Dispersal Orders, it was recognised they could be a valuable tool when there were indications that Anti-Social behaviour could be linked to drug dealing.

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

- Surrey Heath had the lowest rates of crime in the Surrey Police western division and the second lowest crime rate in the County. The crime resolution rate in the western division was 18%. Noting national crime survey statistics, in the past year crime nationally had risen slightly from a low base.

Surrey had also experienced a rise in reported crime. Whilst particular categories of crimes had high reporting rates such as burglaries, it was noted reporting rates for crimes such as domestic abuse and rape were significantly lower. As a result it was opined that the rise in reported crime should be positively perceived as it indicated higher reporting rates in the latter categories.

Despite this it was acknowledged incidents of Surrey-wide burglaries had spiked.

- It was noted as a result of limited resources, illustrated by fewer visible police officers on the beat, greater emphasis was paid to working with neighbourhood watch groups and wider society. Members praised the informative social media bulletins from Surrey Heath Police, which formed part of the engagement with the local community.
- It was suggested that Surrey Police may have withdrawn too many resources from engaging with local schools. It was appreciated that officer engagement with pupils in local schools was a valuable tool in order to reduce instances of youth anti-social behaviour, as exemplified by recent cases in Heatherside and the Old Dean.
- Even though there was always slight potential for Greater London's gang-culture and knife-crime problems to permeate into the neighbouring counties, there had been no sign of gang-related criminal activities in Surrey Heath. However it had been observed there were certain "social

groups” who committed crimes. These crimes were often drug related and on very rare occasions could culminate in drug related violence.

- Surrey Police currently worked in partnership with the Victim Support to keep in contact with victims. There were plans to move the provision in house following a combined Police and Crime Commissioner Victim Support Service model; which had been followed by several police forces nationally. The in house Victim Care Unit would aim to deliver a seamless, coordinated journey of support, which would run from an initial assessment to rehabilitation services such as counselling support. It was estimated that the unit would be running from April 2019 at an initial Surrey-wide cost of approximately £1.4 million a year.
- One of Surrey Police’s best non-material assets was its intelligence gained by its 10 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). PCSOs had been best placed to pick up crucial information in relation to SOC which led to various cases being transferred to the National Crime Agency.
- Offences against people would always take priority over offences against property. Reflecting this, as a product of greater training and a more interventionist mentality, Surrey Police was better equipped to deal with cases of domestic violence than ever before. Whilst the reporting of domestic abuse cases had increased, the number of actual incidents per year had remained at roughly the same.
- An equivalent proportion of the Surrey Police precept was reinvested to pay for police services in Surrey Police.

The Committee thanked Inspector Bob Darkens for his informative update.

13/EP Surrey Police & Crime Commissioner

The Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner, Mr David Munro, gave a presentation in respect of Surrey-Wide Policing issues.

The Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) was responsible and held a democratic mandate for a wide range of duties. These included:

- The appointment of the Chief Constable and hold them to account for running the force.
- Setting police and crime objectives for the area through a Police and Crime Plan and the management of local priorities.
- Setting the Surrey Police force budget and the determination of the Surrey Police precept.
- Bringing together community safety and criminal justice partners.
- Contributing to the national and international policing capabilities as set out by the Home Secretary.

Police-worn body cameras had transformed Policing in Surrey. The cameras gave added security to the police officer, sent a strong message to criminals, and promoted efficiency in the criminal justice system. Furthermore, whilst there had been preconceptions that the police would not have welcomed the introduction of body-worn cameras, they had been embraced by Surrey Police. Looking to the

future, Surrey Police were looking at other new technology to increase efficiency and better police performance.

The PCC was in the process of setting the annual budget for Surrey Police. Whilst it was imperative to keep policing standards high, there was a need to set a sustainable budget, which would require deep-cutting savings Surrey Police currently employed 1,900 Police Officers and 1,300 police staff, and had recently experienced a good officer and staff retention rate. Currently approximately 80% of the Surrey Police budget was allocated for staffing costs.

Some of Surrey Police's key focusses in regard to crime were highlighted for particular attention:

- Anti-Social behaviour cases evoked the highest levels of engagements by residents. Improved relations and greater partnership working with other Public Sector bodies had improved Surrey Police's ability to tackle anti-social behaviour.
- Surrey had recently experienced a rise in burglaries. Whilst tackling organised burglaries was still a high priority, burglary rates were not as high as their peak 18 months ago. It was noted the burglaries of highest propensity were undertaken by highly skilled, organised groups, which were hard to trace and crack-down upon.
- Whilst there was a need to actively tackle drugs related crime, there needed to be greater emphasis paid on reducing the demand for illicit drugs including particular focus to cutting middle class demand for drugs.
- Typically victims of modern slavery were illegal immigrants who had few perceived defensible rights and were terrified of being reported to the authorities. It was important to remind businesses to check that their subcontractors and partners were not perpetrators of illegal employment practises.
- In recent years, unauthorised encampments had been the biggest cause of tension in communities and had taken up significant Police resources. Whilst trespassing by travellers was a civil offence, more attention had to be paid to the criminality surrounding unauthorised encampments. Common residents' complaints claimed a different implementation of the law for the Gypsies, Roma and Travellers (GRT) community in comparison to the majority population. Whilst perhaps unpopular, transit sites in Surrey would aid the police with extra powers to deal with illegal encampments. By having the ability to ask GRT members to move to a specific transit site would enable Police Officers to better implement their powers to move GRT communities on.

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

- Surrey County Councillors had previously conducted research into the feasibility of transit camps. After informal consultation with the GRT community, it was found there was little support towards the provision of transit camps. In addition, whilst there had been significant money invested into the provision of transit camps in Southampton, there had been little use of the sites by the traveller community.

- Even though the provision of transit camps was not the panacea to the problem of unauthorised encampments, statistics have shown where transit camps were in close proximity, unauthorised incursions had plummeted. In addition, there had been discussions amongst senior officers in Surrey Police to revise protocols in regard to dealing with unauthorised traveller incursions. It was underlined that Surrey Police were keen to work collaboratively to move authorised encampments on shown by the recent incursion in Windlesham where the travellers were moved on within 24 hours.
- A few years ago the Stop and Search facility was overly used, and an abused tool. The regulation system for stop and search was now properly enforced, and the recording of stop and searches by Officers allowed in-depth analysis of its use. Mr Munro asserted when there were good grounds to use the tool, Officers should not hesitate in using stop and search; despite the wider debate on the issue. Latest figures in Surrey had indicated that Officers were not afraid to use the Stop and Search facility. Last year there were 12,000 stops carried out, which had increased 16% from the previous year.

Furthermore the Home Secretary was in talks with Senior Police Officers in regard to the relaxation of the 'reasonable grounds' criteria in regard to Stop and Search. The proposals entailed an overall strengthening and widening of the Stop and Search powers and would update criteria; which was currently based on the 1984, Criminal Evidence Act.

- Body-worn cameras provided significant evidence as to whether there were grounds for a complaint against a Police Officer. Duty Officers were able to easily review Officer-public interactions and ensure Stop and Search powers were being used proportionately. In addition the Independent Office for Police Conduct were aiming to shorten the investigation process against officers and the process for deciding whether a case should go to a disciplinary hearing.
- The latest legal advice given to Surrey Police was that the Chief Constable could not delegate Police Parking Enforcement powers to Council led Joint Enforcement Teams. Whilst Surrey Police still held the powers to remove obstructing vehicles from the middle of the road; Surrey County Council held the powers to remove obstructing vehicles from the pavements. It was noted by the Committee that locally these powers had been delegated by Surrey County Council to the neighbourhood policing team.

The Committee thanked Mr Munro for his informative update.

14/EP Committee Work Programme

The Committee received a report setting out its proposed work programme for the rest of the 2018/19 municipal year.

The Committee agreed to change the external partners presenting at the 19 February 2019 Committee Meeting.

The Committee would now receive a presentation from Accent Housing instead of a presentation on the Surrey Heath Lottery.

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 26 November 2018

+ Cllr Oliver Lewis (Chairman)
+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle (Vice Chairman)

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

Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans
+ Cllr Bruce Mansell

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Officers Present: Adrian Flynn, Chief Accountant
Karen Limmer, Head of Legal
Leigh Lloyd-Thomas, BDO
Kelvin Menon, Executive Head: Finance

5/AS Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 23rd July 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

6/AS External Audit

The Committee received a report setting out the audit programme that the Council's External Auditor's intended to follow during the coming year.

The Committee was informed that following the conclusion of a national procurement exercise BDO had replaced KPMG as the Council's External Auditors. It was noted that changes were made every five years to every local authority in England to ensure that a Council's external audit function remained independent and objective.

It was noted that BDO would receive the audit files from KPMG in December and once these had been received a full audit plan would be developed and brought to the Committee's meeting in March 2019.

It was clarified that the Jersey Property Unit Trust (JPUT) which owned Camberley town centre, was audited by PWC in Jersey and that BDO would work closely with them as part of their audit of the Council's accounts.

The Committee noted the report.

7/AS Annual Standards Report

The Committee considered a report providing an update on the outcomes of any matters dealt with under the Council's Code of Conduct during the past twelve months.

It was reported that one formal investigation into a complaint brought against a Borough Councillor had found that there had been no breach of the Code of Conduct. Two further

complaints were currently being investigated; the outcome of these investigations would be reported to the Committee in due course.

It was noted that, in line with previous years, the majority of issues raised with the Monitoring Officer during 2017/18 related to planning matters and in particular when interests needed to be declared. It was acknowledged that there was a lack of understanding amongst the public in relation to the requirements governing the declaration of interests and this had contributed to the number of referrals made.

The Committee was informed that the Social Media Protocol was being reviewed and updated and a briefing note providing practical guidance would be produced to support the Protocol.

It was acknowledged that delineating between private personal messages on social media and those intended for a wider public audience was an ongoing concern. The Committee agreed that the public did not generally differentiate between Councillors' public and private posts consequently it was considered incumbent on Councillors to act professionally at all times when interacting with social media. It was agreed that further guidance and clarification on the use of social media would be welcomed.

The Committee noted the report.

8/AS Independent Persons Protocol

The Committee considered a report providing an update on work to appoint Independent Persons to assist with matters pertaining to the Code of Conduct as required by the Localism Act 2011.

It was reported that in May 2016, the Council had joined a consortium of Surrey local authorities which had appointed six people to act as Independent Persons across the consortium. It was reported that the current arrangements, which would expire in May 2019, had worked well and seven of the Surrey local authorities, including Surrey Heath, had expressed a desire to continue with the joint arrangements.

If the proposals were approved then the participating local authorities would simultaneously advertise the opportunity to join the Independent Persons Pool for a five year period. The Monitoring Officers from each local authority would then agree a shortlist of candidates for interview by an Appointments Panel, which was expected to include some chairmen of the local authorities' standards committees. The Appointments Panel's recommendations would then be referred to each Council for approval.

It was noted that a number of the current cohort of Independent Persons had expressed an interest in continuing in the role. It was requested that the Committee raise awareness of the opportunity through their networks.

RESOLVED that:

- i. The requirements of the joint arrangements be noted.
- ii. The Committee approves in principle the proposed joint arrangement and that the Monitoring Officer be authorised to progress the arrangements for appointing Independent Persons as set out in the report.

9/AS Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee would take place on Monday 25th March 2019 at 7pm.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank