

COUNCIL MEETING

14 October 2020

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1.	Council - 22 July 2020	(Pages 3 - 16)
2.	Council - 26 August 2020	(Pages 17 - 18)
3.	Council - 26 August 2020	(Pages 19 - 20)
4.	Council - 26 August 2020	(Pages 21 - 24)
5.	Executive - 21 July 2020	(Pages 25 - 30)
6.	Executive - 11 August 2020	(Pages 31 - 34)
7.	Executive - 15 September 2020	(Pages 35 - 40)
8.	Planning Applications Committee - 16 July 2020	(Pages 41 - 44)
9.	Planning Applications Committee - 13 August 2020	(Pages 45 - 54)
10.	Planning Applications Committee - 17 September 2020	(Pages 55 - 60)
11.	Employment Committee - 9 July 2020	(Pages 61 - 66)
12.	Employment Committee - 8 October 2020 (to follow)	-
13.	Licensing Committee - 29 July 2020	(Pages 67 - 70)
14.	External Partnerships Select Committee - 8 September 2020	(Pages 71 - 76)
15.	Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee - 9 September 2020 (to follow)	-
16.	Joint Staff Consultative Group - 24 September 2020	(Pages 77 - 80)

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on
22 July 2020**

+* Cllr Pat Tedder (Mayor)
+- Cllr Sarah Jane Croke (Deputy Mayor)

+ - Cllr Dan Adams	+* Cllr David Lewis
+* Cllr Graham Alleway	+* Cllr David Mansfield
+* Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath
+* Cllr Rodney Bates	+* Cllr Charlotte Morley
+* Cllr Cliff Betton	+* Cllr Alan McClafferty
+* Cllr Richard Brooks	+* Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam
+* Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+* Cllr Adrian Page
+ - Cllr Paul Deach	+* Cllr Robin Perry
+* Cllr Colin Dougan	+* Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+* Cllr Tim FitzGerald	+* Cllr Morgan Rise
+ - Cllr Sharon Galliford	+* Cllr John Skipper
+* Cllr Shaun Garrett	+* Cllr Graham Tapper
+* Cllr Edward Hawkins	+* Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+* Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+* Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+* Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+* Cllr Valerie White
+* Cllr Ben Leach	+* Cllr Kristian Wrenn

+ Present at the meeting on 22 July 2020

* Present at the re-convened meeting on 29 July 2020

- Apologies for absence presented for the re-convened meeting on 29 July 2020

14/C Minutes

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the Annual meeting of the
Council held on 20 May 2020 be approved as a correct record.**

15/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor reported on activities she had undertaken since her election. She had attended the Council's Fly the Flag for Armed Forces event on 22 June 2020, a thank you party for Surrey Heath Prepared, and a virtual meeting with the Surrey Mayors, the Lord Lieutenant of Surrey, the High Sherriff and the under Sherriff of Surrey, and the Young Mayor for Surrey.

The Mayor informed the Council that she had attended a virtual day at Ascot Races, raising money for her charities.

Since her election, the Mayor had produced three short videos, two of which had been to thank volunteers and the third to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the D Day landings. The videos had been subtitled, which reflected that the Mayor's Charities were raising awareness of the difficulties for those with a hearing loss.

The Council was informed that the Mayor hoped to see using subtitles become standard policy for videos produced by the Council or by individual councillors.

16/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader reported on his activities since the last Council meeting, which had primarily been related to the Covid-19 pandemic.

17/C Questions from Members of the Public

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Alan McClafferty, received a question from a member of the public, Ms Jane Sherrard-Smith, raising concerns about and requesting the contact details for any and all organisations involved in the replacement masts, poles and antennae around the borough for 5G technology, in order for local people to deliver their questions and concerns.

18/C Questions from Councillors

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Rodney Bates submitted under Procedure Rule 11. The question concerned the impact and financial implications on the Council's plan of being home to the first 5G shopping centre in the UK, following the recent announcement by the Government that buying new Huawei 5G equipment would be banned after 31 December 2020 and that all Huawei equipment would be removed from 5G networks by the end of 2027.

19/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 26 May and 23 June 2020

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 26 May and 23 June 2020 be received and the recommendations from 26 May, 23 June and 21 July 2020 be adopted as set out below:

3/E Watchetts Tennis Court Redevelopment

RESOLVED that the Capital Programme be increased by £135,000 to fund the redevelopment of the Watchetts Tennis Court.

17/E EM3 LEP - Bid for funding - Surrey Heath Online Retail Experience (SHORE)

RESOLVED that the Capital Programme be amended by £10,000 to fund the Council's contribution towards the Surrey Heath Online Retail Experience project.

25/E Review of the Corporate Capital Programme 2019/20

RESOLVED that

- (i) actual capital expenditure for 2019/20 of £7.895m against a budget of £40.328m be noted;**
- (ii) the carry forward budget provision of £32.406 million from 2019/20 into 2020/21 be approved;**
- (iii) the revised 2020/21 Capital Programme of £33.885 million be noted;**
- (iv) the final capital prudential indicators for 2019/20 be noted.**

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 30 April, 28 May and 18 June 2020

It was moved by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 30 April, 28 May and 18 June 2020 be received.

- (c) Audit and Standards Committee – 20 April 2020

It was moved by Councillor Cliff Betton, seconded by Councillor Darryl Ratiram and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 20 April 2020 be received.

- (d) External Partnerships Select Committee – 9 June 2020

It was moved by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Morgan Rise and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 9 June 2020 be received.

- (e) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 25 June 2020

It was moved by Councillor Graham Tapper, seconded by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans and

RESOLVED that the notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 25 June 2020 be received.

- (f) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 1 July 2020

It was moved by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam, seconded by Councillor Shaun Garrett, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 1 July 2020 be received.

20/C Motions

It was moved by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam and seconded by Councillor Kristian Wrenn that

“this Council resolves that

- (i) concern about articles which have appeared in the national press in respect of the Council’s property investments which suggests possible multi-million pound valuation losses in the Council’s property investments in Camberley Town Centre be noted;
- (ii) in order to protect the current and future financial interests of Surrey Heath Borough Council Taxpayers Financial Officers, in conjunction with the Council’s Auditors, and/or other independent organisation, be asked, subject to budget approval, to produce a report, to be presented to the next Full Council Meeting, detailing the purchase costs of property purchased by the Council as investments for treasury management since January 2016, together with independently ratified valuations of those property investments as at the time of purchase and at end of the last financial year and a current valuation, as at the date of this Council meeting;
- (iii) in the event that the valuations as at the end of the last financial year show an erosion of more than 25% of the purchase costs, or 50% of the current valuation, a further independent report be commissioned, subject to budget approval, from the Council’s Auditors or other qualified company or institution (in accordance with the Council’s Contract Standing Orders) into:
 - a) the strategic rationales behind each property investment made since January 2016.
 - b) the procedures followed in respect of each investment to ensure that all Council Standing Orders and protocols were adhered to correctly;
 - c) the amount paid for each property investment made since January 2016 to assess if proper value for money at the time of purchase was obtained for Borough Council Taxpayers in respect of each investment;
 - d) the actual and forecasted rental income, and all other critical financial aspects, to assess whether the full financial costs, risks and benefits were properly evaluated;
 - e) whether the most appropriate financial methods and mechanisms, for both the short and
 - f) long term benefit of Council Taxpayers, were used to fund each property investment made since January 2016; and
 - g) Based upon a), b), c) and d). above, to produce recommendations in respect of procedures to be adopted in future property investments to ensure best practice is followed for the ongoing security and benefit of Council Taxpayers; and

- (iv) Financial Officers, based upon the findings of the independent report(s), and taking further independent advice, as necessary, produce a Property Investment Strategy report in time for the 2021/22 Budget setting process, detailing options in respect of the future management and deployment of the Council's property investments to ensure prudent financial management."

It was noted that, although the Mall Shopping Centre, Camberley, now known as the SQ, had been acquired primarily for the purposes of regeneration rather than purely investment purposes, this acquisition would be considered within the scope of the motion.

The Executive Head of Finance advised Members that the cost of the work proposed in the motion would be outside the existing budget and, if Members were minded to agree to this investigation, the Council would need to agree a budget for this work.

The Council was informed that the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee had agreed to dedicate its meeting on 9 September 2020 to the scrutiny of the Council's property investments and this might be a more appropriate forum for this matter. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12 (e), it was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Alan McClafferty that the motion be referred to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee to discuss in more detail. This procedural motion was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that the matters identified in the motion be referred to the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

21/C Motions

It was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Morgan Rise that

"this Council

- (i) formally supports the general principle of unitary authorities within local government and agrees that any such unitary authority affecting Surrey Heath should be ideally around the region of 300,000 to 500,000 residents;
- (ii) opposes the principle of a single unitary authority to cover Surrey on the grounds that such a unitary authority would be too big, too remote and not in the best interests of Surrey Heath residents;
- (iii) instructs the Acting Chief Executive to formally open negotiations with neighbouring authorities (not just within Surrey) with a view to Surrey Heath forming part of a unitary authority;
- (iv) confirms that it has no formal position or preferred option at this stage regarding the specific unitary grouping that it wishes to be part, but

believes that all options must be thoroughly and positively reviewed and properly considered; this includes the establishment of a network of locally Parish/Town type Councils which could deal with localised issues, including certain planning functions;

- (v) instructs the Acting Chief Executive to convene regular Group Leader meetings to update on the various options as they progress and to bring forward a report to Full Council once all options have been clearly worked through;
- (vi) asks the Acting Chief Executive to send a copy of this motion to the Chief Executives and Leaders of all of Surrey Heath's neighbouring authorities, other Surrey Boroughs, and Surrey County Council to inform them of the Council's position."

The Council was informed that legislation required that police areas must not be divided between council boundaries; therefore, if any unitary authority were to be formed with authorities outside the Surrey County boundary this would have an impact on police areas. It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty that (iii) of the motion be amended to remove "(not just within Surrey)". This amendment was not seconded and therefore fell.

The Council discussed an anticipated White Paper from the Government, which was expected to promote the creation of unitary authorities. Differing views were presented on whether the Council could fully debate and form a position prior to the publication of this White Paper.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.11 (c) it was moved by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Paul Deach that consideration of the motion be deferred. It was proposed that consideration be deferred until after the publication of the Government's White Paper.

This procedural motion was put to the vote. Having achieved an equality of votes, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.2 (c) the Mayor's casting vote was exercised in favour of further debate. A further vote was subsequently taken, at which point the procedural motion to defer consideration of the original motion was carried.

RESOLVED to defer consideration of the motion.

Note 1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillors Paul Deach, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield and Charlotte Morley declared a non-pecuniary interest as they were members of Surrey County Council.

Note 2: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4, a recorded vote on the procedural motion to defer consideration of the original motion was taken.

The following Members voted in favour of the procedural motion:

Councillors Dan Adams, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Valerie White.

The following Members voted against the procedural motion:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Rodney Bates, Cliff Betton, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Ben Leach, Emma-Jane McGrath, Sashi Mylvaganam, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft, Kristian Wrenn.

The following Members abstained from voting:

Councillor Charlotte Morley.

Having achieved an equality of votes, a further vote was taken.

In the second vote, the following Members voted in favour of the procedural motion:

Councillors Dan Adams, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Chalotte Morley, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Valerie White.

In the second vote, the following Members voted against the procedural motion:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Rodney Bates, Cliff Betton, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Ben Leach, Emma-Jane McGrath, Sashi Mylvaganam, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft, Kristian Wrenn.

22/C Windlesham Community Governance Review

The Council was reminded that, at its meeting on 26 February 2020, it had agreed to form a Community Governance Review Working Group (CGRWG) comprising representatives from the various residents associations, the petitioners, officers, all impacted Borough Councillors and representatives from Windlesham Parish Council to agree the options to consider in the second stage of the Community Governance Review (CGR).

The CGRWG had met on 18 March 2020 and a compromise had been proposed, which would include retaining a single parish council and an undertaking from Windlesham Parish Council to fundamentally restructure its governance processes. In addition, the CGRWG had proposed that

- a) the parish warding arrangement be amended by dividing the current Bagshot ward to form 2 wards covering Bagshot village and the northern section of Windlesham village;
- b) six councillors and two councillors be allocated to Bagshot ward and Windlesham North ward respectively; and
- c) the Parish Council's name be changed in order to better reflect the parish's geographical boundaries.

The warding pattern, allocation of councillors to parish wards and proposed name change would form the second stage of the CGR consultation.

The Council had been due to consider the CGRWG's recommendations at its meeting on 8 April 2020; however, due to the Covid-19 pandemic it had been felt that the Council would not have been able to meet its obligations in respect of the public consultation and, following the receipt of legal advice, the CGR had been paused.

Members were informed that Windlesham Parish Council had met on 20 March 2020, where it had considered the CGRWG's proposed way forward. At this meeting the Parish Council had agreed to establish a Working Group to put together options for a desired framework for a revised governance structure.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan that

- (i) A second round of consultation be undertaken in the Windlesham Parish area with the following recommended options:
 - a. A new parish ward co-terminus to the current KC polling district be created and named Windlesham North ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
 - b. A new parish ward co-terminus with the KA and KB polling districts be created and named Bagshot Ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
 - c. The Windlesham ward of Windlesham Parish Council be renamed Windlesham South ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
 - d. Windlesham Parish Council be renamed to better reflect its geographical boundaries;
- (ii) A report be brought back to Council setting out the outcome of the second round of consultation and making final recommendations on the Windlesham Community Governance Review;
- (iii) The Community Governance Review timetable be updated, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report; and
- (iv) Windlesham Parish Council's undertaking to fundamentally review the structure of its governance process be noted.

It was moved by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor Peter Barnett that the motion be amended to:

1. include the addition of brackets to references to “north” and “south” in the Windlesham wards in (i) of the motion;
2. include the addition of a requirement that the wording of the consultation to residents was agreed in consultation with the borough councillors for the Windlesham Parish area and the Working Group; and
3. insert wording to (iv) to reflect that a Working Group had been formed by the Parish Council to review and make recommendations on its governance structure.

The amendment was put to the vote and carried. It therefore became the substantive motion.

It was moved by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans that a minimum response to the consultation from the impacted electorate should be required in order for the proposals to be adopted, with the threshold figure to be proposed by the CGRWG. Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and an equality of votes was achieved. Councillor Edward Hawkins subsequently agreed to withdraw his amendment.

The Council considered the proposal to rename the Parish Council and heard differing views on whether this should form part of the second stage of the CGR consultation or removed from this motion and further considered outside this CGR process. It was moved by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans and seconded by Councillor Valerie White that the motion be amended to remove (d) in (i) of the motion. The amendment was put to the vote and was lost.

The substantive motion was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that

- (i) a second round of consultation be undertaken in the Windlesham Parish area with the following recommended options:**
 - a. a new parish ward co-terminus to the current KC polling district be created and named Windlesham (North) ward of Windlesham Parish Council;**
 - b. a new parish ward co-terminus with the KA and KB polling districts be created and named Bagshot Ward of Windlesham Parish Council;**
 - c. the Windlesham ward of Windlesham Parish Council be renamed Windlesham (South) ward of Windlesham Parish Council;**
 - d. Windlesham Parish Council be renamed to better reflect its geographical boundaries;**

- (ii) the consultation document be agreed in consultation with the borough councillors for the Windlesham parish area and the Working Group;**
- (iii) a report be brought back to Council setting out the outcome of the second round of consultation and making final recommendations on the Windlesham Community Governance Review;**
- (iv) the Community Governance Review timetable be updated, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report; and**
- (v) Windlesham Parish Council's undertaking to fundamentally review the structure of its governance process, and the formation of a Parish Council Working Group to progress this work, be noted.**

Note 1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillors Peter Barnett, Sharon Galliford, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, and Valerie White declared non-pecuniary interests as they were members of Windlesham Parish Council.

Note 2: It was noted for the record that

- (i) Councillor Emma-Jane McGrath declared that she had spoken with members on the community in connection with this subject;
- (ii) Councillor David Mansfield declared that he had attended Windlesham Parish Council meetings where the item had been discussed but had not participated in any discussions at these meetings; and
- (iii) Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had met with representatives from One Windlesham and Windlesham Parish Council's Working Group

Note 3: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4, a recorded vote on the amendment to the motion proposed by Cllr Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor Peter Barnett was taken.

The following Members voted in favour of the amendment:

Councillors Dan Adams, Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Rodney Bates, Cliff Betton, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Emma-Jane McGrath, Charlotte Morley, Sashi Mylvaganam, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft, Valerie White, Kristian Wrenn.

Note 4: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4, a recorded vote on the amendment to the motion proposed by Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans and seconded by Councillor Valerie White was taken.

The following Members voted in favour of the amendment:

Councillors Dan Adams, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Valerie White.

The following Members voted against the amendment:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Rodney Bates, Cliff Betton, Richard Brooks, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Emma-Jane McGrath, Charlotte Morley, Sashi Mylvaganam, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft, Kristian Wrenn.

23/C Section 151 Officer

In accordance with Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1982 and Section 113 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 there was a statutory requirement on the Council to designate one of its officers as its Section 151 Officer/Chief Finance Officer.

The current Section 151 Officer, Mr Simon Little, would be leaving the Council's employment on 11 August 2020. A recruitment process to fill the vacancy was underway and an Appointments Sub Committee would be formed to interview candidates and make a recommendation on the appointment of the Section 151 Officer to the Council.

In the interim, in order to ensure the Council met its requirements to appoint a Section 151 Officer, it was proposed that the Council's Chief Accountant, Mr Adrian Flynn, be appointed as Section 151 Officer for the intervening period. Mr Flynn was currently appointed as a Deputy Section 151 Officer.

RESOLVED that Mr Adrian Flynn be appointed as the Section 151 Officer from 12 August 2020 until further notice.

The meeting was adjourned in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.

The meeting reconvened on 29 July 2020.

24/C Governance Working Group

The Council received a report from the Governance Working Group. The Working Group had reviewed the role and purpose of the Employment Committee and its sub committees after several months of operation and had recommended a number of changes to their Terms of Reference.

The Working Group had also reviewed Financial Regulations in respect of ex gratia payments and recommended amendments to the document. These proposed amendments reflected the recommendations included in the Browne Jacobson report on the decision to award the Chief Executive an additional duties allowance.

It was proposed by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Josephine Hawkins, and

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Terms of Reference of the Executive, Committees and Other Bodies at Part 3 of the Constitution, be amended as set out at Annex A to the agenda report;**
- (ii) the Officer Employment Rules at Part 4 of the Constitution be amended as set out at Annex B to the agenda report;**
- (iii) the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers at Part 3 of the Constitution, be amended as set out at Annex C to the agenda report; and**
- (iv) Financial Regulations be amended, as set out at Annex D to the agenda report.**

25/C Leader's Question Time

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Rodney Bates concerning plans to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Battle of Britain on 15 September 2020. He advised that planning was in the early stages but that work was underway to ensure the occasion was marked.

In response to a question from Councillor Cliff Betton, the Leader deferred to the Portfolio Holder for Places & Strategy, Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans, who advised on measures being put in place by the Greenspaces team following recent concerns about the state of the bins at Frimley Green Recreation Ground and the request for additional bins at the site.

The Leader received questions from Councillors Sashi Mylvaganam, Helen Whitcroft and Kristian Wrenn concerning the Covid-19 pandemic and the expected increase in unemployment and use of foodbanks, provisions being made for residents struggling to pay Council Tax, and preparations in the event of a local lockdown. The Leader advised that he was privy to the planning for a potential local lockdown and felt that it was as progressed as it could be in the circumstances. He also referred to the financial support being provided to charities and other support provided by the Council. The Leader further advised that residents experiencing difficulties with making Council Tax payments should be encouraged to contact the Revenues & Benefits team.

Following a question from Councillor Morgan Rise, the Leader confirmed that he would be delighted to attend the raising of the Pride flag at Surrey Heath House on 3 August 2020.

26/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>
27/C	3
28/C	3
29/C	3

27/C Executive and Committees - Exempt

Executive – 26 May 2020

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 26 May 2020 be received.

28/C Options to replace the post of Chief Executive

The Council was informed that, at its meeting on 9 July 2020, the Employment Committee had considered a report on options for the replacement of the Chief Executive. The Committee had recommended that, in order to achieve the best outcome for the Council, the options to recruit a standalone Chief Executive and further explore a shared Chief Executive should be pursued in parallel.

Since the meeting of the Employment Committee, further information on the proposed approach had been sought. Members were advised of the different processes and the anticipated timescales for the options it was proposed to conduct in parallel.

It was moved by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton that the options to recruit a standalone Chief Executive and to further explore a shared Chief Executive be pursued in parallel.

Members considered the proposal to pursue the two options in parallel. It was advised that there appeared not to be any precedent for this approach to recruiting a Chief Executive. The Head of Legal Services also advised on potential legal or procedural ramifications of this approach. Differing views were put forward by Members in respect of the potential benefits and implications of the proposed course of action.

The motion was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that the options to recruit a standalone Chief Executive and to further explore a shared Chief Executive be pursued in parallel.

Note: in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.5, Councillors Peter Barnett, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Charlotte Morley, and Victoria Wheeler recorded their vote against this decision.

29/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 decision at minute 28/C and the associated agenda report be made public.

Mayor

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on
26 August 2020**

+ Cllr Pat Tedder (Mayor)
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke (Deputy Mayor)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr David Lewis
+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr David Mansfield
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath
+ Cllr Rodney Bates	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Alan McClafferty
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Tim FitzGerald	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Cllr John Skipper
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Ben Leach	+ Cllr Kristian Wrenn

+ Present

30/C Section 151 Officer

In accordance with Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1982 and Section 113 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 there was a statutory requirement on the Council to designate one of its officers as its Section 151 Officer/Chief Finance Officer.

The former Section 151 Officer, Mr Simon Little, had left the Council's employment on 11 August 2020. The Council had agreed at its meeting on 22 July 2020 that the Council's Chief Accountant, Mr Adrian Flynn, be appointed as Section 151 Officer pending the recruitment of a new Executive Head of Finance.

At its meeting on 5 August 2020, an Appointments Sub Committee had agreed to appoint Mr Martin Hone as Interim Executive Head of Finance and had recommended that he be appointed as the Council's Section 151 Officer.

RESOLVED that Mr Martin Hone be appointed as the Section 151 Officer with immediate effect.

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held on
26 August 2020**

+ Cllr Pat Tedder (Mayor)
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke (Deputy Mayor)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr David Lewis
+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr David Mansfield
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath
+ Cllr Rodney Bates	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Alan McClafferty
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Tim FitzGerald	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Cllr John Skipper
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Ben Leach	+ Cllr Kristian Wrenn

+ Present

31/C Motion on Unitary Authorities

The Council was reminded that, at its meeting on 22 July 2020, it had considered a motion on Unitary Authorities. At that meeting it had been agreed to defer consideration of the motion pending an anticipated White Paper from the Government in the autumn, which was expected to promote the creation of unitary authorities.

Members were advised that, since this meeting, matters concerning unitary authority proposals for Surrey had progressed faster than expected and it was now considered appropriate to reconsider the motion. In order to meet the requirements of Council Procedure 16, 10 councillors had requested that the item be reconsidered.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan and

RESOLVED that the procedural decision to defer consideration of the motion on Unitary Authorities be rescinded.

Note: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillors Paul Deach, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield and Charlotte Morley declared non pecuniary interests as they were Members of Surrey County Council and the discussions might relate to the County Council.

Mayor

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held on
26 August 2020**

+ Cllr Pat Tedder (Mayor)
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| + Cllr Dan Adams | + Cllr David Lewis |
| + Cllr Graham Alleway | + Cllr David Mansfield |
| + Cllr Peter Barnett | + Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath |
| + Cllr Rodney Bates | + Cllr Charlotte Morley |
| + Cllr Cliff Betton | + Cllr Alan McClafferty |
| + Cllr Richard Brooks | + Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam |
| + Cllr Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| + Cllr Paul Deach | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Darryl Ratiram |
| + Cllr Tim FitzGerald | + Cllr Morgan Rise |
| + Cllr Sharon Galliford | + Cllr John Skipper |
| + Cllr Shaun Garrett | + Cllr Graham Tapper |
| + Cllr Edward Hawkins | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr Josephine Hawkins | + Cllr Helen Whitcroft |
| + Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Valerie White |
| + Cllr Ben Leach | + Cllr Kristian Wrenn |

+ Present

32/C Suspension of Council Procedure Rule

It was moved by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Sharon Galliford and

RESOLVED that Council Procedure Rule 14.6 (councillors speaking more than once) be suspended for the meeting.

33/C Motions

The Council was reminded that, at its meeting on 22 July 2020, it had agreed to defer consideration of the following motion moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Kristian Wrenn.

“This Council RESOLVES to

- (i) formally support the general principle of unitary authorities within local government and agree that any such unitary authority affecting Surrey Heath should be ideally around the region of 300,000 to 500,000 residents;
- (ii) oppose the principle of a single unitary authority to cover Surrey on the grounds that such a unitary authority would be too big, too remote and not in the best interests of Surrey Heath residents;

- (iii) instruct the Acting Chief Executive to formally open negotiations with neighbouring authorities (not just within Surrey) with a view to Surrey Heath forming part of a unitary authority;
- (iv) confirm that it has no formal position or preferred option at this stage regarding the specific unitary grouping that it wishes to be part, but believes that all options must be thoroughly and positively reviewed and properly considered; this includes the establishment of a network of locally Parish/Town type Councils which could deal with localised issues, including certain planning functions;
- (v) instruct the Acting Chief Executive to convene regular Group Leader meetings to update on the various options as they progress and to bring forward a report to Full Council once all options have been clearly worked through;
- (vi) ask the Acting Chief Executive to send a copy of this motion to the Chief Executives and Leaders of all of Surrey Heath's neighbouring authorities, other Surrey Boroughs, and Surrey County Council to inform them of the Council's position."

Having agreed at its meeting earlier that evening to rescind the decision to defer consideration of the motion, the Council resumed consideration of the debate.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty and seconded by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam that the motion be amended as follows:

- a. amend (ii) by removing and inserting the following wording:

~~"oppose~~ **express serious concern regarding** the principle of a single unitary authority to cover Surrey on the grounds that such a unitary authority ~~would~~ **may** be too big ~~large~~, too remote and ~~not~~ **unlikely to be** in the best interests of Surrey Heath residents";;
- b. amend (iii) by removing "(not just within Surrey)";
- c. amend (iv) to insert the following words at the end of the paragraph:

"with an emphasis that any such local Councils or other bodies must be democratically elected";
- d. add the following additional wording to the motion:
 - i. agree a budget of up to £35,000 in order to conduct a thorough joint business plan with other authorities of all relevant unitary options to submit to the Secretary of State;
 - ii. delegate authority to the Acting Chief Executive in consultation with Group Leaders to agree the procurement and spending authorisation for the joint business plan;

- iii. agree its final position on unitary authorities at a future meeting of Full Council or Extraordinary Full Council following receipt of the joint business plan and that of Surrey County Council and prior to submission to the Secretary of State;
- a. amend (vi) to insert the words “Surrey Members of Parliament”.

Members were advised that the proposed amendments to the motion had been drafted by all of the Group Leaders.

Councillor Rodney Bates, as the mover of the original motion, indicated that he was happy to accept the amendments. As a result, they became part of the substantive motion.

RESOLVED to

- (i) formally support the general principle of unitary authorities within local government and agree that any such unitary authority affecting Surrey Heath should be ideally around the region of 300,000 to 500,000 residents;**
- (ii) express serious concern regarding the principle of a single unitary authority to cover Surrey on the grounds that such a unitary authority may be too large, too remote and unlikely to be in the best interests of Surrey Heath residents;**
- (iii) instruct the Acting Chief Executive to formally open negotiations with neighbouring authorities with a view to Surrey Heath forming part of a unitary authority;**
- (iv) confirm that it has no formal position or preferred option at this stage regarding the specific unitary grouping that it wishes to be part, but believes that all options must be thoroughly and positively reviewed and properly considered; this includes the establishment of a network of locally Parish/Town type Councils which could deal with localised issues, including certain planning functions, with an emphasis that any such local Councils or other bodies must be democratically elected;**
- (v) agree a budget of up to £35,000 in order to conduct a thorough joint business plan with other authorities of all relevant unitary options to submit to the Secretary of State;**
- (vi) delegate authority to the Acting Chief Executive in consultation with Group Leaders to agree the procurement and spending authorisation for the joint business plan;**
- (vii) agree its final position on unitary authorities at a future meeting of Full Council or Extraordinary Full Council following receipt of the joint business plan and that of**

Surrey County Council and prior to submission to the Secretary of State;

- (viii) instruct the Acting Chief Executive to convene regular Group Leader meetings to update on the various options as they progress and to bring forward a report to Full Council once all options have been clearly worked through; and**
- (ix) ask the Acting Chief Executive to send a copy of this motion to the Chief Executives and Leaders of all of Surrey Heath's neighbouring authorities, other Surrey Boroughs, Surrey Members of Parliament, and Surrey County Council to inform them of the Council's position.**

Note1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillors Paul Deach, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield and Charlotte Morley declared non pecuniary interests as they were Members of Surrey County Council and the discussions might relate to the County Council.

Note 2: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4, a recorded vote on the motion was taken.

The following Members voted in favour of the motion:

Councillors Dan Adams, Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Rodney Bates, Cliff Betton, Richard Brooks, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Shaun Garrett, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Ben Leach, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Emma-Jane McGrath, Charlotte Morley, Sashi Mylvaganam, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft, Valerie White, Kristian Wrenn.

The following Members voted against the motion:

Councillors Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins.

Mayor

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held on 21 July 2020**

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr David Lewis |
| + Cllr Josephine Hawkins | + Cllr David Mansfield |
| + Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Adrian Page |

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler and Cllr Valerie White

20/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

21/E Community Infrastructure Levy

The Council had been collecting Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding since the Charging Schedule had come 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 £1,013,934.13 for the reporting period 1 October 2019 to 31 March 2020. The Executive was advised that payments due to parishes from 1 October 2019 for income collected in the last reporting period had been as follows:

- Chobham - £23,641.66
- Windlesham - £16,246.70

The Executive was informed that, due to concerns about the economic impact of Covid-19 on the development industry, the Government would be publishing amended regulations to modify the collection of CIL and Section 106 payments, but was asking local authorities to modify their collection regime in the interim. A revised collection policy would be brought to the Executive once the amended regulations had been published and in the interim a flexible approach would be applied to collection where appropriate.

It was noted that, from 1 September 2019, new amendments to the CIL regulations introduced a requirement for Councils to publish "infrastructure funding statements". These statements would replace existing Regulation 123 lists and should include details of how much money had been raised through developer

contributions and how it had been spent. Councils would be required to publish their first statements by 31 December 2020.

The Executive considered the current policy and Section 123 list and requested that a report be brought to a future meeting, with a view to introducing a revised scheme, with alternative options including:

1. pooling CIL monies, whilst accepting priority for projects within a ward where the funds had been generated;
2. broadening the use of the funds so it is wider than at present; and
3. enabling community groups to apply for grants.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the CIL monies received in the reporting period be noted;**
- (ii) the likely impacts of Covid-19 on income be noted; and**
- (iii) a report be brought to a future meeting with proposals for introducing a new scheme for the allocation of CIL funds.**

22/E Business and Planning Bill 2019-2021: Licensing Implications

The Executive received a report detailing the likely implications of the Business and Planning Bill 2020 and seeking delegation of powers to enable the licensing provisions contained within the Bill to be implemented.

The Bill introduced a new, temporary, fast-track process for these businesses to obtain permission, in the form of a “pavement licence”, from this Council for the placement of furniture such as tables and chairs on the pavement outside their premises which would enable them to maximise their capacity whilst still adhering to social distancing guidelines. Currently, permission for businesses to place tables and chairs outside their premises on the public highway was granted by Surrey County Council. The Government had suggested that these arrangements would come to an end in September 2021 unless extended.

Although it was envisaged that the resources required to process an application was likely to cost in excess of £100, the maximum licence fee allowed under the Act was £100. It was therefore proposed that the licence fee be set at £100.

Members were advised there had initially been indications that the provisions set out in the Bill would be an executive function and consequently the responsibility of the Council’s Executive. However, recent amendments to the draft legislation had suggested it would be changed to a non-executive function and, if this was confirmed upon the Bill receiving Royal Assent, the matter would be reported to the Licensing Committee for consideration.

RESOLVED that

- (i) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Community to determine any application for a pavement licence made in accordance with the Business and Planning Act 2020;**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Executive Heads of Community, Regulatory and Transformation with regards to the remaining licensing provisions in the Act, including enforcement;**
- (iii) the Executive Head of Business be authorised to determine any appeals made against the decisions made at recommendation (i) above;**
- (iv) the fee for the Pavement Licence be set at £100; and**
- (v) the Guidance to Businesses, attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be noted.**

23/E End of Year Performance Report

The Executive received a report detailing the Council's performance in 2019/20.

RESOLVED to note the 2019/20 End of Year Performance Report.

24/E Council Finances as at 31 March 2020 and Requests for Carry Forward of Unspent Budget to 2020/21

The Executive noted the Council's financial position as at 31 March 2020.

It was reported that the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee had reviewed the report at its meeting on 1 July 2020. At this meeting it had agreed to advise the Executive to consider asking the Section 151 Officer to lead the budget process following Zero Based Budgeting principles.

In line with Financial Regulations, the Executive was also asked to agree the carry forward of unspent budget from 2019/20 to 2020/21 totalling £170,507.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Financial Performance for the year 2019/20 be noted;**
- (ii) the recommendations of the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee, as set out at paragraph 5.1 of the agenda report, be considered; and**
- (iii) the Carry Forward requests for 2019/20, as set out at Annex C to the agenda report, be agreed.**

25/E Review of the Corporate Capital Programme 2019/20

The Executive received a report detailing the capital outturn for 2019/20 and requesting approval for any carry forward of budgets into the 2020/21 Capital Programme. Actual capital expenditure during 2019/20 had been £7.895m.

RECOMMENDED to COUNCIL that

- (i) actual capital expenditure for 2019/20 of £7.895m against a budget of £40.328m be noted;**
- (ii) the carry forward budget provision of £32.406 million from 2019/20 into 2020/21 be approved;**
- (iii) the revised 2020/21 Capital Programme of £33.885 million be noted;**
- (iv) the final capital prudential indicators for 2019/20 be noted.**

26/E Monitoring Officer report - Decision to release local land charge over Field 81 Pennypot Lane Chobham Surrey

The Executive received a report from the Monitoring Officer detailing his findings in respect of a decision to release a local land charge over Field 81 Pennypot Lane, Chobham, Surrey which appeared not to have been taken in accordance with the processes and delegations in the Council's Constitution.

The report had concluded that, although there may have been a rationale for the release of the local land charge, it appeared that the decision had not adhered to the procedures and delegations set out in the Council's Constitution. The limitations to the report identified by the Monitoring Officer were noted. Taking into account these limitations, the Monitoring Officer's conclusion was that he was satisfied that there appeared to have been a decision made which may be deemed to have exceeded the scope of any delegated decision making powers.

The Executive considered the report and agreed to endorse the recommendations proposed by the Monitoring Officer. The recommendations concerned updating the Constitution to expand the definition of a Key Decision and to also specify that no officer may release any security, warranty or guarantee in favour of the Council, unless contractually obliged to do so, without the written approval of the Council's Section 151 Officer or relevant committee. It was suggested that the Governance Working Group would be asked to further consider the proposed constitutional changes. The Section 151 Officer would also be asked to consider whether it was appropriate that debts secured by local land charges should appear in the Council's accounts as assets. It was further agreed that, if this had not already taken place, the Council's external auditor would be made aware of the report.

Consideration was given to commissioning an independent investigation into the matter but it was concluded that, on balance, the use of resources when compared

with the expected action the Council could take in response to any report, it would not be expedient to pursue this suggestion.

The Executive was advised that it would now be required to produce a report detailing the action it would be taking in response to the Monitoring Officer's report. A copy of the report would be sent to each member of the Council and the Council's Monitoring Officer.

RESOLVED to note the content of the Monitoring Officer's report and produce a report on accepting the recommendations.

27/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Regulation 4 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 Local Government Act 1972 as set out below:

Minute	Paragraph(s)
28/E	3
29/E	3

28/E Parks and Grounds Maintenance Contract Renewal Arrangements for 2020

The Executive considered a report detailing the outcomes of a tendering process for a new Grounds Maintenance Contract. The new contract would commence on 1 November 2020.

RESOLVED that, subject to completion of the standstill process without challenge,

- (i) the successful bidder be appointed to deliver the Grounds Maintenance Contract for Surrey Heath from 1 November 2020, at an annual tender cost as stated in section 2 of the report; and**
- (ii) the Executive Head of Business be authorised in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Places & Strategy to issue a contract award letter and enter into a contract with the successful bidder that commences on the 1st November 2020.**

Note: It was noted that Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans declared that she was a member of Windlesham Parish Council, which made use of the contract in question.

29/E Review of Exempt Items

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

RESOLVED that

- (i) the decision at minute 29/E be made public following the completion of the standstill period; and**
- (ii) the report associated with minute 29/E be made public following the completion of the standstill period, subject to any necessary redactions.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
on 11 August 2020**

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr David Lewis |
| + Cllr Josephine Hawkins | + Cllr David Mansfield |
| + Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Adrian Page |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Valerie White and Cllr Kristian Wrenn

30/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 21st July 2020 were confirmed as being a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Matters Arising

Minute 21/E Community Infrastructure Levy – It was agreed that details of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments received by ward over the last five years and how the CIL money had been spent on a ward basis would be circulated.

31/E Questions by Members

In response to a question from Councillor Victoria Wheeler, the Leader, in light of the recent fires at Chobham Common, undertook to formally write to Surrey County Council requesting that they review the levels of funding received by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and to the Chief Fire Officer raising concerns over the resourcing of the County's smaller fire stations. It was agreed that the Leader would liaise with Councillor Wheeler over the specific details.

32/E Reinstatement of Car Parking Charges

The Executive considered a report setting out proposals to reintroduce parking charges at the Council's Main Square and Knoll Road Car parks following their suspension in March 2020 as a result of the implementation of Covid-19 pandemic restrictions.

Following the easing of Government restrictions car park use had increased and occupancy levels of the Main Square car park were now at 91% of pre-lockdown levels, whilst Knoll Road car park occupancy was at 23% of pre-lockdown levels. It was noted that over a two week period the year on year incomes from the fees

and charges collected from Main Square car park charges had fallen from £47,162 to £3,442 when compared to the same period in 2019/20. Losses which when replicated over a continuous twelve month period represented a £1.136million loss of income for the Council, a sum which equated to 9% of the Council's overall budget.

It was noted that there were typographical errors in the customer figures relating to the Main Square car park set out in Table 2 of the report's addendum and the correct figures were:

Year on Year Change in customers numbers from 2019 to 2020

	26 Jul - 8 Aug 2019	24 Jul - 6 Aug 2020	Change	% change
Total Customers	33,848	27,291	-6,557	-19.4%
Up to 4 hours	28,812	24,734	-4,078	-14.2%
Over 4 hours	5,036	2,557	-2,479	-49.2%

It was agreed that data in all the tables would be checked and the information circulated to members.

It was noted that, following similar decisions to temporarily suspend parking charges, neighbouring local authorities had reinstated car parking charges in June and July. It was agreed that clarification would be sought from those neighbouring authorities which had reinstated charges on their car park occupancy rates and if reintroduction of charges had had an impact on these.

The Executive RESOLVED that:

- i. The temporary provision of free parking up to 4 hours charges in Knoll Road and Main Square car parks be lifted on 14 September 2020 and fees and tariffs revert to pre-lockdown charges;
- ii. Free parking at Knoll Road Car Park introduced pre-lockdown to support the town during the High Street refurbishment works be reintroduced but extended to two hours rather than one until January 2021;
- iii. Parking charges remain suspended in the rural car parks beyond 13 September 2020 but to be reviewed in October 2020;
- iv. The Executive Head of Business, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, is granted delegated authority to introduce parking reductions and promotions as and when required

33/E Increased Security Measures on Council Owned Greenspaces

The Executive considered a report summarising the outcomes of a review of existing security measures currently in place across the Council's Greenspace estate and its car parks and setting out proposals to enhance the security arrangements at those sites considered to be vulnerable to unauthorised encampments.

It was stressed that no work would take place until consultation with local communities, ward councillors, the Gypsy and Traveller communities and other

stakeholders had been undertaken. If the feedback received indicated that the proposed measures were unnecessary or alternative security measures were preferred for example bollards were preferred over bunds then plans would be reviewed. Reassurance was given that no money would be spent until consultation work had been completed and local stakeholders had endorsed any work proposed.

It was noted that the list of sites included in Annex A was not an exhaustive list and over 80 sites had been assessed during the review. It was agreed that the full list would be circulated to all members so that any anomalies could be identified.

Members were informed that the Council was working closely with Surrey County Council and the Surrey Borough and District Councils to identify appropriate locations for transit sites for the Gypsy and traveller community and a report would be brought to the Executive in September setting out potential options for permanent pitch sites.

The Executive RESOLVED that:

- i. A programme of investment into enhancing Greenspace security measures to be implemented at the locations listed in priority order shown in Annex A (subject to consultation with the local communities, the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities and planning where required);
- ii. The implementation of the individual schemes be delegated to the Executive head of Business after consultation with the Places and Strategy Portfolio Holder.
- iii. The Executive is advised to recommend to Council that the Capital Programme for 2020/21 be increased by £192,000

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held on 15 September 2020**

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr David Lewis
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr David Mansfield
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Adrian Page

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath, Cllr Charlotte Morley, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Morgan Rise, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Helen Whitcroft and Cllr Valerie White

34/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 August 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

35/E Questions by Members

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Morgan Rise, advising that the item on a revised scheme for the allocation of Community Infrastructure Levy funds would be brought to the next meeting. The Leader also undertook to send Councillor Victoria Wheeler a copy of the letter that it had been agreed he would send to the Fire Service at the previous meeting.

In response to a question from Councillor Helen Whitcroft, Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans advised that the item on Loman Road Playground later that meeting would include discussions on a proposal for a wheelchair swing in the borough.

A question from Councillor Graham Alleway on the pre-application process for Planning Applications was referred to the Executive Head of Regulatory, as this matter was a non-executive function and it did not therefore fall within the Executive's remit.

36/E Public Space Protection Orders

The Executive considered a report seeking approval for the extension of 3 year extension to the Surrey Heath Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs) introduced in 2017.

Details of the review consultation undertaken in July and August 2020 were noted. A total of 41 responses had been received, all but one of which had supported the proposed 3 year extension.

Although during the past 3 years no formal prosecutions had been made, key partners, including Surrey Police, had advised that the orders enabled continuous prevention through engagement. Furthermore, the physical presence of the signage across Surrey Heath was a clear indicator of the enforcement for those who behaved irresponsibly or caused anti-social behaviour.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Public Space Protection Order be extended for a further 3 year period; and**
- (ii) the Executive Head of Transformation be authorised to introduce operational amendments from the recommendations outlined within Annex B to this report, in consultation with the Support and Safeguarding Portfolio Holder and Surrey Heath Police Commander.**

37/E New permanent site for Gypsy and Traveller pitches

The Executive was informed that a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken in 2019 had identified a need for 35 new Gypsy and Traveller pitches and 12 new Travelling Showpeople plots in the borough over the next 18 years. Work on the Local Plan had identified sites that could meet this need. The land at Watchmoor Nature Reserve had been identified as a possible site and it was thought it might be able to accommodate 15 pitches and 8 plots; it was therefore proposed to undertake a feasibility study to assess the potential of the land for this use.

Members discussed this proposal and a number of concerns were raised about the location of the proposed site, including air quality issues, noise pollution, flooding, and its situation between a busy road and railway track. Furthermore, there was concern about the removal of this green space and its consequent impact on the Climate Strategy. The value of the amenity of Watchmoor Nature Reserve was also noted. Notwithstanding these concerns, the limited options available to the Council to address Gypsy and Traveller provision within the borough were also recognised.

The Executive reviewed the issues that would be addressed in the feasibility study, as identified in the agenda report, and agreed to add the following additional items to the study:

- Opportunities to buy alternative land, in place of using Watchmoor Nature Reserve
- The value of the amenity of the Nature Reserve
- Any issues of flooding on the site

It was also agreed to conduct a public consultation, to include Gypsy & Traveller groups and the Police, in parallel with the feasibility study.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to undertake an initial feasibility study for provision of a new Traveller site on land at Watchmoor Reserve; and**
- (ii) a public consultation be conducted in parallel.**

Note: It was noted for the record that a number of councillors declared they had received correspondence from residents and the campaign group. It was also noted that several councillors were acquainted with the petition organiser and some councillors had met campaigners at the affected site.

38/E Loman Road Playground

The Executive considered a proposal to draw down £20,000 from the Mytchett & Deepcut Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds to add to the £35,000 play improvement scheme it had agreed in March 2017. Due to the size of the facility, the play providers had advised that £35,000 would only provide a limited scheme in the well-used and popular local area of play.

It was reported that there was currently £20,000 available in the ward CIL funds and the ward councillors supported this draw down of additional funds so a new playground could be developed for the local community.

Members were advised that consideration had been given to including a wheelchair swing at Loman Road playground, but Frimley Lodge Park was now considered to be a more suitable site for this facility. It was hoped this could be included in the next tranche of playground refurbishments.

RESOLVED that

- (i) £20,000 be made available to draw down from the Mytchett and Deepcut CIL funds to help refurbish Loman Road play area; and**
- (ii) the implementation of the works be delegated to the Executive Head of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Places and Strategy**

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the Capital Programme be increased by £20,000 to fund the works at Loman Road playground.

39/E Changes to the Current Planning System

The Executive considered a draft response to the Government's consultation on short-term changes to current planning policy and regulations. It was advised that a response to the proposed fundamental reform to the planning system, as published in a White Paper, Planning for the Future, would be the subject of a future report.

Members discussed the response to small sites thresholds and it was suggested that an alternative response should be included proposing tax breaks for small and medium sized builders delivering 10-40 units. It was agreed that the wording of this response would be further discussed and delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory for final decision.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the publication of the Government's Changes to the current planning system consultation be noted;**
- (ii) the detailed response to the consultation questions, as set out at Annex 1 to the agenda report, be agreed; and**
- (iii) the finalisation of the wording be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory in consultation with the Leader and Planning & People Portfolio Holder.**

40/E Funds received from the DEFRA Hardship Fund

The Executive was informed that the Council had received a grant of £40,922 from Government's DEFRA Hardship fund of a Local Authority Emergency Assistance Grant for Food. The grant could not be used fund services internally, nor for any food provisions funded during lockdown.

Members were reminded that the Council had fully supported Surrey Heath Prepared and its foodbank service this year. It was forecast that the demand for food parcels would increase over the next year from either a second Coronavirus wave, or through the downturn in the economy and increase in unemployment from the fallout from the Pandemic. It was proposed to award the full funding received, to be split between the Camberley Besom and the Woking Foodbank, which incorporated provision for the whole of Surrey Heath.

RESOLVED that

- (i) £29,000 be awarded to Camberley Besom; and**
- (ii) £11,922 be awarded to the Woking Foodbank**

from the DEFRA Hardship funding received by the Council.

Note: It was noted for the record that Councillor Rodney Bates declared that both he and another member of his family were involved in Camberley Besom and he indicated that he would not participate in the discussions on this item.

41/E Zero Based Budgeting

The Executive was informed that, at its meeting on 9 September 2020, the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee had considered a report on proposals for Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB) for the 2021/22 financial year. This report had been produced in response to the Council's request at its meeting on

26 February 2020 that proposals for ZBB be prepared and carried out in time for the setting of the 2021/22 budget.

The Committee had recommended that a three year rolling ZBB programme be implemented; a ZBB process would be undertaken during the first year for services that were particularly reliant on income from fees and charges, with incremental budgeting process retained for all other services. This three year rolling programme would enable the methodology to be thoroughly tested, provide an analysis of the cost drivers in those services which needed to attract customers and provide support to those services most at risk from the current Covid-19 pandemic and the associated economic downturn.

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that a Zero Based Budget be commenced this autumn for services that are particularly reliant on income from fees and charges, with incremental budgeting process retained for all other services.

42/E Response to the Monitoring Officer's report on the decision to release local land charge over Field 81

The Leader, on behalf of the Executive, presented its response to the Monitoring Officer's report on the decision to release a local land charge over Field 81, Pennypot Lane, Chobham.

43/E Write Off of Irrecoverable Bad Debts

The Executive considered a report seeking authority to write-off irrecoverable revenues bad debts over £1,500. It was advised that all of the debts had been subject to the relevant recovery action and tracing enquiries had been undertaken.

RESOLVED that bad debts totalling £98,916.38 in respect of Council Tax and £41,569.98 in respect of Non-Domestic Rates be approved for write off.

44/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 the annex to the agenda report associated with minute 43/E remain exempt.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 16 July 2020

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Richard Brooks, Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Cllr Emma McGrath, Cllr Pat Tedder.

Officers Present: Ross Cahalane, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Jonathan Partington and Eddie Scott

10/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2020 would be considered at the Committee's next meeting as the wrong set of minutes were included in the supplements pack.

11/P Application Number:20/0090 - 134 & 136 London Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5BZ

The application was an Outline planning application for the erection of 26 residential units (Class C3) following demolition of both existing dwellings with new vehicular access off London Road. Access, appearance, layout and scale to be considered with landscaping reserved.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

"UPDATE

Refuse and cycle storage (paragraph 7.6.3)

To clarify, although there is no communal bin store within Block B, the walking distance from its entrance to the communal bin store of Block A would be approx. 25m, which is considered acceptable having regard to the RDG and the Manual for Streets. This proposed communal refuse storage, along with that proposed in

Block, is also considered to provide sufficient capacity for all residents, as advised by the RDG.

The proposed communal cycle stores would be located within Blocks B and C, to provide one space per unit, with the Block B storage also to be used by Block A. The walking distance would be approx. 30m, which is also considered acceptable.

Affordable housing (paragraph 7.9.2)

The provider of the shared ownership housing, Paragon Asra, has an established track record of delivering housing in Surrey as a Registered Provider, and the Council's Housing Services Manager has raised no objection."

There were concerns in respect of the encroachment of the TPO canopies on the proposal's communal amenity areas. As a result an informative was added to the officer recommendation to request that a future management regime, and scheduled tree works programme be submitted as part of the reserved matters application.

It was also agreed that an informative would be added in order to request that the greenspace proposed as part of the indicative landscaping plan be retained and not be used for the purposes of parking. A similar informative was also added to the officer's recommendation to instruct the use of bollards to provide protection to the greenspace.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Graham Tapper, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that

- I. application 20/0090 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report, a Section 106 agreement and the additional informatives; and**
- I. The final wording of the additional informatives be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee and the relevant Ward Councillors.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Valerie White had been contacted by various members of the public in respect of the application.

Note 2

A roll-call vote was conducted and voting on the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Virtually - Public Meeting on 13 August
2020**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Paul Deach,
Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Emma McGrath and
Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder,
Gavin Ramtohal, Patricia Terceiro, and Eddie Scott

12/P Minutes of Previous Meetings

The sets of minutes of the meetings held on 18 June 2020 and 16 July 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

13/P Application Number: 19/2074 - LAND ADJ. GUILDFORD ROAD (SOUTH OF THE M3), LIGHTWATER, GU19 5NT

The application was for a proposed Gypsy/Traveller site (two pitches) comprising the siting of two mobile homes, two touring caravans, the erection of two day rooms, hard standing and landscaping (part-retrospective).

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been called-in by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans on the basis of concerns raised by local residents and potential environmental impact on a Special Protection Area.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Correction

Section 7.3.14 of the agenda report should refer to a “buffer zone”.

Proposed conditions

The applicant has proposed that in place of “No development shall commence”, the proposed conditions be reworded such that they treat the development as though it were retrospective – i.e. “Within X weeks of the date of this permission”.

The applicant has argued that rewording the conditions as such would enable the development to “commence” in the form of the applicants moving back onto the site, but allowing for no further works until the details are submitted are approved, and argues that this is a sensible approach to take giving consideration to the current accommodation situation for the applicants.

The applicant would however accept the pre-commencement conditions as they are, should these alternatively worded conditions require further consideration by members of the Committee.

Officer comment

The conditions should remain as pre-commencement or pre-occupation as outlined, as due to the site’s location near to major roads and the SPA, issues such as landscaping, contamination and noise levels are fundamental to the acceptability of the scheme, and would therefore be at the heart of any planning permission if granted.

Additional consultation response

The Council’s Arboricultural Officer has raised no tree or landscape related objections. The Arboricultural Officer has however commented that due to the progressive presence of Oak Processionary Moth within the eastern sector of the Borough, Oaks should not be planted as part of the proposed landscaping and replanting. Scots Pine and Birch are represented within the area and should be primarily considered. *Rhododendron ponticum* is present throughout the adjacent wooded sectors and presents a pernicious issue with regards to the future of these areas. This should ideally be managed as part of the broader landscape management of the site.

Officer comment

In order to reflect the above comments, Condition 4 (p26) is proposed to be reworded as highlighted below:

Notwithstanding the submitted proposed site plan (Drawing No. J003396 - CD03 Rev A), no development or soft or hard landscaping works shall take place until a further proposed site plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This plan shall include the following:

a) Proposed location and specification of a physical barrier between the application site and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area 400m buffer zone;

- b) Proposed location of any other walls, fences or access features;*
- c) Precise areas of hard standing to be removed and retained - ensuring that no hard standing is within the above buffer zone;*
- d) Location and species of all retained and proposed planting. Replacement planting species shall be of native provenance, **excluding any Oak species**;*
- e) Details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development, **and**;*
- f) A Landscape Management Plan, including management timescales and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, to include the identified presence of *Rhododendron ponticum* within the whole site under control of the applicant.***

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and to avoid adverse impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, in accordance with Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The following additional condition is proposed, to secure the implementation and retention of the approved landscaping details:

Additional planning condition:

All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the first occupation of the site.

Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the Local Planning Authority, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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.

Agenda report

Paragraph 4.3, p18

For clarity, the definition of “gypsies and travellers”, as set out in Annex 1 of the PPTS is as follows:

Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily, but

excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

Accordingly, Condition 3 is proposed to be reworded as highlighted below:

*The site shall be occupied by no more than two gypsy pitches, each comprising no more than one mobile home, one tourer caravan and one day room. In addition **the accommodation hereby approved shall only be occupied by persons meeting the definition of “gypsies and travellers”, as defined in Annex 1 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 (or any planning policy statement replacing or superseding that statement).***

Reason:

To ensure the approved gypsy pitches are retained for their designated purpose in perpetuity and to protect the countryside and visual amenity of the area and to accord with Policies CP1, CP2, CP7, DM6 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

Paragraph 7.7, p24-25

Condition 5 (p27) is proposed as recommended by Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) to provide mitigation and enhancement measures to cover the likely presence of reptiles. This condition can be reworded as highlighted below to clarify that the additional ecological measures required by this condition, once agreed, will have to be implemented, maintained and secured:

*No development shall commence until a Reasonable Avoidance Measures Document, written by a suitably qualified ecologist, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, **with the agreed mitigation and enhancement measures implemented and then maintained and secured in accordance with the agreed Document. This Document shall include the proposed ecology mitigation and enhancement measures for the likely presence of reptiles.***

Reason: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and legally protected species and landscapes, in accordance with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

An additional planning condition is proposed as follows, to ensure compliance with the mitigation and enhancement measures as recommended in the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal:

Additional planning condition:

The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with all the avoidance, mitigation and enhancement actions within Section 5 of the Preliminary Ecology Appraisal (David Archer Associates, November 2020). Any external

lighting installed on this development shall comply with the recommendations of the Bat Conservation Trusts' document entitled "Bats and Lighting in the UK - Bats and The Built Environment Series".

Reason: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and legally protected species in accordance with Policy CP14A of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

The recommended mitigation and enhancement measures include: protection of the woodland edge; replanting of native specimens of local provenance; restriction of light spill towards woodland areas; control of rhododendron, and; installation of bird and bat boxes.

Paragraph 7.8, p25

The SANG contribution would be £19,824.00 and the SAMM contribution would be £1,988.28. The applicant is willing to secure this by means of a Section 106 legal agreement.

Section 10.0 - Recommendation

Accordingly, the recommendation in Section 10 is altered as follows:

GRANT subject to a legal agreement to secure the contributions towards SANG and SAMM, and the following conditions:

[...]

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been completed by 30 September 2020, or any other period as agreed with the Executive Head of Regulatory, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE for the following reason:

1. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14 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 Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and 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 2019."

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and put the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 19/2074 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and updates.

Note 1

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

14/P Application Number: 20/0480 - LAND TO THE EAST OF PENNY COTTAGE, BAGSHOT ROAD, CHOBHAM

The application was for the creation of a 2 pitch Gypsy/Traveller site comprising the siting of 1 mobile home and 1 touring caravan per pitch and associated works and access.

The application would have normally been determined under delegated authority. However, the application had been called-in by Councillor Graham Alleway.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“The SAMM and SANG contributions required for this proposal are £3,408.48 and £33,984, respectively.”

As the application had triggered the Council’s Public Speaking Scheme, a speech written by an objector to the application was read out by the Democratic Services Officer. The objector wished to remain anonymous for the purposes of public speaking.

The officer recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Helen Whitcroft and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

RESOLVED that application 20/0480 be refused.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillors Victoria Wheeler and Graham Alleway had been in communication with neighbours to the site.

Note 2

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl

Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

15/P Application Number: 20/0279 - DEEPCUT BUSINESS CENTRE, 123-127 DEEPCUT BRIDGE ROAD, DEEPCUT, CAMBERLEY, SURREY, GU16 6SD

The application was for the erection of 3 x 3-bedroom terraced dwellings with associated parking and amenity space.

The 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 Helen Whitcroft due to concerns regarding overdevelopment, mass and scale of the development and being out of keeping with the street scene.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Corrections

Condition 2 should read as:

The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

-Drawing no FLU.803.HS.02 rev T- proposed site plan, received 13 August 2020

-Drawing no FLU.803.HS.04 rev G -Plots 1 & 3 Floor Plans & Elevations, received 22 April 2020

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

Condition 7 should read as:

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plan FLU.803.HS.04 for vehicles to park and turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision of on-site parking accommodation and turning area and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Informative

10 – The applicant is advised that no bins shall be kept in the front of the building”.

It was noted for the record that there were some typographical errors in relation to the spelling of Woodend Road in the officer report.

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Fraser Shorey, the applicant, sent in a video-recorded public speaking speech in support of the application which was played to the Committee. Mr Alan Barnard sent in a written public speaking speech in objection to the application, which was read out by the Democratic Services Officer.

Members had concerns in respect of potential overbearing from the proposal on 6 Blackdown Road. As a result it was agreed to amend the existing conditions to the officer's recommendation to require walls facing 6 Blackdown road, to be rendered white or magnolia to mitigate any such impacts.

Moreover there were also reservations on the impact that the proposal may have on nearby residential amenity including the loss of privacy. Consequently existing proposed conditions were amended to secure a landscape scheme that further comprises details of the new fences and fences to be replaced around the perimeter of the site.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Cliff Betton and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED

- I. that application 20/0279 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and updates, and the additional conditions;**
- II. the proposed conditions 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:

- I. A Committee Site Visit had taken place on the application.
- II. Councillors Helen Whitcroft and Morgan Rise:
 - a. had been in both verbal and written correspondence with local residents on the application and
 - b. had written to local residents asking their opinions on the application;
 - c. however they had not expressed an opinion on the application.

Note 2

A roll call vote was taken and the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Graham Tapper and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Morgan Rise, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

Voting in abstention on the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Peter Barnett.

**16/P Application Number: 20/0222 - 30 BOLDING HOUSE LANE, WEST END
GU18 5RH**

The application was for a single storey front extension and part-two storey, part-single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage.

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been called-in by Councillor Graham Alleway due to concerns regarding impact on the character of the area and neighbouring amenity.

As a result of concerns in respect of overdevelopment, a condition was added to the officer recommendation to restrict any second floor accommodation in the loft space hereby approved.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Cliff Betton, seconded by Councillor Robin Perry and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED

- I. that application 20/0222 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and the additional condition; and**
- II. The wording of the additional condition be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Applications Committee.**

Note 1

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway and Peter Barnett.

**17/P Application Number: 19/2277- 21 RIVERMEAD ROAD CAMBERLEY GU15
2SD**

The application was for the erection of a part two storey side / rear extension with a part single storey side extension and the erection of a detached outbuilding to the rear to serve as an annex, all following demolition of existing detached garage.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, the applicant's agent was an employed officer of Surrey Heath Borough Council. As such, at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory, the application had been referred to the Planning Applications Committee for transparency purposes.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Cliff Betton and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry.

Note 1

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Graham Alleway.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee on 17
September 2020**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Deach (in place of Cllr Colin Dougan)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates and Cllr David Mansfield

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop, Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Jonathan Partington, Gavin Ramtohal and Eddie Scott

18/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 August 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

19/P Heathpark Woods TPO Report

The item sought authority to confirm Tree Preservation Order No. TPO 01/20 which related to land known as Land to the east of Heathpark Drive Woodlands Lane, Windlesham. The TPO was originally authorised and made by the Executive Head of Regulatory on 19 March 2020 in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation of functions to Officers.

Members were advised of the following updates:

"An e-mail has been received from Mr Robbins confirming that he is representing the Windlesham Heathpark Wood Group. He also makes representations about the imposition of a tree preservation order on land to the north of the proposed order

A representation has been received from Mr Murphy, a resident of Heathpark Drive also concerning the land to the north of the proposed order."

The officer recommendation to confirm the Tree Preservation order was proposed by Councillor David Lewis, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that Tree Preservation Order No. TPO 01/20 be confirmed as originally made.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she'd had various conversations with the Heathpark Wood Action Group and the wildlife organisation involved in the site.
- ii. Councillor Helen Whitcroft declared that she had also been in correspondence with the Heathpark Wood Action Group.

Note 2

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the item was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to confirm Tree Preservation Order No. TPO 01/20 as originally made:

Councillors: Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

20/P Application Number: 19/2248 - Land Adjacent To Chobham Farm Cottage, Philpot Lane, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8HD

The application was for the erection of a single storey side extension.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been called-in by Cllr Victoria Wheeler due to concerns regarding inappropriate over-development within the Green Belt.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

"The recommendation has been omitted in error from the Committee Report heading on Page 39. For clarity, the recommendation is: GRANT subject to conditions".

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Graham Tapper, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 19/2248 be granted subject to the conditions in the Officer Report

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had been contacted by some residents and had received some communication from Chobham Parish Council on the application. However she came into the meeting with an open mind.

- ii. Councillor Peter Barnett declared that he had also been contacted by a resident on the application, but came into the meeting with an open mind.

Note 2

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the item was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Graham Tapper and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Morgan Rise, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

21/P Application Number: 20/0461 - The Camberley Theatre, Knoll Road, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 3SY

The application was for the removal of existing canopy and replacement with aluminium canopy and external fenestration alterations.

The application was determined by the Planning Applications Committee as the applicant was Surrey Heath Borough Council.

The recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Graham Tapper and seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton, and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0461 be granted subject to the conditions in the Officer Report

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. It was declared that Camberley Theatre was within the ownership of the Council.
- ii. Councillor Morgan Rise declared that he was one of the Council's outside body appointments on Surrey Heath Arts Council which was heavily involved with the Theatre.

Note 2

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the item was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin

Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

22/P Application Number: 20/0310 - 24 The Close, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5RH

The application was for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

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.

The recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Graham Tapper and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0310 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report.

Note 1

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting in relation to the item was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

23/P Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Regulation 4 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 Local Government Act 1972 as set out below:

Minute	Paragraph(s)
24/P (Part)	1
25/P	1

24/P Application Number: 18/0875 - Land To The Side And Rear Of 154 Guildford Road, West End, Woking, GU24 9LT

The application was for change of use to provide two pitch gypsy site (retrospective).

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been called-in by Councillor David Mansfield on the basis of concerns raised by local residents.

The application was deferred from determination at the Planning Applications Committee meeting on 18 June 2020.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“The applicant has confirmed that his grandson has been accepted at a local special needs school and would be expected to attend this school for the next 12 years.”

The proposed condition 4 in the officer report stipulated that the occupation of the gypsy pitches would be limited to ‘those related’, to the applicant, and Mr John Lee and Maurice Black. Members had concerns that the phrase ‘those related to’, was open to interpretation. As a result Condition 4 was changed to specify the occupation of the gypsy pitches shall be limited to ‘family members related to...’.

In addition Members wished to specify that occupation of the gypsy pitches should be limited to family members, specifically of those with the personal circumstances which amounted to very special circumstances. As a result condition 4 was further amended to remove the applicant, Mr Maurice Black, from the named occupants.

RESOLVED that

- i. application 18/0875 be granted for a period of five years subject to the conditions in officer report, as amended and a legal agreement;**
- ii. and the final wording on the amended condition be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Planning Applications Committee, and the relevant ward Councillors.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Graham Alleway declared that he had been contacted by residents who had queries and expressed concerns on the application.

Note 2

A roll call vote was conducted and the voting was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

25/P Review of Exempt Items

The Planning Committee 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.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Employment Committee held on 9 July
2020**

+ Cllr Colin Dougan (Chairman)
+ Cllr Cliff Betton (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Alan McClafferty	
+ Present	

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Adrian Page, Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Robin Perry and Cllr Valerie White

1/EC Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2020 were agreed.

2/EC Data Security Breach Management Policy and Procedure

The Committee was informed that, at its meeting on 12 March 2020, the Joint Staff Consultative Group had considered a revised Data Security Breach Management Policy and Procedure and recommended that the Committee adopt the revised Procedure.

The Policy was designed to ensure that all personal data the Council processed, including that of colleagues and customers, was managed appropriately and in compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA), collectively referred to as 'Data Protection legislation'.

This policy applied to all users of the Council's information, data, information systems and its physical buildings. It applied not only to staff and Members, but also, where appropriate, contractors, agency staff, service providers, consultants and anyone else engaged to work in the organisation. Its scope encompassed data, information, software, systems, and paper documents.

RESOLVED that the revised Data Security Breach Management Policy & Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.

3/EC Data Information Security Policy

The Committee was informed that, at its meeting on 12 March 2020, the Joint Staff Consultative Group had considered an Information Security Policy, which was made up of a number of separate documents or sub-policies, and recommended that the Committee adopt the revised Policy. These documents covered the rules and guidance which needed to be applied by staff, managers, system administrators, ICT specialists and others.

This policy set the framework for protecting and securing the Council's information assets and would help to:

- Ensure that the personal privacy of citizens was respected
- Ensure that organisational confidentiality was protected
- Safeguard the information contained within the Council's computer systems
- Reduce legal risk
- Reduce the risk of error, theft, fraud and misuse of facilities
- Provide guidance for staff to make the best use of the Council's system
- Comply with GDPR legislation

RESOLVED that revised Information Security Policy, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.

4/EC Flexi Time Policy

The Committee considered a new Flexi Time Policy. The Policy had been considered by the Joint Staff Consultative Group at its meeting on 12 March 2020, which had recommended that the Committee adopt the revised Policy.

The current flexi-time policy was part of the Leave & Special Leave policy. However, with the changes proposed to the flexi time arrangements it had been felt that an exclusive Flexi Time policy was required. This policy was designed to ensure employees were able to achieve a balance between the demands of work and their domestic, personal, public duties and circumstances, in order to maintain work performance. The policy and procedure included:

- Who the policy applied to;
- Recording of hours worked;
- Settlement period; and
- Carry-over balances.

Members considered the revised Policy and agreed to add a note to the references to grades in section 7 clarifying that this meant it did not apply to Tier 1 and 2 officers, which was in line with other policies. It was, however, suggested by some Members that the policy should apply to Tier 1 and 2 officers and this should form part of a future review.

RESOLVED that the revised Flexi Time policy, as set out at Annex A to the report, as amended, be adopted.

5/EC Exceptional Payments Policy

The Committee was informed that, at its meeting on 25 June 2020, the Joint Staff Consultative Group had reviewed a revised Exceptional Payments Policy and recommended that the Committee adopt the revised Policy.

The Policy had been updated to clarify that, with the exception of Acting Up Allowances, senior managers would not be eligible for payments made under the

Exceptional Payments Policy. The revised Policy also clarified who could authorise payments in line with the Council's Financial Regulations.

RESOLVED that the updated Exceptional Payments Policy, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.

6/EC Expenses Policy

The Committee was informed that, at its meeting on 25 June 2020, the Joint Staff Consultative Group (JSCG) had reviewed a revised Expenses Policy and Procedure and recommended that the Committee adopt the revised Policy.

The Expenses Policy and Procedure had been reviewed to ensure that employees were provided with clear guidance on being reimbursed for valid business expenses incurred on Council business. The Policy was designed to ensure clarity on what could be claimed for expenses and provide guidelines around certain limitations, for example accommodation. It also clarified who could authorise payments in line with the Council's Financial Regulations.

The revised Policy included a requirement for the Audit & Standards Committee to receive an annual report on expenses claimed by senior officers; this change had been suggested after the JSCG meeting. Having heard concerns expressed about this proposal, it was agreed to remove this requirement from the Policy and include the Leader in the process for signing off the Chief Executive's expenses claims.

Members were advised that the JSCG had requested further information on claiming for travel from a home address outside a working day, when the deduction of a normal commute from mileage would not be relevant, and had asked that this be included in the Policy if relevant. Following receipt of advice on this matter, it was proposed to add the following wording to paragraph 5.3.1 of the Policy:

"If you have to attend a site or travel on Council business due to an emergency, for example to attend a 'dangerous structure', out of hours, or on weekends/Bank Holidays you may claim business miles for the entire trip without having to deduct your normal mileage commute. These instances are to be treated as extenuating circumstances. However, if this differs under your contractual Hours of Work, you will only be entitled to claim the original business mileage, less your home to work travel"

It was noted that the mileage rates, including those for electric cars, were the standard rates approved by HMRC.

The Committee discussed reimbursement for accommodation when an officer was required to stay in accommodation overnight. The revised Policy specified the types of hotels officers would be expected to choose, with a maximum value of £200, and a radius from an employee's home address for eligibility to claim for an overnight stay. Having considered alternatives options, it was agreed to adopt the provisions recommended by the JSCG, with additional wording to clarify that the maximum rate would be per night.

RESOLVED that the updated Expenses Policy, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be agreed.

7/EC Annual Settlement Procedure 2020/21

The Committee was informed that, at its meeting on 25 June 2020, the Joint Staff Consultative Group had reviewed a revised Annual Pay Settlement Procedure and recommended that the Committee adopt the revised Procedure. The document had primarily been updated to include reference to the Employment Committee.

The revised document was considered and it was agreed to amend a minor typographical error.

RESOLVED that the revised Annual Settlement Procedure policy, as set out at Annex A to the report, as amended, be adopted.

8/EC Pay Policy Statement 2020/21

The Committee considered the Pay Policy Statement 2020/21, an annual statement the Council was required to publish in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the Pay Policy Statement 2020/21, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.

9/EC Membership of South East Employers

The Committee was reminded that at previous meetings it had requested information on resuming its membership of South East Employers. The cost of membership would be £4,832 + VAT. Having considered the cost and benefits of membership, it was agreed not to re-join South East Employers.

RESOLVED to not resume membership of South East Employers.

10/EC Work Programme

The Committee considered its Work Programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

RESOLVED that the Work Programme for 2020/21, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.

11/EC Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), 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)
1/EC (part)	1
12/EC	3
13/EC	3

12/EC Options to replace the post of Chief Executive

The Committee considered a report outlining the options for the replacement of the Chief Executive. The following 3 options presented to the Committee were considered:

- Option 1 - Replacing the Chief Executive through a recruitment and selection process to the open market.
- Option 2 - Recruiting an experienced Chief Executive for a temporary period, with the objective of working with the Council to decide the best solution for future leadership of the Council.
- Option 3 - Considering entering into a partnership with another Council for a shared Chief Executive; the Chief Executive would either come from one of the partner authorities or recruited to manage the new partnership.

The Committee reviewed the options set out in the report. Members were advised that Option 3 referred to a partnership as, even if the only element of a partnership was a shared Chief Executive, there would need to be an agreement stating the terms for this arrangement. It was also reported that the post would need to be advertised.

It was noted that a Recovery and Devolution White Paper was expected to be published by the Government in the autumn of 2020, which was likely to include proposals for the creation of Unitary Authorities. Furthermore, recent indications from the Leader of Surrey County Council had indicated support for progressing the creation of a single unitary authority in Surrey.

It was suggested by some Members that a standalone Chief Executive could be appointed for a fixed term until 31 May 2022, with the option to extend the contract, who could lead the authority through unitary negotiations and preparations. Alternative views were put forward on a shared Chief Executive with a neighbouring authority helping to facilitate the expected transition to becoming a Unitary Authority.

Having discussed the advantages and issues associated with each option proposed, the Committee agreed to recommend to the Full Council that, in order to achieve the best outcome for the Council, the options to recruit a standalone Chief Executive and further explore a shared Chief Executive should be pursued in parallel.

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the options to recruit a standalone Chief Executive and to further explore a shared Chief Executive be pursued in parallel.

13/EC Review of Exempt Items

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

RESOLVED that minute 12/EC and the associated agenda report be made public, but the addendum to the report remain exempt for the present time.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing
Committee held at Council Chamber,
Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road,
Camberley, GU15 3HD on 29 July 2020**

+ Cllr Rodney Bates (Chairman)
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman (Vice Chairman)

- Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr David Mansfield
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr John Skipper
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
- Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr Ben Leach	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Lewis	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Cliff Betton and Cllr Alan McClafferty

Officers Present: Paula Barnshaw, Nathita Fleet, Helen Lolley, Tim Pashen,
Eddie Scott and Frances Soper

1/L Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

2/L Food Safety Service Plan 2020-21

The Committee was informed that the Food Standards agency required all food authorities to have a Food Safety Service Plan to ensure that national priorities and standards were addressed and delivered locally.

The number of food businesses which were 'broadly compliant' remained high at 96.4%. This figure had increased in the previous few years from a base of 87% in 2009/10. Officers continued to work with the businesses which were not broadly compliant in order to ensure that they improved their standards.

The report set out the performance of the food safety service team during 2019/20, including inspections, complaint investigations and sampling activities. The plan also provided information on expected demands on the service during 2020/21 including the impact of Covid-19 on the Food Safety Service.

It was stated when a food premise opened in the Borough it was required to be inspected by the Council's environmental health team within 28 days from being registered. The business was then given its food hygiene rating accordingly.

RESOLVED that the Food Safety Service Plan 2019/2020, as set out in the agenda papers be agreed.

3/L Health and Safety Service Plan 2020- 2021

Under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, local authorities were responsible for health and safety enforcement within their area of responsibility, which included a diverse range of premises. Pursuant to the “National Local Authority Enforcement Code” produced by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), a Surrey Heath Health and Safety Service Plan had been developed.

The Environmental Health Team carried out planned risk based inspections of businesses to ensure they complied with health and safety legislation, and took appropriate enforcement as necessary. These inspections occurred at a frequency determined by the national code of practice and in accordance with HSE guidance. The Council’s performance was subject to scrutiny by the HSE and the Council was required to complete an annual return of health and safety enforcement activity.

It was noted that in 2020/21 the Council intended to continue to provide a high-quality health and safety service. This would include advising new and existing businesses on compliance, investigating complaints and accidents, taking enforcement action where necessary and participating in proactive health and safety campaigns.

RESOLVED that the Surrey Heath Health and Safety Service Plan 2019/2020, as set out in the agenda papers, be approved.

4/L Hackney Carriages and Private Vehicle - Age of Vehicles Guidance

The Committee considered a report outlining the options in respect of the relaxation of the current guidelines relating to the age limits on vehicles submitted for licensing as Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles. It was noted a review of the guidelines was heard by the Licensing Committee at the request of Councillor John Skipper.

As it stood no vehicle could be licensed after the sixth anniversary of the car being registered by the DVLA or from its date of manufacture in the case of cars, which were first registered overseas.

In addition vehicles which were registered for more than 3 years with the DVLA at the time of being presented for licensing or, in the case of a car which had been first registered overseas, was more than three years old would also be unable to be licensed.

It was acknowledged that whilst it appeared that Surrey Heath maybe out of line with the guidelines and policies adopted by neighbouring local authorities in relation to the age of vehicles, the necessity to consider the overall picture including the conditions attached to Licences needed to be recognised.

RESOLVED that

- I. A temporary one year exemption to the current 6 year vehicle age limit rule be applied;**

- II. and the Licensing Committee receives a detailed report in order to conduct a full review of the current guidelines/ policies relating to Taxi Licensing within the next 12 months.**

5/L Business and Planning Act 2019-2021: Licensing Implications

The Licensing Committee considered a report detailing the implications of the Business and Planning Act 2020 which received Royal Assent on the 22nd July and proposed delegated powers to enable licensing provisions in respect of street pavement licenses and automatic off sales entitlement.

The act introduced a new, temporary, fast-track process for businesses to obtain a pavement licence, from the Council for the placement of furniture such as tables and chairs on the pavement outside premises. It was envisaged that a license would enable the maximisation of a premise's capacity whilst still allowing adherence to social distancing guidelines.

It was acknowledged that the Council was required to determine applications made in accordance with the Act and that the determination of the applications would be best delegated to the Executive Head of Community. In addition it was noted that the committee were required to make a decision in order to create a suitable appeals process for the decisions made by the Executive Head of Community in respect of the granting of pavement licenses.

RESOLVED that

- I. authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Community to determine any application for a pavement licence made in accordance with the Business and Planning Act 2020;**
- II. authority be delegated to the Executive Heads of Community with regards to the remaining licensing provisions in the Act;**
- III. enforcement powers in respect of the act be delegated to the Executive Head of Community in consultation with the Executive Heads of Transformation and Regulatory where required;**
- IV. the fee for the Pavement Licence be set at £100;**
- V. the Guidance to Businesses, as published as a supplement to the agenda papers, be noted;**
- VI. appeals in respect of the determination of applications, be conducted and determined by the Head of Legal Services in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Licensing Committee and one other Licensing Committee Member;**
- VII. and the final details of the appeals process be delegated to the Executive Head of Community in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Licensing Committee.**

6/L Licensing Act 2003 - Summary of Decisions

The Committee received the numbers of decisions taken under delegated powers in respect of licence applications where no representations had been received from the responsible authorities or any other persons.

7/L Reporting of Urgent Action

The Licensing Committee noted Urgent Action which had been taken in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers.

RESOLVED to note the urgent action taken under the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers.

8/L Licensing Sub Committee Minutes

The Committee noted that the Chairman would sign the minutes of the Licensing Sub Committee meetings which had taken place since the previous meeting.

9/L Committee Work Programme

It was acknowledged that Members were able to request items to be added to the Licensing Committee's work programme; including the review of guidelines and policies as undertaken at minute 4/L.

RESOLVED to note the Committee's Work Programme

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the External
Partnerships Select Committee held
Virtually on 8 September 2020**

- + Cllr Robin Perry (Chairman)
- Cllr Morgan Rise (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr Tim FitzGerald
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Shaun Garrett
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
	+ Cllr Kristian Wrenn

- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Graham Tapper (in place of Cllr Morgan Rise)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Valerie White, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam and Cllr Victoria Wheeler

Officers Present: Jayne Boitout, Louise Livingston and Tim Pashen

5/EP Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes of the meeting were agreed to be signed by the Chairman at the next opportunity.

6/EP Declarations of Interest

It was noted for the record that:

1. Councillor Shaun Garrett declared that he was involved in Surrey Heath Age Concern, Old Dean Community Centre and Chloe's and Sophie's Special Ear Fund who all worked with Voluntary Support North Surrey.
2. Councillor Alan McClafferty declared that:
 - a) he and his Wife both volunteered for Surrey Heath Age Concern who worked closely with Voluntary Support North Surrey.
 - b) he was the Council's outside body representative for Voluntary Support North Surrey.

7/EP Voluntary Support North Surrey

Solette Sheppardson, Chief Executive Officer, gave a presentation in respect of Voluntary Support North Surrey and its work within Surrey Heath. Voluntary Support North Surrey (VSNS) supported the community and voluntary organisations within Surrey Heath which totalled to between 300- 400 organisations within Surrey Heath. The organisation's aim was to empower and increase the capacity of third sector organisations. VSNS had worked in partnership with the Council in order to achieve via the following services:

1. Core Services providing charities and the third sector with guidance on governance, strategy, and funding. It was emphasised during the Covid-19 pandemic funding had become a priority area service for VSNS; with third sector organisations experiencing a squeeze on their funds.
2. Support on how to manage, train and motivate volunteers and the administration of DBS checks.
1. Specific support to the areas of deprivation in partnership with Surrey Heath Borough Council

VSNS directly ran the Time to Talk Project, which was delivered in conjunction with Surrey Heath Age Concern. The project served individuals which were suffering with isolation and loneliness. During Covid-19 the project had reconfigured to provide its befriending services via phone and had seen a rise in demand for its services.

VSNS worked closely in partnership with the Council and Surrey Heath Prepared on the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic. VSNS gave strong assistance to Surrey Heath Prepared helping them recruit and manage volunteers; as well as providing logistics support in respect of acquiring and delivery of Personal Protective Equipment.

It was acknowledged that the third sector was a laggard in respect of providing digital services and VSNS were continually striving to develop what charitable organisations offered to supporters and clients online. VSNS also aimed to inform and help organisations develop new ways to fundraise online and in the post-lockdown world. It was emphasised that fundraising had become more difficult given the economic situation and the success of online grant applications had become more crucial for the third sector, entailing greater demand for VSNS's support and expertise on the matter.

During Lockdown many new volunteers had come forward and in turn had opened their mind to volunteering. Whilst numbers of volunteering opportunities had decreased, there was now a new section of volunteers in society for local groups to harness.

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

- Voluntary Support North Surrey measured their success via statistics captured in respect of volunteering. For example VSNS could measure how many volunteers were currently on placements and how many corporate organisations were currently taking part in volunteering schemes ran by VSNS. However it was suggested by Members that there could be better, more in-depth, regular measurement of VSNS's performance in the future.
- VSNS assisted and guided third sector organisations through the DBS check process.
- VSNS aimed to help third sector organisations to harness the new pandemic-led emphasis on the digital world. VSNS aimed to get more third sector organisations meeting via digital board meetings, and undertaking day to day functions via video-conferencing services. Acknowledging that it was a key indicator for fundholders, VSNS actively helped third sector organisations develop their websites and their social media presence.

VSNS offered training courses on language use in grant applications as well as a grant application checking service.

- VSNS worked with local voluntary organisations in order to place students taking part in the Duke of Edinburgh scheme. However it was acknowledged outside of this they could improve on their efforts to engage with young people. It was acknowledged young people could offer voluntary organisations significant social media expertise and skills. It was suggested that Surrey Heath Youth Council and Surrey Youth Cabinet, as well as Secondary Schools could be good initial channels for promoting volunteering to local young people.
- Although there was acknowledged room for improvement in respect of raising their own funds, VSNS had managed to access funding from central government Health and Wellbeing funds and had attracted small donations from individuals.
- VSNS steered potential volunteers to where they were needed and did not give the Time to Talk Project any preferential treatment.
- As per the annex in the agenda report pack VSNS placed 412 volunteers during the first quarter of this year. However it was noted that this figure was slightly higher than normal due to the influx of volunteers at the start of the pandemic.

The Committee thanked Solette for her informative presentation.

8/EP Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group

Nicola Airey, Director of Planning & Delivery, gave a presentation in respect of the Clinical Commissioning Group's priorities in the next six months and their response to the Covid-19 pandemic and the health recovery which would follow.

NHS Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) was made up of the seven GP practices (10 surgeries) in Surrey Heath and Ash Vale and spent around £114m on community and hospital care for around 95,000 people registered at these surgeries.

The CCG's vision was to improve the health of local people by commissioning hospital and community health care to meet the needs of the population, and to ensure that local health services are high quality, value for money and meet the needs of the population.

Since last presenting to the Committee, a number of key issues had significant impacts on the CCGs work:

- The CCG were a key stakeholder in assuring a successful recovery and restoration to Health Care within Surrey Heath.
- There was significant planning being undertaken in respect of a scenario where winter pressures were to put substantial burdens on NHS Services. The plans included the provision of an innovative drive through flu clinic in order to safely administer the flu vaccination for Surrey Heath.
- The creation of a new 'Community Deal', which sought to assess and improve the ways in which local NHS services had conversations with different communities,

- The need for EU Exit Planning.
- A planned organisational restructure.

In a wider focus, the CCG were still aiming to concentrate on early intervention rather than integrated care which had been the organisation's main focus since its inception. In addition there was a continued emphasis on 'Early Help', which took the form of resources being directed towards new CAMHS services and greater partnerships between Mental Health services and schools.

The following priorities for the CCG over the next six months were outlined:

- The strengthening of Mental Health services including partnership working tying in with the prioritisation of early intervention and reflecting an anticipated greater demand due to COVID-19.
- Further development of the integrated care journey for older people for the next level, ensuring that when older residents go into supported accommodation they do with a joined up package with health partners.
- Identifying how they tackle inequalities within society in Surrey Heath and ensuring that delivered care that is equitable and does not vary in quality of delivery or outcomes because of personal characteristics. It was acknowledged that deprivation, learning disabilities, and difficulties in accessing services led to poorer health outcomes.

The Covid-19 Pandemic had changed forever how the NHS engages with its residents. In its most obvious sense this included a huge increase in the amount of telephone and online appointments and consultations. In addition General practice was now back to the same levels of consultations pre-pandemic and although many more of these had been video and text consultations, feedback suggested that this hadn't taken away from appointments' effectiveness.

There was a conscious effort to ramp up vaccination efforts ahead of flu season which included the provision of holding a drive through clinic at Blackbushe Airport, Camberley. The clinic opened on 21 September and was designed to ensure safe delivery of the flu vaccination.

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

- Surrey Heath CCG followed the Mental Health Investment Standard which required CCGs to increase investment in Mental Health services in line with their overall increase in allocation each year. There was also a reconfiguration of Mental Health services to reflect the new lines of communication given the Covid-19 pandemic, including an increase in 24/7 crisis call lines. In addition the CCG had agreed to give additional resource and support to the Citizens Advice Bureau in respect of clients' access to Mental Health Services.
- Not all of Surrey Heath is covered by Surrey Heath CCG or the partnering CCGs that Surrey CCG regularly liaised with through the Integrated Commissioning Fund (ICF). Whilst Frimley Health Trust had announced the release of a new Electronic Patient Record (EPR), this meant it would be soon working off a different system from St Peters Hospital and the Royal Surrey Hospital which many of the Borough's eastern residents also regularly used. The new EPR will allow for the transfer of the Connected Care Record across the Surrey Heath CCG's social care, community and

acute trust services. However it was unknown how well Surrey Heath CCG's new EPR will be able to connect with other acute trusts.

- There was an acknowledged overload on Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS); whose demand had increased due to the social distancing measures. Surrey Heath CCG was aiming to create greater capacity in the CAMHS system by commissioning and investing in services relating to the early intervention of behaviours including behavioural support for 4, 5 and 6 year olds.
- The Council's planning department were good at informing the CCG in respect of new developments which would increase demand on Surrey Heath's NHS services. A frequent casework comment received by Members was that the local infrastructure was inadequate to absorb future demand from new developments. This was exacerbated by a perceived poor use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds.
- Waiting times at GP Practises within the CCG area were better than the national average. In addition the recent rise in online consultations had reduced waiting times for groups of people and GP waiting times had actually eased during the Covid-19 pandemic.
- It was noted there were additional opportunities for partnership working with the Borough Council, including to feeding to the Equality Working Group's work in respect of ethnicity and access to services.

The Committee thanked Nicola Airey for her informative presentation.

9/EP Covid-19 Update - Recovery Phase and Preparation for 2nd Wave

The Committee received a presentation from Louise Livingston, Executive Head, Transformation, on the recovery phase to the Council's Covid-19 response and its preparations for a second wave.

The Borough Council's emergency response to the pandemic so far had included:

- 1461 tonnes more waste and recycling collected from households compared to a pre-lockdown average
- £15,145,000 of statutory business support grants paid out to 1,189 local firms.
- £825,000 of discretionary business support grants paid out to 99 firms.
- £61,000 of emergency grants awarded to local charities

These were updated figures since the last update heard by the Committee.

The Council's recovery programme consisted of 6 recovery workstreams, which ranged from communication and member engagement to business support and local economic recovery. The Council's recovery started with the launch of the Surrey Heath Covid-19 Emergency Charity Grant Scheme and had transitioned to contingency planning for a possible second wave.

The Council's contingency plan included Covid-19 case monitoring to foot parcel planning and welfare preparation and staffing.

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

- The economic situation resulting from the pandemic and the ending of the Central Government Furlough scheme would result in job losses and Surrey Heath residents accessing the benefit system who haven't previously done so. The Council was currently actively reaching out to businesses to make them aware of what support they had available through the Surrey Chambers of Commerce and the Growth Hub. The Council's Economic Development team were also looking at setting up initiatives in respect of equipping residents with skills and increasing employability as well as specific schemes for 16-24 year olds.
- There was value in a simple and concise one page communication, which could be published in Heathscene and/or on Social Media signposting residents and businesses where they could get help if they were in hardship. This was agreed to be taken forward as a potential initiative by officers.
- As it stood there was no noticeable rise in Surrey Heath residents going back to commuting to London in large numbers. The Council was continuing to encourage compliance with the social distancing guidelines and was taking an active role advising local businesses on how to reopen safely.
- Surrey County Council was working with Surrey's schools in order to use their parent mails as information channels to pass on information in respect of its Covid-19 response. It was recognised that the Borough Council also had the potential to harness its partnerships with the Borough's schools as a means of communication.

RESOLVED that a one page, easy reference communication in respect where to get hardship support in light of the pandemic be explored and created.

10/EP Committee Work Programme

RESOLVED that the Committee Work Programme be noted for the rest of the 20-21 municipal year.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff
Consultative Group held at Surrey
Heath House on 24 September 2020**

+ Anthony Sparks (Chairman)
+ Cllr Graham Tapper (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Rodney Bates	- Louise Aartsen
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	- Garry Carter
- Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Gillian Barnes-Riding
- Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Andrew Edmeads
+ Cllr David Mansfield	+ Lynn Smith
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	+ Karen Wetherell
+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft	

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Officers in attendance: Louise Livingston, Jenny Villamayor and Rachel Whillis

10/J Notes

The notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group meeting held on 25 June 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

11/J Code of Conduct for Officers

The Group considered proposed changes to the Code of Conduct for Officers, which had been reviewed to ensure it had clear processes and procedures regarding officers' conduct.

The proposed amendments were considered and it was agreed to make the following additional changes:

- The addition of a reference to the Speak Up Policy and Member & Officer Protocol in paragraph 13.3;
- Updating paragraph 14.4 to state the Register of Interests can be inspected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Audit & Standards Committee and the Register will be inspected on a quarterly basis;
- In paragraph 15.2, reviewing the wording regarding officers devoting their whole time service to the work of the Council, in recognition that some staff work part-time hours or are on casual contracts;
- The amendment of any references in paragraph 15.2 to the Executive Head of Transformation to Human Resources;
- In paragraph 19.3, amending the reference to the Chief Executive to the Monitoring Officer;
- The correction of a typographical error in paragraph 24.2.

It was also agreed that paragraph 19.4 would be reviewed with the Monitoring Officer.

RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to adopt the revised Code of Conduct for Officers, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report.

12/J Member & Officer Protocol

The Group was informed that the Member & Officer Protocol had been revised to ensure good working relationships between elected members and officers. The revised Protocol included a new section to reflect the changes to the Speak Up Policy agreed by the Employment Committee in January 2020, which provided for specific councillors to be reporting options for raising a concern under the Policy. The section added to the Member & Officer Protocol reflected that any concerns of wrongdoing raised by officers with the relevant Members in accordance with the Speak Up Policy would not be treated as a breach of the Protocol.

In addition to the changes proposed, the Group agreed to make the following amendments:

- Amending paragraph 4.8 to replace the word “question” with “challenge”; and
- Amending paragraph 4.8 (e) to replace “content” with “wording”.

The Group discussed paragraph 5.2 of the Protocol and agreed that Human Resources would be asked to include wording on how any concerns about the Monitoring Officer would be managed; it was recognised that this additional wording would be in line with the provisions in the Grievance and Disciplinary Policies for Statutory Officers.

It was noted that any numbering in the Protocol would be checked once the document was finalised.

RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to recommend to the Full Council that the revised Member Officer Protocol, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be adopted.

13/J Family Friendly Policy

The Group considered a revised Family Friendly Policy, which had been reviewed to ensure there was clarity around processes for maternity, adoption, paternity, parental, shared and bereavement leave, all of which were encompassed by the Policy.

In addition to the changes set out in the agenda, it was agreed to add a sheet to the Policy setting out the relevant abbreviations used. It was also agreed to amend a typographical error in section 4 so it correctly referred to the Equality Action Group.

RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to adopt the revised Family Friendly Policy, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.

14/J Terms & Conditions 2020/21

The Group considered proposed changes to Terms and Conditions of Employment which had been updated to reflect recent employment law changes.

It was agreed to make the following additional changes:

- In 16.5 of the Statement of Terms and Conditions of Employment, the amendment of “termination” to “final date of service”; and
- The addition of details in Appendix 1 on where to find further information on these allowances.

RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to adopt the revised Terms and Conditions, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.

15/J Work Programme 2020-21

The Group considered a Work Programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

RESOLVED that the work programme for the 2020/21 municipal year, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.

16/J Vote of Thanks

The Group recorded its thanks to Jenny Villamayor, who would shortly be leaving the Council's employment, for all of her work and the advice given to the Consultative Group during the past few years and wished her well for the future.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank