

COUNCIL MEETING

9 December 2020

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 14 October 2020** (Pages 3 - 14)
2. **Council - 4 November 2020** (Pages 15 - 18)
3. **Council - 4 November 2020** (Pages 19 - 20)
4. **Executive - 20 October 2020** (Pages 21 - 30)
5. **Executive - 17 November 2020** (Pages 31 - 38)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 15 October 2020** (Pages 39 - 44)
7. **Planning Applications Committee - 12 November 2020** (Pages 45 - 56)
8. **Employment Committee - 8 October 2020** (Pages 57 - 60)
9. **Licensing Committee - 21 October 2020** (Pages 61 - 64)
10. **Audit and Standards Committee - 23 November 2020 (to be laid on the table)**
11. **Joint Staff Consultative Group - 26 November 2020 (to be laid on the table)**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held on
14 October 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
- Apologies for absence presented

34/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Colin Dougan.

35/C Minutes

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

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 22 July and 26 August 2020 be approved as a correct record.

36/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor, on behalf of the Council, congratulated Mrs Aline Poulter, the Council's Operations Manager for Community Services, who had been made a Member of the Order of the British Empire (MBE) in the Queen's Birthday Honours, for services to vulnerable and older people. She paid tribute to Aline's work both as a member of the Community Services team and the work she undertook in a voluntary capacity, including the her role in setting up and running the 'Saturday Club' at Windle Valley Day Centre in Bagshot. The Mayor presented Aline with a bouquet of flowers from the Council.

The Council was informed about a number of the events attended and activities undertaken by the Mayor since July, including:

- commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Britain and the raising of a flag on the lawn of Surrey Heath House
- celebrating with a resident on her 111th birthday
- attending an event in The Square by Creative Minds Academy
- unveiling a Blue Plaque in Lightwater
- attending the opening of the Secret Stage School in Grace Reynolds Walk, Camberley.

The Mayor was pleased to report that Frimley Lodge Park had received its twentieth Green Flag and Lightwater County Park had received a Green Flag for the second year running. She congratulated the officers who had made these achievements possible.

37/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader extended his congratulations to Mrs Aline Poulter, the Council's Operations Manager for Community Services, who had been made a Member of the Order of the British Empire (MBE) in the Queen's Birthday Honours, for services to vulnerable and older people.

The Council was updated on the recent work on local government reorganisation and plans for unitary authorities. Members were reminded that KPMG had been engaged by the 11 boroughs and districts in Surrey to examine all options for unitary structures. He advised that, since the Government had confirmed its intention to place focus on a pathfinder group of 3 counties, which did not include Surrey, KPMG's brief had been modified to look at how the Surrey borough/district authorities and the County Council could work together better.

Members were advised on the progression of work to address Gypsy and Traveller site provision within the borough and county.

The Leader informed the Council that he continued to work with the Acting Chief Executive to prepare for the expected economic downturn arising from the Covid-19 pandemic.

38/C Questions from Members of the Public

The Leader received a question from Mr Richard Wilson concerning recent changes by Surrey County Council (SCC) to introduce a one-way system in Bagshot High Street; in response to the question, the Leader confirmed that following consultation with the ward councillors officers from this Council had advised SCC in June 2020 that there was no support for this measure. He also confirmed he would write to SCC to advise the Highways Authority of the strength of feeling by residents and businesses about the scheme.

In response to a question from Mr Richard Wilson, the Environment & Heath Portfolio Holder, Councillor David Mansfield, outlined the action being undertaken

to address flooding in the villages and confirmed that funding would be made available as necessary.

On behalf of the Business & Transformation Portfolio Holder, the Leader responded to a question from Mr Alan Ashbery outlining the work being undertaken by the Council to help support Frimley High Street.

In response to a question from Mrs Elisabeth Noble, the Environment & Heath Portfolio Holder, Councillor David Mansfield, undertook to write to Surrey County Council's Highways Authority team to highlight concerns about the phasing of traffic lights, which led to long queues on the A322 and the diversion of traffic through Lightwater village, and the consequent effect on Air Quality.

The Leader, in response to a question from Mr Jacques Olmo, suggested that once the Executive had agreed a revised Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) scheme, ward councillors could consider the use of CIL to provide Vehicle Activated Signs to help address concerns about speeding in Mytchett. He further advised that residents and/or ward councillors would need to agree a scheme and costings with Surrey County Council, with any timings dependent on these processes.

Councillor Josephine Hawkins, the Support & Safeguarding Portfolio Holder, received a question from Dr Nirmal Kang concerning the Government's plans to change the law regarding on-street parking, including the effect this would have on local schools where there was no car park available. In response, she acknowledged that the management of on-street parking was a County Council function but recognised the impact that pavement parking had on borough residents.

Ms Lisa Finan-Cooke asked a question about Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and concerns about wards where no CIL funding was available. The Finance Portfolio Holder, Councillor David Lewis, advised that the Executive would be considering an item at its meeting on 20 October 2020 to review how the Council pooled and spent CIL contributions at the local ward level in order to address such concerns.

The Leader received a question from Ms Kel Finan-Cooke concerning the Executive's recent decision to undertake an initial feasibility study on the provision of a new Traveller site on land at Watchmoor Nature Reserve. He outlined that the Council would be examining all of the evidence it had on the site and the agencies with which the Council would be consulting as part of the feasibility study.

On behalf of the Business & Transformation Portfolio Holder, the Leader responded to a question from Mr Rob Lee regarding the current works in Camberley Town Centre. Mr Lee was informed that the "business as usual" signs had been displayed throughout the pandemic, the works were on track to be completed by March 2021, and the final costs outturn was unknown but was expected to have increased due to Covid-19 and delays early in the project due to problems with utilities. The Leader also referred to Christmas parking

arrangements and advised that the Council was working with traders to minimise any impact on access to service areas over the festive period.

39/C Questions from Councillors

The Chairman of Planning Applications Committee, Councillor Edward Hawkins, provided a detailed response to Councillor Helen Whitcroft on the reasons and circumstances that had led to the Council's recent decision not to defend a planning appeal at Chapel Lane, Bagshot. In response to a supplementary question from Councillor Whitcroft, he undertook to provide a written response with details on the estimated costs incurred by the Council for the work it had undertaken to defend the appeal and the anticipated costs that would be claimed by the developer.

The Finance Portfolio Holder, Councillor David Lewis, responded to a question from Councillor Morgan Rise on the reserves that would need to be used to fill the funding gap caused by the coronavirus pandemic, and the financial preparation undertaken to mitigate any future potential lockdown in Surrey Heath. In response, he advised on the Government grants and retail discounts; the review of spend and income to date in the current financial year, against the budget set in February 2020; and the 2021/22 budget preparation work. Councillor Lewis undertook to provide a written response to Councillor Rise's supplementary question on the sustainability of the use of reserves.

40/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 21 July, 11 August and 15 September 2020

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor David Lewis, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 21 July, 11 August, and 15 September 2020 be received and the recommendations therein be adopted as set out below:

38/E – Loman Road Playground

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

41/E – Zero Based Budgeting

RESOLVED 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.

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 16 July, 13 August and 17 September 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 16 July, 13 August and 17 September 2020 be received.

- (c) Employment Committee – 9 July and 8 October 2020

It was moved by Councillor Cliff Betton, seconded by Councillor Alan McClafferty and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Employment Committee held on 9 July 2020 be received and the recommendations from the meeting on 8 October 2020 be adopted as set out below:

16/EC – Member & Officer Protocol

RESOLVED that the revised Member Officer Protocol, as set out at Annex A to the Employment Committee minutes of 8 October 2020, be adopted.

23/EC - Proposal to Enter Into an Agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council to Share the Monitoring Officer Function

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Council enters into an agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council to provide the Monitoring Officer function, on the terms set out in the agenda report, as amended; and**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Transformation to complete the agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council.**

- (d) Licensing Committee – 29 July 2020

It was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates, seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 29 July 2020 be received.

- (e) External Partnerships Select Committee – 8 September 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 8 September 2020 be received.

- (f) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 9 September 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 9 September 2020 be received.

- (g) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 24 September 2020

It was moved by Councillor Graham Tapper, seconded by Councillor David Mansfield and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 24 September 2020 be received.

41/C Motions

It was moved by Councillor Graham Alleway, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler, and

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Government/Local Government Association guidance that states that councillors should be involved within the pre-application process for planning applications be noted;**
- (ii) a process be adopted by no later than 31 December 2020 to ensure that ward councillors are informed about pre-application discussion requests in accordance with this guidance;**
- (iii) prior to the implementation of (ii), ward councillors be provided on request with the site and scope of pre-application discussions concerning anything other than domestic extensions, under confidentiality obligations;**
- (iv) a register of all pre-application discussions and summary of advice given be held by the Council and available for reasonable inspection by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee and relevant ward councillors, with the exception of where conflicts of interest may arise with private capacities; and**
- (v) ward councillors as a matter of course be informed of all appeals within their ward with immediate effect and invited to**

assist officers with information to assist the Council's defence of any such appeals.

42/C Windlesham Community Governance Review

The Council was reminded that, at its meeting on 22 July 2020, it had agreed to proceed to a second stage of consultation on the Windlesham Community Governance Review, to consult on the following proposals:

- a. The creation of a new parish ward co-terminus to the current KC polling district, to be named Windlesham (North) ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
- b. The creation of a new parish ward co-terminus with the KA and KB polling districts, to be named Bagshot Ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
- c. Renaming the Windlesham ward of Windlesham Parish Council as Windlesham (South) ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
- d. Windlesham Parish Council (WPC) be renamed to better reflect its geographical boundaries.

A second round of consultation had been undertaken in Windlesham parish between 4 August and 8 September 2020, to which 109 responses had been received from across the parish area.

The consultation responses had broadly supported the proposals in respect of the revised warding arrangements and the councillor allocations to the wards. However, it was not felt that there had sufficient public support to justify pursuing proposals to change the name of Windlesham Parish Council (WPC).

Members were reminded that Section 75 of the Local Government Act 1972 gave a borough council the statutory authority to change the name of a parish or town council at any time through the laying down of a Statutory Order. As a result, it was not proposed to change WPC's name at this time but the list of alternative names suggested in the consultation would be passed to the Clerk of WPC for the Parish Council to consider in its own time. If, at a future point, WPC felt that a name change was appropriate this Council would work with the Parish Council to take these changes forward.

The Council was reminded that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) had put the current electoral arrangements for WPC in place during its 2016 review of the Borough Council's ward boundaries. Legislation protected electoral arrangements that had been put in place by the LGBCE for a period of five years from the date that a reorganisation order was made. If at any point within this five year period a principal authority wished to change these arrangements then the consent of the LGBCE was required. The electoral arrangements for WPC fell within this five year window and consequently these changes would require the consent of the LGBCE.

RESOLVED that, subject to the agreement of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, the following changes be made to the electoral arrangements of Windlesham Parish Council:

- (i) a new parish ward co-terminus to the current KC polling district be created and named Windlesham (North) ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
- (ii) a new parish ward co-terminus with the KA and KB polling districts be created and named Bagshot Ward of Windlesham Parish Council;
- (iii) the Windlesham ward of Windlesham Parish Council be renamed Windlesham (South) ward of Windlesham Parish Council; and
- (iv) the number of councillors for the revised warding of Windlesham Parish Council be set at:

<u>Ward</u>	<u>Number of Councillors</u>
Bagshot	6
Lightwater*	7
Windlesham (North)	2
Windlesham (South)	3
Total	18

*No changes are being proposed for the Lightwater ward

43/C Governance Working Group

The Council received a report from the Governance Working Group. The Working Group had reviewed the restrictions on the application of the Mayor's casting vote introduced in February 2020 and had proposed that the wording be updated in order to clarify how this would be exercised in practice. It had also reviewed the current automatic application of this Procedure Rule for meetings the Executive, the Committees, and Sub Committees.

Having discussed the matter, the Working Group had proposed that, with the exception of the Planning Applications Committee, the provision for the Mayor's casting vote should continue to be applied to the Executive, Committees and sub committees; there would be no restriction placed on how the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee exercised a casting vote.

The Council was informed that the Working Group had reviewed the Committees, Sub Committees and Other Bodies Procedure Rules regarding attendance at Employment Committee meetings when the Committee considered items in Part II of the agenda. The Procedure Rules currently restricted attendance at Employment Committee meetings to committee members only when it was considering items in Part II of the agenda. The Working Group had recommended that this Rule be altered to allow flexibility to restrict attendance where considered appropriate, but otherwise allow non-committee members to attend during consideration of items in Part II of the agenda.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam, and

RESOLVED that

- (i) **the Council Procedure Rules at Part 4, Section A of the Constitution be updated as follows:**

17. Voting

17.2 Mayor's casting vote

~~(c) The Mayor's casting vote must be used to vote in favour of further debate, or, where it has been previously decided to have no further debate or in some specific instances, to vote in favour of the status quo. In the event of a tied vote, the proposer of the matter under debate shall have the opportunity of making a further speech of no more than 3 minutes. A further vote will then immediately be taken. If deadlock has not been broken, the Mayor must cast a vote in favour of the status quo. The status quo will usually be interpreted as the motion falling.~~

- (ii) **No change be made to the current arrangements for the Mayor's casting vote provision to apply to Executive procedures;**
- (iii) **Paragraph 13 of the Committee, Sub Committees and other Bodies Procedure Rules at Part 4, Section D of the Constitution be updated to remove Voting – Rule 17 from the application of Council Procedure Rules to Committees and Sub Committees; and**
- (iv) **the following Rule be included in the Committees, Sub Committees and Other Bodies Procedure Rules:**

"12A. Voting

12A.1 Unless this Constitution provides otherwise, any matter will be decided by a simple majority of those members voting and present in the room at the time the question was put.

12A.2 (a) If there are equal numbers of votes for and against, the Chairman will have a second or casting vote.

(b) If the Chairman fails to vote when the main vote is taken, an equality of a vote cannot be achieved by the Chairman casting an original vote and following that action with a casting vote. The Chairman's casting vote may be used whether or not the Chairman has already voted.

(c) with the exception of (d) below, in the event of a tied vote, the proposer of the matter under debate shall have the opportunity of making a further speech of no more than 3 minutes. A further vote will then immediately be taken. If deadlock has not been broken, the Chairman must cast a vote in favour of the status quo. The status quo will usually be interpreted as the motion falling.

(d) There will be no restriction on how the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee chooses to exercise a casting vote.

12A.3 The Chairman will take the vote by show of hands, or if there is no dissent, by the affirmation of the meeting.”

12A.4 If, before the Chairman begins to take a vote, three members present at the meeting demand it, the names for and against the motion or amendment or abstentions from voting will be taken down in writing and entered into the minutes. Each member present will be called by name and asked to indicate whether they are voting in favour of, or against the motion or amendment or abstaining from voting.

12A.5 Where any member requests it immediately after the vote is taken, their vote will be recorded in the minutes to show whether they voted for or against the motion or abstained from voting.

(v) the Committees, Sub Committees and Other Bodies Procedure Rules at Part 4, Section D of the Council’s Constitution be updated as follows:

12. Who May Attend

12.2 With the exception of an Appointments Sub Committee, a Hearing Sub Committee, an Appeals Sub Committee, the Joint Staff Consultative Group or the Employment Committee when considering any items on Part II of the agenda **that in the view of the Monitoring Officer and Executive Head of Transformation, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Employment Committee, directly affect an individual’s employment**, any councillor may attend any committee or sub-committee meeting.

44/C Report from the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee

The Council was reminded that, at its meeting on 22 July 2020, it had referred a motion concerning historic property acquisitions to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee for consideration (minute 20/C refers).

The Committee had considered the motion at its meeting on 9 September 2020 and had agreed that concerns raised that there had been insufficient information

available at the time for Members to make a fully informed decision on the Mall's purchase did warrant further investigation. It had also agreed that the information provided in the relevant reports and workshops ought to be reviewed in order to inform future decision making.

The Council was informed that a Member Task & Finish Group had been established to review the information and advice available at the time of the decision and a progress update would be given to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 25 November 2020.

The Committee had also recommended that a budget of up to £40,000 be requested in order to procure an external consultant to complete a desktop review of the property acquisitions set out in Annex B to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee report.

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

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee's response to the motion referred to it by the Council be noted; and**
- (ii) a budget of up to £40,000 be agreed for the provision of an external consultant to complete a desk top review of the property acquisitions set out in Annex B to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee report.**

45/C Leader's Question Time

The Leader received questions from Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam on the Covid-19 pandemic. In response, the Leader advised that he was confident that the Council's response to a second wave would mirror the excellent response earlier that year. He also reported that the Council had strong reserves and that Business Rates and Council Tax collection rates remained high. He undertook to provide details on rental income collected during the pandemic in writing.

In response to a question from Councillor Victoria Wheeler, the Leader advised that he had not received a reply to his recent letter on cuts to the Fire Service from the Leader of Surrey County Council or the Chief Fire Officer of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service. If no reply was forthcoming soon, he would seek a response.

The Leader, in response to a question from Councillor Victoria Wheeler, indicated that he was confident that this Council would encourage joint working between the borough/ districts authorities and Surrey County Council in response on future unitary proposals.

In response to a question from Councillor Kristian Wrenn, the Leader undertook to circulate details on increases to Universal Credit applications in Surrey. He also referred to the approach being taken to prepare for any potential reduction of

collection rates for Council Tax and Business Rates caused by the economic downturn.

The Leader, in response to a question from Councillor Rodney Bates, supported a suggestion to review the last few potential Gypsy and Traveller sites looked at by the Local Plan Working Group in order to ascertain whether there was any new evidence available about any of those sites.

Following a question from Councillor Rodney Bates, the Leader confirmed that a review of governance matters regarding planning appeals, as referred to at minute 39/C, would be added to the Governance Working Group's Work Programme.

Mayor

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held on
4 November 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

- Apologies for absence presented

46/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Dan Adams.

47/C Motions

It was moved by Councillor Morgan Rise and seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton that

“this Council resolves

- (i) to note that 18.7% of Surrey Heath children, equating to some 3,870 children, currently live in poverty after household costs;
- (ii) to note that, within the Parliamentary Constituency of Surrey Heath, 1,332 children receive Free School Meals;
- (iii) to commend and support community efforts made by High Cross Church, the Hope Hub, Just4Kidz and many other individuals, businesses, and charities within Surrey Heath to provide food to eligible children during school holidays; and
- (iv) that a report be brought to the Executive by 15 December 2020 outlining ways in which this Council can provide financial support to assist in the

provision of fully funded, Free School Meals to all eligible children during all school holidays and other periods of school closure caused by current & future pandemics.”

It was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans that the motion be amended by

- a) inserting additional wording at the end of (i) to state “and that 1,151 of these receive free school meals according to the latest Surrey projected figures from January 2020”;
- b) deleting the wording at (ii);
- c) inserting “to note the positive cross party co-operation within Surrey Heath on this issue and the willingness to put aside political loyalties throughout the pandemic in a shared belief that no child should ever go hungry” in (ii);
- d) inserting “schools, churches, community groups, officers and councillors” between “Just4Kidz” and “and many other individuals...” in (iii);
- e) inserting “and the Mayor be asked to formally write on behalf of the Council to thank them for their efforts” at the end of (iii)
- f) deleting (iv);
- g) inserting the following additional clauses to the motion:
 - (iv) to note that the Council has already agreed two previous motions on addressing poverty in February 2018 and October 2019, with relevant actions already part of the current Surrey Heath Corporate Plan;
 - (v) that the Leader of the Council be asked to facilitate a meeting between the MP for Surrey Heath, relevant portfolio holders, and the councillors for Chobham, Old Dean, St Michaels, and Watchetts to directly discuss how the Government can assist with addressing poverty in their wards, including the need for ongoing provision of holiday meals within the period of this pandemic;
 - (vi) that the Leader of the Council and Acting Chief Executive be asked to give regular updates to all councillors regarding the discussions about Surrey wide provision of holiday meals, recognising that Surrey County Council is the statutory lead for supporting vulnerable children and that it has the full list of those receiving free school meals, rather than this Council;
 - (iv) that, whilst the funding responsibilities for holiday meal provision for vulnerable children primarily resides with the Government and Surrey County Council, this Council agrees, as a last resort and should there be an absence of sufficient funding from them, to allocate up to £20,000 from the Community Fund specifically for charities and community groups to provide meals and healthy food provision for

vulnerable children and families during school holiday periods until the end of May 2021; and

- (v) that the Leader of the Council formally writes to Mr Marcus Rashford MBE to commend him for his work in highlighting his personal experience of this important issue and sends him a copy of this motion.

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

RESOLVED

- (i) to note that 18.7% of Surrey Heath children, equating to some 3,870 children, currently live in poverty after household costs and that 1,151 of these receive free school meals according to the latest Surrey projected figures from January 2020;**
- (ii) to note the positive cross party co-operation within Surrey Heath on this issue and the willingness to put aside political loyalties throughout the pandemic in a shared belief that no child should ever go hungry;**
- (iii) to commend and support community efforts made by High Cross Church, the Hope Hub, Just4Kidz, schools, churches, community groups, officers and councillors, and many other individuals, businesses, and charities within Surrey Heath to provide food to eligible children during school holidays, and the Mayor be asked to formally write on behalf of the Council to thank them for their efforts;**
- (iv) to note that the Council has already agreed two previous motions on addressing poverty in February 2018 and October 2019, with relevant actions already part of the current Surrey Heath Corporate Plan;**
- (v) that the Leader of the Council be asked to facilitate a meeting between the MP for Surrey Heath, relevant portfolio holders, and the councillors for Chobham, Old Dean, St Michaels, and Watchetts to directly discuss how the Government can assist with addressing poverty in their wards, including the need for ongoing provision of holiday meals within the period of this pandemic;**
- (vi) that the Leader of the Council and Acting Chief Executive be asked to give regular updates to all councillors regarding the discussions about Surrey wide provision of holiday meals, recognising that Surrey County Council is the statutory lead for supporting vulnerable children and that it has the full list of those receiving free school meals, rather than this Council;**

- (vii) that, whilst the funding responsibilities for holiday meal provision for vulnerable children primarily resides with the Government and Surrey County Council, this Council agrees, as a last resort and should there be an absence of sufficient funding from them, to allocate up to £20,000 from the Community Fund specifically for charities and community groups to provide meals and healthy food provision for vulnerable children and families during school holiday periods until the end of May 2021; and**
- (viii) that the Leader of the Council formally writes to Mr Marcus Rashford MBE to commend him for his work in highlighting his personal experience of this important issue and sends him a copy of this motion.**

Note 1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, the following councillors declared non-pecuniary interests:

- (i) Councillor Rodney Bates declared that he was a trustee of Old Dean Community Group; and
- (ii) Councillor Shaun Garrett declared that he was a trustee of Just4Kidz and Old Dean Community Group.

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

The following Members voted in favour of the amendment:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Rodney Bates, Cliff Betton, Richard Brooks, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, 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.

Councillor Graham Alleway did not vote as he had left the meeting prior to the vote being taken.

Mayor

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held on
4 November 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
- Apologies for absence presented

48/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Dan Adams and Graham Alleway.

49/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>
50/C	1
51/C	1

50/C Appointment of a New Chief Executive

The Council was informed about the outcome of the recent recruitment process for a new Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty, seconded by Councillor Sharon Galliford and

RESOLVED that

- (i) Mr Damian Roberts be appointed to the post of Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service, subject to all the required pre-employment checks; and**
- (ii) the starting salary offered be £118,006.**

51/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 51/C be made public with immediate effect.

Mayor

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held on 20 October 2020**

- Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| + Cllr Colin Dougan (in the Chair) | + 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 Shaun Garrett, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Morgan Rise, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Victoria Wheeler and Cllr Valerie White

45/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

46/E Review the suspension of parking charges in Rural Car Parks

The Executive considered a report on the reintroduction of parking charges in the Council's Pay and Display car parks, which had been suspended on 26 March 2020 in response to the Government lockdown to control the spread of Covid-19. It was noted that parking charges in Knoll Road and Main Square Car Parks had been reintroduced on 14 September 2020.

Members were informed that it was proposed to re-introduce the fees and charges for the Council's Pay & Display Car Parks on 16 November 2020, which would give customers nearly 3 weeks' notice of the resumption of charges and to arrange new season tickets. Free parking for up to 2 hours and at weekends would be available at Bagshot, Chobham, Burrell Road, and Watchetts Road car parks.

It was advised that the Parking Subsidy Season ticket agreed by the Executive on 23 June 2020 had already been advertised formally on all car parks.

Members were informed that the ongoing impact on market forces by the pandemic would require an increasingly reactive response to parking charges, particularly in the lead-up to Christmas. The ability, via delegated authority, to implement special discounts swiftly and offers to encourage visitors to commercial centres on certain days per week would make this possible.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the temporary suspension of parking charges in the Pay and Display car parks be lifted on 16 November 2020;**
- (ii) the 'Parking Subsidy' Season Ticket be sold at £10 per month for all Pay and Display car parks; and**

- (iii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Business, in consultation with the Business & Transformation Portfolio Holder, to introduce parking charge reductions and promotions as and when required.**

47/E Night Stop Rough Sleeper Initiative

The Executive considered a report on a proposed Night Stop project. It was reported that a bid made to the government had been successful in attracting £90,600 of funding to support setting up an emergency accommodation scheme. The proposed Night Stop scheme was aimed at stopping people moving to and staying on the streets by providing stopgap accommodation, which would allow for accommodation requirements to be assessed and needs to be supported.

The Executive was advised that the Hope Hub would manage the Night Stop project at no revenue cost to the Council. It was intended that the scheme would be self-financing; the Hope Hub would be able to draw down on Universal Credit payments and this would provide the necessary funding. It was noted that if the scheme attracted clients who were not eligible for Universal Credit payments or other public funding, alternative funding would need to be found.

Members were informed it was proposed to fund the short-term accommodation as a capital project from the Affordable Housing reserve. The preferred approach for securing suitable accommodation for the project was to explore the re-provisioning of the porta cabin accommodation currently occupied by the Hope Hub. The potential for re-use of the existing porta cabin would also be looked at as part of this project.

A full business case, along with final costs and specification for the property, would be brought to the Executive in February 2021.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Night Stop project be supported;**
- (ii) the Night Stop accommodation be provided through re-provisioning of improved accommodation for the Hope Hub; and**
- (iii) the final costs and specification for the project be brought to future meetings of the Property Investment Working Group and the Executive for agreement.**

48/E Poverty in Surrey Heath

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 18 February 2020, it had considered a report on Poverty in Surrey Heath and agreed that a study would be undertaken to help understand what services were currently offered and what was required to support those living in poverty. An outline action plan would then be produced that could address this inequality, together with clear improvement measures.

A Poverty Working Group comprising of community representatives, the voluntary sector, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group, Councillors, and officers was intended to progress this work. The Executive agreed that the membership of the Working Group would initially involve the ward councillors for Old Dean, St Michaels, and Watchetts wards but this could be broadened in due course.

It was proposed that a revised project scope be adopted due to the expectation that the poverty landscape would be radically changed post Covid. It was suggested that the Poverty Working Group review the data and information outlined within the Citizen Advice Report from Joseph Harley published in June 2020, on 'Universal Credit, 18 months on'.

The Executive considered a proposal to repurpose any unspent money in the Hardship Fund agreed in March 2020. The funding would be repurposed for an individual hardship fund, which would be administered by Citizens Advice Surrey Heath, and to create a Ward Councillor Community Fund Grant Scheme. The details and criteria for the Ward Councillor Community Fund Grant Scheme, as set out at Annex D to the agenda report, were noted.

Members were advised that, although the unspent balance from the Hardship Fund would finance the Ward Councillor Community Fund Grant Scheme for the remainder of the 2020/21 financial year, it had not been identified how it would be funded from April 2021 onwards. It was therefore proposed that a further item be brought to the Executive in February 2021, which would also include a review of the existing Community Grants Scheme.

RESOLVED that

- (i) a Poverty Working Group be established to oversee the revised plans and schedule for addressing poverty within the borough, as outlined in Annex B to the agenda report;**
- (ii) the Poverty Working Group initially be comprised of community representatives, the voluntary sector, Surrey Heath Clinical Commissioning Group, and Councillors from Old Dean, St Michaels and Watchetts wards;**
- (iii) a ward councillor community fund grant be established, as set out at Annex D to the agenda report;**
- (iv) any underspend from the Hardship Fund agreed on 24 March 2020 (minute 110/E refers) be repurposed for an individual hardship fund, to be administered by Citizens Advice Surrey Heath, and to finance the ward councillor community fund grant scheme for the remainder of 2020/21; and**
- (v) a further report be brought to the Executive in February 2021 on a review of the Community Fund Grant Scheme and the funding for the Ward Councillor Community Fund Grant Scheme.**

Note 1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor Shaun Garrett declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was involved with the Old Dean Community Group (ODCOG), which had been referred to in the agenda report.

49/E Community Fund Grants

The Executive considered a grant application to the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme.

RESOLVED that £2,385 be awarded to St Mary's Church Centre to refurbish its main floor hall, subject to the conditions set out at Annex B of the agenda report.

Note 1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct Councillor Rodney Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest, as he was a safeguarding officer at St Mary's Church, Camberley.

50/E Community Infrastructure Levy - Revised Approach Bidding for and Distribution of Funding Including Updating of the Regulation 123 List

The Executive considered a report proposing to revise the process for bidding for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding for local projects and allocation of that funding in the non-parished wards. The report also set out proposals to amend the Regulation 123 list to identify a new list of Strategic Infrastructure Funding priorities.

Members were reminded that CIL income received from each development was proportioned as follows:

- 5% - Administration
- 15% -to local neighbourhood ward or Parish (25% where a Neighbourhood Plan was adopted)
- Funding for SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace), the amount is dependent on area and scheme type.
- The balance of income was allocated to the Surrey Heath BC CIL Main Fund for spending on the strategic priorities, as set out in the Council's Regulation 123 List

It was proposed that funds for non-parished wards be pooled into a single fund for those areas. Priority would be given to funding projects in those non-parished wards experiencing development, with any unspent funding then opened up to the other non-parished wards and to schemes where this Council was only a part funder. It was also suggested that this fund should be opened up to bidding from Community Groups for capital projects as a Local Community Improvement Fund.

The Executive also noted proposals to update the Regulation 123 list as follows:

- a) removing waste and recycling, as no projects had been identified;

- b) removing flooding, as this work was currently being funded by other grant funding from the Environment Agency or through the SANGs provision;
- c) amending reference to transport to local sustainable transport e.g. electric vehicles; and
- d) adding climate change and digital infrastructure projects to the list.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the revised approach to bidding for Community Infrastructure Levy funding to establish a Local Community Improvement Fund, as set out in Appendix 1 to the agenda report, for the non-parished areas be agreed;**
- (ii) the revised approach to distribution of funding through pooling of the funds for the non-parished wards to create the Local Community Improvement Fund for those areas be agreed; and**
- (iii) the revised Regulation 123 List as set out in Annex 2 to the agenda report be agreed.**

51/E Surrey Heath Statement of Community Involvement

The Executive considered a report seeking adoption of the Surrey Heath Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) following public consultation. The SCI set out how the Council would involve the community and stakeholders in the preparation of the Surrey Heath Local Plan and in the determination of planning applications.

In September 2019, the Executive had agreed to a six-week consultation on the Draft SCI. The consultation had taken place in November and December 2019 and the minor changes made to the SCI arising from this consultation were noted. A further targeted consultation had been undertaken in June and July 2020 on additional minor changes made in response to the Covid-19 pandemic and social distancing measures, resulting in a few additional minor changes to the SCI.

The SCI had also been updated to reflect the temporary Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020, that were in force until 31 December 2020.

RESOLVED that the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, as set out at Annex 1 to the agenda report, be adopted.

52/E Planning for the Future White Paper

The Executive considered a draft response to the Government's Planning for the Future White Paper. Members agreed to strengthen the response in respect of developers needing to progress developments where approval had been granted and to make reference to the lack of details concerning neighbourhood plans. It

was also agreed to amend the response to Question 7(b) to state that the Council would support the revision of the Duty to Co-operate, rather than its abolition.

It was agreed that the Leader would send a copy of the Council's response to the Member of Parliament for Surrey Heath and the relevant government minister.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the content of the Governments Planning for the Future White Paper and of this report be noted;**
- (ii) the detailed response to the consultation questions, as set out at Appendix 1 to the agenda report, be agreed, as amended, and submitted as the Council's consultation response;**
- (iii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory Services in consultation with the Planning & People Portfolio Holder to agree any substantive changes to the response arising out of further information from Government;**
- (iv) responses to subsequent planning consultations issued up to the end of March 2021 relating to proposals set out in the White Paper be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory Services in consultation with the Planning & People Portfolio Holder; and**
- (v) a copy of the Council's response be sent to the Member of Parliament for Surrey Heath and the relevant government minister.**

53/E Use of CIL to fund the provision of ducting for future CCTV and Internet upgrades in Camberley Town Centre

The Executive was informed that, whilst the works to Camberley Town Centre had been underway, new ducting had been provided to enable the installation of fibre and cabling when required to support the future upgrade of the CCTV and internet, including 5G, in the town centre. This had been undertaken to avoid the need to excavate the High Street and Princess Way (east) for this purpose at a future date. It was proposed that this be funded from Community Infrastructure Levy monies collected for Town Ward.

RECOMMEND to Full Council that a capital bid for £150,000 for the funding of works to provide new ducting for CCTV and Internet cabling in Camberley town centre as part of the current public realm project be agreed.

54/E Kevin Cantlon Fund Repurposing - Economic Recovery

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 23 June 2020, it had agreed to repurpose the Kevin Cantlon Shop Front Improvement Fund to support the economic recovery necessary arising from the Covid-19 pandemic.

A further report was considered, presenting the action plan detailing the initiatives to support both individuals and businesses across the borough. It was reported that the programme aimed to create successful businesses within the borough, which turned into employers of the future. The initiatives proposed were:

- (i) Pop-up Business School** - This 2 week programme would be aimed at pre start-ups, with costs shared with Guildford BC.
- (ii) Enterprise Business South** - This project would deliver a 1-2-1 Business Health Check and Support Package to each enquirer.
- (iii) Surrey Chambers Start-up Academy** - The Council had been working with the Surrey Chambers for 4 years, providing start up clinics for individuals across the borough and beyond.
- (iv) Youth Hub** - This project, delivered in partnership with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and part funded by a grant from the Government, would be a drop-in service for 16-24 year olds in the borough to get career and job seeking support outside of a job centre.

The Council would also be supporting a Kickstarter scheme, a DWP initiative that assisted 16-24 year olds getting a paid 6-month job placement with a local employer, and Camberley Job Club. It was advised that, although the initiatives concentrated on establishing new businesses, any practical initiatives to assist economic recovery for existing businesses would be considered.

RESOLVED that the proposed action plan to repurpose the Kevin Cantlon Shop Front Improvement Fund to support the Economic Recovery be agreed.

55/E Annual Report on the Treasury Management Service and Actual Prudential Indicators for 2019/20

The Executive received a report detailing the authority's treasury management performance during the year as well as demonstrating compliance with the 2019/20 Prudential Indicators.

RESOLVED to note the report on Treasury Management including compliance with the 2019/20 Prudential Indicators.

56/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)
--------	--------------

57/E	3
58/E	1&3
59/E	3
60/E	1&3

57/E Procurement of Cleaning Contract

The Executive was informed that the Cleaning Services contract in place for the Council's operational buildings was due to end in January 2021. The contract was for the following operational buildings:

- Camberley Theatre
- Knoll Road and Main Square Car Parks
- Surrey Heath House
- Windle Valley Centre

Members noted the outcome of a procurement process and the proposed price of the contract.

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

- (i) **the appointment of the successful bidder to deliver the Cleaning Services for Surrey Heath from 4 January 2021, at an annual tender cost as stated in section 2 of the agenda report be confirmed; and**
- (ii) **authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Business & Transformation to issue a contract award letter and enter into a contract with the successful bidder that commences on the 4th January 2021.**

58/E Community Services Partnership

The Executive agreed to defer consideration of this item.

59/E Repurposing of Supplementary Estimate

The Executive considered a report proposing that any unspent funds from the supplementary estimate agreed in July 2019, which had been carried forward to the 2020/21 financial year, be used to cover the costs of action and defence of the Council's position in a number of other planning enforcement cases.

RESOLVED that the remaining £202,000 of a supplementary estimate agreed for enforcement work at Swift Lane, Bagshot be used to cover the costs of action and defence of the Council's position in a number of other planning enforcement cases.

60/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 57/E be made public following the completion of the standstill period; and**
- (ii) the decision at minute 59/E be made public**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held on 17 November 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 Paul Deach, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Shaun Garrett, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Helen Whitcroft and Cllr Valerie White

61/E Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2020 were agreed.

62/E Petition - Security at Old Dean Recreation Ground

The Executive receive a presentation from Mr Trefor Hogg, chairman of the Old Dean Community Group (ODCOG), on a petition submitted concerning Old Dean Recreation Ground. The petition asked the Council to invest in better lighting that was able to resist vandalism and invest in CCTV to protect the playground area at Old Dean Recreation Ground so that the asset remained fully usable by the community. The petition had been available for signing on the Council's website between 9 July and 9 October 2020 and had received 520 signatures.

Mr Hogg presented the petition, highlighting the recent investment by the Council, Accent Housing, and ODCOG to the play area. Members were informed about vandalism and deliberate damage to the play equipment, along with other anti-social behaviour at the site. He asked the Executive to consider the following measures to help address these issues:

1. Install lighting that worked and was robust, in order to make the footpaths safer and to deter misuse of the area at night;
2. Install CCTV recording; and
3. Install an alarm system in the pavilion.

Members considered the petition and agreed to support its aim. It was agreed that a report would be brought to an Executive meeting within the next 3 months, addressing each of the points raised by the petitioner. It was also agreed to look at reports that the pavilion was not currently in use as part of this work.

The Places & Strategy Portfolio Holder also undertook to discuss with officers issues raised concerning the durability of play equipment.

RESOLVED that

- (i) **the petition be supported;**
- (ii) **a further report be brought to the Executive within 3 months, setting out options for**
 - (a) **replacing the lighting on the paths;**
 - (b) **CCTV recording;**
 - (c) **an alarm scheme at the pavilion; and**
 - (d) **bringing the pavilion back into use.**

Note: The following declarations were made in connection with this item:

- (i) in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillors Rodney Bates and Shaun Garrett declared that they were trustees of the Old Dean Community Group; and
- (ii) it was noted for the record that Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans declared that she had met with the petitioner.

63/E Local Enforcement Plan

The Executive considered a revised Local Enforcement Plan (LEP), which provide a framework of local guidance for the investigation and assessment of breaches of planning control in line with current national policy.

All Councillors had been consulted on the draft LEP, with any comments received from councillors, plus officers' responses to those comments, set out in Annex A to the report. Members discussed the extent of councillor involvement in enforcement matters, taking into account the need to balance legal processes whilst enabling councillors to represent their wards. The need to ensure there was sufficient communication with councillors on enforcement matters within their wards was noted, whilst recognising the operational nature of the work.

RESOLVED that the Surrey Heath Local Enforcement Plan, as attached at Annex B to the agenda report, be agreed.

64/E Householders Duty of Care - setting of fee

The Executive was informed that under section 34(2A) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, occupiers of domestic property disposing of household waste had a duty of care for the disposal of that waste. The duty of care required householders to ensure that they take all reasonable measures available to ensure that they only transfer household waste produced on their property to an authorised person.

It was reported that failure to meet the householder's duty of care was a criminal offence which could result in prosecution. As an alternative, a fixed penalty notice (FPN) may be given; prosecution would only then occur if the fixed penalty sum remained unpaid.

Members agreed to introduce a fixed penalty sum of £400, the maximum permitted by legislation. It was also agreed to apply a discounted penalty of £300 for any FPNs paid within 14 days.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Fixed Penalty Charge be applied where the occupier of a residential premises has failed in their waste duty of care;**
- (ii) the Fixed Penalty Charge be set at £400; and**
- (iii) a discounted penalty of £300 be agreed for any Fixed Penalty Notices paid within 14 days.**

65/E Community Infrastructure Levy

The Council had been collecting Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding since the Charging Schedule had come into effect on the 1st 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 £740,106.93 for the reporting period 1 April 2020 to 30 September 2020. Payments to parishes and neighbourhood funds payable from 1st October 2020 for income collected in the last reporting period were as follows:

- Chobham £526.89
- West End £35,522.64
- St Michaels £25,201.82

It was noted, that during this reporting period, the national lockdown had taken place due to Covid 19, with the building industry temporarily shut down. As a consequence, this had impacted on the amount of CIL receipts collected by the Council during this reporting period.

RESOLVED to

- (i) note the CIL monies received; and**
- (ii) note the impacts of Covid19 on income.**

66/E Local Plan Authority Monitoring Statement

The Executive considered the Surrey Heath Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) which had been produced in line with the requirements set out in the Localism Act 2011. The AMR monitored the period from 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020. The purpose of the AMR was to provide details of the actions which had been taken to implement a Local Development Plan and the Local Development Scheme, to indicate the extent to which policies in the current Surrey Heath Local Plan had

been achieved, and to identify any solutions and changes where targets were not being met.

The proposal to report the AMR to the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee in future was noted.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the Surrey Heath Local Plan Authority Monitoring Report be approved for the purpose of making the document publically available on the Council’s website; and**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory in consultation with the Planning & People Portfolio Holder to approve publication of the Authority Monitoring Report from 2021 onwards; and**
- (iii) the Authority Monitoring Report be hereafter reported to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis.**

67/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)
68/E	1&3
69/E	3
70/E	3
71/E	3
72/E	3
73/E	3
74/E	3

68/E Community Services Partnership

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 26 May 2020, it had considered a report proposing the further development of the Community Services Partnership between this Council and Runnymede Borough Council (RBC). The report had detailed a proposal for developing the existing partnership arrangements into a host/lead authority model, with it proposed that RBC would be the host authority. The proposed partnership model would include the TUPE transfer of Community Services employees from this Council to RBC.

Members noted the outcome of the consultation with staff. The financial information relating to the partnership was also considered, including opportunities to offset the financial growth required as detailed in the report to the Executive in May 2020.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the outcome of the staff consultation and consultation with UNISON be noted;**
- (ii) the opportunities for the Council to offset a proportion of the financial growth required by Community Services in agreeing the integrated partnership be noted; and**
- (iii) an agreement be entered into with Runnymede Borough Council for the shared delivery of Community Services to vulnerable people across both boroughs who want to live independently within their homes and remain active within their community.**

Note: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor Rodney Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of UNISON.

69/E Review of Jersey Property Unit Trust

The Executive was reminded that in 2016 the Council had purchased units in a Jersey Property Unit Trust (JPUT) from Capital and Regional. The JPUT held the interest in The Square Shopping Centre and other retail units around Camberley Town Centre.

Members considered an exempt report reviewing the JPUT and agreed the recommendations set out in the report.

RESOLVED that the recommendations set out in the exempt agenda report be agreed.

70/E Acquisition of Night Stop Property

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 20 October 2020, it had agreed to support a Night Stop project aimed at stopping people moving to and staying on the streets by providing stop gap accommodation. The report had indicated the most likely option for provision to be a portacabin or modular building and it had been agreed a further report would be submitted to the Executive by March 2021 to obtain authority to fund the project. Since that meeting a property had come onto the market in Camberley which was thought to be suitable for a Night Stop.

The Executive considered an exempt report setting out details of the property identified. The acquisition could be wholly funded from the reserve fund for affordable housing. Some works to the property would be needed and it was

considered that these could also be funded from the reserve fund remaining after the purchase.

RESOLVED that, subject to due diligence,

- (i) the proposed property be purchased for the recommended price, as set out in the exempt report, for Night Stop Accommodation; and**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory in consultation with the Property Investment Working Group to progress the acquisition.**

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that

- (i) the acquisition be funded from the funds remaining in the Affordable Housing Reserve; and**
- (ii) any capital works needed be funded from the Affordable Housing Reserve, with a report being taken to Property Investment Working Group to advise of costs.**

71/E Development of a transit site in Surrey

The Executive considered an exempt report and agreed recommendations concerning the development of a Gypsy and Traveller transit site in Surrey.

RESOLVED to note an ongoing revenue contribution of £7,500 per annum for the maintenance of the Transit site.

RECOMMENDED to Council an increase to the Capital Programme the sum of £127,000 as a one off contribution to the construction of a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site at a location in Surrey.

72/E Executive Working Group notes

The Executive received the notes of the Working Group meetings that had taken place in the previous few months.

RESOLVED to note the Working Group notes.

73/E Urgent Action

RESOLVED to note the Urgent Action taken under the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers.

74/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 68/E be made public once affected staff have been informed;**
- (ii) the decision at minute 69/E be made public following the completion of any legal procedures;**
- (iii) the details of the decision at minute 70/E be made public following the completion of the acquisition;**
- (iv) any decision to make details public relating to the decision at minute 71/E be agreed in consultation with the Surrey Authorities;**
- (v) in relation to the Executive Working Group notes presented to the meeting:**
 - a) the Camberley Town Centre Working Group notes from 7 October 2020 remain exempt for the present time;**
 - b) the Climate Change Working Group notes from 25 June and 3 September 2020 be made public;**
 - c) the Equality Working Group notes from 13 August 2020 be made public;**
 - d) the Local Plan Working Group notes from 3 August and 24 September 2020 remain exempt for the present time;**
 - e) the Property Investment Working Group notes from 6 July, 10 August and 7 October 2020 remain exempt for the present time;**
 - f) the Surrey Heath Villages Working Group notes from 3 September 2020 be made public;**
 - g) all Working Group notes remaining exempt to be periodically reviewed by the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, with a view to making them public when appropriate; and**
- (vi) the decision on the tenancy made in the Urgent Action at minute 73/E be made public but any contractual information 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 15 October 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 Paul Deach, Cllr Emma McGrath and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop, Ross Cahalane, William Hinde, Jonathan Partington and Eddie Scott

1/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

2/P Application Number: 20/0226 - Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RN

The application was a reserved matters application pursuant to condition 4, attached to 12/546 as amended by 18/0619 and 18/1002 for the redevelopment of Princess Royal Barracks for 1200 dwellings, for the erection of 21 dwellings (phase 4a) with access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale being considered and submission of details to comply with conditions 16 (ecological mitigation and management), 26 (electric vehicle charging points), 29 (tree retention and protection), 32 (hard and soft landscaping), 33 (landscape management plan), 40 (surface water drainage), 43 (foul sewerage disposal), 52 (archaeology) and 55 (ground contamination).

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Trivselhus have experienced difficulties in sourcing the three pane sliding doors proposed in the rear elevation of house type D. Their supplier is able to provide two pane sliding doors to the same overall opening sizes. This would apply to the doors proposed at ground and second floor levels. Amended plans have been submitted to reflect these changes. These amendments are not considered to

materially affect the visual appearance of the house type D and are acceptable in visual amenity terms.

As a result of the potential impact of the Oak Processionary Moth on Oak trees, the landscaping scheme has been amended to replace Oak with Cherry and Swedish Whitebeam. These changes are acceptable in landscape and visual amenity terms.

Trivselhus have submitted a detailed Construction Phase Plan to address the requirements of proposed condition 6. It addresses previous comments provided by Environmental Health and the County Highway Authority and is considered to be acceptable for the purposes of this condition.

An updated survey plan has also been received to reflect the red line application site.

Amended conditions

As a result of these changes it is proposed that conditions 1, 2, 4 and 6 are amended. To this end the conditions remain as drafted in the report unless referred to below:

Condition 1

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

Landscape

D0378_001_R18, 002_R18, 003 R03, 004 R02 and 005 R02

House types and garages/car barns

00752D-JTP-HTD1-EL-XX-001 rev G and PL-GA-001 rev F, 002 rev E and 003 rev F

00752D-JTP-HTD2-EL-XX-001 rev F, and PL-GA-001 rev F, 002 rev E and 003 rev F

00752D-JTP-HTE1-EL-XX-001 rev G and 002 rev H and PL-GA-001 ref G and 002 rev F

00752D-JTP- HTE1-EL-XX-003 rev A and 004 rev B, PL-GA-003 rev B and 004 rev A

00752D-JTP-HTE2-EL-XX-001 rev G and 002 rev F and PL-GA-001 rev G and 002 rev G

Condition 2

All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers D0378_001_R18 and 002_R18

Condition 4

Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling the feature landscape area as shown in detail on drawing number D0378_002_R18 shall be provided, landscaped and made available for use and thereafter retained and maintained for its designated use.

Condition 6

The development shall be undertaken in full accordance with the Construction Phase Plan dated/received on 14 October 2020.”

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

RESOLVED that application 20/0226 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 item was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

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

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Peter Barnett.

3/P Application Number: 20/0012 - Bagshot Manor, 1 Green Lane, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5NL

The application was for the erection of 5 dwellings comprising 4 x 3 bed semi-detached and 1 x 4 bed detached with associated landscaping and parking.

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Valerie White due to concerns about overdevelopment, overlooking and highway issues.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Flood risk/drainage

Correction:

Paragraph 7.8.7 (Page 67) contains a double negative and should therefore be read as follows:

In light of all the above, it is considered that it has been adequately demonstrated that the development would not lead to a material increase in surface water flood risk within or around the site, contrary to Policy DM10 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

The following additional condition is proposed, to secure implementation of the drainage scheme along with their final management details:

Condition 13

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

Parking

The following additional condition is proposed to ensure that the proposed attached garage to Unit 5 is not converted to habitable accommodation (as stated in Page 65, Para 7.6.1 of the Committee Report:

Condition 14

Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re enacting that Order) the attached garage to Unit 5 hereby approved shall not be converted to habitable accommodation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the enlargement, improvement or other alterations to the development in the interests of visual and residential amenity and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”

The dimensions of the proposed parking spaces have been checked – they are 2.4m wide x 4.8m long in line with the Surrey County Council Transportation Development Planning Good Practice Guide.”

Members raised concerns that vehicles may be parked in the proposed turning area to the right of Unit 5, as shown in the proposed site plan in the agenda pack, which could impede easy access and egress onto the site. As a result it was agreed that condition 9 would be enhanced to specify that no vehicles should be parked in the turning area. It was also agreed that an informative could also be added, if officers felt necessary, to advise the developer.

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

RESOLVED that

- i. application 20/0012 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and updates as amended;**
- 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 the Planning Applications Committee.**

Note 1

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

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

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Morgan Rise, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft, Valerie White.

4/P Application Number: 18/0588 - Wyverne Lodge, Dukes Covert, Bagshot, GU19 5HU

The recommendation to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry and carried.

RESOLVED that application 18/0588 be deferred.

5/P Application Number: 20/0638 - 93 Worsley Road, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 9BB

The application was for the erection of detached three bedroom dormer bungalow dwelling with access off Dunbar Road and associated car parking and landscaping.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam due to concerns about overdevelopment and fitting in with the current streetscene.

The officer recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Helen Whitcroft, seconded by Councillor Charlotte Morley, and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0638 be refused for the reasons in the officer report.

Note 1

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

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

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 12 November 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 Robin Perry)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Ross Cahalane, Jonathan Partington, Gavin Ramothal, Eddie Scott and Patricia Terceiro

35/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

36/P Application Number: 18/0588 - Wyverne Lodge, Dukes Covert, Bagshot, GU19 5HU

The application was for the erection of a rear swimming pool building including changing room facilities to facilitate external swim schools/teachers (retrospective) and proposed side infill extension to provide a one-way entrance and exit.

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 the Executive Head of Regulatory.

This application was deferred from determination at the Planning Applications Committee meeting on 15 October 2020.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Representations

An additional objection has been received from a neighbour and their appointed planning and highway consultant, raising the following planning related issues:

- The Committee Report and proposed recommendation to grant planning permission subject to 6 conditions, is extensive and detailed, but based on incorrect and insufficient information leaving the permission, if granted in November 2020, open to challenge.
- The application fails to include essential scalable plan information about the existing and proposed house and grounds or the existing proposed car parking layout or vehicle tracking / arrangements.
- The applicants have had more than 2 years to rectify these problems and it seems likely now in the face of repeated objections and the requests for more information by the Case Officer, that the applicant has deliberately withheld and obscured key information.

[Officer Comment: It is considered that all relevant planning issues are covered in the Officer's Report and based on up-to-date and on-the-ground information]

Green Belt

- There are several permitted and lawful swimming pools in the area better located and better suited to this use with adequate off-street car parking. within 50 yards is an existing pool granted business use by the Council, and has been in operation for the last 14 years, 1 mile towards Bracknell are 3 swimming pools, with Bracknell leisure centre 500 yards further. Some 3 miles away towards Camberley, SHBC is building a new swimming and leisure centre.
- The proposal fails to demonstrate very special circumstances exist and therefore the presumption must be to protect the Green Belt. It is therefore inappropriate development. This proposal only demonstrates that there are private commercial reasons for this planning application. The applicant has submitted a further document in support naming 9 items that will increase the well-being, health and skills of all users. However, there is no exceptional or vitally important quantitative or qualitative need, with all of the other above pools in operation.

[Officer Comment: Each application must be considered on its own site specific planning merits. Sections 7.2 and 7.6 of the Committee Report cover the impact on the Green Belt and all matters which in combination are considered to amount to Very Special Circumstances]

Character and amenity

- The building is bigger than agreed, and is nearer neighbour's boundary.
- The proposed extensions and use, by reason of its proximity and existing and proposed over-bearing impact to neighbours and failure to respect and character and quality of Dukes Covert would be contrary to the design requirements of Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development.

[Officer Comment: Sections 7.3 and 7.4 of the Committee Report address character and amenity matters.]

Highways

- The proposed development during and outside of the Covid Pandemic would not accord with DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety) because it would adversely affect the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway.
- The County Highway Authority (CHA) has not provided independent or full comments in their consultation response.
- There are no reasonable or enforceable planning conditions that could be attached to mitigate the impact of this proposal. The LPA cannot force all cars to be parked off-road. Condition 5 would be easy to remove/relax, and would still lead to overspill car parking.
- The commercial swim school has led to major parking problems in Dukes Covert and adverse impact on Dukes Covert - a quiet but narrow residential cul-de-sac set within the Green Belt. Thoughtless on-street car parking is ongoing, and is usually at its worst over the weekend.
- If permission is granted, as soon as the COVID Pandemic is over, the applicant will increase the swimming activity and this will cause traffic problems which will eventually result in an accident.

[Officer Comment: Section 7.5 of the Committee Report addresses highway matters. The Update to the Report states that the CHA has undertaken an assessment of the application and the Transport Statement (submitted by the objecting neighbour) in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision, and is satisfied that the current application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The CHA therefore has no highway requirements, commenting that it is satisfied that the on-site parking provision is sufficient for the proposed level of activity. The CHA has also commented that the proposed condition (No. 5) restricting the number of users of the pool to a maximum of five per session will mitigate against the risk of overspill parking. This condition is considered enforceable and additional permission would be needed for any variation to it.]

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

RESOLVED that application 18/0588 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all the Committee had received correspondence on the application;

- ii. Councillor Valerie White declared that she had previously, but not recently, had conversations with the applicant and the neighbour in the past; and
- iii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler had previously had conversations with the neighbours to the application site.

Note 2

A roll call vote was taken on the officer recommendation to grant the application and the voting was as follows:

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

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

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway and Victoria Wheeler.

37/P Application Number: 20/0592/FFU - Queen Anne House, Bridge Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5AT

The planning application was for change of use from Office (Class B1c) to residential (Class C3) comprising 5 no. flats (1x 3 Bed, 2x 2 Bed and 2x 1 Bed) and erection of 4 no. dwellings (1x 4 Bed, 2x 2 Bed and 1x 1 Bed) including pedestrian accesses off Bridge Road with associated parking, landscaping and cycle and refuse storage.

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Valerie White on the grounds of overdevelopment, parking and highway issues.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Corrections

Para 6.1 should read ‘...*four representations*...’.

Para 4.7 should read ‘...*sufficient parking is provided for all units and three parking spaces are provided for visitors*’.

Representations

One representation has been received in support of the proposal, so long as that the development is provided with adequate soft-landscaping.

Parking provision

To clarify, the proposed parking provision would be as follows:

Dwelling type	Recommended provision	No of spaces provided and location
2-bed flat (unit 1)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal parking area
2-bed flat (unit 2)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal

		parking area
1-bed flat (unit 3)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal parking area
1-bed flat (unit 4)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal parking area
3-bed flat (unit 5)	2 spaces per unit	2 spaces in the communal parking area
4-bed dwelling (unit 6)	2 spaces per unit	2 spaces within the plot
2-bed dwelling (unit 7)	1 space per unit	2 spaces in the communal parking area
2-bed dwelling (unit 8)	1 space per unit	2 spaces in the communal parking area
1-bed bungalow (unit 9)	1 space per unit	1 space within the plot
Total	11	13

Three visitor parking spaces would be provided.

Amendment to Conditions

The applicant has proposed that in place of “No development shall commence”, the following conditions be reworded such that they are pre-occupation. This is considered acceptable and the amended conditions are provided below:

4. A landscape scheme to include hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and implemented prior to first occupation. The scheme shall include indication of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out and the details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development.

Any landscaping which, within 5 years of the completion of the landscaping scheme, dies, becomes diseased, is removed, damaged or becomes defective in anyway shall be replaced in kind.

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

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan (Arbtech TPP 01) prepared by ArbTech received 08 July 2020. Within 7 days of commencement of development digital photographs shall be submitted to the Council that record all aspects of any facilitation tree works and the physical tree and ground protection measures that have been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the heritage asset and locality in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.”

Members acknowledged the openness of the current site and felt that if fencing were to be erected around the perimeter of the site, harm would be caused to the

existing visual and residential amenities. As a result an additional informative was added to the officer's recommendation to emphasise that no close board fencing should be erected around the site.

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

RESOLVED that application 20/0592 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and the additional informative.

Note 1

The application was discussed by the Committee concurrently with application 20/0593 as the applications were intrinsically linked. However separate votes were taken on the applications.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Valerie White declared that she had visited the site a couple of years ago prior to the application.

Note 3

A roll call vote on the officer recommendation to grant the application was conducted and the voting was as follows:

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

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

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Valerie White.

38/P Application Number: 20/0593/LLB: Queen Anne House - Bridge Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5AT

The application was for Listed Building Consent for the conversion of Queen Anne House from office (Class B1c) to residential (Class C3) comprising 5 no. flats (1x 3 Bed, 2x 2 Bed and 2x 1 Bed) with associated alterations comprising removal of existing rear canopy, signage and a/c units, new windows, flues and extraction outlets.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee due to the fact that it was intrinsically linked to application 20/0592/FFU which was also determined at the meeting.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application to application 20/0592/FFU, as both applications are intrinsically linked:

“Corrections

Para 6.1 should read ‘...four representations...’.

Para 4.7 should read ‘...sufficient parking is provided for all units and three parking spaces are provided for visitors’.

Representations

One representation has been received in support of the proposal, so long as that the development is provided with adequate soft-landscaping.

Parking provision

To clarify, the proposed parking provision would be as follows:

Dwelling type	Recommended provision	No of spaces provided and location
2-bed flat (unit 1)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal parking area
2-bed flat (unit 2)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal parking area
1-bed flat (unit 3)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal parking area
1-bed flat (unit 4)	1 space per unit	1 space in the communal parking area
3-bed flat (unit 5)	2 spaces per unit	2 spaces in the communal parking area
4-bed dwelling (unit 6)	2 spaces per unit	2 spaces within the plot
2-bed dwelling (unit 7)	1 space per unit	2 spaces in the communal parking area
2-bed dwelling (unit 8)	1 space per unit	2 spaces in the communal parking area
1-bed bungalow (unit 9)	1 space per unit	1 space within the plot
Total	11	13

Three visitor parking spaces would be provided.

Amendment to Conditions

The applicant has proposed that in place of “No development shall commence”, the following conditions be reworded such that they are pre-occupation. This is considered acceptable and the amended conditions are provided below:

4. A landscape scheme to include hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and implemented prior to first occupation. The scheme shall include indication of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out and the details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development.

Any landscaping which, within 5 years of the completion of the landscaping scheme, dies, becomes diseased, is removed, damaged or becomes defective in anyway shall be replaced in kind.

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

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan (Arbtech TPP 01) prepared by ArbTech received 08 July 2020. Within 7 days of commencement of development digital photographs shall be submitted to the Council that record all aspects of any facilitation tree works and the physical tree and ground protection measures that have been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the heritage asset and locality in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.”

Members acknowledged the openness of the current site and felt that if fencing were to be erected around the perimeter of the site, harm would be caused to the existing visual and residential amenities. As a result an additional informative was added to the officer’s recommendation to emphasise that no close board fencing should be erected around the site.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Valerie White and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0593 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and additional informative.

Note 1

The application was discussed by the Committee concurrently with application 20/0592 as the applications were intrinsically linked. However separate votes were taken on the applications.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Valerie White declared that she had visited the site a couple of years ago prior to the application.

Note 3

A roll call vote on the officer recommendation to grant the application was conducted and the voting was as follows:

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

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

39/P Application Number: 20/0510 - The Annexe, 6 Mount Pleasant Close, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5TP

The application was for the demolition of existing single storey annexe and construction of a two storey attached 3 bed house with associated access and parking.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, on the grounds of overdevelopment, not in keeping with the street scene and failing to comply with the Lightwater Village Design Statement.

Members received the following updates on the application:

"Corrections

Para 7.5.9 should read '*...due to the lack of adequate front boundary treatment*'.

Representations

Four written representations have been received following publication of the Committee Agenda which raise the following issues:

- The application would be over development of the site and would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties *[see section 7.5 of the officer's report]*;
- The proposal would lead to further traffic congestion on the roads left hand bend directly where The Annex is situated and the access from the road would be inadequate *[see section 7.7 of the officer's report]*;
- This planning application would not conform to the Lightwater design statement *[see section 7.5 of the officer's report]*.

On 3 November 2020 the applicant also made the following representation in response to the publication of the committee report regarding the (i) width of the proposed plot; (ii) mixed character of the road; (iii) weight afforded to approved application 20/0347/FFU; and, (iv) creation of driveway and boundary treatment.

Officer's comments

Point (i):

In relation to the width of the proposed plot and its relation to local character, it is noted that in the same side of the road as the application property the dwellings to the west are bungalows and the properties to the east are two storey dwellings linked by garages. Directly opposite there are two storey houses. The development in the immediate vicinity of the application site is road frontage development with two storey dwellings and plot widths that do not fall below 10m. The proposed plot, at an approximate 8.2m width, would be narrower than those on its immediate context, which is considered the most sensitive.

The applicant makes reference to the width of plots 9 and 9A further to the west and it is noted that plot 9 would be about the same width as the proposed site and 9A would be slightly narrower. However, these plots accommodate bungalows, which is a different development from the proposed two storey dwelling. As bungalows, the built form is lesser and so smaller plots would be more appropriate by comparison. In addition, the Inspector in para 11 of the 2018 Appeal Decision (page 94 of the Agenda) notes that this area has a different character and, therefore, is not directly comparable. This approach was followed in assessing this proposal.

The plot width for previous application 17/0707 was approximately 7.7m and the plot width for previous application 16/0664 was about 7.6m. In light of the above context, it is not considered the revised plot width would be materially different from the previously dismissed appeals.

Point (ii):

See section 7.4 of the officer's report, where the proposal's impact on the character of the area is discussed.

Point (iii):

The provision of a new dwelling means that the effect on the streetscene would be materially different than a householder extension, as recognised by the Inspector in para 15 of the 2018 Appeal Decision (page 95 of the Agenda). The weight afforded to this permission is a matter of planning judgment and is discussed in para 7.5.4 of the officer's report.

Point (iv):

The creation of a driveway is discussed in paras 7.5.8 and 7.5.9 of the officer's report. In para 15 of the 2017 Appeal Decision (pages 91 and 95 of the Agenda, respectively) the Inspector noted that although these parking arrangements could be achieved under permitted development, it is unlikely that this would be provided without the need created by the proposed dwelling and the same approach was followed in this assessment.

Both appeal decisions refer that the parking spaces, of themselves, would be similar to others in Mount Pleasant Close, however it is the opening up of the site's frontage that would emphasise the proposal's harm to the character of the area (see para 14 of both 2017 and 2018 Appeal Decisions, pages 91 and 95 of the Agenda, respectively). It is also noted that the plans submitted with the 2017 application show a partial boundary treatment to the front elevation, which did not preclude the Inspector of reaching this conclusion. The same approach was followed in assessing this application. It is also noted that there would not be sufficient space to provide soft landscaping to enclose the parking area and soften the proposed built form, as required by Principle 6.8 of the RDG."

The officer recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan, seconded by Councillor Garrett and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0510 be refused.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Peter Barnett declared that he had been in correspondence with the applicant and Councillor Sharon Galliford had visited objectors to the application on his behalf.

Note 2

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

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

Councillors Graham Alleway, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

Voting against the officer recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton and Graham Tapper.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Employment Committee held on 8
October 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

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath.

Officers Present: Louise Livingston, Julie Simmonds, and Rachel Whillis

14/EC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2020 were agreed and would be signed at the next available opportunity.

15/EC Code of Conduct for Officers

The Committee 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.

Members reviewed the Code and, in view of recent changes to the Speak Up Policy and Member & Officer Protocol, it was suggested that the wording at paragraph 13.3 be updated to ensure staff were encouraged to raise any issues within the parameters set out in these documents.

The Committee considered the section of the Code addressing Political Neutrality and it was suggested that a reference to residents of the borough should be inserted to paragraph 7.1. It was also advised that managers had recently received political awareness training and the training would be reviewed on a regular basis.

It was advised that, following a request at the Joint Staff Consultative Group meeting, the Monitoring Officer had confirmed that he was happy with the current provisions at paragraph 19.4 concerning hospitality offered by other local authorities or public bodies.

RESOLVED that the revised Code of Conduct for Officers, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be adopted, with the wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.

16/EC Member & Officer Protocol

The Committee 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 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.

It was noted that the numbering of the document would be updated once all changes had been finalised.

RECOMMENDED to the Full Council that the revised Member Officer Protocol, as set out at Annex A to these minutes, be adopted.

17/EC Family Friendly Policy

The Committee 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.

It was advised that, when it had considered the Policy at its meeting on 24 September 2020, the Joint Staff Consultative Group had requested that a list of abbreviations be added to the Policy.

The Committee considered the Policy and noted the proposal to update wording in paragraph 7.1.2 to reflect different family structures. It was also agreed to add wording to paragraph 7.2.2 to provide some flexibility in respect of the 28 days' notice required for changing timing of paternity leave.

Members agreed that the Policy would be benchmarked against other authorities' family friendly policies and a report on this comparative information would be brought to future Joint Staff Consultative Group and Employment Committee meetings.

RESOLVED that

- (i) the revised Family Friendly Policy, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be adopted; and**
- (ii) a report containing benchmarking information be brought to future meetings of the Joint Staff Consultative Group and Employment Committee**

18/EC Terms and Conditions

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

RESOLVED that revised Terms and Conditions, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.

19/EC Appointments Sub Committee meeting

The minutes of the Appointments Sub Committee meeting held on 5 August 2020 were agreed and would be signed by the Chairman of the Sub Committees at the next available opportunity.

20/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.

21/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)
22/EC	3
23/EC	3
24/EC	3

22/EC Update on the recruitment to the post of Chief Executive

The Committee was updated on the progress of the recruitment to the post of Chief Executive.

23/EC Proposal to Enter Into an Agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council to Share the Monitoring Officer Function

The Committee considered a report setting out a proposal to enter into an agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council to share the Monitoring Officer function. It was advised that the initial agreement would be for a trial period of 6 months to provide both Councils with the opportunity to assess whether the arrangement was working and whether they wished to continue with the arrangement.

The Committee noted the terms under which the agreement would be made with Elmbridge BC. It was agreed to update the draft agreement to ensure there was

detail provided on how sickness absence and leave would be managed and, if not already specified, how the matter would be managed in the event that the Monitoring Officer left the employment of this Council.

RECOMMENDED that

- (i) the Council enters into an agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council to provide the Monitoring Officer function, on the terms set out in the agenda report, as amended; and**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Transformation to complete the agreement with Elmbridge Borough Council.**

24/EC Review of Exempt Items

The 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.

RESOLVED that the report and draft agreement relating to 23/EC remain exempt for the present time but that the decision be made public.

Chairman

Note: the annex referred to in these minutes has not been reproduced in this Minute Book but is available for viewing on the Council's website.

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing
Committee held at Virtually on 21
October 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

Officers Present: Paula Barnshaw, Helen Lolley, Tim Pashen and
Frances Soper

10/L Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2020 were confirmed and would be signed by the Chairman when possible.

11/L Proposed Statement of Licensing Policy

The Committee considered a proposed draft of the Statement of Licensing Policy 2021-2026 with a view to consultation, before the Licensing Committee would consider the final draft Policy, including any amendments arising from the consultation, for recommendation to Full Council in early 2021.

As the local Licensing Authority, the Council was required to prepare and publish a Licensing Policy at least every 5 years. The current Statement of Licensing Policy 2016-2021 was now due to be reviewed and updated. It was noted that the proposed draft policy reflected the Revised Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act, published in April 2018.

Before determination of the Statement of Licensing Policy the Council was required to consult on the revised policy by virtue of section 5 of the Licensing Act 2003. The consultation on the policy would last for a period of 6 weeks commencing on 28 October 2020. An additional published supplement listed the proposed consultees which included the statutory consultees as listed in Section 5 (3) of the Licensing Act 2003.

Members were advised that as part of the consultation all Ward Councillors would be invited to respond. Members of the Licensing Committee were invited to comment on the draft updated policy.

It was highlighted that the new proposed Statement of Policy included the current Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) and that there was a statutory requirement to consult on the CIP every three years to determine whether there was current evidence and support for the CIP to remain in place. The statutory consultees for the CIP were the same as for the Statement of Licensing Policy it was therefore proposed that both consultations would be carried out simultaneously.

RESOLVED that

- I. The contents of the agenda report be noted;**
- II. The draft Statement of Licensing Policy 2021-2026 be approved for consultation as per the agenda pack; and**
- III. The requirements in respect of the Cumulative Impact Special Policy be noted.**

12/L Licensing Act - Summary of Delegated 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.

13/L Coronavirus Regulations Enforcement

Members were given an update in respect of the powers which had been given to Local Councils and delegated to officers that sought to control the spread of COVID-19.

Local authorities were expected to take proportionate action by seeking to achieve compliance by an educative approach, but if necessary with fixed penalty notices which had been made available as an enforcement tool.

Whilst the Police had continued to lead on enforcement in relation to breaches of requirements on individuals for example with regard to the wearing of face coverings in public and the Rule of 6, local authorities were leading on the obligations placed on businesses. These obligations included business closure, restrictions on opening hours, as well the maintenance of social distancing and the rule of 6 within premises. It was noted that businesses were obligated to display notices communicating the need for face coverings and make available a QR code for customer scanning. There was also a requirement to provide a means of manual contact tracing. It was noted that some businesses such as nightclubs were required to remain fully closed.

Environmental Health and Licensing Officers were responding to large volumes of correspondence in respect of levels of observance to the new requirements, whilst also proactively monitoring adherence whilst on Camberley Town Centre night visits. There was also ongoing work being undertaken to communicate the new rules via the Economic Development Team; and to recruit and deploy Covid Ambassadors and Marshals.

There was confusion in the hospitality industry in respect of the 2 metre rule and the associated use of social distancing screens; and there was an identified need for some premises to move furniture to maintain social distancing.

It was reported that whilst on their in person inspections, the Environmental Health and Licensing Teams had identified a number of premises which required follow up actions. These existing issues had included Quick Response (QR) codes and mask wearing posters not being displayed in prominent positions and slow customer responses to the 10pm closure.

Members were informed that the Borough's Covid Ambassadors would be working closely with Collectively Camberley and local businesses to promote mask wearing and social distancing in The Square and in other retail premises. It was also noted that the Council were also planning to deploy the Town Centre's former Taxi Marshalls as Covid Marshalls. Members expressed concerns in respect of the perceived lack of mask-wearing in Camberley Town Centre. It was hoped that the promotion of face coverings and the presence of Covid Marshalls would encourage adherence to the social distancing measures. In addition Members were also advised that there was funding available for the recruitment of an additional Environmental Health Officer, which would add to the resources available for enforcement.

RESOLVED that the verbal update on the enforcement of the Coronavirus Regulations be noted.

14/L Committee Work Programme

The Committee noted its Work Programme for the rest of the municipal year.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank