

# COUNCIL MEETING

**24 February 2021**

## COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 9 December 2020** (Pages 3 - 14)
2. **Executive - 9 December 2020** (Pages 15 - 18)
3. **Executive - 15 December 2020** (Pages 19 - 22)
4. **Executive - 19 January 2021** (Pages 23 - 28)
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 17 December 2020** (Pages 29 - 34)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 14 January 2021** (Pages 35 - 46)
7. **Planning Applications Committee - 11 February 2021 (to be laid on the table)** -
8. **Audit and Standards Committee – 23 November 2020** (Pages 47 – 50)
9. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 25 November 2020** (Pages 51 – 56)
10. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 5 January 2021** (Pages 57 – 60)
11. **Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 27 January 2021** (Pages 61 – 66)
12. **External Partnerships Select Committee – 1 December 2020** (Pages 67 – 74)
13. **Joint Staff Consultative Group – 14 January 2021** (Pages 75 – 78)
14. **Joint Staff Consultative Group – 28 January 2021** (Pages 79 – 80)
15. **Employment Committee – 28 January 2021 (to be laid on the table)** -

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY  
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held on  
9 December 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

**52/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Ben Leach.

**53/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 14 October and 4 November 2020 be approved as a correct  
record.**

**54/C Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed the Council about socially distanced Christmas events she had attended, including the switching on of Christmas tree lights in villages, sharing mulled wine and minced pies, and the drawing of the raffle for the Windlesham luncheon club.

The Mayor thanked all volunteers and the Council's Meals at Home staff providing lunches to residents who would be alone on Christmas Day. She also paid tribute to everyone who would be working over the Christmas Period.

**55/C Leader's Announcements**

The Leader referred to work carried out by the Council and its achievements in 2020, both in response to the Covid-19 pandemic and the work that had continued alongside this response, along with new areas of work and preparing for the issues and challenges in 2021.

## 56/C Questions from Members of the Public

In response to a question from Mr Richard Wilson concerning fly-tipping in Windlesham, Chobham and Bagshot, the Environment & Heath Portfolio Holder, Councillor David Mansfield, reported on incidences and enforcement action taken since January 2019.

Dr Nirmal Kang asked a question of the Places & Strategy Portfolio Holder, Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans, about the progress of the enhancements to security at Heatherside Recreation Ground. In response, the Portfolio Holder informed him that the works would require a planning consent and were expected to be completed by Spring 2021.

In response to a question from Mrs Elisabeth Noble, the Support & Safeguarding Portfolio Holder, Councillor Josephine Hawkins, outlined the provision in place for children in receipt of free school meals over the Christmas period.

The Chairman of Planning Applications Committee, Councillor Edward Hawkins, responded to a question from Mr Jacques Olmo about the progress of the development of the Mindenhurst site in Deepcut.

Councillor Colin Dougan, the Business & Transformation Portfolio Holder, responded to a question from Mr Alan Ashbery on road infrastructure projects in Frimley.

## 57/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 20 October, 17 November and 9 December 2020

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 20 October and 17 November 2020 be received and the recommendations therein be adopted as set out below:**

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

**RESOLVED 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.**

**70/E - Acquisition of Night Stop Property**

**RESOLVED** 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**

**RESOLVED** that an increase to the Capital Programme for 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 be agreed.

**75/E - The Council Tax Base and the Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

**RESOLVED** that

- (i) the 28 day Council Tax discount for an empty unoccupied and substantially unfurnished property remain at 0% for these properties using the freedoms given in the Local Government Finance Act 2012 and relevant statutory instruments;
- (ii) the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for Surrey Heath, approved by Council on 22 January 2013, remain unchanged for 2021/22;
- (iii) the Council Tax Exceptional Hardship Policy remains unchanged for 2021/22, subject to a review of the Policy before the deadline for setting the Tax Base;
- (iv) the Executive Head of Finance be authorised to make minor changes to the Local Council Tax Support scheme so as to ensure that where applicable to income calculation it remains in line with Housing Benefit / Universal Credit changes introduced by legislation; and
- (v) incomes and applicable amounts and non-dependant deductions are uprated in line with the percentages and amounts supplied by DWP and DCLG, and applied to Housing Benefit claims

(b) Planning Applications Committee – 15 October and 12 November 2020

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 15 October and 12 November 2020 be received.**

- (c) Employment Committee – 8 October 2020

It was moved by Councillor Cliff Betton, seconded by Councillor Sharon Galliford and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Employment Committee held on 8 October 2020 be received.**

- (d) Licensing Committee – 21 October 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 21 October 2020 be received.**

- (e) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 26 November 2020

It was moved by Councillor Graham Tapper, seconded by Councillor Josephine Hawkins and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 26 November 2020 be received.**

Note: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4, a recorded vote on the recommendation at minute 53/E was taken.

The following Members voted in favour of agreeing recommendation 53/E:

Councillors Dan Adams, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Emma-Jane McGrath, Charlotte Morley, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White.

The following Members voted against of agreeing recommendation 53/E:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Sashi Mylvaganam, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft, Kristian Wrenn.

## 58/C     Governance Working Group

The Council was informed that the Governance Working Group had reviewed the procedures for Questions from Members of the Public at meetings of the Full Council and had agreed to propose the procedure rules be updated by:

- a. Increasing the time allocated for Questions from 15 to 30 minutes;
- b. Clarifying that questions would be heard in the order received and, where an individual submitted more than one question, one question would be prioritised and all others heard after any questions from other members of the public;
- c. Clarifying that any questions received that are not able to be heard within the 30 minutes will receive a written response from the relevant Member;
- d. Limiting the length of a question to 125 words, with any words exceeding that cut from the published question;
- e. Clarifying that responses to questions will be published by 2pm on the day of the meeting;
- f. Stating that criticism directed at a named officer will not be accepted; and
- g. Giving authority to the Executive Head of Corporate in consultation with the Monitoring Officer to defer or reject a question received during the pre-election period.

The Working Group had also reviewed Questions from Councillors and had agreed to clarify wording to state that the answer must be published by 2pm on the day of the meeting. Having reviewed Leaders' Question Time, with the exception of a minor typographical change, it was not proposed to make any changes to these procedures.

The Council was informed that the Working Group had proposed additions to the Executive Procedure Rules at Part 4 to reflect the recommendations in the Browne Jacobson report on the decision to award the former Chief Executive an Additional Duties Allowance. The Procedure Rules would now state that, where the Leader or a Portfolio Holder made decisions individually, any advice sought or received by a Member must be recorded.

The Working Group had recommended that the definition of a Key Decision be extended to include the release of securities, plus additions to the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers and Financial Regulations to explicitly state that no officer was permitted to release any security, warranty or guarantee in favour of the council, unless contractually obliged to do so, without the written approval of the Section 151 Officer, or the Executive or relevant committee. These changes had been proposed in response to the Monitoring Officer's report on the decision to release a local land charge on Field 81, Pennypot Lane, Chobham.

Members were informed that it was proposed to make a minor update to the licensing functions in the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers to include reference to two pieces of legislation that had been inadvertently missed. It was also proposed to update the General Principles of the Scheme to delegate authority to officers to act in response to any legislation relating to the Covid-19 pandemic and any future pandemics.

**RESOLVED** that

- (i) **Paragraph 3 of Public Speaking Procedure Rules at Part 4, Section E of the Constitution be amended, as set out at Annex A to this report;**
- (ii) **Paragraph 11 of Council Procedure Rules at Part 4, Section A of the Constitution be amended as follows:**

### **11.3 Response**

The question will be put and answered without discussion. An answer given may be given:

- (a) orally;
- (ab) by reference to published material of the Council or that which is readily available to the members; or
- (be) in writing.

The question and the written response will be circulated to Councillors by no later than 2.00pm on the day of the Council meeting;

- (iii) **Paragraph 11A of Council Procedure Rules at Part 4, Section A of the Constitution be amended as follows**

11A.1 The purpose of Leader's Question Time is to allow Members to ask questions of the Leader which relate to his/her area of responsibility.;

- (iv) **paragraph 10.3 of the Executive Procedure Rules at Part 4, Section B of the Constitution be updated as follows:**

*"As soon as reasonably practicable after an Executive decision has been taken by the Leader or an individual member of the Executive or a key decision taken by an officer, the Chief Executive will prepare a record of the decision, a statement of the reasons for it, **any advice sought or received from officers**, and the options considered".;*

- (v) **Paragraph 13.3 (b) (i) of Article 13 of the Constitution be updated as follows:**

### **Key Decisions**

- (i) Key decisions are those:

- likely to result in expenditure, release of any securities (except where any release is pursuant to a contractual obligation) or savings of at least £100,000 or £100 million if it

relates to treasury management matters or there may otherwise be an impact on the Council's financial standing; or

- likely to have a significant impact on people or organisations in two or more wards within the Borough
- which are made in the course of developing proposals to the Council to amend the policy framework;

(vi) Paragraph 5 of the General Principles of the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officer at Part 3, Section B of the Constitution be updated as follows:

5. Finance and Budgets

5.1 Financial Regulations at Part 4 of this Constitution contain a number of authorisations to officers. All financial decisions made by officers must be taken in accordance with Financial Regulations or as otherwise authorised in this Scheme of Delegation.

5.2 No officer may release any security, warranty or guarantee in favour of the Council, unless contractually obliged to do so, without the written approval of the Council's Section 151 officer or the Executive/ relevant Committee;

(vii) paragraph 6.6 of Financial Regulations at Part 4, Section H of the Council's Constitution be updated to include the following:

6. Debt Write-Off and Release of Securities

6.6.3 No officer may release any security, warranty or guarantee in favour of the Council, unless contractually obliged to do so, without the written approval of the Council's Section 151 officer or the Executive/ relevant Committee.

(viii) the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers at Part 3, Section B of the Constitution be updated as follows:

a) The Executive Head of Community's licensing delegations be updated to include the following Acts:

a. The Town and Police Clauses Act 1847  
b. Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976;  
and

b) The following section be inserted in the Appendix to the General Principles

## **10. Response to Pandemics**

**10.1 The Executive Head of Community is appointed as the designated officer for the purposes of the following legislation:**

- 1) The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) Regulations 2020 (as amended)**
- 2) The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (No.2) (England) Regulations 2020 (SI 2020/684), as amended**
- 3) The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (Obligations of Undertakings) (England) Regulations 2020 (SI 2020/1008) (as amended)**
- 4) The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (Self-Isolation) (England) Regulations 2020**
- 5) The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Collection of Contact Details etc and Related Requirements) Regulations 2020 (SI 2020/1005)**
- 6) The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Wearing of Face Coverings in a Relevant Place) (England) Regulations 2020 (SI 2020/791), as amended.**

**and any subsequent relating legislation.**

**10.2 The following officers are appointed for the purposes of the enforcement of the above regulations:**

- a. Any Environmental Health Officer**
- b. Any Licensing Officer.**

**10.3 The Executive Head of Community will be appointed as the designated officer or equivalent in response to a national or local pandemic, as declared by the Government or Surrey Local Resilience Forum. The Executive Head of Community and Head of Legal will be authorised to appoint officers to undertake any necessary enforcement arising from the pandemic.**

### **59/C Food Poverty in Surrey Heath**

The Council was reminded that, at its meeting on 4 November 2020, it had agreed as a last resort to allocate up to £20,000 from the Community Fund Grant Scheme specifically for charities and community groups to provide meals and a healthy food provision for vulnerable children during the school holiday periods until 31 May 2021. This had been a last resort position as the holiday meal provision primarily resided with the Government and Surrey County Council. The Government had amended its policy on 9 November 2020 to provide the necessary funds to Surrey County Council to enable it to supply a school meal service during the holiday periods for those eligible, until December 2021, thus making this Council's decision less immediately relevant.

Members considered a proposal to amend the decision agreed on 4 November 2020 to broaden the scheme criteria to enable local registered organisations to apply for the allocated funds to provide food, to those experiencing poverty within Surrey Heath. This would not preclude the funds being used for the purpose agreed on 4 November 2020, in the event that the situation on Government funding for holiday meal provision changes. This decision would enable local organisations to apply for grants to address immediate need, pending the review of the grants schemes by the Executive in February 2021.

It was recognised that, if the £20,000 was found to be insufficient, further funding for this purpose would be considered.

**RESOLVED that the criteria for awarding grants from the £20,000 allocated from the Community Fund Grant Scheme, for providing meals and healthy food provision for vulnerable children and families during school holiday periods until May 2021, be broadened to enable local registered organisations to apply for funds to provide food to those experiencing poverty within Surrey Heath.**

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

The following Members voted in favour of the decision:

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

#### **60/C      Urgent Action**

The Council noted Urgent Action undertaken in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers.

#### **61/C      Leader's Question Time**

The Leader agreed to meet with Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam to discuss a review of releasing exempt information.

In response to questions from Councillors Edward Hawkins and Victoria Wheeler, the Leader undertook to write two letters to Surrey County Council regarding road safety near schools. The first letter would specifically concern the installation of a Zebra Crossing near Ravenscote School on Upper Chobham Road; the second would refer to a review of wider issues concerning road safety across the borough.

The Leader responded to a suggestion from Councillor Morgan Rise by agreeing to ensure that the Council provided a response to the Surrey County Council's consultation on the reduction for Special Educational Needs.

Following a question from Councillor Sharon Galliford, the Council was updated on the progress of the review of the JPUT arrangements.

In response to a question from Councillor Dan Adams, the Leader supported a suggestion to investigate the option of bringing a short-term car sharing service to the borough. The Leader suggested this could be looked at by the Climate Change and the Local Plan Working Groups.

## **62/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>
63/C	3
64/C	3

## **63/C      Executive and Committees - Exempt**

Executive – 9 December 2020

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

**RESOLVED that the Capital Programme be increased by the amount identified to reflect the estimated total costs of the acquisition, as set out at minute 77/E and the associated agenda report.**

## **64/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 be made public following the completion of the acquisition, but all contractual information to remain exempt for the present time, to be reviewed periodically by the Monitoring Officer.**

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held on 9 December 2020**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

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

+ Present

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

**75/E      The Council Tax Base and Review of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

The Executive received a report on the setting of the Council Tax Base for 2021/22 which also reviewed the technical changes to Council Tax made in 2013/14 and the Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTSS) introduced in April 2013.

Members noted that there had been an increase in the tax base of 285 which would generate an additional income of £65,900 based on the current Band D council tax charge. The Executive received detailed breakdowns of the calculations of the Tax Base for each part of the Borough and a breakdown of the calculation of the Tax Base for the whole area.

Technical changes to Council Tax had been introduced from April 2013 under the Local Government Finance Act 2012 which meant that the Council was empowered to set a number of changes to Council Tax discounts and exemptions, as well as introduce a premium for long term empty properties.

On 1 April 2013 the Council had introduced a new Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTSS) to replace Council Tax Benefit, for working age claimants. The new scheme operated as a Council Tax discount and the Council was able to vary the value of discount on Council Tax granted to working age claimants. Pensioner claimants were protected and would continue to receive help towards their Council Tax, based on regulations set by Central Government.

Members were reminded that in 2017/18 the Revenue Support Grant had been reduced to zero and, therefore, it was reasonable to assume that there would be no governmental support for funding the LCTSS.

For ease of administration, it was important that there was alignment in respect of treatment of income and calculation of applicable amounts between housing benefit and the local council tax support scheme. Each year the Government made minor changes to its scheme to reflect uprating of benefits etc. In order that

the housing benefit and LCTSS remained aligned, it was proposed that the Executive Head of Finance be authorised to make such minor changes as may be necessary to the LCTSS for all types of claimant.

The introduction of the LCTSS in April 2013 had had the effect of reducing the Council Tax base since it operated as a discount rather than a benefit. In order to recognise the effect that this had on parishes, the Government had provided a grant in 2013/14 to give to parishes to ensure they were no worse off because of the introduction of the LCTSS. This money had subsequently been included within the revenue support grant (RSG), but as the Council's RSG was now zero it was reasonable to assume that this funding had been withdrawn.

Despite not receiving any funding from Government, the Council recognised the impact the LCTSS had on parishes and in the spirit of partnership and supporting parishes, had continued to compensate parishes for some of their loss. It was therefore proposed that for 2021/22 the compensation given to parishes remained unchanged from 2020/21.

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting in December 2019, it had agreed that the LCTSS and Council Tax Exceptional Hardship Policy should remain unchanged in 2020/21 but that a review of both those schemes would be undertaken over the next 12 months. It was reported this had not taken place due to the additional work generated by the Covid-19 pandemic and associated government grants. Having discussed the importance of this work, Members agreed to undertake this review before the deadline for setting the Council Tax.

It was agreed to review the information on support available, along with the prominence of this information, on the Council's website. It was also suggested that a review of the use of Enforcement Agents should be undertaken.

## **RESOLVED**

- (i) to note the calculations of the Tax Base in Annexes A to F summarised below:**

### **Band D Equivalent Properties**

<b>Bisley</b>	<b>1,650.60</b>
<b>Chobham</b>	<b>2,062.08</b>
<b>Frimley and Camberley</b>	<b>24,569.93</b>
<b>West End</b>	<b>2,393.17</b>
<b>Windlesham</b>	<b>8,134.78</b>
<b>Surrey Heath Borough Council</b>	<b>38.810.56</b>

- (ii) that £19,943.44 be given to Parishes in 2021/22 to offset the effect on the tax base of the Local Council Tax Support scheme;**

- (iii) that the final setting of the Tax Base be delegated to the Executive Head of Finance.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that**

- (i) the 28 day Council Tax discount for an empty unoccupied and substantially unfurnished property remain at 0% for these properties using the freedoms given in the Local Government Finance Act 2012 and relevant statutory instruments;
- (ii) the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for Surrey Heath, approved by Council on 22 January 2013, remains unchanged for 2021/22;
- (iii) the Council Tax Exceptional Hardship Policy remains unchanged for 2021/22, subject to a review of the Policy before the deadline for setting the Tax Base;
- (iv) the Executive Head of Finance be authorised to make minor changes to the Local Council Tax Support scheme so as to ensure that where applicable to income calculation it remains in line with Housing Benefit / Universal Credit changes introduced by legislation; and
- (v) incomes and applicable amounts and non-dependant deductions are uprated in line with the percentages and amounts supplied by DWP and DCLG, and applied to Housing Benefit claims.

**76/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)
77/E	3
78/E	3

**77/E      Property Acquisition**

The Executive considered an opportunity to acquire a property in Camberley to assist employment and economic development within the borough and to provide long term income to assist in the ongoing provision of local authority services. The Property Investment Working Group had reviewed the opportunity to acquire this property and had supported the acquisition.

The details of the property were reviewed. The projected income, expected gross return before interest and borrowing costs, and the return on investment after interest and the minimum revenue repayment were also noted.

Members were updated on the situation concerning the price of the acquisition and it was agreed that the proposed amount set out in the agenda report would be the maximum offered.

**RESOLVED** that

- (i) the acquisition of the property identified in the exempt report be approved, for the proposed price identified, on the basis that such acquisition will assist in the employment and economic development of the borough, as well as providing long term income to assist in the provision of public services; and
- (ii) the Acting Chief Executive be authorised to complete the due diligence work currently being undertaken and thereafter be further authorised to complete the acquisition of the property, including all necessary legal documentation required to achieve the transfer of ownership, after taking all appropriate legal, valuation and technical advice.

**RECOMMENDED** to Full Council that the Capital Programme be increased by the amount identified in the exempt report to reflect the estimated total costs of this acquisition.

**78/E      Review of Exempt Items**

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

**RESOLVED** that the decision be made public following the completion of the acquisition, but all contractual information to remain exempt for the present time, to be reviewed periodically by the Monitoring Officer.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held on 15 December 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 Sharon Galliford, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler and Cllr Graham Tapper

**79/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2020 were agreed.

**80/E Community Loan Scheme**

The Executive received a report proposing the introduction of a conditional emergency low-interest loan to help sustain key community organisations which may otherwise be forced to close permanently due to financial implications of the Covid-19 pandemic. The scheme was proposed in response to reports that the ongoing financial impact of the pandemic was causing some of these organisations to consider whether they could viably continue to operate. The proposed conditions of the scheme had been attached at Annex A to the report.

The scheme would only be available to charities or not-for-profit community organisations carrying out work in local areas that the Council considered essential. Furthermore, it would not be applicable to businesses or commercial entities which had other means of applying for support such as rate relief, the Bounce Back Loan Scheme, or other government initiatives.

Members considered the report and, whilst the principle was supported, a number of concerns were raised, in particular in relation to charity law. Suggestions were also made that the Council should be offering grants instead of loans. Arising from the discussions, it was agreed to amend the terms of the scheme to include the following provisions:

- i. It would explicitly state that the loan would not be held on the personal liability of any trustees.
- ii. It would state that the charity or organisation's constitution must allow it to take on a loan.
- iii. It would state that, in taking the loan, a charity must be confident that it was not contravening Charity Commission rules.

It was agreed to change the name of the scheme from the proposed 'Pay Back Grant' to 'Community Loan scheme'. It was also agreed that a maximum of £150,000 would be allocated to the scheme.

Members were reminded that the Council's Community Fund Grant Scheme provided grants of up to £25,000 to assist local not for profit organisations with the delivery of community projects and it was suggested that the number of funding cycles should be increased in 2021. It was noted that a review of all grants would be considered by the Executive in February 2021.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) **a Community Loan scheme, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be set up to support eligible charities and community organisations facing permanent closure; and**
- (ii) **any decision making regarding the scheme to be delegated to the Executive Head of Finance in consultation with the Leader.**

**81/E Mid-Year Performance Report - 2020/21**

The Executive considered a report detailing the Council's performance against corporate objectives, priorities and success measures as set out in the Annual Plan. The comments and observations made by the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee on the report were also noted.

**RESOLVED that the Mid-Year Performance Report, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be noted.**

**82/E Council Finances as at 30 September 2020**

The Executive noted the Council's financial position at 30 September 2020 and considered a proposal to transfer a £7,000 residual budget relating to disabled access at London Road Rec to the London Road Rec playground improvement budget, following completion of the disabled access project.

Members noted that it was proposed to include an increase of £139,000 to the Watchetts Tennis Court capital budget in the 2021/22 Capital Programme. This was due to a subsequent detailed investigation which had found that the playing surface required far more structural repairs than the original quote had taken into account. Having discussed the notable increase to the cost of the works since the information was originally presented to the Executive in May 2020, it was agreed that a further report containing up to date information and costs, including information from a tender process, would be brought to the Executive in order for an informed decision to be made on this project.

**RESOLVED**

- (i) **that the Council's financial position at 30 September 2020 be noted;**

- (ii) that a £7,000 residual budget relating to disabled access at London Road Rec be transferred to the London Road Rec playground improvement budget, following completion of the disabled access project;
- (iii) to note that the draft Corporate Capital Programme 2021/22, to be agreed by the Council in February 2021, will include an item on the Meadows Roundabout project; and
- (iv) that a report be brought to a future meeting with further information regarding an increase to the Watchetts Tennis Court capital budget.

**83/E Treasury Management Mid-year Report for 2020/21**

The Executive received a report detailing the Treasury Management Service performance for 2020/21, as at 30th September 2020, and illustrated the compliance to-date with the Treasury Management Indicators for 2020/21.

Approval was sought to change the Council's treasury management strategy to allow greater investment in Money Market funds.

**RESOLVED to note the report and to approve a temporary change to the Council's Treasury Management Strategy, as set out at paragraph 4.18 in the agenda report.**

**84/E Appointments to Surrey Leaders' Group Outside Bodies - Mid-Year Vacancy**

The Executive was informed that a vacancy had arisen on Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (Mental Health Foundation Trust), one of the Surrey Leaders' Group Outside Bodies. Councillor Robin Perry had expressed an interest in being nominated to the vacancy and the Executive agreed to support this nomination.

**RESOLVED that Councillor Robin Perry be nominated to the vacancy on Surrey Leaders' Group vacancy on Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (Mental Health Foundation Trust).**

**85/E Urgent Action**

**RESOLVED that the urgent action taken under the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers be noted.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held on 19 January 2021**

---

+ 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 Paul Deach, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Helen Whitcroft and Cllr Valerie White

**86/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 9 December and 15 December 2020 were agreed.

**87/E Questions by Members**

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Graham Alleway concerning the Department for Transport's consultation on parking restrictions on pavements.

**88/E Revenue Grants 2021/22**

The Executive was informed that the Council funded a number of voluntary organisations which either worked in partnership with the Council or performed functions on the Council's behalf.

Members were reminded that in 2019 a review of the Revenue Grant scheme had been undertaken to assess whether grants were being made at the correct levels, to the right organisations, and the value for money of the revenue grants realised. A revised scheme had been agreed in September 2019, to be introduced from 1 April 2020. The review had introduced ring fencing to 3 organisations who worked with the Council: Citizens Advice Surrey Heath, Blackwater Valley Partnership and the Basingstoke Canal Authority.

Service level agreements had been introduced in 2013 to enable the Council to set out targets and outcomes to be achieved throughout the year. The agreements were used to monitor the performance of organisations throughout the year. Grant payments were only made after a successful monitoring report was received.

The Executive considered the grants sought by the organisations which had applied for Revenue Grants for 2021/22, the relevant supporting information concerning those organisations, and the amounts it was proposed to award.

Members were advised that it was proposed to delegate the decision on the application from the Autism Trust UK, with a suggestion that a maximum of £5,000

be awarded following further information relating to the benefits to local Surrey Heath clients.

The Executive was informed it was proposed to decline applications from Penifcent Ltd, Camberley Care Trust, Creative Minds Community, and Camberley Cricket Club and noted the reasons for these decisions, as set out in the agenda report. It was also proposed that the application from Lightwater Connected be declined that year, but a further application would be welcomed when it became a formalised group.

In response to suggestions from Members, it was agreed to consider including information in future reports on the levels of unrestricted reserves held by the organisations and the number of months they could expect to operate without a grant.

**RESOLVED** that

- (i) the following Revenue Grants for 2021/22 be awarded to:**
  - a. **Surrey Heath Citizens Advice (CASH) – £80,000;**
  - b. **Voluntary Support North Surrey - £30,000;**
  - c. **Surrey Heath Age Concern - £10,000;**
  - d. **Camberley Central Job Club - £7,000**
  - e. **Catalyst Support - £1,500;**
  - f. **The Hope Hub - £31,500;**
  - g. **VSNS-Time to Talk - £10,000;**
  - h. **Basingstoke Canal Authority - £10,000;**
  - i. **Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership - £10,000;**
  - j. **Surrey Heath Sports Council - £3,500;**
- (ii) the other in-kind benefits provided to organisations be noted;**
- (iii) all grants be subject to Service Level Agreements;**
- (iv) the Autism Trust grant decision to be delegated to the Executive Head of Transformation in consultation with the Support & Safeguarding Portfolio Holder to clarify the local benefit of this application;**
- (v) no Revenue Grant be awarded to Penifcent Ltd, Camberley Care Trust, Camberley Cricket Club, or Creative Minds Community;**
- (vi) Surrey Heath Arts Council's decision not to apply for a Revenue Grant for 2021/22 be noted; and**
- (i) No Revenue Grant be awarded to Lightwater Connected but the organisation be invited to re-apply next year.**

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

- (i) Councillor Paul Deach declared he was a Surrey County Council representative on Basingstoke Canal Joint Committee; and
- (ii) Councillor David Lewis declared that he was a trustee of Surrey Heath Age Concern.

Note 2: It was noted for the record that

- (i) Councillor Rodney Bates declared that his sister worked for Catalyst;
- (ii) Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans declared that she had volunteered for the Lightwater Resilience Plan, part of Lightwater Connected;
- (iii) Councillor Alan McClafferty declared that his wife was Chairman of Surrey Heath Age Concern; and
- (iv) Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam declared that he had been involved with Camberley Care Trust in the past.

## **89/E Climate Change Action - APSE and APSE Energy Membership**

The Executive considered a report proposing that the Council became a member of the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) and APSE Energy. APSE Energy was a bespoke Local Authority Energy Collaboration that constituted a partnership of member authorities which looked to leverage and maximise the opportunities afforded to local authorities by working together on a national scale on the green energy agenda. APSE Energy was part of the wider APSE family with the specific aim of getting local authorities back into a position of influence in the local energy market.

It was reported that one of the high priority actions in the Council's draft Climate Change Action Plan was to consider the benefits of it becoming members of APSE and APSE Energy, with membership expected to assist the Council in delivering its Plan and meeting its target of making the Council carbon neutral by 2030. The Climate Change Working Group had recently considered a business case and had recommended that the Council become members of the organisations.

Members reviewed the business case for the Council to become a member of both APSE and APSE Energy. It was noted that becoming members of both organisations was cheaper than only becoming a member of APSE Energy. The current annual fee for joining APSE and APSE Energy was £4,669. It was proposed that from the start of the 2021/22 financial year membership fees would be paid from a requested Climate Change revenue budget.

**RESOLVED that the Council becomes a member of APSE and APSE Energy.**

## **90/E Wheelchair swing at Frimley Lodge Park**

The Executive considered a proposal to install a wheelchair swing at Frimley Lodge Park. The installation, surfacing and fencing of the swing was expected to cost in the region of £28,000, with ongoing inspections and maintenance to be included within the grounds maintenance budget. The wheelchair swing would be funded from Community Infrastructure Levy contributions held in the Mytchett & Deepcut fund.

Members were reminded that Frimley Lodge Park had been refurbished in 2019, during which time an accessible ground level roundabout had been installed, which had proven popular. Adding a wheelchair swing would further develop this play area allowing more children to play along with their friends and family. This would be the first wheelchair accessible swing installed in a play area maintained by the Council.

The location of the swing was discussed and it was advised that it would be within the proximity of the main play area, with the actual positioning to be confirmed during the tender process. The swing would be secured and accessed with the use of a radar key and a key would be held on site by the groundsman and the cafe. The Places & Strategy Portfolio Holder also undertook to speak to the Greenspaces team about ensuring that paths within the park were suitable for disabled access.

**RESOLVED** that

- (i) the installation of a Wheelchair Swing at Frimley Lodge Park be agreed; and
- (ii) the project be funded from Community Infrastructure Levy monies held within the Mytchett & Deepcut fund.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the capital programme be increased by £28,000 to include the Wheelchair swing at Frimley Lodge Park.**

**91/E Draft proposal to the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership for funding of Smart Travel project to provide electric vehicle charging points at Deepcut Mindenhurst Development**

The Executive considered a report detailing a project to support the roll out of electric vehicle charging and smart travel infrastructure across the Deepcut Mindenhurst development. Skanska, as the master developer of the development was required to facilitate the delivery of 'electric vehicle and smart travel' infrastructure.

The total value of the scheme would be approximately £5,600,000, with £4,200,000 being sought from the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in this bid. There was currently no LEP funding available for this work, but the LEP had indicated some support for the project and that new funding was expected to become available next year. A contribution of £10,000 'in kind' match was being

sought from the Council. It was also advised that the Council would be the accountable body for the LEP funding award.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the project to support the roll out of electric vehicle charging and smart travel infrastructure across the Deepcut Mindenhurst development be supported;
- (ii) an EoI for a bid to the EM3 LEP for £4,200,000 to fund the works be supported;
- (iii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and People to submit a final bid once availability of funding is confirmed; and
- (iv) a contribution of £10,000 ‘in kind’ match funding for the roll out of electric vehicle charging and smart travel infrastructure across the Deepcut Mindenhurst development be agreed.

**92/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)
93/E	3
94/E	3

**93/E Executive Working Group notes**

The Executive received the notes of the Working Group meetings that had taken place since November 2020.

**RESOLVED that the Working Group notes be noted and that the non-exempt notes be published.**

**94/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 Climate Change Working Group notes be made public;
- (ii) the Poverty Working Group notes be made public;
- (iii) the Property Investment Working Group notes remain exempt for the present time;
- (iv) the Surrey Heath Villages Working Group notes be made public; and
- (v) all Working Group notes remaining exempt be periodically reviewed by the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer, with a view to making them public when appropriate.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held Virtually  
- Public Meeting on 17 December 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 Sharon Galliford (in place of Cllr Peter Barnett)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop, Ross Cahalane, Will Hinde, Gavin Ramothal, Jenny Rickard, Jonathan Partington and Eddie Scott

**40/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**41/P Application Number: 20/0153 - Land To The Rear Of 42 Station Road, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 7HF**

The application was for the erection of a two storey building comprising 4 two bedroom flats with associated amenity space

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been referred for determination by the Executive Head of Regulatory as the owner of the site had been a Surrey Heath councillor within the last four years

Members received the following updates on the application:

"An email has been received from Mr. D. Allen requesting that the application be deferred until the January meeting. In summary, Mr Allen claims that the agenda report was received less than 48 hours before the meeting and so there has been no time to rebut anything, despite asking to see the report for the past 6 weeks. He states that in every point in the report there is a mistake or serious irregularity and so the applicant would therefore like the opportunity to remedy this. He is also critical of the case officer's handling of the application.

*Officer comment:*

*The agenda was published on the website on Friday 4/12 and so the applicant would have had sufficient time to consider its content. No report is made available until it is published. No substantive explanation has been given as to why the report is incorrect. In the opinion of the officers there are no valid grounds to defer determination of this application.*

Consultation responses

The consultation response received from the Council's Drainage Officer recommends refusal for the following reason(s):

- Insufficient information provided for consideration.
- The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the development won't affect neighbouring property, further details are required. This location does have a flood history and the development is proposed within floodplain. No development will be permitted without prior LPA approval of a fully detailed drainage proposal and flood mitigation scheme.
- The dwelling is removing an area of floodplain that needs to be off-set by a respective reduction of ground levels elsewhere within the application site. Full details are required to indicate where land levels around the dwelling are being reduced to compensate for the loss of floodplain, providing evidence that the overall development will not displace potential standing flood water to neighbouring properties.
- Applicant to retain any existing overland flow routes will across the proposed development site to allow for land to drain after a flood. The applicant needs to demonstrate that the development will not impede flows and will not cause any nuisance flooding to any neighbouring properties.
- Applicant to provide a full site survey of the existing site topography showing the development boundary and an indicative grid of levels throughout the existing site, without any changes, to give an accurate representation of the current site conditions.
- Applicant to provide a fully detailed drainage proposal drawing, clearly annotated with all proposed attenuation measures including any asset levels (cover, soffit and invert, as appropriate). All drainage proposals to be supported by construction details.
- No pumped surface water drainage systems will be permitted.
- There is no public surface water drainage system shown to be connected directly adjacent or within the property boundary. Details of the proposed off-site surface water connection to be provided, to include the route of the surface water connection, outside of the application boundary to its outfall (known Thames Water owned asset). Details of the discharge route to

include pipe sizes, levels, locations of any on-line access chambers and any other known property or asset connections to the pipework.

- Details of the existing, retained property surface water drainage systems to be provided.
- Any new habitable buildings within the proposed development outline to have a minimum FFL of 62.1m AOD.
- As the site is liable to flood, all foul drainage systems are required to have suitable protection to prevent surface water ingress. Full details of the foul drainage system to be provided.
- Applicant is required to agree a suitable development schedule with the LPA to ensure that the drainage scheme is undertaken before any increase of risk including the retention of floodplain capacity, ensuring attenuation for the building footprint during construction, and for maintenance of overland flood routes that allow neighbouring land to drain. If the LPA agreed drainage scheme cannot be implemented prior to the building due to site constraints, a programme of temporary works will need to be agreed with the LPA to demonstrate that the working methods throughout the development period will not increase flood risk to neighbouring properties.
- Maintenance schedule for the joint development drainage responsibilities will need to be provided once the fundamental scheme details are agreed with the LPA. The schedule details provided for consideration should replicate the documentation to be provided to all property purchasers and include copies of the approved drainage layout plan, construction details, and ongoing maintenance responsibilities. The maintenance schedule should clearly state the periodic maintenance required for all identity referenced assets and apportion the financial responsibilities for the properties served, should any expense be incurred by future repair or replacement work.
- All agreed land levels to be maintained in perpetuity. All drainage systems, porous surfaces, attenuation volumes and floodplain mitigation assets to be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.
- Full site drainage and flood mitigation works to be completed, in accordance with final LPA approved drainage submission drawings, prior to first occupation.

## **ADDITIONAL REASON FOR REFUSAL**

As such a reason for refusal on drainage grounds is proposed as follows:

**6. *The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2. In the absence of a detailed drainage proposal and flood mitigation scheme it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal would be acceptable in flood risk terms in relation to the site and neighbouring properties. As such the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Policy DM10 of the Surrey***

***Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011-2028 and the National Planning Policy Framework/Practice Guidance.”***

As there was a technical problem with the viewing of the public speakers' recorded video speeches, Members agreed to defer the application.

The proposal to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 20/0153 be deferred.**

**Note 1**

**It was noted for the record that:**

- I. **Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that:**
  - a. A number of members of the Committee had been Councillors at the same time as the owner of the site
  - b. The owner of the site had contacted himself.
- II. **Councillor Helen Whitcroft declared that she had regularly exchanged comments on Social Media with the owner of the site on other matters. However she had come into the meeting with an open mind.**
- III. **Councillor Darryl Ratiram declared that:**
  - a) He had been copied into two pieces of correspondence between Mr Allen and the Council on the day of the meeting;
  - b) and one of the emails had expressed concern about the Council which he had raised with Officers separately and as a result would vote in abstention on the application.

**42/P Application Number: 20/0819 - Laurel Farm, Fairfield Lane, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9QX**

The application was for the erection of detached single storey three bedroom dwelling (Class C3) following demolition of two agricultural barns.

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 Graham Alleway due to concerns regarding the impact on the Green Belt.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**"AMENDED CONDITION**

A Phase 3 contamination report has been submitted. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has commented that the proposed protection and monitoring

measures are sufficient to part discharge the proposed Condition 4. This is now proposed to be re-worded as follows, to ensure that the agreed works are verified before occupation:

**4. (i) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until a verification report appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the agreed remediation (as recommended in Section 8 of the Phase 3 Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan – Castledine Environmental – Ref 3070D P3 West – Woking – dated 27/11/2020) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;**

**(ii) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with all other parts of the above agreed Remediation Strategy.**

**Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby approved without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment generally in accordance with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”**

Members of the Committee held reservations whether the effect of the proposed dwelling on the 0.15 deficit in housing land supply was enough to outweigh the Green Belt protection policy. In addition it was suggested that the proposal was in conflict with the exceptions in paragraph 145 in the NPPF which implied that like-for-like buildings of the same use could replace one another and it was appreciated the existing barn was inherently an agricultural building as opposed to the proposed residential dwelling.

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

**RESOLVED that application 20/0819 be granted subject to the conditions to the officer report and update.**

**Note 1**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

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

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway and Victoria Wheeler

Voting in abstention on the recommendation to grant the application:  
Councillor Sharon Galliford.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath  
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15  
3HD on 14 January 2021**

---

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| + Cllr Graham Alleway<br>Cllr Peter Barnett<br>Cllr Cliff Betton<br>Cllr Colin Dougan<br>Cllr Shaun Garrett<br>Cllr David Lewis<br>Cllr Charlotte Morley | + Cllr Robin Perry<br>Cllr Darryl Ratiram<br>Cllr Morgan Rise<br>Cllr Graham Tapper<br>Cllr Helen Whitcroft<br>Cllr Valerie White |
|--|---|
- + Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes:

Members in Attendance:

Officers Present:

**43/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

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

**44/P Application Number: 20/0747 - Kamkorp Park, Chertsey Road,  
Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6HZ**

The application was a hybrid planning application comprising: Full application for a new building for Sales, Manufacturing & Heritage (Building 2) together with test road, two new vehicular accesses onto Highams Lane, associated parking, landscaping and ancillary outbuilding. Change of use of existing buildings (comprising former BOC Headquarters) for education, storage, business and ancillary uses. Outline application with all matters reserved for 2 new buildings for Headquarters and Engineering (Building 1) and Vehicle Research and Development (Building 3).

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**“AMENDED CONDITIONS**

New condition - Condition 34:

**The test road hereby approved shall not be used before 9am or after 5pm on weekdays nor at any time at weekends or Public Holidays, unless otherwise**

**agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt public holidays includes New Years Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, all Bank Holidays, May Day, Christmas Day and Boxing Day.**

**Reason: In the interest of the residential amenities of the area and to accord with the Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Amended Condition 22 (new text in bold):

Prior to first occupation of the **full buildout** hereby approved, the proposed highway improvements at the junction of Highams Lane with B386 Chertsey Road comprising the removal or cut-back of vegetation to improve visibility west of the junction and widening of the junction bellmouth shall be completed broadly in accordance with Arup's drawing no. GMDW-ARUP-ZZ-XX-DR-C-2160 P01 and subject to detailed design and Surrey County Council's full technical and road safety auditing requirements.

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

**Further information in respect to the existing molecule building (para 8.4.3, page 21):**

The applicant has confirmed that the Molecule Building will be retained and used for storage and ancillary uses almost immediately as the applicant moves into to the site. The ancillary uses will include a range of business uses which include technicians undertaking servicing of the T50 currently being assembled at Dunsfold and also maintenance / storage of the heritage collection and other business assets.

Turning to the medium and longer term, the applicant is committed to ensuring the molecule building will feature centrally as the site comes into full operation. Works to the building to refurbish it use will start during the first quarter of this year and the long-term intention for the building is for it to be linked integrally to the wider site to educate and assist training in motor vehicle development and automotive technologies.

The molecule building would provide apprentices, students and graduates with access to existing experienced staff and existing technology helping them develop analytical skills by exposure to cutting edge thinking and by making real world knowledge accessible to these future automotive professionals, at the earliest stages of their career development. The molecule building would form a workspace to enable this to happen while providing a tangible link between industry and academia. The training academy will be funded largely from a charitable education trust set up personally by Professor Gordon Murray, in partnership with local academic institutions to be run like any other educational institute, but with the opportunity of regular work experience throughout courses, at the GMG facility all on the same site.”

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

**RESOLVED** that

- I. application 20/0747 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and planning updates; and
- II. the application be referred to the Secretary of State as a Departure from the Development Plan

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- I. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that:
  - a) he had been invited to a number of presentations on the proposal, but had not attended any; and
  - b) he had received correspondence from the applicant on the application.
- II. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that:
  - a) she had spoken to the applicant's agent in respect of the application;
  - b) she had attended a joint meeting with the applicant and with the other ward councillors;
  - c) she had received few representations on the application from local residents;
  - d) whilst she had engaged with the applicant on numerous occasions, she came into the meeting with an open mind.
- III. Councillor Colin Dougan declared that, in his role of Business and Transformation portfolio holder, he had met with the applicant at the application site.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

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

**45/P Application Number: 19/2041- Land To The North Of Bagshot Road, Bagshot Road, Chobham, Woking, Surrey**

The application was for change of use from equestrian to dog day care facility for up to 130 dogs with associated fencing, hard standing and works to existing buildings.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been referred to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Victoria Wheeler due to the concerns of local residents.

"A further objection from Chobham Parish Council has been received raising similar objections and comments to the original proposal.

There was a recent re-notification on receipt of an amended drawing. 26 further objections have been received, some of which have indicated that their previous objections have not been overcome by the amendment and re-iterating earlier objections.

The additional comments include:

- Impact on adjacent equestrian site.
- Recent flood event accentuates flood risk objection
- Would lead to establishment of day boarding kennels.
- Noise impact in combination with local school
- Noise impact on local school (teaching)
- Poor site visibility for access/egress
- Lack of facilities for staff
- Impact on local dog walking/day care businesses
- Inadequate parking would lead to overflow parking in Clappers Lane
- No drop-off facility for dog owners [*Officer comment: The proposal would include a drop off (as well as collection) service*]
- Relationship of some supporters of this application with applicant [*Officer comment: This is not a material planning consideration*]
- Reference to a Norfolk court case on noise disturbance from a dog facility [*Officer comment: Further details not provided*]
- Access provided from Clappers Lane which is inadequate for such purposes [*Officer comment: The access is proposed from the existing access on Bagshot Road*].

## AMENDED CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVE

Condition 2:

The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 102 Rev E and 111 Rev D, except where amended by conditions below, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

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

Condition 5:

Notwithstanding the details provided shown on approved drawing 102 Rev E and the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting

that Order), details of **all fencing** shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to being erected or installed . Once approved, the details shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme before the use hereby permitted is first commenced. **There shall be no variation or amendment to the approved fencing details without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and the openness of the Green Belt and in the interests of nature conservation and in accordance with Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 7:

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the times of dog collection, so that they arrive at the site from 08:30 and leave the site by **18:00** hours on Mondays to Fridays only, and operational hours, of 07:30 and 18:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays only, and maximum staffing levels of 15 staff at the site as set out in Bruce's Doggy Day Care Management Report dated September 2019.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenities and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 10:

The car parking spaces shown on the approved plan 102 Rev E shall be made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles. **Details of the cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and shall be provided prior to the commencement of the approved use.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of on-site parking accommodation, to promote sustainable modes of transport and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Condition 13:

**Notwithstanding the details provided on the approved drawing 102 Rev E, details of the proposed hardstanding shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved details shall be provided in perpetuity prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved.**

Reasons in the interests of visual and residential amenities and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative 3:

It will be expected that the external lighting details, required to be agreed under Condition 9 above, shall only provide for safe access to the building."

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Professor David Moss, on behalf of the Chobham Society, and Mr Alex Vero spoke in objection to the application. Mr Bruce Casalis, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Committee held significant concerns with the application's impact on the openness of the Greenbelt. It was felt that the intensification and the commercial development of the site; and its associated paraphernalia and equipment would result in harm to the openness of the site; and thus the greenbelt. In addition reservations were also raised in respect of the proposed acoustic fencing and its impact on residential amenity and by its inherent nature its impact on the openness of the greenbelt; as well as the existing character of the area.

Whilst it was appreciated that it was not a material planning consideration, Members also held concerns as to the proposal's ability to allow fulfillment of the requirements under the workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992, such as the provision of staff rest facilities.

As there was no proposer and seconder for the officer's recommendation, the officer's recommendation fell.

An alternative recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons below was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler, seconded by Councillor Helen Whitcroft, and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED** that

- I. application 19/2041 be refused for the following reasons:
  - the nature of the commercial use and associated paraphernalia on the land; and the impact of the fencing would be harmful to the openness of the greenbelt; and as there are no very special circumstances to outweigh the harm it is thereby contrary to the NPPF,
  - the proposed commercial use would be detrimental to the rural character of the area and by association be harmful to the residential amenity of the wider area and thereby be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document;
- II. an informative be added to the refusal to note concerns in respect of the lack of provision of facilities, included in the plans, in relation to the Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992; and
- III. the wording of the reasons for refusal and the informative be finalised by the Executive Head of Regulatory after consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee and the Ward Councillors.

### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- I. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had received correspondence from both the applicant and objectors in respect of the application;
- II. Councillor Charlotte Morley declared that she had a friend who lived close to the application site; whom she spoke to about the process of determining the application, but that she came into the meeting with an open mind; and
- III. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that:
  - i. she had received correspondence from objectors, as well as from the applicant via the phone on a number of occasions;
  - ii. she had spoken to local residents on the process of determining the application and how to communicate in respect of the application in her role as their ward councillor; but came into the meeting with an open mind.

### **Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

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

#### **46/P Application Number: 20/0153 - Land To The Rear Of 42 Station Road, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey GU16 7HF**

The application was for the erection of a two storey building comprising 4 two bedroom flats with associated amenity space.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been referred for determination by the Executive Head of Regulatory as the owner of the site had been a Surrey Heath Borough Councillor within the last 4 years.

#### **"UPDATE FROM PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 17 DECEMBER 2020**

An email has been received from Mr. D. Allen requesting that the application be deferred until the January meeting. In summary, Mr Allen claims that the agenda report was received less than 48 hours before the meeting and so there has been no time to rebut anything, despite asking to see the report for the past 6 weeks. He states that in every point in the report there is a mistake or serious irregularity and so the applicant would therefore like the opportunity to remedy this. He is also critical of the case officer's handling of the application.

*Officer comment:*

*The agenda was published on the website on Friday 4/12 and so the applicant would have had sufficient time to consider its content. No report is made available until it is published. No substantive explanation has been given as to why the report is incorrect. In the opinion of the officers there are no valid grounds to defer determination of this application.*

### Consultation responses

The consultation response received from the Council's Drainage Officer recommends refusal for the following reason(s):

- Insufficient information provided for consideration.
- The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the development won't affect neighbouring property, further details are required. This location does have a flood history and the development is proposed within floodplain. No development will be permitted without prior LPA approval of a fully detailed drainage proposal and flood mitigation scheme.
- The dwelling is removing an area of floodplain that needs to be off-set by a respective reduction of ground levels elsewhere within the application site. Full details are required to indicate where land levels around the dwelling are being reduced to compensate for the loss of floodplain, providing evidence that the overall development will not displace potential standing flood water to neighbouring properties.
- Applicant to retain any existing overland flow routes will across the proposed development site to allow for land to drain after a flood. The applicant needs to demonstrate that the development will not impede flows and will not cause any nuisance flooding to any neighbouring properties.
- Applicant to provide a full site survey of the existing site topography showing the development boundary and an indicative grid of levels throughout the existing site, without any changes, to give an accurate representation of the current site conditions.
- Applicant to provide a fully detailed drainage proposal drawing, clearly annotated with all proposed attenuation measures including any asset levels (cover, soffit and invert, as appropriate). All drainage proposals to be supported by construction details.
- No pumped surface water drainage systems will be permitted.
- There is no public surface water drainage system shown to be connected directly adjacent or within the property boundary. Details of the proposed off-site surface water connection to be provided, to include the route of the surface water connection, outside of the application boundary to its outfall (known Thames Water owned asset). Details of the discharge route to include pipe sizes, levels, locations of any on-line access chambers and any other known property or asset connections to the pipework.

- Details of the existing, retained property surface water drainage systems to be provided.
- Any new habitable buildings within the proposed development outline to have a minimum FFL of 62.1m AOD.
- As the site is liable to flood, all foul drainage systems are required to have suitable protection to prevent surface water ingress. Full details of the foul drainage system to be provided.
- Applicant is required to agree a suitable development schedule with the LPA to ensure that the drainage scheme is undertaken before any increase of risk including the retention of floodplain capacity, ensuring attenuation for the building footprint during construction, and for maintenance of overland flood routes that allow neighbouring land to drain. If the LPA agreed drainage scheme cannot be implemented prior to the building due to site constraints, a programme of temporary works will need to be agreed with the LPA to demonstrate that the working methods throughout the development period will not increase flood risk to neighbouring properties.
- Maintenance schedule for the joint development drainage responsibilities will need to be provided once the fundamental scheme details are agreed with the LPA. The schedule details provided for consideration should replicate the documentation to be provided to all property purchasers and include copies of the approved drainage layout plan, construction details, and ongoing maintenance responsibilities. The maintenance schedule should clearly state the periodic maintenance required for all identity referenced assets and apportion the financial responsibilities for the properties served, should any expense be incurred by future repair or replacement work.
- All agreed land levels to be maintained in perpetuity. All drainage systems, porous surfaces, attenuation volumes and floodplain mitigation assets to be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.
- Full site drainage and flood mitigation works to be completed, in accordance with final LPA approved drainage submission drawings, prior to first occupation.

## **ADDITIONAL REASON FOR REFUSAL**

As such a reason for refusal on drainage grounds is proposed as follows:

**6. *The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2. In the absence of a detailed drainage proposal and flood mitigation scheme it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal would be acceptable in flood risk terms in relation to the site and neighbouring properties. As such the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011-2028 and the National Planning Policy Framework/Practice Guidance.***

## **UPDATE 14 JANUARY 2020**

The landowner has submitted a detailed Planning Rebuttal in response to the agenda report. This has also been circulated to councillors. The rebuttal criticises the content of the report and alleges that the case officer has thwarted the application process and failed to engage with the applicants. These comments are being dealt with separately. In the officers' opinion none of the matters raised change the planning merits of the proposal nor the updated recommendation as reported to the December meeting."

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Mark Brown spoke in objection to the application and Mr David Allen spoke in support of the application on behalf of the agent.

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

**RESOLVED that application 20/0153 be refused for the reasons as set out in the officer's report.**

### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- I. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that:
  - i. the landowner of the site was known by himself and several members of the Committee; and
  - ii. members of the Committee had received correspondence from the landowner on the application.
- II. Councillor Darryl Ratiram declared that he would be voting in abstention on the application for the reasons that he had declared during the 17 December 2020 Planning Applications Committee Meeting.

### **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, Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillor Peter Barnett

Voting in abstention on the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillor Darryl Ratiram.

**47/P      Update on the Planning Inspectorate's decision on  
APP/D3640/W/20/3248476: Woodside Cottage Chapel Lane, GU19 5DE**

The Committee received a verbal update on the Planning Inspectorate's appeal decision on APP/D3640/W/20/3248476 Woodside Cottage (planning application 19/0235), from the Executive Head of Regulatory.

It was explained to the Committee why the Council had chosen not to actively defend the Committee's reasons for refusal. In addition it was underlined that the decision letter issued by the Planning Inspector stated that the Council had responded reasonably and responsibly given the change in situation in respect of its 5 year housing land supply.

Going forward, the importance of having a 5 year housing land supply was reemphasised. In addition it was noted by the Chairman that the topic of planning appeals would be discussed at the Governance Working Group and that there would be future training for Members on constructing defendable reasons for refusal.

**RESOLVED that the update be noted.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held virtually on  
23 November 2020**

---

+ Cllr Cliff Betton (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram (Vice Chairman)

- |                         |                         |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| + Cllr Rodney Bates     | + Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam |
| + Cllr Edward Hawkins   | - Cllr Valerie White    |
| + Cllr Charlotte Morley |                         |
- + Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllrs Sharon Galliford and Adrian Page

Officers Present: Stephen Bladon, BDO  
Martin Hone, Executive Head: Finance (Interim)  
Alex Middleton, Senior Auditor  
Gavin Ramtohal, Head of Legal & Monitoring Officer

**13/AS Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**14/AS Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**15/AS External Audit**

The Committee received a report setting out BDO's (the Council's external auditor) plans for their audit of the Council's 2019/20 financial records

It was noted that there had been a delay in the current Interim Executive Head of Finance and committee members receiving the report, therefore limiting the opportunity for Members to review the Audit Plan and thus inform the audit process. The delay had been caused by a number of issues, including the departure of the Council's Executive Head of Finance earlier in the year, his interim replacement then leaving in July and a second interim Executive Head of Finance not taking up the role until mid-August. It was recognised that the circumstances leading to these delays would need to be addressed to ensure they would not be repeated.

Both the Interim Executive Head of Finance and BDO's Audit Partner accepted that these delays should have been avoided and undertook to ensure in future:

- i. A wider distribution of the draft Audit Plan (e.g., to Chief Accountant as well as Executive Head of Finance);
- ii. The receipt, acknowledgement and actioning of papers from BDO to the Council to be a standing item on the agenda of periodic meeting between BDO and the Council's Finance Officers.

It was reported that the audit's scope had been determined by the National Audit Office's Code of Audit Practice and would include auditing the financial statements, reviewing arrangements to secure value for money through the economic, efficient and effective use of its resources and, where appropriate, exercise the auditor's wider reporting powers and duties.

In setting out their approach to the audit of the accounts, DBO had identified the following areas that would be subject to specific scrutiny:

- Management override of financial controls
- Revenue (and expenditure) recognition
- Valuation of non-current assets
- Pension liability valuation
- Allowance for non-collection of receivables
- Going concern
- Sustainability of finances
- Finance statement preparation and informed decision making

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

- It was clarified that the reference to fraud related to fraudulent claims perpetrated against the Council for example Housing Benefit and the majority of these were worth less than £10,000.
- The Jersey Property Unit Trust would be audited by the BDO Jersey Team and the findings include in the main audit report however the Trust's year end was December 2019.
- The additional audit fee reflects a combination of the additional work required to deal with the number of errors identified in the 2018/19 accounts and the increased complexity of the audit in recent years for example the audit of the JPUT and the Council's expanded investment property portfolio.
- It was clarified that if a property was bought solely for the purposes of income generation then it would be recognised as an investment in the accounts. If a property was acquired for a combination of investment income and regeneration purposes then in accordance with the CIPFR Code of Audit and Practice it must be shown in the accounts as 'Other Land and Buildings'.

It was noted that, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the reporting deadlines in relation to completing the audit had been changed. Councils had been given until the end of July 2020 to finalise their accounts and audits had to be completed by the end of November 2020. An additional meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee to discuss the audited report had been scheduled for Monday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021.

The Committee noted the update.

## **16/AS Internal Audit Annual Report**

The Committee received a report summarising the work of the Council's Internal Audit Function during the 2019-20 financial year.

During 2019/20, 21 planned internal audits and two ad hoc audits (of the Elections and the Swift Lane Traveller Enforcement Action) were completed. Arising from these audits 108 recommendations were made of which 15 were classified as being essential and 93 were deemed to be desirable.

Agreeing deadlines for the implementation of audit recommendations was a collaborative process as far as possible because it was recognised that target dates needed to be achievable. If it was not possible to implement an action due to resourcing then this was considered a resourcing issue and not an audit matter. Of the targets agreed during the 2019/20 audits only two recommendations were still to be implemented and the audit team was working with officers on these. If they had not been resolved by January 2021 then a report would be brought to the Committee.

The Committee noted the report.

#### **17/AS Effectiveness of the Internal Audit Function**

The Committee received a report setting out an assessment of the effectiveness of the Council's Internal Audit function.

The Committee considered a report setting out the findings of a review of the effectiveness of the Council's Internal Audit function. The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2006 required all local authorities to annually carry out a review of the effectiveness of its systems of internal control. The review measured the audit function against nine elements: organisational independence, a formal mandate, unrestricted access, sufficient funding, competent leadership, objective staff, competent staff, stakeholder support, and professional audit standards.

The Committee noted the report.

#### **18/AS Annual Standards Report**

The Committee received a report providing an update on the work of the Monitoring Officer during the 2020/21 municipal year.

It was noted that since April 2020 the Monitoring Officer had dealt with 17 complaints relating to Borough and Parish Councillors breaching the Code of Conduct. Of these, it had been found that the Code of Conduct had been breached on only a small number of occasions and the breaches themselves had been minor and could be resolved through informal resolution processes. In addition, the Monitoring Officer and the Deputy Monitoring Officer had provided advice and guidance to the Parish Council Clerks to help them better understand and apply the rules of debate at meetings and supported them to provide appropriate advice and guidance during meetings.

It was stressed that the Monitoring Officer would usually only share information about a complaint with the parties affected and many complaints, on investigation, were found to be unsubstantiated and due to personality differences or the relationships between the individual parties concerned.

#### **19/AS Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee would take place on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021.

**CHAIRMAN**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Performance  
and Finance Scrutiny Committee held  
virtually on 25 November 2020**

---

+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam (Chairman)  
- Shaun Garrett (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Dan Adams	+ Cllr Edward Hawkins
+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Cllr Kristian Wrenn

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Valerie White for Cllr Shaun Garrett

**Members in Attendance:** Cllr Rodney Bates

**Executive Portfolio Holders in Attendance:**

Cllr Colin Dougan, Executive Portfolio Holder: Business and Transformation

Cllr David Lewis, Executive Portfolio Holder: Finance

Cllr Alan McClafferty, Leader

**Officers in Attendance:**

Sarah Bainbridge, Senior Organisational Development Advisor

Robert Fox, Revenues and Benefits Manager

Daniel Harrison, Executive Head: Business

Martin Hone, (Interim) Executive Head: Finance

Louise Livingston, Executive Head: Transformation

Tim Pashen, (Interim) Chief Executive

Richard Payne: Executive Head: Corporate

Jenny Rickard: Executive Head: Regulatory

**19/PF Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**20/PF Portfolio Holder Update: Business & Transformation**

The Committee received a report summarising the work of the Council which was encompassed by the Business and Transformation Portfolio.

The Portfolio covered a number of areas including: building control, Camberley Theatre, car parking, communications and marketing, corporate property, data protection and freedom of information, economic development and ICT and digital services.

It was reported that the restrictions arising from the Covid-19 pandemic had impacted significantly on the Theatre's revenue which between 17<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and 17<sup>th</sup> August

2020 had seen a year on year fall in gross sales of 98% with sales falling from £342,614.40 in 2019 to £7,040.50 in 2020.

Revenue from the town centre car parks, which had seen parking fees suspended during the spring and summer had fallen by approximately 85% when compared to the same period in 2019. However approximately 70% of this lost income would be recoverable under the Government's Sales, Fees and Charges Reimbursement Scheme. During the first and second lockdowns income from the car parks had been almost back to their usual levels and it was expected that income from car parking would recover fully once restrictions were lifted.

Initial figures of 11,000 job losses in the Borough over the past year had been queried with the Office of National Statistics (ONS) as being exceptionally high and they were subsequently reduced to 4,000 job losses. Although this was still a significant reduction in job numbers the fall was attributed to a small number of job losses across a number of companies rather than large number of job losses from a small number of companies. Over the course of the Covid-19 pandemic to date, there had been a 300% increase in the number of Universal Credit claims being made within the Borough and analysis of these had found that 48% of new claims were being made by those who had been self-employed.

The Council had repurposed the Kevin Cantlon Fund to provide funding for a number of measures to support those who were self-employed and small businesses. Officers were working with the DWP and Job Centre Plus to develop a Youth Hub in the Borough which would deliver careers support, interview advice and job application support to 18-24 year olds in the Borough who had found themselves out of work or education. The first tier of the Government's tiered system of grants to support businesses through the pandemic had now been established in the Borough and officers were waiting for guidance on the tier 2 and 3 support packages before these were rolled out.

The Committee commended the Council's newsletter Heathscene. It was acknowledged that it was difficult to ascertain the size of the publication's impact however there was anecdotal evidence to support that it was valued for example the number of enquiries about the meals at home service increased significantly following the publication of an article about the service. Furthermore, it was stressed that Heathscene enabled the Council to communicate key messages to those residents who did not use social media.

The Committee commended the quality of the Council's social media output which had improved in both quality and quantity in recent years.

Other areas of note included:

- The emerging Local Plan would set out how the Council proposed to encourage new technologies including fibre broadband into the Borough.
- It was clarified that the Eli Lily site had been sold to an organisation that was projected to bring approximately 650 jobs into the borough.
- Reports that a number of the TiksPac stands were currently empty would be followed up.

The Committee noted the update.

## **21/PF Portfolio Holder Update: Finance**

The Committee received a report summarising the work of the Council encompassed by the Finance Portfolio.

It was reported that the Council currently had a gross service expenditure of approximately £44million which was funded by a mix of income from investments, grants, Business Rates, Council Tax and chargeable fees. Although Government funding had fallen by £2.7million in cash terms since 2010/11 the Council had managed to maintain services by increasing efficiency and generating income through its investments.

The timing of the pandemic meant that there had been minimal impact on the 2019/20 financial year however there would be significant implications for the 2020/21 financial year not only because of reduced income through the lower collection of rents from commercial property fees and charges, for example car parking and theatre, but also because of increasing demands for services.

To date, 66.63% (£52.7million) of the expected income from Council Tax had been collected. It was expected that by the end of the financial year 99% of income expected from Council Tax would have been collected. During the first lockdown period there had been a 298% increase in the number of applications received for Council Tax Support and 2,562 new claims were processed between 1<sup>st</sup> April and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020 (Compared to 1,234 applications for the whole of the 2019/20 financial year). In addition, to this increase in new claims, 8,071 Local Council Tax Support changes were processed in the first six months of the 2020/21 financial year compared to 9,951 changes for the whole of the 2019/20 financial year.

To date, the Council had collected 61.73% (£13.6million) of the Business rates expected against a projected total of £22.1million. The Council's Revenues and Benefits Section had paid out a total of £15.2million in Small Business and Retail, Leisure and Hospitality Grants to 1,189 local business to support them through the pandemic. Following the closure of the Magistrates Court on 23<sup>rd</sup> March, statutory reminders for non-payment of council tax or business rates had not been sent out. Instead soft reminders and text messages had been sent signposting residents and businesses to sources of support if they were struggling financially. The statutory reminder process had restarted in early October 2020.

Work to develop the budget for the 2021/22 financial year was underway. The budget setting process would involve an element of zero based budgeting techniques which would focus on services which were particularly reliant on income from fees and charges.

The Committee noted the update.

## **22/PF Treasury Management**

The Committee received a report setting out the performance of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020.

It was reported that the Council currently had £11.746million in cash investments and held £170million of borrowing, which was being used to fund a range of capital programmes. The borrowing was made up of £53million of longer term loans from the Public Works Loans Board with the remainder of shorter term loans from other local authorities. It was noted that borrowing had increased by £10million on the previous year's borrowing due to the construction of a new leisure centre.

It was reported that, in April and June, the Council had received £23million of central government funding to support small and medium sized businesses impacted by the pandemic. This had been temporarily invested and to date, £15million of the funding had been disbursed to the Borough's business community.

The Committee noted the report.

## **23/PF Half Year Finance Report**

The Committee received a report setting out a summary of the Council's financial performance during the second quarter (July to September 2020) of the 2020/21 financial year.

It was noted that at this stage in a new financial year it was difficult to provide an accurate forecast as to the outturn at year end and this situation had been exacerbated by the pandemic and it was projected that there would be a £1.4million overspend on the budget at the end of the financial year.

It was reported that rental income from the commercial, industrial and office properties owned by the Council was holding up well however rents from retail units were down and it was anticipated that there would be a shortfall against budgeted income at the end of the financial year.

The Committee noted the report.

## **24/PF Half Year Performance Report**

The Committee considered a report summarising the performance and achievement of the Council against its stated objectives, priorities and success measures in the first six months of the 2020/21 municipal year.

It was noted that a number of projects or targets had been delayed because it had been necessary to divert staff away from their usual work to provide welfare support to residents during the pandemic and initial lock down restrictions however these were expected to be back on track by the end of the year.

Due to the number of constraints on the site, the Land East of Knoll Road regeneration project had been put on hold and resources had been redirected into projects that were already progressing.

Concerns about Japanese Knotweed in Heatherside and Surrey County Council's decision to classify its removal as weed control and therefore not their responsibility would be followed up.

It was agreed that ward members would be included in any consultation work when the Physical Activity Strategy was reviewed and revised.

The work to improve recycling rates and reduce contamination of dry mixed recycling at flats was noted and it was suggested that ward councillors could provide a useful source of information to help identify problem areas.

The Committee expressed their thanks to all staff for their work to continue delivering services and maintaining the Borough's green spaces during the pandemic.

The Committee noted the report.

**25/PF Infrastructure Funding Statement 2019-20**

The Committee received a report setting out the Council's Annual Infrastructure Funding Statement for 2019/20.

The statement was an annual report which summarised all the financial and non-financial developer contributions relating to Section 106 (S106) Legal Agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) received by the Council during the year. The statement also listed the infrastructure projects which would be wholly or partly funded by either CIL or S106 funding.

The Committee was informed that there were currently four applications for projects that were to be funded via CIL which had been received during the 2019/20 financial year and which had not yet been approved predominantly because the projects had not been fully costed.

In order to ensure that the Borough achieved the most effective use of the CIL monies received possible new spending arrangements were under development. If approved it would enable more residents to benefit from the infrastructure provided through CIL.

The Committee noted the report.

**26/PF Property Investment Task and Finish Group**

It was reported that the work of the Property Investment Task and Finish Group was progressing. It was expected that the report would be brought to the Committee's meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2021 for consideration.

**27/PF Work Programme**

The Committee noted a report setting out the Committee's proposed work programme for the remainder of the 2020/21 municipal year.

**CHAIRMAN**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Performance  
and Finance Scrutiny Committee held  
Virtually - Public Meeting on 5 January  
2021**

---

+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam (Chairman)

+ Cllr Shaun Garrett (Vice Chairman)

- Cllr Dan Adams
- + Cllr Graham Alleway
- + Cllr Peter Barnett
- + Cllr Cliff Betton
- Cllr Vivienne Chapman
- + Cllr Sarah Jane Croke
- Cllr Sharon Galliford

- + Cllr Edward Hawkins
- + Cllr Darryl Ratiram
- + Cllr Graham Tapper
- + Cllr Victoria Wheeler
- + Cllr Kristian Wrenn

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Peter Barnett for Cllr Sharon Galliford

Non-Committee Members in Attendance: Cllrs Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White

Executive Portfolio Holders in Attendance: Cllr Adrian Page, Planning & People

Officers Present: Robert Glen, Senior Corporate Enforcement Officer  
Julia Greenfield, Corporate Enforcement Manager  
Louise Livingston, Executive Head: Transformation  
Jonathan Partington, Development Manager  
Gavin Ramtohal, Head of Legal  
Jenny Rickard, Executive Head: Regulatory  
Ryno van der Hoven, Senior Corporate Enforcement Officer

**28/PF Surrey Heath Local Enforcement Plan**

The Committee considered a report setting out a Member Call-in in respect of a decision taken by the Executive on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2020 to approve a Local Enforcement Plan for Surrey Heath which would provide a framework for the investigation and assessment of breaches of planning control in line with current national policy.

The Plan, which replaced one initially approved in 2014, would not only provide the Council with up to date guidance on how to establish priorities and procedures for the investigation of alleged breaches of planning control thus enabling planning enforcement resources to be managed and prioritised effectively but it would also provide the public with clear and transparent information about what they could expect from the Council's planning enforcement service.

The Executive's decision to approve the Plan had been called in by Councillor Alleway, supported by Councillor Wheeler, who expressed a number of concerns about the proposed Plan including that:

- The Plan did not adequately address the monitoring of planning decisions.
- The Plan did not make sufficient provision for ward councillors to provide input into enforcement matters.
- The Plan failed to provide a mechanism by which ward councillors could monitor the progress of any enforcement activities.

- There did not appear to be opportunities for routine audit by members of the consistency enforcing planning conditions.
- The Plan implied that Retrospective Planning Applications would be supported

The Committee considered the grounds for each part of the Call In and the following points were noted:

*Call in reason Paragraph 1.0 - The Plan appears to not address monitoring of planning decisions as NPPF para 58*

Paragraph 58 of the NPPF sets out that effective enforcement is important in maintaining public confidence in the planning system, that enforcement action is discretionary and local planning authorities should act proportionately when responding to suspected breaches of planning control. The NPPF also states that Planning Authorities should use Local Enforcement Plans to proactively manage enforcement in a way that was appropriate for their area including how they would monitor the implementation of planning permissions.

A request for the implementation of a register of planning conditions so that any breaches could be routinely monitored was acknowledged. It was stressed that there was no evidence of significant or widespread breaches of planning conditions in the Borough. Consequently, any monitoring and enforcement activity should be proportionate to the scale of the issue in Surrey Heath. Furthermore, the routine monitoring of all planning conditions would significantly impact on the current resources of the planning enforcement team and significant additional resources would need to be identified to deal with this additional work. It was agreed that the work generated by the development of an enforcement register would be reviewed after six months to ensure that resource levels were appropriate.

It was proposed that a report detailing the progress of any enforcement activities would be taken to the Planning Applications Committee on a quarterly basis to enable any breaches to be monitored by councillors.

*Call in reason Paragraph 2.3 made no reference to ward councillor input on behalf of residents when deciding the extent of public amenity impact.*

It was acknowledged that ward councillors provided a key source of knowledge with regard to the areas they represented. However care had to be taken to ensure that councillors did not leave themselves open to accusations of bias when making planning decisions which must be considered on their individual merits regardless of the strength of local public feeling.

It was agreed that ward members would be kept informed of any enforcement activity in their ward. However, any consultation should be of a light touch in nature.

*Call-In Reason Paragraph 4.5 – Councillors access to up to date progress or status of activity appears missing, and currently means we have to chase officers for updates*

Advice from the Council's Information Governance Officer had cautioned against the sharing of information that could lead the Council to be non-compliant with GDPR legislation.

It was considered that the proposed quarterly monitoring report to the Planning Applications Committee would provide sufficient information to monitor the progress of enforcement activities.

*Paragraph 5.6 – This section does not assert that retrospective applications are not an alternative way to acquire planning permission [...] Due process should be emphasised.*

Retrospective planning applications were a legitimate, albeit risky, means of gaining planning permission. Any applications receive for retrospective permission are determined in the same way as normal planning applications and each application was considered on its own merits. Furthermore, national planning guidance on enforcement recognised that retrospective planning applications could be legitimately used to resolve enforcement concerns.

It was stressed that the Plan did not remove a councillor's right to call in any planning application. Retrospective planning applications were included in the Planning Applications Weekly List which was circulated to a range of individuals including all ward councillors and councillors could within the proscribed time frames continue to call in retrospective planning applications.

It was agreed that the following wording from paragraph 5.6 of the policy “many breaches of planning control occur because the applicant simply did not realise permission was required” would be removed and replaced with “Applicants are highly recommended to seek planning advice when contemplating development.”

*Paragraph 5.8 - The granting of planning permission does not appear to afford Planning Committee the option of scrutiny just like most other planning applications.*

It was reiterated that details of retrospective planning applications received were published on a weekly basis alongside applications for proposed developments and there was nothing in the Plan that changed or removed a councillor's right to call in a retrospective planning application. The Committee noted the actions already taking place in this respect and it was agreed that no changes would be made to this paragraph.

*Paragraph 5.16 – There is no councillor communication in the process and many residents will not directly engage with council, only via their elected representatives.*

It was agreed that the plan would be updated to reflect that if a third party contacted their ward councillor asking them to act as a conduit then the case officer would liaise with the ward councillor and keep them updated on the outcomes of any enforcement investigations. The flowchart in Appendix 1 would be amended to reflect this.

*Paragraphs 5.18 and 5.19 – Four and ten year rules can be used to circumvent due planning process by concealing developments.*

The Committee was informed that the four and ten year rules were set out in the Localism Act 2011. The assessment of deliberate concealment of a development was set at a high level and consequently any matters dealt with relating to concealment were considered on a case by case basis with direct legal input.

*General – The policy appears not to be the subject of routine audit by members.*

The proposed quarterly monitoring report which would be considered by the Planning Applications Committee would provide regular opportunities for members to monitor the progress of enforcement activities.

It was agreed that the Plan would be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that it was remained up to date and policies were aligned with statutory guidance and regulations.

It was noted that the appendices and forms were live documents to be used by officers operationally and did not a formal part of the policy document. It was agreed that these would be removed from the policy document.

**RESOLVED** that:

- i. The Executive be advised to reconsider the approval of the Local Enforcement Plan subject to the following amendments being made to the Plan:
  - a. A report detailing the progress of any enforcement activities would be produced and considered by the Planning Applications Committee on a quarterly basis to enable any breaches to be monitored by councillors.
  - b. *Paragraph 2.3 of the Local Enforcement Plan to be updated to reflect consultation with ward members on any enforcement activity in their ward.*
  - c. Paragraph 5.6 of the Local Enforcement Plan would be revised and the wording “many breaches of planning control occur because the applicant simply did not realise permission was required” would be removed and replaced with “Applicants are highly recommended to seek planning advice when contemplating development.”
  - d. The plan would be updated to reflect that if a third party contacted their ward councillor asking them to act as a conduit then the case officer would liaise with the ward councillor and keep them updated on the outcomes of any enforcement investigations.
  - e. The flowchart in Appendix 1 would be amended to reflect the changes outlined at recommendation 1d above.
  - f. Appendices and forms would be removed from the policy document.
  - g. The Plan would be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that it was remained up to date and policies were aligned with statutory guidance and regulations.
- ii. A register of enforcement activities would be developed. The resourcing required to maintain the register would be monitored and reviewed after six months to ensure that resource levels were appropriate.

**Chairman**

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Performance  
and Finance Scrutiny Committee held  
virtually on 27 January 2021**

---

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam (Chairman)</li><li>+ Cllr Shaun Garrett (Vice Chairman)</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Cllr Dan Adams</li><li>+ Cllr Graham Alleway</li><li>+ Cllr Cliff Betton</li><li>+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman</li><li>+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke</li><li>+ Cllr Sharon Galliford</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>+ Cllr Edward Hawkins</li><li>+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram</li><li>+ Cllr Graham Tapper</li><li>+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler</li><li>+ Cllr Kristian Wrenn</li></ul> |
|---|--|--|

**Members in Attendance:**

Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath, Cllr Robin Perry, Cllr Pat Tedder and Cllr Valerie White

**Executive Portfolio Holders in Attendance:**

Cllr David Mansfield, Executive Portfolio Holder: Environment and Health

Cllr Adrian Page, Executive Portfolio Holder: Planning and People

**Officers in Attendance:**

Sarah Bainbridge, Senior Organisational Development Advisor

Julia Greenfield, Corporate Enforcement Manager

Martin Hone, (Interim) Executive Head: Finance

Louise Livingston, Executive Head: Transformation

Richard Payne Executive Head: Corporate

Jon Partington, Development Manager

Tim Pashen, Executive Head, Community

Gavin Ramtohal, Head of Legal Services

Jane Reeves, Planning Policy Manager

Jenny Rickard, Executive Head: Regulatory

James Robinson, Senior Environmental Health Officer

Darren Williams, Head of Community Services

**29/PF Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2020 were agreed as being a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**30/PF Executive Portfolio Update: Planning and People**

The Committee received a report summarising the Council's work during the past twelve months which was encompassed within the Planning and People Portfolio; a portfolio which covered a number of areas including planning policy, conservation, planning enforcement, drainage, land charges and development management.

The delivery of new housing continued to be a priority area for the Government and a review of the Council's five year housing land supply, completed in August 2020, had established that the Council could demonstrate a 4.85 year housing land supply. There were a number of constraints on the land available for development in the Borough including the Green Belt, the Thames Basins Heaths Special Protection Area and its associated buffer zones and the availability of sites to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) particularly in the west of the Borough. There was the option to

compulsory purchase land that could be used for SANGS however the Council had to be able to demonstrate that all other options had been explored including working with neighbouring authorities and approaching landowners directly and that no suitable alternative land could be identified before this procedure could be implemented.

Flooding continued to be a problem in areas of the Borough. It was noted that some actions within the Chobham Flood Alleviation Scheme were still outstanding and it was agreed that Officers would liaise with ward councillors and the portfolio holder to put pressure on the Environment Agency to complete any outstanding actions. The Environment Agency had reviewed a number of watercourses within the villages upstream of Chobham and it was agreed that the outcomes of these reviews would be shared with members.

The Committee was informed that of the planning decisions which went to appeal the majority of decisions taken by officers under delegated powers were being upheld. However where appeals were made following a decision by the Planning Applications Committee to go against officer recommendations the majority of the appeals decisions were going against the Council. It was agreed that the appeals figures for the past year would be circulated. A report detailing the outcomes of planning appeals was taken annually to the Planning Applications Committee for information.

Resourcing continued to be an ongoing pressure which was exacerbated by a national shortage of planners. This meant that the Council was having to recruit staff in a highly competitive jobs market and it was not always possible to fill vacancies arising in the planning and enforcement teams quickly or with permanent staff.

The Committee noted the update.

### **31/PF Executive Portfolio Update: Environment and Health**

The Committee received a report summarising the Council's work during the past twelve months which was encompassed within the Environment and Health People Portfolio. A portfolio which covered a number of areas including air quality, older peoples' services, emergency planning and business continuity, environmental health, waste and recycling and health and wellbeing.

The Covid-19 pandemic had had a substantial impact on services within the portfolio in terms of both service delivery and income generation for example whilst there had been a significant increase in the number of new customers of the Meals at Home service there had been a significant reduction in the number of journeys provided by the Community Transport service and Emergency Planning and business continuity had played a key role in the Council's response.

The Council had entered into a full partnership with Runnymede Borough Council to deliver community services across both areas, a partnership which would go live on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021. The partnership aimed to provide sustainable services which met the needs of all vulnerable residents and would be overseen by a Partnership Board which would set objectives and targets for the service and monitor and evaluate all aspects of the service. Whilst all staff would be employed by Runnymede Borough Council there would be a physical presence in both council offices.

The number of meals at home products served over the first two quarters of 2019/20 (32,985) meant that the service would exceed the annual target of 35,000 products. To ensure that the Meals at Home Service could sustain this level of demand officers were exploring a number of different options including reconfiguring routes to make the best

use of spare capacity in the current Runneymede routes and leasing an additional van. The booking service was also being revised so that all bookings would be co-ordinated by staff in Surrey Heath.

Emergency Planning and Business Continuity services had been significantly impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic which had been declared to be a major incident on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2020. Throughout the pandemic the Council had worked closely with partners across the Borough to support residents. Further support was provided to the Borough following a major heathland fire on Chobham Common in August 2020 and Storm Dennis in February 2020.

The work with the Frimley Health and Care Integrated Care System was noted. It was acknowledged that a significant proportion of Surrey Heath's residents were covered by the Surrey Heartlands Clinical Commissioning Area and it was clarified that the Council was working in partnership with Surrey Heartlands on a number of projects including a hospital discharge service and an Oximetry project. It was agreed that future portfolio updates would include updates on partnership work with both Surrey Heartlands and Frimley.

It was agreed that the figures for the number of residents supported through the hospital discharge service would be provided for both 2020 and 2019.

The Committee was advised that the Frimley Health and Care Integrated Pathway would provide a number of opportunities for greater delivery of partnership service delivery and a cross party committee would be established to explore how this piece of work might be taken forward and developed.

The Committee was informed that the number of public nuisance complaints received during 2020 had doubled when compared to the number received in 2019 (approximately 500 in 2020 compared to 255 in 2019) with a significant number of complaints relating to bonfires during the periods of Covid-19 restrictions. It was agreed that data relating to complaints received would be included in future portfolio updates.

It was agreed that Joint Waste Solutions would be asked to provide an update on the recent unavailability of the online reporting procedures for missed bins and online payments.

The Committee noted the update.

## **32/PF Air Quality Review 2020**

The Committee considered a report setting out a review of air quality across the Borough during 2019/20.

The annual Air Quality Review formed part of the Council's statutory requirements in relation to Local Air Quality Management under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995. The report set out the results of air quality monitoring work, detailed the activities and strategies employed by the Council to improve air quality and reviewed the progress made in this area.

The 40micrograms per cubic metre limit for NO<sub>2</sub> particulate levels had been defined by the World Health Organisation to protect the health of asthmatic children in urban areas and the location of monitoring equipment and the testing regime used were prescribed in legislation.

It was confirmed that there were two monitoring stations in the vicinity of Frimley Park Hospital, one adjacent to the hospital entrance and a second adjacent to the Grove Primary School. These monitoring stations had been out in place as part of the work on the Blackwater Valley Relief Road and the data collected would be reported for the first time in the 2021 annual review.

Surrey County Council had supported the development of a bespoke air quality themed performing arts show and associated workshops that would help educate children and young people about air quality. In 2019, those schools in the Borough where congestion was known to be a significant issue were offered the opportunity to participate in these workshops at no cost to the school however to date none had taken up the opportunity. The Portfolio Holder agreed that the promotion of these workshops would be followed up with the County Council.

It was acknowledged that increasing the uptake and use of electric vehicles would be a key component in improving local air quality and that ensuring that the public charging infrastructure supported the use of electric vehicles would help facilitate this. It was stressed that any electric charging points installed in public car parks should wherever possible be capable of rapid charging.

The Committee commended the comprehensive report.

### **33/PF Annual Plan 2021/22**

The Committee considered a report setting out the draft Annual Plan for 2021/22. The Annual Plan set out the Council's main goals, projects and targets for the 2021/22 financial year and would be presented to the Executive for approval in March.

It was noted that the Borough's residents received primary healthcare provision from both the Frimley Clinical Commissioning Group and the Surrey Heartlands Clinical Commissioning Group and both organisations would need to be integrated into SHBC Priority 6: Integrated Care System (ICS) and Surrey Heath Health Alliance.

It was requested that the proposed target to review litter bin provisions under Community Priority 5: Joint Waste Solutions include reference to any requests made for litter bins in a particular location.

It was clarified that the Covid Impact Members Workshop referenced under SHBC Priority 3: Camberley Town centre Regeneration would take place as part of the Town Centre Working Group meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> February 2021.

The Committee approved the draft Annual Plan 2021/22 for submission to the Executive.

### **34/PF Corporate Risk Register**

The Committee considered a report setting out the Council's Corporate Risk Register.

The Risk Register summarised the main risks faced by the Council in relation to achieving the objectives and priorities defined in the Council's Corporate Plan, noted the mitigating actions being taken to ameliorate those risks and identified any further action needed to further reduce the impact of those risks. The register was reviewed regularly by the officer Risk Management Group and the Corporate Management Team.

The Covid-19 pandemic had had a significant impact on the Council's services and the risk register had been reviewed to take these impacts into account. It was clarified that level of funding that the Government would reimburse a local authority in respect of fees and charges lost due to Covid-19 restrictions were calculated based on the difference between the budget as it was in February 2020 and the fees actually collected less an administration charge.

The Committee noted the report.

**35/PF Work Programme**

The Committee noted a report setting out their work programme for the remainder of the 2020/21 municipal year.

**36/PF Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee would take place on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> March 2021 at 7pm.

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the External  
Partnerships Select Committee held at  
Surrey Heath House on 1 December  
2020**

---

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

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

Members in Attendance: Cllr Victoria Wheeler

Officers Present: Jayne Boitoult and Louise Livingston

**11/EP Accent Housing**

The Committee received a presentation from Rob Mills, Director of Customer Experience (South), of Accent Housing updating the Committee in respect of their ongoing issues with their repair service affecting their Surrey Heath properties.

Accent's new maintenance contractor, Axis Europe, had now been appointed for approximately 12 months. Out of the 1216 repair cases which were handed back to Accent from its previous maintenance contractor, CHS, 1204 cases had been completed with 12 which were still outstanding.

Despite this the COVID-19 pandemic had severely disrupted Accent's Repair Service; and in March the housing supplier had to pause the taking-on of new maintenance cases and only fully mobilized its repair service in September. This had caused a new backlog of repairs, which were being managed by weekly review meetings, work with Axis Europe to take-on 6 additional maintenance operatives as well as sub-contractors, the provision of additional administrative support to help Axis manage its workload.

Since last presenting to the Committee, Axis had made the Accent Customer Liaison Officer role a permanent position and continued its new emphasis on monitoring satisfaction ratings which were being collected from residents via a free text service. The positive improvements were exemplified by the overall average customer satisfaction ratings which had improved from 3.84 out of 5 in February 2020 to 4.23 out of 5 in the Autumn of 2020.

Even though Accent's programme of long-term planned works was much smaller than normal in order to prioritise the repairs works backlog, Accent's planned capital works totaled at a £1.5million capital investment with some of the works

deferred to 2021/22. It was planned that all replacements which were deemed to be a priority were to be completed by March.

As a result of the pandemic many of Accent's tenants had been badly financially hit. This was illustrated by a severe upturn in the amount of Accent tenants which were on universal credit. Whilst the number of Accent tenants within Surrey Heath on Universal Credit was 96 in February 2020, this number had increased to 670 Accent tenants in December 2020. As a result of economic hardship Accent tenants had also built up larger levels of debt and many had gone into rent arrears. This issue was being proactively tackled by Accent's Income Team in their South Office who were implementing a new rent arrears policy and were aiming to establish a collaborative approach with residents when dealing with arrears.

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

- There was a greater positivity around Accent's maintenance service and Members had noticed a significant reduction in the amount of negative correspondence from Accent residents.
- Accent were ready for the combined negative impacts of the pandemic and Brexit. Accent had been internally modelling the impact of an economic downturn on their future rental income and the amount of their residents in rent arrears. Accent had also ready noticed struggles in obtaining materials needed for maintenance work as a result of Brexit.
- Within Surrey Heath Accent currently had a backlog of 1800 maintenance cases. This was in contrast to a normal run-rate of 600-800 outstanding cases.
- The amount of Accent residents claiming Universal Credit was in line with the 300% increase in Universal Credit applications for Surrey Heath as a whole; and it was reiterated that Accent worked with residents to tackle rent arrears and that eviction was only a last-resort. Accent also worked with organisations such as Citizens Advice Surrey Heath, Step Change, local foodbanks and BESOM in order to refer and signpost residents which were facing hardship.
- Accent had a relative level of financial resilience due to recent bonds which the company had sold and loan facilities which it could easily access.
- Accent were already in conversation with the Council in respect of a parcel of Council-owned land on Sullivan Road which could lead to expansion of its current site on Sullivan Road.

The Committee thanked Rob and Holly for their presentation and answers; and agreed that it would be positive if Accent presented to the Committee again half way through the 2021/22 municipal year.

## 12/EP **Citizens Advice Surrey Heath**

The Committee considered a presentation from Citizens Advice Surrey Heath (CASH) in respect of continued work throughout the pandemic and its future challenges.

CASH were committed to continuing to provide an independent, impartial and free service to the residents of Surrey Heath. In addition to this CASH provided governmental organisations, the Council and the third sector, with vital information about its cases, whom accessed their service and about the demographics of the area. Nationally this also allowed the Citizens Advice Bureau to work as a pressure-group lobbying Government.

CASH's core financial funding came from the Council's Revenue Grant Scheme. However the Council highly benefitted from the relationship and certified modelling showed that the public value of CASH's volunteers amounted to £290,000. Whilst CASH had always continued to help Surrey Heath residents with a wide range of issues, statistics had shown that CASH's clients had increasing amounts of issues per person. Whilst in the 2018-19 financial year there was a 3 issues per person average, in the 2019-20 financial year the average amount of issues per CASH client had risen to 4.

After the first peak of the pandemic and a lull in service-uptake in May, CASH resumed select face-to-face appointments for those clients who were unable to access their services via the telephone or internet. The top issues which CASH clients sought advice on were benefits and tax credits, universal credit, debt and housing problems. This was in turn backed up from data from CASH's website where webpages on Furlough, and 'If you can't pay your bills because of Coronavirus', were amongst the most visited pages. Moreover CASH's website saw a 24% rise in overall traffic.

The organisation faced the challenge of being unable to anticipate the demands on their service post pandemic. The pandemic had caused a noticeable reduction in CASH's volunteer advisers and 75% of those whom stayed on chose to volunteer from their homes. Going forward CASH's challenges looked to be around retention of volunteers and around human resourcing; and the organisation was trying hard to manage a constructed approach to recruitment including training and mentoring.

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

- The Council had the ability to raise awareness in respect of CASH's job vacancies and provide general support to CASH in respect of recruitment issues.
- There were significant numbers of residents who were accessing CASH services for the first time looking to access the benefit system and had fallen on significant hardship for the first time.
- The Council already had significant social media campaigns promoting local services which were available to those in hardship. However there was potential for the Council to provide further social media support to CASH.
- There was potential in the future for the Council and CASH to work in order to develop the organisation's outreach programme post-pandemic.
- CASH were currently able to manage their caseload, as the organisation wasn't currently picking up large amounts of in-person casework. In addition further capacity for CASH was provided by the 24 hour national Citizens

Advice Bureau helpline and CASH worked in close collaboration with Citizens Advice Woking.

The Chairman thanked Kate on behalf of the Committee and reiterated that CASH would have the backing of the Committee if the organisation required any additional support from the Council.

### 13/EP The Hope Hub

Mags Mercer, Chief Executive Officer, gave an update on the Hope Hub which was a charitable organisation which worked to prevent and end Homelessness within Surrey Heath.

The Hope Hub provided crisis and empowerment services for anyone who was or was at risk of becoming homeless, or whom was struggling with mental health, debt issues and unemployment. This included provision of emergency relief and items and one to one casework support, employment advice; and money and debt advice. The Hope Hub continued to be open throughout during the national lockdowns but had reduced their client-open days to two to three days a week. One to One appointments for clients continued in order to try to house them, the Hope Hub's IT services continued to be utilised and recently a gazebo had allowed refinement of the Hope Hub's hot food offering which had continued all throughout the pandemic.

The Hope Hub had seen a dramatic uptake in its services in comparison to previous financial years; and its service had been accessed 4688 times between April and October which was approximately double the number of times which the Hope Hub's services had been accessed during the same months the year before. There had also been a significant rise in new clients and the amount of clients housed, and food parcels provided.

The Hope Hub had experienced rise in numbers of domestic abuse cases, clients with mental health problems, unemployment and destitution which could be attributed to the pandemic. In addition it was found that the Hope Hub's clients with the most complex issues had regressed whilst working with the Hope Hub during the pandemic.

Despite the pandemic, the Hope Hub's employment support service had managed to get 16 clients into work. Moreover, The Hope Hub was looking to reintroduce its regular employment, living-well, cooking and employment support workshops as soon as possible post pandemic.

Looking forward to the 21-22 financial year, the Hope Hub was aiming for the opening of the emergency night stop accommodation being carried out in partnership with the Council. In addition the charity was aiming to increase its upskilling and social enterprise offering; which would lead to increased training, qualifications and employment opportunities for its clients.

The Hope Hub aimed to continue to work in close partnership with organisations such as Citizens Advice Surrey Heath and Accent Housing, as well as statutory bodies such as the Police and NHS, which had recently worked with the Hope Hub to arrange flu jab access and Hepatitis B screening for clients.

- There was potential for the Hope Hub to apply for significant funding from the Surrey County Council Community Fund for the Hope House project which had significant potential to alleviate homelessness throughout the Borough.
- Since the inception of the Hope Hub a few years ago, the organisation had made significant progress which could be attributed to the people involved.
- It was appreciated that there would be higher numbers of Surrey Heath residents needing the services of the Hope Hub in the coming years.
- The Hope Hub had plans to expand and to recruit a Head of Operations and a Project Officer to look after strategy and future fundraising.
- At present there was significant local authority and governmental funding for the charity sector. However it was suggested that this could possibly dry up in the future. Although the Hope Hub was aiming to grow its reserves, this could hit other organisations in the charitable sector which would put strain on and lead to increased demand for the Hope Hub's services.
- Councillors were in a great position via social media to relay to their constituents what items the Hope Hub was in need of.
- At least 90% of The Hope Hub's clients were in Surrey Heath residents.

The Committee thanked Mags and her team for attending and the continued outstanding work they undertook within Surrey Heath.

#### **14/EP Catalyst**

Members received a presentation from Jane de la Rosa, Head of Communications and Business support, and Gemma Johnston, Marketing Assistant, in respect of Catalyst and in particular their mental health and well-being community football team, called The Welcome Wizards.

Catalyst was a Surrey-wide charity which provided mental health; and drug and alcohol services in a friendly, accessible and professional way. The organisation also worked in close partnership with the NHS service i-access to provide support for drug and alcohol misuse including recovery support and SMART groups. Catalyst also provided support at Mental Health safe havens which Catalyst helped to support in Aldershot and Woking.

Catalyst had always aimed to provide groups and activities as a way to allow clients to tackle mental health, substance misuse and wellbeing issues which they maybe struggling with. Recently this has included the Welcome Wizards initiative which had expanded pre-pandemic to include two teams in Surrey Heath and a separate team in Elmbridge. The Welcome Wizards was a community football team which aimed to support its players with mental health and wellbeing support.

Whilst the Welcome Wizards were unable to meet during the worst of the pandemic, they continued to meet online and risk assessments had allowed them to meet later on in the year. Whilst numbers of participants would be higher outside of the pandemic, since April the Welcome Wizards had still supported 22 people, including 16 from Surrey Heath.

During the pandemic Catalyst had continued to provide its other support services including via the telephone, online, outreach and some limited face to face work. Online support had included an online platform called the Catalyst BigBlueButton which centralised activities, counselling and family and friends support all in one place.

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

- Members were happy to pledge their support for catalyst and the Welcome Wizards, both in respect of endorsing their grant bids, as well as offering non-financial support.
- There were opportunities for catalyst to bolster their marketing and communications which would in turn make their self-referral routes more accessible.
- Residents did not need to be referred for Catalyst's mental health and wellbeing services by an organisation or General Practitioner. In addition Catalyst aimed for the self-referral process to be quick and simple; which was exemplified in that self-referrals via the phone were always picked up by Catalyst member of staff. During the phone conversation, an online or telephone appointment would be scheduled to allow for a prompt assessment of the client's needs.
- Catalyst always offered their clients a service relative to their need and if their services were unsuitable for a potential client, they would sign post the person in need to other services.
- Like other third-sector organisations, Catalyst experienced a lull in referrals at the start of the first lockdown.
- Catalyst foresaw major challenges in the years ahead. Catalyst had worked closely with Surrey County Council and Surrey Heath CCG who both anticipated a large spike in the demand for mental health services in Surrey Heath in the future. This was coupled with an anticipated contraction in funding in the long term which meant Catalyst was looking to instigate flexibility in its future strategies and fundraising opportunities.

The Committee thanked Jane and Gemma for their informative presentation.

## **15/EP External Partnerships Select Committee 20/21 Work Programme**

The Committee noted its Work Programme for the remainder of the 20/21 municipal year and noted additional plans for the Enterprise M3 to present at the March meeting of the Committee.

Members requested that newly elected Police and Crime Commissioner be invited to present to the Committee during the 2021/22 municipal year and that the Council's representative on the Police and Crime Panel also be asked to attend the meeting.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held on 14  
January 2021**

---

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

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

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Officers in attendance: Louise Livingston, Bobbie Ludlow and Rachel Whillis.

**21/J Notes of the previous meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on 26 November 2020 were agreed by the Group.

**22/J Grievance Policy and Procedure for Statutory Officers and non-Statutory CMT members**

The Group was informed that the Grievance Policy and Procedure for Statutory Officers and non-Statutory CMT Officers introduced in 2019 had been reviewed. The Policy had been amended to ensure that complaints were handled in line with the procedures set out in the Council's Constitution.

In addition to the amendments proposed in the report, it was agreed to update the Policy to ensure it consistently referred to 10 working days' notice. It was also agreed to ascertain whether the individual receiving a grievance about the Monitoring Officer should be the Head of Paid Service or the Executive Head of Transformation and update paragraph 14.1 accordingly.

The Group was informed that the wording at paragraph 8.1 would be clarified to recognise that, where the Council exercised its right to refuse accompaniment by someone deemed unsuitable by Human Resources, this was not intended to affect trade union representation.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree the Council's Grievance Policy and Procedure for Statutory Officers and non-Statutory CMT Officers, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.**

**23/J Disciplinary Policy and Procedure for Statutory Officers and non-Statutory CMT members**

The Group was informed that the Disciplinary Policy and Procedure for Statutory Officers and non-Statutory CMT Officers introduced in 2019 had been reviewed. The Policy had been amended to change references from five working days to ten working days. References to committees and sub committees had also been updated to reflect the procedures set out in the Council's Constitution.

In addition to the changes set out in the report, the following amendments were proposed:

- The correction of typographical errors in paragraphs 8.2.1, 8.3.3, and 12.2.
- Ensuring the correct full term for JNC was used.
- Adding 'intentional' before the word 'damage' in the third bullet point at paragraph 15.1.
- Rewording paragraph 19.2.1 to state they may appeal against a decision and sanction.
- Amending paragraph 21(b) to state that the employer would provide the paperwork 10 working days before a hearing, when the notice of the hearing is given; however, a caveat would be included to state that, in exceptional circumstances, paperwork received after this time could be circulated, but no less than 5 working days before the hearing.
- Adding wording to paragraph 21.1 to confirm that, if both parties were in agreement, a re-arranged hearing could take place in less than 10 working days.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree the Council's new Disciplinary Policy and Procedure for Statutory Officers and non-Statutory CMT Officers, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.**

#### **24/J Pensions Discretion Policy**

The Group was reminded that the Council was a participating employer in the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) and, as an employer, was under a legal duty to prepare and publish a written statement of its policy relating to certain discretionary powers under the Regulations which applied to the LGPS. The Council also had a duty to formulate, publish and keep under review a Statement of Policy in respect of how these powers were applied where they related to the payment of compensation to employees whose employment was terminated as a result of redundancy or certain other reasons.

The Policy had last been reviewed in January 2020, when a number of changes had been made. The Group was informed that it was not proposed to make any further changes at the current time.

**RESOLVED to advise the Employment Committee that no amendments be made to the current Pensions Discretions Policy.**

#### **25/J Pay Settlement 21/22**

The Group was reminded that there was currently no cost of living increase being offered for 2021/22. Other staff benefits had been looked at as an alternative to a monetary award.

It was reported that, during the Member pre-briefing for the meeting, a suggestion of a one-off payment, within a range of £150 to £250, had been made. It had been suggested that this be paid in a lump sum. Members had proposed this in recognition of the hard work undertaken by staff; it also acknowledged the commitment made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to award a minimum of £250 to public sector staff on national pay agreements earning under £24,000.

The Executive Head of Transformation undertook to discuss the costings with the Executive Head of Finance and thereafter discuss the offer further with Staff Representatives at a meeting arranged for the following week.

## **26/J Policy and Procedure for Fixed Term, Casual and Temporary Workers**

The Group was informed that a new amalgamated Policy Procedure for Fixed Term, Casual and Temporary Workers had been produced. The policy had also been reviewed and updated to ensure it was in line with the latest UK employment legislation.

The Policy was considered and it was agreed to amend the reference to “CRB” in the sixth bullet point of paragraph 7.1 to “DBS”. A minor typographical error in the seventh bullet point of that paragraph would also be corrected.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree the Council’s new Policy Procedure for Fixed Term, Casuals and Temporary Workers, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.**

## **27/J Work Programme**

The Group considered its Work Programme for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

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

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held on 28  
January 2021**

---

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

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

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam

Officers present: Louise Livingston, Julie Simmonds, Rachel Whillis and Bobbie Ludlow

**28/J Pay Settlement 2021/22**

The Group was updated on the current position regarding pay negotiations. It was noted that no percentage cost of living award for 2021/22 had been offered by the Council but negotiations were ongoing in relation to alternatives in the form of additional holiday and one-off payments to staff earning under a specified salary.

Two options had been proposed in respect of additional holiday:

1. an additional day's leave, to be added to all staff leave allowances as part of ongoing contractual terms; or
2. a non-consolidated additional day's leave to be awarded in 2021/22, to be taken on Christmas Eve.

Any additional holiday agreed would be awarded to all staff irrespective of grade. Staff Representatives reported that consultation with staff had indicated a preference for an additional day's leave being added to the contractual entitlement, although strong support for the non-consolidated day's leave had also been received.

With regard to the second option proposed, the suggestion for the majority of staff to take the extra day on Christmas Eve would enable the Council to shut that day; staff unable to take that day off due to work requirements would have the day added to their leave entitlement. It was also recognised that, if necessary, management discretion could be used in order to respect different cultural and religious practices.

The Group was advised that negotiations on a non-consolidated payment for staff earning under a specified full-time equivalent salary were also ongoing, with two options proposed for consideration:

1. a one-off payment of £250 to staff earning £24,000 (FTE) or less; or
2. a one-off payment of £250 to staff earning £28,000 (FTE) or less.

The Group was informed that there were 31 members of staff earning £24,000 or less and 95 staff members earning £28,000 or less, which would result in expenditure of £7,750 or £23,750 respectively. It was noted that an award of £250 was equivalent to a 1% increase for staff earning £25,000 and a 0.8% for a member of staff earning £28,000.

Clarification was provided that members of staff in Community Services transferring to Runnymede BC on 1 April 2021 would receive any pay award agreed by RBC, rather than from this Council. It was understood that RBC undertook its pay negotiations in July.

Members of the Group discussed the proposed options. No majority of support from both the Member and Staff sides was agreed concerning both additional leave and a one-off payment to staff on lower grades, although broad agreement was indicated for the option proposed for an additional day's holiday in 2021/22. However, a majority present at the meeting supported a recommendation for a non-contractual additional day's leave for 2021/22 plus a non-consolidated payment of £250 to members of staff earning £28,000 FTE or below.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to recommend to Full Council**

- (i) **that no percentage cost of living award be agreed for 2021/22;**
  - (ii) **that a non-contractual additional day's leave be awarded to all staff in 2021/22, to be taken on Christmas Eve, or where the member of staff is required to work on Christmas Eve, added to their annual leave entitlement for 2021/22;**
  - (iii) **a non-consolidated payment of £250 be made to staff earning less than £28,000 FTE; and**
- (i) To note that Staff Representatives, whilst recognising the current position, wish to see a pay increase for 2022/21.**

Note: it was noted for the record that all members of staff present at the meeting had an interest in any pay award.

Chairman