

# COUNCIL MEETING

## 27 October 2021

# COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1.	<b>Council - 28 July 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 3 - 12)</b>
2.	<b>Executive - 20 July 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 13 - 16)</b>
3.	<b>Executive - 17 August 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 17 - 20)</b>
4.	<b>Executive - 9 September 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 21 - 22)</b>
5.	<b>Executive - 19 October 2021 (to be laid on the table)</b>	<b>-</b>
6.	<b>Planning Applications Committee - 12 August 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 23 - 28)</b>
7.	<b>Planning Applications Committee - 23 September 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 29 - 36)</b>
8.	<b>Audit and Standards Committee - 4 August 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 37 - 40)</b>
9.	<b>Joint Staff Consultative Group - 22 July 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 41 - 42)</b>
10.	<b>Joint Staff Consultative Group - 23 September 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 43 - 46)</b>
11.	<b>Employment Committee - 27 July 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 47 - 48)</b>
12.	<b>Employment Committee - 7 October 2021 (to be laid on the table)</b>	<b>-</b>
13.	<b>Licensing Committee - 29 July 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 49 - 56)</b>
14.	<b>Licensing Committee - 20 October 2021 (to be laid on the table)</b>	<b>-</b>
15.	<b>External Partnerships Select Committee - 7 September 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 57 - 62)</b>
16.	<b>Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 8 September 2021</b>	<b>(Pages 63 - 68)</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY  
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at  
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on  
28 July 2021**

---

+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke (Mayor)  
+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft (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 Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Kristian Wrenn
- Cllr Ben Leach	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

\* In attendance virtually but did not vote

**16/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Peter Barnett, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Ben Leach and Charlotte Morley. It was noted that some councillors had joined the meeting virtually but would not be entitled to vote.

**17/C Minutes**

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the Annual meeting of the Council held on 19 May 2021 be approved as a correct record.**

**18/C Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor advised Members of the death of Mr Ken Pedder, who had served as a Councillor for the Town Ward from 1991 until 2015. He had been Mayor of Surrey Heath in the 1999-2000 municipal year and Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee between 2004 and 2005. On behalf of the Council, the Mayor sent condolences to Mr Pedder's family.

The Mayor paid tribute to Mr Tim Pashen, the Executive Head of Community, who would be retiring at the end of September and wished him well for the future.

The Council was informed of the variety of events the Mayor had attended since May, including visiting schools, youth groups, and care homes. She had also participated in the Great British Spring Clean in Surrey Heath and had opened a number of new businesses in Camberley. Members were reminded that, on 21 June 2021, the Council's Fly the Flag for Armed Forces event had been held at Surrey Heath House.

#### **19/C Leader's Announcements**

The Council was updated on progress for planning the Freedom of the Borough agreed at its meeting in May, the opening of the new leisure centre, the work to develop the Council's 5 Year Strategy, the moving of the properties within the JPUT onshore, and recruitment to the intern and graduate trainee programmes.

The Leader reported that, following a ballot in June, the Collectively Camberley Business Improvement District had been reappointed for a further five-year term.

Members were reminded that the Pride Fly the Flag ceremony would be taking place at Surrey Heath House on 2 August 2021 and all were encouraged to attend.

The Leader referred to Tim Pashen, the Council's Executive Head of Community, and his impending retirement and wished him well for the future.

#### **20/C Questions from Members of the Public**

The Places & Strategy Portfolio Holder, Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans, responded to a question from a member of the public, Mr Jacques Olmo, concerning the facilities at Frimley Green Recreation Ground and improvements to the public lavatories at the site.

#### **21/C Questions from Councillors**

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Morgan Rise submitted under Procedure Rule 11. The question requested an update from the Leader following the recent letter from the Secretary of State responsible for local government that had signalled the Government's intention to pursue full devolution for England. In response to a supplementary question, the Leader committed to carrying out consultation with residents on any proposals for changes to local government structures that would on Surrey Heath.

#### **22/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies**

(a) Executive – 20 April, 25 May, 15 June and 20 July 2021

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan that the open minutes of the meetings of the Executive held

on 20 April, 25 May, and 15 June 2021 be received and the recommendations from the meetings on 25 May and 20 July 2021 be adopted.

It was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler that recommendation (i) at minute 12/E – Public Realm be deferred pending the outcome of the investigation by the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee on the circumstances leading to the increased costs of the Public Realm project. This amendment was put to the vote and lost.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 20 April, 25 May, and 15 June 2021 be received and the recommendations from the meetings on 25 May and 20 July 2021 be adopted as set out below:**

**12/E Public Realm**

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) an additional £754,600 required for the High Street Public Realm Project be added to the Capital Programme; and**
- (ii) an additional £90,000 be added to the capital programme to fund further landscaping works in the High Street Public Realm area**

**to be funded from the Council's reserves.**

**31/E Capital Outturn and Prudential Indicators**

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) actual capital expenditure for 2020/21 of £24.162m against a budget of £35.711m be noted;**
- (ii) the carry forward budget provision of £10.034 million from 20/21 into 2021/22 be approved;**
- (iii) the revised 2021/22 Capital Programme of £11.275 million comprising the £1.241m agreed in February 2021 plus £10.034m carry forwards, be noted;**
- (iv) the final capital prudential indicators for 2020/21 be noted; and**
- (v) an additional £75k to be added to the 2021/22 capital programme for the Theatre frontage project be approved.**

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 15 April, 20 May, 17 June and 15 July 2021**

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 15 April, 20 May, 17 June and 15 July 2021 be received.**

- (c) Audit and Standards Committee – 26 April 2021

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 26 April 2021 be received.**

- (d) External Partnerships Select Committee – 1 June 2021

It was moved by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Councillor Dan Adams and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 1 June 2021 be received.**

- (e) Employment Committee – 10 June and 27 July 2021

It was moved by Councillor Colin Dougan, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Employment Committee held on 10 June 2021 be received and the recommendation the recommendation from the meeting on 27 July 2021 be adopted.**

**7/EC Pay Policy Statement 2021/22**

**RESOLVED that the Council's Pay Policy Statement 2021/22, as set out at Annex A to the Employment Committee agenda report, be adopted.**

- (f) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 24 June 2021

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 24 June 2021 be received.**

- (g) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 7 July 2021

It was moved by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam, seconded by Councillor Valerie White, and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 7 July 2021 be received.**

## **23/C Motions**

It was moved by Councillor Paul Deach and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder that

“this Council RESOLVES that, in order for residents of all abilities/disabilities to be able to access the borough's services, facilities and infrastructure

- (i) the Council will consider accessibility where applicable in all aspects of its decisions relating to resident facing public services/facilities so that all residents can benefit from such services regardless of ability/disability;
- (ii) the Council will aspire to make the Borough an accessibility exemplar; and
- (iii) any development approved by this council should consider accessibility where applicable and in accordance with Council policy as a component part in respect of any community gains.”

It was moved by Councillor Victoria Wheeler that the motion be amended by removing the words “where applicable” from (i) and amending (iii) by replacing “should” with “will have”. As Councillor Paul Deach indicated his agreement with these changes the motion was amended without vote.

In response to a proposal from Cllr Rodney Bates, the Council indicated its support for arranging a workshop for Members at which they could discuss practical ways of enacting the motion.

**RESOLVED that, in order for residents of all abilities/disabilities to be able to access the borough's services, facilities and infrastructure**

- (i) the Council will consider accessibility in all aspects of its decisions relating to resident facing public services/facilities so that all residents can benefit from such services regardless of ability/disability;**
- (ii) the Council will aspire to make the Borough an accessibility exemplar; and**
- (iii) any development approved by this council will have considered accessibility where applicable and in accordance with Council policy as a component part in respect of any community gains.**

## **24/C Review of Political Proportionality**

The Council considered a proposal to make a minor amendment to the scheme of political proportionality and allocation of councillors to committees for the 2021/22 municipal year.

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

**RESOLVED that the revised scheme of proportionality, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted for the remainder of 2021/22.**

## **25/C Governance Working Group**

The Council received a report from the Governance Working Group on the issues it had discussed at its meeting on 2 July 2021. The Group had considered proposals for a secure ICT storage solution for councillors and revisions to the ICT Code of Practice. Having discussed the proposals and raised queries requiring further clarification on the storage of documents by councillors, their role as ward councillors and information governance issues, the Working Group agreed to further consider the item at its next meeting.

The Working Group had considered the Boundary Commission for England's proposals for new parliamentary constituency boundaries, the consultation on which had opened on 8 June 2021 and would close on 2 August 2021. Having noted the proposals, the Group had recommended that no response be sent by the Council.

The Council was informed that the Constitution had not been subject to a full review for a number of years and it was therefore intended to carry out a holistic review with a view to addressing any anomalies which had arisen. A proposed programme for the review was considered.

### **RESOLVED that**

- (i) the current position on proposals for the provision of secure a storage area for data and documents for councillors and the review of the ICT Code of Practice be noted;**
- (ii) no response be sent to this stage of the 2023 Parliamentary Boundary Review consultation; and**
- (iii) the proposed programme for review of the Constitution as set out in the agenda report be noted.**

## **26/C Section 151 Officer/ Monitoring Officer Update**

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



The current Section 151 Officer, Mr Martin Hone, would be leaving the Council's employment on 30 July 2021. A recruitment process to fill the vacancy had been undertaken and, at its meeting on 8 July 2021, an Appointments Sub Committee had agreed to appoint Joanne Moore as Interim Executive Head of Finance and recommended that she be appointed as the Council's Section 151 Officer.

The Council was also reminded that, at its meeting on 14 October 2020, it had agreed to enter into an arrangement with Elmbridge Borough Council to provide the Monitoring Officer function for Elmbridge BC. This agreement was subsequently reviewed by the Employment Committee following 6 months of sharing the role, where it had been reported that the arrangements were going well. Following consultation with Elmbridge BC's Chief Executive, it was now recommended that that this arrangement ends on 30 September 2021 due to the increasing work commitments of the Monitoring Officer at this Council.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) Joanne Moore be appointed as the Section 151 Officer from 2 August 2021 until further notice; and**
- (ii) the shared Monitoring Officer role with Elmbridge BC cease from 30 September 2021.**

**27/C Leader's Question Time**

In response to a question from Councillor Cliff Betton about a specific case in his ward, the Leader agreed to further discuss the matter with the Support & Safeguarding Portfolio Holder and Councillor Betton.

Following a question from Councillor Edward Hawkins the Leader undertook to circulate further information in relation to councillors' role as Corporate Parents.

**28/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>
29/C	3
30/C	1&3
31/C	1&3

**29/C Executive and Committees - Exempt**

- (a) Executive –25 May and 15 June 2021

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

**RESOLVED that the exempt minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 25 May, and 15 June 2021 be received and the recommendations be adopted as set out below:**

**11/E      Leisure Centre Update**

**RESOLVED that the exempt recommendation set out on the agenda relating to an addition to the capital programme for 2021/22 be agreed.**

**15/E      London Road Development**

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Council withdraws from the procurement process with the current partner; and**
- (ii) the Capital budget for 2021/22 be increased by the amount identified in the agenda to cover the cost of finding an alternative solution to the London Road site including a revised high level masterplan for the site and Camberley town centre as a whole and exploring early demolition of some of the properties on the site.**

**24/E      Cambridge Square Redevelopment**

**RESOLVED that the amount identified in the agenda be added to the capital programme for 2021/22, to be funded from reserves, representing the estimated cost of the refurbishment works.**

**30/C      Report from the Chief Executive**

The Council considered a report presenting changes to the Council's senior management structure proposed by the Chief Executive following consideration by the Employment Committee and the completion of a formal staff consultation.

Members considered the proposals, which included the adoption of the new senior management structure, revised pay scales, associated updates to the relevant sections of the Constitution, and one-off budget costs. The revised structure would comprise two new Strategic Director posts along with two new positions of Head of HR, Performance & Communications and Head of Legal & Democratic Services; the existing Head of Investment & Development and Head of Planning posts would be retained.

It was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton, and

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the revised Senior Management Structure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report together with the associated changes in posts set out in paragraphs 2.8 and 2.9 of the report be agreed;**
- (ii) the revised Pay Scales, as set out at Annex B to the agenda report, be agreed.**
- (iii) the maximum one-off costs arising from this restructure as detailed in the exempt report, be funded from the Council's reserves as previously planned for;**
- (iv) Article 12 - Officers at Part 2 of the Council's Constitution be updated, as set out at Annex C to the agenda report;**
- (v) the list of Proper Officers at Part 3, Section C of the Constitution, be updated as set out at Annex D to the agenda report;**
- (vi) the Officer Employment Rules at Part 4, Section J of the Council's Constitution be updated as set out at Annex E to the agenda report; and**
- (vii) the Management Structure at Part 7 of the Constitution be updated as set out at Annex A to the agenda report.**

### **31/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**

- (i) the decision at minute 29/C relating to minute 11/E remain exempt for the present time, with any future release of information authorised following review by the Chief Executive and Head of Legal Services;**
- (ii) the decision at minute 29/C relating to minute 15/E be made public once relevant parties have been notified;**
- (iii) the decision at minute 29/C relating to minute 24/E with any financial details to remain exempt;**
- (iv) the decision at minute 30/C be made public; and**
- (v) the revised structure, Constitutional documents and pay scales annexed to the report associated with minute 30/C be**

**made public, but the report otherwise remain exempt for the present time.**

Mayor

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 20 July  
2021**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr David Mansfield
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Robin Perry

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Sarah Jane Croke, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler and Cllr Valerie White

**27/E Minutes**

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**28/E Questions by Members**

There were no questions received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, paragraph 16 of the Constitution.

**29/E End of Year Performance Report**

The Executive received a report detailing the Council's performance in 2020/21. The feedback from the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee on the performance was also noted.

**RESOLVED that the End of Year Performance Report 2020/21 and observations from the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee be noted.**

**30/E End of Year Financial Outturn and Carry Forward of Unspent Budget 2020/21**

The Executive noted the Council's financial position as at 31 March 2021.

In line with Financial Regulations, the Executive was also asked to agree the carry forward of unspent budget from 2020/21 to 2021/22 totalling £345,897.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) The Financial Performance for the year 2020/21 be noted; and**
- (ii) The Carry Forward requests for 2020/21 of £345,897, as set out at Annex C to the agenda report, be agreed.**

### **31/E Capital Outturn and Prudential Indicators**

The Executive received a report detailing the capital outturn for 2020/21 and requesting approval for any carry forward of budgets into the 2021/22 Capital Programme. Actual capital expenditure during 2020/21 had been £24.162m.

Members considered a request for an additional £75k for the improvements to the Camberley Theatre frontage, which was in addition to the £125,000 agreed in November 2019, along with the reasons and circumstances for the increase in costs. It was anticipated that the costs of the works would be recovered over the next seven to eight years via the continuation of the £1 per ticket restoration levy.

**RESOLVED that the additional funds for the cost of the repair and improvements to the Camberley Theatre frontage of up to approximately £75,000, in addition to the £125,000 already allocated be agreed, to be recovered by continuing to charge the restoration levy of £1 per ticket as agreed in November 2019.**

**RECOMMENDED to COUNCIL that**

- (i) Actual capital expenditure for 2020/21 of £24.162m against a budget of £35.711m be noted;**
- (ii) The carry forward budget provision of £10.034 million from 20/21 into 2021/22 be approved;**
- (iii) the revised 2021/22 Capital Programme of £11.275 million comprising the £1.241m agreed in February 2021 plus £10.034m carry forwards, be noted;**
- (iv) The final capital prudential indicators for 2020/21 be noted; and**
- (v) An additional £75k to be added to the 2021/22 capital programme for the Theatre frontage project be approved.**

### **32/E New Out of Hours Service to Respond to Unauthorised Encampments**

The Executive was informed that, in order to tackle unauthorised encampments more efficiently during out of hour periods, it was proposed to introduce an out of hours service to respond to unauthorised encampments from 1 March to 30 September each year. This would involve enforcement and communications staff cover over the weekend in the summer months to respond and attend an unauthorised encampment on public land from Friday late afternoon, until the next normal working day. Staff operating over the weekend would be given the necessary powers to take all relevant operational decisions in relation to encampments.

A number of other proposals associated with this service were noted; some Members encouraged reconsideration of the proposal to no longer automatically provide toilets and water and suggested an alternative approach of providing them

prior to the welfare check, at which point the need to provide them would be assessed and provision removed if not considered necessary.

Members considered a suggestion that a standard leaflet for distribution to residents within the immediate vicinity of an unauthorised encampment be produced, setting out basic information on the processes which would be followed. Having heard differing views on whether to produce a generic leaflet, it was agreed to produce a draft, to be reviewed by Members before it became part of the standard process for dealing with unauthorised encampments.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) an out of hours service be introduced to respond to unauthorised encampments from 1<sup>st</sup> March to 30<sup>th</sup> September;**
- (ii) The costs of this service to be agreed which include staff costs to cover a weekend and bank holiday rota and incidental costs caused by the unauthorised encampment e.g. security staff costs. The total indicative cost of this service could be £56,544; and**
- (iii) further consideration be given to producing a leaflet for distribution to residential properties within the vicinity of an unauthorised encampment.**

**33/E Urgent Action**

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

**34/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)
27/E (part)	3
35/E	3
36/E	3
37/E	3

**35/E Write-off Uncollectable Commercial Rent**

The Executive considered an exempt report asking it to write-off debts from a former tenant in relation to rent due to the Council.

**RESOLVED to write-off outstanding rent due to the Council from a former tenant, as detailed in the agenda report.**

**36/E Executive Working Group notes**

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

**RESOLVED that the Working Group notes be received.**

**37/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**

- (i) The report associated with minute 35/E remain exempt for the present time;**
- (ii) In relation to the Executive Working Group notes presented to the meeting**
  - a. the Camberley Town Centre Working Group notes from the meetings held on 11 March, 22 April and 13 May 2021 remain exempt for the present time;**
  - b. the Climate Change Working Group notes from the meeting held on 30 March 2021 be made public;**
  - c. the Local Plan Working Group notes from the meetings held on 29 April and 24 May 2021 remain exempt for the present time;**
  - d. the Poverty Working Group notes from the meetings held on 1 March and 21 April 2021 be made public;**
  - e. the Property Investment Working Group notes from the meetings held on 7 April, 5 May and 2 June 2021 remain exempt for the present time;**
  - f. the Surrey Heath Villages Working Group notes from the meeting held on 8 April 2021 be made public; and**
  - g. 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 Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 17  
August 2021**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr David Mansfield
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Robin Perry

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder and Cllr Valerie White

**38/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**39/E Questions by Members**

In response to a question from Councillor Paul Deach, the Leader updated Members on the resettlement of five Afghan families in the borough, following the decision taken by Urgent Action which had been reported to the previous meeting. He reported that two families had arrived and a further three families would be arriving over the next three weeks. The Leader also emphasised the Council's commitment to supporting this work.

The Executive was updated on a decision made in 2016 to resettle Syrian refugee families, following a question from Councillor Rodney Bates. The Leader advised that, although the Council had committed to host ten households in the borough, at present five families had been resettled. He informed Members that the Council was still committed to taking the number of households agreed.

**40/E Contain Outbreak Management Fund**

The Executive was informed that a government fund known as the Contain Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) had been set up to provide funding to local authorities to help reduce the spread of coronavirus and support local public health initiatives during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The total funding for Surrey was calculated based on the alert level which areas were in at the time and on a per population head basis, with districts and boroughs allocated 37.5% of the county funding. This Council had successfully bid for the funding which had now been received. The funding was allocated in five tranches: payment totalling £359,483 had been received for tranches 1 and 2 and the Council's entitlement for tranches 3 to 5 amounted to £440,146.07.

It was reported that the funds had to be spent on pre-determined categories, which were set out in the agenda report.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the funding received from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund and the expenditure made against tranches 1 and 2 of the fund be noted; and**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Environment & Health Portfolio Holder and Finance Portfolio Holder, to make expenditure from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund against categories set out in Annex A to the agenda report.**

**41/E Disabled Facility Grant**

The Executive was reminded that the Council provided Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to disabled residents to provide essential adaptations to their homes. The maximum DFG award was set at £30,000, although local authorities could, with a Policy in place, add additional discretionary funding.

The Council had a Home Assistance Policy that allowed the Housing Services Manger discretion to award additional funding where there were no other avenues of funding available, which was capped at £15,000. It was reported that the Council's Home Improvement Agency had a case where a full DFG had been awarded along with the discretionary £15,000 and a top up from Social services; however, the cost of the works was still not covered by up to £15,000. Members were therefore asked to consider a discretionary top up to the DFG.

It was agreed that, although this was the first time it had not been possible to secure alternative funding where the Council's contribution has not been sufficient, it had highlighted an area of possible future concern and it was therefore agreed that the Home Assistance Policy be reviewed.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Housing Services Manger be authorised to provide a discretionary top up to a Disabled Facilities Grant to enable the adaption of a disabled resident's home up to the value of £15,000; and**
- (ii) a review of the Home Assistance Policy be undertaken.**

**42/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)
43/E	3
44/E	3

#### **43/E Doman Road Depot, Bulking Facility**

The Executive considered a report concerning the replacement of the bulking shed at Doman Road Depot. Members were reminded that, in 2019, it had been agreed to replace the current bulking shed, which was a temporary structure, with a more permanent structure and update the capital programme in order to fund those works.

Due to delays in the National Waste Strategy, including uncertainty on what the Government's requirements would be for the handling of recycling materials, it was now proposed to remove those works from the capital programme. It was also proposed to undertake a feasibility study into rebuilding of the bulking shed, including matters such as producing drawings, preparing specifications, inviting tenders, and applying for planning permission.

Timescales were dependent on the publication of the Waste Strategy, which was expected to be prescriptive about how recycling materials were to be handled. It was expected that the Strategy would be published within the next few months and therefore hoped that the feasibility study would be completed in early 2022. A further report requesting approval of the project would be brought to Members following completion of the study.

#### **RESOLVED that**

- (i) a detailed feasibility study be undertaken for the erection of a permanent building to bulk recycling materials at the Council's Depot at Doman Road; and**
- (ii) the financial approval for the project will be requested following the completion of a detailed feasibility exercise including receipt of tender prices be noted.**

#### **RECOMMENDED to Council that**

- (i) the Bulking Shed at Doman Road be removed from the Capital Programme at this time; and**
- (ii) a supplementary estimate of £20,000 be agreed to cover the cost of the feasibility study for the rebuilding of the bulking shed in the Council's Depot at Doman Road, including producing drawings, preparing specifications, inviting tenders, and applying for planning permission.**

**44/E Review of Exempt Items**

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

**RESOLVED that the decision at minute 43/E be made public.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 9  
September 2021**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

- |                               |                        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| - Cllr Colin Dougan           | - Cllr David Mansfield |
| + Cllr Shaun Garrett          | + Cllr Adrian Page     |
| + Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Robin Perry     |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Helen Whitcroft and Cllr Valerie White

**45/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 August 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**46/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)
47/E	3
48/E	3

**47/E Contract Award for the Night Stop project**

The Executive was reminded that, at its meeting on 17 November 2020, it had agreed to purchase 151 Gordon Avenue, Camberley, for night stop accommodation. The Council had subsequently agreed at its meeting on 9 December 2020 that the capital works needed to the property would be funded from the Affordable Housing Reserve.

Members considered a report seeking authority to award a contract for the refurbishment of the property, which followed the outcome of a competitive tender process.

**RESOLVED that a contract be awarded at the value identified in the agenda report to carry out refurbishment of the Council property,**

**151 Gordon Avenue to a specification suitable to provide emergency homeless accommodation within the borough.**

Note: This item was considered in accordance with Regulation 11 - Case of Special Urgency. The decision was considered to be urgent and could not reasonably be deferred because of contractual requirements. The Chairman of the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, had agreed that the making of the decision was urgent, could not reasonably be deferred and should be considered in the exempt part of the meeting.

**48/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 but the report remain exempt for the present time.**

**49/E Questions by Members**

It was noted that the agenda had not included an item on questions by Members. However, in view of the cancellation of the meeting scheduled for 21 September 2021, the Leader undertook to discuss a matter on Community Infrastructure Levy raised by Councillor Graham Alleway outside the meeting. He also agreed to refer a question from Councillor Helen Whitcroft on the Garden Waste Scheme to the Environment & Health Portfolio Holder, Councillor David Mansfield.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 12 August 2021**

---

+ 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 John Skipper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr David Lewis	- Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+* Cllr David Mansfield	+ Cllr Valerie White
- Cllr Charlotte Morley	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

\*Cllr David Mansfield attended virtually so did not vote on any item

Substitutes: Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam (In place of Cllr John Skipper) and Cllr Morgan Rise (In place of Cllr Helen Whitcroft)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Adrian Page and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop, Gavin Chinniah, Joe Malone,  
Jonathan Partington, Emma Pearman, Eddie Scott  
and William Hinde

### **15/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

### **16/P Application Number: 20/1048 - 22-30 Sturt Road, Frimley Green, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6HY**

The application was for the erection of a residential development of 160 dwellings, including the conversion of the pumphouse building into residential dwellings, to provide 36 no one bedroom and 48 no two bedroom flats; 30 no two bedroom, 37 no three bedroom and 9 no four bedroom houses, along with associated estate roads and accesses onto Sturt Road, car parking, bin and cycle storage, local area of play and external landscaping following the demolition of all other buildings.

Members were advised of the following updates:

“This application is **DEFERRED**.

Paragraph 1.4 of the officer report sets out the uncertainty on the exact the level of affordable housing to be secured, at the time of the completion of the officer report and this matter has, to date, not been fully resolved. Sufficient further viability

information had not been provided in time to confirm the level of affordable housing that would be required to be provided and secured through the legal obligation and as such it is not ready to be determined by Members. In addition, we have received further education and drainage comments which require a fuller assessment.”

**RESOLVED that the deferral of application 20/1048 be noted.**

**17/P Application Number: 19/2141 - 50 Windsor Road, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8LD**

The application was for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new club building and 9 dwellings, access roads, car parking and landscaping.

The amended submission would have normally been determined under the Council’s Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Victoria Wheeler. The original submission for 10 dwellings constituted a major development and so would have automatically been reported to Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Amended wording for condition 23 as follows:

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans (Drawing No. P102 V) for vehicles to be parked. Thereafter the parking areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose”.

As the application had triggered the Council’s public speaking scheme, Mr and Mrs Brian and Jennifer Lewis shared a public speaking slot and spoke in objection to the application. Ms Suzanne Duke and Mr Kevin Scott shared a public speaking slot and spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant and agent.

Whilst Members acknowledged that the appearance of the scheme complimented the existing streetscene in respect of 79-81 Windsor Road, the Committee felt the proposal failed to fit in with the Windsor Road and Fowlers Mead streetscenes as a whole. In addition, Members felt that the quantum of the proposal was also out of keeping with the streetscene and constituted overdevelopment of the site.

There were also reservations in respect of the effect of the proposal on the green corridor entrance to Chobham village in respect of the Chobham Conservation Area. Furthermore, Members opined concerns in respect of the scheme’s insufficient amenity space.

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

An alternative proposal to refuse the application for the reasons below was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and put to the vote and carried.



A further vote was conducted in order to confirm that an additional reason for refusal would be included in respect of the absence of a SAMM agreement; and was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED that**

**I. application 19/2141 be refused for the following reasons:**

- **failure to meet the Council's minimum design standards in respect of amenity space**
- **quantum of built form and overdevelopment of the site**
- **out of keeping with the existing street scene**
- **negative impact on the green corridor in respect of the entrance to the Chobham Conservation area.**
- **absence of a section 106 legal agreement and SAMM contribution; and**

**II. the wording of the reasons for refusal be finalised by the Head of Planning 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 Victoria Wheeler declared that:
  - a. she had been contacted by local residents who about the site, as well as the applicant;
  - b. she had been contacted by Chobham Parish Councillors whom were involved with the applicant; and
  - c. she had sat through a number of Parish Council debates in respect of the application
- II. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all members of the Committee had received various pieces of correspondence in respect of the application.

**Note 2**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution as Councillors Peter Barnett, Mark Gordon and Valerie White were not present for the entire consideration of the item, they did not vote or participate in the debate on the application.

**Note 3**

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

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

Councillors Cliff Betton, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Sashi Mylvaganam, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting in abstention in respect of the alternative recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillor Graham Alleway.

**18/P Application Number: 20/0514 - 1 Middle Close, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1NZ**

The application was for a proposed single storey front extension including two roof lights, a two storey extension to the western side elevation following demolition of the existing garage, change to main roof form, six roof lights to main front roof slope, two rear dormers and fenestration alterations (this application was a resubmission of 19/0701 to allow for alterations to the height of the building and the front gables, alterations to the dormers and fenestration, and the installation of A.C. units) - retrospective.

This application was deferred from the 15 July 2021 Planning Applications Committee to await the Environmental Health Officer's comments on the technical specification of the air conditioning units and to enable a Member site visit to consider the size and bulk of the proposal.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

"This application is **DEFERRED**.

Following the Member Site Visit, it became apparent that there were some inaccuracies on the drawings which will require amending. In addition, the received comments from Environmental Health will require further clarification."

**RESOLVED that the deferral of application 20/0514 be noted.**

**19/P Application Number: 19/2025- Frimley Hall Hotel, Lime Avenue, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 2BG**

The application was for the erection of a third floor extension with associated alterations to first and second floor.

Members raised concerns in respect of the effects of the construction of the proposal on highway safety and the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. As a result, it was agreed to amend the proposed condition 7 of the officer report to require details in respect of hours of construction and measures to control noise and dust to be included in the submitted construction management plan.

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

**RESOLVED that application 19/2025 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer's report, as amended.**

**Note 1**

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

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

Councillor Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Sashi Mylvaganam, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**20/P Application Number: 20/0342 - Clews Lane Nursery, Clews Lane, Bisley, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9DY**

The application was for the installation of a portacabin office and shipping container for storage of horticultural supplies, construction of plant staging areas on to geotextile membranes and gravel surfacing, the widening, relaying and extension of existing vehicular access off Clews Lane and additional hard standing area.

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to Committee at the request of Councillor David Mansfield. This was due to the amount of concerns raised by the residents on the grounds of traffic in a very narrow lane and the effect upon the Green Belt.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

"One further letter of objection has been received. This objection reiterates the objections summarised on the agenda at pages 158 -160. This includes highway concerns relating to the narrowness of the lane with no footpaths and the unsuitability for commercial activity; concerns over the impacts upon wildlife; and the loss of the enjoyment of the area for mental wellbeing. "

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Ms Sarah Oliver; Ms Lauren Wright and Mr Norman Holden, whom shared a public speaking slot, spoke in objection to the application.

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

**RESOLVED that application 20/0342 be refused for the reasons as set out in the officer report**

**Note 1**

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

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

Councillor Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Sashi Mylvaganam, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**21/P Members' Update**

The Chairman noted that following the conclusion of the meeting, Members will be updated in respect of planning enforcement matters.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 23 September 2021**

---

+ 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 John Skipper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+* Cllr David Mansfield	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

\*Present for minutes 22/P and 23/P

Members in Attendance: Cllr Richard Brooks, Cllr Tim FitzGerald,  
Cllr Shaun Garrett, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam,  
Cllr Morgan Rise and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Duncan Carty, Gavin Chinniah, Julia Greenfield,  
William Hinde, Jonathan Partington, Neil Praine, Eddie Scott  
and Ryno Van der Hoven

Also Present: Nick Molyneaux (Viability Consultant)

## **22/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

## **23/P Application Number: 20/1048: 22-30 Sturt Road, Frimley Green, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6HY**

The application was for the erection of a residential development of 160 dwellings, including the conversion of the pumphouse building into residential dwellings, to provide 36 no one bedroom and 48 no two bedroom flats; 30 no two bedroom, 37 no three bedroom and 9 no four bedroom houses, along with associated estate roads and accesses onto Sturt Road, car parking, bin and cycle storage, local area of play and external landscaping following the demolition of all other buildings.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**“UPDATE**

In the second recommendation set out in the update report (Page 21 of the Agenda report), the satisfactory legal agreement needs to be completed by 28 October 2021.

The infrastructure payment through CIL, discounting SANG, is **£498,520**.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has raised no objections.

The Council's Viability Advisers, the DixonSearle Partnership, have provided a summary on viability which is provided as an Annex to this Update.

The County Highway Authority have advised further on the lack of need for controlled crossings across Sturt Road as follows:

*“Controlled crossings were not required as the likely level of pedestrian use throughout the day would be insufficient to meet the criteria for controlled crossings. It is considered that crossings will only operate correctly if they are used on a regular basis throughout the day. If there are too few pedestrians for most of the day drivers may tend to ignore the crossing and put pedestrians at risk on the occasions when they are using the facility.”*

**Correction**

Para 7.4.25 of the original report: The nearby church is the Church of St Andrew.”

Following the introduction of the Officer's report and recommendation, Nick Molyneux of the DixonSearle Partnership (DSP), as the Council's Viability Advisors, presented the viability position.

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr David Gilchrist spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr David Whitcroft, on behalf of the Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut Society, and Mr Alister Mogford spoke in objection to the application.

It was noted that some Members had concerns in respect of the proposed affordable housing provision (15 affordable dwellings (discount market sales), with a review procedure mechanism). Reservations focussed in on how this figure fell short of the 40% affordable housing requirement in The Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan (CSDMP) and the associated viability assessment. It was reaffirmed that the affordable housing would not go below the 9.4% provision (indicated in the officer update report) and that the provision would be the subject of a secured in perpetuity if the application was approved.

Members expressed reservations in respect of the overall parking layout of the scheme, but also in particular respect of the flatted developments and in particular plots 86, 87 and 88. The Committee felt they needed more information on the proposal's features relating to sustainability including the provision solar panels and ground source heat pumps.

The Committee also had unanswered questions in respect of whether the elements of the scheme would be in accordance with the Council's Residential Design Guide. This was in respect of the requirement for parking arrangements to

be softened by soft landscaping; and the levels of amenity space provided for the flatted units.

As a result of the need for further clarity on these elements of the application, a proposal to defer the application for investigation into these matters was proposed by Councillor Helen Whitcroft, seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 20/1048 be deferred in order to receive further information on the following matters:**

- **Amenity space in regard to compliance with the Residential Design Guide**
- **Parking layout**
- **Sustainable energy features**
- **Landscaping.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Helen Whitcroft declared that her father was attending the Committee meeting as a public speaker, but she had come to the meeting with an open mind.

**Note 2**

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

Voting in favour of the alternative proposal to defer the determination of the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Cliff Betton, Edward Hawkins, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

**24/P Application Number: 20/0405 - Land At Bagshot Retail Park, 150-152 London Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5DF**

The application was for the amalgamation of existing (Class E) retail units (Units 2B & 2C) for use as a foodstore (Class E) along with internal works (including a reduction in mezzanine floorspace), changes to the building elevations (including a revised shop front), site layout (including revised servicing and car parking arrangements), revised opening and servicing hours, external plant area, trolley bay and associated works.

Members were advised of the following updates:

**“UPDATE**

The Council’s GIS system names the properties to be amalgamated as Units 2A & 2B. This has been amended on the proposal description.

The Council's retail adviser raises no objections subject to clarification on retail impact. This clarification was subsequently provided by the applicant and a view was taken by officers on these submissions. Officers are satisfied that all outstanding matters have been addressed.

### **Representations**

Waitrose & Partners have sent a further representation, maintaining their objection to the proposal, and requested that, if approved, they are given the opportunity to comment on the servicing plan (requested by Condition 6). They have also requested additional text to the condition to ensure that the open parts of the service yard shall be maintained free from obstruction and not used for storage purposes (whether temporary or permanent).

*[Officer comment: It is considered that the servicing plan will provide such information and the temporary storage of goods in the service yard (as they are offloaded and before they are taken into the building) would not be easily enforceable. The more permanent storage could more easily enforced. It is noted that the Waitrose service yard is only accessed by vehicles through the service yard to the rear of the proposed store. The servicing plan will be provided to ensure access is maintained through this service yard to the Waitrose service yard beyond and control deliveries (during the proposed extension of servicing hours). No amendment to this condition is therefore considered to be necessary. If approved, any application to agree these details will be published and they can be notified at that time].*

Two further objections have been received but these objections raise no new issues.

### **Corrections**

Para 4.2: The net retail floorspace provided under this proposal (for Units 2A & 2B) is 1,019 square metres. This is the amount proposed to be limited by Condition 4.

Para 4.3: The approved opening hours for the existing development is 07:00 to **23:00** hours on Mondays to Saturdays and 10:00 to **18:00** hours on Sundays [Condition 6 of permission 16/1041 and the same as Condition 26 of earlier permission 13/0435].

Para 7.3.8: The retail assessment considers that the proposal would result in a trade diversion from Bagshot of 1.9%.

### **Response from applicant**

The applicant has commented on the officer report by a two page email summarised below:

- The proposal would not lead to an adverse impact on any defined centre or planned investment within any centre and the proposal complies with the sequential test.
- Under the terms of national and local policy, there is no requirement to consider retail impact and that any retail impact would need to be



“significant adverse”. The benchmark for what is deemed unacceptable is high.

- The existing Co-op stores being top-up shopping destinations is demonstrated by the Council’s retail evidence base [Town Centre Uses & Future Directions Study (August 2021)].
- Bagshot is defined as a district centre.
- The former BHS site had also been discounted in the sequential test because there were a number of constraints which make it unsuitable for a food retailer and Camberley is a different catchment for Lidl from Bagshot.
- The pre-application public consultation exercise undertaken by the applicant concluded that of 7,805 properties notified of the proposal, there were 1,979 replies of which 12,483 were in support and 452 were not in support (with 44 undecided).

The applicant has sought amendments to Condition 9, relating to the provision of electric charging points. The applicant is concerned that it will need to be tested how much the charging points are used to see if there is a demand for 13 charging points. They have suggested providing a number (below 13) and add the remainder if demand arises.

The County Highway Authority has agreed with the principle of this approach but has suggested a shorter timescale to deliver the remainder (6 months after occupation). However, it is considered that the wording of this condition needs to reflect the overall provision requirement and there are other mechanisms to challenge these requirements e.g. the NMA procedure. A longer period (6 months) to provide the full amount is accepted. An amended condition in this regard is therefore proposed.

#### **Amended condition**

*9. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied prior to the provision of **7 parking spaces and a further 6 parking spaces within 6 months of such occupation** with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: In the interests of site sustainability and to comply with Policies CP2, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”*

As the application had triggered the Council’s public speaking scheme, Mr Adrian Fox, who attended on behalf of the agent, Quod, spoke in support of the application.

Members had concerns in respect of the potential negative impact of the deliveries by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), associated with the proposal, on the neighbouring residential amenity. As a result it was agreed that condition 5 in the officer’s report would be amended to stipulate that the latest HGV delivery should be completed by 9:30pm. Furthermore, it was agreed that an associated informative be added to the recommendation to reaffirm that deliveries should be conducted in a manner as to minimise impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

To further protect neighbouring residential amenity, the Committee agreed that an informative would be added to the recommendation in relation to the proposal's travel plan; which requested that staff parking be provided on the application site.

Members had reservations in respect of the loss of trees attached to the proposal which would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area. It was noted that the details in respect of the hard and soft landscaping would be subject to a details to comply application.

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

**RESOLVED that**

- I. Application 20/0405 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report, as amended, the additional informatives, and the completion of a legal agreement to secure a £50,000 contribution towards improvements to traffic lighting; and**
- II. The wording of the revised condition and the additional informatives be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Ward Councillors; and**
- III. The Committee's concerns in respect of the loss of trees be noted.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- I. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that**
  - i. all Committee Members had received a letter from the adjoining retailer; and**
  - ii. himself and Councillor Victoria Wheeler had been copied into an email to Councillor Valerie White from a resident in respect of the application**
- II. Councillor Valerie White declared that she had received a phone call from the manager of Waitrose checking that she had received their written representation.**

**Note 2**

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

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

Councillors: Graham Alleway, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors: Cliff Betton, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, John Skipper and Valerie White.

**25/P Application Number: 21/0724: 151 Gordon Avenue, Camberley, Surrey,**

## **GU15 2NR**

The application was for the change of use of a single family dwelling house (C3) to short term accommodation for up to 6 homeless people (sui generis).

An application of this type would usually be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the Council was the landowner and the applicant.

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

**RESOLVED that application 21/0724 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report.**

### **Note 1**

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

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

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Edward Hawkins, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

## **26/P Application Number: 21/0799: 17 Sefton Close, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9HT**

The application was for the erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension, following demolition of single garage and conservatory.

The application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the applicant was a serving Councillor of Surrey Heath Borough Council.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

### **“UPDATES**

One recommended additional condition as follows:

*4. No additional windows shall be created in the northern elevation of the two storey extension facing number 16 Sefton Close without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: In the interests of the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring residents and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.”*

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

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all members of the Committee knew the applicant as he was a fellow Councillor.

**Note 2**

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

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

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Edward Hawkins, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Voting in abstention in respect of the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Cliff Betton.

**27/P Information Report**

The Committee were advised of a procedural error which had been made during the determination of a planning application. The Committee noted the relating actions which were due to be taken as a result.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**28/P Enforcement Monitoring Report**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 10 of the Constitution the Committee considered whether to continue the meeting post-10pm. It was agreed that the item would be deferred for consideration at the next meeting of the Committee.

**RESOLVED that the item be deferred.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 4 August 2021**

---

- + Cllr Cliff Betton (Chairman)
- + Cllr Darryl Ratiram (Vice Chairman)
  
- + Cllr Rodney Bates
- Cllr Edward Hawkins
- Cllr Charlotte Morley
  
- + Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam
- + Cllr Valerie White
  
- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Non Committee Members in Attendance: Cllr Robin Perry and Cllr Victoria Wheeler

Officers Present: Michael Asare Bediako, BDO  
Adrian Flynn, Chief Accountant & Interim Section 151 Officer  
Alex Middleton, Senior Auditor  
Gavin Ramtohal, Head of Legal  
Damian Roberts, Chief Executive

**1/AS Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**2/AS Annual Governance Statement 2020/21**

The Committee considered a report setting out the draft Annual Corporate Governance Statement for the 2020/21 financial year.

There was a statutory requirement for the Council to produce an Annual Corporate Governance statement that reviewed the effectiveness of the Council's control systems. The Statement formed part of the final accounts for each financial year and set out the governance arrangements in place at the Council, highlighted any key issues identified during the year and summarised progress made towards addressing any previously identified issues.

It was reported that the Council's Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer considered the Council's governance arrangements to be adequate and effective. Whilst no significant governance issues had been identified a number of minor issues that might impact on the Council's ability to operate effectively had been including the restructure of the Council's senior management team, the redevelopment of the London Road Block, the settlement of variable invoices arising from the joint waste contract and issues with the delivery of the Capital Programme, and these would be monitored through the planned work of the Council.

The Committee noted concerns about the over running of the recent public realm works and it was questioned whether monitoring the cost and scheduling of projects is something that should be added to the Statement as an issue to keep under review.

It was noted that changes to the requirements for borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board could impact on the Council's ability to borrow money and it was suggested that this should be added as an identified issue.

**RESOLVED** that, subject to the inclusion of the additional issues identified, the Annual Governance Statement be submitted to the Leader and Head of Paid Services for their signatures.

### **3/AS Effectiveness of the 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 was informed that the size of the Internal Audit Team was considered proportionate to the size of the Council and the work programme had been designed to enable as many areas of the Council to be audited on a rotational basis as possible. It was confirmed that the Team was able to deliver the requirements placed on it at the current time. Team resourcing would continue to be monitored and if it became necessary to bring in additional resources to meet demand then this request would be considered by the Council's Corporate Management Team.

It was noted that there were areas of the Council which had their own assurance regimes in place on top of Internal Audit, including ISO and health and safety, and these should provide the 'combined level of assurance' that the Council needed.

The Committee noted the report.

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

The Committee received a report summarising the work of the Council's Internal Audit Function during the 2020/21 financial year.

The Covid-19 pandemic and its associated restrictions had impacted on the work of the Council's internal audit function during the course of 2020/21. Seventeen internal audits (compared to 23 in 2019/20) and a number of ad-hoc pieces of work including working with the Office for National Statistics to provide support for the 2021 Census, assisting with preparation for elections and co-ordinating the Council's response to the National Fraud Initiative had been completed. The Internal Audit Team had also been redeployed to provide support to the Council's Welfare Cell as well as providing welfare calls to shielding and vulnerable residents over a period of time.

Arising from the 17 internal audits, 86 recommendations had been made of which 16 had been classified as being essential and 70 as being desirable. An exercise was undertaken to follow up all overdue audit recommendations.

It was noted that the properties within the Jersey Property Unit Trust had now been transferred to the Council and these would be incorporated into the audit cycle going forward.

It was clarified that Council Officers could, where there was a business need, be issued with a corporate purchasing card, either a Natwest credit card or a Barclaycard. Barclaycard spend could be controlled using a categorisation system and managers were able to specify the categories that an officer could spend money against. There was also a monthly limit in place for each cardholder. Approximately forty-one officers had been issued with a corporate credit card, of which the majority had been issued with a Barclaycard. Between six and eight officers, predominantly Executive Heads of Service, had been provided with a Natwest credit card.

Before being given a corporate credit card all officers had to sign an agreement which set out the parameters within which the card could be used. The summary statement of an officer's spend had to be approved each month by their manager; the Chief Executive approved the summary statements of all Executive Heads and Heads of Service. The Internal Audit Team received copies of monthly statements and these were cross checked and spot checks carried out to ensure that all expenditure was valid and in line with corporate guidelines.

It was noted that the current Chief Executive had elected not to receive a corporate credit card, however it was suggested that the Section 151 Officer should be responsible for approving any future corporate credit card spend made by the Chief Executive, to ensure that no officer was approving his or her own credit card usage.

The Committee noted the report.

## **5/AS External Audit Update**

The Committee received an update in respect of the work taking place to bring the external audit of the Council's accounts for the 2019/20 financial year to a conclusion.

The Committee was informed that a recent Public Service Auditing Authority webinar focusing on the auditing of public sector accounts had drawn attention to the fact that there were insufficient auditing firms qualified to audit public sector accounts which was causing delays. In addition, the public sector audit system was set up in such a way that auditors were given a set period in which they had to complete an audit. If the audit was not completed within this timeframe then, instead of completing the audit before moving to the next piece of work, the auditor automatically moved on to the next piece of work leaving the previous audit unfinished. It was stressed that this situation affected all public sector audits including police authorities, the NHS as well as local authorities.

It was confirmed that the audit of the Council's accounts for the 2019/20 financial year was progressing. All the papers requested by BDO, the external auditors, had been passed on and answers to the questions arising from these documents would be provided to BDO by the end of this week. Following the Committee's last meeting in April 2021, it had been necessary for a number of amendments to be made to the financial statement, work which was currently underway. Once the amended financial statements had been received by BDO these would be reviewed before they were signed off.

BDO confirmed that they had the resources available to review the financial statements as soon as they were received. If no further issues were identified then it was expected that the audit would be swiftly concluded and it was expected that the final audit report would be available for the Committee's consideration in September.

The Committee noted the update and expressed their frustration and disappointment at the fact that the audit still had not been completed two years after it had started.

**6/AS Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee would take place on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7pm.

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held on 22 July  
2021**

---

+ Cllr Graham Tapper (Chairman)  
+ Lynn Smith (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Rodney Bates	- Garry Carter
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Gillian Riding
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	- Andrew Edmeads
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Eddie Scott
+ Cllr David Mansfield	+ Anthony Sparks
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	- Karen Wetherell
+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft	

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Louise Livingston, Julie Simmonds and Rachel Whillis

**7/J Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 24 June 2021 were agreed as being a correct record.

**8/J Job Evaluation Scheme**

The Group considered amendments to the Council's Job Evaluation Guidance, which had been revised to accommodate the new role of strategic director and the revised head of service and new management career grade within the pay scales. The revisions reflected the proposals set out in the senior management restructure consultation which had concluded on 14 July 2021, which the Employment Committee and the Council would be asked to agree later that month.

The proposed amendments were reviewed and it was also agreed to correct minor typographical errors in Knowledge and Expertise Level 2 and Accountability Level 6. The Group also considered whether the Section 151 Officer should be included in the highest level in the Accountability factor, due to their responsibilities for the Council's finances. It was agreed this query would be further considered and the Scheme would be modified if necessary, with the Group's members notified of the decision by email.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Employment Committee be advised to agree the updated Council's Job Evaluation Guidance, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended; and**
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Transformation to further amend the Job Evaluation Scheme**

**to include reference to the Section 151 Officer in the Local Convention for Accountability Level 6, if considered appropriate, prior to submission to the Employment Committee for agreement.**

**9/J Appointment Process for New Posts**

The Group considered a document clarifying the process for appointments to new posts, which staff had been consulted on as part of the Senior Management restructure.

The document was reviewed and it was agreed to add recent appraisals and any live disciplinaries to the objective criteria which may be considered where compulsory redundancies were required, as set out at paragraph 1.3. It was also agreed to add additional wording to state that sickness records could be both qualitative and quantitative

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree the Appointment Process for new posts as part of the Senior Management restructure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.**

**10/J Temporary Revision - Grievance Policy and Procedure**

The Group considered temporary revisions to the Grievance Policy and Procedure for Statutory and non-Statutory Officers, which amended the procedure in order for the Section 151 Officer to act as the co-ordinating officer in respect of any grievances or appeals relating to the Senior Management restructure in progress. The amendments also reflected the appeals procedure for redundancy. Once the Senior Management restructure had concluded and appointments made, the policy would revert back to the current arrangements.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree the temporary revisions to the Grievance Policy and Procedures for Statutory and non-Statutory Officers and appeal procedure for redundancy, as set out at Annexes A and B to the agenda report.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held at Surrey  
Heath House on 23 September 2021**

---

+ Cllr Graham Tapper (Chairman)  
- Lynn Smith (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Rodney Bates	- Keiran Bartlett
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	- Andrew Edmeads
- Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Joe Fullbrook
- Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Kathy Lindsay
- Cllr David Mansfield	+ Gillian Riding
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	+ Anthony Sparks
+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft	+ Karen Wetherell

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

**11/J Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 22 July 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

**12/J Leave and Special Leave Policy and Procedure**

The Group considered revisions to the Leave and Special Leave Policy and Procedure, which principally reflected the introduction of the new HR system, iTrent, and incorporated Jack's Law relating to time off for parental bereavement. Further corrections to job titles would be made as necessary.

It was reported that iTrent managed leave in hours rather than days. The application of leave for employees working part time hours or with flexible working arrangements, including the carry forward of leave, would be monitored to ensure fairness. In addition, paragraph 6.5, which referred to carrying forward annual leave entitlement to a cumulative maximum of 20 days, would be reworded to ensure it was clear that this would be worked up in increments of up to 5 days, over a number of years, to obtain the 20 days.

The Group noted that CMT officers were currently exempt from flexi time, but this would be kept under review. It was also not proposed to change the compassionate leave section at paragraph 8.1 at this at this time but a review to ensure the terminology remained relevant would be undertaken shortly.

With regard to leave to undertake public duties referred to at paragraph 8.8, it was advised that, although it was not stated, this was unpaid.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the updated Leave and Special Leave Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the report, as amended, be adopted.**

### **13/J Review of Sickness Absence Policy and Procedures**

The Group considered proposed revisions to the Sickness Absence Policy and Procedure, which principally related to the introduction of the new HR system, iTrent.

In addition to the changes included in the report, it was agreed to amend the reference in paragraph 9.1.2 (c) from 'visit their doctor' to 'contact their doctor', as well as correct any typographical errors which referred to iTrent.

The Procedure Trigger Points referred to in paragraph 15 were discussed, in particular the trigger point of 10 days of absence within a 12-month period. It was recognised that the trigger point should be used with management discretion and this would be kept under review.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the updated Sickness Absence Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the report, be adopted.**

### **14/J Flexible Working Policy & Procedure**

The Group considered proposed revisions to the Council's Flexible Working policy, which primarily reflected the new HR system, iTrent and changes to senior management titles.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the updated Flexible Working Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.**

### **15/J Flexi Time Policy**

The Group considered proposed revisions to the Council's Flexi Time policy, which primarily reflected changes the recording and booking of Flexi Time, which would be processed through the new HR system, iTrent.

It was noted that there was a need to clarify that the 4 week settlement period, as referred to at paragraph 7.1, ran from 1 April.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the updated Flexi Time Policy, as set out at Annex A to the report.**

### **16/J Agile Working Policy 2020/21**

The Group reviewed the Agile Working Policy, which had been introduced in 2020. The policy had been updated to reflect the changes to working practices which had come about due to the continuing effects of COVID-19. The Policy now stated that there was an expectation that employees would attend the office for a minimum of one day a week, although employees' patterns and place of work would be agreed following discussions with their managers, taking into considerations the business requirement within their role. The requirement for staff

to attend the office for a minimum of one day per week would be kept under review.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the updated Agile Working Policy, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.**

#### **17/J Update on Climate Change Actions Assigned to Human Resources**

The Group considered a report presenting the actions taken in relation to the Climate Change Action Plan, as assigned to Human Resources. In addition to the actions identified, it was reported that a staff training module would be rolled out to staff and incorporated into the induction programme.

The electric charging points installed in Surrey Heath House Car park were discussed and it was advised that staff were recharged for using this facility, which was charged at cost.

**RESOLVED to note the actions taken to date in response to the actions assigned to Human Resources from the Climate Change Action Plan, as set out at Annex A to this report.**

#### **18/J Christmas Closure 2021**

The Group was informed that for a number of years in succession Surrey Heath House had closed the building to the public and staff had needed to take some leave to accommodate the closure. A number of options for closing the offices over Christmas 2021 were considered, including the option that mirrored previous years, where staff would be asked to take on day as annual leave and one day extra day would be given on 30 and 31 December 2021. With the extra statutory day's leave in Terms and Conditions and the additional day's leave agreed as part of pay negotiations for 2021/22, Surrey Heath House would close from 5pm on 23 December 2021 and reopen on 4 January 2022. It was noted that, despite the closure of the offices, a number of services would continue to operate and cover would reflect business need.

The options were discussed and it was reported that Members of the Council had not been aware of the arrangements agreed in previous years when the decision to award an additional day's leave on 24 December 2021 was made.

The decision was put to the vote and, with a majority of both the Staff Representatives and Member representatives voting for Option 1 identified in the agenda report, as detailed above, the Employment Committee would be advised to agree that option.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree Option 1 for Christmas Closure 2021, with staff being asked to take one day as annual leave and awarded one day extra day on 30 and 31 December 2021.**

**19/J Work Programme**

The Group considered https its work programme for the remainder of the 2021/22 municipal year.

**RESOLVED that the work programme for the remainder of the 2021/22 municipal year, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the  
Employment Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath  
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15  
3HD on 27 July 2021**

---

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

+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Cllr Alan McClafferty
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	- Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam (In place of Cllr Graham Tapper)

Members in Attendance: Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Valerie White (minutes 5/EC to 9/EC).

**5/EC Minutes**

The open and exempt minutes from the meeting held on 10 June 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**6/EC Pay Policy Statement 2021/22**

The Committee received a report setting out the Council's Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22. Members were reminded that the Council was required, in accordance with Section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011, to review and update its Pay Policy Statement on an annual basis.

**RECOMMENDED to Full Council that the Council's Pay Policy Statement 2021/22, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.**

**7/EC Probation Policy and Procedure 2021/22**

The Committee received a report setting out a proposed Probation Policy and Procedure. Members were informed that the Probation Policy was a new policy which aimed to provide clear guidance for both managers and staff on the procedures that would be followed during the probationary period of newly appointed members of staff.

**RESOLVED that the Council's Probation Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be adopted.**

**8/EC Work Programme**

The Committee considered a draft Work Programme for the remainder of the 2021/22 municipal year. It was agreed to bring forward the review of the Agile Working Policy to the meeting in October 2021.

**RESOLVED that the Work Programme for 2021/22, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be agreed.**

**9/EC Exclusion of Press and Public**

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

Minute	Paragraph(s)
5/EC (part)	1&3
10/EC	1&3
11/EC	1&3

Note: Minute 10/EC is a summary of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

**10/EC Report from the Chief Executive**

The Committee made decisions in relation to proposals for a revised senior management structure.

**11/EC Review of Exempt Items**

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

**RESOLVED that minute 10/EC and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time.**

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing  
Committee held at Council Chamber,  
Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road,  
Camberley, GU15 3HD on 29 July 2021**

+ Cllr Rodney Bates (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Dan Adams (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr David Mansfield
- Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr John Skipper
+ Cllr Paul Deach	Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Tim FitzGerald	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Lewis	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Cllr David Mansfield was present virtually so did not vote on any item.

Officers Present: Paula Barnshaw, Rebecca Batten, Helen Lolley and  
Tim Pashen

**1/L Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**2/L Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2021-2026**

The Committee considered the revised draft Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire (PH) Licensing Policy 2021-2026, following consultation and with a view to approval.

In July 2020 the Department of Transport issued new Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Standards which recommended that Councils made available a cohesive policy document which brought together all their procedures on Taxi and Private Hire vehicle standards and outlined that policies should include but not be limited to policies on convictions and vehicle standards. Under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 the Council was responsible for regulating the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire trades operating in the borough. This included the central aim of protecting the public, including children and vulnerable adults, when using such services.

Following the Committee's decision on 24 March 2021, consultation on the proposed policy ran from 12 May 2021 to 21 June 2021. The consultation included 2 virtual meetings with the taxi trade via Zoom, which had been attended by a total of 17 members of the trade; and had resulted in 12 written consultation responses being submitted.

Following the consultation, it was recognised that the proposal requiring that a 'Big Face Badge' be located in a position which was clearly visible to the passenger

had caused concern amongst the trade. The requirement had been added to the proposed policy as a safety measure. It was noted that whilst it was recommended that the measure remained in the policy, there was commitment from officers to work with the trade to address their concerns regarding the potential damage to their vehicles that the Badge may cause. In addition, following engagement with the trade, it was noted that paragraph 7.4.2, which had been included in the first draft of the policy in respect of the fitting of taxi meters in private hire vehicles, had now been removed.

The Committee were also verbally updated that an additional clause would be added to Section 4.5, page 9 of the policy stating the exception of licences which were surrendered as a result of death or serious illness, reimbursement would be considered where there was at least 3 months remaining on the licence; and that there may be a small administrative charge that would be deducted from any refund. It was clarified that the policy would come into force on the first working day of August. Following Members' comments it was also agreed to amend the typographical error on page 23, paragraph 6.1 of the policy.

Members noted the considerable amount of work and diligence which had resulted in the proposed policy and also recognised the excellent consultation response from the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire trade. In addition, it was noted that the Council was in dialogue with Uber, in order to try to allay the negative effects of Uber's business in the borough on local firms and drivers.

Lastly, it was felt by Members that the Council had an opportunity to make Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles more accessible to those with hearing impediments by the encouragement of the use of clear masks for drivers and by the creation of a register of drivers who were proficient in British Sign Language.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. The report be noted; and**
- II. The revised draft Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and PH Licensing Policy 2021-2026 be approved, as per the agreed minor amendment.**

**3/L Review of Hackney Carriage (Taxi) Fares**

The Committee considered a report outlining the proposed methodology for the recalculation of taxi fares for the hire of taxis licensed within the borough.

Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 gave borough and district councils the ability to set local taxi fares for journeys within its area by means of a table or scheme of fares. However boroughs and districts held no power to set Private Hire (PH) vehicle fares. It was noted that the current Hackney Carriage fares had been set in 2012 and were due for review and that Department of Transport best practice guidance maintained that it was good practice to review fare scales at regular intervals.

As a starting point to the review it was proposed that fares within the borough be raised in accordance with the annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) changes for each year 2012- 2021.

The Council were planning to run a consultation with the trade on the proposed fares and any comments from the taxi trade would be considered. Any necessary resulting revisions to the fares or methodology would be made before reconsideration by the Licensing Committee in October 2021.

It was noted that where the Council proposed to amend the taxi fares it was required to publish the new fare chart in a local newspaper, advising that any objections should be made within 14 days. If no objections were received or where objections were made but subsequently withdrawn the new table of fares would come into immediate effect.

However, if objections were received the representations would need to be considered within two months following the end of the 14 day notice period. Where objections were received it was proposed that the objections be presented and that the amended fares be considered by the Licensing Committee in February 2022.

After the consideration of the proposed updated fare chart for Surrey Heath as appended to the agenda report, members of the Committee opined that the taxi fare scale was due review and that drivers were long overdue a de facto pay rise. In addition it was suggested that there was an opportunity to greater highlight to hackney carriage users, the costs which drivers incurred to maintain their vehicles and service.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. The report be noted;**
- II. Further consultation be undertaken with the trade as to the proposed fares with a view to any amendments being considered by the Licensing Committee Meeting at its next meeting;**
- III. The proposed uplift of fares, as per Annex C of the agenda report, be approved; and**
- IV. The required steps following approval of the proposed uplift be noted.**

**4/L Review of Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire Licensing Fees**

As the relevant licensing authority, Surrey Heath Borough Council was responsible for the licensing of taxis and private hire drivers, vehicles and operators. The Local Government( Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (the Act) included provisions that allow district and borough councils to recover such fees as they consider reasonable with a view to recovering the costs of the issuing and administration of drivers' licences for both taxis and private hire vehicles. (Section53(2) ) Furthermore Section 70 of the Act allowed the same for vehicle and operator's licences.

'A district [or borough] council may charge such fees for the grant of vehicle and operator licences sufficient in the aggregate to cover in whole or in part –

- The reasonable cost of carrying out by or on behalf of the district council of inspections of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles for the

purpose of determining whether any such licence should be granted or renewed

- The reasonable cost of providing hackney carriage stands, and
- Any reasonable administrative or other costs in connection with the foregoing and with the control and supervision of hackney carriages and private hire vehicles.'

Following the agreement of the Committee of the proposed methodology, the Executive Head of Community would be asked to approve, in consultation with the Portfolio holder and Executive Head of Finance, the methodology of calculating the proposed fees.

This would then be used to calculate the revised fees which would then be brought back to the Licensing Committee at its next meeting. The Licensing Committee will be asked to recommend the new fees. The Executive Head of Community would then be asked to approve, in consultation with the portfolio holder and Executive Head of Finance the revised fees.

Once approved a notice would be placed in the local newspaper as required and a further update would be provided to the Licensing Committee in February.

Once a notice had been placed for the statutory 28 days and if no objections were received or where objections were made but subsequently withdrawn the new table of fees could come into effect from 1 April 2022.

However, if objections were received these must be considered within two months following the end of the 28 day notice period. The proposed fees could be amended to reflect the objections after which the new table of fees came into effect.

It was noted that where objections were received it was proposed to present the objections and amended fees to the Licensing Committee in February 2022. It was affirmed that final approval for the proposed fees rested with the Executive Head of Community in consultation with the appropriate Portfolio holder and the Executive Head of Finance.

Following discussion from the Committee the need to review the fees on a more regular basis was recognised. Furthermore it was noted that although it was not legally required, the Council would consult with the taxi trade and online in addition to the publication of the fees in a local newspaper.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. The report be noted; and**
- II. The proposed methodology for calculating the revised fees and charges for the taxi and private hire trade be agreed.**

**5/L Licensing Sub Committee Minutes**

The Committee noted that since 2005 the Chairman of the Licensing Committee had signed the minutes of the Licensing Sub Committee meetings which had taken place since the previous meetings of the full Licensing Committee.

However it was agreed that in the future the Chairman of the Licensing Committee would only sign the minutes of the Licensing Sub Committee meetings which had taken place since the previous meeting of the Licensing Committee, after confirmation that the minutes were a true and accurate record from the members of the relevant sub-Committee(s).

**RESOLVED that the Chairman of the Licensing Committee be authorised to sign the approved minutes of any Licensing Sub Committee meetings after authorisation from the members of the relevant Sub Committees.**

#### **6/L Licensing Act 2003 - Summary of Decisions**

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

**RESOLVED that report be noted.**

#### **7/L Committee Work Programme**

The Committee noted its work programme for the remainder of the municipal year. In addition to the work programme as outlined in the agenda pack, the consideration of the pavement licensing fee and an update in respect of the temporary event notices legislation would also be reported to the October Committee Meeting.

**RESOLVED that the Committee's Work Programme be noted.**

#### **8/L Covid-19 Update**

The Committee considered a verbal report from Mr Tim Pashen, Executive Head of Community, updating the committee on Covid-19 actions

Despite the move from the Council's response to the recovery phase, as the borough's infectious disease control body, it was anticipated that Covid-19 mitigation would continue to be a significant area of work for Council's Environmental Health (EH) Team for sometime to come. To help with this Surrey County Council (SCC) public health team had provided additional funding of £108,000 to the Council through a Service Level Agreement to strengthen the team's capacity to respond to COVID-19. A proportion of this money would be used to cover the staffing costs of the required out of hours service as well as extra staffing resources to help the recently increased food safety workload.

Step 2 and 3 of the business roadmap had meant amended business restriction regulations in respect of the reopening of hospitality. Furthermore, Road Map Step 4 had meant the majority of the COVID business restrictions legislation had been revoked and the legal requirement for providing a Covid-safe workplace had become part of an employer's existing duties under the Health & safety At Work Act 1974. In response to this the Environmental Health Team would be supporting

the borough's businesses with the new approach and initiatives were planned to work with the Council's Economic Development team to survey businesses to find out how best to support them. This was with a view to providing tailored advice on risk assessments and to work with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) on COVID-19 compliance spot checks.

Where complaints about a lack of COVID controls from the public or employees had been investigated, Covid Marshals were deployed to monitor and support business compliance. Where a more formal enforcement approach had been required to achieve compliance this was undertaken by the Environmental Health Officers.

The department were working with SCC Public Health Team and Public Health England (PHE) to investigate a number of workplace outbreaks that had occurred in the borough and were working with the businesses concerned to ensure COVID controls were in place.

From the 1 April 2021 the EH team had investigated two outbreaks. The first was in a large retail business and the second in a large hotel. In both premises good infection controls were in place which prevented further spread. There were a few outbreaks in nursery/school/nursing homes but they were investigated by PHE and did not involve the Council. Furthermore Officers were now carrying out Face to face contact tracing (visiting COVID cases resident in the borough who had not engaged with Test & Trace) and following up on any reports of cases of new variants of concern.

The Council's officers continued to work with event organisers to provide advice on carrying out adequate COVID-19 risk assessments and the implementation of necessary control while case numbers remained high. Moreover officers continued to attend the Surrey Safety Advisory Group meetings to share good practice as well as to ensure a coordinated response to events across Surrey. It was also noted that the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) (No.3) Regulations 2020 remained in place and had been extended until end of September 2021. These Regulations enabled the Council to work with the Director of Public Health at Surrey County Council to issue instruction to prevent or restrict an event/ activity in order to manage local COVID-19 risks or outbreaks by the means of breaking chains of transmission.

The Business and Planning Act 2020 had streamlined the process for businesses to apply for pavement licences. In addition the act had also allowed off sales until 11pm for businesses that did not have the benefit of off-sales on their existing licences.

It was noted that on 19 July the Business and Planning Act 2020 (Pavement Licence) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2021 extended the current provisions to the end of September 2022. In cases where premises wished to continue or start to place chairs and tables on the pavement after the 30 September 2021 they should apply for a replacement/new Pavement Licence using the existing procedures. At the October meeting of the Committee, Members would be asked to consider whether the fee of £100 should continue to be waived for applications for Pavement Licences received for licences which would take

effect after 1 October 2021 and which would expire on or before 30th September 2022.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Licensing Committee, gave a vote of thanks to Mr Pashen for his lengthy service and hard work in supporting licensing and environmental health within the borough and wished him a long and happy retirement

**RESOLVED that the update be noted.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



**Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 7 September 2021**

---

+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman (Chairman)

+ Cllr Morgan Rise (Vice Chairman)

- |                         |                          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| + Cllr Dan Adams        | + Cllr Josephine Hawkins |
| + Cllr Richard Brooks   | + Cllr David Lewis       |
| + Cllr Sarah Jane Croke | + Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath |
| + Cllr Paul Deach       | + Cllr Pat Tedder        |
| + Cllr Tim FitzGerald   | + Cllr Helen Whitcroft   |
| - Cllr Mark Gordon      |                          |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Victoria Wheeler and Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam

Officers Present: Jayne Boitout and Louise Livingston

**7/EP Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 June 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**8/EP Accent Housing**

The Committee received a presentation from Holly Sheppard, Contract Manager, in respect of the ongoing maintenance issues in relation to Accent properties within Surrey Heath.

Accent undertook circa 12,000 repairs per year for its properties within Surrey Heath. However, it was underlined that performance of the maintenance service was not as Accent expected or felt to be acceptable. Following an unsuccessful change of maintenance contractor, Axis Europe was appointed as Accent's main maintenance contractor during November 2019. Going into March 2020, Axis Europe was carrying a large backlog of maintenance cases which had been inherited from Accent's previous maintenance contractor, CHS. As a result of the emerging COVID-19 pandemic, during March 2020 an 8 week pause on non-routine repairs was implemented.

As a result of the pandemic, during the summer of 2020 a new backlog of repair cases emerged as a result of customers shielding, limited access to properties and national lockdowns. Furthermore, Axis Europe had experienced recruitment and retention issues in respect of operatives; and the maintenance programme had suffered from a lack of availability of materials as a result of Brexit. As it stood, there was a particular lack of availability in respect of timber, concrete and fencing.

Whilst it was targeted that all repairs would be completed within 15 days, during 2021/22 only 65.8% were completed within the targeted time period. On the other hand whilst, still not yet at the target mean average score of 4.5; reported customer satisfaction was at 4.18 during 2021/22. Furthermore room for improvement in respect of the repairs service was also underlined by the repair service experiencing a customer satisfaction (CSAT) score of 2.72. This was in contrast to the 4.75 average CSAT score which planned servicing cases managed to achieve between June 2021 and August 2021. In order to improve customer satisfaction, Accent met with its gas heating contractor, TSG Building Services, on a fortnightly basis to discuss implementation of its service improvement plan and to promote consistency on its repair quality.

Looking at an overview of cases which were being dealt with under the formal complaints process, there were currently 80 open complaints relating to 2.7% of properties. 74 complaints related to repairs or planned works. The remaining complaints related to lettings, grounds maintenance or colleagues. Only 3 complaints were currently with the Housing ombudsman. When any complaint was dealt with, Accent aimed for an early resolution and now only closed complaints when they received confirmation that the customer was satisfied with the repair service; and not just post-repair as previously.

Accent aimed to complete a large capital works programme during the 21/22 financial year, which totalled to £4.4 million and would make a total of 1,006 improvements to Accent properties including bathrooms, boiler, radiator and roof upgrades.

In respect of partnership working, Accent had supported the Trussell Trust's 'More than Homes', campaign and offered arrears support to 200 customers. Locally Accent were represented on both the Community Support Working Group and the Old Dean, St Michaels and Watchetts Poverty Group and had housed 5 refugees in conjunction with the Council as part of the Afghan resettlement programme.

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

- With reference to past problems with the heating systems at Cranmore Court, Accent were confident that its gas heating contractor TSG were ready and had enough capacity to adequately deal with any potential spike in heating and hot water related maintenance orders during the winter. During the winter, Accent also ran a 4 hour emergency repair service in relation to hot water and heating repairs. Accent also actively flagged vulnerable residents to its contractors; so TSG and its other appointed contractors were able to prioritise such cases.
- Councillors had received complaints that major works were conducted in an uncoordinated, piecemeal fashion and to a poor quality. Even though Accent had specific standards and specifications it had previously agreed with the contractor in relation to kitchen replacements; not all planned works were completed to a satisfactory standard. Customers had also reported that major works weren't conducted simultaneously on a property, and thus exacerbating the associated disruption on its residents. In addition, Councillors had received reports of the contractors' representatives

suggesting that there was a different standard between private sector repairs and an Accent Housing repair.

- There had previously been an issue experienced by Cranmore Court residents, when upgraded combination boilers had been installed and found to be incompatible with the existing older central heating system. In response to this all radiators in Cranmore Court properties had been surveyed, and replaced where needed, in addition to the removal of any 3 port valves.
- It was felt that in the event of a future lockdown and when undertaking contingency planning, Accent should look to open its properties' communal lounges quicker than it did during previous lockdowns. It was suggested that communal lounges offered a safer place to meet than a local café or pub.
- Better communication and customer service featured heavily in Accent's maintenance service improvement plan. It was noted that Councillors had found Accent residents to be understanding of delays and shortfalls in respect of the maintenance service if they had been well informed and updated. Axis Europe had recently employed a new customer service manager and it was felt that Axis' staff return to the office lent itself to better customer service.
- Accent's planned maintenance programme's resilience was questioned, as Accent had awarded both Ockley Contractors and Kinraig Construction contracts, despite being owned by the same parent company. However, Accent's procurement process considered financial viability aspects and acknowledged that a shift to another contractor would always be kept as a potential option.
- As it stood Accent had no plans to introduce a mandatory full vaccination status amongst its frontline staff. However, it strongly encouraged twice weekly testing amongst its customer facing staff and maintained standards of social distancing and the use of Personal Protective Equipment during visits to customers' homes.

The Committee thanked Holly for attending the meeting and giving an informative update.

## **9/EP Surrey Police**

The Committee received a presentation from Borough Commander, Inspector Alick James, on Surrey Police's role during the COVID-19 pandemic and the general challenges of policing within the Surrey Heath Area.

Whilst residential burglaries and commercial burglaries had fallen by 39% and 24% within the last year respectively, theft of a motor vehicle and hate crime had risen in the past year by 14% and 27% respectively.

Motor vehicle thefts within Surrey Heath had centred in the wider Camberley Urban area, as well as in Lightwater and Chobham. The borough had experienced a notable rise in relay attacks which targeted cars with keyless entry and start systems. A relay attack typically involved two people working together. Whilst one perpetrator stood by the targeted vehicle, the other stood near the house with a device that would pick up a signal from the key fob. The device then relayed the

key fob's signal directly to the car, which allowed the thieves to get in and drive away immediately.

Owners of potential target cars could place their car keys in something which would block the key fob's wireless signal, such as Faraday or Radio-frequency identification (RFID) bag or metal travel mug. Furthermore car owners could also use a steering wheel lock to make the car a less attractive target.

Whilst hate crime within the borough had risen, the arrest rate and voluntary attendance rate had improved on previous years. 20% of hate crimes were between neighbours and 22% were between strangers, whilst the rest of cases were between known rivals or part of feuds. Surrey Police were emphasising the value of partnership intelligence in respect of hate crimes and were actively encouraging the reporting of witnessed hate crime cases, which could be used as evidence by police boards.

The Joint Neighbourhood Survey for Quarter 1 of 21/22 highlighted the stress the public paid to tackling issues such as anti-social or inconsiderate parking and anti-social driving. In relation to the car-meets which were taking place at the Meadows and Watchmoor Park; Surrey Police had secured a dispersal order at Watchmoor Park, which gave the Police powers to direct a person committing or likely to commit antisocial behaviour to leave Watchmoor Park for 48 hours. Positively the Joint Neighbourhood Survey stated that 90.2% of residents were confident or fairly confident in Surrey Heath neighbourhood team, which was the highest confidence rating in the County.

Surrey Police prioritised roads, where speeding offences were reported and where Surrey County Council had reported the highest speeding cases and casualties were most prevalent. This was outlined in its speed management plan. Such highest priority sites were provided with mobile enforcement and central casualty reduction officers from Surrey Police's Central Roads policing resources. Lower priority sites were policed by Surrey Police's local casualty reduction officer and by local resources.

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

- Dangerous, speeding and anti-social driving made up a significant proportion of complaints that Councillors received from residents.
- There had been large numbers of keyless vehicle thefts on the Copped Hall Estate in Parkside and Wellington Park in St Pauls. Whilst due to their inherently quick nature, it was difficult for the Police to respond to such thefts whilst they were taking place, the Roads Policing Team had the ability to tackle the issue by tools such as convoy analysis, comparative time analysis, and comparisons against stolen vehicle descriptions to identify suspects.
- There was an opportunity for Surrey Police to better promote its successes and promote the crime-prevention initiatives; such as use of a faraday pouch, which could be undertaken by residents; via their social media channels.
- Surrey Police's 'Meet the Beat', Initiative had been well received by residents. It was noted that the opportunity to meet with their Police

Community Support Officers (PCSOs) face to face had been reported to Councillors as of being of great reassurance.

- As it stood Surrey Heath Beat were intentionally overestablished for PCSOs, as some were due to leave to join as PCs or move to take up positions in different boroughs. Whilst 2 new PCSOs were due to shortly join the borough's force; there continued to be once PC vacancy; and a number of workload pressures which faced the borough's PCs.

The Committee thanked Inspector Alick James for his informative presentation and his continued positive work throughout the borough.

## **10/EP Surrey Heath Neighbourhood Watch**

Neighbourhood Watch was a grassroots charitable movement. It was the largest crime prevention voluntary movement in England and Wales and had upwards of 2.3 million members. Schemes were run by volunteers across England and Wales supported by volunteer Associations, and by Neighbourhood Watch Network, which was the national umbrella organisation for the movement.

Surrey Heath Neighbourhood Watch (SHNW) volunteers supported Surrey Heath beat to reduce crime and make Surrey Heath a safer place to live and work. A borough wide support group coordinated activity and disseminated information to each road/watch.

Watches regularly shared information, promoted good citizenship and aimed to encourage greater public participation to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour. The watch aimed to actively raise awareness of crime and crime patterns, such as cybercrime, text and telephone based scams as well as physical crimes such as burglary and anti-social behaviour.

During the pandemic Neighbourhood watch reconfigured its services to hold its watch meetings via Zoom, supported its watch coordinators by the phone, and joined the COVID champions scheme and distributed weekly updates and created an electronic newsletter.

Despite the pandemic, within the last year SHNW updated and refurbished all NHW street signs to a more contemporary design. Additional funds to support vulnerable people were raised in order to support vulnerable people by enhancing their home security via provisions such as new locks, alarms and CCTV. SHNW had also worked in greater partnership with Crimestoppers and had successfully applied to Your Fund Surrey for the funding of a Community Support Vehicle.

SHNW had worked in close partnership to support Surrey Police on a number of initiatives. SHNW had supported the Police and Crimestoppers with a catalytic converter theft awareness campaign at Longacres and had worked with PCSOs to set up new neighbourhood watches in high crime areas.

SHNW funded its activities from a significant grant from the Safer Surrey Heath Partnership and smaller grants from the fund of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and other bodies such as Windlesham Parish Council. Furthermore

SHNW raised some of funds from the sale of home security devices from the stalls at which it attended.

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

- There was an opportunity for SHNW to make use of Duke of Edinburgh Award participants in respect of volunteer activities.
- Members could opt to use their Surrey County Council Members' Community Allocation or Borough Ward Councillor community fund grant scheme funds to fund the activities of their local watches.
- Keyless entry car manufacturers were slowly transitioning to fobs which went into a sleep mode when placed down. However it was emphasised that there were multiple methods of entry, including key cloning which could have taken place before second-hand cars were bought.
- There was an opportunity for the Council and Ward Councillors to highlight the dangers of keyless car theft via their various social media channels.

## **11/EP Committee Work Programme**

The Committee considered its Work Programme for the remainder of the municipal year. The Committee were informed that a Surrey Heath Lottery Update Report would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee for noting.

Furthermore it was noted that Voluntary Support North Surrey, The Hope Hub, Camberley Alzheimer Café, Chobham Burymead Football Club and Bisley Village Hall would also present to the Committee during upcoming meetings. The Committee agreed that presentations from Camberley Judo Club and Surrey Search and Rescue would also be considered at future meetings. The Committee's intention to continue to receive presentations from Accent Housing at every meeting for the foreseeable future was reaffirmed.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 8 September 2021**

---

+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Valerie White (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Edward Hawkins
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Cllr Adrian Page and Cllr Robin Perry

Officers Present: Sarah Bainbridge, Senior Organisational Development Advisor  
Gavin Chinniah, Head of Planning  
Adrian Flynn, Chief Accountant  
Louise Livingston, Executive Head: Transformation  
Kate Noviss, Marketing & Communications Manager  
Richard Payne, Executive Head: Corporate  
Gavin Ramtohal, Head of Legal  
Damian Roberts, Chief Executive

## 10/PF Minutes

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## 11/PF Five year Strategy Update

The Committee received a report providing an update on the work to develop a new Five Year Strategy for Surrey Heath Borough Council.

The Committee was informed that the Strategy's development had been guided by a cross party task and finish group which had, to date, met five times and agreed that the strategy would be focused around the following four overarching priorities:

- Environment
- Health and Quality of Life
- Economy
- Effective and Responsive Council

Following early engagement with key partners, an extensive public consultation programme had been launched in July to gather the views and opinions of residents, visitors businesses and partner groups and organisations on the aspects of the Borough that they loved and valued, what they thought needed to be improved and the issues that they considered to be important factors for the future of the Borough.

The consultation had taken place across a number of different channels including general and targeted promotion on a range of social media platforms, articles in Heathscene, promotion of the survey through the Surrey Heath Youth Council, Meals at Home, residents' associations and neighbourhood watch schemes and the Borough Boards. Officers had also attended public events across the Borough. By the end of the consultation period, on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2021, a total of 703 full surveys had been completed and a significant amount of feedback had been received via social media and more detailed conversations at focus groups and feedback from local groups.

It was noted that work to analyse all the feedback received was still underway, and emerging headlines had been included in the report. It was reported that the aspects of Surrey Heath that respondents valued had included its green and open spaces and the rural feel of the borough, transport links, local facilities and amenities and the local community. Respondents also felt that Surrey Heath was a safe area. Areas which were considered to need improving had included: roads and traffic levels, public transport, facilities and services, levels of development, town and village centres and shopping facilities.

The draft strategy had been written to reflect not only feedback from members, partners and the public but also those priorities previously agreed by the Council including alleviating poverty and climate change. Efforts had also been made to link targets in the draft Strategy with existing policies and work with key partners and delineate between those aspirations which the Council could facilitate or deliver and those aspirations where the Council could act as a community leader seeking change through lobbying on behalf of residents.

Arising from the subsequent discussion of the draft Strategy the following points were noted for each of the agreed priorities:

#### Priority: Environment

- Consideration needed to be given to tackling air inequality and pollution across the Borough and not simply focusing on air quality.
- A balance needed to be struck between preserving the green nature of the Borough and ensuring that people's quality of life was not unduly impacted by policies restricting the removal of trees.

#### Priority: Health and Quality of Life

- Reference needed to be included to both the Clinical Commissioning Groups which covered Surrey Heath.
- Support for older and vulnerable residents needed to be incorporated into the Strategy.
- Housing must be fit for habitation and partners should be held to account where problems arose.
- Affordable housing encompassed more than Registered Social Landlords and reference should be made to the actions that the Council would take to work with developers to deliver affordable housing through the Local Plan and planning process.
- Consideration should be given to the possibility of the Council developing its own affordable housing stock.
- Specifics over the types of affordable housing needed to be given.
- The action "Improve transport accessibility for villages" needed to be clarified.



### Priority: Economy

- Our communities were more diverse than just 'towns and villages' and plans to invest in town and village communities should reflect this.
- The section needed to be expanded to take into account both the green economy and how the local economy worked for residents.
- Consideration should be given to how the Council might utilise the green economy in a post pandemic world.
- Reference needed to be made to the number of people who travelled into and out of the Borough each day for work and the impacts that these movements had on all aspects of life including the economy, health and the environment.

The Committee expressed disappointment that the substantive comments provided by many residents in response to the consultation appeared not to have been taken into account in the Strategy's development. It was stressed that the substantive comments were still being analysed and categorised and would be shared with the Task and Finish Group once this work was completed. Details of the substantive responses would also be included in the report that would be taken to the Executive in October.

It was considered that a number of the proposed targets needed to be reworded to ensure that they were specific and achievable and it was suggested that the Task and Finish Group review these. Target implementation years for the priorities would be included in the final strategy.

The Committee was informed that the feedback provided would be combined with any feedback received from the Surrey Heath Partnership at their meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 and taken to the Task and Finish Group for discussion on the 29<sup>th</sup> September 2021. The final draft would be presented to the Executive in October before it was taken to Full Council for adoption.

The Committee commended the officers involved in developing and delivering the comprehensive consultation.

## **12/PF Complaints Monitoring Report 2020/21**

The Committee received a report summarising the outcome of complaints received by the Council at either Stage 2 or Stage 3 of the Council's Corporate Complaints Policy.

During the 2020/21 municipal year, 28 formal complaints had been dealt with at either stage 2 or stage 3 of the Corporate Complaints Procedure (compared to 17 in 2019/20). Of these, 21 had been found to be not justified, four were found to be partly justified and three had been found to be justified. From the seven complaints that were considered to be justified or part justified five related to operational matters and a failure to respond to the resident concerned in a timely manner.

During 2020/21 the Local Government Ombudsman investigated seven complaints relating to Surrey Heath Borough Council of these one was not upheld, three were referred back to the Council for local resolution and three were closed after initial enquiries. The Local Government Ombudsman made no recommendations to the Council in relation to any of the complaints it had investigated.

It was recognised that whilst Covid-19 had impacted on the Council's resources, it was accepted that this should not be a reason for delivering a poor customer experience to residents. The Council's Management Team had committed to a fundamental review and

refocus of customer service including the implementation of revised service standards as well as staff training and development.

In recognition of the fact that planning matters constituted a significant proportion of the complaints received, the Planning Advisory Service had been engaged to holistically review the Council's planning processes with a focus on improving the service that people received. The review would start at the end of October. It was agreed that the Committee would receive an update on the findings of the review.

The Committee noted the report.

### **13/PF Executive Portfolio Update: Planning and People**

The Committee received a report summarising the Council's work during the first six months of the 2021/22 municipal year which were encompassed within the Planning and People Executive Portfolio; a portfolio which covered a number of areas including planning policy and conservation, planning enforcement, development management, building control, drainage and land charges.

It was reported that at the current time, work to develop a new Local Plan was focused on identifying sufficient suitable land to meet both the Government's identified housing need and the five year land supply targets for the Borough and the requirement for additional Gypsy and Traveller sites; the constrained nature of the Borough's landscape with its proximity to amongst other things Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Green Belt and areas of flooding and the lack of Suitable Alternative Green Spaces (SANGs) to mitigate homes developed in the west of the Borough made this particularly challenging.

The Committee was informed that the latest Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2020) showed a significant need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Borough and it was stressed that without a viable Gypsy and Traveller Policy the Local Plan would be found to be unsound at the examination stage. This would in turn leave the Borough vulnerable to unsuitable and unsustainable developments.

The Council's target of 35% of new housing provided in developments of more than 10 units to be affordable had been missed for a number of years. A fact that was attributed to a combination of developers stating that the provision of a high volume of affordable housing made developments unviable and negotiating a reduction in the number of affordable units to be provided and many developments being completed through the Prior Approvals process which did not place a requirement on developers to deliver a proportion of affordable homes.

Developers seeking to reduce the levels of affordable housing in a development were required to provide a viability assessment which was independently checked before any agreements were reached. However the Council was bound by the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework when assessing requests for a reduction. It was noted that the situation with regard to affordable housing was expected to be exacerbated by the introduction of the Government's First Homes Scheme which would require the first 25% of any new development to be classified as a First Home and offered for sale at a reduced rate.

There had been a significant increase in the numbers of planning applications from homeowners seeking to build extensions submitted for consideration. Consequently, it had proved a challenge for officers to always determine applications within the statutory timescales of with 64% of minor development applications being determined within the 8 week statutory timeframe and 67% of major development applications being determined

with in the 13 week timeframe during the first quarter of 2020/21. It was noted that the threshold for Government intervention in respect of determining planning applications was 50%. To alleviate pressure on the Development Management Team and speed up the determination of planning applications two additional planning officers, who would focus primarily on reducing the backlog of applications and lead on the delivery of major cases, had been appointed on a temporary basis until March 2022.

The Committee noted that over the winter of 2020/21, the flood defences and attention measures put in place by the Council had performed as intended and consequently no reports of flooding had been received that could be attributed to fall within the Council's responsibility. It was clarified that work on Frimley Fuel Allotments had not been completed because, at the current time, it was not considered to be a problem area and consequently resources had been diverted to other areas of the Borough where need was greater.

The Committee commended the achievements of the Council Drainage Section which had very limited resources and questioned the resilience of the service in view of the fact the drainage service was delivered by a single officer.

The Committee noted the update.

#### **14/PF Review of Public Realm Works**

The Group received a report setting out the proposed remit of the Task and Finish Group that had been convened to examine the over spend on public realm works in Camberley town centre.

The Group was informed that the Monitoring Officer would be conducting a review of of the circumstances leading to the increased costs of the Public Realm project and this would form part of the Task and Finish Group's final report.

It was requested that any comments on the Task and Finish Group's remit be forwarded to Councillor Mylvaganam in the first instance.

#### **15/PF Work Programme**

The Committee received a report setting out the work programme for the Performance and Finance Scrutiny committee for the remainder of the 2021/22 municipal year.

It was agreed that the following item would be added to the work programme:

- Review of Planning Processes

The Committee noted the report.

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank