

# COUNCIL MEETING

## 23 February 2022

# COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

- |     |   |                        |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 1.  | <b>Council - 15 December 2021</b>   | <b>(Pages 3 - 10)</b>  |
| 2.  | <b>Executive - 25 January 2022</b>  | <b>(Pages 11 - 16)</b> |
| 3.  | <b>Executive - 15 February 2022 (to be laid on the table)</b>                                   | <b>-</b>               |
| 4.  | <b>Planning Applications Committee - 9 December 2021</b>  | <b>(Pages 17 - 22)</b> |
| 5.  | <b>Planning Applications Committee - 20 January 2022</b>  | <b>(Pages 23 - 32)</b> |
| 6.  | <b>Planning Applications Committee - 10 February 2022 (to be laid on the table)</b>             | <b>-</b>               |
| 7.  | <b>Licensing Committee – 15 December 2021</b>   | <b>(Pages 33 – 34)</b> |
| 8.  | <b>Licensing Committee – 16 February 2022 (to be laid on the table)</b>                         | <b>-</b>               |
| 9.  | <b>Performance &amp; Finance Scrutiny Committee - 19 January 2022 (to be laid on the table)</b> | <b>-</b>               |
| 10. | <b>Employment Committee - 8 February 2022 (to be laid on the table)</b>                         | <b>-</b>               |
| 11. | <b>Joint Staff Consultative Group - 13 January 2022</b>   | <b>(Pages 35 - 38)</b> |
| 12. | <b>Joint Staff Consultative Group - 3 February 2022</b>   | <b>(Pages 39 - 40)</b> |

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY  
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at  
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on  
15 December 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

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

\* In attendance virtually but did not vote

**46/C Suspension of Council Procedure Rules**

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

**RESOLVED that Council Procedure Rule 21.2 (requirement to stand) be suspended for the meeting.**

**47/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Dan Adams, Cliff Betton, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Josephine Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans and David Mansfield. It was noted that some councillors had joined the meeting virtually but would not be entitled to vote.

**48/C Minutes**

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 27 October 2021 be approved as a correct record.**

**49/C Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor presented a video of the many events she had attended since the previous Council meeting. Of particular note were the events associated with commemorating Armistice Day.

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

The Leader welcomed the new Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services, Bob Watson, to the Council and thanked Amanda Fahey for her work when covering the role on an interim basis. He also paid tribute to the police Borough Commander, Alick James, who would be moving to a new role in Guildford, and advised that Acting Inspector Samantha White would be covering the role until Inspector Gemma Taylor took up the role in the New Year.

The Council was informed that the refurbishment works to the exterior of the Camberley Theatre had been completed on schedule.

It was reported that, since the launch of the Household Assistance Grants at the end of November, approximately 900 applications had been received and £15,000 had been granted to date. The building and refurbishment work for the new emergency homeless night stop accommodation had been completed and the facility was due to be handed over to the Hope Hub on schedule; the Hope Hub was recruiting and training staff in preparation for opening in the New Year.

The Leader informed the Council that the Garden Waste service was still suspended due to shortages of HGV drivers. However, a second interim collection had been arranged for the week commencing 10 January 2022.

Members were informed that the anticipated White Paper on levelling up and local government reform had been delayed until the New Year. The Leader also advised that, in view of the ongoing pandemic, the Council continued to lobby for Councils to hold meetings virtually and had written to the MP for Surrey Heath and the Leader of the House of Commons on the matter.

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

- (a) Executive – 16 November and 7 December 2021

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 16 November and 7 December 2021 be received and the recommendations therein be adopted as set out below:**

### **75/E Calculation and Setting of the Council Tax Base for 2022/23**

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) **with effect from 1 April 2022 the Empty Homes Premium be introduced at the maximum levels allowed in the legislation**

where the property has been empty for 2, 5 or 10 more years as detailed in paragraph 7 of the Executive agenda report; and

(ii) the Council Tax Exceptional Hardship Policy remains unchanged for 2022/23, and the fund available remain at £80,000.

(b) Planning Applications Committee – 28 October and 11 November 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 28 October and 11 November 2021 be received.**

(c) Licensing Committee – 20 October 2021

It was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates, seconded by Councillor Valerie White and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 20 October 2021 be received.**

(d) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 10 November 2021

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 10 November 2021 be received.**

(e) Audit and Standards Committee – 22 November 2021

It was moved by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam, seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 22 November 2021 be received and the recommendation therein be adopted as set out below:**

**8/AS Procurement of External Audit for the Period 2023/24 2027/28**

**RESOLVED that the Council accepts the invitation from Public Sector Audit Appointments to opt in to the sector led process for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for the five financial years from 1 April 2023.**

(f) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 25 November 2021

It was moved by Councillor Graham Tapper, seconded by Councillor Sharon Galliford and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 25 November 2021 be received.**

- (g) External Partnerships Select Committee – 30 November 2021

It was moved by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Councillor David Lewis and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 30 November 2021 be received.**

## 52/C Motions

It was moved by Councillor Sharon Galliford and seconded by Councillor Graham Alleway that

“this Council

- (i) believes that:
- a. all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to limit the negative impacts of Climate and Ecological Breakdown; local authorities should not wait for their national governments to change their policies;
  - b. all tiers of local government are well placed to lead the way in reducing carbon emissions and tackling the ecological emergency as they have closer links with their residents;
  - c. having already declared a Climate Emergency in 2019 and committed to carbon neutrality by 2030, there is also an ecological emergency;
  - d. the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill needs the full support of local government to highlight the urgency of the twin climate and ecological emergencies;
- (ii) declares an ‘Ecological Emergency’ to accompany the Climate Emergency it has already declared;
- (iii) commits to:
- a. leading by example and promoting the good work it is currently undertaking;
  - b. working with partners and volunteers locally and regionally to drive coordinated leadership and collaborative action to aid the recovery of nature and natural environments and identify areas for greater biodiversity;
  - c. ensuring irreplaceable habitats are protected, the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy is followed and that net biodiversity gain is fully implemented;
  - d. reviewing and implementing a borough-wide Tree Strategy;
  - e. continue to review Surrey Heath’s Green Infrastructure Strategy;

- f. demanding that new developments contribute to increasing biodiversity and ecological improvement
- g. register its support for the CEE Bill with the CEE Bill Alliance;
- h. write an open letter, to be shared through local media; and
- i. write to the Member of Parliament for Surrey Heath to urge him to sign up to support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill.”

Having expressed concerns about the duplication of work already being undertaken by the Climate Change Working Group, it was moved by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan that the motion be referred to the Climate Change Working Group for discussion. The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

The Council discussed the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill and heard differing views on the merits of the Bill. It was moved by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins that the motion be amended by removing (i) d, (iii) g and (iii) i. The amendment was put to the vote and lost. It was subsequently moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page that the motion be amended by removing (iii) g. The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

**RESOLVED that this Council**

**(i) believes that:**

- a. all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to limit the negative impacts of Climate and Ecological Breakdown; local authorities should not wait for their national governments to change their policies;**
- b. all tiers of local government are well placed to lead the way in reducing carbon emissions and tackling the ecological emergency as they have closer links with their residents;**
- c. having already declared a Climate Emergency in 2019 and committed to carbon neutrality by 2030, there is also an ecological emergency;**
- d. the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill needs the full support of local government to highlight the urgency of the twin climate and ecological emergencies;**

**(ii) declares an ‘Ecological Emergency’ to accompany the Climate Emergency it has already declared;**

**(iii) commits to:**

- a. leading by example and promoting the good work it is currently undertaking;**
- b. working with partners and volunteers locally and regionally to drive coordinated leadership and collaborative action to aid the recovery of nature and natural environments and identify areas for greater biodiversity;**

- c. ensuring irreplaceable habitats are protected, the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy is followed and that net biodiversity gain is fully implemented;**
- d. reviewing and implementing a borough-wide Tree Strategy;**
- e. continue to review Surrey Heath's Green Infrastructure Strategy;**
- f. demanding that new developments contribute to increasing biodiversity and ecological improvement**
- g. register its support for the CEE Bill with the CEE Bill Alliance;**
- h. write an open letter, to be shared through local media; and**
- i. write to the Member of Parliament for Surrey Heath to urge him to sign up to support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill."**

Note 1: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4, a recorded vote was taken on the substantive motion.

The following Members voted in favour of the motion:

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

The following Members voted against the motion:

Councillors Colin Dougan, David Lewis, Alan McClafferty, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram,

The following Members abstained from voting:

Councillors Stuart Black, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, Valerie White.

## **53/C Governance Working Group**

The Council received a report detailing the items considered the recent meeting of the Governance Working Group, which included recommendations on updating the following documents:

- (i) Members' Code of Conduct,
- (ii) Arrangements for Dealing with Allegations of Misconduct,
- (iii) Planning Code of Practice for Councillors and Officers,
- (iv) ICT Code of Practice for Members.

The Code of Conduct for Members was considered and it was suggested that a section should be added on the use of Social Media. Members were advised that the Social Media Protocol for Councillors was included in the Documents Which Support the Constitution and the Code of Conduct would apply if the relevant



Member was deemed to be acting as a councillor when participating on social media. It was agreed to ask the Working Group to add the Social Media Protocol to its Work Programme.

Members discussed the proposed changes to the ICT Code of Practice. In addition to rolling out Multi Factor Authentication to further enhanced security when accessing email and data, it was proposed to upgrade existing Microsoft licences to enable access to OneDrive for Business and Office apps for iPad. This had been proposed in response to previous conversations about the lack of digital storage for Members. Concerns were raised about whether, at the present time, Members could meet the requirements in respect of storage proposed in the changes to the Code; it was advised that there were opportunities for emails being stored in sub folders within the email system, which would meet these amended requirements in the Code.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Members' Code of Conduct at Part 5, Section A of the Constitution be updated as set out at Annex A to this report;**
- (ii) the Arrangements for dealing with allegations of misconduct under Section 28 Localism Act 2011 at Part D of the Documents Which Support the Constitution, be updated as set out at Annex B to this report;**
- (iii) the Planning Code of Practice for Councillors and Officers at Part 5, Section D of the Constitution be updated as set out at Annex C to this report; and**
- (iv) the ICT Code of Practice for Members at Part 5, Section C of the Constitution be updated as set out at Annex D to this report.**

Note: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.5, Councillor Victoria Wheeler recorded her vote against the decision.

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

The Leader undertook to provide a response to a question raised by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam at recent meetings.

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 25  
January 2022**

---

+ 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 Rodney Bates, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Edward Hawkins, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Helen Whitcroft and Cllr Valerie White

**83/E Minutes**

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**84/E Questions by Members**

In response to a question from Councillor Adrian Page concerning the increases to labour and material costs, the Leader indicated that a review would be undertaken on projects included in the Capital Programme.

**85/E Revenue Grants 2022- 2024**

The Executive considered a report detailing recommendations for revenue grant payments to voluntary organisations for the period 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2023, and the three organisations identified for ring-fenced funding for the period from April 2023 to 31 March 2024. Members were reminded that that the 3 ring-fenced organisations were Citizens Advice Surrey Heath, Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership and the Basingstoke Canal Authority.

It was reported that, since the preparation of the report, conversations had taken place with Voluntary Support North Surrey to resolve an outstanding question and it was now proposed to award the organisation a grant of £30,000.

The Executive was advised that the budget preparations for 2022/23 had indicated that the Council would be unable to sustain the same level of funding as in previous years and would not be able to support any new organisations. Furthermore, the Council would be unable confirm the continuation of funding for non-ringfenced organisations beyond 1 April 2023. It was proposed to use the Containment Outbreak Management Fund, which would enable the Council to continue to support the existing organisations for the 2022/23 financial year and those that were ring-fenced for the 2023-24 financial year.

Members recognised a need to further understand the impact of the Council removing the funding to the organisations. It was therefore agreed that a report would be considered by October 2022, examining the impact of not funding each of the organisations and the potential impact on the Council, plus whether services could be delivered in another way.

**RESOLVED that**

**(i) the following Revenue Grants for 2022/23 be awarded to:**

- a. Surrey Heath Citizens Advice (CASH) – £80,000.**
- b. Surrey Heath Age Concern - £10,000.**
- c. Camberley Central Job Club - £6,000**
- d. Catalyst Support - £1,500.**
- e. The Hope Hub - £31,500.**
- f. VSNS-Time to Talk - £10,000.**
- g. Basingstoke Canal Authority - £10,000.**
- h. Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership - £10,000.**
- i. Surrey Heath Sports Council - £3,000.**
- j. Voluntary Support North Surrey - £30,000;**

**(ii) the other in-kind benefits provided to organisations be noted;**

**(iii) all grants be subject to Service Level Agreements;**

**(iv) No Revenue Grants to be awarded to: Windlesham Field of Remembrance, The Women’s Institute Bagshot, RASASC (Rape and Sexual Abuse Support Centre) Guildford, the Mustard Seed Trust, Farnborough, Home-Start Surrey Heath, Lightwater Connected and Surrey Heath Arts Council;**

**(v) the funds available within the Containment Outbreak Management Fund be utilised to meet the Revenue Grant Costs as detailed above 1) A to J for the period of 2022-23 at a maximum total cost of £192,500;**

**(vi) the available funds from the Containment Outbreak Management Fund be utilised to meet the Revenue Grant costs of the 3 ringfenced organisations which consist of: Citizen’s Advice Surrey Heath, £80,000, Basingstoke Canal Authority, and Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership, both at £10,000 giving an additional allocated amount of £100,000 to meet revenue costs for the year, 2023-2024, and throughout the remainder of this year for the work to continue to identify the funding necessary to retain support for all other organisations; and**

**(vii) a further report be considered by October 2022 examining the impact of the lack of funding on each of the organisations and the potential impact on the Council, or whether services could be delivered in another way.**

Note 1: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans declared a non-pecuniary interest as she was a Council representative on Surrey Heath Sports Council.

Note 2: It was noted for the record that

- (i) Councillor Rodney Bates declared that his sister worked for Catalyst Support and he indicated that he would not comment on that decision;
- (ii) Councillor Shaun Garrett declared that he volunteered for Surrey Heath Age Concern; and
- (iii) Councillor Alan McClafferty declared that his wife was the Chairman of Surrey Heath Age Concern.

### **86/E Surrey Heath Community Grants Review**

The Executive considered a report setting out the recommendations proposed by the Community Support Working Group following a review of the Council's community grants.

Members were advised that, in relation to the Ward Councillor Grant Scheme, from April 2022 any funds not spent at the end of the financial year would not be carried forward into the next year. It was agreed that an up-to-date statement of unspent funds would be circulated to all councillors.

**RESOLVED that the Community Support Working Group's recommendations relating to the Council's Community Grant Schemes, as set-out in Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.**

### **87/E Review of Parking Fees and Charges**

The Executive considered a report reviewing car parking fees and charges for the Council's off-street car parks. The report made a series of recommendations in relation to permits, season tickets, and transferring the costs of RingGo convenience charges to the service user, along with specific proposals for changes to tariffs.

It was reported that tariffs for the Camberley Town Centre car parks not been increased since 2014; furthermore, the out of town Pay & Display tariffs had not been amended since 2009. At present, only the Camberley Town Centre car parks provided a surplus and the income from Pay & Display car parking charges was insufficient each year to meet the operational costs of providing those car parks. This review aimed to get closer to a point where the out of town car parks could break even.

Members discussed the proposed increases to the tariffs for Camberley Town Centre car parks, which related to Main Square car park and Knoll Road car park, and indicated a degree of support for increasing the tariffs. The proposals included the removal of the temporary free parking at Knoll Road introduced during the High Street redevelopment works. The Executive noted suggestions that future

reviews look at phasing out the separate Sunday rate and introducing options for differential charging in car parks. Having heard suggestions that the town centre car parks should include a period of free parking, Members were reminded that free parking was available at on-street parking bays within the town, for up to 30 minute periods.

The proposed changes to tariffs for the borough's out of town car parks were reviewed. In relation to Bagshot car park, Burrell Road car park (Frimley), Chobham car park, and Watchetts Road, it was proposed to retain a free first hour of parking and introduce a new tariff for 2 hours parking. Existing tariffs would be increased and weekend charges introduced.

It was advised that no changes were proposed to weekday Yorktown car park tariffs as its current charges were broadly in line with proposals for the other borough-wide pay and display car parks. Also, unlike the other out of town car parks, this one did not provide any free parking period. The proposed increases to Surrey Heath House charges were also noted.

Members raised concerns that removing the second hour of free parking at Chobham car park could affect the use of the adjacent SANG. It was suggested that reducing the free parking period at this car park, which provided the only parking for the SANG, could encourage dog walkers to use Chobham Common, where parking was free, instead, thereby countering the purpose of the SANG. References were also made to the impact that reducing the period of free parking would have on use of this car park by a nearby school. In response to specific concerns raised, the Portfolio Holder undertook to confirm whether any SANG money had been used for the maintenance of Chobham car park.

The report proposed to introduce charges at Wharf Road car park, Frimley Green, with free parking for stays for up to one hour. This was intended to encourage greater turnover of spaces and deter all day parking, as the car park was currently oversubscribed with lots of commuter parking, whilst providing additional income to ensure the car park contributed to its maintenance and capital investment. Concerns were expressed that the introduction of charges could affect the use of local amenities, increase parking on residential roads by employees, and impact the parking at the doctor's surgery and the library.

In relation to Deepcut Car Park, the Council had further explored the cost-benefit to residents of introducing a residents permits at Deepcut car park and, although no changes were proposed at the current time, it was agreed that the position would be reviewed should circumstances change.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) car parking tariff changes, as set out in Annex 1 to the agenda report, be agreed to come into effect as soon as the statutory Traffic Regulatory Order process is complete and after review and consideration of any feedback received;**
- (ii) pay and display parking tariffs be introduced at Wharf Road car park, Frimley Green once the statutory Traffic Regulatory Order**

**process is complete and after review and consideration of any feedback received;**

**(iii) the temporary NHS/Carers permit be extended until 1 May 2022;**

**(iv) the RingGo convenience fees be passed on to the customer;**

**(v) Parking Services investigate incentives to encourage greater use of zero emission vehicles;**

**(vi) charging for the first two hours of parking in Knoll Road car park be reinstated as the public realm works in the High Street have now been completed. This will follow a statutory 3 week notice process, coming into effect on Monday 27 February 2022;**

**(vii) the Parking Subsidy Season Ticket for low paid workers permit be retained as part of the revised tariffs; and**

**(viii) the position in respect of Deepcut Car Park be reviewed should circumstances change.**

#### **88/E Surrey Heath Physical Activity Strategy**

The Executive considered a draft Physical Activity Strategy. The vision of the strategy was to create an environment where all Surrey Heath residents, regardless of age, background or circumstances, had the opportunity to participate in physical activity in a way that worked for them.

Members were advised that physical activity levels played a key role in the health and wellbeing of the community and could have positive impacts on wider agendas such as community safety and the climate emergency. In line with regional and national partners, officers were bringing forward a physical activity strategy that highlighted priority areas for the next five years where the Council would concentrate its efforts.

**RESOLVED that the physical activity strategy for Surrey Heath, entitled “Moving Forward”, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be formally adopted for the 2022-2027 period.**

#### **89/E COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund**

The Executive was informed that Government had introduced a number of new measures to support business as a result of the ongoing pandemic. This follows the significant support provided through business grants and rate reliefs in 2020 and 2021.

The COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund (CARF) had been announced in March 2021, but details had been delayed until December 2021 due to the legislative process. Government guidance had been received on 30 December 2021 for COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund (CARF) scheme rules. Approval was sought for

the authority to be delegated to agree a discretionary local scheme that would be drawn up based on the emerging Government guidelines.

**RESOLVED that authority be delegated to the Strategic Director Finance & Customer Services after consultation with the Finance Portfolio Holder to approve the Business Rates COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund policy, scheme rules and authorise the award of the relief.**

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 9 December 2021**

---

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

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	- Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	- Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
- Cllr David Mansfield	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Morgan Rise (In place of Cllr Helen Whitcroft)

Members in Attendance: Councillor Paul Deach

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop, Gavin Chinniah, William Hinde, Jonathan Partington and Eddie Scott

Also in attendance: Andrew Stokes (Surrey County Council, Highways)

**40/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**41/P Application Number: 21/1003 - Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RN**

The application was to vary the section 106 agreement, as varied, in respect of hybrid permission 12/0546, as amended by 18/0619 and 18/1002 to amend the delivery or occupation or payment triggers for the completion of the Village Green and combined NEAP/LEAP, the provision of the Sports Hub, the Formal Park, the Allotments, the Basingstoke Canal Towpath contribution, shared pedestrian/cycle infrastructure, various highway works, bus infrastructure; to amend the clauses to Junction 3 M3 to allow for a payment of a contribution in lieu of works; to amend the highway layout at the junction of Frimley Green Road with Wharf Road and Guildford Road to provide a roundabout scheme, the phased provision of the Southern SANG, option to extend the management company for the SANGs to all non residential land areas, amend the Bellew Road Closure clause and consequential amendments to the definitions, clauses and plans.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

## “Representations

A further representation has been received from the Mytchett, Frimley Green and Deepcut Society. It advises that overall the Society is happy to support the proposals but have requested that two outstanding suggestions are taken on board as follows:

- Given previous concerns, further work to be undertaken in relation to the sightlines for the new pedestrian crossing going from the Rose and Thistle across the Guildford Road prior to final submission to the Planning Committee;
- There is one parking space outside the petrol station that the Society would like removed as it effectively reduces the width of the carriageway and causes an unnecessary pinch point exactly where cars will want to overtake the northerly bus when it is at the stop. For the new scheme to be fully effective this should be addressed prior to final submission to the Planning Committee

They also would like to be consulted on the proposed external materials and street furniture to be used in the scheme.

## Consultee responses

The County Highway Authority has responded to the above comments as follows:

- With regards the first issue relating to the crossing point by the Rose & Thistle, this does not need to be addressed before the planning committee. There is currently no crossing point in this location, but it's likely that those wishing to make use of a dropped kerb will use the existing dropped kerb behind the pub. The new crossing point on Guildford Road at the junction could be deleted if deemed unsuitable, but we do need to recognise the possible pedestrian desire line and slow approach speeds of vehicles. The Safety Audit raised these pedestrian visibility issues at this location, which will be dealt with as part of the detailed design.
- With regards the road space outside the filling station, it is not a parking space. Parking is allowed to take place here if it is deemed safe to do so. I agree that it would be prudent for the lines to be extended, so suggest that this be confirmed by way of a Cttee update or updated drawing, if only to allow a more efficient TRO processing route to be taken at the construction stage. It could wait until the detailed design stage but the implementation process requires an SCC Cttee report so the process is much longer. If added now, my Team has delegated authority
- With regards materials they would be part of the detailed design stage, but acknowledge that there is a local expectation to achieve a high quality scheme which we support, and higher quality materials may be possible in areas of the scheme to achieve this.

Having regard to the commentary above, it is noted that further detailed design work will be required for the revised scheme. The proposed extension of lines outside the filling station is supported for inclusion within the detailed design of the scheme.

Windlesham Parish Council have responded to the proposal in relation to Junction 3 M3 and seeks clarification of the alternative wording as the use of 2 x 'unless' in the same sentence make it confusing to read.

In the interests of clarity the applicant has amended the wording to read

*"2.17 The Owner shall not Commence the construction of more than 600 (six hundred) Dwellings **unless** otherwise agreed in writing with the Council and the County Council **until** it has submitted the Junction 3 M3 Highway Works Notice to the County Council to establish whether the Junction 3 M3 Highway Works are required, or whether the payment of the Junction 3 M3 Contribution is required. The County Council, following consultation with the Council will respond to the Junction 3 M3 Highway Works Notice within 20 (twenty) Working Days of receipt to confirm whether the Works or Contribution is sought."*

The County Highway Authority are satisfied with this wording. The proposed amendment is considered to be acceptable.

#### **Amended recommendation**

AGREE proposed amendments to section 106 agreement, as previously varied, to be drafted in detail broadly in accordance with the agenda report, the assessment report and this update."

A verbal update was also given to the meeting in respect of Schedule 5 Part 6 Village Green and Combined NEAP/LEAP Paragraph 1.4 for the amended trigger number to be 350 to correspond with the text.

The recommendation to agree the amendments was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Councillor Robin Perry, and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that the proposed amendments to the Section 106 agreement, as previously varied, to be drafted in detail broadly in accordance with this report and the assessment report, be agreed.**

#### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all Members of the Committee had received representations on behalf of Skanska in respect of the proposal.

#### **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 agree the revised Section 106 agreement:

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

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

Members were advised that the application's determination was to be deferred due to amended plans having been submitted and the resulting need to consult on the application.

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

**RESOLVED that application 20/0514 be deferred.**

**43/P Application Number: Clear Spring, Brick Hill, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8TH**

The application was for a single storey rear extension.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Victoria Wheeler because of concern over the harm to the Green Belt.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**"UPDATE**

The proposed plans for approval include velux windows which are permitted development. To provide clarity on what works are to be undertaken it is proposed to update condition 4 to enable all the works shown on the approved plans to be undertaken as follows:

Amended condition 4 (change in italics)

Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A, Class B, Class C, Class D, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no further extensions, roof alterations, porches or outbuildings shall be erected on the site without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

*Unless otherwise shown on the approved plans any other development under the Classes stated above undertaken or implemented between the date of this decision and the commencement of the development hereby approved shall be demolished and all material debris permanently removed from the land within one month of the development hereby approved coming into first use.*

Reason: To retain controls in the interests of the openness of the Green Belt and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Amended recommendation**

Grant subject to the conditions set out in the agenda report as amended by this update”.

The Committee felt that in order to understand the total existing potential scope of the dwelling, they needed confirmation as to whether the Permitted Development rights relating to the 1973 granting of planning permission had been removed. As a result a proposal to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 21/0902 be deferred in order to seek further information on the planning permission granted in 1973.**

### **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 proposal to defer the application:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the proposal to defer the application:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Robin Perry and Graham Tapper.

Voting in abstention on the proposal to defer the application:

Councillor Graham Alleway

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 20 January 2022**

---

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

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Robin Perry
- Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Mansfield	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Morgan Rise (In place of Cllr Cliff Betton)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Simon Chalcraft, Michael Gavin  
Gavin Chinniah, Bex Green, Julia Greenfield  
William Hinde, Shannon Kimber, Jonathan Partington  
James Robinson, Eddie Scott, Nick Steevens  
Patricia Terceiro and Ryno Van der Hoven

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

The Committee were advised that it was proposed that the following text would be inserted into minute 41/P relating to application 21/1003 – Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RN:

‘A verbal update was also given to the meeting in respect of Schedule 5 Part 6 Village Green and Combined NEAP/LEAP Paragraph 1.4 for the amended trigger number to be 350 to correspond with the text.’

The minutes were subsequently confirmed by the Committee.

#### **45/P Exclusion of Press and Public**

In accordance with Section 100A(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:

<u>Minute</u>	<u>Paragraph(s)</u>
45/P (Part)	1 and 3

**46/P Planning Enforcement Update**

The Committee considered an information item which provided an overview of function and performance of the Corporate Enforcement Service for the period 1st September 2021 – 31st December 2021.

During the period in question, the Planning Enforcement Team investigated allegations of planning breaches, as shown below:

<b>Number of referrals received</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>No breach found</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Breach resolved</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Not expedient to pursue</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Enforcement Notices issued</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Requisition of Information Notices (PCN/S16/S330) issued</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Planning applications received dealing with matters under investigation</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Pending consideration</b>	<b>33</b>

In addition to this it was noted that a number of enforcement notices had been issued on a number of sites including:

- 1-23 St Georges Court, St Georges Road, Camberley, GU15 3QZ – ref: 21/0221/ENF
- Graylands, Windlesham Road, Chobham, Surrey, GU24 8SN – ref: 20/137/ENF£
- Hall Grove Farm Industrial Estate, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5HP – ref: 21/0059/ENF – (Notice A)
- Land lying to the East of Hall Grove Farm Industrial Estate, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5HP – ref: 21/0059/ENF – (Notice B)
- 19 Bedford Avenue, Frimley Green, Camberley, GU16 6HP – ref: 20/0028/ENF

Members noted that with greater additional resource in place, the enforcement service had been concentrating on resolving the highest priority, often historic investigations as well as reviewing internal procedures to ensure that the planning enforcement process was streamlined and efficient.

On reviewing practices in respect of the dealing of retrospective planning applications, the need for the enforcement service to have greater involvement



from the outset to provide assistance to case officers and share any vital information was underlined. Furthermore, a new process had now been implemented to ensure that where appropriate, enforcement notices were issued in a timely manner for refused retrospective planning applications with a separate new expediency report template created.

The Committee noted that unfortunately, due to a large number of significant high priority urgent investigations in existence, to date, resource had been prioritised to focus on dealing with such investigations. However, the team had made significant progress in reviewing the outstanding investigations and had moved into the new year in a much better position, noting in particular the added temporary resource in the form of an additional Planning Enforcement Officer. Therefore, officers were working to formally commence the compliance role from the start new financial year. Following discussion from Members, it was advised that the monitoring of compliance would be prioritised following a risk-based assessment of sites; and such process could be shared with Members in due course. Moreover, it was noted that an additional software programme, Enterprise, had been procured in order to enable more complex reporting in respect of data, caseloads and workloads.

**RESOLVED that the update be noted.**

**47/P 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 the annex associated with minute 46/P remain exempt.**

**48/P Application Number: 21/1122- Erlwood Manor, London Road, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6PH**

The application was for alterations to existing buildings and landscape; demolition of Biology East; construction of a three storey collaboration hub and link building; landscaping; creation of footpaths; associated infrastructure and other works.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**“UPDATE**

Correction to page 9 of the agenda: The applicant is UCB Celltech (UCB)

**Conditions**

Condition 3 (Materials) amended to read:

*Prior to construction, alteration and extension works relating to the Collaboration Hub and Manor House, details and samples of materials to be used for the external surfaces of those buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. In respect of the Manor House these details shall include detailed drawings at 1:100 and 1:20 and shall include details of treatment*

*of the north elevation and terrace base. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details. In relation to all other alteration works at the site the external materials shall match those of the building concerned.*

*Reason: To ensure a high quality of construction and appearance and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.*

Condition 8 (Archaeology) is replaced by a new condition:

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Archaeology Desk-Based assessment, Savills, Revised Draft, December 2021.

Reason: To ensure full assessment of the potential archaeological value of the site and to comply with policy DM17 of the CSDMP 2012.

Condition 15 (Trees): add clause *k) A strategy for removal of invasive species, this to include details of management over a period of 5 years following completion of the development to ensure eradication.*

Condition 18 (Woodland management plan) is deleted.

Condition 19 (Lighting) is amended to read:

*Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved a lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.*

*Reason: To protect biodiversity and prevent light pollution and to comply with policies CP14A and DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.*

Additional condition (Lighting during development works)

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved a Demolition and Construction Phases Lighting Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and works shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect biodiversity and to comply with policy CP14A of the CSDMP 2012.

Additional condition (Protection of trees during demolition)

Prior to commencement of demolition works a Demolition Tree Protection Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect trees during demolition works and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

Additional Informative

Pursuant to condition 9 (Travel Plan) the applicant is requested to consider inclusion of a station-to-site shuttle bus service to transport employees.”

Following consideration of the Planning Updates, the Committee wished to clarify that the proposed Condition 17 in the officer’s report should also refer to any

superseding landscaping management plan, which had not yet been agreed with the Local Planning Authority. As a result it was agreed to add the words, 'or a variation to' after 'approved landscaping plan', in the proposed condition.

Furthermore following discussion, the Committee agreed to amend condition 10 of the officer's report to specify '15 passive rapid or fast charging electric vehicle charging points'.

The officer recommendation, as amended, was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 21/1122 be granted subject to the conditions in the Officer Report and Planning Updates, as amended.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that herself, her fellow Ward Councillors and Parish Councillors had met the applicant, on site, and reviewed the existing building and discussed the plans for the site; however she came into 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 officer recommendation to grant the application:

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

**49/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 is 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 fixed plant for heating and cooling units) - retrospective.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee by Councillor Edward Hawkins on the grounds of residents' concerns over size and bulk, and concerns over the inappropriateness of the heating and cooling units and their potential impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of 3 Middle Close.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

## **“UPDATE**

### **Representations**

A further five representations have been received from four addresses. These objection comments have been summarised below:

- Overdevelopment of site
- Built without permission or building regulations/retrospective application
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Noise and emissions pollution from heating and cooling units
- Removal of trees
- Concreting rear garden
- Removal of earth and erection of retaining wall
- Non-porous driveway, resulting in drainage issues of run-off on to 3 Middle Close
- Not in keeping with wider character of the estate
- Noise and disruption from the building works, blocking of the roads, workers pouring cement down the rain drains, builders' rubble in the front garden, flood lit rear garden, the complete disregard to anyone and everyone and the general attitude of the property owner
- Negative impact on outlook
- Disagreement that the block plan and orientation between number 1 and number 3 is correct
- Heating and cooling units are industrial looking and out of keeping for the character of the area
- Disagreement with the accuracy of the noise survey

### **Conditions**

Condition 1 amended (change in italics):

Within 4 weeks of the date of this decision, the new acoustic enclosure to the three heating and cooling units to the western side elevation of 1 Middle Close will be enclosed in a new acoustic casing with Caice 150mm Acoustic Louvered section as per design by acoustic specialist, set out in the approved noise impact assessment (Nova Acoustics, dated 1st December 2021) and annotated in the approved plans, *and thereafter the acoustic casing shall be retained and maintained.*

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and to protect the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.”

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Gordon Naisby and Mr Stephen Craig spoke in objection to the application. Mr Sam Peacock spoke on behalf of the applicant in favour of the application.

Committee members had various, notable concerns in respect of the proposal. It was felt by the Committee that the proposed heating and cooling units would be overbearing and have an adverse impact on both the residential and visual amenities enjoyed by 3 Middle Close. It was also noted that the units would be cluttered and industrial in a residential area. Furthermore, it was opined that the increased height of the front gables would appear as unsubservient to the existing dwelling; and when combined with the existing extensions resulted in a building which was prominent, incongruous and out of keeping in relation to the existing streetscene.

As there was no proposer and seconder for the officer's recommendation the recommendation to grant the application fell.

An alternative recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons outlined above was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. application 20/0514 be refused for the following reasons:**
  - i. impact on residential amenity**
  - ii. negative impact on visual amenities**
  - iii. out of keeping with the existing streetscene; and**
- II. the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that two Committee Site Visits had taken place in respect of the application and the Committee received various pieces of correspondence from neighbours;
- ii. Councillor Graham Tapper had received correspondence and had engaged with neighbours in respect of the application, but came into the meeting with an open mind; and;
- iii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had received direct email correspondence in respect of the proposal.

**Note 2**

In line with Part 5 Section D of the Council's Constitution, as the application had previously been deferred by the Planning Applications Committee in order to conduct a Member Site Visit, only those members who attended the deferred-for Site Visit were able to vote on the application.

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 refuse the application:

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

**50/P Application Number: 21/0306 - 9 Christie Close, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5UG**

The application was for the change of use from amenity land to garden land, and erection of a part two storey and part single storey side/rear extension, following demolition of existing garage.

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Head of Planning, because the applicant was the daughter of former Councillor Mr Surinder Gandhum.

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

**RESOLVED that application 21/0306 be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the Officer Report.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that members of the Committee knew the father of the applicant from when he was a serving Surrey Heath Borough 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, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

**51/P Application Number: 21/0902 - Clear Spring, Brick Hill, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8TH**

The application was for a single storey rear extension.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Victoria Wheeler because of concern over the harm to the Green Belt. The application was deferred from the 9 December 2021 Planning Applications Committee in order to verify from the planning history that permitted development rights had not already been removed.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**“UPDATE**

**Conditions**

The proposed plans for approval include velux windows which are permitted development. To provide clarity on what works are to be undertaken it is proposed to update condition 4 to enable all the works shown on the approved plans to be undertaken as follows:

**Amended condition 4 (change in italics)**

Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A, Class B, Class C, Class D, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no further extensions, roof alterations, porches or outbuildings shall be erected on the site without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

*Unless otherwise shown on the approved plans any other development under the Classes stated above undertaken or implemented between the date of this decision and the commencement of the development hereby approved shall be demolished and all material debris resulting permanently removed from the land within one month of the development hereby approved coming into first use.*

Reason: To retain control in the interests of the openness of the Green Belt and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework”.

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

**RESOLVED that application 21/0902 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and planning updates.**

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, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Licensing  
Committee held at Council Chamber,  
Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road,  
Camberley, GU15 3HD on 15 December  
2021**

---

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

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

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Adrian Page

Officers Present: Paula Barnshaw, Rebecca Batten, Louise Livingston  
Helen Lolley and Frances Soper

**17/L Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

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

**18/L Review of Hackney Carriage (Taxi) and Private Hire (PH) Licensing fees  
2022-2023**

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 allowed 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 operators' 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.'

The Committee were updated that following dialogue between Officers and the Chairman, a revised recommendation was proposed in order for the fees for operators' licences for 1 Vehicle for 5 years, and operators' licences for more than 1 vehicle for 5 years to remain unchanged, until further review was undertaken by the Head of HR, Performance and Communication to identify the costs of the administration of the licences to the Council. It was clarified that the rest of the proposed licence fees remained unchanged from those detailed in the agenda report.

It was noted that following the agreement of the Committee of the proposed fees, the Head of Human Resources, Communications & Performance would be asked to approve, in consultation with the Portfolio holder and Strategic Director, Finance and Customer Service, the fees. A notice detailing the proposed fees would then be placed for the statutory 28 days notice period 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.

**RESOLVED that**

- i. the contents of the report be noted, and**
- ii. the proposed revised fees and charges for the Taxi and PH trade be recommended for approval by the Head of HR, Performance and Communication in consultation with the Strategic Director- Finance and the Finance Portfolio Holder, subject to the 28 day notice period, as per the agenda report; and**
- i. the fees for PH Operators Licences - 1 Vehicle (5 years), and PH Operators Licences - more than 1 vehicle (5 years) remain unchanged but that the Head of HR, Performance and Communication be requested to further review these charges once further information on the costs were known.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held at Surrey  
Heath House on 13 January 2022**

---

+ 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

In Attendance: Jayne Boitoult, Louise Livingston, Julie Simmonds, Rachel Whillis.

**26/J Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 25 November 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

**27/J Safeguarding Policy and Procedure**

The Group considered an updated Safeguarding Policy and Procedure, which had been subject to a fundamental review. In addition to the amendments proposed in the revised policy, the following changes were agreed:

- Correcting grammatical errors and clarifying acronyms;
- Inserting reference to eLearning options for training and referring to continuous training at section 5 of the Policy;
- Inserting “or appropriate adult” at the end of the first sentence of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph in the Wellbeing Principle paragraphs at section 4;
- Removing the reference to political parties within section 3, Councillors;
- Ensuring that points of contact in the list of safeguarding champions were updated as appropriate;
- Updating the PiPoT leads with current job titles;
- Updating the reference in the Hate Crime Policy in Appendix 4 from gender reassignment to gender identity.

**RESOLVED to ask the Employment Committee to adopt the revised Safeguarding Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended.**

**28/J Casual, Fixed Term and Temporary Workers Policy and Procedure**

The Group was informed that the Casual, Fixed Term and Agency Workers Policy and Procedure had been reviewed to take into account the new Senior

Management Structure and associated titles. Members of the Group agreed to recommend the adoption of the revised policy, subject to the correction of minor typographical errors in the document.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the revised Casual, Fixed Term and Agency Workers Policy and Procedure, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as amended, be agreed.**

#### **29/J Pension Discretions Policy**

The Group was informed that each pension fund was required to have a discretionary policy, which needed to be kept under review. Surrey County Council had not issued an updated Pensions Discretions Policy. Although there was no legal requirement that it be reviewed annually, it was this Council's practice to review it annually. Furthermore, the Policy had recently been reviewed by the new Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services and Section 151 Officer.

Whilst no material changes to the Policy were proposed, the Group agreed to update paragraph 5.2 of the Policy to state that the table in the appendix referred to for the relevant decision maker. It was also agreed that references to job titles would be updated to reflect the revised senior management structure.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be advised to agree that the current Pensions Discretions Policy be updated, as set out above.**

#### **30/J Pay Settlement 2022/23**

The Group noted that discussions concerning that the Pay Award for 2022/23 were still ongoing and that an additional meeting of the Consultative Group would need to be arranged to consider the item when negotiations were further progressed.

#### **31/J Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution**

The Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution had been reviewed and updated to reflect the establishment of the Employment Committee and its role in relation to the agreement of Staff Terms & Conditions. Amendments to the Constitution had also been made to reflect the revised senior management structure and the HR Manager's job title.

The Group considered the proposed revisions and also agreed to alter paragraph 4 of its Constitution to state that the Head of Paid Service would be invited to meetings of the Consultation Group. Minor amendments would also be made to paragraph 7 to capitalise any references to the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

**RESOLVED to advise the Employment Committee to recommend to Full Council that the revised Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution, as attached at Annex A to this report, as amended, be adopted.**

**32/J Work Programme**

The Group noted its work programme for rest of the municipal year.

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

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group on 3 February  
2022**

---

- 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

In Attendance: Louise Livingston, Julie Simmonds and Rachel Whillis.

**33/J Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

**34/J Pay Settlement 2022/23**

The Group was updated on the current progress of pay negotiations for 2022/23. It was reported that an offer of a consolidated increase of £350 on all pay scale points had been made to Staff Representatives. In response, Staff Representatives had requested a consolidated increase of £650 on all pay scale points.

Staff Representatives delivered a presentation detailing the rationale for the group's counter request. A table was presented, setting out how a pay rise of £350 compared to a pay rise of £650 in relation to a percentage increase. The table also provided information on the percentage of staff on each pay grade. It was advised that, with a £350 pay rise, staff on pay scales up to grade SH5 would receive a pay increase of 1% or more, with members of staff on grades SH6 and above receiving less than a 1% increase. A pay increase of £650 would mean all staff on grades up to SH9 would receive an equivalent increase of 1% or more; only staff on grade SH10 and above would receive an increase equivalent to less than 1%. The table also demonstrated how the upcoming National Insurance increase would affect each pay grade: with a pay increase of £350, the NI increase would effectively be a real-term pay decrease for staff on grade SH7 or above. A pay rise of £650 would mean that only staff on grade SH10 or above would receive an award that was less than their increase in NI contributions.

In addition, Staff Representatives made reference to factors affecting cost of living pressures, current rates of inflation, the Council's need to demonstrate investment in its staff, staff morale, and recruitment and retention issues being experienced. Staff responses to a consultation were also shared with the Consultative Group. Staff Representatives also indicated a wish to see the pay increases factored into

the budget planning and the Medium Term Financial Strategy in order to provide proper forward planning for the negotiations. Clarity on Christmas closure and maintaining the practice undertaken in recent years was also requested. Staff Representatives also requested a review of the pay negotiation procedure with a view to making it a more efficient process.

Having considered the presentation, Member Representatives proposed an alternative offer of a consolidated £500 increase on all pay scale points. Members acknowledged the issues raised by Staff Representatives and suggested that an increase of £500 would demonstrate a balance between those concerns whilst also recognising the Council's financial position. They also stated support for the representations made about the budget planning process and linking pay awards to the Medium Term Financial Strategy, and indicated they would work with Staff Representatives on improving the pay negotiation process. However, any discussions on Christmas closure for 2022 would be undertaken separately at a future meeting.

Staff Representatives discussed the offer of a £500 increase to all pay scale points and thanked Members for their response. The implications of a £500 were reviewed: when compared to the Staff Representatives' request for a £650 increase, 12% more staff would receive an award under 1%; furthermore, staff on grade SH8 or above would have a real-term pay decrease when factoring the NI increase. For comparative purposes it was also noted that the national pay offer was understood to be 1.75%, meaning all staff on grade SH5 or above would receive less than the anticipated national offer. In addition, Staff Representatives referred to being mindful of the staff feedback they had received. Whilst it was recognised that an increase of £650 would have a greater impact on the budget, it was felt that the difference between a £500 and a £650 increase was unlikely to substantially alter any impact on savings required to fund the pay award. Staff Representatives therefore decided to continue with their original request for a consolidated increase of £650 on all pay scale points.

As no consensus was reached, both options were put to the vote. Neither option achieved a majority of both staff and member representatives voting in favour of that option, as required by the Group's Constitution. Consequently, in accordance with the Annual Pay Settlement Procedure, both options would be presented to the Employment Committee for consideration.

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

- (i) A consolidated increase of £650 on all pay scale points, as proposed by Staff Representatives; or**
- (ii) A consolidated increase of £500 on all pay scale points, as proposed by Member Representatives.**

Note: It was noted for the record that any pay award affected all members of staff present at the meeting.

Chairman