

# COUNCIL MEETING

## 20 April 2022

# COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

- |     |   |                        |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 1.  | <b>Council - 23 February 2022</b>   | <b>(Pages 3 - 18)</b>  |
| 2.  | <b>Executive - 28 February 2022</b>   | <b>(Pages 19 - 22)</b> |
| 3.  | <b>Executive - 15 March 2022</b>  | <b>(Pages 23 - 26)</b> |
| 4.  | <b>Planning Applications Committee - 7 April 2022 (to be laid on the table)</b> | <b>-</b>               |
| 5.  | <b>Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 17 February 2022</b>            | <b>(Pages 27 – 30)</b> |
| 6.  | <b>Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 9 March 2022</b>                | <b>(Pages 31 – 34)</b> |
| 7.  | <b>External Partnerships Select Committee – 1 March 2022</b>                    | <b>(Pages 35 – 40)</b> |
| 8.  | <b>Employment Committee – 6 April 2022 (to be laid on the table)</b>            | <b>-</b>               |
| 9.  | <b>Joint Staff Consultative Group - 3 March 2022</b>                            | <b>(Pages 41 - 42)</b> |
| 10. | <b>Joint Staff Consultative Group - 29 March 2022</b>                           | <b>(Pages 43 - 46)</b> |

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY  
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at  
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on  
23 February 2022**

---

+ 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 Stuart Black	+ Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Paul Deach	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Tim FitzGerald	+ Cllr John Skipper
+ Cllr Sharon Galliford	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Edward Hawkins	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Josephine Hawkins	+ Cllr Kristian Wrenn
+ Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	

+ Present

\* In attendance virtually but did not vote

**55/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.**

**56/C Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Peter Barnett, who had joined the meeting virtually but would not be entitled to vote.

**57/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 15 December 2021 be approved as a correct record.**

## **58/C Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor shared a video presenting the numerous events she had attended since the last Council meeting. She also reminded Members that her Charity Ball would be held on 25 March 2022 at the Camberley Theatre.

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

The Leader thanked all staff, contractors, emergency services, energy companies and community organisations who had kept services operating during Storm Eunice the previous weekend. He also thanked the members of staff who had telephoned and visited vulnerable residents affected by the widespread power cuts and the Council Members who had volunteered.

Members were advised that council staff had distributed £460,000 to Surrey Heath businesses that year and, since the beginning of the pandemic, had awarded over £48m in grants and business rate relief to businesses in the borough. Staff were also working with businesses to help them access additional funding through a number of government-sponsored schemes. The Leader reported that the Surrey Heath Annual Lottery Scheme had awarded nearly £5,000 to three local organisations. He also referred to the Household Support Grant, which had launched on 7 November 2021 and was operated in partnership with Citizens Advice Surrey Heath; at the end of the previous week, the scheme had paid 2132 claims, totalling over £77,000.

The Leader welcomed the new Strategic Director for Environment & Community, Nick Steevens, to the Council. He also welcomed the new borough commander for Surrey Heath, Inspector Gemma Taylor.

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

The Business & Transformation Portfolio Holder, Councillor Colin Dougan, responded to a question from a member of the public, Mr Singh, on behalf of Camberley Sikh Association, which hired the Ian Goodchild Centre for monthly prayers and social gatherings. The question concerned restoring the faulty extraction system in the Centre's kitchen, which was affecting the Association's preparation of the Guru's communal meal which formed an essential part of the Sikh religion's practice. In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Dougan referred to recent dialogue between Mr Singh and the Council's Chief Executive to help to resolve the matter.

## **61/C Questions from Councillors**

The Business & Transformation Portfolio Holder, Councillor Colin Dougan, responded to a question from Councillor Sharon Galliford submitted under Procedure Rule 11. The question concerned 10 buildings in the borough that had been assessed for cladding risk. In response, Councillor Dougan confirmed that the buildings did not require remedial work nor were considered to pose a risk to the health, safety and welfare of the residents; he also outlined to processes that could be undertaken should any concern arise.

## Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/23 - 2025/26 and Annual Budget 2022/23

The Council considered a detailed report setting out the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2022/23 to 2025/26, the revenue budgets estimates for the 2022/23 financial year, the indicative estimates for the period 2023/24 to 2025/26, a 4-year capital strategy and programme, plus the Treasury Management Strategy for 2022/23.

The Leader, in presenting the budget for 2022/23, referred to the savings already identified in the budget and those that would need to be made that year, along with the savings required over the period of the MTFS. The use of reserves to support the MTFS, along with the plans at the end of the Strategy to begin to replenish reserves again, were noted. It was reported that the budget included an increase to Council Tax of £5 a year on a Band D property.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty and seconded by the Councillor Robin Perry that the recommendations as set in the agenda report be approved.

It was moved by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam and seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton that the recommendations in the agenda paper be amended. The amended budget had been circulated prior to the meeting and contained the following proposals:

- (i) Freezing Council Tax at the current level (£228.66 for Band D properties);
- (ii) Addressing Poverty issues as follows:
  - a. An additional £50k towards support for Food Banks;
  - b. An additional £50k towards the Hardship Support Fund for Universal Credit recipients;
- (iii) Funding of £100k for Camberley regeneration incentives to tenants;
- (iv) An additional £50k towards the Staff Pay Award for those in Bands 1-5; and
- (v) An additional savings target of £75k.

The Council debated the amendment and, whilst the principles it sought to achieve were acknowledged, concerns were expressed about the impact of the additional savings required and the permanent impact on the Council Tax precept. The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

It was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler that (iii) of the items to note in the recommendation be amended as follows:

- (iii) “the Medium Term Financial Strategy contains a savings target of £1.350 million over the period of the strategy which will be achieved through a combination of further services efficiencies, increases in income and potentially service reductions to be identified through a output-based budget review for all services of the Council, **apart from Community Services, Planning Enforcement, Food Safety, and Parks and Open Spaces where no service reductions will be considered**, and subject to a Star Chamber challenge review that will commence in March 2022”

The Council was informed that the Members proposing this amendment would support efficiencies within the areas identified, but opposed any reduction in service. Having debated the definition of a reduction in service, some Members indicated support for prioritising those areas for protection, whilst also recognising they would not wish to restrict the Council's options when identifying the necessary savings. The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

**RESOLVED that the Medium Term Financial Strategy, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed, comprising:**

- (i) the Revenue Budget Estimates covering the period 2022/23 to 2025/26 as follows:**
  - a) the 2022/23 budget estimates giving a net cost of services revenue budget for the Council of £14.788 million as shown in Appendix 1 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy;**
  - b) the unavoidable and service pressures of £4.791 million shown in Appendix 1 and in more detail in Appendix 1-1 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy;**
  - c) the revenue efficiencies of £2.413 million shown in Appendix 1 and in more detail in Appendix 1-2 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy;**
  - d) the recommendation from the Executive that a sum of up to £7.500 million of earmarked reserves at this stage be repurposed to the general revenue fund balance to support the revenue budget over the period of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and provide a sustainable budget for the Council and that authority be delegated to the Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services, in consultation with the Chief Executive and the Portfolio Holder for Finance, to identify which reserve(s) this sum is to be drawn from and the eventual amount to be re-purposed;**
  - e) that the Surrey Heath Borough Council element of the annual precept be increased by £5.00 per Band D property and in the appropriate statutory proportions for other properties; and**
  - f) that a total of £0.270 million of earmarked reserves be allocated to support budgets in the services these earmarked reserves were set aside for;**
- (ii) the Capital Strategy, as set out at Annex A, Appendix 2 to the agenda report, and associated Capital Programme (appendix 2-1) covering the period 2022/23 to 2025/26 which includes:**
  - a) the new capital bids for £1.139 million in Appendix 1 to Annex A for 2022/23 be approved, and that they be incorporated into the Capital Programme; and**

- b) **The Prudential Indicators summarised below and explained in Annex A for 2022/23 to 2025/26 in accordance with the requirements of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2011 be approved;**

Prudential Indicator	2022/23 Proposed £m	2023/24 Estimated £m	2024/25 Estimated £m	2025/26 Estimated £m
Capital Expenditure	1.139	1.428	1.428	0.928
Capital Financing Requirement	174	171	167	164
Ratio of net financing costs to net revenue stream	28.22%	27.54%	26.89%	26.30%
Financing Costs	3	3	3	3
Operational Boundary	230	230	230	230
Authorised Limit	235	235	235	235

- (iii) **The Treasury Management Strategy for 2022/23 shown at Annex A, Appendix 3 to the agenda report, including;**

- a) **The Treasury Management Indicators for 2022/23 at Annex C to the Strategy;**
- b) **The Minimum Revenue Provision policy statement and estimated minimum revenue provision payment table at Annex F to the Strategy; and**
- c) **the Treasury Management Policy Statement at Annex G to the Strategy.**

**RESOLVED to note:**

- (i) **the forecast level of reserve balances shown at Appendix 4 to the Medium Term Financial Strategy. It should further be noted that these will be subject to confirmation once the outturn position for the current financial year (2021/22) is known and this will be reported in the revenue outturn report which will be considered by the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee and the Executive early in the new financial year;**
- (ii) **the Council Tax base for Surrey Heath Borough Council is 38,976.2 as set at Council on 15 December 2021;**
- (iii) **the Medium Term Financial Strategy contains a savings target of £1.350 million over the period of the strategy which will be**

**achieved through a combination of further services efficiencies, increases in income and potentially service reductions to be identified through a output-based budget review for all services of the Council and subject to a Star Chamber challenge review that will commence in March 2022 and**

**(iv) The statement of the Chief Financial Officer (Strategic Director Finance and Customer Services) on the robustness of estimates and sustainability of balances.**

Note1: In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, recorded votes were taken.

Voting in favour of the amendment moved by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam and seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Tim FitzGerald, Sashi Mylvaganam, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft, Kristian Wrenn.

Voting against the amendment moved by Councillor Sashi Mylvaganam and seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton:

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

Voting in favour of the amendment moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler:

Councillor Graham Alleway, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Tim FitzGerald, Sharon Galliford, Emma-Jane McGrath, Charlotte Morley, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft, Kristian Wrenn.

Voting against the amendment moved by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler:

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

Voting in favour of the substantive motion:

Councillors Dan Adams, Stuart Black, Richard Brooks, Sarah Jane Croke, Vivienne Chapman, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Lewis,



David Mansfield, Alan McClafferty, Charlotte Morley, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Valerie White.

Voting against the substantive motion:

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

Note 2: It was noted for the record that

- (i) Councillor Dan Adams declared that his company leased property in the Square; and
- (ii) Councillor Paul Deach declared that he undertook professional work in Camberley Town Centre.

### **63/C Setting of Council Tax 2022/23**

Having determined its Council Tax Requirement for 2022/23, the Council was now required formally to approve the Council Tax for the area taking into account precepts received from Surrey County Council, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner and the Parishes.

In approving the Council Tax for 2022/23, it was noted that, in December 2021, a Council Tax base of 38,976.17 Band D equivalent properties had been approved for 2022/23, and that precepts for 2022/23 had been received from the Parishes, Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner.

It was moved by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Alan McClafferty and

#### **RESOLVED**

- (i) **to note that the Council Tax Base for 2022/23 calculated in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:**

- (a) **For the whole Council area is 38,976.17 (Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the 'Act')); and**

- (b) **For dwellings in those parts of the area to which a Parish precept relates the following:**

<b>Bisley</b>	<b>1,658.21</b>
<b>Chobham</b>	<b>2,075.35</b>
<b>West End</b>	<b>2,393.10</b>
<b>Windlesham</b>	<b>8,222.82</b>

**(Being the amounts calculated by the Council in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amount of its Council Tax**

base for the year for dwellings in those parts of the area to which special items relate);

- (ii) that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2022/23 (excluding parish precepts and special expenses) is £9,107,172;
- (iii) that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2022/23 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) £44,076,876 being the aggregate for the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31(A)2 of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
  - (b) £35,145,610 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act;
  - (c) £9,931,067 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act);
  - (d) £254.80 being the amount at (c) above (Item R), as divided by Item T ((i) (a) above) calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts);
  - (e) £823,895 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act;
  - (f) £233.66 being the amount at (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (e) above by Item T, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount for its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates;
- (iv) to note that the County Council and Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwelling as indicated in the Table at paragraph 4(i) and 4(ii) of the agenda report;
- (v) that the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables at paragraph 4(iii), 4(iv), 4(v) and 4(vi) of the agenda report as the amounts of Council Tax for 2022/23 for each part of its area and for each category of dwellings; and

**(vi) to note that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2022/23 is NOT excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as the proposed increase is not more than £5.00 at Band D.**

Note: In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken.

Voting in favour of the motion:

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

Voting against the motion:

Councillor Graham Tapper.

Abstaining from voting:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Tim FitzGerald, Sashi Mylvaganam, Morgan Rise, John Skipper, Helen Whitcroft.

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

(a) Executive – 25 January and 15 February 2022

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 25 January and 15 February 2022 be received and the recommendation therein be adopted as set out below:**

#### **95/E Review of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) The revised Local Council Tax Support Scheme, as set out at Annex A to the Executive agenda report, replace the existing Local Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2022;**
- (ii) Transitional protection for those impacted by more than a £5 per week reduction in support in payments of council tax due to the introduction of the revised scheme from 1 April 2022; and**
- (iii) Transitional protection from the new capital limit for those current vulnerable group claimants with over £6000 but less than £16,001 capital for the period 1 April 2022 to 30 September 2022.**

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 9 December 2021, 20 January and 10 February 2022

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 9 December 2021, 20 January and 10 February 2022 be received.**

- (c) Licensing Committee – 15 December 2021 and 16 February 2022

It was moved by Councillor Rodney Bates, seconded by Councillor Shaun Garrett and

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Licensing Committee held on 15 December 2021 and 16 February 2022 be received and the recommendation therein be adopted as set out below:**

**20/L Gambling Act 2005- Draft revised Statement of Principles 2022-2025**

**RESOLVED that the revised Statement of Principles 2022-2025 in relation to exercising functions under the Gambling Act 2005, as set out at Annex B to the Licensing Committee agenda report, be adopted.**

- (d) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee – 19 January 2022

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 19 January 2022 be received.**

- (e) Employment Committee – 8 February 2022

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 8 February 2022 be received and the recommendations therein be adopted as set out below:**

**23/EC Pay Settlement 2022/23**

**RESOLVED that a consolidated increase of £500 on all pay scale points be agreed as the Pay Award for 2022/23.**

### **30/EC Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution**

**RESOLVED that the revised Joint Staff Consultative Group Constitution, as attached at Annex A to the Employment Committee agenda report, be adopted.**

- (f) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 13 January and 3 February 2022

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

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 13 January and 3 February 2022 be received.**

### **65/C Motions**

It was moved by Councillor Sharon Galliford and seconded by Councillor Mark Gordon that:

“this Council

- (i) notes that
- a. the pressure on organisations to pay the right amount of tax in the right place at the right time has never been stronger;
  - b. polling from the Institute for Business Ethics finds that “corporate tax avoidance” has, since 2013, been the clear number one concern of the British public when it comes to business conduct;
  - c. almost two-thirds (63%) of the public agree that the Government and local councils should consider a company’s ethics and how they pay their tax as well as value for money and quality of service provided, when undertaking procurement;
  - d. around 17.5% of public contracts in the UK have been won by companies with links to tax havens;
  - e. it has been conservatively estimated that losses from multinational profit-shifting (just one form of tax avoidance) could be costing the UK some £7bn per annum in lost corporation tax revenues;
  - f. the Fair Tax Mark offers a means for business to demonstrate good tax conduct, and has been secured by a wide range of businesses across the UK, including FTSE-listed PLCs, co-operatives, social enterprises and large private businesses:
- (ii) believes that
- a. paying tax is often presented as a burden, but it shouldn’t be;
  - b. tax enables us to provide services from education, health and social care, to flood defence, roads, policing and defence. It also helps to counter financial inequalities and rebalance distorted economies;

- c. as recipients of significant public funding, local authorities should take the lead in the promotion of exemplary tax conduct; be that by ensuring contractors are paying their proper share of tax, or by refusing to go along with offshore tax dodging when buying land and property;
  - d. where substantive stakes are held in private enterprises, then influence should be wielded to ensure that such businesses are exemplars of tax transparency and tax avoidance is shunned - e.g., no use of marketed schemes requiring disclosure under DOTAS regulations (Disclosure Of Tax Avoidance Schemes) or arrangements that might fall foul of the General Anti-Abuse Rule;
  - e. more action is needed, however, current law significantly restricts councils' ability to either penalise poor tax conduct or reward good tax conduct, when buying goods or services;
  - f. UK cities, counties and towns can and should stand up for responsible tax conduct - doing what they can within existing frameworks and pledging to do more given the opportunity, as active supporters of international tax justice;
- (iii) approves the Council's for Fair Tax Declaration;
  - (iv) leads by example and demonstrates good practice in our tax conduct, right across its activities;
  - (v) will prompt contractors and ensure agency contractors implement IR35 robustly and pay a fair share of employment taxes;
  - (vi) commits to not use offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty;
  - (vii) undertakes due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately as an artificial device to reduce the payment of tax and business rates;
  - (viii) demands clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers and their consolidated profit & loss position;
  - (ix) promotes Fair Tax Mark certification for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due;
  - (x) supports Fair Tax Week events in the area, and celebrates the tax contribution made by responsible businesses who say what they pay with pride; and
  - (xi) supports calls for urgent reform of EU and UK law to enable local authorities to better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct through their procurement policies.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan that the motion be amended by removing (vi). Councillor McClafferty advised that he would not wish to prevent an opportunity to purchase a property where the only means was through an offshore vehicle that could subsequently be

brought onshore. Councillor Galliford, as mover of the motion, indicated she could not accept the amendment as she felt it removed the core of the motion. The amendment was put to the vote and was carried. It therefore became the substantive motion.

**RESOLVED that this Council**

**(i) notes that**

- a. the pressure on organisations to pay the right amount of tax in the right place at the right time has never been stronger;**
- b. polling from the Institute for Business Ethics finds that “corporate tax avoidance” has, since 2013, been the clear number one concern of the British public when it comes to business conduct;**
- c. almost two-thirds (63%) of the public agree that the Government and local councils should consider a company’s ethics and how they pay their tax as well as value for money and quality of service provided, when undertaking procurement;**
- d. around 17.5% of public contracts in the UK have been won by companies with links to tax havens;**
- e. it has been conservatively estimated that losses from multinational profit-shifting (just one form of tax avoidance) could be costing the UK some £7bn per annum in lost corporation tax revenues;**
- f. the Fair Tax Mark offers a means for business to demonstrate good tax conduct, and has been secured by a wide range of businesses across the UK, including FTSE-listed PLCs, co-operatives, social enterprises and large private businesses:**

**(ii) believes that**

- a. paying tax is often presented as a burden, but it shouldn’t be;**
- b. tax enables us to provide services from education, health and social care, to flood defence, roads, policing and defence. It also helps to counter financial inequalities and rebalance distorted economies;**
- c. as recipients of significant public funding, local authorities should take the lead in the promotion of exemplary tax conduct; be that by ensuring contractors are paying their proper share of tax, or by refusing to go along with offshore tax dodging when buying land and property;**
- d. where substantive stakes are held in private enterprises, then influence should be wielded to ensure that such businesses are exemplars of tax transparency and tax avoidance is shunned - e.g., no use of marketed schemes requiring disclosure under DOTAS regulations (Disclosure Of Tax Avoidance Schemes) or arrangements that might fall foul of the General Anti-Abuse Rule;**

- e. **more action is needed, however, current law significantly restricts councils' ability to either penalise poor tax conduct or reward good tax conduct, when buying goods or services;**
- f. **UK cities, counties and towns can and should stand up for responsible tax conduct - doing what they can within existing frameworks and pledging to do more given the opportunity, as active supporters of international tax justice;**

**(iii) approves the Council's for Fair Tax Declaration;**

**(iv) leads by example and demonstrates good practice in our tax conduct, right across its activities;**

**(v) will prompt contractors and ensure agency contractors implement IR35 robustly and pay a fair share of employment taxes;**

**(vi) will undertake due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately as an artificial device to reduce the payment of tax and business rates;**

**(vii) demands clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers and their consolidated profit & loss position;**

**(viii) promotes Fair Tax Mark certification for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due;**

**(ix) supports Fair Tax Week events in the area, and celebrates the tax contribution made by responsible businesses who say what they pay with pride; and**

**(x) supports calls for urgent reform of EU and UK law to enable local authorities to better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct through their procurement policies.**

## **66/C Governance Working Group**

The Council received a report from the Governance Working Group on the issues it had discussed at its meeting on 28 January 2022. The Group had reviewed and made a number of recommended changes to the Terms of Reference of the Executive, Committees & Other Bodies and the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers. These documents had been reviewed as part of the holistic review of the Constitution being undertaken by the Monitoring Officer.

### **RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Terms of Reference of the Executive, Committees and Other Bodies be updated, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report; and**



- (ii) the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in respect of non-executive functions be updated, as set out at Annex B to the agenda report.**

## **67/C ISO 9001**

The Council considered a report exploring the applicability of the ISO 9001 standard to services being delivered by the Council. The item was being considered following a motion agreed by the Council on 27 October 2021. A report had been considered by the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 19 January 2022 and the comments and recommendations from the Committee were noted.

It was moved by Councillor Alan McClafferty and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry that

- (i) the key principles that underpin the ISO 9001 and related quality and customer service standards, be used to inform the Council's approach to delivering improved performance and customer focus across the organisation; and
- (ii) in line with the feedback from the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee, Option 2 in the report , namely that the Council seeks full ISO 9001 certification across all functions, not be supported and is removed as an option.

It was moved by Councillor Cliff Betton and seconded by Councillor Morgan Rise that the motion be amended by removing (ii) and replacing it with the following wording:

“the Council works towards certification of ISO 9001.”

The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

### **RESOLVED that**

- (i) the key principles that underpin the ISO 9001 and related quality and customer service standards, be used to inform the Council's approach to delivering improved performance and customer focus across the organisation; and**
- (ii) in line with the feedback from the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee, Option 2 in the report (that the Council seek full ISO 9001 certification across all functions, paragraph 4.2) not be supported and is removed as an option.**

Note: it was noted for the record that Councillor Graham Alleway declared that he was employed by QMS UK Ltd as a consultant for certification and an IRCA certified auditor for compliance to the standard. However, he advised that QMS UK Ltd did not certify public bodies and he would be retiring the following day.

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

The Leader received a question from Councillor Rodney Bates concerning opportunities to become a Fair Trade borough. He indicated support for the principle and for further investigating this matter.

In response to a question from Councillor Kristian Wrenn, the Leader indicated that, if the Council had the ability and such a request came from the Government, he would be prepared to consider providing similar support to Ukrainian refugees as had been provided in the recent Syrian and Afghan resettlement programmes.

The Leader received a question from Councillor Victoria Wheeler regarding changes to the Surrey County Council Local Committee, requesting support for petitioning that the status quo be retained. The Leader indicated that he was broadly supportive of the proposed arrangements.

## **69/C Councillor Resignation**

Councillor David Mansfield informed the Council that he would be standing down as a councillor at the end of that meeting as he had moved out of the borough and was now retiring from his work at the NHS. The Mayor, on behalf of the Council, thanked Councillor Mansfield for his service and wished him well for the future.

Mayor

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 28  
February 2022**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

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

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Cliff Betton, Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Morgan Rise, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler, Cllr Helen Whitcroft and Cllr Valerie White

**98/E Response to the Ukrainian Crisis**

The Leader, on behalf of the Council, expressed dismay and horror at recent events in Ukraine. He referred to the Council's history of coming to the aid of refugees and indicated that, although the Government had not asked for assistance at that point, the Council would do everything it was able to in response to any such requests. As a symbol of solidarity with the people of Ukraine, and in support of international law and the right to democracy, the Council would be flying the Ukrainian flag.

Members were reminded that collections for Ukrainian refugees were taking place at specified locations in the borough and the Council would be sign posting these collection points. The Leader praised the terrific effort being demonstrated by residents and businesses in the borough.

**99/E Questions by Members**

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans, confirming that Surrey County Council would be consulted as part of the Local Plan consultation process.

**100/E Draft Surrey Heath Local Plan: Preferred Options (2019 - 2038)**

The Executive considered a detailed report seeking approval of the Draft Local Plan, together with the mapping booklet and Interim Sustainability Appraisal for public consultation. The Draft Local Plan set out the planning framework for the Borough up to 2038 and once adopted, would replace current Local Plans.

Consultation on the Draft Plan would be undertaken between 14 March and 9 May 2022. Responses from this consultation and any additional evidence would be used to prepare the next version of the Local Plan.

Members discussed the plans for a further call for Gypsy and Traveller sites and additional consultation scheduled for summer 2022. At that stage, only one specific site allocation for four pitches had been identified, at Diamond Ridge

Woods, Old Dean, and was included as a site allocation. The importance of identifying sufficient Gypsy and Traveller sites to ensure the Local Plan was found sound at examination was noted. Members were encouraged to work with their fellow ward councillors and the County Councillor for their area to identify options for small sites within their wards. The Leader undertook to write to all councillors about this matter.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the Draft Surrey Heath Local Plan: Preferred Options (2019 – 2038) and associated Mapping booklet, attached at Annex 1 and 2 to the agenda report, be agreed for a period of 8 weeks consultation from March to May 2022;**
- (ii) the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, attached at Annex 3 to the agenda report, be agreed for a period of 8 weeks consultation from March to May 2022; and**
- (iii) minor changes to the draft Local Plan and Mapping booklet be agreed by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and People.**

Note: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor Rodney Bates declared

- (i) a pecuniary interest in relation to a reference to Gordon's School at page 242 of the agenda as he had occasional paid employment at the School as an exam invigilator; and
- (ii) a non-pecuniary interest in relation to a reference to the land at Pine Ridge Golf Course in at page 537 of the agenda as he was a community trustee of Frimley Fuel Allotments.

**101/E Local Development Scheme**

The Executive was informed that the timetable for producing the Local Plan was set out in the Local Development Scheme. The Council was required to produce and update this document to outline future planning documents it would be producing.

The next stage of public consultation would be on the Draft Local Plan, as agreed earlier that meeting. The LDS also set out the plans for a further consultation on Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site allocations in Summer 2022.

**RESOLVED that the Surrey Heath Local Development Scheme (LDS) attached at Annex 1 to the agenda report, covering the period 2022 – 2025 be agreed and published on the website.**

## 102/E Review of Parking Fees and Charges

The Executive considered the feedback from the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee, which had considered a call-in of its decision on 25 January 2022 regarding Car Parking Tariffs. It was noted that the Committee had recommended that changes to the fee structures at the Borough Council owned car parks should go ahead, as set out in the report considered on 25 January 2022, with the exception of those proposed for Wharf Road car park and Chobham car park.

Members discussed the Committee's recommendation that a decision on changing the fee structure at Wharf Road to be delayed to enable officers to:

- a. consult with ward councillors, local businesses and residents in the immediate vicinity of the car park.
- b. Monitor the capacity and usage of car park.

The Committee's recommendations were reviewed and, although the recommendations had been unanimous, it was recognised that ward councillors had expressed differing views on tariffs for Wharf Road car park at that meeting. It was indicated that it was not standard practice to undertake consultations where parking charges were to be introduced. Members also expressed a lack of clarity on what would be achieved by the monitoring capacity and usage of the car park given the need to generate some income to help offset the cost of running this car park.

The Committee had also recommended that a decision on changing the fee structure at Chobham car park be delayed to enable officers to:

- a. Consult with Natural England, and other organisations as appropriate, on the impacts that the changes might have on the SSSI.
- b. Explore the possible use of SANG contributions to offset the costs of running the Chobham car park.

The Executive was informed that, since the Committee's meeting, Natural England had confirmed in writing that the retention of an hour's free parking would allay any concerns they may have about changes to the tariffs. It was confirmed that, in the event that Natural England altered its position, the decision would be reviewed. The proposals for monitoring any displacement from the SANG to Chobham Common were discussed. It was proposed to monitor this using Chobham car park ticket sales, but further options for monitoring the effect on the SSSI at Chobham would be considered with officers. Using CIL monies to offset the costs of running Chobham car park was not considered appropriate because CIL money had not been allocated for this purpose.

**RESOLVED to endorse its decision at minute 87/E on 25 January 2022 on the review of parking fees and charges.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive  
held at Surrey Heath House on 15  
March 2022**

---

+ Cllr Alan McClafferty (Chairman)

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

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Graham Alleway, Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr Mark Gordon, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam, Cllr Graham Tapper, Cllr Pat Tedder, Cllr Victoria Wheeler and Cllr Valerie White

**103/E Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 15 February and 28 February 2022 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**104/E Questions by Members**

In response to Councillor Victoria Wheeler, the Leader undertook to circulate the response he had received from Michael Gove MP concerning a question on housing targets.

**105/E Annual Plan 2022/23**

The Executive considered the proposed Annual Plan for 2022/23, which set out the key projects and performance indicator targets for the next financial year. The Annual Plan was the main delivery vehicle for ensuring that the ambitions in the Five Year Strategy, which had been agreed in October 2021, were delivered. The draft plan had been considered by the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in January and its comments had been included.

**RESOLVED that the Annual Plan for 2022/23, as attached at Annex A to the agenda report, be agreed.**

**106/E Household Support Fund Update**

The Executive was informed that a further £21,650.39 had been allocated to the Council from the Government's Household Support Grant for providing financial support for vulnerable households. This was in addition to the £176,820.17 received at the end of 2021. The suggestions for the allocation for the funds, as detailed in the agenda report, were noted.

Members were advised that the funds would need to be allocated by 31 March 2022 or they would be returned to the Government.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) the revised action plan outlined in paragraph 2.2 of the agenda report, and the allocation outlined in paragraph 3 of the agenda report be agreed; and**
- (ii) in order to ensure that all money is allocated, authority be delegated to the Head of HR, Performance & Communication in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Support & Safeguarding to distribute the funds as required.**

Note: In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor Rodney Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest as he volunteered for Camberley Besom, a proposed recipient for funding, and one of his immediate family members was a key worker for the charity.

**107/E Camberley CCTV Review**

The Executive considered a report about a review of CCTV in Camberley Town Centre undertaken over the previous 6 months. The outcomes of an audit conducted on the existing monitored CCTV system located in Camberley Town centre by 'CCTV in Focus' July 2021, a specialised independent company, were noted.

It was proposed to introduce a CCTV Management Group to oversee the operation and governance compliance of all systems within the Council. The management group would also collaboratively work towards the implementation a new Council CCTV policy, which would include updates in the standard operating procedures, privacy risk for each camera and a register of cameras, and ensures that the Council fulfilled its obligations from the Surveillance Code of Practice.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) a 'CCTV Management Group' to implement a consistent approach in connecting all Council teams involved in this area be established;**
- (ii) the outcome of the CCTV in Focus audit carried out in 2021 relating to the Camberley Town Centre and Old Dean monitored CCTV system and for the above group outlined in a) to develop a short and medium term plans to meet the ICO governance requirements, based upon the local community and business requirements by optimising all resource available without cost to the Council be noted; and**
- (iii) the terms of reference for this group as outlined in Annex A to the agenda report be agreed.**



## **108/E Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers – Executive Functions**

The Executive considered a report setting out proposed revisions to the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in respect of executive functions. Members were advised that, at its meeting on 23 February 2022, the Council had reviewed the Scheme in respect of non-executive functions and agreed the changes proposed.

**RESOLVED that the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in respect of executive functions be updated, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report.**

## **109/E Revenue 2021/22 Monitoring Report - Quarter 3**

The Executive considered a report containing a high-level view of the financial performance for the third quarter of 2021/22. It was reported that, at the end of that quarter, an overspend of £893,000 was being projected, a decrease from the projection of £1.6m at the end of the second quarter. The major variances against the budget were noted.

Following questions raised about the apparent discrepancies between the budget agreed by the Council in February 2021 and the information presented in quarterly reports, Members noted the reasons for any differences in numbers and were advised that future monitoring reports would include a reconciliation against the agreed Council budget.

**RESOLVED that the spend against the approved revenue budget for the period 1 April to 31 December 2021 and the end of year forecast be noted.**

## **110/E Capital Programme 2021/22 Monitoring Report - Quarter 3**

The Executive received a report setting out expenditure on the approved capital programme for the 2021/22 financial year as at the end of the third quarter, along with the end of year forecast.

It was reported that the year-end forecast outturn was £5.034 million, 35.90% of the programme. Members were advised that the Property Investment Working Group had asked for a number of capital projects to be delayed in order to conduct a thorough review of these projects' viability. It was also advised that, in future, capital budgets would be presented over a 4 year period.

**RESOLVED to note the expenditure on the capital programme for the period 1 April to 31 December 2021 and the end of year forecast.**

## **111/E Write off of Irrecoverable Bad Debts**

The Executive considered a report seeking approval to write off bad debts incurred through the non-payment of Council tax and Non-Domestic Rates.

All of the debts had been subject to the relevant recovery action and tracing enquiries. The Council's enforcement agents had also been unable to recover the debts from any forwarding address obtained from the tracing undertaken and the debt was now considered irrecoverable.

It was agreed to ascertain the status of a report to the Performance & Finance Scrutiny Committee on the use of enforcement agents to recover debt, which had been agreed at a previous meeting. It was also suggested that consideration be given to whether further examination was required regarding the makeup of individuals included in the lists of individual debtors and the Council's equality policies.

**RESOLVED that bad debts totalling £49,153.55 in respect of Council Tax and £93,045.17 in respect of Non-Domestic Rates be approved for write off.**

#### **112/E Review of Exempt Items**

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

**RESOLVED that the annex to the agenda report associated with minute 111/E remain exempt.**

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 17 February 2022**

---

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

- Cllr Graham Alleway	- Cllr Sharon Galliford
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Edward Hawkins
+ Cllr Rodney Bates	+ Cllr David Lewis
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke	- Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Tim FitzGerald	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Rodney Bates for Cllr Graham Alleway  
Cllr Tim Fitzgerald for Cllr Graham Tapper  
Cllr David Lewis for Cllr Paul Deach

Members in Attendance: Cllrs Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Sharon Galliford, Shaun Garrett, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Mansfield, Emma-Jane McGrath, Adrian Page and Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Julia Greenfield, Corporate Enforcement Manager  
Eugene Leal, Parking Services Manager  
Gavin Ramtohal, Head of Legal & Democratic Services  
Damian Roberts, Chief Executive  
Nick Steevens, Strategic Director: Environment & community  
Bob Watson, Strategic Director: Finance & Customer Services  
Stephen Wilkinson, Head of Investment & Development

**41/PF Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**42/PF Overview and Scrutiny Committee Call In Meeting Procedure**

The Committee noted the procedure that would be followed during the meeting.

**43/PF Call In of Executive Decision: Review of Parking Fees and Charges**

The Committee considered a report setting out a Member Call-in in respect of a decision taken by the Executive on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2022 to approve changes to the fees and charges imposed at the Borough Council's car parks.

The Executive's decision to approve changes to the fees charges at car parks owned by the Borough Council had been called in by Councillors Betton, Rise, Tapper, Tedder and

Wheeler, who expressed a number of concerns about the proposed changes including that:

- There had been a lack of consultation with ward councillors, local residents and businesses about the changes.
- There had been a lack of information about where the additional monies raised from the changes would be spent.
- The changes would negatively impact on local businesses in Frimley Green and Chobham
- The changes would increase the levels of on street parking in residential areas.
- The changes to charges in Chobham car parks would deter people from using the Chobham Water Meadow Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) which would in turn place additional pressure on the nearby Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at Chobham Common.
- Parking in Chobham was limited and the car park was heavily used by parents of children attending the nearby school.

Those members who had requested the Call-in indicated that they were in agreement with the Executive's decision to raise the fees charged in Camberley Town Centre Car parks and that their main concerns were focused on the impacts that changes to the parking charges at Chobham Car Park and Wharf Road Car Park in Frimley Green would have on local residents and businesses. It was agreed that the charges at Chobham and Wharf Road car parks would be the focus of the debate.

Officers clarified that any monies received from the car parks contributed to the Council's overall budget. It was noted that car parking charges for out of town car parks had last been increased in 2009 and that under the current charging regime the monies collected were insufficient to cover the costs of the current service provision. It was stressed that even if the projected increase in income was achieved it would still not be enough to cover the costs of providing car parks in the rural areas of the Borough.

The Committee noted that the greatest expenditure being incurred was the Non-Domestic Rates imposed by the Government, something that the Council had no control over, other areas of expenditure included maintenance of car park surfaces and lighting and maintenance of the lifts in the multi-storey car parks.

It was clarified that the figures for the projected split between 1 hour tickets and 2 hour tickets had been reached followed an assessment made by an experienced parking team.

The Committee acknowledged that the projected gap in the Council's finances had to be covered and that services wherever possible should be covering their costs. Members recognised that parking fees should have been reviewed in an annual basis to ensure that they kept pace with inflation.

It was acknowledged that the introduction of charges in the out of town and rural car parks could deter some people from using them. However, experience with the town centre car parks had shown that even with the two hour free parking period currently available at Knoll Road the car park was rarely full with visitors preferring to pay to park somewhere with direct access to shops and services. Given the nature of the shops and services in Chobham and Frimley Green it was considered that a period of one hours free parking would be sufficient to cover the majority of people's needs when visiting the areas in question.

It was recognised that introducing charges at Wharf Road would in all probability result in a rise in on street parking by those people working in local businesses which didn't have their own staff parking. However, the car park had not functioned well as a car park for

customers of the local businesses for many years and the introduction of charges would encourage greater churn in the number of visitors using the car park and free up spaces during the day.

Whilst the use of Chobham car park by parents collecting and dropping off children from the local primary school was noted it was stressed that residents would still be able to park for free for an hour, a time limit that was considered sufficient for this activity. Where longer parking periods were required, for example volunteers helping at the school, the possibility of working with the school to establish a parking pass scheme could be explored.

The lack of consultation with ward members was acknowledged and it was indicated that in future greater consideration would be given to broadening the scope of those who were consulted before non-routine decisions were made.

It was clarified that all of the Borough council's car parks were visited by Enforcement Officers on a daily basis and the majority of those using the car parks did adhere to the rules. The Committee stressed that Enforcement Officers should be visiting car parks randomly.

It was noted that following comments made at the Executive meeting, on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2022, officers had initiated discussions with Natural England over the potential impacts that changing the charging regime might have on the SSSI and SANG and Natural England had verbally indicated that they would support the retention of one hour's free parking in the Chobham car park; although written confirmation of this had been requested.

It was reported that the original business case for Chobham Water Meadows SANG referenced there being an assessed need for car parking at the site and that the status quo at the time the SANG was developed would be maintained. It was also noted that whilst the circular walk in Chobham Water Meadows measured approximately 2½km it did link to footpaths in the wider area and this should be taken into account when assessing how long visitors spent in the car park. It was agreed that these matters would be followed up outside the meeting.

It was questioned whether it would be possible to use SANG contributions from developers to offset the cost of parking in the rural areas.

**RESOLVED** that the matter be referred back to the Executive for reconsideration and the following points to be made:

- i. Changes to the fee structures at the Borough Council owned car parks should go ahead, as set out in the Executive report, with the exception of those proposed for Wharf Road car park and Chobham car park.
- ii. A decision on changing the fee structure at Wharf Road to be delayed to enable officers to:
  - a. consult with ward councillors, local businesses and residents in the immediate vicinity of the car park.
  - b. Monitor the capacity and usage of car park.
- iii. A decision on changing the fee structure at Chobham car park to be delayed to enable officers to:
  - a. Consult with Natural England, and other organisations as appropriate, on the impacts that the changes might have on the SSSI.
  - b. Explore the possible use of SANG contributions to offset the costs of running the Chobham car park.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 9 March 2022**

---

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

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Edward Hawkins
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ 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

Non-Committee Members in Attendance: Cllr Peter Barnett, Cllr Rodney Bates,

Portfolio Holders in Attendance: Cllr Shaun Garrett, Portfolio Holder: Support & Safeguarding  
Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Portfolio Holder: Places & Strategy  
Cllr Robin Perry, Portfolio Holder: Finance

Officers Present: Jayne Boitout, Community Development Officer  
Clive Jinman, Housing Services Manager  
Louise Livingston, Head of HR, Performance & Communications  
Sue McCubbin, Recreation and business Services Manager  
Damian Roberts, Chief Executive  
Nick Steevens, Strategic Director, Environment & Community  
Bob Watson, Strategic Director: Finance and Customer Services

#### **44/PF Minutes of Previous Meetings**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2022 and 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **45/PF Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Garrett declared an interest in respect of the fact that he was a trustee of Surrey Heath Age Concern, a beneficiary of the Council's grant schemes.

Cllr Croke declared an interest in respect of the fact that she was a trustee of Surrey Heath Age Concern, a beneficiary of the Council's grant schemes.

Cllr Jennings-Evans declared an interest in respect of the fact that her daughter was a beneficiary of the Borough's Free Access for County Sportspeople Scheme

#### **46/PF Executive Portfolio Update: Support and Safeguarding**

The Committee received and noted a report summarising the Council's work over the past twelve months which were encompassed by the Support and Safeguarding Portfolio; a portfolio which included work with the voluntary and community sector, the Council's grant

schemes and the Surrey Heath Lottery, community safety, safeguarding, housing and homelessness, disabled facilities grants and family support.

It was confirmed that the closing date for applications to the ward Councillor Grant Fund should be received by midnight on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 to be considered as part of the current financial year's funding allocation. Due to the Bisley and West End Ward By-Election on 14<sup>th</sup> April the outcome of any applications received between the date of this meeting and the 14<sup>th</sup> April would not be announced until the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2022. Any funds not spent by the end of the financial year would be returned to the Council's general revenue budget.

The Council's support of the UK Resettlement Scheme, formerly known as the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme, and the Afghan Refugee Resettlement scheme was noted. It was clarified that the Council's Family Support Team administered the scheme on behalf of both Surrey Heath and Runnymede Councils and to date 10 families had been resettled across both local authority areas. With regard to the recent invasion of the Ukraine by Russia, the Council was waiting for guidance from the Government in respect of accommodating Ukrainian refugees and assistance would be given if possible. It was stressed that the most difficult aspect of the resettlement programme was securing suitable accommodation.

It was agreed that a list of the organisations receiving support through the Surrey Heath Lottery would be circulated.

It was noted that the Hope Hub received funding through a variety of Council schemes and it was agreed that details would be circulated of all the funding received.

The Committee noted the update.

#### **47/PF Executive Portfolio Update: Places and Strategy**

The Committee received and noted a report summarising the Council's work over the past twelve months which were encompassed by the Places and Strategy Portfolio; a portfolio which included recreation and leisure services, greenspaces, contract management, physical activity and health and wellbeing.

The Committee was informed that requirement for personal trainers who wanted to deliver exercise sessions in the Council's parks to hold a Council issued licence had been put in place not only to ensure that trainers held appropriate qualifications and sufficient insurance cover but also so that they contributed towards the cost of maintaining the parks they used. The cost of a licence was not considered to be prohibitive and a sliding scale of fees applied depending on the number of classes being delivered each week and the number of people participating in each class. To increase flexibility and affordability there was also an option for applicants to pay for a licence by direct debit and in stages over the course of the year. At the current time, approximately 20 licences had been issued and the Greenspaces Team monitored use of the parks to ensure that those using them for fitness sessions were licensed.

The delay in refurbishing the Whitmoor Road Play area had been due to the ownership of the land not having been transferred to the Council following the completion of the development. It was confirmed that the work would be undertaken when the transfer of the Title Deeds had been completed and funding of £40,000 had been allocated to the project.

The new Leisure Centre had opened on time and on budget on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021. Following the relaxation of pandemic restrictions there had been a significant increase in the



demand for all the services offered and membership had increased month on month since the venue opened. In January 2022, 369 memberships had been taken out taking the total number of memberships that month to 4,367 and Places Leisure, the management group, had reported that this level of membership was the highest in their portfolio.

The analysis of the bookings of the grass tennis courts in Watchetts Recreation Ground had found that they were not being booked with any great frequency and it had been decided to repurpose them to form a fenced socialisation and exercise area for dog walkers on a trial basis. Initial feedback on the new facility had been positive and a decision on whether the facility, along with a similar one at Lightwater Country Park, would be retained would be taken at the end of the three month trial.

It was clarified that the refurbishment of the Watchetts Tennis Courts was being completed in phases to enable residents to continue using the facility while work progressed.

The Council's work with the County Council and the Environment Agency to tackle infestations of Japanese Knotweed across the Borough continued.

#### **48/PF Quarter 3 (October to December 2021) Finance Reports**

The Committee considered a report setting out the financial position of the Council at the end of the third quarter (October to December 2021) of the 2021/22 financial year.

It was reported that the Covid-19 pandemic, and the allied Government restrictions, had continued to impact on the Council's finances and the revenue budget was projecting an overspend of £0.893million at the end of the financial year. Areas where significant variance from the agreed budgets lost income from car parking fees, reduced rental income from the Council's investment property portfolio, a loss of income following the suspension of eth garden waste collection service and expenditure on agency staffing to cover vacancies within the finance section.

It was clarified that the Council's contract with Places Leisure to run the new Camberley leisure Centre had been designed such that in the early years the Council paid money to the contractor to help them offset their development costs. As the contract term progressed the amount paid by the Council to the Contractor reduced and the Council started to receive increasing amounts from the Contractor. Initial uncertainties over the ending of the pandemic restrictions and the impacts that these would have on customer levels had resulted in additional funding being put aside in anticipation of a need to support Places Leisure; however once the restrictions had been lifted the take up of memberships and ticket purchases had been much higher than anticipated and Places Leisure had decided that they would not need additional support.

The Committee was informed that £300,000 had been allocated in the 2022/23 budget to cover the cost of rebates to residents who had been subscribers to the garden waste collection service however Joint Waste Solutions was in negotiation with Amey over the payment of compensation for the lack of service.

It was clarified that the budget costs allocated to the Chief Executive stated in the Council Tax leaflet that had been recently published covered the Council's strategic management costs. Whilst costs had increased this reflected in reduced costs in other areas following the restructure of the Council's senior management team as responsibilities had been taken into the central core. It was agreed that this would be clarified on the Council's website.

Following delays in the delivery of the 2021/22 capital programme it would be reviewed to ensure that projects were still viable and that anticipated costs were still within budgeted amounts.

The Committee noted the reports.

#### **49/PF Public Realm Task and Finish Group**

The Committee received a report setting out the findings of a review into the overspend for the public realm works in Camberley Town Centre.

Disappointment was expressed that the Task and Finish Group appointed to oversee the review had not had the opportunity to examine the review's findings before they were published and it was agreed the report's recommendations could not be accepted at the current time.

**RESOLVED** that a meeting of the Task and Finish Group be convened to review the findings before a report is brought back to the Committee for consideration.

#### **50/PF Committee Work Programme**

The Committee received and noted a report setting out its work programme for the 2022/23 municipal year.

It was noted that an extra meeting could be scheduled to enable discussion of the outcomes of the 'Star Chamber' work to scrutinise the budget.

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 1 March 2022**

---

- + 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

\* In attendance virtually

Members in Attendance: Cllr Shaun Garrett, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam,

Officers Present: Louise Livingston and Nick Steevens

#### **19/EP Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2021 were confirmed by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

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

The Committee received a presentation from Kate Sawdy, CEO, in respect of the work of Citizens Advice Surrey Heath.

Citizens Advice Surrey Heath (CASH) gave advice across a whole range of problems for people in Surrey Heath, including benefits, debt, housing, employment, family issues and immigration. CASH saw the 'whole person', and more than ever, clients were visiting CASH with multiple problems. CASH's service was primarily delivered by highly trained volunteers and was quality assured by the national network to the highest standards. There was an emphasis for CASH to help their clients find solutions without escalation and that their service was always impartial, confidential and free.

CASH also collected data about their clients and their issues and used this information on a national but also a more local level in order to campaign for change where needed.

In January 2022, more than 270,000 people sought one-to-one advice from Citizens Advice across England and Wales, topping a previous high of 265,000 in November 2021. 24,000 required some type of crisis support such as food bank referrals and charitable payments - the highest on record for Citizens Advice. In

addition the number of people supported with energy debts hit more than 8,000, the highest on record. The average energy debt of CASH clients with such cases now stood at £1,450, up from £1,330 in 2020.

On a local level, comparing the 21/22 financial year to 20/21, enquiries received by CASH relating to debt had increased by 56% and enquiries relating to utilities and communications bills had increased by 79%. However positively, enquiries regarding employment had fell by 22% on the previous year. Furthermore, CASH had experienced record numbers of enquiries in January including 257 enquiries in respect of the Household Support Fund.

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

- Part of CASH's plan for 2022-25 was to increase the diversity and knowledge of its team of staff and volunteers. However, it was noted that it took at least 6 months of training before a CASH volunteer made a meaningful contribution to the organisation; and this made it difficult to successfully recruit and retain younger volunteers. The Council had the opportunity to offer social media support to CASH in respect of the recruitment of volunteers through digital channels. Furthermore, whilst CASH services and volunteering opportunities were already promoted via various community magazines, there was potential to further promote volunteering opportunities with CASH in Heathscene.
- Outstanding work had been conducted in respect of promoting the Surrey Heath Hardship Fund. However, it was noted that in-need, eligible residents were still unaware of the fund, as demonstrated by recent referrals at the Old Dean Free Food Stall. It was noted that unfortunately applications for the fund closed, before the rise in the energy price cap due to take place on 1 April 2022.
- In respect of the recruitment of volunteers there were potential opportunities to engage with groups such as the University of the Third Age and the Rotary Club. CASH had recently presented to a group of NHS staff, in respect of the service and long-term volunteering opportunities.

The Committee thanked Kate and her team for their continued work supporting those in need within Surrey Heath.

## **21/EP Accent Housing**

The Committee received a presentation from Julie Wittich, Executive Director of Assets and Sustainability, and Holly Sheppard, Contracts Manager, in respect of Accent Housing's future plans, recent charges, and an update as to the ongoing maintenance issues in relation to its Surrey Heath properties.

Julie Wittich had joined the organisation in the role of Executive Director of Assets & Sustainability, which reflected Accent's new focus on asset management, and building capacity and undertaking a review of its maintenance service.

Accent had secured a significant grant from the Social Housing Decarbonisation Funds and would be investing in a pilot scheme for the use of part of the funds, including 66 properties within Surrey Heath, to a total of £40,000. Such initiatives were key to Accent's focus to make its assets more energy efficient and to tackle fuel poverty.

Following Storm Eunice, Accent had prioritised resulting repairs which mostly consisted of roofing, fencing and treework issues. Whilst recruitment and retention issues still continued in relation to the maintenance service, Accent was working with Axis Europe in order to ensure the recruitment of quality operatives and the use of additional sub-contractors in order to increase capacity. During 2021/22 (Year to date), 62.9% of repairs were completed within 15 days against a target of 95%. Furthermore, despite noting that some repairs, where prior specification work needed to be undertaken, could not be completed on the first visit, the targeted rates for first time fixes and the targeted customer satisfaction letter had also fallen below the target standard.

In total, so far this financial year, 838 planned works had been completed, which would soon include new radiators at Cranmore Court, which was due to be completed by the end of February. Customer satisfaction still continued to be lower than wished. This was partly attributable to challenges in respect of material supply which had been caused by the pandemic and Brexit.

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

- The current backlog of outstanding responsive repairs, which had failed to be dealt with outside the targeted 28 day routine period, currently stood at circa 500 within Surrey Heath. Accent regularly reviewed their 'WIP (Work in Progress)', of outstanding maintenance repairs, which required a fine balancing act between aiming to meet the 28 day routine period for newer jobs and also tackling the long-outstanding jobs.
- Accent had 100% nominations from the Council in respect of filling its homes; and Accent did not have its own allocations policy. However, there was an opportunity for Accent Housing to perhaps use tools such as its tenancy agreements and its procedures on anti-social behaviour to split apart disruptive combinations of tenants. In the case of new build estates, local lettings plans, which would be created in conjunction with the Council, could enable the creation of more socially sustainable communities and provided a mix between larger and smaller properties and between employed and unemployed tenants.
- There were multiple cases of urgent, severe repairs which hadn't been completed and had been outstanding for very long periods of more than 6 months. Furthermore, Councillors had heard horror stories from their residents in respect of inadequate repairs and terrible communication. It was felt that the cases reflected, not just the scale of the backlog, but the severity of the cases included.
- Accent Housing was terminating its maintenance contract with Axis Europe. Accent had received assurances that they wanted an amicable, demobilisation of the contract. The new contract with the future

maintenance contractor would return to the traditional method of payment, where Accent would only pay for completed jobs.

- Accent and the Council had worked in exemplary partnership in respect of the Afghan Locally Employed Staff (LES) Relocation Scheme.

Accent agreed to arrange a single point of contact to be arranged for Surrey Heath Borough Councillors and Members thanked Julie and Holly for their time and presentation.

## **22/EP The Hope Hub Report**

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

The Hope Hub provided crisis and empowerment services for anyone who was or was at risk of becoming homeless, or whom was struggling with mental health, debt issues and unemployment. This included provision of emergency relief and items and one to one casework support, employment advice; and money and debt advice.

Recently, the Hope Hub had reintroduced its living well programme, where it was envisaged that in the future one programme per weekday would be featured. Sessions included a 5 week affordable cookery course, shopping on a budget and understanding labelling. It was recognised that many clients had enjoyed sharing experiences and socialising during such sessions which had been missed during the height of the pandemic.

The Hope Hub's digital inclusion project called IT Connect allowed clients to borrow a tablet for up to three months. The programme also worked to train and upskill clients; and this ran alongside a programme provided by a training and employment coach. In addition a number of clients had completed a certificated volunteering programme. Overall a total of 183 individuals had attended the Hope Hub's training courses; some of whom left with accredited qualifications.

Moving forward the charity was developing a service user forum, which would be made up of individuals which reflected the Hope Hub's client base. In addition, as many of the volunteers which had lent their time during the pandemic had moved on to other opportunities, the Hope Hub was seeking to engage new volunteers and had benefited from the expertise of the Frimley Park Hospital Volunteer Coordinator.

On looking forward and on evaluation of the recent changes to the demand for the Hope Hub's services, statistics showed that Hope Hub Clients now suffered with more complex needs and were often multiple disadvantaged. This resulted in the Hope Hub's average client engaging with the service on 31 occasions. In relation to this the Hope Hub aimed to provide a wider range of services, which included social enterprise initiatives, and had longer term ambitions of a 'Hope House', and skills centre.

The Hope Hub's Emergency Accommodation Service, provided in conjunction with the Council, was due to officially open on 22 March 2022. However, the service was already providing 3 rooms with a further 3 rooms slowed down by defect and building material supply issues. The accommodation's residents would live at the house for 6 weeks in which they would work intensely with the day service offering. At the end of the period the client would move into private rental or social housing.

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

- Where a homeless person was entrenched in rough sleeping, the Hope Hub would provide them with the necessities, but would not support them in order to enable them to continue sleeping rough on a permanent basis. In such instances, the day service would help them obtain identification in order to give them access to temporary accommodation and would often add them to the 2 year SAN programme, where the Hope Hub would report on the individual's progress to Surrey Heath and Surrey County Councils.
- All of the Hope Hub's Emergency Accommodation's residents signed a declaration stating that they would not engage in substance misuse whilst at the house.
- There was potential for The Hope Hub to work in conjunction with the Man with a Pan initiative.
- Following the completion of a risk assessment, coordination between the Council's Housing team and The Hope Hub could allow for a rough-sleeping individual to be placed within the emergency accommodation within the same day.
- There was a lack of emergency accommodation within easy reach of Camberley. This problem was exacerbated by the lack of a clear emergency accommodation referral process for out of office hours. It was felt that there was an opportunity to hold easily-assessed emergency rough sleeping kits, which would include a sleeping bag, clothing and essential toiletries, at St Michaels, St Martins and St Marys Churches.

The Committee thanked Mags for her informative update and continued fantastic work in the borough.

## **23/EP Camberley Street Angels**

The Committee received a verbal update from Reverend Mike Thomason and Richard Salt, Street Angels Coordinator, in respect of Camberley Street Angels.

Camberley Street Angels was a Churches Together initiative and a group of volunteers who believed that people deserved care and love at their time of need.

The Street Angels provided emergency welfare support in Camberley Town Centre, when the nighttime economy was most active. The Street Angels currently provided support on two Fridays a month, including the monthly payday, and

worked alongside the Police and doorstaff. The initiative was reemerging, post lockdown, and currently had 13 volunteers.

Following Members' comments it was clarified that in order to volunteer as part of Camberley Street Angels individuals did not need to be a member of the church, but instead just needed to share the church's ethos and values. Members also felt that there was an opportunity to promote the Street Angels in Heathscene in order to help with the recruitment of volunteers and it was noted that various Members had volunteered with Camberley Street Angels and had found the experience enlightening.

Members thanked Mike and Richard for the update.

## **24/EP Committee Work Programme**

The Committee considered its Committee Work Programme for the 22/23 municipal year. It was noted that the work programme had a level of flexibility in order to encourage attendance from the Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner at the same meeting as the Borough Commander. Furthermore the Committee expressed its wish for Accent representatives to attend future meetings in-person, rather than virtually. In addition, it was asked by the Committee to have an update as to the status of the Surrey Heath Arts Council.

Chairman



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held on 3 March  
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 Charlotte Morley	- Gillian Riding
+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft	+ Anthony Sparks
	+ Karen Wetherell

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Officers in Attendance: Louise Livingston, Julie Simmonds, Rachel Whillis.

**35/J Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 3 February 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

**36/J Establishment of a Human Resources Policy Working Group**

The Consultative Group considered a proposal to establish a Human Resources Policy Working Group, the purpose of which would be to enable representatives from both the employer and staff sides to review new or fundamentally altered policies in detail prior to their consideration by the Joint Staff Consultative Group. As the purpose of the Working Group was to only review policies that were new or significantly changed, it was not anticipated that the Working Group would meet regularly. It was also emphasised that the Consultative Group would remain the formal meeting for negotiation of changes to Staff Terms and Conditions of Employment.

The proposed membership of the Working Group was discussed and it was agreed to amend the membership, as set out in the Terms of Reference, to comprise three Employer Representatives and three Staff Representatives, with a quorum of two representatives per side. It was also agreed that the membership could remain flexible in order to best utilise individuals' skills, taking account the matter under consideration. In addition, Member representatives recognised there would be a need to keep the Chairman of the Employment Committee informed about items under discussion.

**RESOLVED that**

- (i) a Human Resources Policy Review Working Group be established and its Terms of Reference, as set out at Annex A to this report, as amended be agreed; and**

- (ii) the membership of the Working Group be agreed on the nomination of the respective sides.**

Chairman

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Staff  
Consultative Group held at Surrey  
Heath House on 29 March 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 Charlotte Morley	Gillian Riding
+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft	+ Anthony Sparks
	- Karen Wetherell

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Jo Hill, Louise Livingston and Julie Simmonds

**37/J Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 3 March 2022 were confirmed by the Group.

**38/J Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**39/J Information Security Policy**

The Group considered a report which outlined information and proposed changes regarding the Council's Information Security Policy, which was considered by the Group on an annual basis.

The proposed policy had been amended to reflect:

2.5 inclusion of web browser

5.3 further information regarding personal and third party equipment

6.10 further information regarding remote access in particular to Microsoft Azure

9.2 Further information regarding storing documents and files

It was agreed that a typographical error would be amended to reflect the correct date of the proposed amended policy. Furthermore, it was agreed that there would be reference made in Section 2 of the policy to the requirement for password managing spreadsheets should be encrypted and preferably within a compressed zip folder.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be asked to agree that the revised Information Security Policy, as set out at Annex A to the report, be adopted.**

#### **40/J Data Protection Policy**

The Group considered a report which provided information and a proposed change regarding the Council's Data Protection Policy.

The Group were advised that the proposed revised policy had not changed with the exception to the updating of job titles.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be asked to agree that the revised Data Protection Policy, as set out at Annex A to the report, be adopted.**

#### **41/J Data Security Breaches Policy**

The Group received a report which reviewed the Council's Data Security Breaches Policy and proposed a few minor changes.

The proposed policy has been amended to reflect that the United Kingdom was no longer part of the European Union as detailed in section 1.6. The section now reflected UK GDPR. Furthermore, changes to Paragraph 3.1 reflected the job role changed for SIRO as a result of the recent Senior Management Restructure.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be asked to agree that the revised Data Security Breaches Policy, as set out at Annex A to the report, be adopted.**

#### **42/J Social Networking Policy**

The Group considered a report outlined proposed changes to the Council's Social Networking Policy which was considered by the Group on an annual basis.

It was acknowledged that the proposed updated policy had been amended to note that some social networking use may be applicable to Freedom of Information (FOI) or Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) requests.

Furthermore, it was noted that it would be checked by Officers as to whether there were data protection implications in respect of the policy and the Bring Your Own Device scheme.

**RESOLVED that the Employment Committee be asked to agree that the revised Social Networking Policy, as set out at Annex A to the report, be adopted.**

#### **43/J Organisational Change Policy and Procedure**

The Group considered a revision to the Employment Stability Policy and Procedure which was proposed to be renamed the Organisational Change Policy

and Procedure. The Group were advised that the policy required review because it had been found that the policy was unclear and left gaps which allowed room for interpretation and that there was an opportunity to make the policy more informative to staff.

The proposed amended policy sought to reduce the term of the protected policy to 12 months and clarify that it could only be applied if an employee accepted a role one grade down from their redundant post. The Group agreed to amend the proposed policy so that where there was a drop of more than 1 grade below their substantive post, the employee would benefit from 6 months protected salary. It was noted that this would be preferable to the Council in contrast to the loss of corporate knowledge and the costs of redundancy and recruitment. In addition, in respect of notice periods, it was agreed to amend the proposed policy to allow the continuation of the options of 'payment in lieu', and 'gardening leave', for specific circumstances.

The Group felt that voluntary redundancy should remain as an option within the policy; and principally it was good practice and better for all parties for someone to leave via voluntary redundancy rather than members of a team leave via compulsory redundancy. It was agreed that those taking voluntary redundancy would receive the same package as those subject to compulsory redundancy.

Furthermore, it was felt by the Group that there was a lack of general understanding in respect of the effect of redundancy or an individual's pension and it was agreed that the pension strain should be defined in the policy. Moreover, it was acknowledged from the discussions that the Council's retirement policy needed review.

It was agreed that it should be included in the policy that outplacement should be made available to all staff who were subject to redundancy. It was also agreed to amend typographical errors and superseded job titles throughout the policy; as well as to add headings to the columns of the table under section 11 of the proposed policy.

However, the Group had differing opinions in respect of when the multiplier should apply. Whilst, the employer's representatives felt that the proposal for the multiplier should apply to any restructures which had started before 31 March 2023, the staff representatives wished for this to be extended in the proposed policy till March 2024.

As no consensus was reached and neither option achieved a majority vote amongst both staff and employer's representatives, separate recommendations would be presented to the Employment Committee for consideration.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. the Employment Committee be asked to agree that the revised Organisational Change Policy (formerly the Employment Stability Policy) as set out at Annex A of the agenda report, subject to the amendments outlined above, be adopted; and**
  
- II. the Employment Committee be asked to agree either**

- i. the x 1.5 multiplier be applicable to restructures, which had started by 31 March 2024 as proposed by staff representatives;  
or
- ii. the x1.5 multiplier be applicable to restructures, which had started by 31 March 2023 as proposed by member representatives.

#### **44/J Work Programme**

The Group noted its work programme for rest of the municipal year. It was agreed that review of the Retirement Policy would be added 12 January 2023 scheduled meeting.

**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, as amended.

Chairman