

MINUTES of the WAVERLEY
BOROUGH COUNCIL held in
the Caudle Hall, Wilfrid Noyce
Community Centre, Crown
Court Car Park, Godalming,
GU7 1DY on 14 December
2021 at 7.00 pm

- * Cllr John Robini (Mayor)
- * Cllr John Ward (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| * Cllr Brian Adams | Cllr Jerry Hyman |
| * Cllr Christine Baker | Cllr Peter Isherwood |
| * Cllr David Beaman | Cllr Jacquie Keen |
| * Cllr Roger Blishen | Cllr Robert Knowles |
| * Cllr Peter Clark | * Cllr Anna James |
| * Cllr Carole Cockburn | Cllr Andy MacLeod |
| Cllr Steve Cosser | * Cllr Penny Marriott |
| * Cllr Martin D'Arcy | * Cllr Peter Marriott |
| * Cllr Jerome Davidson | Cllr Michaela Martin |
| * Cllr Kevin Deanus | Cllr Peter Martin |
| * Cllr Simon Dear | * Cllr Mark Merryweather |
| * Cllr Sally Dickson | Cllr Kika Mirylees |
| Cllr Brian Edmonds | * Cllr Stephen Mulliner |
| * Cllr Patricia Ellis | * Cllr John Neale |
| * Cllr David Else | * Cllr Peter Nicholson |
| * Cllr Jenny Else | * Cllr Nick Palmer |
| Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass | * Cllr Julia Potts |
| * Cllr Paul Follows | * Cllr Ruth Reed |
| * Cllr Mary Forszewski | * Cllr Paul Rivers |
| * Cllr Maxine Gale | * Cllr Penny Rivers |
| * Cllr Michael Goodridge | Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman |
| Cllr John Gray | Cllr Trevor Sadler |
| * Cllr Joan Heagin | * Cllr Richard Seaborne |
| * Cllr Val Henry | * Cllr Liz Townsend |
| * Cllr George Hesse | Cllr Michaela Wicks |
| * Cllr Chris Howard | * Cllr Steve Williams |
| Cllr Daniel Hunt | * Cllr George Wilson |

*Present

Apologies

Cllr Steve Cosser, Cllr Brian Edmonds, Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass, Cllr John Gray, Cllr Daniel Hunt, Cllr Peter Isherwood, Cllr Jacquie Keen, Cllr Robert Knowles, Cllr Andy MacLeod, Cllr Michaela Martin, Cllr Peter Martin, Cllr Kika Mirylees, Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman, Cllr Trevor Sadler and Cllr Michaela Wicks

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, prayers were led by the Reverend Chris Bessant.

CNL60/21 MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

60.1 The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 19 October and 1 November were confirmed and signed.

CNL61/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda item 2.)

61.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Steve Cosser, Jan Floyd-Douglass, Brian Edmonds, John Gray, Daniel Hunt, Peter Isherwood, Jacquie Keen, Robert Knowles, Kika Mirylees, Andy MacLeod, Michaela Martin, Peter Martin, Anne-Marie Rosoman, Trevor Sadler and Michaela Wicks.

CNL62/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda item 3.)

62.1 The following declarations of interest were made prior to the meeting:

- Councillor Peter Martin declared a registrable interest in item 9.2 as a member of Godalming Town Council.
- Councillor Richard Seaborne declared a registrable interest in item 9.2 as Chairman of Bramley Parish Council.
- Councillor Julia Potts declared a registrable interest in item 9.4 as a member of one of the organisations which had made representations on the Local Plan and would not be present for consideration of that item.

62.2 The following declarations of interest were made in the meeting:

- Councillor Paul Follows declared a registrable interest in item 9.2 as the Leader of Godalming Town Council
- The Mayor, Councillor John Robini declared a registrable interest in item 9.4 as a member of Haslemere Town Council and the Haslemere Society which had responded to the Local Plan.
- Councillor Steve Williams declared a registrable interest in item 9.2 as Deputy Leader of Godalming Town Council.
- Councillor Chris Howard declared a registrable interest in item 9.4 as Vice-Chairman of Wonnersh Parish Council.
- Councillor Simon Dear declared a registrable interest in item 9.4 as a member of and the Mayor of Haslemere Town Council.
- Councillor Joan Heagin declared a registrable interest in item 9.2 as a member of Godalming Town Council.
- Councillor Peter Nicholson declared a registrable interest in item 9.4 as a member of Haslemere Town Council.
- Councillor Jerome Davidson declared a registrable interest in item 9.4 as a member of Haslemere Town Council.
- Councillor Maxine Gale declared a registrable interest in item 9.4 as a member of Witley Parish Council.

CNL63/21 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 4.)

63.1 The Mayor advised that he had cancelled his Christmas Carol service in order to protect residents and staff in light of the Covid situation. The event would have raised money for the Mayor's charities, however the raffle would

continue and he encouraged anyone who wanted to buy a raffle ticket or donate to the Mayor's charities to contact the Council.

- 63.2 The Mayor had attended some events since the last Council meeting, including the at the Haslemere Society; the Rowleys Community Centre; the Skillway centre and the Haslemere craft fair. Remembrance services had also been held, culminating in Remembrance Day parades held across the borough.
- 63.3 The Mayor urged everyone to stay safe and his thoughts and prayers were with those who were being affected by the rising Covid numbers and new variant.

CNL64/21 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 5.)

- 64.1 The Leader opened his announcements and made the following points:
- He thanked all those who had attended the meeting and noted that a number of Councillors had submitted apologies for the meeting due to health concerns. He highlighted that Covid was once again preventing Councillors from carrying out their duties and that the Council was legally prevented from operating remotely as it had done previously. He had joined the Leader of Guildford Borough Council in writing to the Government to express concerns over the current situation and remind them of the cost of putting on meetings in venues which allowed sufficient social distancing. He had attended a meeting with the Department for Levelling up, Communities and Housing and had been given no indication that the Government intended to legislate to allow local authorities to hold council meetings remotely.

The Leader then invited Executive Portfolio Holders to give brief updates on current issues:

- 64.2 Councillor Clark, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Business Transformation and IT:
- The Radware solution continued to protect the Council's planning documents portal from malware attacks and operate well.
- 64.3 Councillor Penny Marriott, Portfolio Holder for Equalities, Diversity, Inclusion and Community Safety:
- Referring to the recent case of Yorkshire cricket club, it was important to be mindful of the impact of language used. The Council was working on strengthening its equalities objectives.
 - Her portfolio now included Community safety, which was an important issue and she looked forward to further work and update in this area.
- 64.4 Councillor Merryweather, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Assets and Commercial Services:
- On 10 December 2021 a letter had been submitted to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities regarding future funding of local government and thanked Conservate colleagues for their constructive input, although expressed regret that they did not feel able to sign the letter.

65.5 Councillor Palmer, Portfolio Holder for Operational and Enforcement Services:

- Parking revenue had been fluctuating, partly due to season influences and partly due to the changing situation with the pandemic and reminded the Council to exercise caution and not assume things were returning to normal.

65.6 Councillor Liz Townsend, Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, Leisure and Dunsfold Park:

- Thanked the staff for their hard work during another difficult year and welcomed the achievements, which included the development of the Dunsfold Park Supplementary Planning Document which was currently undergoing a public consultation. The Executive was committed to biodiversity in the borough and the Tree and Woodland Management Policy had been considered by the Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Once adopted, work would begin on an overarching Greenspaces Strategy.

65.7 Councillor Williams, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability:

- Waste collection services were currently up to date, despite the challenges faced by the contractor and thanked the collection staff for their efforts on behalf of the community. He thanked residents for their patience and any missed bin collections would be collected as soon as possible.

CNL65/21 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Agenda item 6.)

65.1 The following question was received from Mr Daniel Kuszel in accordance with Procedure Rule 10:

“The Council's discussion of a new leisure centre at Cranleigh is welcome, although £20 million is almost 4 times the price of the leisure centre built in Godalming only 9 years ago. Why is the proposed price so expensive? Additionally, it has been known by the authority since 2018 that Godalming Leisure Centre has vastly outperformed its estimated revenue, with the facility significantly oversubscribed. Additional facilities are needed for the centre. If Cranleigh is to benefit from a new leisure centre at a cost of £20 million, Haslemere enjoying the benefit of 2 leisure centres, why is no money available to expand Godalming Leisure Centre, a town twice the size of Haslemere that has already exceeded its allocation of new housing under the Council's Local Plan 11 years ahead of schedule?”

65.2 Councillor Liz Townsend, Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, Leisure and Dunsfold Park gave the following response:

“Thank you for your question. We as an administration are very pleased to be in a position to present a viable business proposal for a new Cranleigh Leisure Centre. The leisure centre is 52 years old and has far exceeded its life expectancy and we are therefore, at a point where Council has to make a critical decision regarding the future of leisure provision in the Cranleigh area. The proposal for a new facility is based on a combination of cost proposals from the consultants, Sport England guidance and local leisure operator experience. In addition to Cranleigh being a larger site, with more facilities than Godalming, there has been a significant amount

of change since Godalming Leisure Centre was built in 2012 so a direct comparison, as you suggest, does not give an accurate picture. The challenges of an increase in construction costs (labour and materials), a global pandemic and a corporate commitment and responsibility to reduce carbon emissions has resulted in an increase to the updated costings.

The Council must consider the entire leisure stock and prioritise where finance is spent to ensure that the facilities meet the demands of the local community. Cranleigh Leisure centre is over 50 years old and Farnham Leisure Centre is over 40 years old and as you highlighted Godalming is only 9 years old. However, a redevelopment of the Godalming Leisure Centre, to accommodate the public demand, is still very much in mind and we are awaiting a decision from the Department for Education regarding the release of school land to enable the project to move forward. The pandemic has had a substantial impact on the leisure industry, and it is imperative that we review all business decisions to ensure that the projects still remain viable. Once we have received approval from the DfE to proceed we will conduct such a review accordingly.”

65.3 The following question was received from Mr Mike Baudry in accordance with Procedure Rule 10:

“The Council is aware of Haslemere Town Council’s representations that it supports the allocation of the Royal School within LPP2 but only on the basis of a ‘limit of development of 90 units only, being on land on which there were **previously constructed buildings or hardstanding.**’ The Leader confirmed at the Full Council meeting on 22nd September 2021 that he had responded to and would continue to listen to the community of Haslemere, as represented by HTC and its Neighbourhood Plan. It is concerning that the Officer’s report on LPP2 accompanying this evening’s meeting does not propose any amendments to the Royal School allocation in reflection of the requirements of the Town Council. The Town Council are clear that no development over the playing fields and green spaces of the site, being wholly within the AONB, must be permitted. Please can Members amend the description of the Royal School allocation to reflect the Town Council’s position.

Further Haslemere Vision has also now stated that the numbers proposed at the Royal School site seem high.”

65.4 The Leader of the Council gave the following response on behalf of the Portfolio Holder who could not be present:

“Waverley is aware that that Town Council has commented on the Addendum to LPP2 that they feel the dwellings proposed in the housing allocation for the Royal Junior School should be accommodated within the existing built-up area of the site and also that Haslemere Vision have stated that the numbers seem high. However, both the Town Council and Haslemere Vision are clear in their general support for the allocation of this site for housing. Whilst it is in the AONB, the site is classed as previously-developed land, it already has a number of buildings and areas of hardstanding on it, and is visually very well screened. The evidence that the Council has gathered concludes that there is a low to medium sensitivity to development in landscape terms. Taking these matters into account, Waverley considers that the number of dwellings proposed for the site in Local Plan Part 2 is

appropriate and there is no need to change the allocation. It is recognised that it will not be possible to design an acceptable scheme for this number of units that is solely contained within the footprint of the existing buildings and hard surfaced areas. However, the Council is confident that the character of the site, its size and degree of natural screening are such that a well-designed scheme for the quantum of development as proposed in the Addendum to LPP2 can be accommodated without having an adverse impact on the countryside and AONB.”

The Leader added that he would be happy to answer any questions on this topic as part of the debate on the LPP2 item later on the agenda.

CNL66/21 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Agenda item 7.)

66.1 The following question was received from Councillor Seaborne in accordance with Procedure Rule 11:

“On September 18th, 2019, this Council declared a Climate Emergency, requiring urgent action. At the same meeting the Council resolved to instruct officers to provide to the Council’s Executive, within six months of the date of the decision, a report on the actions the Council and the local community could take to address these issues together with an action plan, specifying year on year milestones and metrics to show progress towards achieving the goal of carbon neutrality by 2030 noting any additional costs that might be involved.

On December 15th, 2020, some 15 months later, a Carbon Neutrality Action Plan was brought to Council for noting, having been approved by Executive two weeks earlier. Some delay was understandable because of Covid but nine months seems a lot given the declared need for urgent action.

That plan stated: *This action plan is intended to be a live document and will be updated frequently as required. An update of the action plan will be presented to Executive and Environment O&S Committee annually with the next update scheduled for October 2021 in order to align with budget setting processes for the following year.*

Will the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability please advise members when they can expect to see the update to the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan? Neither Executive nor Environment O&S or its successor committee has seen anything in formal meetings and so it will not be until sometime in 2022 that the clearly stated objective in the plan can be delivered, well after the time for 2022-23 budget setting.”

66.2 Prior to reading out his written response below, the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Williams, asked that it be noted that following the declaration of a climate emergency, an action plan had been considered by the Executive on 3 March 2020, six months later not 15 months later as stated in the question.

“I am pleased to confirm that the annual update on the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan will be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for Services on 24th January 2022 and then to the Executive on 8th February and Council on 22nd February 2022.”

66.3 The following question was received from Councillor Cosser in accordance with Procedure Rule 11:

“As we near the end of 2021 it is now 27 months since this Council declared a climate emergency but we have as yet seen no hard numerical data with which to gauge progress in that period. The Carbon Neutrality Action Plan published at the end of 2020 was based on a 2015 baseline figure for the Council's operational CO₂ emissions. When the overdue update to the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan is released can we be assured that this will contain fully detailed current data that will enable the Council to make effective judgements on how much progress has actually been made towards achieving the Council's stated objective of carbon neutral operations by 2030 and, if not, why not?”

66.4 Prior to reading out his written response below, the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Williams, clarified that numerical data had been presented to the Executive at its meeting on 3 March 2020 and the subsequent Council meeting. Work was ongoing to refine the data used.

“Since the adoption of the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan in December 2020, councillors have received regular progress reports on elements of the action plan at meetings of both the executive and full council in the regular portfolio holder updates. An informal interim update of the plan has been presented to Executive members in July 2021. The Greenhouse Gas emissions data for 2020/21 has also been produced and is available of Waverley's website.

I am pleased to confirm that the annual update on the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan will be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for Services on 24th January 2022 and then to the Executive on 8th February and Council on 22nd February 2022.

The Carbon Neutrality Action Plan was adopted as a living document and not a fully quantified 10 year plan. The Council has engaged consultancy support for reviewing the trajectory and providing some quantification on key projects, including costs. The revised Carbon Neutrality Action Plan along with the covering report will provide key data to indicate and measure progress toward our target of carbon neutrality by 2030. The plan will continue to be reviewed and updated with more specific numerical data as and when projects mature and have funding allocated to them. This way the Executive can make fully informed decisions on a project by project basis.”

66.5 The following question was received from Councillor Henry in accordance with Procedure Rule 11:

“How much Officer resource has been devoted in 2021 to the task of researching and calculating the Council's carbon reduction targets and estimating the associated costs and timescales of achieving these targets? AND, Is the Administration planning to increase that level of Officer resource in 2022?”

66.6 The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Williams, gave the following response:

“The plan and its targets constitute a corporate commitment impacting on every activity of the council and therefore requiring officer time from across the council

services. As a result the actual overall level of officer resource devoted to it is difficult to quantify.

The sustainability team, a team of 3 officers supported by the Head of Environmental and Regulatory services, is responsible for managing and coordinating the progress on the Carbon Neutrality Action across all council services and managing its monitoring processes.

We are currently actively considering additional resources to support the delivery of this very ambitious plan in order to both focus on the range of key priorities in our Carbon Neutrality Action Plan, facilitate carbon reduction work across the full range of service areas and see through our commitment to developing our waste reduction strategy.”

66.7 The following question was received from Councillor Dickson in accordance with Procedure Rule 11:

“Earlier this year, £50000 was allocated for a preliminary feasibility study in respect of the Hale Trail or Eastern Boundary Cycle Path. Please could the Portfolio Holder provide an update?”

66.8 The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Williams, gave the following response:

“Waverley remains committed to delivery of the Farnham Park, Eastern Boundary Cycle Path (Hale Trail). The project was included as part of the Surrey County, Waverley Borough and Farnham Town Council partnership to deliver the wider Farnham Infrastructure Programme (FIP). The Hale Trail Greenway along the eastern boundary of Farnham Park, had been included in the list of infrastructure improvements as one of the ‘medium term interventions’.

Unfortunately, the sift and prioritisation of this list by FIP has been delayed. Therefore, Waverley, concerned about the need to progress this project in this financial year, has now agreed with the FIP Programme Manager to remove the Hale Trail from the FIP list and proceed directly with the preliminary study. Following an initial meeting with FIP, a way ahead has been proposed. The Atkins project manager is outlining a feasibility study for the FIP programme manager. This study would look at all the aspects of the Greenway and provide a small number of options with rough costings. Following consultation and option selection, the project would proceed with detailed design, securing the construction funding and then implementation.

Waverley remains committed to delivery of the Farnham Park, Eastern Boundary Cycle Path (Hale Trail Greenway). It is incorporated into our Carbon Neutrality Action Plan.”

CNL67/21 MOTIONS (Agenda item 8.)

No motions have been received.

CNL68/21 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Agenda item 9.)

68.1 It was moved by the Leader, duly seconded and

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive meetings held on 2 and 30 November and the Minutes of the Special Executive meetings held on 9 November and 14 December 2021 be received and noted.

68.2 There were three Part I matters, for Council consideration, from the meeting on 30 November and one Part I matter, for Council consideration, from the meeting on 14 December 2021.

CNL69/21 EXE 57/21 WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION ON WARDING PATTERNS (Agenda item 9.1)

69.1 The Leader introduced the report which set out the Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's consultation on warding patterns in Waverley. He thanked the officers involved and the Deputy Mayor and members of the cross party working group for their work. He moved the recommendations which were duly seconded.

69.2 Councillor Goodridge endorsed the comments made by Councillors Seaborne and Howard as set out in the report and expressed concern over the recommendation for the Bramley and Wonnersh ward which covered a large geographical area. He also expressed concern that there were now three single member wards proposed which seemed undemocratic and did not give a choice to the electorate.

69.3 Councillor Nicholson echoed the comments made by the Leader and thanked the Chairman of the Working Group and highlighted a typographical error in the recommendation on page 52 of the agenda, in relation to the wards of Haslemere East and Haslemere West.

69.4 Cllr Baker welcomed the recommendations which reflected the wish of Hambledon residents to continue to be included with Witley in respect of representation in Waverley.

69.5 Councillor Merryweather spoke in support of the recommendations although noted that some of the recommendations in the report had not had the same level of scrutiny from the working group as previous recommendations and asked that this be noted for the future.

69.6 The Leader thanked all Councillors for their engagement with the consultation process and commended the recommendations to the Council and it was

RESOLVED that

- i. the Council's formal response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's 'Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Waverley Borough Council' is approved and submitted to the Commission; and**
- ii. the Joint Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader, is delegated to finalise the Council's submission, incorporating points raised in debate at this Council meeting.**

CNL70/21 EXE 58/21 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF TOWNS AND PARISHES

IN THE WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL AREA (Agenda item 9.2)

- 70.1 The Leader introduced the report which set out the proposed Terms of Reference for a Community Governance Review of all Towns and Parishes in the Borough. This was in a response to a request from Farnham and Godalming Town Councils to reduce the size of their respective councils following recommendations made in the Local Government Boundary Commission in respect of Parish ward boundaries in those areas. The publication of the Terms of Reference for the Community Governance Review would provide the opportunity for these and any other such requests to be submitted and considered ahead of the May 2023 Town and Parish elections. The Leader moved the recommendations which were duly seconded and it was

RESOLVED that the proposed Terms of Reference for a Community Governance Review of all Towns and Parishes in the Waverley Borough Council area be adopted.

CNL71/21 EXE 59/21 CRANLEIGH LEISURE CENTRE INVESTMENT (Agenda item 9.3)

- 71.1 The Leader formally moved the recommendations which were duly seconded by Councillor Townsend who introduced the report which set out proposals for a capital investment to build a new low carbon leisure centre in Cranleigh to replace the 52 year old leisure centre which was no longer financially viable due to the operating and maintenance costs. Cranleigh had seen an increase in the demand for leisure facilities following the growth in population. Councillor Townsend thanked the commitment of the Executive in bringing the recommendations forward, which were in line with corporate commitments to improve the health and wellbeing of residents and take action on climate change. She thanked the Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee for its support for the recommendations.
- 71.2 Councillor Foryszewski spoke in support of the recommendations and thanked the officers for their work on the proposals. She suggested that a multi-agency working group be set up to develop the technical proposals.
- 71.3 Councillor Seaborne spoke in support of the recommendations however sought assurances that officers would stay in regular contact with Exeter and Spelthorne to track lessons learnt from their two flagship Passivehaus developments. He sought clarification from the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability that the Co2 reductions quoted were operational or whether the emissions involved in the construction of the new centre been factored in; that the data set did not include emissions from Waverley's housing stock; and where the 2019/20 emissions data could be found.
- 71.4 Councillor Wilson welcomed the recommendations which would also benefit all the Borough's leisure centres. Councillor Williams welcomed the recommendations, thanking the officers for their work on the proposals. He advised that the Council would continue to learn lessons from Exeter and Spelthorne. The new centre would provide a significant reduction in the Council's carbon footprint and contribute to net zero carbon. The existing

leisure centre represented around 11% of the Council's total carbon footprint. A further 2% was emitted from the housing stock.

- 71.5 Councillor Reed spoke in support of the recommendations and the business which would be generated in Cranleigh from the proposals and echoed the point made by Councillor Forszowski that the current leisure centre manager should be involved in the development of the proposals.
- 71.6 Councillor Dickson welcomed the report and congratulated the Portfolio Holder in bringing forward the recommendations. She spoke in support of the positive impact they would have on health and wellbeing in Cranleigh. However she was concerned over the cost and timeframe for delivery and suggested bringing in a third party to deliver the project.
- 71.7 Councillor Mulliner advised that the Exeter leisure centre had been opened in July 2021 and the Spelthorne centre was yet to be built, which would provide invaluable experience on which to draw upon. The £20m was an indicative cost and would become clearer. He understood that it was expected that the revenue would offset the build cost in the coming years and welcomed the centre for the residents of Cranleigh.
- 71.8 In summing up the Leader thanked the Portfolio Holders and the officer teams across the Council involved in bringing the proposals forward. He echoed some of the comments made in the debate and advised that a sustainable business plan was in place and was keen for the project to be delivered in-house. He welcomed the proposals to build a centre which was green and environmentally sustainable, but one that would also generate revenue for the Council and commended the recommendations to the Council and it was

RESOLVED that

- i. a capital budget of £19.95m be allocated to deliver a low carbon new-build Cranleigh Leisure Centre, to a minimum of Passivhaus standard;**
- ii. that officers appoint a project manager and specialist energy consultant as part of the professional technical services team, to be supported by an in-house client team and to approve an associated budget of £250,000;**
- iii. to approve a new-build leisure centre on Village Way car park, subject to planning, (Option 1, to the north of the existing centre) as the preferred location, as set out within Annexe 1 of the report; and**
- iv. to ask officers to report back to members when final costs, design, preferred contractor, and precise funding arrangements are known.**

CNL72/21 EXE 65/21 WAVERLEY BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES (Agenda item 9.4)

- 72.1 The Leader presented the report on behalf of the Portfolio Holder for Planning, which set out modifications to the pre-submission draft considered at the Special Council meeting on 22 September and proposed submission to the Secretary of State for examination. He thanked the officers involved in

delivering the draft for consideration. He reminded Councillors on the limitations placed on the Council in respect of what could be added to the Local Plan, which could not establish new policy in addition to that already established in Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1). The Leader read out a short list of corrections to the report which had been raised at the Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee the previous night. Notwithstanding the restrictions of Local Plan Part 1, he felt that the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) reflected the wishes of Waverley residents as far as possible and would ensure that the borough was protected for the future, therefore it was important to submit the Plan to the Inspector without delay. Councillor Clark duly seconded the recommendations.

- 72.2 Councillor Dear spoke on the recommendations in respect of the exclusion of the Red Court site and the choice of the Royal School site for inclusion. He referred to a discussion at a Haslemere Town Council meeting regarding restricting development on the Royal School site to the existing footprint due to it being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). However the draft Plan included proposed development beyond the existing footprint and therefore he wished to move an amendment to either remove the Royal School site from LPP2 or redraw the boundary to be in line with the decision of Haslemere Town Council. This amendment was duly seconded by Councillor Mulliner who reserved his right to speak until later in the debate.
- 72.3 The Mayor called for any speakers on the amendment. The Leader spoke in objection on the grounds that there had been a number of opportunities to raise this issue prior to the meeting and to propose this amendment at this stage was negligent. The site proposed to replace the Red Court site would deliver more housing on previously developed land, as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 72.4 Councillor Nicholson clarified the discussion which had taken place at the Haslemere Town Council meeting in respect of the site. Councillor Clark spoke against the proposed amendment and urged Councillors to vote against so as not to delay the submission of the draft Plan for one site allocation which did not sit comfortably with a small number of councillors. Councillor Liz Townsend spoke in objection to the amendment which would be contrary to the NPPF. She felt that it was important to get the best use of the land.
- 72.5 Councillor Adams spoke in support of the amendment and disagreed with the comments made by Councillor Townsend as the site was within the AONB which was under review by Natural England and he felt that the site would be rejected on that basis. Councillor Cockburn spoke in support of the amendment on the grounds that the Council had the duty to do no more harm to the AONB or the Green Belt than already exists and she felt that the inclusion of the Royal School site would cause harm. Councillor Davidson spoke in opposition to the amendment and the powers of a planning inspector to allow development in the AONB and Green Belt.
- 72.6 Councillor Mulliner spoke in support of the amendment and disputed that the entire Royal School site could be classed as previously developed land. He referred to the definition as set out in the NPPF and the advice of Surrey County Council's AONB officer in respect of safeguarding the AONB. He felt

that the inclusion of the Royal School site would not be accepted by the Inspector. At the invitation of the Mayor, Councillor Dear clarified that his amendment would represent the views of the Haslemere Town Council

- 72.7 On a point of order, the Leader sought clarification on whether the amendment would be *ultra vires*. The Head of Policy and Governance confirmed that the amendment was in order and the Borough Solicitor advised that he was of the view that it would not be *ultra vires*. The Leader requested a recorded vote on the amendment, in accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4, which was supported by five Members and that vote was lost.

For (12)

Councillors Cockburn, Deanus, Dear, David Else, Jenny Else, Goodridge, Henry, Hesse, Howard, James, Mulliner and Seaborne.

Against (26)

Councillors Adams, Baker, Beaman, Blishen, Clark, Davidson, Dickson, Follows, Forszewski, Gale, Heagin, Penny Marriott, Peter Marriott, Merryweather, Neale, Nicholson, Palmer, Reed, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, Liz Townsend, Phillip Townsend, Williams, Wilson, the Deputy Mayor Councillor Ward and the Mayor, Councillor Robini.

Abstentions (2)

Councillors D'Arcy and Ellis.

- 72.8 The Mayor asked for speakers on the substantive recommendations. Councillor Nicholson spoke briefly on sewage issues and screening. Councillor Goodridge spoke in opposition, referring to the relocation of the Royal School and the implications for traffic.
- 72.9 Councillor Forszewski spoke in support of the recommendations and the importance of approving LPP2 which would give the protection to the borough it so needed. Councillor Jenny Else spoke against the recommendations, particularly in reference to the inclusion of the Royal School site and the impact of a proposed development on that site on the waste water network. Councillor Seaborne spoke on the inclusion of the Royal School site and sought clarification on the mitigation of the loss of sports pitches.
- 72.10 Councillor Merryweather spoke in support of the recommendations and echoed comments made by Councillor Forszewski although was surprised that the debate was focussing on the Royal School site. Councillor Cockburn spoke against the recommendations. She fully supported the previous iteration of LPP2 which she had expected to be submitted earlier in the year and which she felt was sound. Cllr Cockburn expressed concern over the process for selecting the Royal School site and stressed the need for a defensible plan which worked for the whole borough and not one small part of it.
- 72.11 Councillor Beaman spoke in support of the recommendations, although expressed concern over the allocation of traveller sites which he felt were in conflict with local planning policies and would therefore abstain from voting

on that basis. Councillor Williams also spoke in support and referred to the strength of public opinion on the inclusion of the Red Court site.

- 72.12 Councillor Liz Townsend spoke in support of the recommendations and highlighted that all the comments in the debate so far were focussed on the Royal School/Red Court and was concerned that no comments had been made about any of the other site allocations. She felt that the Council should be looking at the delivery of the whole plan and stressed the importance of the recommendations being approved without delay. She had some concerns over biodiversity, but that would be looked at as part of any planning applications submitted.
- 72.13 On a point of clarification, Councillor Cockburn advised that she did not want to delay the plan any further. Councillor Wilson stressed that the protection of the Royal School site would come when it came before the planning committee and importance of approving the plan for submission without delay. Councillor Dickson echoed the comments made and felt it was essential that LPP2 be approved. She highlighted some issues in Farnham around the small list of green spaces and the Strategic Gap between Aldershot and Farnham. She also expressed concern over two fields between Badshot Lea and Farnham which were vulnerable to development that must receive protection.
- 72.14 Councillor Clark addressed the points made by the Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the pre-occupation with one particular site. He reiterated the comments made by Councillor Townsend that the Plan should be viewed as a whole and be approved without delay. Councillor Mulliner spoke in support of the recommendations as he felt that the Plan should be submitted to the Inspector without delay and welcomed the recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning to make further minor modifications the Inspector felt necessary. However he stressed that it was impossible to conduct proper scrutiny when the Overview and Scrutiny took place the day before the Council meeting. He felt that the debate had focussed on one particular site as that was the site which could jeopardise the approval of LPP2.
- 72.15 The Leader summed up and responded to some of the points raised by the councillors in relation to water and drainage, playing fields and protection of greenspaces. He spoke about the frustrations with the current planning system, in having to allocate sites which it did not own, and the restrictions placed on the Council by the Government. He advised that the owners of the Royal School site wanted to amalgamate their two sites and had begun consulting parents on this issue, with a view to redeveloping the site. Officers were confident that the Plan was sound although reminded the Council that nothing was ever guaranteed, they could only go on best efforts. He urged Councillors to vote for the Plan as he felt that a vote against or an abstention was a vote for further delay. The Leader requested a recorded vote, in accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4, which was supported by five Members and it was

RESOLVED that

- 1) The Council agrees to submit to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities the Pre-submission version of LPP2 November 2020 (Annexe 1 to this report) for examination as modified by the main modifications set out in the Addendum to the Pre-submission version of LPP2 October 2021 [set out in Annexe 2.](#)
- 2) The Council agrees that the schedule of minor modifications to the Pre-submission version of LPP2, set out in Annexe 5 to this report, be submitted to examination of LPP2 in addition to the minor modifications agreed on 22nd September 2021.
- 3) The Council requests that the Local Plan Inspector appointed to examine LPP2 considers making two further main modifications to LPP2 at the examination as set out in Annexe 6 to this report.
- 4) The Head of Planning and Economic Development be authorised to formally request that the Local Plan Examination Inspector recommends further main modifications to the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 November 2020 and the Addendum to the Pre-submission version of LPP2 October 2021, if the Inspector considers that they are necessary to make the plan sound and/or legally compliant.
- 5) The Head of Planning and Economic Development be authorised to make any other minor modifications to the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 November 2020 and the Addendum to the Pre-submission version of LPP2 October 2021 with regard to factual updates and corrections before the Plan is submitted for its examination.

For (30)

Councillors Baker, Blishen, Clark, D'Arcy, Davidson, Deanus, Dickson, Ellis, Follows, Forszewski, Gale, Heagin, Henry, Hesse, Penny Marriott, Peter Marriott, Merryweather, Mulliner, Neale, Nicholson, Palmer, Reed, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, Liz Townsend, Philip Townsend, Williams, Wilson, the Deputy Mayor Councillor Ward and the Mayor, Councillor Robini.

Against (5)

Councillors Cockburn, Dear, Jenny Else, Howard and James.

Abstentions (5)

Councillors Adams, Beaman, David Else, Goodridge and Seaborne.

CNL73/21 MINUTES OF THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE (Agenda item 10.)

73.1 It was moved by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, duly seconded by Councillor Ellis and

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 8 November 2021 be received and noted.

73.2 There were two Part I matters, for Council consideration, from the meeting on 8 November 2021.

CNL74/21 LIC 57/21 REVIEW OF WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL'S POLICY FOR THE LICENSING OF SEX ESTABLISHMENTS- FEEDBACK FROM CONSULTATION (Agenda item 10.1)

74.1 Councillor Goodridge introduced the report which set out minor revisions to the Council's Policy for the Licensing of Sexual Entertainment venues, and this was duly seconded. Councillor Wilson reminded the Council that it had a statutory duty to have this policy and review periodically.

RESOLVED that the revised Policy for the Licensing of Sexual Entertainment venues be approved.

CNL75/21 LIC 58/21 REVIEW OF WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL'S STATEMENT OF GAMBLING POLICY - FEEDBACK FROM CONSULTATION (Agenda item 10.2)

75.1 Councillor Goodridge introduced the report which set out minor revisions to the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and Principles, and this was duly seconded.

RESOLVED that the revised Statement of Licensing Policy and Principles be approved.

CNL76/21 MINUTES OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE (Agenda item 11.)

76.1 It was moved by the Chairman of the Committee, duly seconded by the Vice-Chairman and

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Audit Committee held on 8 and 29 November 2021 be received and noted.

76.2 There was one Part I matter, for Council consideration, from the meeting on 29 November 2021.

CNL77/21 AUD 101/21 AUDIT TENDER (Agenda item 11.1)

77.1 It was moved by the Chairman of the Committee, duly seconded by the Vice-Chairman and

RESOLVED that the Public Sector Audit Appointments' invitation to opt into the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023 be accepted.

CNL78/21 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BIENNIAL REPORT 2019/20 AND 2020/21 (Agenda item 12.)

78.1 Councillor Deanus presented the report which set out the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees for the period 2019-21. He thanked all the Councillors and officers involved for their work and highlighted the work of task and finish groups and call-in of contentious decisions.

RESOLVED that the Biennial report, set out at Annexe 1, on the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's work for the period 2019-2021 be received and noted.

CNL79/21 CONTINUING ABSENCE - COUNCILLOR PETER ISHERWOOD (Agenda item 13.)

RESOLVED that approval be given to the extended absence of Councillor Peter Isherwood for a further six months due to his continuing ill-health.

On behalf of the Council, the Mayor sent best wishes to Councillor Isherwood for a speedy recovery.

The meeting concluded at 9.35 pm

Mayor